

Dream Incubation: The Roles of Instinct and Archetype in Ritual

Dr. Vincenza A. Tiberia*

E.mail: drtiberia@hotmail.com.

Dr. Charles D. Laughlin**

E.mail: cdlaughlin@gmail.com.

* Psychologist, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

** Professor of anthropology and religion, Carleton University,
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

Dream Incubation:

The Roles of Instinct and Archetype in Ritual

Dr. Vincenza A. Tiberia

Prof. Charles D. Laughlin

Abstract:

This paper explores Jung's view of psychodynamics in order to show both (1) that attributing simple dichotomies to his theory are wrong-headed, and (2) that Jung worked-out the relations between evolutionary biology and symbolic activity in a way that can be useful in understanding both dream symbolism and dream incubation—that is, the ritual evocation of “big” dreams. We look closely at the relationship between instincts and archetypes, and show the importance of the notion of psychoid process in bridging symbolism and ritualized action. We then examine the archetypal and ritual evocation of dreams across cultures using ethnographic data. We demonstrate how dream incubation and active imagination are related, and track the latter approach in Jungian dream-work.

Keywords: Jungian anthropology, Myth-ritual complex, Archetypes, Instinct, Dream incubation, psychoid process.

دور الغريزة والنموذج الأولي في الطقوس

د. فينشينزيا تايبيريا

أ. د. تشارلز لولين

الملخص:

نستكشف في هذا المقال منظور يونغ للديناميات النفسية لبيان، أولاً، أن نسبة التفرعات البسيطة إلى نظريته خطأ دائم. وثانياً، أن يونغ أوضح العلاقة بين علم الأحياء التطوري والنشاط الرمزي على نحو جعلها ذات جدوى في فهم رمزية الأحلام ونشوتها. وتحديداً، طقس استدعاء الأحلام «الكبرى». ثم ننظر عن قرب في العلاقة بين الغرائز والنماذج الأولية بغية بيان أهمية مفهوم العمليات النفسية في ردم الهوية بين الرمزية والفعل الطقوسي. فضلاً عن ذلك، نفحص طقوس استدعاء الأحلام والنموذج الأولي للأحلام عبر ثقافات متعددة من خلال استخدام بيانات أثوغرافية، وندلل على الكيفية التي ترتبط بها نشوء الأحلام والمخيلة النشطة، كما نتقصى المقاربة الأحدث في نظرية يونغ للكيفية التي يعمل بها الحلم.

مصطلحات أساسية: الأنثروبولوجيا اليونانية، عقدة الطقس/الأسطورة، النماذج الأولية، الغريزة، استحضر الحلم، العمليات النفسية الدينامية.

Yet this division between “rational man” and “irrational brute” cannot really be maintained. It is true that as one progresses along the scale of living species in the direction of simpler and less intricately organized nervous systems innate behavior plays a more and more important role, and the ability to modify behavior in the light of experience (to “learn,” that is) becomes less important. The difference in this respect between man and other animals is not that between “yes” and “no” but, rather, that between “more” or “less.”

Isaac Asimov, *The Human Brain*

INTRODUCTION

One of the major hindrances that have kept anthropologists from applying Carl G. Jung’s depth psychology to cross-cultural phenomena is the very common, but naïve and mistaken idea that Jung posited a categorical distinction between instincts and archetypes.¹ By assuming this distinction, ethnologists fail to apply one of the most powerful and ethnologically useful models of human depth psychology available in the literature. If a symbolic activity is culturally “constructed,” ethnologists often argue, then the activity cannot be archetypal in any inherited sense, because the activity varies from society to society depending upon enculturative and environmental contingencies. Thus ethnologists frequently project their “nature vs. nurture” conditioning about culture and cross-cultural psychology upon a theoretical framework far more

complex and useful than any psychological anthropologists have thus far developed. Moreover, Jung’s thinking has the added advantage of being consonant with modern neuroscience, neuroethology, cognitive neuroscience, developmental psychology and developmental linguistics. Jungian theory offers ethnology a conceptual bridge between biology and culture that can take us very far toward transcending simple mind-body, culture-biology and nature-nurture dichotomies that seem to have adhered to ethnology over the generations like bubblegum to shoe leather.

It is our intention in this paper to explore Jung’s view of psychodynamics and to show both (1) that attributing simple dichotomies to his theory are wrong-headed, and (2) that Jung worked-out the relations between evolutionary biology and symbolic activity in a way that can set ethnology back on the right track.² We will discuss how an application of Jungian theory can provide us a platform for applying modern neuroscience and other biogenetic research perspectives to ethnological issues by showing how inherited structures produce psychological and cultural variation. We will offer a number of examples of how inherited structures mediate learning and adaptation throughout the animal kingdom. Our intention is to demonstrate how a Jungian anthropology allows us to get rid of the old assumption that at some point in prehistory the human brain and its mental functions ceased to be genetically determined and in some kind of saltation—some form of Rubicon-like revolution—

transcended being a biogenetic organ and became wholly cultural (see Pinker, 2003, Carruthers, Laurence, & Stich, 2005 on this issue). The Jungian approach allows embracing both the universal aspects of human psychology and the various transformations of cultural traits among individuals and local societies so richly described by ethnographers.

INSTINCT AND ARCHETYPE IN JUNGIAN THEORY

As some readers will already know, Jung concluded that the foundations of the psyche are the innumerable archetypes we inherit by virtue of being human (see Laughlin & Tiberia, 2012 for a detailed account of the archetypes and their relevance for anthropology). These archetypes are the same for everyone on the planet, regardless of culture.

Man “possesses” many things which he has never acquired but has inherited from his ancestors. He is not born a *tabula rasa*, he is merely born unconscious. But he brings with him systems that are organized and ready to function in a specifically human way, and these he owes to millions of years of human development. Just as the migratory and nest-building instincts of birds were never learnt or acquired individually, man brings with him at birth the ground-plan of his nature, and not only of his individual nature but of his collective nature. (Jung, CW 4, 315)

The sum total of the inherited archetypes in everyone’s brain

constitutes part of one’s distinctly human *collective unconscious*.³ The archetypes are structures that mediate all we psychologically share as members of the human species. Depending upon adaptation to the physical and social environment, some archetypes develop while others languish in a relatively undeveloped state. When archetypes (neural circuits) develop into more elaborated structures (or networks)—usually amalgamating perceptual, affective, cognitive, behavioral and other processes—they are called *complexes*. Interaction with the physical and sociocultural environments are primary in the development of complexes, and thus the entire psyche (the sum total of all archetypes and complexes, whether conscious or unconscious) as a whole is the product of both genetic inheritance and adaptation (including the results of enculturation).

Jung argued for a fully embodied consciousness. One complex among many becomes the presiding structure we call the ego (i.e., the “I”). One function of consciousness is to maintain the relationship between the ego and the unconscious (Jung, CW 14, 371n). The development of the ego and consciousness unfold hand-in-hand. Metaphorically speaking, “...the conscious rises out of the unconscious like an island newly risen from the sea” (Jung, CW 17, 52). The psyche is full of structures that mediate aspects of perception, cognition, imagination, emotion and action that may or may not be conscious to the ego—some in fact never are. Above all,

consciousness for Jung is not a thing, nor an entity, but rather a very Jamesian and dynamic flow of experienced moments in which first this and then that archetype or complex enters ego awareness. Consciousness usually manifests with the ego at its center.

The relationship between the archetypes and the instincts is not a simple duality in Jung's thought. The relationship is rather more complex than that, and is at the very core of the powerful model that Jungian theory potentially provides for anthropology.

Instincts

For Jung the *instincts* are inherited structures that are more complex than simple reflexes. *Reflexes* are "wired" to react to a stimulus instantaneously, and the response is completed within a fraction of a second. "When I speak of instinct ... I mean what is commonly understood by this word, namely, an *impulsion* towards certain activities. The impulsion can come from an inner or outer stimulus which triggers off the mechanism of instinct psychically, or from organic sources which lie outside the sphere of psychic causality" (Jung, CW 6, 765). For example, when a doctor taps our knee or ankle with her little rubber hammer, the leg or foot twitches by reflex. The action is rapid and totally unconscious because it is mediated by mechanisms at the spinal cord level. Instincts are the more complex structures that mediate behaviors of the kind that ethologists today call "fixed action patterns" (Tinbergen, 1951;

also, see quote from Jung above) which are mediated by neural circuits higher up in the central nervous system called "innate releasing mechanisms." Once triggered, instinctual structures produce a largely invariant, all-or-none, behavioral response (like a computer subroutine).⁴ Examples of instinctive behavior abound in the animal world and include most aggression displays and courtship rituals, as well as protective, predator-avoidance responses—e.g., moths upon hearing a bat's echolocation sounds will instantly fold their wings and head for the ground.

Instinctive mental processes are characterized by (1) being motivated by unconscious "inner necessity," (2) occurring universally among a species, (3) requiring little or no learning, (4) making adaptational sense when examined evolutionarily, and (5) being inherited channels of *libido* (or "psychic energy; Jung, CW 5, 128-131, CW6, 765). As Jung wrote:

Only those unconscious processes which are inherited, and occur uniformly and regularly, can be called instinctive. At the same time they must show the mark of compelling necessity, a reflex character of the kind pointed out by Herbert Spencer.⁵ Such a process differs from a mere sensory-motor reflex only because it is more complicated. ... Instincts share with reflexes their uniformity and regularity as well as the unconsciousness of their motivations (Jung, CW 8, 131).

An immediate aversion to snakes is an instinctual reaction (Jung, CW 8, 130-131) that is ubiquitous to all primates,

including humans. The response is unconscious, and demonstrates the “inner necessity” (or unconscious motivation) element. The response makes perfect sense in terms of adaptation over thousands of years to potential danger, however unlikely that danger is to crop-up today among people living in, say, Nunavut, downtown Manhattan, or Al Salmiya. Similarly, instinctive reactions to heights, deep water, spiders or stinging insects are common across cultures and are comprehensible when considered evolutionarily. Undoubtedly an aversive response to these dangers, so common during prehistoric times, was selected for early-on in primate phylogenesis. On the other hand, *alektorophobia*, the fear of chickens, is not universal and makes no sense adaptationally (Jung, CW 8, 131), and in all probability occurs in individuals due to a specific traumatic event.

Humans are a very social species of primate, and as such may be characterized as sharing social instincts.

...every man is born with a highly differentiated brain and is thus assured of a wide range of mental functioning which is neither developed ontogenetically nor acquired. But, to the degree that human brains are uniformly differentiated, the mental functioning thereby made possible is also collective and universal. This explains, for example, the interesting fact that the unconscious processes of the most widely separated peoples and races show a quite remarkable correspondence, which displays itself, among other things, in the extraordinary but well-authenticated

analogies between the forms and motifs of autochthonous myths. The universal similarity of human brains leads to the universal possibility of a uniform mental functioning. This functioning is the *collective psyche*... (Jung, CW7, 147)

As we shall see later on, this “uniform mental functioning” propels all human societies to perform collective, instinctual actions we call “rituals.” In any event, being a social creature, the extent to which mental functions become developed, or lay dormant, and become reelevated into individual consciousness, or remain relegated to the unconscious, is determined in part by social factors. There is no better example than the myriad of ways societies have of regulating, fostering, inhibiting and channeling sexual energies among their peoples.

A number of phenomena were considered instinctive by Jung, some of which were shared with other animals, and some characteristic of humans alone. Among the cross-species instincts are *hunger* (“a characteristic expression of the instinct of self-preservation;” Jung, CW 8, 116), *sexuality* (which “undergoes a radical psychization which makes it possible for the originally purely instinctive energy to be diverted from its biological application and turned into other channels;” Jung, CW 8, 116-117) and the *drive to activity*, including the *play instinct* (Jung, CW 8, 117; Laughlin & McManus, 1982). Jung recognized, long before more recent research on mirror neurons and empathy (see De Waal, 2009), that empathy is instinctive in

humans, and perhaps other social animals as well, and is a fundamental ingredient of transference (Jung, CW 4, 285). He also agreed with Freud in positing an inherent *death instinct*, an "...inner longing for the stillness and profound peace of all-knowing non-existence, for all-seeing sleep in the ocean of coming-to-be and passing away" (Jung, CW 5, 356).

The compulsions are clearly instinctual, for as Jung wrote, they are infantile and "blind" cravings (Jung, CW 7, 86, 104). Yet, Jung also added the *reflexive instinct* which he considered to be unique to humans (Jung, CW 8, 117). This is the tendency to direct attention inward toward reflection upon memories, images, impulses, reactions, etc. "*Reflexio* is a turning inwards, with the result that, instead of an instinctive action, there ensues a succession of derivative contents or states which may be termed reflection or deliberation. Thus in place of the compulsive act there appears a certain degree of freedom, and in place of predictability a relative unpredictability as to the effect of the impulse" (Jung, CW 8, 117). These aspects of psychic operation come together in the transference—a patient's unconsciously generated affective projection upon, and bond with the therapist—and in Jung's view, accounts for the stubborn adherence to that relationship, even after a great deal of reflection on the part of the patient (Jung, CW7, 133).

Even the primordial urge to heal is considered by Jung to be an instinctive response to psychic disturbances and

fragmentation of the psyche. "That is evidently an *attempt at self-healing* on the part of Nature, which does not spring from conscious reflection but from an instinctive impulse" (Jung, CW 9i, 388). It is here that we can see that the instincts may come into conflict with conscious will and action. For instance, the instinctive response to a dangerous situation may be to run, but the conscious intent is to stand and fight. "The instincts operate most smoothly when there is no consciousness to conflict with them, or when what consciousness there is remains firmly attached to instinct. This condition no longer applies even to primitive man, for everywhere we find psychic systems at work which are in some measure opposed to pure instinctuality" (Jung, CW5, 227).

Keeping in mind that the instincts for Jung are inherited channels of energy—neural, endocrine and circulatory circuits, to put it in more modern anatomical parlance—then the operation of consciousness may well interfere with, inhibit or facilitate the natural flow of energy. Let us take a very contemporary example: Many of us live very stressful lives. What this means physiologically is that, whereas the body is genetically designed for short periods of stress ("eustress" in Selye's terms; Selye, 1974) followed by lengthy periods of rest and recuperation, we choose to follow a lifestyle that may require lengthy periods of stress (Selye's "distress") and insufficient "downtime" for rest and recuperation. Moreover, many of us walk through our lives in a perpetual state of anxiety, as though we were

forever in a state of danger; a condition that psychologists used to call “neurosis.” Conscious schemes—so typical of higher cortical system “planning,” modulation of emotion, tagging action to memory and social values—may stand in the way of the instinctual structures of the unconscious, and thus, as it were, “dam-up” the natural free-flowing course of energy and proclivity (Jung, CW 5, 139).

It is well worth noting in this anthropological context that many cultural practices are carried out as antitheses of instinctual processes. Many religious and spiritual traditions utilize such mechanisms as fasting, intentional infliction of pain, evocation of fear, physically stressful ordeals, sleep deprivation and so forth as means of driving individuals to experience alternative states of consciousness. Many of these *drivers* (Laughlin, McManus, & d’Aquili, 1990, pp. 146-147) have their effects precisely because they are antithetical to the natural instincts like hunger, pain avoidance, expression of intense emotion, the sleep drive, etc.

Archetypes

While one may point out numerous occasions in which Jung refers to both the instincts and the archetypes, he had early-on concluded that the archetypes are an evolutionary elaboration of the instincts. That is, the archetypes are archaic, instinctive mental structures (or “primordial images;” Jung, CW6, 747) that mediate operations of the psyche. Because they are instinctive, the

archetypes are by definition universal and mediate species-typical psychic functions across all cultural boundaries (Jung, CW 5, 3-6; see also Edinger, 1972; Neumann, 1969, p. 270; Hillman, 1985, p. 12) For example:

Instincts are given in the case of every newborn individual and belong to the inalienable stock of those qualities which characterize a species. What psychology designates as archetype is really a particular, frequently occurring, formal aspect of instinct, and is just as much an *a priori* factor as the latter. (Jung, CW 9i, 388)

The unconscious bases for dreams and fantasies are only apparently infantile reminiscences. In reality we are concerned with primitive or archaic thought-forms, based on instinct, which naturally emerge more clearly in childhood than they do later. But they are not in themselves infantile, much less pathological. ...The instinctive, archaic basis of the mind is a matter of plain objective fact and is no more dependent upon individual experience or personal choice than the inherited structure and functioning of the brain or any other organ. (Jung, CW 5, 38)

The archetype is a symbolic formula which always begins to function when there are no conscious ideas present, or when conscious ideas are inhibited for internal or external reasons. The contents of the collective unconscious are represented in consciousness in the form of pronounced preferences and definite ways of looking at things.

These subjective tendencies and views are generally regarded by the individual as being determined by the object—incorrectly, since they have their source in the unconscious structure of the psyche and are merely released by the effect of the object. They are stronger than the object’s influence, their psychic value is higher, so that they superimpose themselves on all impressions. (Jung, CW6, 377)

Phrasing the matter in more modern terms, the archetypes are neural circuits that are genetically inherited and organized during the neurogenesis of the young brain, whether the brain be that of a human, or that of a monkey, elephant or lion (Laughlin & Tiberia, 2011).⁶

James Hillman (1985, p. 13) and others (e.g., Griffin, 1989, p. 40) have rejected Jung’s distinction between the archetypes as unknowable structures (i.e., they are “psychoid;” see below) in themselves and archetypal images and ideas as knowable transformations of those structures (expressions or “contents”). They do so on the dubious grounds that, if the “archetypes in themselves” are in principle unknowable, then how can we know anything about them? This criticism is a serious error that further confuses the underlying ontological difficulties with the notion of archetype. Moreover, it is a view that is both over-rationalized and phenomenologically naïve (see Shamdasani, 2003, p. 260). Let us suggest a simple phenomenological exercise that will illustrate what Jung was getting at. If you focus your attention on your hand and arm, you can quickly

see that when you grasp something (e.g., coffee cup, pencil, steering wheel) you can see *both* the function *and* to some extent the structure of grasping.⁷ This is because the elements of grasping—muscle contractions, movement of bones, swelling of veins, so forth—are available to your senses. But what about the conscious will to grasp? Can you see the act of will, or do you know it only by its psychological and behavioral expressions? The body has no sensory system that can be directed at internal (usually unconscious) operations of its brain—from the phenomenological point of view, the brain and its structures *do not move*. Hence, while we can see and feel the behavioral act of grasping, we cannot directly perceive or be aware of the structure of the instinct or archetype. We are only able to perceive the experiences (images, thoughts, actions, etc.) they mediate. Put simply, with grasping we can see both what the structures are and what they do, whereas we cannot see (unaided by technology) what neural structures look like, but only what they do.⁸

We have gone into great detail about the nature of the archetypes elsewhere (see Laughlin & Tiberia, 2012) and it would be tedious to go through that lengthy presentation here. In summary, we showed that for Jung the *archetypes*:

- Are the result of the evolution of the structure of the human psyche over millions of years.
- Undoubtedly have changed during our evolutionary past, but in their present

form they encode the recurrent structures that mediate the typical experiences of human beings over hundreds of millennia and across all cultural boundaries (Jung, CW 14, 390, see also Stevens, 1982, p. 17; Krippner, Bogzaran, & Percia de Carvalho, 2002, p. 149).

- Underlie all recurrent, pan-humanly “typical” ideas, images, categories, situations, and events that arise in experience (Hillman, 1985, p. 12; Stevens, 1982, p. 23).

- Have no inherent content, but exist “at first only as forms without content, representing merely the possibility of a certain type of perception and action” (Jung, CW 9i, p. 48).

- Mediate images and ideas that arise in the symbolism of our experience, or that we deduce from the ideas and images found in texts and other symbolic media (Jung, CW 9i, pp. 56-57, CW 8, 213).

- Are not material that was once conscious and became lost either in early childhood, or in some archaic hominin age, but rather, have never been conscious during the course of either ontogenesis or phylogenesis (Jung, CW 9i, p. 42, CW 8, 210).

- Underlie and generate the symbolism that is so fundamental to all mythological and cosmological systems, and are responsible for the patterned similarities among these systems (Jung, CW 8, p. 206; Edinger, 1973, p. 4; Laughlin & Throop, 2001).

- Are known through reflection

upon their various *transformations*—upon their manifestations in dreams, fantasies, projections, myths, art, etc.—a structuralist methodology very similar to those of Claude Levi-Strauss and Jean Piaget (Jung, CW 8, p. 214).

- May endlessly change their eidetic form within the experience of the individual, among individuals in a group, and across cultures.

- May develop during ontogenesis while at the same time retaining their essential character (Jung, CW 13, p. 272).

- Are not merely theoretical concepts, but are derivable from introspection of patterns in one’s own direct experience (Jung, CW 9i, p. 56).

- Are frequently associated with a sense of numinosity in direct experience (Jung, CW 8, p. 205, CW 14, pp. 390, 524), an affective pairing which may lead to fascination, conversion and faith (CW 5, 232), and even to states of possession and over-identification with the imagery (CW 9i, CW 12, p. 36, Edinger 1972, p. 7).

Most discussions of the archetypes, including Jung’s own at times, tend to emphasize a handful of relatively “big,” dramatic mythic themes; e.g., the Wise Old Man, the Great Mother, “internal” marriage, the anima and animus, the Mandala, the Philosophical Tree, the Divine Child, the hero, the Kore or Divine Maiden, the Trickster (humorous figures like Mullah Nasruddin in Sufi stories, or Coyote in Navajo stories), and sundry spiritual journeys

and initiations, etc. These few forms are those that are particularly salient in important dreams and myths, whereas most archetypes mediate the “little” mental operations—the very mundane functioning of perception, cognition and activity in everyday psychological life. “Little” archetypes such as physical object, causation, linear and cyclical time, distance and space, face, hand, water, air, etc., may rise to the level of “big” archetype if used metaphorically in myth (e.g., the air element, the face of god) or practice (e.g., baptism in flowing water)—take as an excellent example Jung’s treatment of the tree as both “little” tree of perception and “big,” archetypal “philosophical tree” (Jung, CW 13, pp. 272-349). In most cases, it is the “big” archetypes that concern anthropologists as they deal with dreams and mythic texts, and that will concern us eventually in linking dream symbolism and ritual.

Psychoid Process

Before we get to that, however, the key to understanding the instinct-archetype relationship in evolution and neurogenesis, and one that is commonly missed in superficial treatments of Jungian thought, is the concept of the *psychoid process* (aka *psychoid factor*, *psychoid nature* or *psychoid field*; Jung, CW 8, ¶368, see also Cadigan, 2007, Stevens, 1982, pp. 70-76, Addison, 2009; Shamdasani 2003, pp. 180-181; Haule 2011, pp. 168-170). Jung borrowed the term “psychoid” from the vitalist biologist, Hans Driesch (1867-1948; see

Oppenheimer, 1970), as well as from his early mentor, Eugen Bleuler (1857-1939; see Falzeder, 2007), both of whom made early arguments that most operations of subcortical mentation are both inherited and unconscious to the individual. For Bleuler, “The *Psychoide* is the sum of all the purposive, mnemonic, and life-preserving functions of the body and central nervous system, *with the exception of those cortical functions* which we have always been accustomed to regard as psychic” (quoted in Jung, CW 8, ¶368; emphasis added). However, Jung finds these earlier definitions of the term problematic. “If I make use of the term ‘psychoid’ I do so with three reservations: firstly, I use it as an adjective, not as a noun; secondly, no psychic quality in the proper sense of the word is implied, but only a ‘quasi-psychic’ one such as the reflex-processes; and thirdly, it is meant to distinguish a category of events from merely vitalistic phenomena on the one hand and from specifically psychic processes on the other” (Jung, CW 8, p. 177).

What Jung is driving at here is that mental (or neural) functions lay on a gradient from those that serve as “organic material substrate” (Jung, CW 8, p. 183), the “merely vitalistic” processes, like regulation of the vital functions (heart rate, blood pressure, CO₂ content, etc.) which go on in the background and are never conscious, to those mental functions that mediate phenomena that are either conscious, or lay in the unconscious and are potentially conscious. Psychoid processes are those

ranging in complexity from reflexes and instincts to the archetypes residing in the middle of what we may term the *psychoid-psyche continuum*. Jung reserves the term “psyche” for any mental functions that may become conscious and that “...can be brought under the influence of a will” (Jung, CW 8, p. 183). The instincts are forever outside the psyche, for they are outside our capacity to know them directly. “Looked at from this angle, psyche is essentially conflict between blind instinct and will (freedom of choice). Where instinct predominates, psychoid processes set in which pertain to the sphere of the unconscious as elements incapable of consciousness. The psychoid process is not the unconscious as such, for this has a far greater extension” (Jung, CW 8, pp. 183-184).

Now, to make things really interesting, the archetypes in and of themselves are psychoid processes. As we said above, they cannot be known phenomenologically, but only by the effects they mediate. If this sounds peculiar, consider this analogy: When we run fast, we breathe faster. We are aware of our deepening breath, but can never be aware of the structures in the medulla oblongata and pons of our brain stem that regulate respiration. We can be exquisitely aware of our legs while running, but cannot be aware of the reflex arcs that alternate contraction and flexion of our muscles. These are instinctual processes that are psychoid. In the same sense, the archetypes are psychoid; hence, so too is much, if not all of the collective unconscious: “I will only point out that it is the decisive

factors in the unconscious psyche, the archetypes, which constitute the structure of the collective unconscious. The latter represents a psyche that is identical in all individuals. It cannot be directly perceived or ‘represented,’ in contrast to the perceptible psychic phenomena, and on account of its ‘irrepresentable’ nature I have called it ‘psychoid’” (Jung, CW 8, p. 436).

Anthony Stevens argues that it is the psychoid nature of the archetypes that allows the planting of the roots of consciousness squarely in the energetic nature of inorganic matter (1982, pp. 70-71). To our reading at least, Jung certainly seemed to be thinking in this direction:

In cases where neither our sense organs nor their artificial aids can attest the presence of a real object, the difficulties mount enormously, so that one feels tempted to assert that there is simply no real object present. I have never drawn this overhasty conclusion, for I have never been inclined to think that our senses were capable of perceiving all forms of being. I have, therefore, even hazarded the postulate that the phenomenon of archetypal configurations—which are psychic *par excellence* may be founded upon a *psychoid* base, that is, upon an only partially psychic and possibly altogether different form of being. (Jung, 1963, p. 351)

All of life is evolved from, comprised of, grows out of and depends upon the inorganic materials available on planet Earth. Thus one may imagine a Whiteheadian¹⁰ continuum of organization

from inorganic matter/energy up through levels of organic organization, culminating in consciousness and will (see Shamdasani, 2003, pp. 260-261)—hence the powerful symbolism of the Philosophical Tree, or Tree of Life (Jung, 2002[1912], pp. 246-247).¹¹ The instincts (or “drives”) channel libido (i.e., metabolic energy) upwards, as it were, from the “roots” into the higher cortical “branches” of the psyche and its archetypes—as Jung noted, “...instinct, the most original force of the unconscious...” (Jung, CW 9i, p. 303). With respect to mythic symbols, Jung wrote “The onslaught of instinct then becomes an experience of divinity, providing that man does not succumb to it and follow it blindly, but defends his humanity against *the animal nature* of the divine power” (Jung, CW 5, p. 338; emphasis added). The “animal nature” to which he refers are the lower instincts being expressed through higher mythic symbols. In warning of the dangers of regression, for instance, Jung wrote:

Regression carried to its logical conclusion means a *linking back with the world of natural instincts*, which in its formal or ideal aspect is a kind of *prima material*. If this *prima material* can be assimilated by the conscious mind it will bring about a reactivation and reorganization of its contents. But if the conscious mind proves incapable of assimilating the new contents pouring from the unconscious, then a dangerous situation arises in which they keep their original, chaotic, and archaic form and consequently disrupt the unity of consciousness. (Jung, CW 5, p. 408;

emphasis added)

While the Self strives for unity, it must draw its sustenance from the *prima material* of the instinctual stratum of the unconscious, and the unconscious is chock-a-block with potentially semi-independent structures, many of them psychoid in nature. These structures are evolutionarily designed to channel energy into the pursuit of biological adaptation and survival (Jung, CW4, pp. 122-124). In more modern terms, all operations of the brain, including the psyche, are essentially *trophic* in nature (Purvis, 1990). Different systems of cells compete for their share of the body’s limited metabolic resources. The channels of metabolic energy upon which the brain cells depend are inherent in the structure of the brain as an organ. As the reader may know, it is upon the brain’s trophic nature that the measurement of blood flow (MRI, PET, CI, etc.) in brain scan studies depends. Active cellular structures draw upon the body’s stock of metabolic energy to a greater extent than do quiescent structures. Neurophysiologically speaking, any mental operation will “feed” upon energy provided by inherited metabolic structures—operations including those mediated by the reflexes, the instincts and the archetypes—all psychoid processes.

Archetypes and Dreaming

As everyone knows, Jung was extremely interested in dreaming as a phenomenological window into the archetypes and the collective unconscious

(see Jung, 1963, 1974, CW 8, pp. 237-297, also Moorcroft, 2003, pp. 174-178, Hunt, 1989, Chap. 10). For him, the ordinary Western everyday dream is “a fragment of involuntary psychic activity, just conscious enough to be reproducible in the waking state” (Jung, 1974, p. 68).¹²

Dreams are neither deliberate nor arbitrary fabrications; they are natural phenomena which are nothing other than what they pretend to be. They do not deceive, they do not lie, they do not distort or disguise, but naively announce what they are and what they mean. They are irritating and misleading only because we do not understand them. They employ no artifices in order to conceal something, but inform us of their content as plainly as possible in their own way. ...they are invariably seeking to express something that the ego does not know and does not understand. (Jung, CW 17, p. 103)

Dreams are *selfscapes*—dreams “... reflect back to the dreamer how his or her current organization of self relates various parts of itself to itself, its body, and other people and objects in the world” (Hollan, 2004, p. 172). As such, dreams have their own logic, are often irrational – even surreal and bizarre – and often fragmented, full of puzzling and disturbing events and images. For this reason, Jung says, most Westerners choose to ignore their dreams as “stupid, meaningless and worthless” (Jung, 1974, p. 69). However, dreams are, in fact, the expressions of the “dark recesses” of the unconscious, and if studied in the right way, may, as we shall see, deliver valuable information

about not only our unconscious personal self, but about the primordial, archetypal nature of our species. In other words, dreams depict the entire hierarchy of primordial structures from the ground of energy/matter up through the psychoid instincts and archetypes and into the personal unconscious and the phenomena of consciousness.

Jung acknowledged that dreams may express repressed desires, but unlike Freud he considered there to be much more to dreaming than mere wish-fulfillment (Jung, 1933, p. 11). That archetypal dreams exist is no longer in dispute (see Taylor 2009). Since Jung’s time there have been numerous experimental studies demonstrating the archetypal loading of certain types of dreams. H.Y. Kluger (1975) carried out a statistical study of Jungian archetypes in manifest dream content. “Dreams were gathered from 218 subjects. In the effort to tap archetypal dream material three types of dreams were requested: childhood dreams, vivid dreams, and recent dreams. ...Childhood and so-called ‘vivid’ dreams were found to include significantly ...more archetypal dreams than those recent dreams. The results indicated that archetypal dreams do exist as a differentiable category of dreams and that archetypal phenomena may be discerned on the basis of the criteria set forth by Jung...” (Tiberia, 1981, p. 35). Cann and Donderi (1986) replicated Kluger’s methods and tested hypotheses concerning the relations among personality types and the recall of archetypal dreams. Dream reports were collected from subjects in two stages: “... ”

first, recall of the most recent, most vivid, and earliest remembered dreams (N = 146), and then dream recall on awakening, over an average of 23 nights, from 30 of the first-sample subjects. A total of 697 dreams was recorded. ...The dream diary recall data showed that Jungian intuitives, as measured via Myers-Briggs continuous scores, recalled more archetypal dreams; introverts ...recalled more everyday dreams; high EPI neuroticism scorers recalled fewer archetypal dreams. The results support several propositions of Jungian personality theory.” Tiberia has importantly demonstrated the cross-cultural incidence of archetypal dreams using comparative methodology with data from the Human Relations Area Files (Laughlin & Tiberia, 2012; Tiberia, 1981).

THE CULTURAL DIMENSION

While dreaming is universal to humans and other animals, sociocultural treatment of dreaming varies considerably. It is useful for ethnologists working with alternative states of consciousness to distinguish between monophasic and polyphasic cultures.¹³ *Monophasic cultures* are those that pay scant attention to experiences had during dreaming and other alternative states of consciousness. Monophasic culture is typical of technocratic societies, materialistic economies and fairly secular societies. Only states of consciousness from which veridical information about the *external world* are considered worthy of attention. Hence, in monophasic cultures, dreams are considered of little

value and involvement in dream sharing is discouraged in childrearing.

Among *polyphasic cultures*—the great majority of cultures on the planet—experiences arising during dreaming and other alternative states *are considered to be real* and thus are important sources of information about the normally hidden aspects of reality. What this means from a Jungian point of view is that among polyphasic peoples (and among individuals in monophasic societies that do pay attention to their dreams), dreaming provides the individual, and via dream-sharing the group, with a window onto not only their personal issues and concerns, but onto a living depiction of our species’ primordial past. In a very real sense, our brain “knows”¹⁴ its own evolutionary course and its inherent relations with the world (Laughlin, McManus, & d’Aquili, 1990; Corruthers, Laurence, & Stich, 2005; Buss, 2004; Barkow, Cosmides, & Tooby, 1992; Cosmides & Tooby, 1995; Donald, 1991; Valli & Revonsuo, 2007), and is able to portray that knowledge in a symbolic language that for polyphasic societies informs their cosmology, their dream culture, their social organization and their understanding of the self.

The Myth-Ritual Complex and the Cycle of Meaning

The really interesting question is, how does a society’s stock of symbolic and cosmological information—both archetypal and more developed—get transformed into the direct experience

of individuals? How do societies make sure that just the right archetypes become activated and “do their thing” in mediating experience? The answer to those questions involves what Laughlin’s late friend and colleague, Eugene G. d’Aquili (1983, 1985, 1986), liked to call the “myth-ritual complex.”

I propose there is a powerful inbuilt mechanism encouraging us to act out our thoughts. This proclivity is especially powerful when our thoughts and words form a learned, closed cognitive system as in the recitation of a myth. Because of the reciprocal representation of the content of the major neural systems, human beings are naturally disposed to act out their myths, but not by using ordinary motor behavior. They usually choose some form of rhythmic motor behavior. *This propensity to enact a myth in rhythmic motor form is responsible for the myth-ritual complex.* Humans reach far into their evolutionary past and graft an ancient motor behavior onto the product of their neocortexes, that is, myth. Why should we do so? The answer lies in the consideration of the nature of ritual behavior itself. (d’Aquili, 1983, p. 261)

In a very real sense, ritual and myth are two sides of the same coin. Myth refers to a primordial mode of knowing, while ritual is the process of enactment (see Turner, 1969, 1974, 1982). As Anthony F.C. Wallace (1966) was fond of saying, “ritual is the work of religion.” A traditional (especially a polyphasic) society’s worldview or cosmology is

transmitted via a corpus of sacred stories and often given behavioral expression by way of ceremonial rituals.

This relationship between myth and ritual is perhaps easier to understand if we place it in a more general model we can call a society’s *cycle of meaning* (see Figure 1).

[Figure 1 about here]

Traditional worldviews are expressed and transmitted via the societies’ mythopoeic system, which includes their mythology, ritual, mobiliary and parietal art, architectural constructions, drama, performance, sacred landscape and games (see Laughlin, 2011, Chap. 7; Laughlin, McManus, & d’Aquili, 1990, pp. 214-225). All the different symbolic media comprising a traditional symbolic system tend to be interconnected and integrated within the context of a single cosmological understanding. These media are variant expressions of a single reality as understood by the people. The symbolic system “comes alive” when it is enacted by the people in some way, through a ceremonial ritual (like the Catholic Mass, Jewish “sitting Shiva,” the Moslem *Salat al Jama’a*, a mystery play (Hopi *Wuwuchim* and other annual ceremonies, Japanese *Noh* theater), a sacred game (Navajo *Keshjee*’ or Shoe Game), or, germane to our present purposes, a pilgrimage to a dream incubation temple (e.g., a Bengali Hindu pilgrimage; see Morinis, 1982).

People who participate in such ritual

enactments often have extraordinary experiences. Such experiences may be due to ritual *drivers* embedded in the enactment—drumming, ingesting psychoactive drugs or “entheogens,” fasting, dancing, painful ordeals, chanting, sleep deprivation, so forth (see Laughlin, McManus, & d’Aquili, 1990, pp. 146-147). The key to understanding the cycle of meaning is that such experiences (dreams, visions, body transformations, spirit possessions, speaking in tongues, etc.) arising in the context of the enactment are then interpreted, either by the participant herself, or as is often the case, by a shaman or priest.¹⁵ Either way, the interpretation of the experience *is always couched in terms of the culture’s worldview and mythopoeic system*. This process is usually a negative feedback loop, as the experience is seen as instantiating, intensifying and reinforcing that people’s worldview.

A society’s worldview as expressed symbolically is part of a living system of meaning for people born under the influence of an intact and relatively stable traditional culture. As Turner and Bruner (1986, p. 33) noted, “... meaning arises when we try to put what culture and language have crystallized from the past together with what we feel, wish, and think about our present point in life.” The cosmology and its symbolic representations are not merely informative, they are *lived*, and in the living, the cosmology is animated and self-validated within the crucible of each person’s consciousness. Keeping in mind that a traditional cosmology is mainly

carried around in people’s brains, aided by symbolically rich, verbally transmitted mnemonic materials like myths, fairy tales, oral histories, iconographies, etc., the cosmology is a living reality among people, not a textbook-type theory of the universe (Laughlin & Throop, 2001). As Alfonso Ortiz (1972, p. 135) emphasized, the associations, principles and assumptions upon which a traditional cosmology is founded are rarely, if ever, worked out by people. Rather, most people accept and participate in accordance with the worldview they inherit from their culture.

A society’s cycle of meaning is never static, of course—it is never totally closed to input and change. Some positive feedback is essential, for direct experiences can, upon occasion, provide novel information leading to alterations in interpretations, which in turn can change cosmological understanding, the elements of a cultural theory, and the mythopoeic reflections of that cosmology found in myth, stories, songs, procedures, etc. Indeed, the evidence of historical ethnology supports the notion that people have to change their life-ways from time-to-time in order to adapt to changing environmental and social conditions. It is no surprise that many such changes in a people’s worldview occur as a consequence of dreaming. History is rife with examples of prophetic dreaming leading to cultural change over time. All of the world’s major religions provide evidence of the power of dreaming as a catalyst of culture change. Anthony Wallace (1956, 1957) demonstrated

the necessity of “revitalization” of worldviews faced with massive change.

Jung on Ritual, Myth and the Psychoid Process

What we are arguing here is that the psychodynamics underlying d’Aquili’s “myth-ritual complex”—the inherent and universal association of myth and ritual—is due to the psychoid process. That is, ritualization of behavior is instinctual while myth is the expression of archetypal structures.

Myth, ritual, dreams and imagination are expressions of archetypal processes which wield transformative power over consciousness. The psychoid nature of the archetypes of the collective unconscious provides a creative force which can result in an upheaval and eventual rearrangement of conscious contents, a psychic transformation akin to rebirth, which Jung termed the “individuation” process. By its very nature, the individuation process is fraught with “great psychic danger” due to the possible “identification of the ego-consciousness with the self” (Jung, CW 9, p. 254).

Jung expounded on the transcendental aspects of individual and group experiences induced through ritual, reflecting that the ritual of the Mass “is not a repetition of the historical event but the original, unique, and eternal act. The experience of the Mass is therefore a participation in the transcendence of life, which overcomes all bounds of space and time. It is a moment of eternity in time”

(Jung, CW 9, p. 209). The archetypal process of transformation is also expressed in Islamic legend and through the figure of *Khidr* in Islamic mysticism. Jung describes Sura 18 of the Koran, as “an almost perfect picture of a psychic transformation or rebirth which today, with our greater psychological insight, we would recognize as an individuation process” (Jung, CW 9, p. 258).

Dream Incubation and Active Imagination

As a Jungian therapist, one of the authors (VAT) knows that dream incubation is a psychic ritual central to facilitating the Jungian individuation process. The Jungian therapist typically works with dream material which is analyzed during the session. More often than not the modern “novitiate” is not “connected” to their dreams. Newcomers to the Jungian analytical process may in fact categorically state that they do not dream. When this happens, VAT explains that this is most likely because they had not given their dreams much importance up until now. Then she instructs them to give themselves a “suggestion” before going to sleep that they will remember their dreams and to prepare to write down their dreams by having a pen and paper on their nightstand. The therapeutic “suggestion” that the “novitiate” will remember their dreams starts the “incubation” process and almost invariably they will return to the next session with dream material.

The process of deciphering dream

symbolism is often challenging as the language of the unconscious mind is by its very nature foreign and even threatening to ego consciousness. "Active imagination" is a therapeutic method invented by Jung which "is part dream, part vision, or dream mixed with vision. . . . One concentrates one's attention on some impressive but unintelligible dream-image, or on a spontaneous visual impression, and observes the changes taking place in it" (Jung, CW 9, p. 319; see also Jung, CW 8, p. 211, and Jung, 1997). The process of dream incubation may be continued in a directed manner on a more conscious level through the use of "active imagination" which requires a "deliberate weakening of the conscious mind and its inhibiting effect, which suppresses the unconscious" (Jung, CW 9, p. 320). The narrow confines of ego consciousness must be transcended and expanded for the language of the unconscious to be understood and for psychic integration to occur. Dream incubation and active imagination comprise the psychic rituals of the individuation process.

Akin to the transcendental experiences induced by ritual. "Dreams contain images and thought-associations which we do not create with conscious intent. They arise spontaneously without our assistance and are representatives of a psychic activity withdrawn from our arbitrary will." (Jung, CW 7, p. 131). Active imagination as a form of dream incubation is a means of uncovering archetypal "motifs which could not possibly be known to the dreamer" (Jung, CW 9, p. 100). According to Jung, "dreams often contain fantasies

which 'want' to become conscious" (CW 9, p. 101). The psychoid nature of the archetype creates the climate, so to speak, for its own expression by organizing an interface between the psyche and the external world.

The researcher's goal of isolating archetypal material may be achieved by analyzing dream series which contain certain symbolic elements which evolve through time. Jung elaborates by saying that "the same method can be applied to the products of active imagination. . . . You can select any figure which gives the impression of being an archetype by its behaviour in the series of dreams or visions. . . . one can discover interesting facts about the variations undergone by a single type. . . . its variants too can be substantiated by evidence from comparative mythology and ethnology" (CW 9, p. 110).

Hence the psychoid nature of the archetype not only serves to organize the collective unconscious but the individual psychic experience of all human beings as well which gives rise to common psychological, social and cultural realities which in turn define what is it to be human. Archetypal manifestations continue to evolve as their psychoid nature communes with modern day vicissitudes and the ever-changing aspects of the physical and social world. The archetype of the "marriage" which may have given rise to the primitive religious rituals centering around "fertility magic" nowadays continues to express itself as a psychological process culminating in

what Jung called, the “marriage of the opposites” (Jung, CW9, 297).

The following examples of an evolving archetypal motif have been taken from a series of dreams recalled by a European woman, in the second half of life, going through an accelerated process of psychic integration which Jung called “the individuation process.” Much of the dream material centers on the *heiros gamos* or sacred marriage of the opposites. The archetypal theme of the *coniunctio* develops as the “feminine consciousness” of the dreamer begins the psychological process of integrating with the “masculine personification of the unconscious,” an archetypal process which also forms the basis for the “mythological hermaphrodite” (Jung, CW 9, pp. 295-297). The archetypal *coniunctio* is thereby transformed into a “psychological process” which combines elements of consciousness and the unconscious and becomes a symbolic marriage of the opposites. The feminine aspects of a male dreamer would be symbolized by the anima whereas the masculine aspects of the female dreamer are symbolized by the animus (Tiberia, 1977).

The following dream excerpts show the parallel development of the *coniunctio* archetype and the personal symbol of the “hairdresser” who prepares the “bride” for the ceremony. The “hairdresser” prepares the bride in the literal sense much as the psychoid process prepares the psyche for the symbolic union or marriage. The dreamer recalls:

I am in a hairdresser salon with big windows which open up over the street (we are high up). The room is white, naturally lit and kind of “empty” with a distribution almost “geometrical” with big blocks (the walls). By the window there are a series of stalls divided among them with big “chunky” walls, with empty chairs in each and every one of them. Opposite to it . . . there is a big mirror and a group of people. There is a young guy, with blond hair who I identified with “the hairdresser.” He is talking to a group of people (faceless women?) complaining about the two women behind him: a young one standing by an old one sitting on a chair. The man says that—at the request of the young woman—he should look after the old one at meal times, feeding her, when she should do things by herself as she is not incapable. I can feel his frustration, his tiredness as well as the understanding—maybe agreement too—of the group of females he is talking to. I feel the same and I agree with the guy: it is a burden. I am behind him when he is talking to the woman and then I cannot see the window anymore, just a door ahead . . . and a goldy light. . . and I—the hairdresser will “solve” his problem taking that door—have the feeling that I have to cross it . . . leave the burden behind me and leave through that door. I am in the same salon but now alone and out of the “half-dark and gloomy area,” although not completely in the light. I am beautifully dressed as a bride, with a luxurious, shiny bridal gown.

Jung describes the archetypal aspects of the mother daughter motif in myth

and ritual as an important aspect of the “expansion of consciousness” which also occurs as part of a woman’s individuation process, stating:

Demeter and Kore, mother and daughter, extend the feminine consciousness both upwards and downwards. They add an “older and younger,” “stronger and weaker” dimension to it and widen out the narrowly limited conscious mind bound in space and time, giving it intimations of a greater and more comprehensive personality which has a share in the eternal course of things The individual’s life is elevated into a type, indeed it becomes the archetype of a woman’s fate in general. . . . An experience of this kind gives the individual a place and a meaning in the life of the generations, so that all unnecessary obstacles are cleared out of the way of the life-stream that is to flow through her. At the same time the individual is rescued from her isolation and restored to wholeness. All ritual preoccupation with archetypes ultimately has this aim and this result. (Jung, CW 9, p. 316)

The dream series reflects and drives the individuation process and the archetypal theme of the wedding is developed further in the following dream:

I am in a small house, white inside, with a narrow corridor and many rooms out of it. It is a hairdresser salon. It is daytime and I am at the front room with a big window over the garden. . . . My . . . hair dresser is with me doing my hair. It looks beautiful and everyone compliments me for it. I told her I will be back later

because I want her to do my hair for my wedding. She agrees. It is nighttime. I am again at the front room over the garden and I can see the moon light. I wait and wait in the darkness and nothing happens. How can this be? I told [my hairdresser] it was my wedding. I go into another room in the back. . . . Other two young women came for me; I recognized one of them, who also does and looks at me with distress. I ‘ignored’ her and said nothing of knowing each other. I left the room and go down the corridor. I go by a toilet and end up in the same front room as at the beginning, but now there is another room coming out of it, “whitely-lit” with [my hairdresser] washing the hair of another client. She looks at me and tells me she had another client. I listen in disbelief and with a tint of irritability. How come? It is my wedding!

In this, the final dream of the “wedding series” the bride—the feminine ego—unexpectedly meets the animus/shadow—as symbolized by Barak Obama—and is suddenly transformed:

I am in the . . . Parliament . . . it is all covered in wooden panels, walls, ceilings, desk but the chairs are not so big and impressive. There is a yellow light on the ceiling that shows the brown color, kind of dull, of the wood. I am sitting at the corner of one of the front rows, in the middle section. In front of us there is a stage . . . at a higher level. I am not alone: besides me I feel other young women, both on the same row and across the “corridor” up. In front of me the place is reserved for Obama (?). I leave my place.

“We” are trying wedding dresses. I am by the side of the stage, sitting on a chair that looks “poor” . . . when Barak arrives (him or a man with black skin) surrounded by a group of people. I realized I’m dressed beautifully, with a long and rich gown, on a nice pair of high heels. I wake up.

The etymology of the word “parliament” derives from the French *parler* which means “to speak”. The setting of the dream is in a ceremonial room where communication, discussion and legislation take place, symbolically akin to the therapist’s office where “talking” eventually leads to the mobilization of psychoid forces which drive the individuation process. The conscious ego is at the beginning of the dream seated in a lowly position “sitting on a chair that looks poor”, surrounded by unintegrated, split-off aspects of consciousness made up of persona, ego and the generalized feminine other (“young women”). The focus of the dreamer and the other “young women” is the anticipated arrival of the animus/shadow, as symbolized by Barak Obama, who paradoxically emerges at an elevated level and occupies a higher position in consciousness also surrounded by a “group of people.” The ego consciousness becomes aware of its lowly status while anticipating the emergence of the animus/shadow on the stage of consciousness. The animus/shadow arrives on stage which instantly transforms the dreamer’s ego consciousness and prepares the ego for the sacred union of the opposites. This transformation is sparked and mobilized by the conscious ego’s insight into the

archetypal process as symbolized by the sudden realization that the feminine ego of the dreamer is “beautifully dressed” in full wedding attire and that the union of the opposites is immanent. True to the psychoid nature of the archetypal process, the transformation occurs outside of conscious awareness and is only perceived after the fact right before the dreamer “wakes up” or comes to waking consciousness again.

According to Jung, “natural transformation processes announce themselves mainly in dreams” (Jung, CW 9, p. 235). The resistance of the ego to the process of psychic integration is also a natural one and is to be expected since “we . . . prefer to be always ‘I’ and nothing else” (CW 9, 235). In reference to the goal of the individuation process, Jung points out that the “other being” is really the “larger and greater personality maturing within us” (CW 9, p. 235). Apropos to the experience of the dreamer in the “parliament,” Jung describes a process of “talking to oneself,” calling it the “simplest and most natural thing imaginable” (CW 9, p. 236). The dream as selfscape sets the stage for the predominantly unconscious soliloquy of the Self, as symbolized by still unintegrated aspects personified as specific yet “faceless” individuals and in the “generalized other.”

CONCLUSION

We began our discussion by highlighting some of the erroneous notions ethnologists have about Jungian thought, and thus have missed an opportunity to

apply Jung's concepts to cross-cultural ethnographic comparison. Primary among the mistakes anthropologists make is in attributing a dualism between instinct and archetype—a distinction that Jung did not make. Instinct and archetype are both inherited and are more like two sides of the same coin. Both are amenable to neuroscientific research and explanation and can lay the foundations for a more accurate account of cultural differences in how both instincts and the archetypes may develop in local situations. We went into great depth in discussing the instincts and archetypes in order to make Jung's thinking clearer. Often missed by anthropologists and others is the factor of the psychoid process, those "psyche-like" neurophysiological processes that act like the psyche, but which can never become conscious. Archetypes are psychoid processes.

Dreaming, being a universal state of consciousness, presents to the consciousness a "self-scape"—a domain of experiences where the archetypes may generate imagery related to the greater realm of the self. Also, for traditional peoples who consider dreams to be another domain of reality, archetypal material are seen as forms from the spiritual world, replete with ancestors, demons, gods and goddesses and everyday objects and activities having other than everyday

significance. We made a distinction between monophasic peoples who do not pay attention to their dream life, and polyphasic peoples who do. Among the latter, people will undergo certain ritual procedures in order to "incubate" important dreams. As we all know, Jungian psychology recognizes the importance of dreaming as a means of exploring the "selfscape" dimension of being and provides incubation-like methods for bringing the process of dreaming into that of individuation. Jungian therapists use the method of "active imagination" to encourage involvement in dream work and to develop an individual's skill in accessing and interpreting archetypal material.

It may well be argued that the process of individuation—of personal psychic development—becomes distorted for monophasic peoples who are conditioned during childhood to ignore their inner selves and to pay attention primarily to the outer world of material existence. The introduction of dream work, and especially techniques for dream incubation, can go a long way to correct this distortion of individuation. Indeed, we can see that this is happening in many communities in Western society today. It will be interesting to track this process and explore the cultural changes unleashed, if any.

Endnotes

- 1- We have addressed elsewhere (Laughlin & Tiberia, 2011) the range of hindrances facing anthropology in taking full advantage of Jungian theory.
- 2- Laughlin (2011, pp. 38-44; Throop & Laughlin, 2007) has argued that the ethnological enterprise envisioned by Adolph Bastian (1826-1905) in the 19th century was grounded upon similar notions as Jung's, and that the original ethnological project as envisioned by Bastian was essentially a structuralist one.
- 3- Anthropologist Earl W. Count (1973) called the sum total of our inherited neuropsychological and motor structures our human *biogram*.
- 4- However, fixed action patterns will tend to show some development over the lifetime of the animal.
- 5- Jung is probably referring to Spencer's treatment of instinct in the third edition of his classic text, *Principles of Psychology* (Spencer 1910: 432-443).
- 6- In other words, archetypes are *neurognostic structures* (see Laughlin 2011, Laughlin, McManus and d'Aquili 1990).
- 7- For a more complete description of this thought experiment, see Laughlin and Throop (2009).
- 8- Of course contemporary neuroscientific research can now show us something about the archetypal structures themselves, a vast field of information that was not available to Jung.
- 9- I.e., the shamanic tree, the Cosmic Tree, the Tree of Life, etc.
- 10- See Whitehead's great work, *Process and Reality* (1978).
- 11- Jung himself used the continuum of the light spectrum with the drives at the red end and consciousness and will at the ultraviolet end (CW 8:¶414).
- 12- Jung is clearly not talking about lucid dreaming here. Indeed, it is not clear to us that Jung ever experienced lucid dreaming in the modern experimental sense of the term.
- 13- See Laughlin (2011:62-66), Laughlin, McManus and d'Aquili (1990:292-295), LaHood (2007), Saniotis (2010), Rodd (2006).
- 14- Laughlin calls this primordial knowledge "neurognosis" (Laughlin 1996, Laughlin and Loubser 2010, Laughlin, McManus and d'Aquili 1990: Chap. 2, Laughlin, McManus and Webber 1984).
- 15- Specialists are sometimes involved in the ritual and the interpretive phases of the cycle. Shamans and priests are often ritual specialists and keepers of the esoteric teachings pertaining to the spiritual domain of life (see Winkelman 2010).

REFERENCES

- Addison, A. (2009). Jung, vitalism and 'the psychoid': An historical reconstruction. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 54(1):123–142.
- Baerends, G.P & Groothuis, T. G. G. (1993). The 'fixed action pattern' concept revisited: An ethological commentary on the chapters by Prechtl and Provine. In A. F. Kalverboer, B. Hopkins, R. Geuze, & D. Magnusson (Eds.), *Motor Development in Early and Later Childhood* (pp. 74-88). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barkow, J., Cosmides, L. & Tooby, J. (Eds.) (1992). *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buss, D. M. (2004). *Evolutionary psychology: The new science of the mind*. Boston: Pearson.
- Cadigan, J. L. (2007). *The psychoid: Articulating a psychophysical reality*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pacifica Graduate Institute (copy available through ProQuest).
- Cann, D. R. & Donderi, D. C. (1986). Jungian personality typology and the recall of everyday and archetypal dreams. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(5), 1021-1030.
- Carruthers, P., Laurence, S., & Stich, S. (Eds.) (2005).. *The innate mind: Structure and contents*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cosmides, L. & Tooby, J. (1995). From function to structure: The role of evolutionary biology and computational theories in cognitive neuroscience. In M. S. Gazzaniga (Ed.), *The Cognitive Neurosciences* (pp. 1199-1210). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Count, E. W. (1973). *Being and becoming human*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- D'Aquili, E. G. (1983). The myth-ritual complex: A biogenetic structural analysis. *Zygon*, 18, 247-69.
- D'Aquili, E. G. (1985). Human ceremonial ritual and the modulation of aggression. *Zygon*, 20(1), 21-30.
- D'Aquili, E. G. (1986). Myth, ritual and the archetypal hypothesis. *Zygon*, 21(2), 141-160.
- De Waal, F. (2009). *The age of empathy: Nature's lessons for a kinder society*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

- Donald, M. (1991). *Origins of the modern mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Edinger, E. F. (1972). *Ego and archetype: Individuation and the religious function of the psyche*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Falzeder, E. (2007). The story of an ambivalent relationship: Sigmund Freud and Eugen Bleuler. *The Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 52(3), 343–68.
- Gordon, R. (1961). The death instinct and its relation to the self. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 6(2), 119-135.
- Griffin, D. R. (1989). Introduction. In D. R. Griffin (Ed.), *Archetypal process: Self and divine in Whitehead, Jung and Hillman* (pp. 1-76). Evanston, IL: Northeastern University Press.
- Gunter, P. A. Y. (1982). Bergson and Jung. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 43(4), 635-652.
- Haule, J. R. (2011). *Jung in the 21st century* (volume two). New York: Routledge.
- Hillman, J. (1985). *Archetypal psychology: A brief account*. Dallas, TX: Spring Publications.
- Hollan, D. (2004). The anthropology of dreaming: Selfscape dreams. In C. Stewart (Ed.), *Anthropological Approaches to Dreaming*, Special issue. *Dreaming*, 14(2-3), 170-182.
- Hunt, H. T. (1989). *Multiplicity of dreams: Memory, imagination and consciousness*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Jung, C. G. Most citations and quotes are taken from *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, the Bollingen Series published by Princeton University Press (e.g., CW 8, ¶212 for paragraph number, or CW 5, p. 356 for page number). All other citations to Jung's writings are referenced hereafter chronologically.
- Jung, C. G. (1933). *Modern man in search of a soul*. New York: Harcourt.
- Jung, C. G. (1963). *Memories, dreams, reflections*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Jung, C. G. (1974). *Dreams*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G., 1997. *Jung on Active Imagination*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (2002[1912]). *Psychology of the unconscious*. Mineola, NY: Dover.
- Kluger, H. Y. (1975). Archetypal dreams and 'everyday' dreams: A statistical investigation into Jung's theory of the collective unconscious." *The Israel Annals of Psychiatry and Related Disciplines*, 13(1), 6-47.
- Krippner, S., Bogzaran, F. & Percia de Carvalho, A. (2002). *Extraordinary dreams and how to work with them*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- LaHood, G. (2007). One hundred years of sacred science: participation and hybridity in transpersonal anthropology. *Re-Vision*, 29(3), 37-48.
- Laughlin, C. D. (1996). Archetypes, neurognosis and the quantum sea. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 10(3), 375-400.
- Laughlin, C. D. (2011). *Communing with the gods: Consciousness, culture and the dreaming brain*. Brisbane, Australia: Daily Grail.
- Laughlin, C. D. & Loubser, J. H. N. (2010). Neurognosis, the development of neural models, and the study of the ancient mind. *Time & Mind*, 3(2), 135-158.
- Laughlin, C. D. & McManus, J. (1982). The biopsychological determinants of play and games. In R.M. Pankin (Ed.), *Social Approaches to Sport* (pp. 42-79). Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Laughlin, C. D., McManus, J. & d'Aquili, E. G. (1990). *Brain, symbol and experience: Toward a neurophenomenology of consciousness*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Laughlin, C. D., McManus, J. & Webber, M. (1984). Neurognosis, individuation, and tibetan arising yoga practice." *Phoenix: The Journal of Transpersonal Anthropology*, 8(1/2), 91-106.
- Laughlin, C. D. & Throop, C. J. (2001). Imagination and reality: On the relations between myth, consciousness, and the quantum sea." *Zygon*, 36(4), 709-736.
- Laughlin, C. D. & Throop, C. J. (2009). Husserlian meditations and anthropological reflections: toward a cultural neurophenomenology of experience and reality. *Anthropology of Consciousness*, 20(2), 130-170.
- Laughlin, C. D. & Tiberia, V. A. (2012). Myths and archetypal dreams: Toward a Jungian anthropology. *Anthropology of Consciousness*, 23(2), 127-157.
- Moorcroft, W. H. (2003). *Understanding sleep and dreaming*. New York: Kluwer Academic.
- Morinis, E. A. (1982). Levels of culture in Hinduism: A case study of dream incubation at a Bengali pilgrimage centre. *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (NS), 16(2), 255-270.
- Neumann, E. (1969). *The origins and history of consciousness*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Oppenheimer, J. M. (1970). Hans Driesch and the theory and practice of embryonic transplantation. *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 44(4), 378-82.
- Ortiz, A. (1972). Ritual drama and the Pueblo world view. In A. Ortiz (Ed.), *New perspectives on the Pueblos* (pp. 135-161). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

- Pinker, S. (2003). *The blank slate: The modern denial of human nature*. New York: Penguin.
- Purves, D. (1990). *Body and brain: A trophic theory of neural connections*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rodd, R. (2006). Pirola sorcery and the navigation of negative affect: To be aware, to turn away. *Anthropology of Consciousness*, 17(1), 35-64.
- Samuels, A. (1985). *Jung and the post-Jungians*. New York: Tavistock.
- Saniotis, A. (2010). Making connectivities: Neuroanthropology and ecological ethics. *NeuroQuantology*, 8(2), 200-205.
- Selye, H. (1974). *Stress without distress*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Shamdasani, S. (2003). *Jung and the making of modern psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spencer, H. (1910). *The principles of psychology*, Vol. I (3rd ed.). New York: Appleton.
- Stevens, A. (1982). *Archetypes: A natural history of the self*. New York: William Morrow.
- Taylor, J. (2009). *The wisdom of your dreams: Using dreams to tap into your unconscious and transform your life*. New York: Tarcher.
- Throop, C. J. & Laughlin, C. D. (2007). Anthropology of consciousness. In P. D. Zelazo, M. Moscovitch, & E. Thompson (Ed.s), *Cambridge handbook of consciousness* (pp. 631-669). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tiberia, V. A. (1977). The feminine component of the masculine psyche as anima projection. *International Journal of Symbolology*, 8(1), 1-16.
- Tiberia, V. A. (1981). *Jungian archetypal themes in cross-cultural dream symbolism*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, School of Human Behavior, United States International University. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International.
- Tinbergen, N. (1951). *The study of instinct*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Turner, V. (1969). *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Turner, V. (1974). *Dramas, fields, and metaphors: Symbolic action in human society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Turner, V. (1982). *From ritual to theatre*. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.
- Turner, V. & Bruner, E. M. (Eds.) (1986). *The anthropology of experience*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Valli, K. & Revonsuo, A. (2007). Evolutionary psychological approaches to dream content. In D. Barrett & P. McNamara (Eds.), *Cultural and Theoretical Perspectives* (pp. 95-116), Volume 3 of *The New Science of Dreaming*. Westport CT: Praeger.

- Wallace, A. F. C. (1956). Revitalization movements. *American Anthropologist*, 58, 264-81.
- Wallace, A. F. C. (1957). Mazeway disintegration: The individual's perception of socio-cultural disorganization. *Human Organization*, 16, 23-27.
- Wallace, A. F. C. (1966). *Religion: An anthropological view*. New York: Random House.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1978). *Process and reality: An essay in cosmology* (the corrected edition ed. by D.R. Griffin & D.W. Sherburne). New York: The Free Press.
- Winkelman, M. J. (2010). *Shamanism: A biopsychosocial paradigm of consciousness and healing* (second edition). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.