Depth Psychology and Climate Change

The Green Book

Edited by Dale Mathers

Copyrighted material

First published 2021
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2021 selection and editorial matter, Dale Mathers; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Dale Mathers to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted by them in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

LCCN: 2020911717

ISBN: 978-0-367-23717-2 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-367-23721-9 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-0-429-28135-8 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

Copyrighted material

Part Four

Myths and Futures

Chapter eleven

Time, intuition and imagination

Dale Mathers

> The idea of the future, pregnant with an infinity of possibilities, is thus more fruitful than the future itself, and this is why we find more charm in hope than possession, in dreams rather than reality.
>
> Bergson, Henri (1912 / 2018 p. 10)

What is change?

There is so much 'gloom and doom' around climate change, I felt in need of a fresh approach. So, before writing this, I asked for a dream . . .

> *In an old library, an older friend, the late George Blaker, sits in a leather chair, with an open book on his desk. He smiles and says, 'Re-read "the Imprisoned Splendour," and you will find the philosophy you need.'*

In 1975, whilst I was a young medical student, George lent me this book (1953).
Its author, Raynor Johnson, was Professor of Physics at the University of Melbourne. The 'Imprisoned Splendour' is the name he gave to the spirit trapped in the material world. Here, 'spirit' means 'the Eternal soul' as well as 'spirit' - as in spiritualism. Johnson gives descriptive accounts of many paranormal experiences: clairvoyance, mediumship, ghosts, precognition, telekinesis. Jung researched parapsychology for his Doctorate, writing about his

young cousin, Helene Preiswerk, a self-proclaimed trance medium (CW 1, para 1 - 165). His convincement of the reality of the paranormal contributed to his split from Freud (Main, 1997 pp 2 - 5).

Jung became fascinated by alchemy, a ‘great grandparent’ to natural philosophy and science. Alchemists supposed ‘the Divine spirit’ was imprisoned in matter. So, alchemy as a metaphor is an insight from this dream. Metaphor is part of the insight also – metaphors are symbols for transformation. For me, a library symbolises transformation: books are distillations of thoughts and feelings, where the ‘gold’ of new thinking may be hidden.

In this chapter, I look at how understanding time, using intuition and imagination, can help us face into climate change and how a perennial philosophical problem – the distinction between spiritual and material explanations about ‘being in the world’ - entangles with how we navigate time. Time navigation is a skill. It’s use depends on our occupation and our culture. Musicians are highly tuned to time. Analysts are good at knowing how long fifty minutes is. I’ll look at the ‘behind, below and above’ of time, as it’s perception (or lack of it) is a contributing cause of climate change.

Naturally, we simply cannot experience time beyond ‘our lifetime’ – about seventy-five years. We may know a great grandparent; we may meet a great grandchild. Three generations behind and before gives a transgenerational span of about a hundred and fifty years. For a beech tree, a transgenerational span is about twelve hundred years; for a bacteria, maybe twelve hours. So, actions with consequences in a future we can never know obviously can’t be felt-and-lived experiences, they can only be perceived by intuition or imagination.

Our planet and its many ecosystems survived several ice ages. Now it's overheating. Climate always changes, and change is, usually, natural. Whether for a galaxy or a planet, change is a result of existing in time. We don't usually think about time in the abstract; we live in it as a fish lives in water, swim in its flow from past to present to future, and know, for each of us, 'our time' will end. Mostly, we live in denial of our own death, to make our personal world feel safe. But denial of time's flow can never work. Time catches up with us.

Time also 'permits' free will. Without it, actions cannot have consequences. Temporal flow creates causality. In the West, this is a basic metaphysical concept: 'meta' is Greek for 'behind, below or above'; metaphysics is the 'behind, below and above' of physics (formerly called 'natural philosophy'). In the East, the idea actions have consequences isn't a metaphysical argument; it is an everyday fact, called karma. As a Buddhist, I'd say all our experiences arises from karma. Climate change is our karma. This hardly seems worth saying, except when denial becomes a political change-management technique. Denial, like splitting and projective identification (analysts call these 'the primitive defences of the Self'), works against reality testing. If you remove reality, you remove freedom of choice.

We don't have to 'save the planet'. Our planet, as a planet, is perfectly safe - until the sun expands in about three billion years. The ecosystem is in danger, and this sense of danger invades our inner worlds, our minds, creating shame and guilt, evoking 'primitive defences'. Our minds are likewise complex ecosystems - neural forests, each with over ten billion interconnected trees. Through an unconscious sharing percepts and concepts, we connect to others by the collective unconscious. This natural network uses intuition and imagination to find new choices, to adapt to new realities. We have no choice about the reality of climate change, we have many choices about *how* we face it. We could become angry, grief stricken,

or both. An early description of Eco-grief is given by American hospital chaplain and ecologist Phyllis Windle in 'Ecopsychology' (Roszak et al.,1995, p 136 - 46): it feels the same as any other bereavement.

Floating on a raft of denial, rage, guilt and shame, eco-grief arises from our inability to experience time beyond 'our lifetime'. Loss can be painful beyond imagining. Yet, till recently, we simply couldn't imagine where our old trainers or plastic bags went. Now we can, and do, and despair. So, to start finding hope, I 'll tell you about . . .

The scientific and medical network

Amplifying the dream further, in the early 1970's George Blaker, a senior British civil servant, co-founded the Scientific and Medical Network with Dr. Patrick Shackleton, then Dean of Southampton Medical School. Once, Patrick gave me a lift, and our conversation was life changing. We spoke about the Imprisoned splendour, sharing concerns about the exclusion of the Spiritual, in any form, from our discipline and its replacement by Scientific (and Medical) Materialism – fundamentalism in a white coat. As a young member of the Student Network, I watched John Davy (science correspondent of the Observer newspaper) hold up a micrometer and ask, 'Can you measure happiness by using this to measure a smile?' He introduced the distinction between the quantifiable - the scientific, and the unquantifiable - inner experience.

This distinction was made by the French philosopher, Henri Bergson. Distinguishing between quantifiable time (how long it will take for the Ice caps to vanish) and qualitative time (how deeply will we grieve after the Ice caps vanish) helps us be aware of both time-bound and

time-free experience. This discrimination helps in adapting to change. Perhaps, as other writers in this book suggest, denying 'the Spiritual' fosters abusive and neglectful attitudes to each other and all living beings. But Materialism isn't a synonym for greed. In philosophy, materialism means imagining one 'substance' makes everything: consciousness, thought and feeling arise *only* from material interactions. As a Buddhist, I might say, 'arise from material interactions' - the 'word '*only*' is the problem - as in 'there is *only* the material world'.

The idea 'everything is quantifiable', (measurable) and *only* the quantifiable exists belongs to scientific monism. Its opposite, spiritual monism, isn't synonymous with 'good'. There are many 'self-styled' gurus and more-than-doubtful religious practices, at least as problematic as scientific materialism. They may create 'transcendent defences', like this: 'Climate change? It's God's Holy Plan! We live in the Tribulation before Judgement day, when the Righteous . . .' and so on . . . a popular, populist discourse.

Seeing the universe as both spiritual and material is called Dualism. It has several forms; some suggest certain things are beyond human understanding yet are knowable to 'a creator God'. The philosophical problem - monism versus dualism - matters for eco-crisis because how we see 'spirit' and 'matter' shapes how we navigate time and whether we retain Free Will. As 'actions have consequences' and climate change will affect future people more than three generations ahead, we are free to choose not to endanger them. Young English philosopher Charlotte Wright explains (2018 p.9) current people have a moral obligation to future people. She argues there are two ways to approach this:

> 'T*he Rights Account* - future people have rights which we ought not to violate. These rights mean that we ought to benefit future people in certain ways, or else we are being immoral.'

> And
>
> 'The *Value Account* - we should do that which makes the world go best, and whenever that entails protecting or benefiting future people, we ought to protect or benefit them.'

Like Wright, I favour the Value account. Measuring 'rights' leads to endless legal arguments. Perhaps 'values' are an 'Imprisoned Splendour', the notion we share a common humanity? Let's look at a different sort of law: natural philosophy, the project of including the spiritual with the material. Let's step back a hundred years, to . . .

Henri Bergson

. . . born in Paris in 1859 to a Polish father and an English mother. After a traditional Jewish religious education, he lost faith during adolescence, finding too many contradictions between dogma and experience. Mathematically gifted, at eighteen he won a prestigious national prize. His tutor, learning Henri wished to study philosophy reputedly said, 'what a waste!' (Lawlor and Leonard, 2016). But Maths includes learning to write equations - propositions describing reality. This Bergson did, tackling the matter / spirit problem, challenging the view of the eighteenth-century Prussian metaphysician Immanuel Kant.

Bergson taught philosophy in Clermont- Ferrand, France, where, in 1889, he completed 'Time and Free Will', winning his Doctorate. In this work, he questions Kant's idea that causality 'belongs to God,' who lives outside of time. Bergson suggests our immediate, inner experience is of duration (la durée), the flow of felt time, in which there is no sequencing of events. Felt - experiences of time are not measurable (see Bergson, 1912 / 2018, p 56 -77; Guerlac, 2006 p 68 – 70). In 1907 he wrote 'Creative Evolution', which in 1927, won him

the Nobel prize. The English philosopher Bertrand Russell (1912)said, 'he writes *literature*'; and regarded Bergson as a distinguished *fiction* writer (though he accepted the same prize in 1950). In 1913, Bergson toured America, lecturing on freedom and spirituality to large audiences. The same year he Chaired the Society for Psychical Research (SPR) in London; then, boundaries between psychology and parapsychology were undefined. The 'Imprisoned splendour' was open to scientific investigation.

Paranormal (spiritual and spiritualist) phenomena may be understood, in part, as temporal disturbances, when 'inner time' experiences are mistaken for 'outer'. The late Prof. Arthur Ellison (a Network member, and a Chair of the SPR) suggests ghosts are felt memories persisting after the person from whom they came has died (1988 p. 15 – 25) Ghosts (apparitions) are, if you like, a legacy for future people. They're a link across time: much analysis involves letting ghosts become ancestors.

In 1922, Bergson 'lost' a debate with Albert Einstein on the nature of time: perhaps he didn't grasp the finer points of quantum mechanics, perhaps Einstein didn't grasp the finer points of philosophy. However, Bergson's distinction between 'material time' (science's time 't') and 'spiritual time', says, like quantum mechanics, what you see depends on where you observe – and what you observe *for*. Like Jung, he suggests we can observe the spiritual, the material, or both. His argument is against 'quantifying' and for 'qualifying'. We can't measure inner, felt experience: perhaps that's why we can't 'measure' the paranormal? Then, we can't measure 'guilt' either.

A musical analogy may help. Though we stick to 'the time signature' it is the *feeling* brought to the notes – and the space between them – which gives music its soul. Suppose spiritual

experiences, in inner time, are about feeling. In the dream, my late friend George smiled. The feeling was lightness and relief: 'there is an answer!' Knowing we see time in two ways, inner and outer, helped me gain perspective about climate change: 'change has always happened. We survived the Ice ages . . .' The dream led me to Bergson, whose influence on Jung is deep; yet, curiously, hardly acknowledged. His name doesn't appear in American philosopher Marilyn Nagy's book on Jung's philosophical influences (1991). Maybe because of his spirituality and spiritualism, Bergson's reputation lay hidden, until rediscovered by, amongst others, French philosopher Gilles Deleuze (1925 - 1995). He said:

> If philosophy has a positive and direct relation to things, it is only insofar as philosophy claims to grasp the thing itself, according to what it is, in its difference from everything it is not, in other words, in its internal difference (Deleuze, 2004, pp. 32 - 51).

The 'thing in itself' is 'the thing seen intuitively'. Intuition requires a sense of ourselves as beings flowing within time. So, what is time? Is it material, spiritual, or both? We face climate change: we know what climate is, we need to understand what *change* is. It is made of . . .

Time

Scientific time (the 't' in equations) is measured in seconds, defined in SI units derived from the natural vibrational frequency of caesium 133. In the early twentieth century, the emergent discipline of psychology obsessed about measurement - using micrometers to measure smiles. Bergson saw this approach ignored felt and lived experience. In 'Time and Free Will' he suggests time is mobile and incomplete. For an individual, inner time can speed up, slow down, stop or go backwards (as in a déjà vu experience).

Outer time is consistent. Inner time wobbles, remember waiting to see the dentist or to take an exam which we've not prepared for. Analysts notice this: a 'fifty-minute hour' may feel like it passes in seconds or drags on for years. Time bends and twists in our dreams: my friend George died many years ago but is alive in my inner world. Dream time is not clock time. Once, we lived almost time free lives. Hopefully, you remember how time felt when you were a child. First, there is 'now', 'this present moment'. Gradually, we discover telling the time; yet, at nine years old, the distance between breakfast and bedtime is vast. As we age, time contracts. Grand children turn from babies to teenagers in 'next to no time'.

Time perception depends on our perceptual apparatus. In humans, this is complex, involving several overlapping neural networks. Some determine wake / sleep cycles, involving the pineal gland and melatonin. Others, far larger, determine hormone releases and give the felt-sense of time. Yet others give 'time as a memory' - 'I read Jackson's book when I was a student . . .' We can't do 'fine discrimination' of time. We can't see flickering light if the frequency is greater than twenty-five times a second: so, cinema works by flicker fusion; we see separate images as continuous (a solid line) when they are discrete (a broken line, a packet - a quantum). Bergson emphasized the difference between continuous and discrete experience: between the flow of time and a quantum of time.

So, what is inner time? Clearly, not 'clock time' - the 't' in equations. Scientific time is 'discrete'. This is the 'quantum' in quantum physics - broken lines. The unit of quantum time is 'Planck time' (named after German physicist Max Planck), it is 5.4 x 10 *to the minus forty-four* of a second. At this scale, time does not flow. We can only imagine this, as does the Italian physicist Carlo Rovelli (2018, pp. 72 – 85): who describes, at the quantum level,

space-time is granular, like rice. We may feel this in the bubbles of collective despair arising from natural disasters, like the Australian bush fires. Suffering has a granularity.

To explore 'felt' time we need to be in touch with our inner worlds. Duration, (la durée) is glimpsed in symbols and images, grasped by intuition and imagination. Bergson's friend, American psychology pioneer William James, said Bergson helped him give up logic, squarely and irrevocably' as 'reality, life, experience, concreteness, immediacy, use what word you will, exceeds our logic, overflows, and surrounds it'. (James 1909 / 2015, pp. 111 – 136). This helps us now because rational, logical 'scientific' arguments fail to convince many of the reality of climate change. Fine. So, we need illogic, unreason . . . and imagination, one of the gifts of childhood's timeless experience. We need dreams, which are time free.

Ancient Greek representations of time help make this clearer. Chronos (father of the Olympians) is Old Father Time, Saturn, the grim reaper with the scythe and hourglass who measures 'Life-Time'. Kairos, the young god, is 'the opportune moment' – god of chance and change. London Jungian Yvette Weiner (1996) reminds us when we imagine gods, we're looking at metaphors for psychic processes. So, if time is *both* an inner *and* outer experience, *both* Chronos *and* Kairos, how do we navigate? Do we decide inner time is imaginary and scientific time is real? This is not theoretical: the existence of future people depends on deciding whether climate change is real or imaginary. Time perception is crucial to reality testing.

Reality testing and alethiometry

Here is a fictional 'clinical example', taken from Philip Pullman's fantasy trilogy 'His Dark Materials'. In 'Northern Lights' the young heroine, Lyra, is given an Alethiometer (1988, p 79). It looks like an old-style pocket watch, with three large hands and a small one. It measures truth (in Greek αλήθεια, Alethia, means truth). You choose three symbols for your question from the thirty-six round the rim, then push the button. The thin hand, driven by 'dust' (elementary particles linked to consciousness) spins round and settles on a symbol suggesting an answer.

Let's ask about climate change. We choose a skull (death), a globe (the planet), and an hourglass (time), and our answer is a tree. What does a tree mean? Trees link above to below - earthy roots to airy leaves - water is moved up them by the fire of the sun – this is an alchemical metaphor - so, plant more trees. Fourteen billion trees (twenty per person) fixes enough carbon to make a difference. Trees symbolise life, a forest symbolises an ecosystem . . . any symbol is an ecosystem of ideas with multiple layers of meaning, as described in Jungian analyst Leopold Stein's classic paper 'What is a symbol supposed to be?' (1957). Greek messenger boys were given half a broken disc bearing the sender's seal. The recipient proved their identity by joining their half to the messengers'. In Greek, 'Sym' means 'together' and 'Bolos' means 'to throw' - symbols 'throws ideas' together to make new ones.

Symbolic truths are open and flexible, with layers and levels of meaning (Mathers 2001 pp. 191 - 6). Analysts play with symbols when we work with dreams, helped by our intuition: a sense of what *may* happen. My first analyst supposed 'paranormal events' were attuned intuition, adding, 'the trouble with intuition is we assume it's true; and it is, half the time. The

trouble is, we don't know which half.' Intuition relies on trusting the unconscious *may* pull out from sense data the likeliest of a set of future probabilities. To intuit is to be with duration (la durée) where there is no causality. Things *just are.*

As mentioned earlier, speculations about space, time and causality are basic to metaphysics, the 'behind, below and above' of natural philosophy. Imagine an oil painting: if metaphysics is the frame and canvas, then philosophy is the picture. Pictures evoke feeling. Science evokes feelings too, sometimes outrage when it contradicts entrenched political positions. We need to look 'behind, below and above' political discourses, and, as the young climate activist Greta Thunberg said at the Unite Nations, 'look at the science.' But many people don't want to look at the science. Political discourses have a political purpose – to create an illusion of control to benefit of those in power. Challenging their discourse upsets fundamentalists (and fundamentalist parts of our psyche) which deny change: lying is necessary to maintain closed system thinking. What might open system reality testing be like? This is what an analyst encourages. Could it help us test the truth or falsity of a discourse? How would it do this? To move forward, let's step back – this time, to the eighteenth century.

Percepts without concepts are blind

This famous saying is by Kant, the metaphysician: who is sometimes paraphrased as saying' we perceive reality not as *it is*, but as *we are*.' This is at the heart of our collective problem with 'being in time' and being with climate change. As this is scientifically, materially, real, how can anyone imagine otherwise? Because they don't have, or choose not to have, the appropriate concepts; or, they lie. Science is based on accurate and repeated perceptions, it's

a search for truth. Metaphysics questions perceptions: asking ‘what’s real, and how do we know it?’ Useful, to help recognise lies.

If you had an alethiometer, it would be useless without concepts to fit the symbols. What symbols would you choose if you asked about climate change? Your choices depend on your concepts. If you conceive of spiritual reality as an ‘Imprisoned Splendor’, this would shape your choice. In the Middle Ages Alchemists (early scientists), didn’t fuss about the material / spiritual duality. For them, *obviously,* Spirit was trapped in Matter (a gnostic idea) and it was their noble task to free it! Base metals (like lead) *obviously* contained the spiritual seeds of higher metals, like gold. All you had to do was encourage the metal to grow (see ‘Splendor Solis’ an illuminated manuscript on the alchemical process; Skinner et al, 2019 p 14 – 16 & 146). The ‘obvious’ is ‘the world-as-it appears-to-us.’

Kant argued cause and effect are in the ‘world-as-it-appears-to-us’, and so are space and time. They are concepts, not a ‘things-in-themselves;’ and they are ‘concepts’ we impose on sense-data, rather than features of the real world. He thought there is a world outside our minds which is the way it is regardless of our concepts, yet we have no access to what it is like. He suggested causation occurs *only* in the ‘world-as-it-appears-to-us’, not in an underlying mind-independent reality. It's not clear Kant consistently thought causation is always *only* part of ‘world-as-it-appears-to-us’ and not a ‘thing-in -itself’, because he thought ‘things-in-themselves’ are the source of our sensory experiences. It's hard to see how they could be the ‘source’ of our sensory experiences unless they also ‘cause’ those experiences.

However, without time, there is no cause and effect, no choice and no free will. If causality lies *only* in the ‘hand of God’ – His Ineffable Divine plan. This creates problems about free

will: ‘predestination.’ Though Kant tried, he couldn’t escape his awful childhood education in Pietism, a fundamentalist Evangelical sect which slithered towards ‘brutal predestination’: as in Calvinism - ‘the Elect’ who reach Heaven are chosen before they’re born.

Kant helps us understand the status of a concept, with which we can work out what’s real. How do we know the science of climate change is real? We look at cause and effect. What happens when we look at dreams or other timeless inner-world experiences? Are they real? Confused? That’s an honest response, as the boundary between real and unreal is *fractal*. Imagine a cloud, or a coast: where is the edge? We imagine we’ve seen it, but the closer we look, the more the pattern repeats. Symbols also lack edges; in part, because they are timeless. Any symbol on an alethiometer has endless interpretations.

Freud reflected on Kant’s ‘Critique of Pure Reason’. The French philosopher Paul Ricoeur (1965) points out the psychoanalytic project is full of cause and effect thinking, as in the much-parodied interpretation - ‘it’s your mother’. Comparing Freud to Marx and Nietzsche, Ricoeur suggests the three are a ‘trio of suspicion’, believing our unconscious seeks to conceal or disguise experience: dreams and symbols *conceal* rather than *reveal* truth. Symbols are *only* distorted reflections of basic (sexual) desires. It is as if Freud assumes our unconscious lies. This is not probable. More likely our unconscious strives to tell the truth. Where will we turn to find out how to face into climate change? To our unconscious, particularly our collective unconscious, which navigated the Ice Ages and the Great Thaws. The idea of the collective unconscious another Bergson and Jung had in common. Let’s see how their ideas came together.

Jung and Bergson

How did Jung happen on Bergson's ideas? I'm indebted to research by Pete Gunter from the University of Texas (1982) for what follows. Jung read Bergson's 'Time and free will' in 1907 - Bergson was already famous - and discussed it with friends in Zurich. When he distanced himself from Freud, around 1913, a big argument was over the meaning of 'libido'. Did this simply mean sexual energy? Could it mean *elan vital* (vital energy)? This, Bergson suggested, was the differentiating substance between spiritual and material realities. Maybe 'Imprisoned Splendour' is a synonym for *elan vital.*

It's well known Jung could not 'reduce' dreams to sexual fantasies, or hold religious experience was '*only*' an elaborate deception by a perfidious unconscious. By 1913 he was working on 'the Red Book', internally torn apart by the conflict with Freud. He symbolised it as between 'the Spirit of the Times' (scientific time, and materialism), and 'the Spirit of the Depths' (inner time, and spirituality) (see Jung, C.G., 2009, pp. 229 – 31). These concepts derive from Bergson. Jung lived out and lived through his own materialist / spiritualist dilemma. The inner world he found was a vivid landscape peopled with mythological figures: Salome, Elijah, Philemon and the dying God, Izdubar. The Red Book is unfinished. It gives us a method as useful as Free Association, called active imagination (see chapter eight). Both Jung and Bergson use symbolic thinking as a meaning-making bridge between external and internal space-time. What might happen if instead of 'fighting climate change' we wondered what it symbolises?

Symbolic thinking

For Bergson and Jung, symbols are ways to reveal, not conceal, truth. Dreams talk to us in symbols, in timeless language based on archetypes. An archetype can be thought of as a shared pattern for psychological behaviour: for example, the patterns 'mother' and 'father' are shared by all mammals. Forming and using symbols requires intuition, by which Bergson means 'going inside the skin'. He uses the word 'sympathy' to mean 'being inside the object' (Lapoujade, 2018, p 39 – 40). The same happens in empathy, in an analysts 'counter transference' – sharing sensations and feelings with our patients, which resonate with past experience. We leave 'clock time' and enter duration, (la durée) - a fifty-minute hour can 'last' fifty seconds or fifty years. Time is a 'both /and' experience: reality is a 'both / and' experience too. Reality testing happens in the immediate present – which William James called 'the specious present' - it takes time for neural impulses to be transmitted.
It is ' . . . the prototype of all conceived times... the short duration of which we are immediately and incessantly sensible.' (James 1893, p 609)

Paranormal events, and symbolic events occur on or in the borders between the material and the spiritual, sharing something of both. They are liminal. Materialist science tends to ridicule this: if we can't measure it, then it's not real. How do you measure a feeling? With a micrometer? Bergson's solution to the spiritual / material problem is both are 'real', though it depends how you look at it, and what you are looking at it for. We live in a liminal time, perhaps answers may come from liminal experiences: dreams, active imagination and symbols.

Jung and his friend, the pioneer of quantum physics Wolfgang Pauli, developed thinking around the spiritual / material problem in what's called the 'Pauli / Jung conjecture' (Atmansbacher and Fuchs, 2017 pp. 1- 7). This offers a pluralistic view, a 'both / and'. An 'Imprisoned Splendour' is the 'both / and' construction. This allows more than one thing to be true at the same time. I think this is part of the natural philosophy of symbols - as a symbol, like the position, mass and charge of an electron, can never be completely defined. Symbols contain an 'X', where 'X' means an unknowable; not something we could measure (like the weather on Neptune), but something we can never measure - like a feeling, or 'the Spiritual'. Using 'both / and' defines pluralism: a natural antidote to fundamentalism which is an unwavering attachment to an irrational set of beliefs -which psychiatrists call a delusion. As Anthony Giddens, then Director of the London School of Economics said to The New Statesman magazine:

> Q: 'What do you consider the greatest threat at present to individual freedom and liberty?'
>
> A: 'The rise of fundamentalism of all kinds. Contrary to received wisdom of the moment, I believe we should oppose all forms of moral absolutism. The simplest way to define fundamentalism is as a refusal of dialogue - the assertion that *only* one way of life is authentic or valid. Dialogue is the very condition of a successful pluralistic order.'
>
> Giddens (1997)

The Pauli Jung Conjecture

. . . is an example of scientific pluralism: an applied 'both / and. Austrian physicist Wolfgang Pauli (1900 - 1958) was, like Bergson, a youthful genius, publishing a paper on Einstein's theory of relativity in 1918, when he finished High School. He met Jung in 1930, after a difficult divorce and the death of his mother. Jung referred him to a colleague, kept his friendship, wrote about his dreams in 'Psychology and Alchemy' (CW vol 12, discussed further in the Jung Pauli letters: Jung, C.G., and Pauli, W. 2015 *passim*).

They collaborated, among other things, on aspects of the spirit / matter problem and synchronicity, which I'll briefly discuss later. Their conjecture supposes mind and matter are quantal (exist in minimal quantities). As light can be both a particle and a wave so 'substance' can have spiritual and material properties: depending on who is observing, and for what purpose. Rather as Raynor Johnson describes, (1953 pp. 190 – 217) ghosts tend to vanish when you go looking for them. The intention affects the observation. They suggest spirit and matter are complementary, mutually exclusive, yet both needed to describe the natural world - to do natural philosophy, to understand climate change.

Formally stated, the 'Pauli Jung conjecture' or 'double aspect theory' says different aspects of perception show a complementarity in a quantum physical sense. As the Swiss analytical psychologist Harald Atmanspacher (2012) says, 'Two descriptions are complementary if they mutually exclude each other yet are both necessary to describe a situation exhaustively.' This amplifies Bergson. Another example of dual aspect theory is synchronicity, which Pauli helped Jung clarify.

Synchronicity

One of the strange things about Pauli was his legendary ‘paranormal’ ability to cause practical physics experiments to break. Apparatus would mysteriously fall apart, go wrong or smash:

> ‘ . . . in Professor J. Franck's laboratory in Göttingen . . . without apparent cause, a complicated apparatus for the study of atomic phenomena collapsed. Franck wrote humorously about this to Pauli at his Zürich address and, after some delay, received an answer in an envelope with a Danish stamp. Pauli wrote that he had gone to visit Bohr and at the time of the mishap in Franck's laboratory his train was stopped for a few minutes at the Göttingen railroad station.’ (Gamow, 1966 p. 64)

A synchronicity is always a memorable felt experience; an event is synchronicity when a meaningful coincidence occurs within a close time, without causal connection. Jung suggested there is an ‘acausal connecting principle’. His idea originated in the nineteen twenties (CW 8, para 816 – 862, and Main (1997) *passim*). Meaningful coincidences are common in analysis, we see patterns of meaning in symbols repeat across a lifetime and over generations. Cultures have synchronicities too: like realising ‘planting trees helps prevent climate change’. One person realises, then everyone has the same idea. Intuition flows naturally through the collective unconscious without advertising or marketing. Suddenly, ‘everyone knows’.

It may look like ‘the tree planting revelation’ is *only* a ‘but we always knew that’ - perhaps cultural synchronicities take longer to notice? Cultures are like holograms: each person carries the whole picture. London Jungian Louis Zinkin (1987) describes the brain as a

hologram: the capacity to make meaning, indeed meaning itself, is distributed across the whole brain, rather than localised in one part.

Perhaps synchronicity is a 'cross over' state, in which internal time is experienced as external - we projectively identify a need for meaning into the world, then find it, as if the meaning was implicit. David Bohm, professor of theoretical physics at Birkbeck College London also proposed the value of using two different frames of reference to describe the paradoxical behaviour of subatomic particles. Like Bergson's ideas about the difference between the quantifiable and the qualifiable, between clock time and felt time, and in the Pauli Jung conjecture, he suggests the difference between implicate and explicate order relates to differences in behaviour as scale changes. At a subatomic scale, space and time are not good describers of position or interaction. Space, time and causality are enfolded within reality, creating the ground of being (Bohm 1980 p xv). The 'material world' we live in and experience is 'explicate', folded out from this.

This enfolding of meaning is described by the American psychologist Lawrence Le Shan in 'The Medium, the Mystic and the Physicist' (1974, *passim*) who gives many examples of synchronicity. Jung's idea is the projection of unconscious content onto and into the material world is not surprising. He imagined this happened in the paranormal - an intuitive, future dimension. As Le Shan explains (ibid., p 62 - 79) 'trusting the science' no longer must mean 'abandoning a spiritual perspective' - it means regaining a sense of wonder, remembering science includes the imaginal and the intuitive. The Pauli -Jung conjecture simply gives words to this. Synchronicity is a principle which has explanatory power for Jung's concepts of archetypes and the collective unconscious.

I'm not suggesting awareness of synchronicities or 'the spiritual' will 'solve' climate change. I am suggesting our capacity to make new meanings from old symbols is far greater than we imagine.

Time and climate change

'But it is too late. We've run out of time. We're doomed!' No, not really. Time is granular at the smallest level – and - time is both a felt experience and a scientific fact. It is a descriptive name for a frontier between material and spiritual experience. We can't talk about 'the timeless present' or 'the eternal now' if we don't have a concept of time in the first place. Time is the space where choice occurs. We don't have to get stuck in a loop in time by making the same mistakes all over again. I'm not suggesting we will be saved by 'the Sprits in the Sky' - a transcendent defence. We need to engage with 'things as they really are'.

Analysts see these loops of trapped meaning occurring in 'projective identifications', one of the primitive defences of the Self. All of them appear when a person, culture or community are under serious threat. Projection means seeing in other people things which belong to us, usually negative things we'd like to deny (like our greed, hatred and delusions). Jungian analysts call this archetype 'the Shadow' - 'everything we would not wish to be' (CW 9 ii para 13 - 19). It can be as simple as feeling 'it's all their fault', or 'it's all the fault of *(fill in the blank)* - say, *'greedy capitalism*' (but where is your Pension Fund investing?) The Shadow also contains our potential, our unlived lives: it's our psychological 'Pension', something we unconsciously draw down as required. So, 'solutions' to climate change exist in the Shadow, and 'out of time' - in inner time, graspable by intuition.

Projective identification differs from projection. This occurs if an unconscious 'particle' leaves one person (or group) and appears in the unconscious of another, producing an immediate, time-free, response - before the other's conscious engages: for example, unspoken hostility in body language often provokes a physical retaliation. Unspoken meanings are shared, and there are causal, yet unconscious, connections. In synchronicity, there is a conscious, non-causal connection: the opposite. Much of the 'denial discourse' works by projective identification. A 'mighty leader' is found, promising safety, with ideas which are simple, uncomplicated – and wrong. Truthful answers are complex and need 'a library' – like the one in which I met George in my dream. 'Truth' is an imprisoned splendour.

Conclusion

I looked at the concept of time, linking Bergson's idea of quantifiable (scientific, material time)and non-quantifiable (spiritual, inner time), to Jung's vision of 'the Spirit of the Times' and 'the Spirit of the Depths.' I introduced the Pauli / Jung conjecture, to marry the long-standing split between materialist and spiritual views: this is one reason I joined the Scientific and Medical network as a youth. Analysis helped me learn how to use intuition – to have a better sense of when it was right or not by learning how to form and use symbols. The time-free symbolic language of the unconscious lets us imagine new possible futures (see next chapter).

The conjecture also explains synchronicity and parapsychological experiences, and why these don't 'behave' under laboratory conditions. They may be 'loops in the fabric of time' - poetic experiences which can't be measured with a micrometer - but could be measured with an alethiometer. In synchronicity, meaning emerges because in such rare moments

‘scientific’ time and ‘inner’ time overlap, becoming symbolic time - an internal event experienced externally.

Managing change by inducing guilt is never going to work (See chapter four). If guilt and shame are projected, the result will be resistance. To adapt to climate change, we need a dual temporal vision. We could see *both* scientific time (when will the ice caps melt) *and* inner time (how long we feel distress when they melt) as valid. We don’t have to do the same thing repeatedly imagining we will get a different result, which is how a psychiatrist defines a neurosis. I began with a dream: I’ve amplified the dream. It surprised me, because this was not what I imagined writing.

It changed my perception. I had thought climate change was to do with greed. Now, I think it also has to do with a natural perceptual limit. We can’t meet future people. We can’t usually know forebears or descendants more than three generations away. I might meet my great grand child, but I can never meet their grand-child, a future person. The ‘value’ argument about moral obligations to future people implies we can leave them things of value, rather than burden them with ‘rights’. I’d leave them my analytic toolbox, which I value. There’s an alethiometer hidden in it.

Other analytic tools for imagining possible futures include free association, reverie, creative listening, active imagination and dream work. If we learn to form and use symbols, then we can play with meaning. There already are unconscious patterns about facing catastrophe and adapting, many are in the Shadow, in liminal experiences (see chapter nine). Patterns exist in our collective unconscious to cope with catastrophic change. We have used them before. They are time free experiences, open to everyone. They are ‘an Imprisoned Splendour’.

We need to listen to the science, which is 'both / and' 'material /spiritual'. The transcendent is not escapism, it is innate to our shared experience of inner time. We are not running out of time. Inner time is as big as the collective unconscious - at present this has a size of about seven billion lifetimes. Which is about fourteen billion hours of dreaming every single night the planet turns. Nor are we running out of ideas. Time is one defining characteristic of causality. Dreamed, imagined and intuited actions also have consequences. Once I imagined editing a book about depth psychology and climate change, a tiny quantum toward a change in dominant cultural attitudes. Each of us can make a quantal difference. This means giving our time, external as well as internal. Now, let's go and plant some trees.

Acknowledgements

My sincere thanks to Grant Clifford, Grace McLean, Dr. Carola Mathers, Dr. David Mathers, Mary Jayne Rust and Andy White for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this chapter.

References

Atmanspacher, Harald, (2012) 'Dual-aspect monism a la Pauli and Jung,' *Journal of Consciousness studies* 19 (9-10): 96 – 120 (25).
---, (2017) *The Pauli - Jung conjecture and its impact today,* Exeter: Imprint Academic.
Bergson, Henri, (1912 /reprint by Forgotten Books, 2018) *Time and Free will: an essay on the immediate data of consciousness,* London: George Allen.
Bohm, David, (1980) *Wholeness and the Implicate Order,* London: Routledge.
Deleuze, Gilles, (2004) 'Bergson's conception of difference,' in *Desert Islands, and other texts,* Paris: Semiotexte.
Ellison, Arthur, (1988) *The reality of the paranormal,* London: Harrap.
Gamow, George, (1966) *Thirty years that shook physics – the story of Quantum theory,* New York: Doubleday & Co.
Giddens, Anthony, (1997) in: Brasher, Steven 'Influences', London: The New Statesman 126, 4319: 32.
Guerlac, Suzanne, (2006) *Thinking in time: an introduction to the work of Henri Bergson,* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Gunter, Pete A. Y. (1982) 'Bergson and Jung', *Journal of the History of Ideas,* 43: 4 pp. 635-652, Pennsylvania, PA.: University of Pennsylvania Press.
https://www.jstor.org/stable/2709347

James, William, (1893) *The principles of psychology,* New York: H. Holt and Company.
—, (1909 / 2015), *A Pluralistic Universe: the Hibbert lectures, at Manchester University,* London: reprint by Erik Publishing: Amazon, UK.
Johnson, Raynor C., (1953) *The Imprisoned Splendour,* London: Hodder and Stoughton.
Jung, C.G.,(1953 - 77) except where indicated, references are by volume and paragraph number to the Collected Works of C. G. Jung, 20 vol. (ed. Herbert Read, Michael Fordham and Gerhard Adler; trans. R. F. C. Hull). London: Routledge, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
—, (2009) *The Red Book,* (ed. Shamdasani, S.) London: W.W.Norton.
---, and Pauli, W., (2015) *Atom and archetype: the Pauli – Jung letters, vol.1,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Lapoujade, D., (2018) *Powers of time, Versions of Bergson,* Minneapolis MN: Minneapolis University press, Univocal.
Lawlor, Leonard and Leonard, Valentine, (2016) 'Henri Bergson', in: *The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy,* Stanford CA: Stanford University. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2016/entries/bergson/
Le Shan, Lawrence, (1974) *The medium, the mystic and the physicist,* London: Turnstone Press.
Main, Roderick, (1997) *Jung on Synchronicity and the Paranormal,* London: Routledge.
Mathers, D., (2001) *An introduction to meaning and purpose in analytical psychology,* London: Routledge.
Nagy, Marilyn, (1991) *Philosophical issues in the psychology of C.G. Jung,* Albany NY.: State University of New York Press.
Pullman, Philip, (1988) *Northern lights,* London: Scholastic.
Ricoeur, Paul ,(1970) *Freud and philosophy: an essay on interpretation,* Yale, USA: Yale University Press.
Rovelli, Carlo, (2018) *The order of time,* London: Allen Lane.
Russell, B., (1912) 'The Philosophy of Bergson', *The Monist* vol. 22 pp. 321–347
Skinner, S., Prinkle, R., Hedesan, G., Goodwin, J., (2019) *Splendor Solis; the world's most famous alchemical manuscript,* London: Watkins.
Stein, Leopold, (1957) 'What is a symbol supposed to be?' *J. Anal. Psychology* 2,1: 73 – 84.
Weiner, Yvette, (1996) 'Chronos and Kairos two dimensions of time in the psychotherapeutic process,' *Journal of the British Association of Psychotherapists* 30, 1: pp 65 - 85.
Windle, Phyllis, (1995) 'The ecology of grief,' in Roszak, T., Gomes, M.E., Kanner A.D. (eds.) Ecopsychology: Berkeley CA., Counterpoint.
Wright, Charlotte, (2018) 'Obligations to future people': thesis for B.Phil, Oxford University.
Zinkin, L., (1987) 'The Hologram as a Model for Analytical Psychology'. *J. Anal. Psychology,* vol. 32, part 1., 1 – 21.

Website

The Scientific and Medical network website: https://explore.scimednet.org/