

# INDIVIDUATION AND THE INDIVIDUATION PROCESS

RUNNING HEAD: Individuation

David Johnston

## ABSTRACT

In this essay I discuss the significance of both individuation and what Jung refers to as the individuation process. Individuation is the natural fulfillment of life which, in some cases, can be perverted. I turn to several psychologists, both developmental and individual, for thoughtful observations on how lives can find fulfillment and individuate in the normal way. I also compare the theoretical edifice of these psychologies with Jung's views in order to emphasize the difference between them and, consequently, to highlight what Jung means by the individuation process. Essentially it refers to conscious individuation and ultimately involves a process whereby the teleology of the Self super-seeds the telos of nature, while embracing and transforming it.

## INDIVIDUATION AND THE INDIVIDUATION PROCESS

### Introduction

C. G. Jung refers to the first intense part of the conscious individuation process as an “auseinander-setzung mit der unbewusstsein” which roughly translates into English as “having it out with the unconscious.” This process involves becoming more conscious of disparate aspects of one’s being including shadow qualities and all the four functions of consciousness, thinking, feeling, Intuition and sensation, along with the two attitudes, extraversion and introversion. It leads to a relative degree of wholeness, at which time the Self, that is to say one’s inner centre of being, begins to direct one’s life. Having it out with the unconscious involves engaging in an intense dialogue with the unconscious as well as taking ethical decisions in life based on the insights gained.

With the decree of Grace [the Divine Mother] this effort leads to an inner marriage between the conscious will and the demands of the unconscious, which is to say, ultimately the Self. In the process, the ego-Self axis shifts from ego dominance to the dominance of the Self. Not only can the Self be defined as one’s inner centre but also a super-ordinate centre of being as well as one’s wholeness, which includes both the conscious and the unconscious, the Self and nature. In contrast, the ego, despite its pretentious claims to power, can be defined as only the centre of awareness, the field for which contains contents of the psyche that have been consciously differentiated. Although it has to give up its claim to power the ego has an important, even decisive,

role to play in orchestrating a dialogue with the unconscious. This eventually results in the ego, along with a more individuated psyche, becoming an instrument of a super-ordinate Self.

### Individuation

From the extraverted point of view and the ego's perspective, individuation is simply the developmental unfolding of the psyche over the course of a lifetime. From Jung's perspective, the conscious personality emerges from the unconscious like a flower from the earth. Ultimately, his model of the psyche is profoundly Self-oriented where one can potentially enter into a dialogue with the Self. The life-cycle, according to him, is like the described arc of the sun from its rising to its setting. It includes several points of transition: birth, childhood, young adulthood, adulthood, mid-life transition, old age and death. Jung's most important contribution to psychology is his description of conscious individuation in the second half of life in cases where the ego consciously participates in its unfolding. Individuation then becomes what he referred to as the individuation process, potentially resulting in a profound transformation of being.

In Jung's writings there is little emphasis placed on development during the first half of life. Nor is there any emphasis placed on what might be called normative development during the second half of life, that is to say when the individual makes little or no effort to engage in a dialogue with the unconscious. To fill in this lacuna I turn to three developmental psychologists, Eric Erickson, Ronald Kegan and Daniel Levinson, and briefly examine their thinking on the nature of individuation. I then examine the writings of several different individual psychologists, Maslow, Adler, Fromm, May and Rogers

and their basic understanding of individuation. By making these comparisons I intend to define and differentiate more clearly what Jung means by individuation and the individuation process from the view held by other thoughtful psychologists. At the same time I present different perspectives on natural individuation and its enhancement.

It goes without saying that such a cursory examination of the different approaches to psychology as presented here leaves much to be desired. There will be many lacunae. Nonetheless, I believe that this brief study serves the purpose of differentiating between individuation as a natural phenomenon and the individuation process as described by Jung. That is my sole intention.

#### Erikson, Kegan, Levinson and Developmental Individuation

Erikson (1985) and Kegan (1982) describe, each from his own theoretical perspective, the life cycle from childhood to adulthood. Erikson also describes a further stage, old age. Levinson (1978) puts the main emphasis on adult development. All three psychologists take a basically ego-oriented approach with emphasis on the developmental growth of the self, that is to say sense of individual and social identity and meaning.

Erikson (1985) sees development as an epigenetic unfolding of the psyche, which is formed through its encounters with socio-environmental forces, particularly at eight age-related points of crisis or turning points. For healthy psychological development the

individual must learn the lesson of each stage, failing which there is a knot in the maturing process that perversely affects all the later stages of growth. According to Erikson, the developmental knot can be resolved at a later date.

Kegan (1982) sees the psyche as an organic system that evolves through regular periods of stability and change in a spiral fashion. Taking a more introverted and Logos oriented approach than most life-span psychologists including Erikson, Kegan refers to the process as “evolution of meaning” rather than ego development. He emphasizes the ego’s existential perception of the world and its way of “making meaning.” With psychological maturity, he observes, one’s cognitive perception widens along with moral development.

Levinson (1978) contends that during the adult years the life structure evolves in a relatively ordered sequence, which consists of a series of alternating stable and transitional periods. The primary task of the stable periods, which lasts six to seven years, he believes, is to build a stable life-structure by making appropriate key choices. The primary task of the transitional periods is to reappraise the existing structure, to explore various possibilities and to move towards commitments that form the basis of a satisfying new life-structure. Failure to adequately pass through any given period, stable or transitional, according to Levinson’s admittedly limited research, seems to have a deleterious effect on future development judged by success in one’s chosen profession and relationships.

According to Erikson, healthy psychological development culminates in old age with the realization of a fulfilled life and a sense of integrity. When this is not the case, one's remaining days, he believes, are spent in despair. Although seldom realized, moral development in Kegan's view culminates with personal morality and integrity that goes beyond institutional values to the realization of differentiated personal values and self-referral. Levinson actually refers to Jung's injunction that in the second half of life the task is to integrate aspects of the contra-sexual psyche, the anima for men and the animus for woman, and to come to some realization of the Self. His descriptive studies, however, give no evidence of this happening except in the most superficial way.

#### Differentiating the Individuation Process from Natural Individuation

Overall, then, our three developmental psychologists have some understanding of how life is usually fulfilled, with some sense of how it can more fully realized in what might be referred to as in the normal fashion. There is here individuation but not what Jung calls the individuation process with its demands for intense conscious participation and the assimilation of one's personal relationship to the archetypes of the collective unconscious as well as the Self. In order to differentiate the nature of the individuation process according to Jung, I now compare and contrast his understanding with several other psychologists, namely Maslow, Adler, Fromm Rogers and May. I have often been told by intelligent people that they are all talking about the same thing from different perspectives. For the discriminating mind this, of course, will not do. What can be asserted is that they do present interesting insights on healthy natural individuation.

Maslow.

Inasmuch as a life form, whether human or otherwise, fulfills its destiny in the way that an acorn becomes an oak tree, according to Jung, there is individuation. Individuation refers to the fulfillment of the *telos* of nature, whereas the individuation process ultimately involves the teleological unfolding of the Self that, however, embraces nature and transforms nature. The individuation process for Jung involves conscious participation in this unfolding, radically changing the outcome and ultimately leading to a far-reaching transformation of personality by way of the Self. The goal of the individuation process is wholeness and conscious realization of the Self in life.

In contrast, Abraham Maslow (1985) understands individuation to be a peculiarly human phenomenon and psychological development as a potentially progressive movement upwards through a hierarchy of needs culminating in the need for self-actualization. Moreover, although theoretically anyone in any walk of life can self-actualize, he does concede that some people may be in lousy jobs which are not conducive to self-actualization. Maslow's examples of self-actualizers are historical and contemporary creative people, professionals and business executives, a limited group that excludes a wide swath of life. His assertion that self-actualizers successfully resist the need for enculturation is highly suspicious given the latter two examples. Professionals and business executives, in my opinion, are right in the midst of contemporary culture and one way or other need to be involved in the enculturation process even if it is only at the level of the persona. I would also add that, from a Jungian perspective, the job itself is



not the determinant of whether one is consciously individuating or not; it is simply indicative of where one is psychologically and what needs to become more conscious.

Maslow classifies the lower level needs as deficiency needs. He considers them to be instinctual and more powerful than what he called higher level or instinctoid needs. These higher level needs are Being and Growth needs and exert a weaker pull. Thus, if a lower level need is no longer being satisfied, he asserts, it can consume all one's energy and divert one's attention away from the need for self-actualization. Jung's conception of individuation and the individuation process is much more all-embracing and one's energy goes where there is a need to become more conscious, whether it be up, down, or away from any such hierarchy as expounded by Maslow. In fact, the individuation process eventually involves a considerable amount of descent of consciousness and the need for lower levels of the psyche to be lit up with consciousness. Maslow obliquely recognizes something of this possibility, inasmuch as he admitted that there were exceptions and that some people lived with a different order of motivation than is indicated by this hierarchy.

The Being needs which motivate self-actualizers, according to Maslow, include Truth, Love, Goodness, Beauty, Unity, Uniqueness, etc. Maslow also postulates the existence of another order of needs, which begin with the need to know and culminates in the need to understand. Finally, he eventually distinguished between what he refers to as "peakers", self-actualizers who often have "peak experiences" and the more down-to-

earth “non-peaker”, self-actualizers who have such experiences significantly less often, if at all.

“Peakers” experiences seem to be of a different order than the “non-peaker” and can be described as spiritual, religious, ecstatic or numinous, etc. In fact, Maslow’s comments regarding peak experiences betray some confusion in his mind on what is involved. His encouragement, for instance, for people to strive after such experiences and feeling “larger, greater, bigger, stronger, taller, etc.” after having them is inducement for inflation of the ego (p. 62, 63). Moreover, his very dichotomy between “peakers” and “non-peakers” indicates a split in Maslow’s conception of the psyche, which one does not find in Jung. Conscious individuation periodically involves numinous experiences of the Self which, however, are not sought after. There is no question of that being reserved for a special kind of individuation or person who is individuating. It is rather a question of finding one’s unique Self and living more humbly, more fully.

In keeping with his hierarchical view of the psyche, according to Maslow, any experience of real excellence or real perfection, or any movement towards perfect justice or any other perfect value tends to produce a peak experience. Jung abhors the idea of seeking excellence or perfection, as he put more emphasis on wholeness and becoming more conscious of the darkness within, that is to say the inferior side of one’s nature including the shadow side of the Self. According to him, seeking perfection in an imperfect world leads to one-sidedness that is blind to subtly, nuance, shadow and evil. In contrast to Maslow’s conception of a self-actualized individual, Jung’s image of an

individuated person would be somebody like Job who discovered to his grief that a stronger will than his own often crossed his path.

Maslow's conception of self-actualization seems, in some ways, to be similar to Alfred Adler's "(1956, 1979) striving for superiority", along with an attempt to integrate the fact that some people live otherworldly, God-oriented lives. His frequent and tiresome conjecturing lead me to believe that he was an introverted thinker open to an intellectual and spiritual world of ideas, which he had difficulty in knowing how to realize. So it is not surprising that Maslow had a relatively naïve idea of human nature, which he conceived as inherently good. His strong belief in free will and that everyone can consciously choose to self-actualize contradicts experience. It probably results from his undervaluation of the unconscious and his real lack of understanding of the numinous and the Self.

#### Adler.

Alfred Adler's (1956, 1979) superior or individuated person has a healthy life style, which has been gained pre-eminently through a positive relationship to power, as expressed through work, love and friendship, as well as social interest. An individual's striving for perfection, that is to say will to power, is based on primordial feelings of inferiority, which must be overcome through courage. Adler regarded individuals as being self-consistent unities in every expression of their personality. Thus, each individual has a subjective fictive goal and related life style around which all decisions are based. The fictive goal

motivates people “as if” it were real, resulting in a unique life style. A healthy fictive goal, Adler initially believed, involves both a positive relationship to the will-to power and social interest.

Adler’s understanding of teleology is based on life being creative and purposive in the sense that it is fulfilled through adaptive adjustments to the demands of one’s worldly potential and social interest. His approach to psychology has been called soft determinism given his belief that individuals are not simply passive objects helplessly subjected to environmental forces but that one’s subjective values, attitude and behaviour are decisive in determining one’s life-style. In Aristotelian terms the individual human being is causes finales.

The principal influences on Adler include Darwin [survival of the fittest], Nietzsche [will to power], Marx [social interest], Kant [the subjective nature of the mind] and Vahinger [“as if” and the fictive goal]. With time, social interest became more important than striving for perfection or significance [will to power] as an indicator of a healthy life-style, although at the beginning it was seen as only needing to be a moderating influence. It is important to remember that, according to Adler, striving for perfection is always based on feelings of inferiority. Feeling too perfect, having a superiority complex or striving for personal power is, from his point of view, the result of a mistaken life-style and a fundamental inferiority complex.

In fact, eventually Adler stopped using the expression “striving for power” because he found that it gave the wrong impression and, in its place, he used the expression “overcoming.” He believes that what was necessary for a healthy life-style was for individuals to compensate for feelings of inferiority by courageously overcoming any obstacles that deter them from adequately fulfilling the three life tasks of realizing love, work and friendship. But in order to avoid having a tight-bound little ego, these three tasks of life need to be based not only on common sense but social interest sub species aeternitas.

Adler shows relatively little interest in the unconscious, preferring to concentrate on conscious perceptions, attitudes and values. It is noteworthy that he felt the need to adjust his conception of a healthy life-style from one emphasizing the will to perfection to one where social interest became more dominant and that, according to Adler, the individual always strives from a feeling of inferiority. Adler’s inferiority feeling would have something in common with Jung’s concept of the personal shadow, at least an aspect of it. It would, in particular, be related to the experience of introverts confronting their shadow in a highly organized world based on extraverted values and attitudes.

Adler’s formula for an improved life-style based on courageous overcoming appears to fit the needs of some, more introverted people and would lead to the integration of some shadow qualities. Jung’s understanding of the nature of the shadow, however, is far more varied and the life direction required for its integration differs considerably depending on whether one is basically introverted or extraverted, and which functions of

consciousness, sensation, intuition, feeling or thinking are conscious and which are inferior. According to him, the shadow ultimately has archetypal roots, which is to say it is based on a universal principle beyond the ego. A major aspect of the individuation process is to gain a more conscious and differentiated relationship to it through a dialogue with the unconscious rather than a formula, however enlightened, as proposed by Adler.

Adler's recognition of the need for social interest, that is to say community feeling, points to another aspect of the personal shadow, especially for the introvert who tends, by natural inclinations, to be self-involved. However superficially, it is an acknowledgement of the need for what Jung referred to as Eros. Jung's understanding of Eros, however, goes considerably deeper, and includes feelings of both love and hate and means being related to inner thoughts, feelings, intuitions and sensations as well as outwardly to people and to the community. Most importantly, Eros ultimately allows one to be related to both the archetypes and the spiritual and apprehending mode of being, and the instincts or the intelligent [conscious] and dynamic mode of being. It ultimately means being related to the Self, where one's individual Self is the Self of all.

Regarding the individual as causes finales, Jung's position is similar to that of Adler in that one must make decisions "as if" there is free will at the level of the ego. In fact, practically speaking, the ego has access to a certain amount of disposable energy. However, ultimately, Jung described free will as doing willingly what destiny requires as

the telos of nature is embraced yet super-seeded and transformed by the teleology of the Self. The alchemical saying that the realized person is “tied to the stone, most bound, most free,” illustrates rather graphically that true freedom comes only from one’s relationship to the Self, and yet that there is a determinism in nature. Indeed, there are different levels of determinism, depending on the completeness of one’s relationship to the Self and how much one is driven by a complex. Along with Jung’s concept of synchronicity, that is to say meaningful coincidences, his understanding of free will points to a profound and paradoxical understanding of the nature of the psyche and reality. Only with awareness of a constellated archetype in one’s life, for example, through dreams, visions and synchronistic experiences, can something of freedom beyond the statistical probability of determinism be consciously experienced and meaningfully integrated.

### Fromm.

More complex and intellectually satisfying than either Maslow or Adler is Erich Fromm (1955,1965,1975), whose understanding of human nature appears to come closer to Jung’s, although his orientation still does not go beyond the ego. His emphasis lies on the socio-historical forces that have a determining effect on one’s psyche, and which he analysis extensively. Realized individuals for Fromm become aware of the impact of these forces on their psyche and through the light of reason and ethical conduct relativize their influences, allowing them to become a “productive person.” Fromm is a post-Freudian and the emphasis on the arbitrating voice of reason is the result of his

master's influence, while his concern about freeing oneself from socio-historical determinisms is due to a Marxian influence.

Although Fromm and Jung cover some of the same ground, there are essential differences between them and their perspectives differ widely. Jung gives considerable importance to the collective unconscious and archetypal influences on the psyche, which come from within as well as from without. Fromm, in contrast, principally stresses the external expression of the archetype as experienced through social-historical determinisms. In particular, he points to contemporary social patterns, which he finds defective and conducive to a neurotic life, from which one needs to gain freedom. Personal freedom, according to Fromm, comes by overcoming a regressive pull back to the mother and the tendency to function in automaton conformity and, more positively, by finding a spontaneous relationship to work, love and expression at all levels of being, emotional, sensual, and intellectual.

Reason for Fromm becomes considerably broadened through what can be considered psychological introspection and philosophic enquiry. Despite the fact that his understanding of reason goes well beyond Freud and many other contemporary psychologists, it cannot on its own cope with the eruptive influences of the archetypes of the collective unconscious which inevitably confronts one during the individuation process as understood by Jung. Although Jung does not underrate the value of enlightened reason according to him, along with the help of the ego, only the Self, the creative and ordering centre of being and wholeness, can ultimately assimilate these



influences, which it paradoxically actually initiates. True freedom for Jung depends on one's degree of relatedness to the Self and the infinite, something about which Fromm does not seem to be particularly concerned.

### May.

Rollo May's (1953, 1985, 1991) understanding of individuation and the individuation process is particularly noteworthy. Of all the approaches to psychology being discussed here, his appears to come closest to Jung's. May's approach to psychology is existential in the broadest terms, where he defines Existentialism as being centered in the existential individual, with emphasis on the emerging, becoming person. Realized individuals, according to May, have been able to affirm their being in the world, where being is defined as the individual's unique pattern of potentials that emerge in the process of becoming. This process of becoming comes with a sense of the tragic as the individual must face the anxiety of the possibility of non-being destroying being, which is to say that one does not realize one's unique pattern of potentials.

Realized individuals have the existential courage to affirm and be themselves. They are able, wrote May, to realistically deal with all the forces that enter their reality that come from either the environment or the unconscious. Such individuals are capable of making active, responsible decisions and commitments and come to terms with their destiny with all its limitations. According to May, they not only have the *courage to be*

but also the *courage to create*, where creativity is not only meant in the broadest sense of the word, but where it goes beyond determinism.

May delineates a position that at first glance appears to be similar to Jung's. Yet he isn't a Jungian and only gives passing reference to him. His philosophy of life seems to be based on his own experiences of anxiety over non-being as well as his observation of struggling neurotic patients who have similar experiences of anxiety. He has also been influenced by existentialist philosophy and theology, particularly Nietzsche, Kierkegaard and Tillich. In his appreciation of the demonic and tragic he has been influenced by Freud.

Although in his book, The Cry for myth, May does illustrate a literary understanding of the role of archetypal patterns behind life and acknowledges Jung's pioneering work in this regard, there is little or no recognition of the collective unconscious *per se* and the objective psyche. Nor do I sense a deep and continuing dialogue with it that Jung experienced, and that anyone consciously participating in the individuation process experiences to some degree. Although May acknowledged the importance of a creative factor beyond determinism, there does not seem to be any understanding of the role of archetypes, and especially the Self as the creative ordering principle beyond the ego. In fact, according to Jung, when confronted with an insoluble problem in life, there is a need to appeal to the Self, as transcendent function, which reconciles both conscious and unconscious factors, thus providing a creative answer to the dilemma.

It would not be fair to criticize May's approach to psychology as being too intellectualist; he writes phenomenologically and there is far more to it than that. He writes sincerely from the perspective of a wide introverted intuitive intellect. I would rather charge May with not going quite far enough. He developed a philosophically inclined understanding of life and it appears to reflect his own coming to terms with life that, as a psychologist and teacher, he imparted to others. Like Jung he put primary emphasis on the need for the development of consciousness in order for personality transformation to occur.

Nonetheless, there is no conceptual recognition of the world, both inner and outer, as a unus mundus, which is to say one world that can be experienced by way of synchronistic events. It is through experiences of synchronicity that one can begin to see and experience life as potentially symbolic and creative beyond determinism. Compared to Jung, May seems to put more emphasis on the decisive role of conscious decision making and the will-to-act, in combination with love, and less on the unconscious *per se*. Although not unimportant for Jung, according to him, with conscious individuation the personal will becomes relativised as another will takes over and the ego-Self axis dramatically shifts from the ego to the Self.

### Rogers.

Despite his immense current popularity, I find Carl Rogers' (1961) approach to psychology intellectually unsatisfying, although perhaps it does have some appeal to the feeling side of one's nature. Rogers assumes that people are conscious rational

beings neither overly influenced by past events [as Freud believed] nor unconscious forces [as both Jung and Freud believed]. He postulates the existence of a self or self-concept which is defined by the words “I,” “me,” and “myself,” as well as an ideal self, which is a picture of what a person should be and consciously might like to become. The self, according to Rogers, is an organized and consistent conceptual gestalt which is composed of perceptions on the characteristics of the “I” and “me,” as well as perceptions on the characteristics of the “I” and “me” in relationship to others and to all relevant aspects of life, along with the values attached to these perceptions.

Rogers’ self or sense of identity sounds like the ego and its field of conscious awareness with emphasis on the perceptive functions of sensation and perhaps intuition along with the feeling function, as defined by Jung. Although Rogers defines the self as an organized whole it should not be confused with Jung’s conception of the Self, an individual’s wholeness, which consists of both conscious factors and the unconscious. Indeed, regardless of how much of the Self becomes assimilated to consciousness during the individuation process, there is infinitely more that remains unconscious.

Rogers also developed what in many ways is a differentiation of Freud’s superego in a concept he referred to as “conditions of worth.” According to him, it derives from one’s relationship and experience while growing up with what he called “positive regard,” which includes acceptance, love and approval from others. When given unconditionally Rogers called it “unconditional positive regard,” whereas when it is given with only

approved behaviour, he referred to it as “conditional positive regard” believing that it teaches children that affection and approval are conditional on how they behave.

Children, he believes, eventually introject the “positive regard” and associated values. If it be “unconditional” they develop a positive regard not only towards themselves but also to others, if “conditional,” they judge themselves and others’ thoughts, feelings, values, attitudes and behaviors according to their habitual “conditions of worth.” Rogers’ belief in the possibility of people being able to have “unconditional positive regard” seems to derive from his fundamental assumption that human beings are basically good and, when fully functioning, people can be aware of all impending experiences, while being able to accept both positive and negative feelings in themselves and others, without denial. In this regard Rogers seems to be favouring the perceptive mode over the judging mode of being, which has its own value. From a Jungian perspective, this is naïve and devalues thinking while relativising the feeling function, which is apparently so important for Rogers.

Rogers believes that all humans are motivated by an intrinsic tendency to self-actualize. He argues that, by way of an orgasmic valuing process that has a biological core, fully functioning people are capable of evaluating experiences positively or negatively as to their ability to further self-actualization and proceed accordingly. Unlike Freud, who sees death and destructive forces emerging from the Id, as well as Eros and the affirmation of life, Rogers only sees the emerging potential for self-actualization,

believing that inhibiting forces to psychological fulfillment only come from “conditions of worth” in oneself and the environment.

Like Rogers, Jung feels that individuation is a natural instinct but he observes that creative individuation, that is to say the individuation process, requires conscious participation in a dialogue with the unconscious in order for the Self to find fulfillment in life. Such a dialogue and discernment is essential because, according to Jung, there are both powerful positive and negative forces beyond personal conditioning that can emerge from the [collective] unconscious and be experienced not only there but in life and the environment. Believing that only “conditions of worth” introjected during childhood and youth, along with environmental “conditions of worth,” inhibits self-fulfillment, is ultimately superficial. It betrays the fact that Rogers has no understanding of the archetypal nature of the objective psyche that embraces both the unconscious and the conscious world of lived-experience.

According to Rogers’ description, his conception of an organismic valuing process that has a physiological basis seems to include information from the sensation and intuitive functions as well as feeling evaluation and potentially intellectual judgement. The fully functioning person can presumably readily consult this process in making or contemplating life decisions now that the shoulds and oughts of the “conditions of worth” no longer interfere. Such fulfilled people have unconditional positive self-regard and regard for others. There is no longer denial, distortion of reality and feelings of threat to one’s integrity, but openness to experience. There is instead, he believes, congruence

and compatibility between their perceived reality and the way things really are, both in the environment and in their own self-concept.

Given his radical undervaluation of the unconscious and his naïve view that humankind's nature is basically good, Rogers' assertion that fully functioning people, as he defines them, are realistically aware of all life experiences along with positive and negative feelings towards them is highly suspect. His concentration on the individual's existential feelings, whether positive or negative, no doubt includes what was hitherto unconscious. But his unwillingness to explore the unconscious itself, including the collective unconscious, means that there is a good deal of what is universally common to the psyche that remains unacknowledged. This includes the inferior functions of consciousness, whether intuition, sensation, thinking or feeling, and inferior attitudes, whether introversion or extraversion. The Self as integrating centre of being and the archetypes, some of which include a dark and shadowy nature, are also denied. One's experiential reality therefore remains relatively limited. Given these considerations, Rogers' other assertions about the fully functioning person also seem to me to be unlikely.

Along with the fact that his theoretical edifice lacks both depth and width, Roger's articulation of the nature of the evaluative function of feeling is limited. His conception of self-actualized individuals being able to radiate warmth, have empathy and be genuine, in touch with their own feelings, sounds like a description of people with a differentiated feeling function and possibly some Eros. I say possibly some Eros because one can

have a differentiated feeling function working in the power principle. The attributes of empathy and warmth, however, speak to the likelihood that some Eros is involved. Jung also distinguished between the introverted and extraverted attitude, which Rogers failed to do. In fact, it appears to me that Rogers is speaking mainly about introverted feeling given his emphasis on evaluating one's own feelings. Despite the theoretical shortcomings to Rogers' work, his championing the [introverted] feeling function has value as compensation for the overly mentalized and extraverted American psyche.

\*\*\*\*

In this essay I distinguish between the individuation process as articulated by Jung and individuation *per se*. Individuation is a natural process of self-fulfillment in the way that an acorn becomes an oak tree or a human embryo becomes a mature adult. The individuation process involves conscious participation and refers to the teleological fulfillment of the Self in life. I have briefly examined the works of several different psychologists, both developmental and individual, and have tried to indicate their value in terms of describing healthy normal psychological development, which is to say individuation, and what they perceive as obstacles to self-fulfillment. I have also differentiated their views on the nature of the human psyche and self-fulfillment from Jung's observations on the nature of the psyche and the individuation process. There is clearly a major difference largely based on Jung's articulation of the archetypes of the collective unconscious and the Self that none of the other psychologists, except perhaps May and Fromm, consider.



However, even May and Fromm don't appear to understand the archetypes potential power for realization, or the nature of the Self and its essentially transformative potential. According to Jung the individuation process involves the fulfillment of the teleology of the Self, which super-seeds the telos of nature while embracing and transforming it. It leads to wholeness and the realization of one's unique self in a differentiated way, all ultimately in service to the Self and the greater whole.

## REFERENCES

- Ansbacher, Heinz, Ansbacher, Rowena, Editors (1956). The individual psychology of Alfred Adler: A systematic presentation in selections from his writings. New York: Harper & Row Publishers
- Ansbacher, Alfred, Ansbacher, Rowena, Editors (1979). Superiority and social interest: A collection of Later Writings. New York: W. W. Norton & Company
- Erikson, Erik (1985). The life cycle completed: A review. New York: W. W. Norton & Company
- Fromm, Erich (1955). The sane society. Greenwich Conn.: Fawcett Publications.
- Fromm, Erich (1965). Escape from freedom. New York: Avon Books
- Fromm, Erich (1975). Man for himself: An inquiry into the psychology of ethics. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Jung, C.G. The collected works Bollingen Series XX Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, passim.
- Kegan, Robert (1982). The evolving self: Problem and process in human development. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Levinson, Daniel, et al. (1978). The seasons of a man's life. New York: Ballantine Books
- Maslow, Abraham (1986). Religions, values and peak experiences. New York: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Maslow, Abraham (1985). The farther reaches of human nature. New York: Penguin Books Ltd.
- May, Rollo (1985). The courage to create. New York: Bantam Books.
- May, Rollo (1953). Man's search for himself. New York: W. W. Norton Inc.
- May, Rollo (1969). Love and will. New York: W. W. Norton Inc.
- May, Rollo (1991). The cry for myth. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc.
- Rogers, Carl R. (1961). On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.