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by Laura L. M. Fair-Schulz and William E. Herman

Department of Fine Art and Department of Psychology
State University of New York College at Potsdam

“It all depends on how we look at things, and not how they are in themselves.”
- Carl Jung, *Psychological Reflections*

“He who is reluctant to recognize me is against me.”
- Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*

Carl Gustav Jung’s monumental *Liber Novus* or *The Red Book* journal, begun in 1914 and published posthumously in 2009, presents the viewer with a dazzling array of painted images. The project references both his accumulated and specialized knowledge as a theorist and practitioner of psychoanalysis, as well as the personal explorations of his own “subconscious” mind. It also reveals contextually his privilege of being able to undertake such a work. He ventured into visual images to open a conduit into myth, for “great art,” he said,

“‘till [sic] now has always delivered its fruitfulness from myth, from the unconscious process of symbolization which continues through the ages and which, as the primordial manifestation of the human spirit, will continue to be the root of all creation in the future.”

1 Carl Gustav Jung was born in Kesswil, Switzerland, on July 26, 1875, into a “middle-class” family, being the only son of a Protestant clergyman, Paul. His mother, Emilie, suffered from mental illness. He died at his estate home in Küssnacht on Lake Zurich on June 6, 1961.

Jung, Switzerland’s most famous psychologist, expressed that “how” we see is more important than the qualities of reality itself. Herein he expresses a dialectical relationship between embracing a high level of subjectivity en route to approaching something universal, as reality. However, Jung’s exploration of his concept, the collective unconscious, was limited by his omission of the myths and/or realities of class-consciousness: an understanding of what societal barriers may exist for the lower classes, under-educated, and disenfranchised (barriers unbridgeable by the individual),—to address or relieve their “anxieties.”

**Psychoanalysis**

Sigmund Freud, as a denizen of Europe in the Victorian Age, studied his mostly female patients, who came to him with anxiety and physical symptoms, for which there did not seem to be a physiological cause. Freud, who had his own economic anxieties, was reputed to have refused to treat patients without a fee, but later with Wilhelm Reich, Erik Erikson, Karen Horney, Erich Fromm, and Helene Deutsch, set up free clinics in response to WWI:

the heady climate of progressivism and social movements between the two world wars ... (in which) ... psychoanalysis was supposed to share in the transformation of civil society, and these new outpatient treatment centers were to help restore people to their inherently good and productive selves.4

Notably absent from these efforts however was Carl Jung, who despite acquiring significant wealth via his spouse Emma (née Rauschenbach), did not participate in creating free clinics, although

---


he was in a far better position to do so than Freud. Arguably, Jung’s patients represented an even more-privileged spectrum socio-economically, ethno-nationally, and/or educationally, than Freud’s.5

Freud’s clinical analysis showed that his patients’ symptoms vanished or were greatly reduced when clients spoke about childhood traumas, repressed memories and unthinkable desires. Psychoanalytic treatment, that employed free association, uncovering repressed memories, and dream analysis, offered a radically different view of human nature and was controversial and revolutionary for the time. He presented a paradigm that continues to inspire debates with modern research findings, supporting and refuting these explanations of human behavior.

Freud’s famous iceberg metaphor suggested that the self we normally present to the world (as seen above the waterline) is only a small part of the human personality. Lurking dangerously below is the hidden nature of the human, largely unknown to the conscious mind. The forces that lurk in the unconscious include the “primitive” and/or socially-unacceptable instincts, such as sexual and aggressive drives, as well as repressed memories, which humans are drawn (for both personal and societal reasons) to avoid. Conscious awareness of what exists as unconscious motivational forces manifest themselves as anxiety and “disorder.” Artistically, knowledge of one’s unconscious elements has been a source of inspiration.

The Modernist period heralded the opportunity for the contents of the unconscious to become a reservoir or “mother-load” of inspiration, source material, and the genesis of new artistic genres. Artists prepared to disturb both the comfortable slumber of societal stātī quo and themselves. According to this view, it is not enough to define and describe what is the antithetical between conscious and unconscious elements. “Successful” psychoanalytic therapy demanded an understanding of the interplay and procedural influences between these powerful and dynamic forces. However, “resolving” anxiety and disorder also served the interests of the ruling-class and became another means of reproducing “order.” Artists exposed to both Psychoanalysis and Marxism (as within the Surrealist and

Dadaist movements) theorized to varying degrees that seeking psychological “harmony” and “order” was a way of replicate societal norms in the interests of the ruling-class, who neither spoke for nor had the interests of the lower classes in mind. Therefore, cessation of anxiety went hand in hand with controlling, and/or putting out of sight and mind, the crises of the working classes and “criminal” elements. In other words, the creation of “new meaning,” for both client and/or artist, could still very much remain in the service of old meanings. Therefore, personal and meaningful journeys of exploration can be used progressively (in pursuit of social justice, defined democratically: from below) or conservatively, as defined by existing-entrenched social strata, from above (distracting from horizontalized social justice). “Self-discovery” could serve either ends: traditional or acknowledging true diversity, creating a more-genuine “level” playing field of opportunity.

Sigmund Freud, as founder of psychoanalysis, felt considerable responsibility for ensuring that the psychoanalytic movement would have an enduring legacy and growing positive influence upon medicine, psychology, sociology, literature, art, and other fields. As a mentor to other analysts who might have assumed the leadership role in guiding the movement upon his demise, he selected Carl G. Jung as his heir apparent to lead psychoanalysis into the future. The intensely respectful relationship continued from their first personal meeting in 1907, where they conversed for 13 hours, until their schism in 1913, when they went their separate ways. As an example of this close personal/professional relationship, Freud and Jung in 1909, during a total of sixteen days spent crossing the Atlantic Ocean in both directions, chose to talk about and interpret each other’s dreams. Jung’s Christian background set him apart from other Jewish psychoanalysts and suggested to the world that the future of this psychoanalytic movement was not an exclusively “Jewish” interpretation of human nature.


While Freud, as founder, is credited with outlining the basic principles of the human personality, dream interpretation, and the personal nature of the unconscious/conscious experience, Jung was to challenge his mentor on key points such as the exclusivity of human sexuality as the root cause of all neurosis and the potentially positive role that religion could play in treatment and societal advancement. Jung applied psychoanalytic theory to the related domains of Christian religion, cultural myths, and the collective unconscious, and for a brief, albeit creatively explosive period, manifested his personal journey in the visual arts. In doing so, he ensured a conservative direction, in terms of maintaining the existing social order.

Jung offered uniquely different symbolic interpretations as compared to Freud, whom he saw as “reductionist, reactionary, and backward-looking, oriented to the social morality of the nineteenth century, at the same time... lacking religious and philosophical dimensions.”8 Jung examined motifs in dreams and “fantasies produced by deliberate concentration.” Jung’s vision was that the “aim of one’s life, psychologically speaking, should be not to suppress or repress, but to come to know one’s other side, and so both to enjoy and to control the whole range of one’s capacities; i.e., in the full sense, to ‘know oneself.’ For him the collective unconscious “consists of the sum of the instincts and their correlates, the archetypes. Just as everybody possesses instincts, so he also possesses a stock of archetypal images.”9

The collective unconscious is a part of the psyche which can be negatively distinguished from a personal unconscious by the fact that it does not, like the latter, owe its existence to personal experience and consequently is not a personal acquisition... the contents of the collective unconscious have never been in consciousness, and therefore have never been individually acquired, but owe their existence exclusively to heredity... this second psychic system of a collective, universal, and impersonal nature which is identical in all individuals (it is inherited). An archetype indicates the existence

of definite forms in the psyche which seem to be present always and everywhere. Mythological research calls them “motifs.”

The following problem emerges: who defines or speaks for the inherent “collective, universal, and impersonal nature which is identical in all individuals?” If it is inherently the individual who manifests these archetypes, what happens when the majority of a population will never have access to the process? As today, mental health treatment is largely a matter of access, and that remains a question of “class.”

Modern Art

Modernism, generally set into motion by the Renaissance and emblematic of “increased observation” and “scientific inquiry,” is like a spiral. It started relatively slowly, moving inward toward a center, speeding up until it imploded. While science is arguably regarded as objective, trafficking in measurable realities, it has always been marbled through with idealism, tradition, cognitive dissonance (the avoidance of insight that leads to change), blind spots regarding class and all things subjective. A hundred years from now (assuming there is “progress,” which is hard to define and is not at all a foregone conclusion), our cutting-edge science will most likely be embarrassing. Obviousness is often proximate. As the Modernist spiral sped up, so too multiplied the details within the scope of definition for Modernism.

Alongside Sigmund Freud, Carl Jung’s influence on Modern Art was primarily based in the dynamic and creative potential of psychoanalysis. Surrealists, such as André Breton, René Magritte, and Paul Éluard, laid claim, apprehending that dismantling the parameters of societal repression was fertile ground to explore humanity. Like Jung, they conjectured that there existed a dialectical relationship between immersing oneself in subjective tropes and ideations as a means of revealing universality and deeper meanings in reality. Identifying with the metaphor of a raw, untamed, and often misunderstood unconscious, they confronted censorship and

---

deconstructed long-standing societal rules and codes of acceptability in their work.

Surrealism was comprised of two approaches to style and visualization: one as naturalistic representation (veristicism) and the other developing along the lines of automatism (toward abstraction, non-objective). Veristicism has two trajectories made famous by the iconoclastic and iconophilic crises of Christianity (centered in the Abrahamic tradition): sublimated naturalism in the service of symbolism and outright devotion to replicating "reality." The type applicable here is like the "making of graven images" in early Christianity, eschewing the "idolatry" of mimicking the natural (fallen) world. Sublimating style to the needs of communicating, conveying, or manifesting "spiritual" content is a hallmark of medieval art, analogous to the Late Roman Empire, when Christians moved from Classism to stylizations that are more mystical. Visual automatism represents the physical of painting and drawing, unrestrained by adherence to conscious mimicry. Theoretically, it stems from the trajectory of bringing forth the unconsciousness. Artists such as Paul-Émile Borduas of Les Automatistes and Jackson Pollock, an Abstract Expressionist, would carry the ideas of automatism furthest in the mid-20th century. Pollack when once asked if he painted from nature, replied that he "is nature." This fits well with the psychoanalytic conception of the primacy of what is deep within: "[m]an's task is to become conscious of the contents that press upward from the unconscious." However, Jung himself favored a symbolic veristicism in art, precisely because of the potential dialogue that could be engaged via the recognition of painted symbols and because ultra-naturalism would become craft, dominated by conscious processing and utterly shutting out streams of unconsciousness. Yet, of Modern Art Jung metaphorically: "[a] scream is just always just that—a noise and not music." Although he went on to wish it well, apparently, for Jung, abstraction and non-objective artwork could be too subjective and as such not art, not a vehicle for the collective unconscious: "[t]he artist is not a person endowed with free will who seeks his own ends, but one who

---

1 Québécois artists from Montreal.
allows art to realize its purpose within him.” Jung conceded that colors (which are non-objective elements) “express the main psychic functions of man,” but it is clear in his reasoning that they need to be attached to something recognizable to express a psychic function.

Early on, the founding Surrealists (who were mostly male) identified the movement itself as female and questioned the conspicuousness of “man” in humanity, spurred on by Jung’s combinations of opposites, like anima and animus. However, many reached beyond Jung, adopting aspects of Marxist thinking on gender, which questioned existing gender and ethnic structures – as rooted in class and exploitation. The leading Surrealist, André Breton, adopted Friedrich Engels’ (Marx’s intellectual collaborator) “belief that only after the revolutionary transformation of society will man be liberated from the need to purchase the surrender of a woman through money or social pressure, and women free to surrender to man for no reason other than love.” Predictably Surrealist as leftists extrapolated that the unconscious stood in stark rejection of “bourgeois” conformity, – the latter as something inherently unnatural to natural humans. The conceptual importance of opposites certainly did not eradicate the male-centric privilege of Carl Jung, or the Surrealists for that matter, but among the latter, many female surrealists were embedded early on in the dominant circles, and overall there were more working female practitioners of Surrealist art than in the other Modern Art movements of the time.

---

18 Eileen Agar, Emmy Bridgewater, Leonora Carrington, Ithell Colquhoun, Nusch Eluard, Leonor Fini, Valentine Hugo, Frida Kahlo, Rita Kernn-Larsen, Jaqueline Lamb (Breton), Dora Maar, Lee Miller, Meret Oppenheim, Grace Pailthorpe, Valentine Penrose, Alice Rahon (Paalen), Edith Rimmington, Kay Sage (Tanguy), Dorothea Tanning (Ernst), Toven (Mari Cerminova), Varo, Remedios, Chadwick, pp. 240-243.
In 1906, Jung suggested that Freud read an obscure novel by German author Wilhelm Jensen, entitled *Gradiva*. Freud published the essay “Delusion and Dream in W. Jensen’s Gravida” the next year, and in this explication of literary analysis articulated that Jensen:

"...beautifully reveals the working of the unconscious, its relationship to conscious action, and the role played by dream in this nexus. He concludes that both scientist and artist arrive at the same understanding of the unconscious. The Surrealists were quick to seize on Freud’s conclusion that science and art confirm rather than contradict one another..."19

Freud and Jung shared the view that science and art were complimentary mediums, fortuitously unleashed by access to the unconscious mind: another dialectical example of presumed opposites (objective and subjective) producing dynamic insight. Perhaps the analogy of historical sources is applicable, with secondary sources being synthetic-abstract summations/descriptors (science), and primary sources being the direct manifestations of experiences (art). However, there was some quibbling about the extent to which both approaches were artifacts of human creativity. *The Red Book* also highlights the different emphasis that Freud and Jung accredited to the “word” versus the “image/word,” respectively, with Freud regarding image production, in general, as a “product of technique” and “narcissistic autoeroticism.”20

Unlike the Surrealists, Jung, in *The Undiscovered Self*, distances himself from the dynamic creative influences of Marxism, viewing it with mistrust and conflating it with what he perceived as Nihilism in Modern Art: the “seemingly nihilistic trend towards disintegration must be understood as the symptom and symbol of a mood of world destruction and world renewal that has set its mark upon our age.”21 However, Marx rather posited that “destruction” was a symptom of existing and expanding exploitation, and that

---

19 Chadwick, p. 55.
21 Ibid.
recognizing this was a sign of hope (a call to action to change the world\(^22\)): a characteristically dialectic approach, rather than straightforward nihilism. Stopping the existing violence of the state, capitalist, and/or landlord, etc., was to turn existing violence back on itself, via revolution and restructuring societal relationships for the benefit of all, — as the long-term means to stopping war, exploitation, and violence itself. Marx’s concentration on internationalism also stood in contrast to Jung’s romantic sense of “organic” ethno-nationalism (völkische Bewegung).

**Jungian and Marxist “Spirituality”**

The publication of *The Red Book* was held back from publication for approximately 90 years, due to, among other things, the “spiritual” content of the work: a point of divergence between Freud and Jung as well as the “scientific character” of psychoanalysis itself. Utilizing a personal library full of literature on “psychology, mythology, religions, cults, ethnology, history and archaeology,”\(^23\) Jung quested to “re-find the soul,” via “conversations” “not about everyday business, but literally about God and the world, life and death, heaven and hell; in other words, existential questions from an area in which psychology, philosophy, art, and religion merge.”\(^24\) The loss of the soul, according to Jung, was something that could happen to anyone who had reached “honor, power, wealth, knowledge, and every human happiness.”\(^25\) It is important to contrast Jung’s concern for what essentially amounts to the anxieties of the upper classes with the anxieties of whole swaths of society, that would have different priorities and concerns, and would never taste of these fore-mentioned joys. How might the latter’s anxieties contrast the former’s, and how could psychoanalyzing the individual soul address the systemic limitations upon the lower classes? Therefore, on the topic of the soul, it is useful to address Karl Marx’s famous quote about religion


\(^{23}\) Hoerni, p. 8.

\(^{24}\) Ibid., p. 6.

\(^{25}\) Ibid., p. 6.
being the “opiate” of the masses, which is habitually misinterpreted in a non-dialectical fashion, as a black-and-white dismissal, by non-Marxist scholars. The context of the famous quote reveals a broader view, regarding the state of crises, as to the privations in the material world, of “the soul:”

[r]eligion is the general theory of this world, its encyclopaedic compendium, its logic in popular form, its spiritual point d’honneur, its enthusiasm, its moral sanction, its solemn complement, and its universal basis of consolation and justification. It is the fantastic realization of the human essence since the human essence has not acquired any true reality. ⁴⁶

To grasp his meaning, it is useful to separate the concept of religion, as representing a complex social power structure, from the idea of spirituality. In fact, one of Marx’s early essays was on Jesus Christ as a revolutionary. Far from being singularly hostile to religious or spiritual ritual and/or tradition—as expression,—the Marx family also famously celebrated Christmas (no doubt with a side of spirited analysis). Marx goes on in the same quote to say that,

[r]eligious suffering is, at one and the same time, the expression of real suffering and a protest against real suffering. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people. The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of the people is the demand for their real happiness. To call on them to give up their illusions about their condition is to call on them to give up a condition that requires illusions. The criticism of religion is, therefore, in embryo, the criticism of that vale of tears of which religion is the halo. ⁴⁷

He argues that in a world of real suffering, opiates are unavoidable, but they are no solution to the ongoing causes of misery. Marx expresses his concern for the soul via the active application of liberation and social justice. Far from “reducing” the human experience to social stratification, Marx advocated, in the words of Ellen Meiksens Wood,

⁴⁶ Karl Marx, Introduction to a Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, Collected Works, vol. 3 (Luxembourg: CreateSpace, 2014).
⁴⁷ Ibid.
"the centrality, not the exclusivity of class" to approach a world where laborers (who produce the wealth and surplus of the world), could have the time, resources, and opportunities to fully develop their human potential. Marx inveighed against vulnerability making people prey to the agenda of religious hierarchies,—as bound to the state and the interests of the ruling elite.

The charitable treatment of poor patients by Freud and other psychiatrists, though "well-intentioned," stands as a top-down and paternalistic approach, preserving the status quo, which neither acknowledges nor questions existing-structural social-economic inequities. The Marxist "specter haunting Europe" called for questioning "why" the poor existed, in societies with surpluses. The ways in which an upper-class, economically-secure patient's experience diverged from the indigent and poverty-stricken patient (assuming that the latter could access treatment) functions as the fault line, where any appreciable content for "collective unconscious" would be missing the majority of the "collective." Educational privilege also generally parted ways along economic lines. As a student of Georg W. F. Hegel, Marx wrote about another type of "alienation," an anxiety of the working-class. Separated from economic freedom and security, they amply created the wealth for their bosses, who then could pursue the healing processes of exploring their unconscious, unhindered by material worries. To this day, most health and mental health practitioners are free from having experienced poverty and are prone to underestimate the mental stresses of poverty, economic insecurity, dependency, and discrimination within the modern labor market.

Carl Jung's background in educational privilege and independent wealth enabled him to pursue not only a career, but the artistic and literary experience creating The Red Book. The period of "Modern Art" is notable in the way that it marked some profound departures from patronage determining artistic content. Although that still existed, and the commercial gallery gained prominence (determining content according to what would sell), this tenuous and relative freedom, from economically-imposed ideological constraints,

---


https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/sahs_review/vol53/iss1/4
allowed for a wide variety of very experimental and profound leaps in human expression. However, due to the precariousness of “making a living” as an artist, untold numbers of potential artists were deterred from their vocations, defaulting the lion’s share of Modern European art production to artists emerging from economically and/or educationally privileged backgrounds. As an artist, Carl Jung was free to manifest his unconscious processes free of want or need. While Jung pursued the collective unconscious artistically, enabled by his economic, gender, and educational privilege, this same privilege would also generate blind spots that would render invisible much of the human experience outside of his own class.

**Hildegard von Bingen’s Scivias and Carl G. Jung’s Liber Novus**

Hildegard von Bingen (1098-1179) was a polymathic German Benedictine abbess, who wrote, painted, and composed music, plays and an alphabet; she sermonized, philosophized and advised. In Germany, she is credited as the founder of “scientific natural history,” for her work in herbal remedies. Undergirding all of her output were her mystical sensibilities, having received extraordinary mystical Christian visions, starting at age 3 until the end of her life. She was the daughter of lower nobility, and as such, despite being frail and prone to ill health, was privileged to have access to a vocation as nun. Her visual artwork takes the form of illuminated manuscripts, most notably her 3-volume Scivias [*Sci vias Domini -- Know the Ways of the Lord*]. She produced very original and inventive imagery at a time, when the craft of illustrating manuscripts also included drawing from codices of set visual examples. Her very creative life’s work, not unlike Carl Jung’s, was to liberate souls.

In his self-professed approach, Jung’s art is less reflective of modernist art movements, like the Surrealistic that psychoanalysis inspired, and more analogous to the art of the Medieval period: “I must catch up with a piece of the Middle Ages—within myself.”29 Both he and von Bingen would recognize their visual artworks

as manifestations, using recognizable symbols for the sake of communication, and as having a mission: unlocking the layers of a soul and readying oneself for revelations to flow.


The Red Book, like a Medieval religious text, invites the reader to engage the images, in both intuitive contemplation (in Modern parlance: unconscious to conscious) as well as unraveling text and image in a rigorous and active intellectual journey (conscious to unconscious and back and forth). Beyond the striking resemblances of Jung to von Bingen stylistically, there are remarkable parallels between them as individuals, as to their class, sense of entitlement, opportunities, and “faith.”

For their time: both were on the forefront of combining “science” and mysticism/spirituality. Von Bingen’s religious rank, enabled her to practice herbal medicine (outside of the sanctification of the Church, this could have been heretical). Both were healers and sought-after lecturers. She, like Jung, arrived at art primarily to explore her “visions.” She was compelled by illness (a sign of God’s displeasure for her hesitance to record her experiences) to write and paint.” Jung too was compelled to write and paint in order to explore: “[t]he wealth of the soul” that “exists in images,” submitting to a flow of symbols from within. Both rose to positions of prominence, influence, and respect and were sought after for guidance. And both effectively cloistered themselves in their output to explore the visionary manifestations of artistic production. Despite the gender and epochal differences, they were harbored within the insularity of a relatively closed and hierarchical conceptual system: Christianity and Psychoanalysis. Both were protected from material privations and effectively freed from needing to challenge the hierarchies of class for their survival.

Like Jung, von Bingen’s artwork is stunning in its attention to detail, color, symbolism, craft, and devotion, which can be appreciated across philosophical and ethnic barriers. However, those who do not identify as Christian will not be “healed” in von Bingen’s schema. Similarly, only those who submit to the processes of psychoanalysis can have the possibility of healing. Ergo, both Jung and von Bingen’s art were not universal vis à vis their target audience. The collectivity of any truth in their work refers mostly to themselves, as it does not apply to the collective realities of the “unbeliever” and outsider.

30 Ibid., 232.
Franz Fanon, Psychoanalysis, and The Wretched of the Earth

Jung’s statement that “[i]t all depends on how we look at things, and not how they are in themselves,” is certainly correct of all subjective perception. However, when Jung’s statement is placed alongside another statement, that of the Afro-Caribbean (Martinique) psychoanalyst Frantz Fanon, it takes on a very different meaning: “[h]e who is reluctant to recognize me is against me.” There is a scale of subjectivity drawn, with enhanced distortion at one end and the inescapable subjectivity of individuality at the other. According to Fanon, not “recognizing” another person is a way of “re-writing” and dominating them and who they say they are. Privilege and insularity alter perception, taking what is unavoidable in subjectivity and amplifying perceptual distortions.\textsuperscript{31} It becomes willful in effect, whether or not it is passively or aggressively applied. Indeed, at what point is any ignorance willful? As a Marxist, Fanon’s books the Wretched of the Earth and Black Skin, White Masks, call into question the distortions and cognitive dissonance within class, highlighting ethnic and racial privileges,—fleshing out the blind spots of paternalistic projections. Any concept of a “collective unconscious” implodes at the point where “humanity” is limited to a “privileged” narrative.

Was Jung typical of his time, as a psychoanalytic explorer and innovator? No! Was Jung typical of his time, in terms of gender, ethnic, and class chauvinism and privilege? Yes! Why did he abruptly stop his foray into artistically exploring the collective unconscious via images? What actual wall did he approach, working on The Red Book, when he stopped, as he did in mid-sentence?

Conclusion

Jung’s project of artistically delving into the unconscious through The Red Book, suggests, in theory, that nothing should be “off limits” while exploring the “soul.” However, Jung did not

\textsuperscript{31} To paraphrase Friedrich Engel’s theory of dialectical materialism: “new quantities create new qualities.”
engage class-analysis as a way of expanding his search into the realm of human (mythologized and religious/spiritual) experience. His artwork, among his most fascinating and luminous insights, nevertheless manifested a cloistered sense of class, ethnic, and gendered privilege. Jung’s artwork is remarkable regardless and is certainly more immediately accessible than his texts. One wonders if and how the blind spots of class privilege may have played a part in how he stopped mining the unconscious via the visual arts.
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