

Jungian Psychology and Personal Correlations

Part 3 of 7

Franklin Merrell-Wolff
September 1977

The second postulate of the Jungian psychology is to the effect that human beings are organized in patterns of a complex psychology consisting of two attitudes and four functions. The two attitudes are called extraversion and introversion. These are to be described in the following way: conceive of our consciousness as being organized in the form of a relationship between a self, a subject, or cognizer and an object which consists of all the content of cognition, in other words, the world and the universe about us. The different types of human beings may be oriented more toward the objective component or more toward the subject component. If they are typically oriented more to the objective component, the individual is extraverted. If more oriented in their general attitude to the subjective component, or the self, they are introverted. The relative valuation of the objective component and the subjective component by individuals varies and this leads to the establishment of certain human types, namely, those that are more extraverted and those that are more introverted.

There are also four primary functions listed as follows: thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition. Thinking is the function which is employed in all of our mental processes, particularly those dealing with science, mathematics, and philosophy, and in general with the dealing with conceptions that aid in the manipulation of our problems in this world. Feeling is a function that is oriented to valuation. The term 'feeling' has several meanings and the result is that unless these meanings are identified it can lead to a certain confusion. For instance, one may say that he feels pain or that he feels cold; he may also say that he feels happy or sad; or he may say that he feels that it is going to rain tomorrow or that the stock market is to go up. Now, in these three cases we have totally different meanings of the word 'feeling'. The first, a feeling of pain or the feeling of cold, is a sensation; the feeling of sadness or of happiness is an affection; and the feeling that the stock market will go up or that it is going to rain would be identified as an intuition. But the use of the term in connection with the type psychology, wherein we would speak of a given individual as a feeling type, is not an application of any of these three meanings. It is employed in the sense of valuation; in other words, an orientation that deals with objects and with situations from the standpoint of valuation such as: such an object is useful or such an object is useless, as such an action is good or such an action is bad, or that something is beautiful or ugly, and so on.

Then there are the functions of sensation and intuition, generally listed as irrational, but not irrational in the sense of being against reason, but in the sense of being not in the province of reason. Thus a bare fact such as there is a tree out there which one experiences; the mere experiencing of it is a fact. There is no question of reason involved here because there is no question of relationship involved. It is bare fact. Intuition is an orientation to that which is not sensuously apparent, a communication essentially from

our unconscious levels. One is oriented to intuition if he goes beyond the bare sensuous facts of a given situation to a possibility hidden behind those facts.

Now, every individual is conceived of as involving in his total constitution all these functions. Everyone thinks, more or less; feels, more or less; senses, more or less; and intuits, more or less. Types are identified when a given function is dominant in the general life of a given individual. He depends upon this function for dealing with situations primarily and makes use of the other functions in a subordinate way.

Thinking and feeling are classified as rational functions. This means that they are functions that involve judgment and use judgment in a different way. The guiding principle of the judging is different. In the case of thinking, the primary judgment is, concerning any given proposition, is it true or false? Now, in the case of feeling, a typical pattern would be is a given idea or situation good or bad, or is it beautiful or ugly, or is it desirable or undesirable? In the case of the irrational functions, as I've already said, there is no judging involved. One deals simply with a given is-ness, as it were, a simple factuality; one, in the case of sensation, to the impact upon our consciousness through our various senses. It is just "that," without any element of judging evaluation either as true or false, in one case, or good and bad, in the other. And intuition is of the same sort but oriented to that which to our outer surface consciousness is at least relatively unconscious.

So far we have isolated four functions and two attitudes. Disregarding the attitudes for the moment, the four functions would give us four psychological types consisting of those human beings who are oriented respectively primarily to thinking, or feeling, or sensation, or intuition. This would delimit something like four classes among human beings, but the picture becomes more complicated than that when we combine the four functions with the two attitudes. Any particular type may be more oriented to the objective phase or the subjective phase; in other words, may be more extraverted habitually or more introverted habitually. And we would thus have an introverted thinking type and an extraverted thinking type, or an introverted feeling type and an extraverted feeling type; and the same with the two irrational functions. But even this does not complete our classification. Thus, for instance, a purely judging type must have a material upon which the judgment is cast and this comes from one or another of the irrational functions. Thus, we have in addition to the primary orientation, an auxiliary function. To give a specific instance, let us assume an introverted thinking type. He could be oriented either to sensation or intuition as an auxiliary function. This multiplies our type classification to something like sixteen. But, however, there is a more or less sympathetic rapport between those who are oriented to thinking, for instance, whether in the introverted or extraverted senses and whether oriented to intuition or to sensation. The picture on the sum total can become quite complex.

Now, if human beings are heterogeneous like this, instead of being homogenous, there are many consequences that follow. The conditions favorable for the life and fulfillment of one type may be quite oppressive for another type; and as a result, if we are to have a society in which equal facility is provided for all individuals, it cannot be a society organized along the lines that are exclusively favorable to one particular type or type group. It would have to become a complexly organized society. That is one of the difficulties in the organizations with which we are familiar. Just take the example of a

democratic society. The democratic society is oriented, theoretically, to the point of view of majorities, not to minorities. Now, whereas, in fact, it seems to be the case a majority of the people have a certain type organization, government oriented to their influence would be oppressive with respect to those who have a countertype influence. And this would not be justice. There is thus in our present human society a built in injustice, and if that is ever to be corrected, the political man must take the facts of type psychology into account. This also has bearings in many other directions. Thus, in the therapeutic field, a method which is effective with, say, an extraverted type of individual may be quite ineffective with respect to an introverted type of individual. Or in even the matters of the taking of food, dieting and the like, the same problem arises, particularly in view of the fact that type characteristics are not solely psychical. In Dr. Jung's psychology, the treatment is exclusively directed to the psychical side; but there is also a physiological and an anatomical side to typology, and this we will now proceed to consider.

In our own time, a Dr. Sheldon has written two volumes dealing with the typology of the physical body and made a correlation with psychological aspects which corresponded to these physical types. This material was presented in the form of two books entitled as follows, *The Varieties of Human Physique* and *The Varieties of Human Temperament* corresponding to the physical types. This is a valuable contribution to the whole subject of typology, but it develops more the physical side of this problem than the psychological side. There is not the elaborate development of the psychical side that is found in Dr. Jung's work. Mainly, Dr. Sheldon correlates the physical types with the attitudes of introversion and extraversion but does not go into the elaborate discussion of the functional types: thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition. Nonetheless, this work is quite important and is a real contribution to the whole subject.

The three physical types are correlated with certain aspects of the embryo with which I am not presently familiar, and the three types are called: the endomorphic type, the mesomorphic type, and the ectomorphic type. Each type develops especially certain aspects of the whole organism. The endomorph develops peculiarly the viscera and is inclined to develop fatty tissue in an extraordinary degree. The mesomorphic type tends to develop the musculature of the body along with the bones. And the ectomorphic type develops particularly the cerebral portion of man and the nervous system, along with the skin. They are easily recognizable types when they are strongly developed. Every individual has all three aspects in his physical organization, as is true in the case of the functional types in Jung's psychology, but there is an accentuation of certain parts of the physical entity in each type. Dr. Sheldon has divided the degree of development of each of these aspects of the human body into seven grades. An entity highly developed in the endomorphic component would be graded as 7; one highly developed in the mesomorphic component would also be graded as 7, and so on. But the development of any of these components can be minimal, in which he'd get a grading of 1, and if he occupies some intermediate position he would get a grading from 2 through 6. Thus a given individual who is called an endomorph might be classified, if it is an extreme case, as a 7-1-1; if a modest case, perhaps a 5-3-2. A highly developed muscular type might get a classification as a 1-7-1 and with several modifications of this in muscular types that are not so strongly accentuated; and the same is true of an ectomorphic type. The most extremely developed form would be a 1-1-7, and so on.

The strongly developed endomorph may be a 350 pounder with an enormous bulge in the middle. His center of interest tends to be food. He is the one who is the gourmet, the one who dines in terms of quantity and quality; all of this is the center of life to him. His generosity would lie in providing a good meal for his guest. Because his viscera is on average much better developed than in the other two types, he is able to handle food that is relatively difficult to handle. It is said that a differential in the intestinal tract as between the extreme ectomorph and the extreme endomorph has been found to be as much as 26 feet. The rules that govern him are thus very different from those that govern the other types. He could be the vegetarian. He could handle the food that is most difficult to digest. On the other hand, the mesomorph is developed in terms of muscularity and bone. He is oriented to physical activity. He is the one who glories in physical exercise. He is the athlete, the achiever on the field of contest.

Both of these types are extraverted according to Dr. Sheldon, but they are extraverted each in a different way. The endomorph is oriented to sensation in the sense of the *jnanendriya*, in the Indian classification. The Indians classify the senses in two ways: those that are known as the *jnanendriya* and those that are known as the *karmendriya*. The *karmendriya* are the action senses, those that belong to muscularity; while the *jnanendriya* are oriented to the intake in a conscious sense as sense impression through the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, and the rest.¹ Both are extraverted essentially but in two different senses: the endomorph may attach very great importance to diet; the mesomorph a very great importance to exercise.

Now, in contrast to these two types, there is the ectomorph, whose prime development is in the cerebrum, cerebellum, and the nervous system, generally. His body tends to be rather weak in contrast to his nervous development. His domain tends to be that of thought. He is only slightly interested in food and physical exercise. He tends to be greatly interested in the development of ideas.

Now, we have a number of problems that grow out of these different physiological types. The rules that lead to the optimum life of each type are not the same as those that lead to the optimum of the other types. The result is that if we generalize on the basis of the point of view of one of these types for all men, a great mistake is effected. What is true, what is valid for one type may be positive poison for a strongly contrasting type. I shall not develop this as it is developed in the books that I have named, but I introduce this to complete the elaboration of the importance of typology. We may universalize validly for one type but we rarely can universalize for all types. The endomorph might say man is what he eats. The mesomorph might say man is what he does. And the ectomorph might say man is what he thinks.

There is a certain relevance of this typology to the Grail myth that was basic in Robert Johnson's analysis of the evolution of the Western male in his psychology. Recently, Gertrude read to me a history of the Celts, and a brief review of this will be helpful. It appears that the major portion of Europe north of the Mediterranean was from an early time, three or four centuries B.C., occupied almost wholly by the Celtic and the Germanic races, and that they were in a barbaric stage of development when civilization

¹ John Woodroffe, *The Serpent Power* (Madras: Ganesh & Co., 1964), 59.

had advanced rather substantially in the Mediterranean area. The Greek, Roman, and other races in the Mediterranean had advanced to a relatively advanced stage while the Celtic-Germanic development in Europe north of the Mediterranean was still in a barbaric stage. At a time when Rome had reached a modest development of civilization, there was an impact upon Rome by the Celts that horrified the Romans. They were obviously barbaric and, one might say, even savage. They gloried in war, but war in a primitive way. They were looters and headhunters, which would correspond to a very modest development in the racial consciousness. They gloried in combat for its own sake, not only with others but among themselves. They were, in fact, headhunters. They even provided, it appears, niches in their huts where they placed the heads of the adversaries which they had overcome in battle. Both the Germanic and the Celtic peoples were characterized by similar features in this respect. The Germanic peoples may have been even more formidable than the Celtic peoples. Thus, Europe north of the Mediterranean was at the time of Christ and before in a stage of development that we would classify as either barbaric or even savage.

There was at the time of Caesar, a conquest of Gaul, and the Gauls were simply Celts; and that Roman conquest continued until it included the larger portion of Europe including England, a little of Scotland, but not of Ireland. The result was that there was a Roman influence superimposed upon this Celtic-Germanic stage of culture. At an early stage, England was invaded by the Anglo-Saxons, who constituted a portion of the Germanic race, and they became dominant in England but not in Wales, not in Scotland, and preeminently, not in Ireland.

Now, it was the Anglo-Saxons who founded the colonies in North America which were dominant in the area identified with the United States and with Canada. Our primary inheritance in the racial sense is Anglo-Saxon, and because of the interblending of the Anglo-Saxon and the Celt, we may say that the predominant influence here, in the beginning, was Anglo-Saxon and Celtic. Thus, a psychology that would fit the major portion of the peoples in this country would be the psychology related to the Celts and the Germanic peoples. In later days, other elements have come to form an important minority influence in this country, namely the peoples from Africa, the peoples that are the descendants of the pre-Columbian Americans, and a minor portion from Asia.

Now, a distinction must be made here. It is entirely probable that the psychology of the male in the West here in America connected with the myth of the Holy Grail may be valid only for that portion which is Germanic-Celtic and not for the portion that is essentially African, or of the portion that is from the pre-Columbian stocks in America, and the portion from Asia. This point I suggest as something of some importance. The Grail myth arose among the Germanic-Celtic peoples primarily, apparently, from within the latter racial whole.

Now, the type that seems to have been expressed by the belligerent Celt and Germanic races would tie in with the mesomorphic type in Dr. Sheldon's classification—not with the ectomorphic and not so particularly with the endomorphic. It is thus a muscular, belligerent kind of entity. Now, when Christianity came in to this portion of Europe, it involved a superposition of a more advanced culture upon an essentially primitive culture. The belligerent mesomorphic spirit had to be tamed and civilized. Therefore, the myth of the Grail is formulated in terms of belligerence, namely, it is the

Knight of the Grail, a fighter, who overcomes the belligerence of the primitive soul of the peoples. It's a battle between the knight of the Grail and the knights that represent the primitive spirit, such as the Red Knight.

If the redeeming principle which comes to influence any people is to be effective, it must meet that people where they actually are in their psychological and spiritual development. When Christianity came into northern Europe, it met a people who were only partially lifted above a purely barbaric level by the Roman influence. They were still primarily the people of contest; and this gives a significance as to the concept of the Knight which plays such an important part in the Grail myth. The Knight of the Grail was the bearer of the redeeming force. He met the opposed knights and conquered them. The principle of determination by force was employed to redeem a people who were highly oriented to the principle of determination by force. This is a redemption working at essentially a low level. It is the level where the hero bearing the Light is the supreme image. It is only at a later and much higher stage that the supreme image is found in the saint or the sage. Therefore, the noble ones here are the Knights of the Grail—not the thinkers, not the people of outstanding benevolence, as in the case of the saints. This is thus a particular form that the redeeming force takes in this case. We're dealing with a people who are still primarily fighters—not thinkers, not entities oriented to benevolence.

Now, in the recapitulation of earlier stages of the race in the individuals, it does seem to be true that in the young adolescent male we have a recapitulation of this same belligerence. He tends to fight for his place. This tendency is channeled into competitive sport, in a large measure, so we have the competitive games. But there is a principle of struggle evident in these young males, and the applicability of the message of the Grail to modern male man, I would suggest, is valid only for those who have the barbaric background of only a few centuries ago. Others who've come up other ways would not find the Grail myth valid. Robert Johnson speaks of the fact that the idea of the bleeding sword is entirely foreign to the psychology of the East Indian, and I would suggest that it is foreign also to some of the individuals who are living in this Western culture today, and that therefore the symbolism of the myth does not apply to all Western men.

A footnote here. Thought is flooding into my consciousness in such massive and complex form that I am having difficulty keeping in mind the principle of organization which is so necessary for clear exposition. I ask the hearer to bear with me in this. I may have to break away from that form in order to get all of the material set down. End of footnote.

As an additional component in the formulation of our verbal picture, I wish to direct the hearer's attention to an essay by Sri Aurobindo on Heraclitus.² In that essay, Sri Aurobindo notes the fact that Heraclitus had stated that the first principle that was determinant in nature and in man was the principle of force, that this was followed by the principle of reason which grows in strength until it becomes determinant and subordinates the principle of force to itself. Then Aurobindo continues and notes the fact that not only Heraclitus but Western man in general failed to recognize a third step which involved the principle of *ananda* as a determinant fact in the consciousness of man.

² Aurobindo Ghose, *Heraclitus* in vol. 16 of the *Sri Aurobindo Birth Centennial Library* (Pondicherry: Sri Aurobindo Birth Centenary Library, 1970), 335-371.

Actually, at our present stage of evolution, we do find an emerging of the principle of reason in contrast to the determination by force; but as I look across the world, I would still say that still the principle of force is dominant in world affairs and that the principle of reason is only partially in dominance over the principle of force. But in as much as the principle of determination by reason is emerging, we may expect that some few, at least, among the human whole are more conditioned by the principle of determination by reason as contrasted to a mass which is still more conditioned by the principle by determination by force. The Grail myth is relevant to that portion of this Western humanity which is still predominantly conditioned by determination through force; hence the great spirit of competitiveness that dominates today. The Grail myth, no doubt, fits this particular portion of our humanity, but does not fit that minority which is oriented to determination by the principle of reason.

A footnote here. At one point in his essay, Robert Johnson notes the fact that the general pattern of the development of the Western male has some exceptions, that the youth may follow the path of the hermit; and this is a matter of very considerable interest. I was disappointed that Robert Johnson did not develop this possibility at length, and I shall have to say something along this line. End of footnote.

I foresee that I shall have to employ in the further development of the present thesis, material connected with the third fundamental postulate of Dr. Jung's psychology. Therefore, I shall ask the reader to bear with me while I introduce a discussion of that postulate into the tape, and that then we will continue with our general development.