



Re- thinking Carl Jung's psycho-religious epistemology as a viable epistemic complement for the 21st century world

Okoro, Kingsley Nwannennaya and Osunwokeh, Clement I

Department of Philosophy and Religion, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Nigeria.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 10 June 2014;

Received in revised form:
20 July 2014;

Accepted: 2 August 2014;

Keywords

Carl Jung,
Psycho-Religious,
Epistemology,
Epistemic Complementary,
Collective Unconscious,
Archetypes.

ABSTRACT

Knowledge inspires human behaviours and actions and also influences the nature and directions of development. The study of knowledge [sources and contents] technically known as *epistemology* is traditionally rooted in philosophy. However, this branch of philosophy being bedeviled with much controversy has shredded scholars into various groups and created relationship impasse between them. Consequently, modern direction of development became adversely affected with its emphasis on the material aspect of mankind and nature. This method reduces the spiritual/ metaphysical aspect of mankind and nature to state of triviality in modern development. Thus we suffer personality crisis as we live without knowledge of ourselves and our world. Therefore, this paper betook itself to explore a complementary epistemology based on the spiritual aspect of human nature. This model is couched in Carl Jung's Psycho-Religious ideality. The paper discovers through Histo-religious and philosophical investigations that the centerpiece of Jung's epistemology/metaphysics hinges on '*Collective unconscious*. Jung's epistemology oscillates between psychology, sciences, philosophy, various religious traditions and mythology and he uses the composite knowledge of these disciplines to guide humanity in her desire for holistic knowledge. Against this backdrop, this paper concludes that if Jung's Psycho-Religious epistemology is explored as a complementary epistemic system for the 21st Century, then humanity would have attained a holistic knowledge of herself and nature and this will reduce the violation of all lives and in consequence facilitates a balanced development.

© 2014 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

What constitutes a valid knowledge claim has been an age long controversy among scholars of Philosophy, Psychology, Theology, Linguistics etc. This field of study is technically known as epistemology and deals with the sources, contents, validity and correctness of any knowledge claim. It applies scientific method to the studying of human minds and experiences in relations to what they claim they know. In this regard Holder (1995) limiting epistemology to its traditional root, opines that epistemology or the theory of knowledge is the branch of philosophy which is concerned with the nature and scope of knowledge, its presuppositions, basis and the general reliability of claims to knowledge (299-305). To this Eboh (1995) adds, '... we can say that the theory of knowledge is concerned with the justification of human knowledge, asks questions about the state and the extent of our knowledge of the world, of ourselves and other people' (1).

In tying epistemology to its traditional root, we note that the pre-Socratic philosophers took it for granted that the knowledge of nature and reality were axiomatic and needed not to be debated. Therefore, Holder (1995) writes, 'the pre Socratic philosophers did not give any fundamental attention to this branch of philosophy, for they were primarily concerned with the nature and possibility of change' (299-305). Within this period, the only important step taken was a mere suggestion of the structure of reality, which they maintain could come from some sources other than others (Daniel, Garrett, and Pearson, 2006:341-360). Thus Heraclitus emphasized the use of the

senses, while Parmenides stressed the role of reason, however none of them doubted that knowledge of reality was possible

It is against this backdrop that the word epistemology gained and sustained its definition. Its root 'episteme' is a philosophical notion associated with the inquiry of truth and knowledge. Thus the pre-Socratic philosophers seeded the study and from this cultivation of thought the growth of many sciences emerged (Peters 1967 -214-271). In this sense, Robert (1995) maintains that the meaning of epistemology in its root has three basic distinctions. First, epistemology can be a quest for true scientific knowledge as opposed to opinion or belief. Secondly, reality to an organized body of thought and lastly, sometimes referred to as the first philosophy, is the understanding of the divine. Therefore, in its root, epistemology has three focuses, a practical application, an applied sciences and theologies [23]. These three focuses coalesce to form a holistic knowledge claim that formed, nurtured and developed the Greco-Roman civilization. However, this holistic nature of knowledge investigation came under serious critical attack within the fifth century B.C, when geographical location of philosophy shifted to ideological location and the Sophists, who came to the center stage of this epoch, leveled great attack on the rational school, they themselves belonging to the empiricist's school.

It was at this period that both human institution and practices came under critical examination for the first time; hence numerous ideas that had previously thought to be part of nature were jettisoned. Therefore, a general antithesis was

drawn between nature and human conviction or custom and question of where the line was to be drawn between them arose (Holder 1995:299-315). Taking the lead, the Sophists, who were the protagonists of this great debate, asked how much of what we think we know about nature is really an objective part of it and how much is contributed by the human mind (Norman 2007:62). Other questions of doubt include: Do we have any knowledge of nature as it really is? Protagoras queried if Plato's report is to be believed, that everything is as it appears to man, that appearances are the only reality. This being the meaning or part of the meaning of his famous dictum, 'Man is the measure of all things'. Georgias was more radical in claiming that there was no such thing as reality, that if there were, we could not know of it and even if we could know it, we could not communicate our Knowledge.

It is therefore this skepticism that led to the beginning of epistemology in its present form. The epistemologist therefore is not concerned with whether or not and how we can be said to know some particular truth but with whether we are justified in claiming knowledge of some/ whole class of truth or indeed, whether knowledge is possible at all. Against this backdrop, some aspects of knowledge not based on empirical proofs were dismissed as nonsensical, illusionary and irrelevant to the human society. Here the area of knowledge that belong to metaphysics; psychology and/ or religion came under this categorization and consequently rejected as inconsequential to the modern man. Justifying the above assumption Omeregbe (1993) writes, 'Early Wittgenstein, the Wittgenstein of the Tractatus and the logical positivists maintain that religious propositions are meaningless (180). Hence under the heavy influence of Wittgenstein, the logical positivists ruled out religious and metaphysical propositions as nonsensical and meaningless. They maintain that metaphysical propositions are meaningless because what they assert cannot be verified to justify or repudiate it. In his 'Opus magna' *Language, Truth and Logic*, Ayers maintains that any proposition about God is meaningless. In his own words:

The mention of God brings us to the question of the possibility of religious knowledge. We shall see that this possibility has already been ruled out by our testament of metaphysics... for to say that, 'God exists' is to make a metaphysical utterance which cannot be either true or false and by the same criterion no sentence which purports to describe the nature of the transcendent God can possess any literal significance. All utterances about the nature of God are nonsensical (Omeregbe 1993: 181)

From the above assumption, it becomes clear that in the modern epistemological discourses, the question of psycho religious/metaphysical epistemology is jettisoned in favour of empiricism. Therefore, most modern epistemologists, like John Locke proposed that the mind of a child at birth is 'tabula rasa' (empty slate) in opposition to innate knowledge, as expounded by Socrates /Plato and some modern epistemologists like Emmanuel Kant and Rene Descartes. In this regard, the great debate was between idealism and empiricism as the main source of knowledge. The implication of the debate between idealism and empiricism is that if idealism is adapted as the only sources of knowledge claim then our knowledge of the materials /physical world through sense experiences by empirical investigation will be rejected and that will affect the development of both social/materials and pure sciences. On the other hand, if empiricism is accepted, as it has been done today, then our knowledge of the metaphysical world by intuition and reason will be dismissed as unverifiable and as

such nonsensical. This will also affect our holistic knowledge of humanity and the world.

The overall consequence therefore as it is now, is that both man and nature will be materialized or regarded simply as mere material with no spiritual values. However, our common knowledge shows that both man and nature have intrinsic/non material aspect or spiritual aspect. A no less personality and philosopher, M.I Crombie aptly scored this point vividly when he avers that the concept of God is derived from the spiritual aspect of man's being and argues succinctly that man is not a completely material and spatio-temporary object [see Omeregbe 1991: 188]In his own words,

It remains true that you cannot adequately describe a human person with a range of concepts which is adequate for the description of a chair, a cabbage or even an electronic calculating machine. And the additional concepts which are needful for the adequate description of human experience— loving, feeling, and even seeing are obvious examples- all have a relative independence of space [see Omeregbe, 1991]

Therefore, it then becomes necessary to rethink a **Psycho-Religious** epistemology for the modern world which will complement the existing empiricists/ material epistemology. The aim of the study is to give mankind a holistic knowledge to deal with the problems facing humanity and nature in the contemporary age. The work will anchor on Carl Jung's psychological opsis as its discursive paradigm.

Modern Epistemology: Nature, Development and Debate

Questions such as, what can be known? And 'how do we know it? Questions about what claims to knowledge can in principle be justified, how they can be justified are the province of theory of knowledge or epistemology (Eboh, 1995) Until the modern period, knowledge claims were sacrosanct that no one questions it. Thus, several unjustifiable assumptions were made with regard to the nature of man, reality and the universe. However, this state of affairs was rejected with the development of critical thinking (philosophy) in the modern period. In his delineation of modern philosophical period, Omeregbe (1991) opines:

Modern philosophy ... is understood to mean the philosophy from the Renaissance period to the end of Nineteenth century. The Renaissance movement was a landmark in European history as well as in the history of Western Philosophy. It marked the end of medieval philosophy and the beginning of modern philosophy (v)

In modern epistemology, critical questions were asked to ascertain not only the source of knowledge, its veracity but its certainty/candor. Thus such questions-- as what it really means to say, we know 'this object or that object, are the objects really what we take them to be? Is their existence independent of us or are they the products of our minds? - emerged and occupied the centerpiece of philosophical discussions. To proffer plausible answers to these torrent questions, several schools of thoughts arose. This development led to general skepticism about knowledge. Skepticism as a method of doing philosophy (epistemology), on its own posits that knowledge has to be based upon the assumption that we ought not to claim knowledge about anything unless we are absolutely sure about it and unless there is no possibility of being wrong (Anonymous 2014:11-74). The result of this skeptics' position is the assumption that it is impossible to point out that it is at least logically possible to be wrong about most, if not all the things that we ordinarily claim to know.

Here, Philosophers, who took interest in skeptics' argument and attempted showing that at least there are some things that we can claim to know, about which we cannot be wrong took up the challenge against the skeptics (Anonymous, without boundaries... : 2014: 1-4). However, in spite of the claims of certainty of knowledge of certain things and phenomena, it is also argued that most of the things we normally think we know cannot be said to be known at all. Here philosophers differ both on what this certain knowledge is and on how it is connected with what we claim to know. In our attempt to handle the debate precisely, we have chosen two schools of thought as a representation of the myriads of schools of thought for our discussion. The schools are Empiricism and Rationalism.

Modern empiricism is a British philosophical tradition that emerged from the works of John Locke. Locke in his theory of knowledge disclaims the theory of innate knowledge or innate ideas. According to him, all ideas come from the sense experience as no idea is born with the soul. Accordingly, man is not born with any idea in his mind. Locke enunciates that with regard to our claim to knowledge, that the issues of theory of knowledge of first philosophy most come first in philosophy (Wikiversity, 2014-1-12). He therefore avers that unless we are clear about our capacities for receiving knowledge, we are likely to waste our time in controversies over matters that are beyond our grasp and end in confusion (Daniel, Garrett Pearson, 2006: 376). Locke's goals in postulating this epistemic system, is simply to clear some misconceptions and absurdities that had accumulated on the grounds of philosophy. To this end, he sets about discerning disputes whether religious or political (Daniel, Garrett and Pearson 2006 374). In Locke's own words, 'it is ambitious enough to be employed as an under labourer in clearing the ground a little and removing some of the rubbish which lies in the way to knowledge' (Donald, 2006:72). In order to achieve his goal of making knowledge less complex and removing ambiguities, Locke with other empiricists claims that all genuine human ideas and knowledge must necessarily derive from sense perception. In this case, immediate objects of human knowledge are ideas. This denotes that we have no direct knowledge of the things themselves but only of our ideas about them. The main issue therefore rests on how we generate these ideas? Here, Locke's answer is quite simply and that is that things impress themselves on our minds, leaving in them their images or copies, which represent them (Omeregbe 1991:58). Ideas are therefore representation of things, Locke asserts.

Accordingly, Locke distinguished between two kinds of ideas, which he identified as simple and complex ideas. On the one hand, simple ideas are the impressions that things make on our minds. They are the copies or representations which things leave in our minds, when they impose themselves on them. Accordingly, Omeregbe (1991) situates that simple ideas are directly caused as these ideas resemble their causes and corresponds to them (59). By implication Locke opines that there is a correspondence between simple ideas in our minds and the things they represent. On the other hand, complex ideas are formed by the union of two or more simple ideas. Therefore complex ideas are the combination of simple ideas. Omeregbe (1990) apt description of complex idea may throw a watershed here:

General or abstract ideas are ideas from which all circumstance of time and space and all other particularizing factors (such as height, colour, and size) have been removed, stripped of these particularizing traits, they become abstract ideas. We cannot know what things are in

themselves, we can only know the impression they made in our minds (59).

The implication of the above assumption is that the knowledge of any substance is impossible, hence what our mind can perceive is simply qualities or mere ideas of thing but not the substance thereof. Notably, Locke's current epistemic system was an outgrowth of his formal theory in which he described the human brain at birth as "*Tabula rasa*" (blank slate). Here, Locke proposed that at birth the mind of human beings is like dry sponge. Thus he believes that knowledge is acquired *posterior* (subsequently). Posterior as a means of acquiring knowledge holds experience as the only source of authentic knowledge. This uses empirical approach to acquiring knowledge as its major tool. Though, the idea of *tabula rasa* is accredited to Locke, however, historically, Aristotle proposed its germ and Avicenna gave it propensity and currency. Thus Locke building on the foundations of these earlier scholars, enunciates that at birth the intellect of a human being is like an empty slate but through empirical fluency, intellect is gained and developed

Locke furthered this position in his '*Essays Concerning Human Understanding*'. In this work, Locke criticized innate knowledge theory and consequently proposed that there are two main sources of knowledge namely: sensation and reflection. Accordingly, sensation is external to the mind and it is a physical experience, while reflection, on the other hand is internal to the mind and has no physical forms. By this proposition, Locke while refuting the validity of innate theory pointed out its lack of evidence. He argued that if everyone has one idea, it may not be evidence in support of the proposition that an idea is innate in human mind. (Samet, 2014:1-12). Therefore, he situates that if we all had an innate idea, we would not need reason to discover them, because they would already be present in human mind. Here Locke opines that any idea in the mind is either actual perception or product of memories of previous perceptions, hence innate ideas cannot be true. This position hinges on the fact that we have no previous perception at birth. The perception had to have been caused by sensation and reflection and due to the lack of any, then Locke considers innate ideas impossible. By the forgoing arguments, Locke repudiates rationalism/idealism and intuition as authentic source of knowledge claim and as such maintains that every authentic knowledge must be empirically and experientially got and demonstrated.

The other competing school of thought is "*Rationalism*". Notably, great company of philosophers pitches their tent with the rationalist system. Having taken side with rational school, they leveled death blows on the empiricism and its model of sense perception as the only means of generating authentic knowledge. We shall use Rene Descartes as a representative figure of this school of thought. Our choice of Descartes is informed by the fact that he is considered the father of modern philosophy. Descartes: a mathematician, scientist and philosopher, was influenced by his mathematical background. Descartes description by Omeregbe [1993] may throw a watershed into his tall figure as he says, ... he was, of course mathematician, scientist, and philosopher, who brought to bay a new foundation for philosophy with a mathematical method' (6).

With background as a philosopher/mathematician, Descartes came to conclusion that it is only truth attained by mathematical method that are clear, certain and indisputable (Robert, 2014:1-16). Here Descartes feels that the uncertainty and confusion we find in epistemology were due mainly to the

fact that in the past, philosophy was founded on doubtful and shaky grounds (Omeregbe, 1991:6). Thereto, Descartes determined to give philosophy a new and more stable foundation informed by mathematical methods. He describes his vision thus, 'As regards all the opinion which up to this point I had been entranced, I thought that I would not do better than endeavour once and for all to sweep them away, that they might later on be the same when I had them conform to a rational scheme' (Descartes 1968:23). By mathematical method, Descartes proposed a systemic analysis of facts and ideas. According to him facts and ideas are clearly known without any iota of doubts to other truths that follow necessarily from the established truth. This method aims at bringing into philosophy the clarity and certainty of mathematics, so as to end all disputes.

Therefore, Descartes rejects the senses as a means of acquiring valid knowledge. According to him, the senses are deceptive and unreliable (Omeregbe 1991:7). On the contrary, reason is the only reliable sources of attaining a clear, distinct and certain knowledge. Defining reason, Descartes calls it that human faculty illumined by light of intuition that operates in human beings (Descartes 1968:17). He maintains that whatever the mind grasps by intuition is free from error and illusion of the senses and as such it is true, certain and without doubts. Consequently, by means of intuition mankind clears the debris covering truth and gets the fact as clear and distinct. At this point therefore, the mind reaches a second stage in analyzing the truth by means of deduction. Omeregbe (1991) affirms this proposition when he says, 'with the truth apprehended, the mind begins to make inferences and to discover new truths, which necessarily follow from those already apprehended by intuition' (7). Descartes arrived at his scheme by means of systematic doubts also known as methodic doubts and by it he deconstructed the whole edifice of epistemology erected on weak, uncertain and shaky foundation and in its place reconstructed what he called fundamental truth that is beyond any possibility of doubts.

In his reconstruction exercise, everything that was hitherto known but could be doubted was set aside. In other words, anything previously known but has the possibility of being doubted was rejected in the interim. The process continued endlessly until he arrived at the substance of truth, which will be impossible to be doubted. In Descartes own words:

Because I wish to give myself entirely to the search after truths, I thought that it was necessary for me to adopt an apparently opposite course and to reject as absolutely false everything concerning which I could imagine the least ground of doubt, in order to see whether afterwards there remained anything in my beliefs which was entirely certain (Descartes 1968, 21, Omeregbe 1991:8)

Descartes reached his epistemic heights in his methodic doubts, where he had the occasion to doubt even the reality of his personal existence. He maintains that since the senses sometimes deceive him, therefore he could not be certain that what he perceived with the senses is true. Thus he doubted having real body, hands, eyes, legs etc. According to him, he could be dreaming and when he is in dream, because often in his dream state, he always has certain things he never got in actual life experiences. Therefore, he maintains that at present, he was not sure of anything, including his personal existence. He articulated this thought in the following lines:

I am not even sure any more that two plus two is four (2+2=4) because it is possible that an evil spirit is deceiving me by making me believe that mathematical proposition. I doubt

everything I used to know or believe and at present I am not sure of anything as true (Omeregbe 1991:9)

However, Descartes on the process of doubting everything notices through the flash of light of reasons (intuition) that he was thinking and when he wants to doubt that he was thinking he found that he was simply confirming his thinking status., then he concludes that it was impossible to doubt that he was thinking. In his argument, he came to conclusion that since thinking is synonymous with existences, it then follows necessarily that he exists. Therefore he came up with the maxim 'Cognito Ergo Sum'. (*I think, therefore I exist*). In Cognito Ergo sum, Descartes came to conclusion that he has discovered a truth that is sublime and not subject to doubts, since it is impossible to doubt the fact of one's personal existence.

By extolling reason beyond sense experiences, Descartes shared in the ancient philosophic traditions that dates back to Parmenides through Plato, who had used reason via deduction to arrive at certain irrefutable truths that have stood the test of time. Descartes, having discovered the principles, then goes on to construct his epistemic system on this discovery as he asserts that what makes a proposition certain is that the truth affirmed by the proposition is seen clearly and distinctly.

Notably, the two traditions- empiricism and rationalism-we have discussed have not really satisfied our curiosity of attaining a holistic knowledge of humanity and nature. Hence, we seem to be groping in the dark without knowing where to turn for direction. This is because the mystic nature of human being and the natural environment have been vitiated upon as inconsequential and that became the borderline of human crisis and conflicts in the modern era, hence we undertake to re-think a metaphysical epistemology based on Carl Jung's opsis.

Carl Jung's Basic Epistemology/ Metaphysics

Anyone who wants to know human psyche will learn next to nothing from pre mental psychology. He would be better advised to abandon exact sciences, put away scholars gown, bid farewell to his study and wander with human heart throughout the world (George, 2006: 1). Though astute academic, Carl Jung, a Swiss psychiatric, took a side step from the conventional scientific knowledge/investigations and carved a niche for himself and his world by his studying human psyche in unconventional scientific method. For Jung, the organizing principle of the human psyche is "*the unconscious*". Here he asserts that the existence of collective unconscious is the common intellectual fact shared by all human beings. Carl Gustav Jung was influenced in his theory of collective unconscious by his personal dreams, which he maintained had universal relevance. Notably, besides being a psychiatrist, Jung had a good background in Freudian theory of personality, knowledge of mythology, religion, philosophy, symbolism of complex mystical traditions', such as Gnosticism, alchemy, kabala, and similar traditions in Hinduism and Buddhism. (George, 2006:12). He also had a capacity for lucid dreaming. In 1913 Jung had a vision of 'monstrous flood' engulfing most of Europe and lapping the mountains of his native Scotland. He saw thousands of people drowning and civilization crumbling. Then, the waters turned into blood. This vision was followed, in the next few weeks, by dreams of eternal winter and rivers of blood. He was actually afraid that he could be manifesting traits of psychotic. However, in August, 1 of 1913 the World War I began. Here, Jung felt that there had been connections between himself as an individuals and humanity in general that could not be explained away ordinarily. George (2006) enunciates on the effect of this experience as he says, from then till 1928 Jung

went through a rather painful process of self exploration that formed the basis of all of his later theorizing (2).

Actually from these definitive events, Jung began to record his dreams, fantasies and vision. He drew, painted and sculpted them down. To Jung's surprise, his experiences formed themselves into persons, beginning with a **wise old man** and his companion, a **little girl**. The wise old man evolved over a member of dreams into a **spiritual guru**. The little girl became an '**anima**', the feminine soul, who served as his main medium of communication with deeper aspects of this unconscious. Further, a **leathery brown dwarf** would show up guarding the entrance to the unconscious. He was '**the shadow**' a primitive companion of Jung's ego. Jung also dreamt a lot about the dead, the land of the dead and the rising from the dead (George 2006:2). These are the factors that influenced Jung's epistemology.

In his epistemology, Jung took the psyche as the base and divided it into three parts: 1. The conscious, 2. The personal unconscious and 3. The collective unconscious. Our concentration shall be the collective unconscious. Bidwell (2000) maintains that it was through Jung's exploration of those images and experiences as he recounted in *Meditations, Dreams and Reflections* [MDR], that he slowly developed his theories of the collective unconscious (13-21). The collective unconscious according to George (2006) could also be called a 'psychic inheritance' or a reservoir of humanity's experiences as a species, a kind of knowledge we are all born with but cannot be directly conscious of it (Brookes, 1996:344 -351). However, it unconsciously influences all our experiences and behaviours, especially our emotional part of life, but we only know about it indirectly by looking at the influences. According to Jung, there are some experiences that show the effects of collective unconscious more clearly than others. These are: 1. The experience of love at first sight, 2. The feeling that you have been there before, 3. Immediate recognition of certain symbols and meanings of certain myths. According to him, all these could be understood as the sudden conjunction of outer and inner realities of the collective unconscious (George, 2006:4) Jung further enunciates evidences of other collective unconscious as a shared experiences of humanity in general. There are: (1) The creative experiences shared by artists and all musicians. (2) The spiritual experiences of mystics of all religions, (3) The parallels in dreams, fantasies, mythologies, fairy tales and literatures (4) The near death experiences.

Jung explicating further on the collective unconscious ideality opines that the collective unconsciousness as a universal experiences of all humanity is manifested through '**the archetypes**'. The concept of archetypes does not have single stereotype. Thus he defines it with such imageries as '**dominants**', **imagoes**, **mythological or primordial images** etc. Archetypes seem to be the most prominent imagery with which the collective unconscious is defined and discussed in the modern literature. Archetype is an unlearned tendency to experience things in a certain way and this is open to all humanity without exceptions. Archetype has no form of its own, but acts as an organizing principle on the things humanity see or do (George 2006:5) Wendy (2006) was apt in her description of the archetypes when she says that Carl Jung believes that the unconscious had a creative capacity. The collective unconscious of archetypes and images which made up the human psyche was processed and renewed within the conscious. Jung's archetype is the engine of the collective unconscious essential to human society and culture. (493). In George's (2006) opinion, archetype works the way instincts

work in Freud's theory [6]. In his hypothesis, archetypes are numerous and as such there is no single stereotype that can be used to categories all of them. However, the most prominent and most definitive archetypes in Jung's ontology include but not limited to the followings: 1. The mother (2) The mana (3) The shadow, (4) The persona. (5) The anima and animus. Since our goal is not the study of archetypes but to generate a psycho-religious epistemology through it, we therefore turn attention to the relevance of the scheme in our new epistemological search. Here, Jung divided psychic component into three principles, namely: 1. principle of opposites, 2. principle of equivalence and (3) principle of entropy.

Beginning with principle of opposites, Jung professes that in every wish there is the opposite. in his own words, if I have a good thought, for example, I cannot help but to have in me somewhere the opposite (bad thought) (George 2006:9). It is this idea that gave birth to the axiom that in order to have a concept of good, one necessarily needs to have a bad one. Jung confessed that such an idea of principle of opposite came to him when he was eleven (11) years old. In his own word:

I occasionally tried to help poor innocent woodland creature, who had been hurt in some way- often, I am afraid of killing them in the process. Once I tried to nurse a baby lobin back to health. But when I picked it up I was so stuck by how light it was that the thought came to me that I would easily crush it in my hand. Mind you, I did not like the idea but it was undeniably there (George, 2006:9)

Jung enunciates that it is this opposite (opposition) that creates the power or the libido of the psyche. Principle of opposite is like two poles of a battery or the splitting of an atom. It is the contrast of the opposite that gives the energy, so that a strong contrast gives a strong energy and weak contrast gives a weak energy.

The second principle is the principle of equivalence. In this principle, the energy created from opposition is given to both sides equally, thus in the illustration of the bird above, there was the energy to go ahead and help and there was also an equal amount of energy to go ahead and crush it. Then as I decided to help the bird, the energy went into various behaviours involved in helping. The question therefore is what happened to the other energy in opposition? In answering the question, Jung maintains that it all depends on ones attitude towards the wish that one did not fulfill. Thus if one acknowledges it, faces it, keeps it available to the conscious mind, then the energy therefore goes into the improvement of one's psyche, hence one grows. On the other hand, if one denies and suppresses it, then the energy will go towards the development of a complex. He defines complex as, 'a pattern of suppressed thoughts and feelings that cluster- constellate- around a theme provided by some archetypes (George, 2006:10). Therefore, if one denies ever having thought of doing something wrong, one might put the idea into the form offered by the shadow (ones dark side) or if one denies his emotional side, his emotionality might find its way into the anima archetype. The suppressed energy develops into a complex and hunts the individual at a later date in his life. It is in this regard that one begins to have nightmares and if unchecked the nightmare will take possession of one's life and this will result into the formation of a complex personality (George 2006:10).

Finally, the principle of 'entropy' is the tendency for oppositions to come together in order to decrease opposing energies over one's life time. This is a physics term which Jung borrowed. In physics, entropy refers to the tendency of all physical system to 'run down' as to make all energies become

evenly distributed. Jung maintains in the usage of this ideology that when we are younger, the opposites will tend to be in an extreme and we also tend to have a lot of energy, for example, adolescents tend to exaggerate male-female differences with the boys trying hard to be macho and the girls trying equally hard to be feminine, hence, their sexual activity is invested with great amount of energy. Remarkably, adolescents often swing from one extreme to another, being held wild and crazy one minute and finding religion the next minute. Conversely, as one gets older, one becomes more comfortable with one's difference facets of life and becomes less idealistic as one recognize that humanity is all a mixture of good and bad. We also become less threatened by the opposite sex within us and become more androgynous. Physically, in old age, men and women become more alike. This is the process of rising above opposites and of seeing both sides of our being as transcendent; hence this idea gave birth to Jung's theory of the self.

In Jung's ideality, the self is the most important personality archetype and also quite difficult to understand. Jung himself called it the central archetype. It is also known as the archetype of psychological order and the totality of the personality (Frager and Fadham 2005:56). The self therefore is regarded by Jungian scholars as the archetype centeredness. It is the union of the conscious and the unconscious that embodies the harmony and balance of the various opposing elements of the psyche. According to Jung, the self directs the functioning of the whole psyche in an integrated manner. Here Jung notes that in actual sense, the conscious and the unconscious are not necessarily in opposition, rather complements one another to form a totality, which is the self (Hoepke 1926:172 -180)

Jung discovered the self archetype through his investigation of personality. According to him the self shows up in dreams or images in an impersonal form as a circle, mandala, or stone. It could also show up personally in the form of royal couple, divine child, or some other symbols of divinity. Jung notes that great spiritual teachers and mystics, such as Christ, Buddha, Mohammad etc are all symbols for the self (Bolen, 1984:21). Thus the self symbolize wholeness, unification, reconciliation of polarities and dynamic equilibrium, which is the goal of individuation process. (Edinger 1986:72) Jung explains the functions of the self thus:

The ego receives the light from the self, though we know of this self, yet it is not known ... although we receive the light of consciousness from self and although we know it to be the source of illumination, we do not know whether it possesses anything we would call consciousness... if the self could be wholly experienced, it could be limited, whereas in reality its experience is unlimited and endless... if I were one with the self, I could have knowledge of everything. I would speak Sanskrit, read cuneiform script, know the events that took place in pre history, be acquainted with the life in other planets etc (Frager and Fadham 2005:56)

Jung maintains that the self is a deeper, inner, guiding factor, totally different from the ego and the consciousness. The self is not only the center but also the whole circumference, which embraces both conscious and unconscious. The self may first appear in dreams as tiny insignificant image. This is because the self is not quite familiar with mid-development in most people. However, it could be noted that the development of the self does not mean that the ego is dissolved. In this regard, the ego remains the centre of consciousness. It is an important structure within the psyche. Howbeit, the ego becomes linked to

the self due to the long hard work of understanding and accepting unconscious processes at work in the material world.

The goal of every epistemic inquiry is the attainment of self realization and this Jung's work attempts to achieve. Here Jung arrives at his concept of individuation. According to him, every person naturally seeks individuation. Individuation is also called self development. Jung believes that the psyche has an inner urge towards wholeness. Accordingly, individuation connotes becoming a single homogenous being, and in so far as individuality embraces our innermost, last and incomparable uniqueness, it also implies becoming one's own self, we could therefore translate individuation as "coming to selfhood or self realization (Jung 1926b:171) Jung anchored his Psycho-Religious epistemology on the foundation of these principles.

Carl Jung's Opsi and Psycho-Religious Epistemology: A Hermeneutics

Carl Jung's theory of the mind (Psyche) and by extension human nature is so complex that it cannot be defined or pigeonholed into one epistemic category. His thought oscillates between psychology, meta-psychology, metaphysics, and Western religion -kabalism and Eastern religions- orientalism. The complexity that Carl Jung's metaphysics is webbed in is a by-product of his background, training, experiences and research. Hence Frager and Fordham (2006) writes, 'Carl Jung is one of the most important, most complex and most controversial psychological theorist...Jung's analysis of human nature includes investigation of Eastern and Western religions, alchemy, parapsychology and mythology' (56). The complexity of his theory, notwithstanding, a careful study of his theories reveals that the core of his epistemology is the '**unconscious**'. Thus the goal of his psychological vision is to make unconscious consciousness with a major emphasis on '**collective unconscious**' Accordingly, Frager and Fordham (2006) state that Jung's psychology focuses on establishing and fostering the relationship between conscious and unconscious processes (56). In Jung's vision, a dialogue between the conscious and the unconscious aspects of the human psyche enriches a person and without such dialogue, unconscious processes can weaken and even jeopardize our personality. On the one hand, with a genuine dialogue, one reaches the goal of one's personality, which is the attainment of individuation. Here, Frager and Fordham (2006), categorization of individuation becomes apt.

One of Jung's central concept is individuation, his term for a process of personal development that involves establishing a connection between the ego and the self. The ego is the center of consciousness, while the self is the center of the total psyche, which includes both the conscious and the unconscious. For Jung, there is constant interplay between the two. They are not separate but are two aspects of a single system. Individuation is the process of developing wholeness by integrating all various parts of the psyche (56)

In developing collective unconscious as the core of his epistemic ideality, Jung identifies collective unconscious 'as interpersonal unconscious' or the centre of all 'psychic materials' that does not come from personal experiences. The collective unconscious contains images that are shared with people of all time. Here Jung repudiates Locke's psychological theory that consider human mind at birth as '*Tabula Rasa*' [blank sheet]. The implication of the theory is that the evolutionary pressures have individual predestined knowledge manifested in archetypes. Therefore, Jung defines archetypal imagery as the primordial images. Hence, archetype is the

introspectively reorganized forms of apriori psychic orderedness. As already noted, archetype has no form of its own but acts as an organized principle on the things we see or do (George, 2006:4). It was Bradle (2014) that gave an apt description of Jung theory of the archetype with its resources when he writes:

Jung exploration into the world mythology and religion led him to the hypothesis of collective unconscious. In the hypothesis Jung stressed that some fraction of our unconscious is impersonal and genetically inherited. This impersonal or collective unconscious housed what Jung called archetypes. These archetypes served as categorization of basic human behaviour and experience (1-17).

The next major theory that defines Jung's epistemology is synchronicity. This theory has attracted severe scholarly debate and criticism more especially, from the ranks of personality theorists, the basic argument has been whether psychological processes function in terms of mechanism or teleology (George 2006:11). Mechanism as system is the idea that things work through cause and effect- one thing leads to another, which leads to another and so on, so the past determines the present. While teleology is the ideas that we are led by our ideas about a future state by things like purpose, meaning, values etc. Mechanism is linked with determinism and with natural sciences, while teleology is linked with freewill and this is common among moral, legal and religions scholars. Jung actually accepts that both mechanism and teleology play particular role in defining human condition, human psyche and determines source of human knowledge. However, he adds a third alternative, which he calls synchronicity. Synchronicity, for Jung, is the occurrence of two events that are not linked causally nor linked teleological, yet they are meaningfully related. He stumbled at this theory by personal experience and professional practice. According to him, once one of his clients was describing a dream involving a scarab beetle, when at that very instant, a similar beetle flew into the window. In expounding this theory, Jung notes that often people dream about the death of loved one and surprisingly, the next morning they discover that the person is actually dead. Furthermore, people pick up phone to call a friend and surprisingly, they discover that either their friend was on phone or at their door. Some scholars have actually called the incidences such as these, *coincidence* but Jung believes that these events are indications of how we are connected with our fellow humans and with nature in general through our collective unconscious.

Synchronicity as a psycho-religious ideality found expression in Hindu religious view of reality. In Hinduism, thinking of individual/personal existence is considered a 'Maya' (illusion). Thus our individual existences (ego) are simply like islands in a sea, as we look out to the world and each other, we think we are separate entities, without noting that we are connected to each other by the means of the ocean floor beneath the water (George 2006:12). The summary of Jung's concept of synchronicity is that we are an extension of '*the one and only Brahman*' - the **Over-Soul** who, allows a bit of himself to forget his identity and become apparently separate and independent- to become us. However, we are not truly separate. When we die we wake to realize who we were from beginning: The Brahman— the Over-Soul. When we dream or mediate, we sink into our personal unconscious, coming closer to our true selves, the collective unconscious. It is in such state that we are actually open to communications from the other selves.

Jung's epistemic theory couched in collective unconscious, synchronicity and individuation squares up with Immanuel Kant's theory of innate knowledge. It is in this regard that Ross (2009) describes Jung in an unmistakable term as 'a good Kantian' (1-6). Here Ross equates Jung's theory of synchronicity' (acausal connecting principle) with Kant's distinction between phenomena and things-in-themselves and Kant's another theory that states that causality will not operate among things-in-themselves, the way it does in phenomena (Ross, 2009: 1-5) Kant could allow for free will (unconditioned causes) among thing- in-themselves as Jung allows for synchronicity (meaningful coincidence). Here the unconscious aspect of Jung's epistemology, especially his theory of the collective unconscious belongs to Kantian things-in -themselves or to the transcend will of Schopenhauer. It is against this backdrop that Bechard (2000) describes Jung as a phenomenological psychologist (13-20). This description was informed by the fact that Jung based most of his study on his personal experiences, insights, and reflections rather than in the experiences of others as with American psychologists (Wulff, 1995:185).

Jung's epistemic ideology also square up with René Descartes' theory of innate idea. In his work, *meditations on first philosophy*, Descartes argues that we have some ideas that must be innate, since they have not originated from the senses and they could not have been invented by our own mind (Cortinyham, 1996:72). Ideas such as existence, identity and infinity are not derived from anything we may perceive through the senses as it is also far beyond what the power of imagination of the human mind is capable of creating. These ideas are therefore products of pure reason/intuition, rather than experiences. Here Descartes having repudiated all arguments in favour of experimental knowledge concludes that he could come to terms with his personal existence and self identity through the act of thinking/-reasoning. Here Descartes' logic for deducing his existence relies heavily on the faculty of the mind rather than sensory experiences or perception of the outside world. Furthermore, Descartes maintains that such ideas as God and the infinity contain more formal reality than we, finite human beings do and as such must have been "put there by some cause which contains at least as much as reality as (we) conceive to be in (the objects of the idea) (Descartes 1941:41) By this postulation, Descartes eliminates the possibility of the finite beings inventing the idea of infinite being- God. Therefore, these ideas, he argues must be innate, having been engraved in the mind at birth (Cortingham 1995: 47)

However, Jung differed from Kant and Descartes substantially in that his theory of knowledge is an amalgam of reason and experiences. Jung maintains that our conscious mind is limited to the sequential flow of word and their corresponding ideas, which arise from our subconscious mind. Notably, our subconscious mind, Jung asserts, is made up from the innate knowledge and experiences gathered over period of time in our lives voyage, which possibly may have started from the lives of our ancestors, where knowledge is stored in genetic structure. This is a coalesce of rationality and empiricism This ideality being a bye product of his psycho-religions foundation, attenuate him to believing that there is a universal relationships and harmony of all things within the universe. In his own words, '...if we are to have harmony between our conscious and subconscious minds and the external world of our experiences, we must unite these apparently separate thing' (Haselhurst 2012:1-9). To achieve this goal requires an understanding of what matter is and who we are (as humans) and how we are

necessarily connected to all other matters in the universe. To achieve such knowledge of the self within, the other selves and ultimately the universal self, Jung recommends the use of active imagination. He maintains that active imagination is a means of facilitating self understanding through unimpeded symbols. Jung encourages his patients to paint, sculpt or employ other arts form as a way to explore their inner depths. He enunciates that active imagination is not passive fantasy but an attempt to engage the unconscious in a dialogue with the self through symbols.

On the whole, active imagination refers to any conscious efforts to produce material directly related to unconscious processes, to relax our usual self (ego), controls our thoughts and imaginations without allowing the unconscious to take over us completely (Fadhaum, 2005:1-16). Notably, the process of active imagination differs for individuals, some may value drawing or painting, while other may prefer conscious imagery or fantasy or some other forms of expression. Jung himself used various outlets of active imagination to create his own self awareness. He painted murals on the walls and described his manuscripts in Latin and German scripts and also illustrated his own manuscript and also carved on stones

Furthermore, he regards dream as an epistemic source. Accordingly, dreams play important complementary role in the psyche. He notes that widely varied influences we are exposed to in our conscious life tend to distract us and also to mould our thinking in ways that are unsuitable to our personality and individuality. Hence, the general function of dream is to attempt to restore our psychological balance by providing dream material that re-establishes in a subtle way, the total psychic equilibrium (Jung 1964:50). Therefore Jung approaches dreams as living realities that must be experienced and observed carefully to be understood. He attempted to discover the significance of dream symbols by paying close attention to the form and content of the dreams and gradually moves away from the psychoanalytic reliance on the free association in dream analysis.

Here, free association will bring out all complexes, but hardly ever gives the meaning of dream (Fodham,2005:11) Therefore, to understand the meaning of dream, one must stick closely to dream images. In his practice, Jung would always bring his patients back to the dream images and ask them what does the dream say (Jung, 1964:29) Because dream deals with symbols that have more than one meaning, there can be no simple mechanical system for dream interpretation. Any attempt whatsoever, at dream analysis must therefore take into account the following (1) attitudes (2) experiences and (3) background of the dreamer. Jung, thus encourages us to befriend our dreams and to treat them not as isolated events but as communications from the unconscious. Dream overtly, creates a dialogue between the conscious and the unconscious and as such, it is an important step in the integration of the two worlds apart (Singer 1972:283). The ultimate goal of Jung's epistemology is to attain self realization, which he called individualism. Accordingly, every individual naturally seeks individuation or self development. This postulation is an outgrowth of his belief that the psyche has an innate urge towards wholeness. This is the process of joining the conscious with the unconscious, by having knowledge of former which arise from the latter. Thus when mankind is completely aware of his subconscious and what is stored therein, he has reached self realization and truly knows himself, other selves and his universe and be properly acquainted on how to have a positive/harmonious relationship with all.

Conclusion

In our survey of Jung epistemology, we come to conclusion that his theory of knowledge is quite complex and cannot be interpreted by a single stereotype. However, the complexity is borne out of the fact of Jung's own backgrounds, influences, experiences and practice. He combined mythology, sciences, psychology and several oriental religious traditions. However, his epistemic goal was to lead mankind to self actualization. Mankind's self realization should be seen as holism in relations to other selves and the over-soul. So mankind is not an isolated individual or a separate self but inseparably related to other selves and the ground of self, from whom all sources of our knowledge emanate. Here such knowledge comes to us through ancestry heritage, which manifests itself in collective unconscious, dreams and synchronicity.

Reference

- Anonymous (2014) Epistemology History. Accessed from [www. Epistemology.edu/scholarshipinterest.org](http://www.Epistemology.edu/scholarshipinterest.org) on 2nd February, 2014
- ... (2014) Without Boundaries: An Inquiry into Deaf Epistemologies through Meta-paradigm. *American Annals* Vol. 4:7 Spring, 2008 accessed On 2nd Feb, 2014, from [www Epistemology.edu/org/html/2895067024001](http://www.Epistemology.edu/org/html/2895067024001)
- ... (2014). *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy* New York Cambridge University Press
- Bidwell, Duane R (2000). Carl Jung Memories Dreams, Reflections: A Critique Informed by Post Modernism. *Pastoral Psychology* Vol 49. No 1. (13 -21)
- Bolan J (1989). *The Gods in Everyman*. San Francisco: Happer and Row
- Brendle Mark (2014). Archetypes and Monomyth CGC Jung and Joseph Campbell. accessed on 2nd April 2014 from [www.cgjung epistemology.worldorganization.edu.org](http://www.cgjung.epistemology.worldorganization.edu.org)
- Brookes C.E (1996) Jung's Contributions to the Evolving Concept of Self. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis* 56(344 -357)
- Daniel K, Garret T, Pearson L (2006). *The Longman Stanford History of Philosophy*. York: University Press.
- Daniel, Garrett and Pearson (2006). *Longman Standard History of Philosophy*. New York: Education Inc
- Descartes Rene (1968) *Discourse on Method*, Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Donald, M Borchart (2006)(Eds). 'John Locke's Epistemology' *Encyclopedia Of Philosophy* N.J Macmillan Reference, Thompson Crop.
- Eboh, B.O. (1995). *Basic Issues in the Theory of Knowledge*. Nsukka: Fulladu Publishing House
- Edinger E (1996) *The Aion Lectures*: Toronto: Inner City Books. Accessed on 2nd April, 2014, from [Www Carljungmetaphysics//edu//org.html/6200872056782](http://www.Carljungmetaphysics//edu//org.html/6200872056782)
- Fragar R And Fadham J (2005) *Transpersonal Pioneers: Carl Jung : Excerpt from Personality and Personal Growth* (eds) New York: Person Prentice Hall. accessed on March 14, 2014 from [www carljungepistemology.edu/Psychology.Org](http://www.carljungepistemology.edu/Psychology.Org).
- George Boerce C (2006) *Carl Jung 1875 -1961*. New York: Modern Library
- Haselhurst Geoff (2012). *The Wave Structure Matter (WSW) in Space* accessed from [www.franciscan. Com/jung.html](http://www.franciscan.Com/jung.html). on March 21, 2014.
- Holder E (1995). 'Psychoanalysis and the Sciences – Epistemology- History'. *American Journal of Psycho-therapy*. Vol 4 No6 (290-315)
- Hopeke R (1928) *The Relations between Ego And The Unconscious*. In *Collected Works* Vol, Originally Published In

1928b New York Royal Literary. Accessed On March 14, 2014 On www.carljungmetaphysics.edu/org/html/20456905276.

Hopeke R (ed) (1964) *Man and His Symbols*. New York: Doubleday accessed on 2nd April, 2014 from www.jungmetaphysic.edu/Org/html/056708969824

Jung C.G (1969). *The Archetypes and Collective Unconscious* 2nd edition translated by RFC Hull Princeton: Princeton University Press

... (1936) *Individual Dream Symbolism in Relation to Alchemy* in *Collected Work Relation To Alchemy*. In *Collected Works* Vol. 12 Originally Published In 1936 accessed On March 29, 2014 from www.Jungmetaphysics.edu/org/html/06617894283

Norman Melchert (2007) *The Great Controversy 5th Edition*. Vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Okoro, Kingsley (2014) 'Inquest into Common Humanity through Myths and Mythologies: Joseph Campbell Paradigm' *Scholars Journal Of Arts , Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol 2, No 1 (79-93)<http://sasjournal.com/sjahss>.

Omerogbe J.I. (1991). *A Simplified History of Western Philosophy* Vol 2 *Modern Philosophy*. Ikeja: Joja Press.

... (1993) *Philosophical Look at Religion*. Ikeja: Joja Educational Research

Peter F.E (1967) *Greek Philosophical Terms: A Historical Lexicon*. New York: University Press

Rene Descartes (1641) *Meditation on First Philosophy with Selections from the Objections and Replies*. (ed) John Cortingham (1996) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. accessed on 21st March, 2014 from www.ModernEpistemology.edu/Org

Robert Audi (1995). (ed) *Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Ross, Kelley L (2009) *Carl Gustav Jung 1875 -1961*. New York: New breed Publications assessed on 4th April 2014 from www.Jungepistemologyworldorganization//edu

Samet, Jerry (2014) *The Historical Controversy Surrounding Innatism* The Standard Encyclopedia of Philosophy. New York: Standard Publishers

Singer. D.. (1972) *Boundaries of the Soul: The Practice o.f Jung's Psychology* New York: Doubleday

Wendy, Swan (2006) *Tina Keller's Analyses with C.G Jung and Toni Volff, 1915 -1928*. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*. Vol. 57 September, 2006 (493)

Wikiversity Historical Introduction to Philosophy/Epistemology. accessed On 3rd Feb., 2014. from www.epistemology.edu/Org.html/6275089601

Wulff .D.M (1997). *Psychology of Religion: Classic and Contemporary*. New York: John Wiley.