
The Natural Life: An Endangered Species?

Meredith Sabini

In the course of the millenia, we have succeeded not only in conquering the wild nature all around us, but in subduing our own wildness at least temporarily and up to a point.

— C. G. Jung [†]

In 1928, Jung made the following provocative remark to a dream seminar: "Matter in the wrong place is dirt. People got dirty through too much civilization. Whenever we touch nature, we get clean." You may not associate such earthy wisdom with Jung, but as early as 1912 he voiced objection to the hurried pace of modern life, the overvaluation of reason, and the loss of mythic reality. At the Polzeath seminar given in Cornwall in 1923, he named four elements that had been repressed in Western civilization. According to Barbara Hannah, Jung identified *nature* as the first of four integral parts of the psyche to have undergone the most serious repression in civilized people, the other three being animals, primal man, and creative fantasy (Hannah 1976, p. 149-52). Analytical psychology contributes well to the restoration of creative fantasy; nature, animals, and primal man await the same differentiated treatment.

In 1936, Jung made this simple and elegant diagnosis of our times: "In the last analysis, most of our difficulties come from losing contact with our instincts, with the age-old unforgotten wisdom stored up in us" (McGuire 1977, p. 89). Statements such as these, embedded in Jung's writings, speeches, letters, and interviews, function as guideposts for my own process, which spans two decades, of recovering from too much civilization and reconnecting with the primal or archaic aspect of the psyche that Jung considered our phylogenetic foundation as a species. This essay is a tribute to Jung and to the help I believe his perspective can offer us today. What follows is an attempt to showcase Jung's lesser known contributions regarding nature, instinct, tech-

nology and modern life, with only minor commentary of my own. I think you will find what he said surprisingly practical and highly relevant.

Jung's autobiography, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, opens with his earliest memory of the beauty of the natural world as seen from his pram, and closes with this reflection on life's end: "This is old age, and a limitation. Yet there is much that fills me: plants, animals, clouds, day and night, and the eternal in man." It was through his mother that a "sympathy with all things" was fostered: "She was somehow rooted in deep, invisible ground . . . connected with animals, trees, mountains, meadows, and running water. . . . This background gave me a sense of security and the conviction that there was solid ground on which one could stand" (Jung 1961, p. 90).

When Jung left the countryside to go away to the university, the contrast between nature and civilization came as a shock. In the world of his childhood:

Animals were known to sense beforehand storms and earthquakes. There were dreams which foresaw the death of certain persons, clocks which stopped at the moment of death, glasses which shattered at the critical moment. All these things had been taken for granted in the world of my childhood. And now I was apparently the only person who had ever heard of them (Ibid., p. 100).

This is a fine description of the split that exists between nature and culture, country and urban, primal and modern, a split that affects each of our lives to one degree or another.

Jung built a stone tower at Bollingen, on the edge of Lake Zurich, where, he imagined, a person from the Middle Ages would feel at home. "Silence surrounds me almost audibly, and I live 'in modest harmony with nature.' Thoughts rise to the surface which reach back into the centuries." He actually lived much as a person of the Middle Ages might:

I have done without electricity, and tend the fireplace and stove myself. Evenings, I light the old lamps. There is no running water, and I pump water from the well. I chop the wood and cook the food. These simple acts make man simple; and how difficult it is to be simple! (Ibid., p. 225-6).

At Bollingen, the separation between self and other fell away: "At times I feel as if I am spread out over the landscape and inside things, and am myself living in every tree, in the splashing of the waves, in the clouds and the animals that come and go, in the procession of the seasons" (Ibid., p. 225).

These passages sound like the confessions of a classical nature mystic, some-

thing for which Jung has been denigrated, and about which he himself was at times defensive. Perhaps with the distance of time we can redeem this soulful aspect of who Jung was, and look more closely at what he has to contribute by virtue of his own personal life experience. Here, in a paragraph that is enormously moving and poetic, Jung describes our present condition:

As scientific understanding has grown, so our world has become dehumanized. Man feels himself isolated in the cosmos, because he is no longer involved in nature. . . . Natural phenomena. . . have slowly lost their symbolic implications. Thunder is no longer the voice of an angry god, nor is lightning his avenging missile. No river contains a spirit, no tree is the life principle of a man, no snake the embodiment of wisdom, no mountain cave the home of a great demon. No voices now speak to man from stones, plants, and animals, nor does he speak to them believing they can hear. His contact with nature is gone, and with it has gone the profound emotional energy that this symbolic connection supplied (Jung 1964, p. 95).

Jung reaches out to us with the wisdom of a tribal healer, the knowledge of an historian, and the stature of an elder who recognizes our plight. As I hope to show, he helps us to understand how things got this way and what can be done to remedy them. His perspective is an evolutionary one: "In this civilizing process, we have increasingly divided our consciousness from the deeper instinctive strata of the human psyche and even ultimately from the somatic basis" (Ibid., p. 52). This is the paradox of consciousness: it is Janus-faced, involving both benefits and losses. But Jung emphasized that "Western consciousness is by no means the only kind of consciousness there is; it is historically conditioned and geographically limited" (CW 13, 84). Characterized by its upward development, it lacks a corresponding expansion downward. In a rather humorous passage, he explains the problem to Hans Carol, a geographer who interviewed Jung in 1950 for his advice on regional planning:

We keep forgetting that we are primates and that we have to make allowances for these primitive layers in our psyche . . . Individuation is not only an upward but also a downward process. Without any body, there is no mind and therefore no individuation. Our civilizing potential has led us down the wrong path (McGuire 1977, p. 202).

Imagine our political debates with the addition of an advocate for "the human primate"!

In many places, Jung used the image of a multi-storied house to describe the psyche of modern peoples, where we live only in the upper floors and have

forgotten about those beneath. "It is as if our consciousness had somehow slipped from its natural foundations and no longer knew how to get along on nature's timing" (CW 8, 802). He gives us an image of our modern self; in "The Meaning of Psychology for Modern Man," Jung imagined that this person came to him for consultation. Suffering from "the disease of knowing everything better," modern man has already tried "all the patent medicines, both good and bad, every kind of diet, and all the bits of good advice given him by all the clever people" (CW 10, 298, 300). Yet he is isolated in the cosmos and has lost his participation in natural events. I want to suggest that this image of "modern man," with the gender pronoun remaining male to signify the overly masculine orientation of modern civilization, is a component in the psyche of each of us, simply by virtue of being alive at this time and belonging to one degree or another to this civilization. This component is part of what Jungian analyst Joseph Henderson and anthropologist Edward Hall both have identified as the *cultural* unconscious.

When Jung first visited America in 1912, he commented on modern man's domination over nature: "There is no question that in America you have sacrificed many beautiful things to achieve your great cities and the domination of your wilderness. To build so great a mechanism you must have smothered many growing things." At that early date, Jung sounded a serious warning, which now seems prophetic: "America does not see that it is facing its most tragic moment: a moment in which it must make a choice to master its machines or be devoured by them" (McGuire 1977, p. 17-18). Now that the information highway has been built, 500 television channels are to be available, computer terminals and fax machines invade homes, schools, and libraries, we witness the price paid for our not having faced that moment with more consciousness of its implications.

These themes came up again when Jung was interviewed by Richard Evans in 1957 for the Houston Films. Jung was very candid: "American life is, in a subtle way, so *déraciné*, uprooted, that you must have something to compensate the earth. . . . The real, natural man is just in open rebellion against the utterly inhuman form of life. You are absolutely divorced, you know, from nature, and that accounts for the drug abuse" (Ibid., p. 335). The uprootedness of life is no longer especially subtle and by now accounts for much more than drug abuse. This was the form of compensating the earth that Jung saw: "By way of compensation for the loss of a world that pulsed with our blood and breathed with our breath, we have developed an enthusiasm for *facts*—

mountains of facts, far beyond any single individual's power to survey" (CW 11, 767). One issue of *The New York Times* apparently has more facts in it than persons during the Renaissance dealt with during their entire lifetimes.

With new telecommunication thrills, heroic modern man is less likely than ever to glance backwards. No longer respectful of the fact that we are of a species millions of years in the making, we suffer from what Jung diagnosed as a "dangerous atrophy of instinct" (See CW 12, 74, 174; CW 13, 15; CW 18, 1494-5). Jung felt that modern man did not realize "his rationality is won at the expense of his vitality" (Jung 1961, p. 245). And thus we have depression as a primary symptom of modern life, with caffeine as the socially accepted daily drug of choice. Our culture encourages the avoidance of instinctive patterns, such as at the holidays when our need to withdraw and sleep more (i.e., hibernate) is actively subverted by social pressures to be extroverted and active; the instinct then asserts itself via colds and flu, which force us to rest. Young women who are not ushered into womanhood with respectful preparation will not know there is a natural tendency toward introversion during the menses, and are more likely to suffer P.M.S. Young men who are not challenged by some strenuous ordeal as part of an initiation into manhood may attempt to initiate themselves through reckless driving or competitive bouts of drinking. Jung was vociferous about the neglect of archetypal instincts: "The facts of nature cannot in the long run be violated. Penetrating and seeping through everything like water, they will undermine any system that fails to take account of them, and sooner or later they will bring about its downfall" (CW 16, 227).

Although the passages presented here are obviously my own selection, chosen to convey ideas that I consider to be important, I think it is evident just how down-to-earth Jung's orientation was. He described each archetypal form as having an ultraviolet and an infrared end of its spectrum, one manifesting as image and mythic pattern, the other as psychophysical instinct. Jungian psychology tends to be more differentiated at the *image* end of the spectrum, with the result that it can seem abstract and ethereal. Yet Jung's own definition of archetype was wholly organic: "the roots which the psyche has sunk not only in the earth in the narrow sense, but in the world in general" (CW 10, 53). He likened them to vital organs: "Archetypes were, and still are, living forces that demand to be taken seriously . . . their violation has as its consequence the "perils of the soul" . . . behaving exactly like neglected or maltreated physical organs" (CW 9:1, 266).

Health psychology research provides an excellent example of this. Heart

attacks tend to cluster between 8 and 9 a.m. on Monday mornings, an hour that signifies the start of the work week in the dominant culture. According to another study, people are working one *month* per year more today than they did in 1965. But who would want to admit they “can’t keep up the pace”? Unable and unwilling to do so, modern man has it done for him via symptoms.

As I gathered together this material, I was struck that, over and over, Jung tried to warn people about the shadow side of “progress” and the Western heroic stance. We are familiar with his emphasis on dealing with the personal shadow, but Jung went further, alerting us to the shadow of the *cultural* unconscious. He stated very plainly: “The tempo of the development of consciousness through science and technology was too rapid and left the unconscious, which could no longer keep up with it, far behind, thereby forcing it into a defensive position which expresses itself in a universal will to destruction” (Ibid., 617). Forcing the unconscious into a defensive position is a dangerous thing to do, like trying to force a horse to proceed along a path its instincts know is too risky; it will either bolt or throw the rider. What elements of society are we forcing to carry the shadow of technological modernity?

He gave the example of an educational problem in Zurich. School teachers came to him and complained that they were unable to complete the yearly curriculum. “I told them the fault lay with the cinema, the radio, the television, and the continual swish of motor-cars and the drone of planes overhead. For these are all distractions.” He was irritated that one “cannot go into a hotel or restaurant and carry on an intelligent conversation over a meal or a cup of tea because your words are drowned out by music. . . .” He had nothing against music, but “these days one can’t get away from it.” On holiday in the Italian Alps, “when they turned on the radio in the restaurant, I got so exasperated, that I pulled out the plug” (McGuire 1977, p. 249).

Jung’s observations about the shadow of science and technology need to be more well known. He pointed out that we refuse to recognize that everything better is purchased at the price of something worse: “Reforms by advances, that is by new methods or gadgets, are of course impressive at first, but in the long run they are dubious and in any case, dearly paid for. They by no means increase the contentment or happiness of people on the whole. Mostly, they are deceptive sweetenings of existence” (Jung 1961, p. 236). How many examples of this we now see! Electric blankets were an advance that turned out to cause, through their electro-magnetic fields, increased birth defects for pregnant women. This was not learned of through adequate research or intu-

itive guesswork, but only afterwards when the maladies occurred. Car phones today may give drivers a certain additional freedom, but already we are paying the price in increased accidents. A large amount of collective denial goes into their production, sale, and use.

Here is Jung's cynical view on the contemporary compulsion to save time, taken from a 1941 interview, "Return to the Simple Life": "All time-saving devices, amongst which we must count easier means of communication and other conveniences, do not, paradoxically enough, save time but merely cram our time so full that we have no time for anything" (CW 18, 1343). What would he think today, fifty years later, of "conveniences" such as sidewalk tellers for fast money, fast food joints, overnight postal service, voice mail, fax machines, and instant credit? Complaints of people not having enough time are reaching epidemic proportions; and how ironic, as Jung implies, that this is all an artifact of the cultural fantasy of "saving time." In the rest of that passage, he tells us what the psychological consequences of this pressure will be: "Hence the breathless haste, superficiality, and nervous exhaustion with all the concomitant symptoms—craving for stimulation, impatience, irritability, vacillation, etc. Such a state may lead to all sorts of other things, but never to any increased culture of the mind and heart" (Ibid., 1343).

In 1957, a law professor wrote to ask Jung if he would lend support to a noise ordinance proposal. Jung replied that, unfortunately, he believed it could not be effective. In his explanation we find the most amazing interpretation of modern urban ills and why programs to remedy them fail:

The degenerative symptoms of urban civilization . . . have already led to a widespread though not generally conscious *fear*, which *loves noise* because it stops the fear from being heard. Noise is welcome because it stops the inner instinctive warning. . . . Noise protects us from painful reflection, it scatters our anxious dreams. . . . It relieves us of the effort to say or do anything, for the very air reverberates with the invincible power of our modernity (Adler 1975, p. 389).

If I were to choose one passage among all of his contributions in this area, it would be this one. Here, Jung acts as analyst to the culture, inviting us to look behind our symptomatology into the unconscious motivations that support it. The agony of actually experiencing the loss of tribal cultures, the degradation of the environment in so many places, the extinction of plant and animal species, and political conflicts on nightly news can indeed be overwhelming; one might want to blot out the warnings with noise. Ironically, the discovery of the

ozone hole followed this pattern. Weather-monitoring equipment picked up its existence but scientists denied the meaning of the data and brushed it aside. It took two land-based explorers using old fashioned, hand-held equipment to validate the fact.

Jung's warnings reached an epitome in this statement written near the end of his life: "It is becoming ever more obvious that it is not famine, not earthquakes, not microbes, not cancer but man himself who is man's greatest danger to man" (CW 18, 1358). He considered the psyche more basic than the atom, calling it "the world's pivot," something partly personal, partly impersonal, not limited to time and space nor to our species alone. When "modern man" operates without being connected with the rest of the psyche, the resulting imbalance disturbs the world: "The psyche not only disturbs the natural order, but, if it loses its balance, actually destroys its own creation" (CW 8, 423, 428).

This is the pivotal point in Jung's contribution, where his ideas reach a paradox concerning the importance of the individual. His plea for more cultural value given to the human psyche as stated in this next passage is very poignant:

Everything possible has been done for the outside world: science has been refined to an almost unimaginable extent, technical achievement has reached an almost uncanny degree of perfection. But what of man, who is expected to administer all these blessings in a reasonable way? He has simply been taken for granted (CW 10, 442).

In the Houston Films, Jung pointed out our culture's non-psychological bias: "Nobody would give credit to the idea that the psychic processes of the ordinary man have any importance" (McGuire 1977, 304). It was, of course the psychic processes of ordinary man that brought us, for example, the Valdez spill and Three Mile Island.

Some construe Jung's emphasis on the individual to be a continuance of Western heroism and separatism, as if Jung meant "the individual, alone." My impression is that this is not the case, but because of the avoidance of Jung's "mystical" side, the whole of his contribution here has been missed. He believed that "ultimately every individual life is at the same time the life of the species" (CW 11, 146).

Also missed are his down-to-earth practical suggestions. He told Hans Carol, "Every man should have his own plot of land so that the instincts can come to life again. To own land is important psychologically, and there is no substitute for it" (McGuire 1977, p. 202). Aside from the social issues involved

in this proposal, it does convey the value Jung placed on each person's living connection with the earth and its cycles.

Jung believed that "technology is an imbalance that begets dissatisfaction with work or with life. It estranges [man] from his natural versatility of action and thus allows many of his instincts to lie fallow." The suggestion he offered was very simple: "The remedy would presumably be to move industry out of towns, a four day week, and the rest of the time spent in agricultural work on one's own property—if such a thing could be realized" (Jung 1976a, 1405). The pace of work typifying peasant life is more in accord with natural human instinct and secures "unconscious satisfaction through its symbolic content—satisfaction which the factory worker and office employees do not know and can never enjoy" (CW 7, 428).

Jung also offered an alternative to our usual conception of progress: "Reforms by retrogressions . . . are as a rule less expensive and in addition more lasting, for they return to the simpler, tried and tested ways of the past" (Jung 1961, p. 237). An example would be returning to the rake to replace the leaf blower, a machine which has been found to impair the immune system as well as contribute to air and noise pollution. A rake is a simple and inexpensive method from the past that functions on nature's timing and does not disrupt interaction with family and neighbors.

With these examples, we again see that Jung is full of paradoxes—rather old-fashioned and yet quite modern. Would his psychology not be considered an integral part of "the new paradigm," since it is a systems approach in the broadest and deepest sense? How similar to Gaia theory is this expansive view: "And it seems to me, in one of its aspects the psyche is not individual, but is derived from the nation, from the collectivity, from humanity even. In some way or other we are part of a single all-embracing psyche" (CW 10, 175). The individual psyche is the access point each of us has to the all-embracing psyche.

Jung often quoted the Taoist story of the Rainmaker, who affected the disorder in his culture through subjective means, putting himself in order to effect order in the environment. This gives us a model for the link between the individual and history. Jung believed that "in the collective unconscious of the individual, history prepares itself; and when the archetypes are activated in a number of individuals and come to the surface, we are in the midst of history" (CW 18, 371). The women's movement, the hippie movement, the ecology movement, as well as negative events such as wars, all involve archetypal shifts that come to the surface and carry along large numbers of individuals.

With this model in mind, we can appreciate how Jung arrived at an ultimately hopeful position: "It is, however, true that much of the evil in the world comes from the fact that man is in general hopelessly unconscious, as it is also true that with increasing insight, we can combat this evil at its source in ourselves" (CW 10, 166). Of course, it is more comfortable to assume that "modern man" who is harming the earth is that logger with a chainsaw, or the CEO of a polluting corporation, or that person using a leaf blower. How much less comfortable it is to enter into an on-going dialogue with modern man as a living component of our own psyche and keep track of its denial, its rationalizations, its manic defenses. Through this subjective effort to transform modern man in our own psyches, we may, like the Rainmaker, be able to affect the morphogenic field of our endangered species and live up to its designation, *Homo sapiens sapiens*.

Through the individual psyche we also have access to a component Jung identified as "archaic man," which I feel is the crucial counterpoint to modern man. The split between these two aspects is a central theme in Jung's work. In his essay "Archaic Man," reprinted in the popular paperback *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, Jung informs us that "every civilized human being, whatever his conscious development, is still an archaic man at the deeper levels of his psyche" (Jung 1933, p. 126; CW 10, 105). This may not seem good news to those who wish to keep distance from our primate and primal history. But Jung is enormously fair to both modern and archaic man, showing the advantages and disadvantages of each. "Nothing goes to show that primitive man* thinks, feels, or perceives in a way that differs fundamentally from ours. His psychic functioning is essentially the same—only his primary assumptions are different" (Jung 1933, p. 129; CW 10, 111). We might say that a house burned down because lightning struck it; primitive man might say a sorcerer used the lightning to set fire to that particular house. Neither view is more logical or illogical than the other, simply different.

Living closer to the phylogenetic instincts, archaic man tends to be more conservative. "When an ancient Roman stumbled on the threshold as he left his house, he gave up his plans for the day. This seems to us senseless, but . . . such an omen inclines one at least to be cautious" (Jung 1933, p. 138; CW 10, 125). Were we to not override our conservative instincts but permit non-

*About this word Jung said, "I use the term primitive in the sense of "primordial," and . . . I do not imply any kind of value judgment" (Jung CW 8, 218).

rational data into our personal and societal decision-making, we might not have opted to heat ourselves with electrical current next to the skin; we might not drive a metal vehicle at 65 miles per hour while talking on a telephone; we might rebel at having pesticides in our food and smog in our air. The irony is that archaic man may be the best supporter of “saving the earth,” since this component of our human nature does not need a huge influx of facts and information to know that it is dangerous to have water tainted and mountains deforested.

Jung told the story of his only experience of an earthquake; he responded to the surprise and mystery of this drama of nature as archaic man might: “I once experienced a violent earthquake, and my first, immediate feeling was that I no longer stood on solid and familiar earth, but on the skin of a gigantic animal that was heaving under my feet. It was this image that impressed itself on me, not the physical fact” (CW 8, 331). He emphasizes mythic reality, beside which a physical explanation pales.

The popularity of Joseph Campbell’s television series on myth attests to our hunger for “emotional participation in natural events.” The current attraction to tribal practices—drumming rituals, vision quests, medicine wheels—also testifies to our desire to reconnect with the archaic or phylogenetic foundation of the psyche, the age-old unforgotten wisdom stored up in us. If trends among youth and artists indicate what is emerging from the cultural unconscious, then body decoration and piercing are symptomatic of the return of the culturally repressed. The newly emerging field known as evolutionary psychiatry (which seems not to have noticed Jung’s contribution in this area) is another sign of this shift. I am hopeful that with the kind of inspiration and guidance Jung offers through his own personal example, we may be able to reconnect with this aspect more consciously, and not have to enact the search via imitation of indigenous cultures or theft of their spiritual practices. Much as Jung was “first to laud those doctors in the tropics who risked their lives, and frequently lost them, on lonely outposts,” he ultimately questioned abandoning the *cura animarum* in Europe to become white saviours to the natives: “Should we all, following Schweitzer’s banner, emigrate to Africa and cure native diseases when our own *sickness of soul* cries to heaven?” (Adler 1975, p. 141).

Jung cautioned that modern man “needs to return, not to Nature in the manner of Rousseau, but to his own nature. His task is to find the natural man again” (CW 11, 868). He knew that “people go to the woods and mountains nowadays in order to become unconscious; it is a great relief to identify with nature after the strains of conscious city living. But it may be overdone and have

a bad effect, it may make people too primitive" (Jung 1976b, p. 221).

So what are we to do? Jung tells modern man, "Go to bed. Think on your problem. See what you dream. Perhaps the Great Man, the 2,000,000 year old man, will speak. Only in a cul-de-sac do you hear his voice" (McGuire 1977, p. 359). But he knew modern man would reply:

What can a dream do . . . in a world brimful of overpowering realities? Realities must be countered with other equally palpable realities, and not with dreams. . . . You cannot build a house with dreams, or pay taxes, or win battles, or overcome the world crisis (Jung 1970, 313).

But Jung's wisdom prevails: "What would be more natural, when we have lost ourselves amid the endless particulars and isolated details of the world's surface, than to knock at the door of dreams and inquire of them the bearings which would bring us closer to the basic facts of human existence?" (Ibid., 305). Our phylogenetic heritage presents itself to us in dreams: in images of animals that are caged, hungry, neglected or wounded; of tribal people teaching us to make music; of border crossings; of ancient caves, caverns, and subfloors dark and dank with disuse. Figures that we label as "shadow" because of their dark appearance may harken back to our primal origins in Africa.

Jung believed that if we could retain our current level of conscious development and add to it a connection with the archaic or primal self, we would be achieving a unique evolutionary advance. His final work, written just before his death in 1961 and published as *Man and His Symbols*, contains this encouraging passage: "The symbol-producing function of our dreams is an attempt to bring our original mind back to consciousness, where it has never been before. . . . We *have been* that mind, but we have never *known it*" (CW 18, 591). Dreams function as the bridge between the conscious, modern self and the phylogenetic layer of the archaic self. The connection is direct and explicit:

The evolutionary stratification of the psyche is more clearly discernible in the dream than in the conscious mind. In the dream, the psyche speaks in images, and gives expression to instincts, which derive from the most primitive levels of nature. Therefore, through the assimilation of unconscious contents, the momentary life of consciousness can once more be brought into harmony with the law of nature from which it all too easily departs, and the [individual] can be led back to the natural law of his own being (CW 16, 351).

Efforts to deal with the global extinctions and environmental degradation are unfortunately influenced by the dominant archetype of the hero and by

pragmatic and rationalistic ideals. As Jung poignantly noted, "There is no legitimate place in our world for invisible, arbitrary, and so-called supernatural forces" (Jung 1933, p. 130; CW 10, 113). I hope that with this presentation of his contributions, interest in reading Jung with new eyes will be sparked. For his definition of nature is inclusive rather than exclusive, not limited to the earth in the narrow sense: "Our psyche is part of nature, and its enigma is as limitless. Thus we cannot define either psyche or nature. We can merely state what we believe them to be and describe, as best we can, how they function" (Jung 1964, p. 23).

He did not, in contrast to the popular impression, over-emphasize the individual or inwardness, but invited us to hold the paradox that "a new thing never came exclusively either from within or from without. If it came from outside, it became a profound inner experience; if it came from inside, it became an outer happening. In no case was it conjured into existence intentionally or by conscious willing, but rather seemed to be borne along on the stream of time" (CW 13, 18). This respect for inner and outer enables us to be cognizant of the synchronicity between the near-extinction of our human instincts and the extinction of plant and animal species.

Do we have to come right up to the possibility of human extinction in order to take ourselves more seriously, and care for ourselves as a species? Jung closed his essay "The Spiritual Problem of Modern Man" with Holderlin's famous line from *Patmos* "Danger itself fosters the rescuing power." We are in that situation of danger, and the rescuing power of the objective psyche seems to be present also.

We can expect a return of the repressed on the cultural level, just as we do on the personal. The four integral parts of human nature most seriously repressed in civilized people—nature, animals, primal man, and creative fantasy—are certainly making an energetic effort to return. Our efforts to integrate them into conscious modern life is challenging to say the least. I have found my own efforts to understand this process and live through it aided on a daily basis by Jung's wisdom. Whichever of these aspects calls to you, I hope you find something here that facilitates your endeavor.

The natural life is the nourishing soil of the soul.

— C. G. Jung ^{††}

NOTES

† (*CW* 8, 87) †† (*Ibid.*, 800)

REFERENCES

- Adler, Gerhard. (1975). *C. G. Jung Letters: 1951-1961*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hannah, Barbara. (1976). *Jung: His Life and Work*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Jaffe, Aneila. (1979). *C. G. Jung: Word and Image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1933). *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- _____. (1953). *Psychology and Alchemy*. *Collected Works* 12. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- _____. (1959). *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious*. *Collected Works* 9:1. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- _____. (1960). *Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*. *Collected Works* 8. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- _____. (1961). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. New York: Random House.
- _____. (1964). *Man and His Symbols*. New York: Doubleday & Co.
- _____. (1966a). *The Practice of Psychotherapy*. *Collected Works* 16. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- _____. (1966b). *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*. *Collected Works* 7. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- _____. (1967). *Alchemical Studies*. *Collected Works* 13. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- _____. (1969). *Psychology and Religion: West and East*. *Collected Works* II. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- _____. (1970). *Civilization in Transition*. *Collected Works* 10. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- _____. (1976a). *The Symbolic Life*. *Collected Works* 18. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- _____. (1976b). *The Vision Seminars. Book One*. New York: Spring Publications.
- McGuire, William, and R. F. C. Hull. (1977). *C. G. Jung Speaking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Meredith Sabini, Ph.D., has a blended career as a licensed clinical psychologist, dream consultant, researcher, poet, and writer. She lives and practices in Berkeley, CA. With friends, she is restoring a dilapidated mineral spring in a wilderness area of the Napa valley, in concert with restoring her Amish heritage.