

## Editorial

Darrell Dobson

It is with great pleasure that we present the inaugural volume of *Jung: the e-Journal of the Jungian Society for Scholarly Studies*. This journal arises from the work of a group of scholars, mostly from New England, who, in 2002, initiated what has become an annual academic conference celebrating, questioning, and critiquing the research and theories of C.G. Jung and the post-Jungians (particularly important to the creation of this group is the work of Charlotte Spivak, Christine Herold, Barabara Silliman, and Glenda Andrade). The foundational focus of the conference was (and remains) the humanities and the arts, though contributions to the conference and the journal are welcomed from any field. In 2003, this group began publishing peer-reviewed, selected papers from the conference, and these are available at [www.thejungiansociety.org/Conferences](http://www.thejungiansociety.org/Conferences); this practice will continue.

I sense that we are on the cusp of a most exciting time for Jungian studies in the academy. A growing impression of place, purpose, and voice can be seen in the founding of this society, journal and annual conference (this year in Providence, Rhode Island; next year in Toronto, Ontario, Canada) as well as the recent founding of the International Association of Jungian Studies, their journal, *Harvest*, and annual conferences (this year in Texas, next year in Greenwich, U.K.). Arising independently, and both established in 2002, these groups share the goal of supporting the use of Jungian theory and research in the academy; I anticipate and encourage as much co-operation and intermingling between the groups and their members as possible.

Why now? I suggest that Jung's arguments for the social role of the arts provide an apt insight into the current surge of activity and interest in analytical psychology in the academy:

By giving [the archetypal image] shape, the artist translates it into the language of the present, and so makes it possible for us to find our way back to the deepest springs of life. Therein lies the social significance of art: it is constantly at work educating the spirit of the age, conjuring up the forms in which the age is most lacking. The unsatisfied yearning of the artist reaches back to the primordial image in the unconscious which is best fitted to compensate the inadequacy and one-sidedness of the present. People and times, like individuals, have their own characteristics and attitudes...very many psychic elements that could play their

part in life are denied the right to exist because they are incompatible with the general attitude...Here the artist's relative lack of adaptation turns out to his advantage; it enables him to follow his own yearnings far from the beaten path, and to discover what it is that would meet the unconscious needs of his age. Thus, just as the one-sidedness of the individual's conscious attitude is corrected by reactions from the unconscious, so art represents a process of self-regulation in the life of nations and epochs (*The Spirit in Man, Art, and Literature* 91)

Where Jung writes artist, I will be bold enough to substitute scholar. The arising of these two organizations "represents a process of self-regulation in the life" of the academy, which needs to compensate for a century of behaviouristic and quantifiable values and practices. Perhaps this movement has become possible due to the postmodern age, with its increased interest in the phenomenological and a general questioning of the positivist scientific perspectives that have dominated the paradigms of research in so many academic fields, even those outside of the sciences. I think these developments are due to a collective desire for meaning, for an increased awareness that we need more emphasis on the *qualities* of our academic, social, and personal lives. There is a shared recognition of the need to further imbue our professional and personal lives with soulfulness -- a spirituality that can be found by honouring the life of the psyche.

Let me acknowledge that there remains much resistance in the form of ignorance and bias against Jungian studies, exhibited often by those who have read little or none of Jung and the post-Jungians. I hope we can contribute to alleviating these biases. We also recognize that there are valid questions about archetypal theory being asked by scholars in fields such as post-modernism, gender, post-colonialism, race, and many others. If Jungian and post-Jungian thought is to gain a firmer place in the academy, those working in the field will show themselves to be familiar with that work and to be able to engage in informed dialogue -- certainly there will be many areas of divergence, but Jungian scholarship can be, and can be shown to be, informed by contemporary perspectives. Much work has been done within the domain of Jungian studies to answer such critiques, but that work too often remains unknown outside of the Jungian community. One of the goals of this journal will be to facilitate conversations between the 'Jungians' and the academic community. It seems to me that in doing so, an important task is to more clearly and adamantly define the nature of Jungian research and theory in order to respond to questions and movements current in the academy. In this regard, I recommend, for instance, Susan Rowland's fine book *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, in which she responds to valid feminist and postmodern critiques of archetypal theory -- For similar reasons, I also recommend Christopher Hauke's *Jung and the Postmodern*.

### **3 Dobson**

#### ***This Issue:***

Submissions arrived in the in-box from Israel, Taiwan, Poland, Canada, and the United States, and we look forward to expanding the international nature of the work represented herein. Each of the papers selected for publication has undergone blind review by at least three scholars (my own submission was recommended by each of four reviewers -- a fact I mention only in anticipation of valid questions regarding the 'peer-reviewed' integrity of editing and publishing in the same journal), and we are grateful to the reviewers for their contributions and suggestions.

The papers included cover a variety of topics: Austin Clarkson's paper details some pedagogical implications and applications of archetypal theory in his design and teaching of a university class on creativity. Kathryn Berthlesen provides an analysis of Wilson Harris' *The Guyana Quartet*, and provides an excellent example of contemporary archetypal literary theory in practice. My own paper uses a specific case, that of a postmodern feminist critique of Northrop Frye, to respond to some common postmodern critiques of archetypal literary theory. More papers are scheduled to be added to the journal as they become available. What they share is their practice of translating Jungian theory into the language of the present, and so making it possible for each of us to find our way back to the deepest springs of our professional and personal life.

Darrell Dobson  
Toronto, Ontario, Canada  
April, 2005