psyche and world', was too large a notion to be forced into the theory of projections. It was Jung's early conversations with Einstein that initially sparked his interest in synchronicity.[54] As these intuitions developed into a theoretical view of the world, Jung was aware that some of his work was thrown into doubt and confusion. Synchronicity calls for a different conception of the world than that provided by the notion of projections.

If, after withdrawing projections, there is nothing left that binds us to the world in a meaningful way, something has gone horribly wrong with our worldview. It was at this point that Jung found himself in need of a worldview that transcended psychology. Gilles Quispel reports that after Jung delivered his lecture on synchronicity at Eranos in 1951, Jung told him that 'now the concept of projection should be revised completely'.[55] This is a far cry from the Jung who wrote that 'Sooner or later we had to understand that the potency [of the world of objects] was really ours, and that their significance was our projection.'[56] It was as if the sorcerer who wanted to dispel spirits from the world wanted to reverse his sorcery. This moment represents a crisis in the history of analytical psychology, but it is a crisis which has yet to be fully realised or admitted. Analytical psychologists continue to speak in their practice about the withdrawal of projections, as if this is an axiomatic truth, without being mindful of Jung's concerns about the theory.

In *Synchronicity: An Acausal Connecting Principle*, he struggles with the notion of meaning in the world beyond that which is projected by humans. He calls it 'objective', 'transcendental', 'latent', 'a priori' or 'self-subsistent' meaning. 'The great difficulty', he writes, 'is that we have absolutely no scientific means of proving the existence of an objective meaning which is not just a psychic product', since 'meaning is an anthropomorphic interpretation'.[57] In a letter to Neumann, Jung says that the fact that we discover meaning after we have experienced something generates the impression that meaning has been invented by us. He disagrees with this subjectivist interpretation, which he thinks is a kind of illusion:

> Meaningfulness always appears to be unconscious at first, and can therefore only be discovered *post hoc*; hence there is always the danger that meaning will be read into things where actually there is nothing of

the sort. Synchronistic experiences serve our turn here. They point to a latent meaning which is independent of consciousness.[58]

If meaning is already present, how can we know this if we are forced to discover it *post hoc* or after the event? The rules of the epistemological game, of how we come to know things, seem to work against the discovery of *a priori* meaning, and in favour of the notion that meaning has been super-added by us, which provides the bias of materialistic science and existential philosophy. Jung recognises that there is meaning in the world beyond that which might be projected into it, but lacks the science to be able to tackle this problem.

Toward a post-rational animism

Increasingly in late career, Jung reversed the directions of his earlier thinking about psyche and world. He sought an objective psyche that was not 'put there' by the projection-making factor. It is as if, beneath a certain top layer of projections, which psychotherapy attempts to withdraw or make conscious, there is a deeper layer in which psyche and world are intermingled. This is the point at which normal therapy, concerned as it is with the development of the individual, gives way to a different kind of process, which might be called the therapy or making of the world soul. Perhaps this is the point at which psychology gives way to philosophy.

But Jung kept hitting an epistemological brick wall. His scientific thinking, based on Newtonian science and Cartesian logic, could not carry him across the dualistic boundary which separates psyche and world. In his attempts to write about the psyche that is already in the world, he has to resort to poetry, myth and metaphor. He cannot find the right scientific language that would allow him to walk in a one world or *unus mundus* that is free from such boundaries. In a letter of 1943, he writes: 'I am deeply convinced of the – unfortunately – still very mysterious relation between man and landscape, but hesitate to say anything about it because I could not substantiate it rationally.'[59]

In *The Reenchantment of the World*, Morris Berman acknowledges that Jung was the only figure in the scientific community of his time to attempt to move beyond the dualistic Cartesianism in which science had been caught. But Berman ends up dismissing Jung's attempt as a failure:

> Jung broke with scientism, but doing so propelled him backward in time. In Medieval and Renaissance alchemy he recognized a wholeness that permeated the psyche of the Middle Ages, and which was still present in human dream life. Clearly, dream analysis has a timeless importance, but any science constructed on Jungian premises would necessarily be a straightforward revival of the occult world view and thus a return to naïve animism. Jung shows us the path to a non-Cartesian world view, but his premises cannot be the basis for a post-Cartesian paradigm.[60]

This is an example of what I mentioned earlier: Jung takes the 'swerve' in the direction of the past and is accused of being naïve and regressive. The Lacanian scholar, Slavoj Zizek, makes the same accusation:

> Jung advocates a return to the pre-modern universe of Wisdom and its sexo-cosmology, the universe of a harmonious correspondence between the human microcosm and the macrocosm – that is to say, for him the subject of psychoanalysis is the pre-modern subject living in a universe in which 'everything has a meaning'.[61]

It is too easy for intellectuals to poke fun at Jung's project. They claim he is not transcending the modern paradigm, but going backwards, into a premodern cosmology. But not all voices chime in with this condemnation. For instance, physicist Wolfgang Pauli and biologist Rupert Sheldrake have argued that Jung's thinking points the way forward to a post-Cartesian paradigm.[62] More recently, scientific enquirers such as Jean Knox, Joseph Cambray and John Clarke have argued that Jung may have been more successful than Berman or Zizek intimate.[63] Although his work on psyche and world may seem like a reversion to magical thinking, developments in neuroscience, complexity theory and emergentism may be able to show that Jung was working with postmodern scientific concepts ahead of schedule as it were, and was groping in the dark for a science that had not yet been invented. Recent interpreters of Jung have argued that Jung's research can be better understood in the twenty-first century than in the twentieth, now that we have the 'new sciences' to act as our guide.[64]

Hillman and the new animism

In Hillman's view, Jung was trapped by the constrictions of science and wasted time trying to align his insights to scientific rationality. Hillman was not concerned about the problems of science, and felt Jung ought to have abandoned this pretence and opened up to the discourses of myth and philosophy. Hillman believes that postmodernism has exposed science as merely one 'fantasy' or archetypal lens through which we see the world. There are other lenses and some are more appropriate when it comes to seeing soul in the world. It is not that Hillman is not capable of scientific thought, but he is impatient with the slow pace of science, and does not want his intuitive apprehension to be stymied by questions of scientific validity. For Hillman, the fact that he has an insight about something is as much validity as he requires. This is another way of saying that Hillman is a poet rather than a scientist, and as such he has the ability to draw out the poetic and mythic qualities of Jung's thinking.

Hillman's notion that science is another myth is not only supported by postmodern philosophy, but by Jung himself:

> Psychology therefore translates the archaic speech of myth into a modern mythologem – not yet, of course, recognized as such – which constitutes one element of the myth 'science'.[65]

As Christopher Hauke has argued, Jung seemed to be a 'postmodernist' ahead of schedule.[66] Or, he had postmodern elements in his thinking, even if much of his thought remained in a modernist mode. Although Hillman's supporters claim that he represents a quantum leap beyond Jung, it is hard to imagine any single element of Hillman's thought that is not found also in Jung. Hillman attaches Jung's psychology to the notion of the world soul:

> Psychology may take the wider road, extending its horizon, venturing to the interior in a less literal manner [with] no cuts [between inside and outside]. The interior would be anywhere: anywhere we look and listen with a psychological eye and ear. The whole world becomes our consulting room, our petri dish.[67]

While this appears self-evident to Hillman, steeped as he is in the tradition of Platonic thought, most psychologists would see this as poetry rather than science. But in *Re-Visioning Psychology* Hillman attempted to win psychology back from science and to enlist it in the service of poetry. In that work he asserts a 'poetic basis of mind' and argues that psychology

should ‘start neither in the physiology of the brain, the structure of language, the organization of society, nor the analysis of behavior, but in the processes of imagination’.[68] Mind itself is mythopoetic and there is no need to analyse it in scientific terms. Just as poetry is based on metaphors, Hillman insists that a psychology based on archetypes is necessarily metaphorical. ‘Archetypes are metaphors rather than things. We find ourselves less able to say what an archetype is literally and more inclined to describe them in images. Archetypes throw us into an imaginative style of discourse.’[69] Although analytical psychologists still try, following Jung, to rescue the scientific status of the work, Hillman's followers jettison science as irrelevant and content themselves with metaphor and myth as explanatory principles.

Hillman is uncompromising when it comes to the question of projections: ‘The idea of projection’, he says, is ‘one of depth psychology's denial of things as they are so as to maintain its view of the world’.[70] Hillman exaggerates to make his point. It is possible, I would argue, to engage in a therapeutic withdrawal of personal projections and remain mindful of a transpersonal psyche in the world. In a rage against psychotherapy, he claims projection is a ‘defense’ against *anima mundi*, and as such it ‘needs reversing’. ‘What psychology has had to call ‘projection’ is simply animation…[in which] the soul of the thing corresponds or coalesces with ours.'[71] There is none of Jung's ambivalence here, no wrestling with the problem of separating ‘mind-created projections’[72] from soul in the world. Hillman has taken leave of science, and is exploring psychic reality with intuition and vision. He enjoins us to ‘re-vision’ not only psychology but projection as well, although few have followed this lead. Perhaps developing this line of research lies in the future of Jungian psychology. Ironically, it will probably be science that breaks the deadlock and allows us to understand animism in greater depth.

In his foreword to *Ecopsychology* Hillman says he reflects less on the difficulty of extending psychology across the Cartesian divide than he does on how psychology, as a discipline, was so easily uprooted from its base in philosophy and poetry:

> Sometimes I wonder less how to shift the paradigm [from inside to outside] than how psychology ever got so off base. How did it cut itself

> off from reality? Where else in the world would a human soul be so divorced from the spirits of the surroundings? Even the high intellectualism of the Renaissance, to say nothing of the modes of mind in ancient Egypt and Greece or contemporary Japan, allowed for the animation of things, recognizing a subjectivity in animals, plants, wells, springs, trees, and rocks. Psychology, so dedicated to awakening human consciousness, needs to wake itself up to one of the most ancient human truths: we cannot be studied or cured apart from the planet.[73]

According to Hillman animism is a natural part of our experience of the world. Where there is soul there is anima, and where there is anima there is animism. Hillman makes an important link between the rebirth of animism and the breakdown of the physical environment:

> The renaissance of a psychology that returns psychic reality to the world will find its starting point in psychopathology, in the actualities of the psyche's own suffering where depth psychology always arises.[74]
>
> The world, because of its breakdown, is entering a new moment of consciousness: by drawing attention to itself by means of its symptoms, it is becoming aware of itself as a psychic reality. The world is now the subject of immense suffering, exhibiting acute and crass symptoms by means of which it defends itself against collapse.[75]

In conversation with Michael Ventura, Hillman exclaims:

> The world has become full of symptoms. Isn't that the beginning of recognizing what used to be called animism? The world's alive [and] it's having effects on us…There's pathology in the world and through that we're beginning to treat the world with more respect. The soul is always being rediscovered through pathology. In the nineteenth century people didn't talk about psyche, until Freud came along and discovered psychopathology.[76]

Just as psyche speaks through pathology and disease, and was discovered through symptoms, we are faced with the rediscovery of soul-in-the-world through ecological illnesses. This is a genuinely original insight of Hillman's and an important one for the recovery of ecological integrity. To become sane, we need to become a little crazy, and see that the world's sufferings are cracks, fissures, doorways into what might be called the

inside of the world. It is through the cracks that the soul of the world is being revealed, but if the world 'cracks up' there will be no future. Therefore, working on the symptoms of the ecological breakdown is not only important for physical survival but is a way of facing the repressed subjectivity of the world. The world is coming alive to us because we can feel its suffering as never before.

According to Hillman, a psychology that sees the world as a play of archetypes must lead to a restoration of animism: 'The artificial tension between soul and world, private and public, interior and exterior disappears when the soul as *anima mundi*, and its making, is located in the world.'[77] Perhaps we could call it postmodern animism, or a new version of pan-psychism. Hillman's view is both 'old-fashioned and radically novel'.[78] It is not a regression to a previous stage of history, but an awakening, in the modern context, of an ancient and archaic mode of apprehension. As Mircea Eliade put it: 'The sacred is an element in the structure of consciousness, not a stage in the history of consciousness.'[79] As a structure of consciousness, animism is destined to return. It will return, Hillman says, in conjunction with our experience of a disordered world. As Jung announced in 1929, 'the gods have become diseases',[80] so today we might say 'the spirits of the earth are toxic', and we are urged to take them seriously.