

JUNG'S PSYCHOLOGY/CREATIVITY

ANIMA, ANIMUS & ANDROGYNY

Jung's psychology or depth psychology, deals naturally with the conscious mind or ego centred consciousness. However, its greatest value lies in the breadth and depth of psychic reality which is not subliminal to consciousness but a psychic reality which goes beyond the limitations of the logical mind. To be purely logical can also be very limiting. The irrational aspect, with which Jung deals so much, i.e. the collective unconscious, is from where our creativity comes, where our spontaneity comes forth. All creative people are in touch with the collective unconscious in some way. If you ask them how and why they have done something they will nearly always say they had an inspiration. That is so, it just comes. So it would seem that that which we create is already existent in the unconscious psyche.

Jung has always stressed that the psyche is real. There are so many people who have cast aside the idea of the reality of the psyche, they say it is 'only' psychological. If a thing belongs to the material world it is real, but if it belongs to the psychological it is unreal, imaginary. Hence, Jung was always emphasising that the psyche is real. It is the reality on which our lives exist. He has said, "I have in me a man a million years old" and this is true. We have the whole of the past with us, the intelligence upon which life and creation seemingly exist and to which depth analysis can lead. I say 'can' lead because many people who come into analysis only do so to get rid of a certain problem and if they get rid of that problem they are quite happy and don't want to know anything deeper. We do find with Jungian analysis that it does lead to people wanting to know much more about the meaning of life and what life is all about and the deeper aspects which lead them into many fields which they may not have gone into otherwise.

The analytical process is a matter of taking off the veils that are hiding from us our real selves. Then the truth appears as to what we really are. In Jung's book 'Memories, Dreams, Reflections' there is a picture of a hall with many doorways. All these doors are symbols of areas of ourselves we have to look at. Once we have turned those doorknobs we have discovered as it were, another world. The world of the psyche. We discover intentionality, purpose, meaning. We discover our uniqueness but a uniqueness which is contained in a oneness, because Jung always shows you that the basis of life is what he termed, after Indian philosophy, the Self. The aim of self knowledge in analysis is not to put on another veil, that of perfection.

The unconscious in Jungian terms is not an area below consciousness or below the conscious mind. The unconscious is that of which the conscious mind is unaware. Man in his formal education is educated towards ego consciousness, but not towards the collective unconscious. Therefore Jung stresses the importance of the Self because it contains not only the collective unconscious or super consciousness, but that which appears as ego conscious. Also, there seems to be a striving in man toward consciousness. I have here a quote but I don't know from where. It is, "The purpose of every cell from which we take form has within it one purpose, the development of a higher consciousness. It is as if when a child comes into the world he brings with him that life or intelligence or the stages he's gone through in becoming a human being. He is then educated to recognise the outer material world not the inner world.

One could illustrate the Self as a circle and the ego is but a spot on that circle. Jung says that the Self is as many faceted as there are egos. It is like a jewel with many facets, surrounding the pin-point of the ego is the personal unconscious. Here are the things which are forgotten and which are subliminal to consciousness. Here are also our shadow aspects along with forgotten and repressed events and those things which we don't want to know about.

You see, getting to know oneself analytically means being aware of one's own inferior side and what is more, loving it in order that it can transform. To shut it out makes it behave badly, to give it thought and love allows growth. When Jesus said "Love thy neighbour as thyself" he meant it. Jung says if you can love yourself, with all your shadow and weakness etc., then you can really love your neighbour. But let us go back to the discussion of what the unconscious is.

The thing about the personal unconscious area is that all these things could just as easily be conscious. Moving further away we get to the collective unconscious which is moving out towards the Self. That collective unconscious is the great cosmic realm, the world of archetypes that are pushing through to consciousness from that area of the collective unconscious where the archetypes exist, this is where we draw on for our creative aspects in science, art, mysticism etc. Some of the great discoveries of science have come as flashes of intuition. The scientist then sets about proving it. There is nothing that we can discover that is not already there. We don't create it, we find out about it.

There is an interesting story that Jung told about a relative of his who was a mathematician. He was working on a problem he could not solve. He had papers all over his desk and finally decided to leave it and go to bed. During the night his wife heard him going downstairs and going to investigate she realised he was sleep-walking so she followed him to the study. He sat at the desk and tore a hole in a piece of paper and placed it on top of one of the sheets of calculations. He then went back to bed. In the morning he went to the study and exclaimed that the answer to the problem was revealed in the hole in the sheet of paper on top. This illustrates how the unconscious works for us. It is always working and we can accept it although we may at times call it irrational it is sometimes very rational.

Animus and Anima

These are archetypes which have a very powerful effect on our lives if we don't understand what they are doing to us. We all have fathers and mothers. We all have male and female or masculinity and femininity within us. Within every man is Eve and within every woman is Adam. Our education leads us away from this. I think one of the important findings of Jung is that of the anima and animus. They are important and powerful in relationships especially between the sexes. When Jung first discovered them he used to speak of the unconscious soul, the unconscious psyche and he saw there was a certain movement in it in this way. He then noticed something very strange and that was that the unconscious of a woman seemed to be more masculine and the unconscious of a man seemed to be more feminine. It was from this feminine area that a man established his relationships, that is if he didn't leave them to his wife, and it was from the masculine unconscious of the woman that she drew her logic and rationality. Jung then used the latin terms 'animus' and 'anima'. In doing this he was not saying these are people, he was saying that they are conditions of the unconscious. It can and has been said of all the psychologists of our century, Jung is the one who has clearly differentiated the sexes and has thus shown that they can relate consciously and that as individuals we are both masculine and feminine.

Today, more than ever before, people are questioning the absolutism of the sexes. Men have thought of themselves as only men and women thought of themselves as only female. In fact women have thought themselves to be inferior because of it. Even Freud didn't help us there. Actually in his Tavistock Lectures he plainly states that woman is very very inferior to man. Generally these attitudes are no longer true and the fact that each human being is an androgenous being is becoming more recognised.

There is an ancient American-Indian belief that within every woman there is a man reflected and in every man there is a woman reflected. So we

can see that this is not a new idea, it is a very old one. The old alchemists thought the same. Hermes Trismegistus said "Our adamic hermaphrodite, though he appears in masculine form, nevertheless carries his eve or feminine part about with him hidden in his body."

Mercurious, an agent of transformation, is frequently depicted as the hermaphrodite, an image designed to reflect the nature of divinity which is all in one. The mythical teacher, Hermes Trismegistus, in revealing some of his secrets to Aesclepius said, "God has no name or rather he has all names since he is at once one and all. Infinitely rich with the fertility of both sexes he is continuously bringing to birth all these things which he planned to create." The young healer god, Aesclepius asked "What, you say that God has both sexes?" Trismegistus replied, "Yes, and not God alone, but all beings, animal and vegetable."

Adamic man is an archetype of the first man and Eve as the opposite as the first woman. In Persian and Talmudic mythology they speak of a two sexed being who was later separated. The anthropos, or original man, is an adamic figure. Plato's Symposium refers to the original human being as perfectly round with four arms and legs and one head with two faces which look in opposite directions. These beings had remarkable intelligence but the gods felt threatened by them and cut this spherical being in two and thus feminine and masculine emerged. As Plato expressed it, the result was that they strive to get together again. When one of them meets the actual other half of himself the pair are locked in love, in friendship and in intimacy. He then goes on to say something about them passing the rest of their lives together and never knowing the reason for being so bound.

So you see, the idea of androgyny has been expressed in mythology and even by intuitive thinkers. It was Jung who was the first empirical scientist, I think, to observe this fact in Human nature. He thus named the unconscious of

woman the animus and of man the anima. We must realise they are archetypes, they are patterns. They are foundations of a natural being even though cultural and social expectations have a tremendous effect on the way people live and the things they do, Jung saw an underlying archetypal pattern which was different for each sex.

In the ordinary course of an analysis one deals with the shadow first, that area that is around the ego. It doesn't always happen that way but it is the ideal way that one deals with one's shadow qualities because one usually comes to analysis projecting them onto other people. The shadow, although the term suggests it is darker than ego consciousness, that is not necessarily true. One often finds the gold of the personality lost in the shadow while the person has not lived his potential. In dreams then, the shadow turns up as the same sex as the dreamer. Jung once referred to the integration of the shadow as the apprentice piece of becoming whole, and the integration of the animus or the anima as the masterpiece.

As soon as one speaks of one aspect of Jungian psychology one has to touch on other areas to explain it, as it is all so enmeshed, therefore one seems to dodge about quite a lot. To speak of the anima and animus and shadow as archetypes I then have to speak a little about personification. The unconscious naturally personifies or we would not dream. We dream in images, we think a lot in images and therefore this personification is the thing that presents to us as human beings a picture that has greater and greater meaning leading outward to the symbol of the Self.

Jung always claimed that the unconscious quite naturally personifies so both these figures, the animus and the anima, which emerge as figures in dreams, are archetypes of the collective unconscious that reach our limited consciousness in a form we can understand. The closer they are to human limitation the more we see them materialistically. The more numinous figures speak more directly of their divine qualities.

If a man had no femininity within him, a physically impossible situation since only one gene different is needed to determine sex. Anyway if he had no feminine archetype within him a woman would be a complete puzzle to him, as he would have no way of understanding. So a man, when he wants to relate to a woman does it via that internal anima she helps him understand that feminine being. It is the same with the masculinity for woman, it is the animus in the woman that helps her to understand man otherwise there would be no possibility of them relating.

A man who has been cut off from his feminine side by education into a solely masculine world, finds it very difficult to understand the feminine. For instance, he would find it difficult to understand and cope with a woman weeping and would become very embarrassed and try to get away from that. But a man who has developed his feminine side could say "I can understand that." I knew a man who was a clergyman, sent out from the U.K. to a small town in W.A. in the timber forests. He had had Jungian analysis in London. He brought his English wife with him who had never left London. She behaved and dressed as she had done in London. She smoked, she wore slacks and ended up shocking the small town as none of her behaviour was acceptable to the local people who had never had any opportunity of development. They did not know how to cope with people different from themselves. While doing the work of a clergyman's wife in the village she ran into a lot of difficulties: he came home one day to find her in a terrific rage threatening to go back to London. She really got into an animus situation, she told him all his faults, not just for that moment but for the last twenty years! Her husband, because of his understanding, knew she was not talking from a balanced point, her logos and eros were not functioning together. (Eros is the principle of femininity and Logos the principle of masculinity.) He said his first reaction was to get into

a very bad mood, rush out and slam the door and fall into the anima himself. But he did not, instead he listened and realised that here was a suffering woman and he had to understand what she was going through. This was the feminine side of himself that was able to understand her, able to tolerate all that emotion.

Sometimes a man will get into an anima mood. Perhaps he's been in the office all day and things haven't gone so well and when he comes home he is no longer in a masculine world, he's in an eros world with a woman and children where what is needed is relatedness, love and understanding. This is, at times, very difficult. There is the story of the woman whose husband came home from the office one evening whilst she was getting the dinner. He came into the kitchen and sliced another piece of carrot for the stew, opened the refrigerator and complained about stale milk which should have been thrown out etc. This is negative anima behaving in an inferior feminine way. There is no logos in it, it's just an interfering aspect of relationship.

What really happens unconsciously, is that he is trying to rouse the other person. What he was trying to do was to rouse his wife into an animus mood so that she would react to this little girl who was running around the kitchen. If he can rouse that then he knows where the devil is - life has been pretty tough in the office and he's had to repress this all day but now wants to let it all out at home and if she doesn't react he has nowhere to let it out. There are two ways in which the wife can react: the first is to tell him that if he feels he can do it all better, then she'll go and put her feet up in the lounge while he carries on, or she could agree with him and not get into a mood herself. On the human condition these things have a very marked effect on our effect on each other and of course, it is not confined to within a marriage but goes on in all relationships.

The shoe can be on the other foot and she can bedevil him with animus complaints until he drops into an anima mood and animus complaints can extend back for years. Let that fellow loose and he can find a dozen things to back up any statement. It's wise never to argue with either animus or anima. The first will beat you with his air of authority and the latter with aggrieved moodiness and even refusal to speak.

I have given you a glimpse at the negative side of something that can be very positive. We have all had fathers and mothers and a woman has introjected something of the masculine, whether from father, brothers or teachers etc. They have a pattern forming impact on the unconscious. If she has had a very loving father she probably has a father complex which can be either positive or negative. I'm going to say that all writers are fathers' daughters! If one uses the animus and puts him to positive use he can become very, very creative, but if he is not put to positive use, he functions, not in a cosmic expanding way but in a very gossipy way, a half philosophical way and nothing comes out of it. You know, "Mrs. B. has left her husband." the woman says over the back fence. Just gossip. But if the animus went further and asked why is it that human beings are driven to behave like this, there would be the beginning of the cosmic wing. Of course, the mother has an effect on both male and female child, as does the father, but a woman naturally relates to her mother. She's feminine and she learns a lot from her mother and follows her in many ways, but the father comes in as a different thing. He comes back in the evening and is something magical. I can always remember my father coming home at night when I was a little child and the effect it had on me. I used to wait at the back gate for him because he seemed to bring the magic of the outer world to me. This has a tremendous effect on people. It establishes a pattern of relationship to the male and in men, the relationship to the female. On the other hand, if the relationship is too positive a child can be tied to a

parent and never move out to the opposite sex. But that is a different subject.

With regard to the animus, Jung has said, "The animus is meant to be cosmic. It is a function which should widen out the spiritual and mental possibilities into infinite space, into the infinity of the collective mind or Absolute Knowledge. Inasmuch as the animus is expanding into the great unconscious cosmos he is really in his own element where he belongs. The anima is in her right place when adding the experience of soul to man's conscious mind. She is the inspiratrix bringing cosmic soul into his life with its feeling, love and its understanding."

Let us return to the circle of the Self, the spot of the ego and the area around the ego which is the area of personification. It is here that the animus and anima appear in human clothing. By the fact that women have masculinity in the unconscious, we have certain expectations of men. A man, because he has a feminine pattern in the unconscious, he has expectations of woman. We expect a man to be this, a man expects a woman to be that and Jung says that actually when people marry, for instance, they marry back to back because they are marrying the projection. A man sees a woman, falls in love with her, she falls in love with him, but are they falling in love with the man and the woman, or are they falling in love with this projection onto them?

A projection onto someone has to have a hook. That person turns up in a woman's life who carries something of this innate pattern of what a man should be. This is why one can see women marrying men who are like their fathers and men marry women who are like their mothers. Jung says therefore they have married back to back. As life goes on the woman probably changes as she is likely to become a mother and she isn't just that magical creature that

he has seen from his own unconscious, so they turn and face each other and begin to face each others' reality. If the affection between them is real they will be able to accept the reality of the changes in each other. But some people are unable to do that. As soon as they see each other in a different role they don't want each other anymore. This is very often the reason for a marriage breakup, the partner no longer carries the ideal projection and his or her reality is disturbing because the innate pattern is stronger than the love. Or, one partner remains a child in the embrace of childhood's image. It is the man who does not grow up who is the puer eternus and the woman who doesn't grow up who is the puella eterna.

Jung divided the psyche up like this so we could understand it. Actually it is really all one. The putting of the personal unconscious 'out there' is like a play for us to see that which goes on in our own unconscious, to see our own mythology. We have to realise that the anima and the animus are not people who inhabit the psyche, they are not static. They are images, patterns leading to our own development. They are in fact, bridges to the Self and our own wholeness because they have a spiritual connotation. They are soul and provide, by their eros and logos, a balance to our conscious adaptation.

The Self is the ultimate aim of depth analysis. This way of approaching figures of the unconscious seems almost polytheistic and this is an important factor, but the figures are merely tools. If I want to build a house I need imagination, an image, a hammer and nails and wood, and then with my own labour I begin to see the finished article. So in dealing with shadow qualities, with animus and anima, we come face to face with ourselves and by dealing with their negativity or their positive aspects, because they have both, we create a healthy psyche.

For instance, a man has a wife and a family and he dreams of an extraordinarily numinous figure. If he is in analysis he could possibly accept

that this is his anima and soul image. But he is just as likely to project that image on to a real woman who can carry that numinosity. That's the story we all know. He wants to be with her, to take her to bed, in other words, he wants to drag the numinous figure of the unconscious into the world below without understanding the message that is there for his own development. There are extraordinary women who can carry that for a man and at the same time lift him. A woman either succumbs to the projection or she runs for her life as she knows she's not a goddess. It is a rare woman who is sufficiently aware to act towards that man as if to say, "Look within and you will find the numinous being that you think you find in me." It is also a rare man who can carry the spiritual projection of a woman so that she has grown from the contact. It has happened and does but mainly it has to be dealt with from within. It is at this stage for both man and woman that the question is asked, "Is this divine creature my soul image? If so, what is its meaning for me?"

The animus and the anima are bridges leading to our development if only we understand them. And as Jung said "They are in their right place when they are cosmic." On the mundane level, if they are not understood, they lead nowhere.

A woman can demand of a man that he should live out her anima image disregarding what that man's reality is and a man can demand of a woman that she should fulfil his anima image. You all know the old problem. "My mother used to do it this way so that's the way it should be done." Then when it's not done that way he gets into an anima mood and if his wife reacts in an animus way one gets into a situation one cannot solve, unless one becomes conscious.

To deal with this on a personal level and to help it lead out to its cosmic reality, if a man is in a mood it is better perhaps to lift the blind a tiny bit and let him discover it for himself. One should never pull the whole blind up on shadow anima or animus for the person would not be able to take it. It is the same for a woman. You can't argue with the animus because if the animus makes a statement and you start to argue with it, she'll bring up twenty statements to support it. They'll all have validity, but they're beside the point and it's the same with his mood, it is beside the point. The best way to deal with them is to move out and leave them to deal with themselves. Such as the woman who was so nice to the husband in his anima mood that he had to drive around the block several times before he got over it because she would not carry his projection onto her.

I shall quote a little from Dr. Lockhart's book 'Psyche Speaks'!

"I awoke from a dream speaking the last line of a poem to an unknown audience, "Where madness is psyche's only nurse." Later that day I walked along the market street in San Francisco and experienced events that were a powerful reminder of that line which haunts me still. It is my sense that the failure in modern life to nurse psyche in ourselves and in others does in fact open the door to madness, and madness itself may become nurse. The dream, the poem and the day's events have led me to work on the problem of how to nurture psychic development in our day which means how to listen to the psyche in the overlooked and under valued market street we call every day ordinary life. Jung perceived and taught that the psyche now, as in ages past, produces myth by which to portray its sufferings, its realities and its hopes. These images may correspond to ancient myths of other peoples and eras, but we need also to hear the symbolic expression of the psyche in our own times which are new or different and not contained in old stories or categories, mythological or clinical. What is the psyche trying to say to us in her new tale."

Dr. Lockhart believes the new myths have to do with eros or relatedness, with new eros forming an eros which cannot be portrayed or comprehended with old explanations, interpretations or analysis. An eros which recognises that psyche wants first and foremost to be heard, psyche is soul. The soul wants to be heard.

Hearing and telling therefore take on major importance. To hear and to tell means to keep faith with the myth inducing quality of life and the myth producing quality of the psyche. This eros also requires a re-casting of our normal distinction between inner and outer for psyche seems to be speaking from a space between these realms. One must therefore search for the links which join the inner psychic events and the outer events together as a portrayal and enactment of psyche's faithful patterns.

Jung says, and this is something that women never like, "Women are never really unconscious, except on a deeper level of the collective unconscious." In the unconscious there is the masculine logos so when the unconscious comes up it brings with it logos, so therefore she is never really unconscious. If you really look at it, a woman who is honest will say, "Well I really did know." even though she hasn't wanted to admit it.

Story about Dr. Kirsch and his anima.

Jung says further that men are not conscious which annoys women to have the consciousness of these things pushed on to them. A man's unconscious eros has no logos. His logos is in consciousness. The eros is related, it brings all things together. I have an example of this in my book 'The Old Wise Woman'. I was walking out of a shop and a woman came up to me and began to talk to me and tell me all about Charlie and what had happened. This is an example of the unbounded eros. She just related to the first person that came along and these things were on her mind so she just said them. This is

the boundlessness of eros and these are the people that are sort of all over you but there is no edge to it. This is the eros which is in the unconscious of man and therefore it is not discriminating as this woman was not discriminating. She didn't look at me and think I don't know that woman so I can't talk to her, "I'd like to tell someone about Charlie but I can't tell her."

Jung says that men can therefore be genuinely unconscious of what they are doing and this is where one can sometimes just pull the blind up a little so they can just begin to see this is what is happening. So the eternal boy and the animus and the male aspect are related and so is the eternal girl related.

We bring the whole of the past with us when we are born. We bring with us that primal intelligence of creation.

Illustration.

Then we expand again, as it were into the world below. We are captive in a human body. We have spirit, imagination, intuition and it appears that man's positive drive is to return to the primal intelligence. This is not only a mystical concept, I think it is recognised in advanced sub-atomic physics. It is the return to the unity of life. The Oneness, or the unity of all creation, appears at higher levels of consciousness. In our lower, daily levels, we appear separate and many.

Jung said, "It has been causing a lot of theological argument, that at the animus and anima stage i.e. when we deal with the personifications of the unconscious, we are polytheistic but when we realise the unity in the Self we are monotheistic. While some theologians, and there is recently a book published on it, are arguing, I see no contradiction. It is the manyness in the One. In the same way that we scientifically know that the universes are one whole though we appear separate. (Note: Henry Corbin said $1 \times 1 \times 1$ not $1 + 1 + 1$)

So regarding animus and anima, they are collective archetypes and the closer they are to the human limitation, the more we limit them materialistically. But at that level, they are the nails in our psyche house. They are not static but a bridge to the higher Self. If we let them govern us in their so-called lower state, animus opinions, anima moods, we are just standing on the bridge rather than being conducted across it. Then if you believe there is such a thing as destiny - that this is a fact of life, one can feel more dedicated to the ideal of transformation or growth.

Depth psychology, microphysics, mysticism and genuine depth astrology, all arrive at the recognition of that which transcends. So if we accept a reality higher and more refined than our physical senses perceive, in the appearance of the ephemeral world, it becomes apparent that the most important solutions, answers to everything come, not from the outer world as we know it, but from within. Then we are more interested in the growth a circumstance has provided, than the ease it gave us or the suffering.

Jung pointed out that things of which we are unconscious happen as fate. Then we don't take responsibility for them. If we become aware that we have a destiny, we are a part of the Whole, we can begin to handle that destiny. Destiny is intentionality put into our hands.

Not taking responsibility for the shadow, the animus or anima is exactly what is meant by polytheism. These images have to be understood as a purely psychological personifying of psychic content. The gods who once lived on Olympus have been internalised. Perhaps if they were still on Olympus we'd have fewer guilts and a sense of responsibility toward our own growth.

To speak mythically, we can say the gods have been internalised, not so that we can say "That was the animus or anima" and in a way shelve responsibility, but to enable us to recognise the manysidedness of ourselves. The many in the One. The One.

The animus and anima are, I emphasise again, bridges to the Wholeness. When we learn to recognise them we grow from the experience. When we are functioning properly neither animus nor anima interfere. They are in their right place as stars of our psychic cosmos.

In this talk today, there is time to go further and show that the development of a man in equilibrium with his anima and of a woman with the animus, leads to that balanced and whole personality Jung has referred to as the androgynous being.

There are really no sex and gendered stereotypes as seen by the early psychologists. The theme of yesteryear that demeaned woman and femininity as inferior, is fast being outdated. That feminine eros is inferior to masculine logos is no longer true. It never was, but culture, a polarised consciousness, gave evidence to a division of the sexes and added false values.

Those boundaries of the soul no longer exist, for man is no longer unconscious of his feminine side or the anima as he used to be. Nor is woman unconscious of the animus. Of course this does not mean that all men and women are conscious all the time of this. These images can always be projected until made really conscious. It does mean, though, that the soul, spirit etc. is urging people today to break away from stereotypes and move toward a boundless Self. People have grown tired of the gender role. As Jane Singer says, "There are intimations of the Divine Self within ourselves and the desire to experience more of this draws us forward with increasing energy and speed toward an inner unity."

All of this leads to the idea of androgyny. The androgynous being is the one of either sex who has developed both aspects, male and female and brought them into consciousness.

The new androgyny has nothing to do with the hermaphrodite in whom both sexes exist anatomically, physically. There was a period of the decadent writers, Baudelaire, Marquis de Sade, who saw only the physical aspect. They were not concerned with the possibility of a new type of psychologically developed human being in whom the sexes are not polarised.

The modern androgynous being is a purely psychological concept. In order to show you it is, and was in nature from the beginning, I will, in part, paraphrase words of wisdom from the Bio-Chemist and philosopher, Shelton Hendler:

"It is unfortunate that science has been confused with the technological feats that the century has witnessed; bombs that are capable of complete annihilation of life on this planet; devices that can invade our most intimate moments as well as things which have improved the quality of our lives."

"Science, as does mythology and religion, asks questions: Where did it all begin? And why? Scientists and makers of myth and religion are human. The question about creation is a human question. The child who asks where he came from is taking his first step into becoming a human being - later he will ask why he is here."

Cosmologists say that our universe was born some fifteen thousand million years ago, by a great explosion. They have not gone further than that 'big bang'. If you ask what existed before the big bang, no one knows, even though intuitions exist with greater discoveries in micro-physics. Some of those same scientists began to realise it had to be some kind of consciousness and that that consciousness is possibly the core of matter from which everything came.

So Hendler poses his question as to where, when and why it commenced. He takes us to the time when all the elements which now occupy the universe were formed from that first explosion at the beginning of time, and space itself was created from the original core of matter. Matter, we are going to find out in a later session, is velocity, energy and consciousness is now being added.

Hendler goes on to say, "Now the heat of that first explosion still bathes the universe. Thus an unknowable source of energy created matter, time, space and light. We could call this genesis."

The elements that are the units of matter are comprised of three basic particles: protons and neutrons, which determine their mass and electrons which determine their chemical reactivity. Scientists tell us that the primordial cosmic soup was most likely primarily neutrons. From there, amongst other things, came also hydrogen and helium. As all the particles drifted out from the 'bang' area (you know the universe is still expanding), gases and particles commenced to drift together. Further condensation formed clouds. Then came gravity and gravity caused the clouds to contract into stars which then gave rise to new elements and seed to produce new children in other parts of the universe. When the universe was ten thousand million years old, a family emerged which we call the Solar System. A sibling of this family, Earth, was born five thousand million years ago. Here it was, a child of the universe with a dense core covered with crust and water and an atmosphere of steam. About two thousand million years later, there was another explosion - the cry of life. LIFE the great mystery.

So we have come from a neutron which is two particles in one. That neutron is the archetype of androgyny; of the two in one which we all are. Of course, that first life did not walk on two legs, but it lived. Those first

organisms were single celled creatures much like bacteria. They were not organised like our cells but they lived, breathed, ate and replicated and they seemed to have some sense of awareness. They lived in water devoid of oxygen. In time they evolved into organisms that created oxygen in the water and they were stimulated to make contact with each other. They were clever little things. They intended to survive. I say intended, because there seems to be intention in all of this. They sort^d places and conditions for survival.

That very intention is probably the basis of the human mind. It was the basis of all the 'intention' we see in nature. Where there is intention there is a consciousness guiding it.

Shelton Hendler says: "In the course of the evolution of the Universe, beginning from the union of all matter, there arose an entity on this planet that began to contemplate the meaning of it all, the human mind. This event I believe to be the third major explosion in time and as significant as the origin of the universe and the origin of life. It is also as mysterious. It is exactly between the 'void' and creation of matter, between non-life and life and between no-mind and mind that the greatest mysteries are found and where most important meanings lie."

Then he adds: "It is hard for those of us who have eaten the apple of science to accept the thought that our creation was divine That this world has its reality in that consciousness. The creation of the life form we call man was not unique, but the creation of life certainly is, irrespective if life exists only on this planet or elsewhere in the universe. Man may not be a divine creature but life certainly is divine. We are really brothers and sisters not only with fellow human beings, but with all that lives, all that ever lived and all that will live. I don't find this thought disturbing nor will it deny me my specialness."

In the act of creation, whether it be of the universe or a poem, the conception of a child or the elaboration of the most profound scientific theory, there is always made the most intimate of all possible contacts between

two different entities, producing, for a fleeting moment a Blakean 'fearful symmetry'. The intense energy generated by this contact each time produces something new in the universe. In this way the long cosmic journey continues toward, I believe, the revelation of the Infinite, the Unknowable.

Integrating the qualities of the inner feminine for men and the inner masculine for women, enhances them. Who does not like a man with feeling and with Eros values, who can relate and understand? And who does not like a woman whose Logos is developed, who can discern and clarify. When those twins Logos and Eros combine in one human being, we find the individuated being in whom the qualities of masculinity and femininity interplay quite naturally. There we have the personality whose understanding and discrimination stand side by side. The new consciousness which we see emerging is androgynous in nature. This development is necessary. The rationalistic technological age has brought us many benefits, but the scientific development has outstripped the development of attributes necessary for living a balanced life. The technological age is not an age of understanding and feeling for man or animal and it is not a time when planet earth is receiving the love and care it should have. An earth, born with such great birth pains over so long a period. The earth is plundered but everywhere we hear faint cries rising up in protest. Those are the cries of Androgyny.

Jung attempted to bring us to a realisation of our place in the entire scheme of things. To quote Blake, "We begin to hold infinity in the palm of your hand, and eternity in an hour." We live in both the temporal and a-temporal world at the same time.

June Singer says, "The ego, the part of ourselves with which we consciously identify, is only one element of the psyche. The psyche, and more specifically, the centre of the totality which Jung has called the Self, is both

great and small. I am my ego. I am the Self. I am the traveller, the world is my terrain. I am the pilgrim taking faltering steps on a road that stretches backward into infinity and forward into infinity."

It was Titus Burkhardt who said when speaking of the Sufi way of thought "A rahim expresses imminent infinity. The world which seems to limit the infinite in reality only limits itself. It could not exclude the infinite which descends mysteriously into it and virtually re-absorbs it into Its Plenitude.