

Human Types

As it is of fundamental importance that those who perform the social function of priests should have as wide an understanding of the nature of man as possible, it becomes necessary for the members of this Order to regard man in his psychological make-up as well as in his more spiritual aspects. The term 'psychology' has a number of meanings, many of which are far from clear, but there are two important senses which may be readily distinguished. In one sense, psychology is a science devoted to the study of the observable phenomena of the psychical nature. But as much of the psychical inner constitution of man lies in a subjective region beyond external observation, the study of psychology has lead into a field that is only partly within the range of scientific observation. The more profound and significant psychology of the present has come to occupy this larger range which, while on one side it may be called scientific, in another respect it encroaches upon the domain of religion. In this larger sense when the psychologist functions practically as a helper of men he is really performing the principle service that has fallen to the lot of the priest heretofore. Thus the importance of knowledge of psychology in the larger sense, for members of this Order, should be clear.

This larger and more recent form of psychology is often called 'psychology with a psyche or soul' as contrasted to the more strictly scientific type which may be called a 'psychology without a soul'. The latter is of more technical significance only and does not vitally concern the priest. The former is just beginning to become important in our own day as an occidental development. In the hands of Dr. C.G.Jung, its chief representative, it has even come to comprehend material that, heretofore, has been almost exclusively confined to eastern Yoga. The present western

psychology is, admittedly, only beginning in a field that has long been highly developed in the East. However, as the typical western psychological constitution and attitude is, in important respects, different from that of the Oriental, it has become evident that in many respects it is impractical to graft eastern Yoga upon the western subject without first submitting it to substantial modification. Thus, for example, the typical oriental analysis of the psyche and formulation of methods is grounded in an understanding of the oriental man, with almost complete neglect of the feminine psyche. This was for the reason that in the East it was almost exclusively among men that culture had risen to the point where the supreme step toward Realization had become a possibility. In contrast, in the West, women are more developed and differentiated than in the East and so are in a much better position to achieve the decisive step which marks the crown of culture, i.e., the attainment of Yoga. For this reason an understanding of the typically feminine inner psychology becomes both necessary and possible as has not been the case heretofore. But in this we are dealing with a pioneering problem, and must be prepared to discover real additions to and modifications of method in the problem of consciousness-transformation.

One consideration of the very highest importance in connection with consciousness-transformation that has emerged as the result of studies in our own time is that of fundamental differences in human types. It is a familiar saying that all men are not the same, but how fundamentally and vitally this is true is very poorly appreciated. Important type-differences between men make agreements in valuations in many respects quite impossible. This applies to questions of truth and reality as well as to matters of taste. As a result there are philosophical, religious, political, social and other differences in the views of different

men and women that can never be resolved by reference to facts or by logical argument. For this basis difference in valuation makes possible the derivation of quite diverse significance from consideration of identical facts and logic. As it is impossible to challenge the right of any type to existence it is, therefore, impossible to affirm that any one system of valuation is exclusively valid. This means, then, that at least the immediate goal for one type of individual will almost certainly be different from that of a different type. So a broad tolerance on the part of the priest becomes necessary while, at the same time, he must be true to the necessities of his own type for otherwise he commits a sort of psychological suicide. The life which he leads himself and the valuation to which he should be true may be quite at variance to the life which he would have to advise another to follow. This does not involve an inconsistent position; It is not properly a case of failing to practice what one preaches. For the practice which he himself follows and that which he advises is predicated on differences in essential type. He is consistent in that in each case he is affirming the necessity for each to be true to his own type.

Unquestionably any priest can help those who are like himself with respect to type better than others who are quite different. For in the former case he has inside information and can understand the problems involved in a vital rather than in a merely academic way. However, he is bound to ~~must~~ have to deal with the problems of those who are fundamentally different from himself and here he must depend upon the findings of competent psychologists supplemented by his own observation. In this case his understanding can scarcely be more than external and intellectual as he has not in his own experience a basis for an intimate felt-understanding.

He may have to take his cues in giving advice to the one seeking help very largely from what the latter may say or otherwise indicate. And, he may very often find, that that which is food for another is often just that which would be poison to himself. This is not an easy service to render, but it meets a very grievous need, and only the man who can combine in himself both the standpoint of the physician and of the spiritual guide can perform it. It is, in fact, being what a priest is supposed to be.

In its fuller elaborations the problem of human types becomes very complex and can be effectively understood only after much study and observation, combined with a goodly share of intuition. But we can approach the problem by taking it first in its most general and simplest form, baring in mind, meanwhile, that only a few individuals actually correspond to this simplest statement. We begin with a very broad classification. Perhaps the simplest approach is to consider the typical attitude of different people toward the external object of consciousness as given through the senses. The lives and consciousnesses of some individuals are centered in the object, while in the case of others the life and consciousness is more or less withdrawn from the object and centered in the idea. In general, the former class attaches a very great importance to experience, while the latter finds the really vital values in thought or a felt relationship to the idea. The first is known as the extrovert, the latter the introvert. Now, it is true that a given individual may be at times more extrovert than introvert, while at other times he may reverse his mode of functioning. There is a wide range of degree in introversion and extroversion, ranging from pure extreme types to those who approach a balance. But so long as we function our consciousness through bodies, and particularly through bodies in which one phase

of the sex-principle is necessarily dominant, it is unavoidable that the predominant disposition should be more or less one-sided in any given incarnation. Thus an extrovert, for instance, is as incapable of ceasing to be predominately extrovert in his valuations as he or she is incapable of changing his sex. The same is true of the introvert.

In a broad and general way we can see a predominant extrovert and introvert tendency following the lines of sex-differentiation, though the contrast exists equally well within each sex but giving results that are by no means identical. On the whole, because women have a stronger feeling for the object, for the person, for objective social values than men they would be more strongly extrovert than men. This corresponds to the emphasis of the Eros principle. In contrast, as man has a greater and surer capacity for the idea and thought and thus for a consciousness abstracted away from the sensuously given object, he is more strongly introvert. This corresponds to the emphasis of the Logos principle. Here we see the psychical explanation of the psychological attraction and conflict between the sexes. Each feels within him or herself the lack which the other sex has objectively developed and hence there is an attraction, while, at the same time, each is under the necessity of being true to his own nature and this fact introduces conflict. As each is weak where the other is strong, it follows that each is more or less the victim of the other as well as his or her master. In the feminine movement for emancipation only one side of this problem is taken into account. The result is, that today western woman, particularly in America, is more emancipated than man. Man must achieve a similar, though subtler, emancipation if we are not to continue in a state of unbalance. For make no mistake on this point. Precisely the most strongly masculine dominant type is most easily vulnerable before the typically feminine power.

At first glance it may seem strange that we should class woman as relaviely extrovert and man introvert since we see men dominant on the pages of history. But it must be remembered that it is only in the history of culture and civilization has achieved such a dominant role. In the more primitive pre-cultural stage of human history it is the woman who really wields the dominant power, so much so that the oldest religious images are female goddesses. Man's strength in the cycles of culture and civilization does not rest upon a superior feeling for the object, as compared with woman, but upon control of nature and relations through the magical power of the idea. This is really an introvert power applied objectively. It is a power that maintâins itself precariously against the force of life and nature and is always vulnerable in the long run. It is also significant that man is always stronger in the cycle of crative culture than in the cycle of civilization that follows, where woman begins to wield the products of man's creativeness with an even greater facility than man himself possesses. Right at the present day we can see in our own country this shift from culture-phase of civilization phase with regimentation smothering creativeness and with woman becoming able to administer and attend the form in ever increasing degree, just as well or better than the men can themselves, &c.

The modern American man seems weak and spineless as compared with his masculine ancestors of just a generation or two ago. Otherwise he would not value security above opportunity as is now the case. For my own part I am forced to feel a greater respect for the modern American woman than for her masculine counter-part. Often she is the better man of the two, though she is attaining this dominant position at the price of becoming a less likable woman. On the whole, beauty better fits a woman than ~~ixxm~~ strength, and the reverse is true with man. But profound and widely manifested

tendencies must be recognized and understood, as it is useless to resist them. And it is just in the study of the type problem ^{and} than the psychology of the unconscious that much of this will become clear.

Another consideration which may help to clarify the classing of woman as predominantly extrovert, when the reverse seems superficially to be the case, is found by ~~tax~~ regarding the fact that extroversion in one sense implies introversion in the reverse sense. The dominant phase of woman is in differentiated and developed feeling for the object. Correspondingly as a type she is undeveloped as a thinker, being in this respect on the whole rather primitive and childish. If then, she is viewed from the standpoint of the highly developed thinker and valued as from that standpoint exclusively she seems subjective and elemental. This fact, at first glance might lead classing her as introvert, but the valuation is superficial. From her standpoint as a being of developed and differentiated feeling, in which respect she is more adult than man, when she views man she always sees a ~~man~~ boy or child who needs her care. So long as man does not become conscious of this immature side of himself he is vulnerable before woman's power. His exaggerated egoism in fact becomes his own undoing as it blinds him to the immature quality of his feeling nature. A masculine emancipation commensurate with the present feminine emancipation will require as its precedent condition that man should be able to take an objective view of his own egoism and thus be able to discount his own self-valuation. The boy who knows that he is a boy is not nearly so vulnerable as the man who is quite unconscious of the immature boyish side of his nature.

Yogaenani.

Human Types
Part II

In the last paper we gave a general identification of the feminine principle with the extrovert type and of the masculine principle with the introvert type. This is true in only a general sense and for the reason that feeling, the pre-dominant feminine function, is more closely identified with the object, than thinking. Actually the extrovert and introvert types are to be found in both sexes in a vast variety of combinations. This subject, in the end, when we consider it with an ever-growing completeness, becomes exceedingly complex. Consequently, the best approach for those who are not equipped with extensive technical training seems to be by a method of first stating the facts and principles in an oversimplified and generalized form, so as to form the first outline of the picture, as it were, and then proceed to modify the first impression to a greater agreement with actuality. All simple statements in this field are only partly true, and in large measure false. Further, the most complete statement that any one individual can make, however competent he may be, suffers from the defect that it is formed from the viewpoint of the type to which he individually belongs. No ^{one} can wholly escape from himself and remain able to express himself.

At the present state of our knowledge the indication is that there are four dominant psychical functions, and each of these functions has two phases, the introvert and the extrovert. The four functions may be called, thinking, feeling, sensation and intuition. Now, our common consciousness in this world is characterized by a consciousness-relationship which may be called the subject-object relationship. In a given individual the general attitude may be polarized more toward the object or toward the subject, which corresponds to the extrovert ^{and} or the

introvert attitudes. But, in addition, it is also true that the four psychical functions are not equally developed in any individual. In fact, they cannot be for the simple reason that some of these functions require conditions and attitudes that are incompatible with others. We thus have a possibility of eight possible pure types, as follows:

- | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Extrovert thinking type, | 2. Introvert thinking type, |
| 3. Extrovert feeling type, | 4. Introvert feeling type. |
| 5. Extrovert sensation type, | 6. Introvert sensation type, |
| 7. Extrovert intuition type | 8. Introvert intuition type. |

When we speak of pure type we mean an individual in whom the whole differentiated conscious development is in terms of one type function exclusively. All the other seven functions and phases are repressed and do not function in his consciousness at all. Naturally such genuinely pure types are extremely rare if they exist at all. On the whole purity of type is only relatively so, and so ~~very~~ while we may have some very pure types there may be none that are absolutely pure. So the above classification is only a further approximation to the truth ~~any~~ in any individual case. The actuality is more complex and, generally, much more complex. However, among those individuals who stand out from the general mass of men as being in some respect superior there is almost, if not quite, necessarily an accentuation of type. On the other hand, those individuals who have all eight functions and phases active in consciousness are on a primitive and undeveloped level. Their capacities in any of these functions would be quite elemental. It is thus easier to classify historic individuals than the average representative of the 'man in the street'. Perhaps it is easiest of all to classify those who get into the asylums, for while

high differentiation of a special function tends to great achievement and contribution to culture and civilization, yet the driving of this specialization beyond a certain critical point leads to a disruption of the psyche and the revolt of the repressed functions and phases. The evidence is that genius is a crown of function that runs close to madness. Thus the pioneer in the hidden realm of the psyche faces dangers analagous, but more serious, than those faced by the physical pioneer. Perhaps, this will make clear some of the dangers the Adepts face in Their researches in the unknown. And yet, just because there are those who have dared these unknown dangers we now enjoy a life illumined by culture and civilization and a sure guidance in the realms beyond the grave.

Occult psychology views man as composed of seven principles. One of these principles, i.e., Atman, is synthetic, while the other six may be regarded as functions in a sense fairly analagous to the four functions of our western analytic psychology. The seven principles are divided into two groups known as the higher and the lower respectively. The three higher are known as Atma, Buddhi and the Higher Manas and the four lower as, Kama Manas, or lower mind, Kama Rupa, or the desire body, Linga Sharara or the astral body, and Prana or the life principle. A correspondence between the four lower principles and the four functions of analytic psychology seems to follow quite readily. The correlation appears as follows:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. Thinking corresponding to | Kama Manas |
| 2. Feeling, corresponding to | Kama Rupa |
| 3. Sensation, corresponding to | Linga Sharira |
| 4. Intuition, corresponding to | Prana or Life. |

A further correspondence with the three higher principles is also suggested, but in this case the correspondence is not as clear

and and some other more ~~hidden~~ hidden type of function is evidently involved. In making this further correlation it is important that the attention should be directed to the fact that the higher principles are more interior, that is, in the direction of the Subject, the Self or the Atman, and hence are more accessible to the introvert phases of the functions. Baring this point in mind we arrive at the following table of correspondences:

- | | | |
|-------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| 1. Introvert thinking | corresponding to | Higher Manas |
| 2. Extrovert thinking | corresponding to | Lower Manas |
| 3. Introvert feeling, | corresponding to | Buddhi |
| 4. Extrovert feeling, | corresponding to | Kama |
| 5. Extrovert sensation, | corresponding to | Linga Sharāra |
| 6. Introvert intuition, | corresponding to | Atma* |
| 7. Extrovert intuition, | corresponding to | Prana or Life. |

*The correlation of introvert intuition with Atma is to be understood in the sense that Atma carries the meaning of Jiva. But since Atma is synthetic it comprehends all functions.

So far I have been unable to find a correlation among the seven principles corresponding to introvert sensation, so in this respect the table remains incomplete. Further, it must be born in mind that these are correspondences rather than identifications, particularly in the case of the higher principles. Thus we may regard introvert thinking and feeling as only more in the direction of Higher Manas and Buddhi than the extrovert type. Only rarely is the introversion sufficiently developed so that the individual is conscious on the level of these higher principles.

The last remark leads us to a very important consideration. The general phase of a given race or culture taken as a whole may be predominantly extrovert or introvert. In this respect when we contrast the western race with India, the former is seen to occupy a very extrovert position, while the latter is relatively

introvert. I say 'relatively introvert' in connection with the East Indians for a reason which will become clearer when we have discussed the two phases in relations to Manvantara and Prayaya, to the Universe of Objects and Nirvana. After this discussion it should become clear that no man is really predominantly introvert who has a physical body. Physical embodiment implies predominance of extroversion. So we may regard the difference in phase among embodied men and races as ~~the~~ being the contrast between extrovert extroverts, on the one side, and introvert extroverts on the other. So in any case the contrast is between degrees of extroversion, some being more and others less, while genuinely predominant introversion belongs to the states known as Pralaya and Nirvana. Bearing this point in mind, the western culture affords us an example of intense extroversion, while the Indian culture is a case of a less extrovert extroversion.

As a consequence of the foregoing considerations, if we take ~~the~~ norm of our own western culture as a base of reference from which we judge the dominant phase of a given individual, then those who we call predominantly introvert may often still appear as quite extrovert when judged from the Indian base, and still more so when judged from the base of Nirvanic consciousness proper. For us practically it is a question of degree. Actually, among us and in only lesser degree even among the East Indians, the truly introvert state is the unconscious state of dreamless sleep. Highly developed introvert self-consciousness is still very rare in this world and will become general only toward the close of the last Rounds. Only a short time ago, relatively speaking, this humanity attained its apogee in extrovert consciousness in the fourth sub-race of the fourth Root Race. We are now, in accordance with the general scheme of racial evolution, only slightly less extrovert. But, in as much as the human race is lagging behind the

evolutionary scheme, the present existent norm of extroversion is more extrovert than it should be. That means that our current norm is actually abnormal and tends to be pathologic. We can easily see in this the fundamental reason why our psycho-pathological institutions are receiving ever more and more patients.

The above remarks are based upon factors which the western empiric psychologist is unable to take into account unless he is also a student of the esoteric philosophy and psychology. This fact limits the general validity of his conclusions. He must, perforce, take as his standard that which he actually finds to be the norm of the western races. But this is the norm of what is already, mostly the norm of an insane asylum. The institutions merely receive the tougher cases and also some who are actually in the process of becoming more sane than the average but who because of the tension between their own psychical state and that of the average humanity find adjustment difficult. Those individuals who actually are in their own psychical development in a position or stage which would be normal for the race if the race were in a ~~a~~ atunement with the general scheme, are very apt to be judged by the exoteric psychologist as abnormal because of their deviation from the actual current norm of the race. But if this fact is kept in mind we can make considerable practical use of the findings of our empiric psychologists and, in addition, become familiar with a language and point of view that is generally acceptable at the present time.

Whether or not there is such a thing in the universe as an exclusively extrovert consciousness, that is, a consciousness that is entirely a consciousness of the object or in the object, at any rate, so far as human consciousness is concerned there is always a discernable subjective element. Our consciousness is that

of a Subject in a relationship of awareness to objects. But it is only through the experiencing of objects that we become aware of the fact of the subject and the consciousness itself. We can hardly say that a new-born child is aware of its Self or even of the fact of its own consciousness. It is through experience of objects and particularly through the experience of something like friction in the objective field that self-consciousness is finally aroused. As a result we become self-conscious with respect to the subject only indirectly and naturally this process is more developed with some individuals than with others. All who have bodies are first of all aware of objects as the prior condition to the more subjective recognitions. But from due consideration of as simple and commonplace an event as going to sleep it readily becomes clear to the human being that something more than the object-field is involved in being conscious of objects. The going to sleep is something that happens in the man himself that has a decisive effect upon his being aware of the field of objects. So, inevitably, the reflective man must have some sense of a Self as well as of objects. However, while we may regard at least a dim sense of the presence of the Self as common to all men, yet the degree of importance attached to this varies quite widely with different individuals. Some focus nearly all their attention upon the objects and these are the extreme introverts. As I have already pointed out, the center of emphasis in the West is on this side. However, others give a larger and larger importance to the Self in their consciousness-interest and in these cases we have a greater or less degree of introvert focus. At a certain point where this introvert focus is greater than that of the average Westerner we call the individual a predominant introvert. And this is the basis we will take in general for future discussion.

Yogagnani

Human Types (Series III)

In this paper we will consider certain of the consequences which grow out of the predominance in different individuals of extrovert thinking or of extrovert feeling. In this case we will not be considering the differences between introversion and extroversion, but the conflict and difference of valuation which grows out of a predominance of thinking, on one hand, and feeling on the other, both in the extrovert phase. As just precisely these contrasts of human type have been the cause of much conflict that has become needlessly bitter in human history, it is a matter of considerable importance that we should acquire a broad and understanding as possible of the type differences in question. With understanding the unavoidable conflict can be reduced in bitterness and intensity and progress be made toward a greater harmony of function.

In the first place, it should be clearly understood that it is impossible to predicate an absolute superiority of either of these functions. For certain purposes thinking is the superior power, while in other connections feeling is superior. In the ultimate sense we must regard these two functions as supplementary, the one corresponding to Logos, the other to Eros. Each operates according to its own inherent law and in cases where one of these functions is well developed and trained in a given individual it is manifested in a high degree of purity and fidelity to its own necessities. But there is an incompatibility in the laws that govern these two functions which becomes quite evident when they manifest in the same media. This happens ~~whenever~~ especially when the common media is the words, sentences, etc. that form our language, or when it is in the form of decisions in terms of action. The conditions favorable or necessary for either function are largely of contrary nature. Good thinking requires the coldness of dispassion,

while feeling requires warmth of heart. Clearly, because of these incompatibilities of inherent law and favorable conditions a given individual cannot manifest both qualities justly and effectively at the same time, particularly when functioning in an identical medium. Further, since years of training upon a base of natural aptitude is necessary to be genuinely superior in the formation of either thinking or feeling judgments, it follows as a practical rule that the competent thinker cannot be really competent in feeling judgment, while he who is competent in the art of feeling will form inferior intellectual judgments. This unavoidable specialization is one of the prices exacted when consciousness becomes embodied.

Thinking and feeling each has its objective or goal to which it is devoted, and this we may call the religious quality of each function. The supreme objective of thinking is Truth, while feeling envisages the supreme is Value, such as Beauty, Goodness, Loveliness, etc. Thus a thinking type, while he may appreciate Beauty, Goodness and Loveliness, yet if Truth demanded or seemed to demand ~~the~~ a choice between these and Truth, he would take the latter and sacrifice the former. In such a situation the feeling type would follow the reverse course. Now, while it is true that on a sufficiently high level of consciousness Truth and Value are found to be reconciled without violation to each other, yet on lower levels there is often a conflict which requires a sacrifice of one or the other. Here it is that the thinking and feeling types will make diverging judgments and, through lack of cross-understanding, come into more or less violent conflict. Each has its characteristic moral code which in the purer and more developed types takes on a religious intensity. As a result, conflict becomes intensified each feeling or believing that God is on his side, and

the devil on the other. This can easily result in the bitterest kind of conflict because both sides are genuinely sincere and often highly competent with respect to its own peculiar function.

The accentuation of one of these functions in an individual does not imply that he lacks the other function entirely. He simply has the subordinate function in a relatively undeveloped and primitive form, and he will always sacrifice the demands of the latter in the face of conflicting demands of the former. Thus it naturally follows that to a feeling type the feeling function of the thinking type seems defective and unevolved, and this is perfectly true. But so is the reverse true with respect to the quality of thinking manifested of the feeling type. However the psychical energy value of the subordinate function may be as great or even greater than that of the dominant function, but it is a more or less chaotic form of energy. The essential mark of the superior function is that it is differentiated, cultivated and developed into an effective tool, while the subordinate function remains crude, even though it may be quite forceful.

In the extrovert phase both thinking and feeling are concerned with the object. This means that they are primarily occupied with the environment rather than with the introspective world. Social activities and the world of affairs in general form the special domain of these extroverts. Thus, business men, social leaders, politicians, engineers, labor leaders, soldiers, etc. generally must be extroverts in order to be successful. Business men, engineers, professional men in general, and the higher ranking officers among soldiers tend to be more thinking extroverts than feeling extroverts, particularly among those of superior accomplishment. But social leaders, politicians, labor leaders and the dynamic, as opposed to the strategic, soldier tend to be predominantly extrovert feeling types. The higher cultural fields,

such as religion, art, pure science, mathematics and philosophy are predominantly the domain of the introvert phases of the functional types, and so these do not belong in the present discussion.

Just at the present time, in our own country and throughout a large part of the world there is a strong intensification of the conflict between the extrovert thinking and feeling types in the fields of sociology, politics and economics. In certain foreign countries at this moment, i. e., in Italy, Germany, Russia and Japan, the thinking type in both the extrovert and ~~introvert~~ introvert phases, particularly the latter, is being ^{suppressed} ~~subjected~~ by methods of extreme brutality. In our own country this conflict has not developed to the same degree of intensity, but there is the possibility of such intensification if we fail to cultivate the necessary balancing restraint in adequate degree.

In the three social fields listed above, extrovert thinking has the superior advantage in practical as well as theoretical economics. The ~~superior~~ successful politician both in the inferior and superior senses, is typically a predominant extrovert feeling type. In sociology the division does not seem to be so clear, though on the whole, I should say the feeling quality leads here. But as practical power in the objective sense manifests mostly through economic and political action, sociology enters into the conflict only in a subsidiary sense. Our concern is then primarily with the economic and political power principles.

The economic function operates largely through finance, management, technical knowledge and labor. The political function divides mainly into the familiar three phases of legislation, administration and adjudication. Again there is a relative preponderance of thinking and feeling in these different phases. Thus finance, technical knowledge clearly belong predominantly to the thinking type, while

with management the dominant type may be either, though in the greater phase of business the thinking type seems to predominate. With labor as a whole feeling predominates, that is, with those who think of them selves as labors rather than as men who are temporarily functioning in the labor phase of activity. In politics, feeling predominates in legislation, while thinking is clearly dominant in competent adjudication. Again the executive function ascillates between the thinking and feeling types. Our last two presidents are excellent examples of the strongly marked thinking and feeling type executives. Hoover is an example of a decided extrovert thinking type, ^{and} Roosevelt perhaps an even more decided extrovert feeling type. This is a contrast that can very easily lead to a bitter intensity of conflict.

It should now be clear why there should be a community of understanding between the leaders of economic power and professional men generally and the judicial mind, and a distrust of the legislator. The success of the economic and professional function requires a favorable ratio between the calculables and the incalculables in the concrete situation, since the essential problem is one for thought. The judicial mind is relatively calculable while the extrovert feeling mind of the legislator certainly is not. For the same reason economic leaders and professional men prefer an executive of the thinking type. In contrast there is a stronger rapport between the legislator and the typical politician with labor and the general mass of the population, as in these groups feeling predominates over thinking. Likewise, also, these groups prefer the feeling type of chief executive.

Now, summing up the total effect of the current situation in simple terms we have a conflict between money power, representing the extrovert thinking type, and political power, representing the extrovert feeling type. On the whole, the self-conscious labor-

movement must be classed with extrovert feeling and the politician, though the division between the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. again reflects type difference in a subordinate degree. The craft unions of the A.F. of L. being semi-professional in spirit naturally have a larger relative proportion of the thinking types than the C.I.O. At the present time the political power groups are decidedly in the ascendent, while heretofore there has been a fair balance of power between the political and money groups, the latter through superior skill often offsetting the superior numbers of the former so that on the whole they have had the determinant voice in the development of American culture so far. The larger number of our superior statesmen have been heretofore in the money group. There is considerable reason to believe that future dominance for some undetermined period of time will swing to political power. History shows us a periodic oscillation between the dominance of thought power and feeling power which in our culture at this time is represented by a swing between money power and political power. The great danger is a swing that will go too far which will mean dictatorship and an accentuation of the present tendency toward the regimentation of life.

It is both grossly unjust and superficial to regard the issue to day as lying between social and anti-social forces, between altruistic politicians and selfish men of business. Both camps have their social and anti-social spirits, their altruistic and selfish men. The real issue is between the necessities and ideals of two fundamental functioning types. It is not a question of relative sincerity or competency. Both camps are more or less sincere and both camps have competent and incompetent men. But each camp violates the moral code of the other, and this is a fruitful cause of bitterness.

The reason why the conflict is fraught with bitterness is made clear by the following illustration. For the thinking type a care-less attitude toward logical contradiction is just about the capital sin. This is true for the reason that conformity to logical law is fundamental to his characteristic function. The politician is characteristically careless concerning contradiction since for him concepts or ideas mean little more than poker chips in a game that is really concerned with feeling values. Therefore he will use ideas for their expediency-value rather than for their truth-value. This does not mean that he is totally without a sense of honor, though I must confess that I have found it difficult to realize this fact. Even while inconsistent he may be loyal to his felt-standard which may lead him to say, as though speaking his own conviction, that which ~~the current wish~~ conforms with the current wish of his constituency. To the thinking type this is rank dishonesty if the statement does not actually conform to private conviction. Such a way of using ideas is absolutely fatal to financial, technical and scientific thinking. Naturally the latter groups dread dominance by the politician.

Now, assuming that we are in the initial phase of definite domination by political power, what will the results be? In the first place either a lowered economic efficiency or a crystallizing of economic status, since the creative intellect will be hopelessly bound in the economic field. Standard of living in the economic sense will not grow on the whole as high as it would otherwise, though some classes will realize an improvement of economic status. The feeling side of life will have superior opportunity. We will enter a phase corresponding to the Middle Ages in Europe, though at a higher level. For it was feeling that held the reigns during the middle ages and the intellect that was enslaved. Thus the Middle Ages was rich in the feeling-type of mysticism, but poor in phil-

osophy and science. Life will be much more highly regulated in detail by political authority and the creative intellect will be viewed with suspicion, and more or less completely suppressed.

and women
Will men be happier? The answer will depend on type. Some and, perhaps, the larger number will be. Others, particularly superior the creative types whose medium is not confined to the fine arts, will have a very much worse time of it. Dostoievsky in the "House of the Dead" showed very clearly that under objectively standardized conditions the affective effect on different individuals varied extremely widely. Thus under the severely regimented condition of a Russian prison while the aristocrat lived in a condition of almost unbearable torture, there were others who found the life the happiest they had ever known. Those like the latter group will certainly be happier under the new order, but men of strong individuality and originality will face greivous suffering.

But then the repressed power will develop force which in time will become sufficiently explosive so that it will rise to the top again and so the pulsation of the cycles will continue.

Yogagnanā

Human Types (Series IV)

We should now be ready for a more complete formulation of the complex functional organization of man. So far we have seen:

1. That there are two possible attitudes that an individual may take. He may be either more polarized to the subjective or to the subjective phase of consciousness in his predominant functioning in a given life. In the former case he is said to have an extroverted attitude; in the latter an introverted attitude.
2. There are four clearly defined ways in which consciousness functions and these are, thinking, feeling, sensation and intuition.
3. That as each individual tends to be characterized by his predominant attitude, as introvert and extrovert, so also is he characterized by the predominance of certain functions, so that we have thinking types, feeling types, etc.
4. That each of these functions may predominate in either the introvert or extrovert phase, so that we have altogether eight primary functional-attitude types.

Now in point of fact the psychological organization of each individual in its totality consists of all four functions with both phases. But because of incompatibilities in the laws governing these functions on this plane of consciousness it is impossible above a rudimentary stage of development for one individual to have all functions and both attitudes equally developed. Evolution proceeds by a process of differentiated development. By taking into account reincarnation ^{we can see how it is possible} for a given individual to bring along all functions and phases through a series of lives, that which is repressed in one life being developed in a later life, and so on. This is one of the points where a knowledge of occultism enables the student to construct a more complete picture than is possible for the purely exoteric western psychologist.

When any function or attitude is predominant the opposite attitude and the other functions are more or less repressed. This means that their functioning is driven back into what Dr. Jung calls the unconscious level of the psyche. (At this point I deviate in a certain respect from Dr. Jung. What he calls 'unconscious' I call 'consciousness which is not self-conscious or conscious of itself', and what he calls 'Conscious' I call 'consciousness which is conscious of itself'. The reason for this is developed in other writings of mine, and it is not important that it should be restated here. However, if the student will bear this point in mind, I will continue to use the terms 'conscious' and 'unconscious' because they are simpler to handle.) That which is driven into the unconscious continues to have an effect upon the individual's life, but he is largely unconscious of this effect. On the other hand, those who observe him may be very conscious of, especially in those cases where the unconscious determines conduct more than the conscious portion of the life. This fact complicates the determination of any individual's type. By observation alone he might be classed in one way, whereas if due consideration of what the individual knows of himself is taken into account, he would be classed quite otherwise. In order to be fair, then, we must let the individual's own conscious determinants rule as to classification. However, the functions that are conscious in the individual may not be those which determine his primary social importance. An individual may be important to others for functions of which he is little, if at all, aware.

We are now in a position to distinguish between the Subject or Self in the larger sense, and the personal ego. The latter is the center that rules directly the consciousness, as distinguished from the unconscious, of the embodied man. The larger Self, on the other

hand, includes the whole of the unconscious, as well as the personal ego, and is more in the nature of an unseen field or domain, more like a space than a point. It is a region which is the counter-phase of the universe of objects, a hidden domain that is just as much a region for research as the external universe.

The degree of repression of an attitude or of functions varies quite widely. It is possible for an individual to be conscious in some measure with respect to both attitudes and all functions, but typically a certain function and a certain attitude determines his primary orientation to life and activity. The latter is cultivated, educated and adapted consciously. Relatively the other functions and the other attitude ^{are} is reduced to the status of servants of the main function and attitude. In other cases, certain functions and the counter attitude may be so repressed as to be quite unconscious. In this case the individual is quite without conscious control of these repressed elements. They may control his actions in ways that are quite obvious to those who surround him, but he is not aware of it. In such a case it is useless to try to get such an individual to master himself by an appeal to his conscious will. For the conscious will has power over only that which is within the field of consciousness. The individual must be first awakened to consciousness of the unconscious functions before he can take control. To help an individual accomplish this requires extensive knowledge of psychological methods that help to unveil the unconscious. In any case it is quite unjust to judge the operation of unconscious functions in an individual on an ethical basis, for the ethical attitude of an individual is determined by his motive and practice in the domain wherein he is conscious. If the ethical character is good, the problem is simply that of making the unconscious functions to

become conscious, and then the individual will himself supply the motivation and effort for their appropriate direction and control.

Here we are dealing with a very fruitful cause of unjust moral evaluation of fellow human-beings. The conscious motivation of a given individual may be highly altruistic, conscientious and competent. But if he is a strongly one-sided type the opposite character tends to operate in the unconscious and may have a strong effect upon his visible actions, although quite unbeknown to himself. Observers may see the latter more clearly than the former and thus judge the individual as decidedly selfish and otherwise possessed of a negative moral character. This is not just, for the moral evaluation should be given to that side of the individual which is conscious. What is needed in such a case is a wider awakening of consciousness, and the moral transformation of the former unconscious will be effected by the individual himself. A course of conduct which if performed by the observer of a given individual might well be selfish and dishonorable, does not necessarily imply such a motivation on the part of the one observed.

The four functions fall into two groups having radically different character. The first group consists of thinking and feeling. Both of these are characterized by a process of judging, which includes the notion of ordered evaluation. Jung calls these 'rational'. The second group consists of sensation and intuition. In this case we have simple perception or reception of what is without any judgment or ordering. Jung calls these 'irrational'. There is no logical objection to Jung's designation as there is no praise or depreciation intended any more than there is in calling some numbers rational and others irrational. But as the term 'irrational' has some popular connotations that are prejudicial in the opinion of certain types, I shall not use these terms, but speak of the

judging and perceiving functions.

As between the two judging functions there is a deep-seated incompatibility in the laws that govern each. So for an individual to be predominantly of either the thinking or feeling type implies that the opposite judging function will be strongly depreciated. This does not mean that in theory he depreciates the other judging function, but in practice being true to his own predominantly developed function forces him to do so. For where the logic of thought and the order of feeling lead to incompatible results the individual must choose to follow either the logic or the order. His type determines which course he will and should take.

An analogous incompatibility exists between sensation and intuition. For sensation is concerned with that which is immediately given through the senses, while intuition is responsive to that connected with the object which is not sensed. In the same given situation each immediately receives a different perception, which tends to obscure the other function. Hence, an individual of the perceptive type is either an intuition type or a sensation type, with the opposite function repressed. This group differs from the judging group in that it is concerned immediately with just what is, in the objective or subjective sense. It is not concerned with an order or a logic between elements. It places the 'what is' or the 'what happens' above any evaluation.

Now a predominant judging type may be also well developed in terms of one of the perception types, and visa versa. Thus either a thinking or feeling type may also be well developed and conscious in terms of sensation or intuition. The leadership lies in thinking or feeling, but either sensation or intuition can stand as a close co-operator, because the type of function being so different there is no fundamental incompatibility. In fact, intuition or sensation

give the material or substance for thinking or feeling. Otherwise, the judging functions become largely sterile and empty. On the other hand, the perception functions taken in isolation from the judging functions are blind. They then stand out of relation to any system, program or valuation, being merely just what at this moment is. But it often happens that one or the other of the perception functions dominates in an individual, and either thinking or feeling occupies the subordinate position. In this case, sensation and intuition are not blind, but the substantial given material of consciousness exceeds the understanding, or evaluation. Humanity supplies us with all sorts of combinations.

Owing to the fact that a type may be compound, it may be difficult to determine which function actually predominates. We have here another problem in addition to the one already discussed in connection with the effect of the conscious and unconscious attitudes. Thus a given individual may have both feeling and intuition dominant in consciousness and then we have the problem as to whether feeling of intuition leads. Is the feeling judgment servant to the intuitive perception or visa versa? Is the sense for the felt order stronger or is the attitude mostly determined by the immediate presentation through intuition? It may take a lot of study to answer this question in any given case. The individual himself may not be very good at self-analysis and so confuse that which belongs to perception and that which belongs to judgment. He may think that he got the judgment intuitively, but this would be a mistake, for judgment belongs to some order or system of relations, while intuition is the 'now given' without any concern for order or system. To be sure the individual may combine the 'now given' with an order or system, but no single function in isolation does this.

Our total picture of types has now become quite complicated. We can see this in the following table of some possible combinations.

Thinking Types

Extrovert, combined with
Extrovert sensational
Introvert sensational
Extrovert intuitional
Introvert intuitional

Introvert, combined with
Extrovert sensational
Introvert sensational
Extrovert intuitional
Introvert intuitional

Feeling Types

Extrovert, combined with
Extrovert sensational
Introvert sensational
Extrovert intuitive
Introvert intuitive

Introvert, combined with
Extrovert sensational
Introvert sensational
Extrovert intuitive
Introvert intuitive

Sensation Types

Extrovert, combined with
Extrovert thinking
Introvert thinking
Extrovert feeling
Introvert feeling

Introvert, combined with
Extrovert thinking
Introvert thinking
Extrovert feeling
Introvert feeling

Intuition Types

Extrovert, combined with
Extrovert thinking
Introvert thinking
Extrovert feeling
Introvert feeling

Introvert, combined with
Extrovert thinking
Introvert thinking
Extrovert feeling
Introvert feeling

In addition there are the types which we may call pure rather than combined types, though, presumptively, these are much rarer. Also we must take into account the degree of intensity of a type function and also the degree to which the unconscious produces visible effects upon action. All of this makes type determination a quite involved problem. We must also remember that an extrovert predominant type may function in an introvert phase at times and that there is an important difference between this introvert phase and that which belongs to the genuine introvert type. The same is true with respect to the introvert.

Is it not now clear that it is useless to hope for universal agreement relative to valuation or reality? There can be no one thing which all men will agree is univervally most important. Each is under a duty to be true to himself, and just with respect to recognizing the same duty for others.

Yogagnani.

Human Types (Series V)

1. In this paper we will make a general survey of the characteristics which mark the introvert and extrovert ~~and~~ attitudes, regardless of whether the predominant function is thinking, feeling, sensation or intuition. Later we will consider the four functions in detail.

As previously noted the contrast of attitudes grows out of the subject-object character of our consciousness. The primordial Consciousness which I have elsewhere called 'Consciousness-without-an-object' does not have this contrast but is at once a blend of all attitudes and functions. But consciousness of our kind is possible only by an abstraction of partial aspects from the original synthetic whole and, consequently, its manifestation in any individual or race is incomplete. By taking the combined consciousness of all individuals in a race we arrive at a more synthetic consciousness than is possible for any one embodied individual. But this racial consciousness would have its distinguishing characteristics which would set it apart from other races. In the same way the consciousness of one globe would differ from that of another, and of one round from that of another round. The combination of all this forms the complete consciousness of the world entity which, in turn, would have its characteristics that mark it off from other world entities, etc. In the end 'Consciousness-without-an-object' is that totality from which all these possibilities are derived as well as every future possibility.

Ordinarily we may think of our subjective aspect as an 'I' which is a bare point having the capacity of being aware of the objective world. However, when an individual has had a sufficiently profound mystical realization he finds it necessary to modify this view. The subject is found to be much more than a bare point-like 'I', but is a domain like a Space in which there is no discernable limit.

And just as the external world is in a sense a domain common to all creatures that are manifested within it, so likewise, the inner subjective domain common to all Subjects or Selves. Now the old notion of a 'Self' or an 'I' which seemed like a distinct kernel separate from the other kernel-like selves, ceases to be adequate. It is nearer to the truth to speak of an objective and subjective Space or domain, such that the one is the inverse of the other. To be sure, egoistic centers may be produced through the interplay of these two spaces either in a higher or lower sense. In the higher sense we have the Higher or reincarnating Ego which persists from one life to another among those creatures that have reached the human level, but not, in general, among lower creatures. In the lower sense we have the personal ego which, in general, persists for one life-time only. Egoistic centers are thus something that is evolved or creatively produced, but are not to be considered as original existences. It is possible by the appropriate art to develop a persistent Egoic center in a higher sense which will have a continuity of individual existence indefinitely extended. But in order to master this art it is first necessary to overcome the restricting and determining power of the ego whether in the higher or lower sense, then ground one's identity in the eternal selfless Reality and, finally after this, hold and cultivate the egoic character through the conscious use of intelligence and will. But first of all, the individual has risen above egoism in both the lower and higher sense so that his deeper an eternal identity surrounds that Ego, rather than being bounded and defined by it.

I believe the foregoing statement gives to the Ego its due, and clarifies my attitude on the subject. Thus, when in the future I discuss the relationships between the subjective and objective Spaces with an apparent disregard of the ego, it should be understood that I am dealing with general principles that are more

fundamental than any egoistic relationship. All egocentric or formed consciousness depends upon these more general principles. Each individual, to the degree of his power and understanding, can make use of these principles to carve out his destiny in such ways as his self-produced inclination may indicate. My primary concern is with the clarification of the principles, and then leaving every individual to his self-chosen destiny in the highest possible freedom.

In our own day science has enormously extended the range of the objective universe for our consciousness. We deal with distances on the order of hundreds of millions of light-years and cosmic time-ranges on the order of trillions of years. At the other extreme we have found a world and time-system below the range of unaided vision that has a smallness comperable to the foregoing largeness. Students who have not kept an eye on scientific developments may not know this, but they can in a very short time acquire a fair general view of the situation through the many excellent popularizations of science that exist. All of this constitutes ~~the~~ a portion of the objective world or space. There are, however, many subtle worlds or spaces, inaccessible to our science, that also form part of this external universe. This grand sum-total of externality which fairly makes the senses real with its largeness and seemingly unlimited elaboration, is but one half of the space in which our consciousness moves. The other half is the subjective Space which we must conceive to be in its own nature no less rich than the totality of the objective space. But it is not a mere duplicate of the objective space, but its inverse. Its character is totally different, but complementary. It is not a domain of extension but of intension, meaning and value. This latter Space is never in its true nature an object of knowledge, hence to think

toward it we must use materials drawn from the external universe either in a gross or subtle sense. But these materials are then used as symbols designed to arouse recognition of a Meaning that is not itself an object of knowledge, but is something with which the individual is identical. Thus we must use the external universe to realize the subjective universe. This would seem to give the subjective Space a secondary or derivative position, but this is only true in connection with the process man must employ in arousing his self-conscious recognition in practice. In the genetic or original creative sense the objective universe is projected from the subjective Space, so that in this sense the former is more derivative. In a still higher sense both are interdependent and are derived from the GREAT SPACE, which I have called 'Consciousness-without-an-object.'

We may think of our consciousness as being something like a shuttle-cock which plays back and forth between the subjective and objective spaces in a breath-like rhythm. When we awake from sleep we move toward the objective. When we go to sleep we move toward the subjective. In a larger sense, when we are born in a physical body, we move toward the objective, and when we die we move toward the subjective. In a still larger sense since this is the rhythmic play between the Manvantaric phase and the Pralayaic phase of consciousness. We may draw a vertical line down the center of a plane sheet of paper and call one side subjective and the other objective. On the subjective side there is no form nor object in any sense, however subtle, yet it is not a simple homogeneity but a richness not inferior to the sum-total of all objective space and form both subtle and gross. Now, if we draw another vertical line at some distance from the central line on the objective side we may call this the center of oscillation around which birth and death plays for most men at the present time. That means that the

typical after-death conscious is still on the objective side of the line, although it is a subtle phase of objectivity. For most individuals the actual crossing to the subjective side of the median line means a state of so-called unconsciousness like dreamless sleep. The typical after-death state is only partly like this but is in the form of a kind of experience and therefore in a sub-phase of the objective space. Again, we may draw another vertical line still further over on the objective side and call this the axis of oscillation for sleeping and waking. For, in general, we do not go as far inward during sleep as we do after physical death. These two secondary vertical lines on this fourth globe are further over on the objective side of the median line than they are on the other globes, and also further on the objective side during this race than they will be in the sixth and seventh races. At present these lines are further out in the objective domain than they should be at this stage of world-evolution. That is why we are said to be, particularly in the West, too materialistic or objective. The immediate need is to correct this condition.

To actually cross the median line and retain self-consciousness is to realize the Nirvanic State. That is a very difficult thing to do at this stage of evolution. But on the seventh Globe at the close of the seventh Round it will be very easy. So it is not expected that more than a rare individual here and there will actually succeed in making the crossing to the other Shore (Nirvana) at this stage of evolution. But, what is needed and is quite possible in an extended measure, is to deepen the ^{whole} subjective phase of objective consciousness so that the race as a whole may be in a better position of harmonious adjustment to the grand cosmic play of in-breathing and out-breathing. Practically a great deal of readjustment of this sort must come if we are to cure the general neurotic condition of the world which became so strongly manifested

during the world war and, has, if anything, become worse since.

'Extroversion' and 'introversion' are terms evolved by modern analytic psychology to express phases of consciousness that are respectively more objective or more subjective in their focus. But the current usage is taken generally in a narrower sense than I have outlined above, for these are conceived as attitudes and phases of function of the waking consciousness. Naturally the waking state is typically more objective or extrovert than that of sleep. Hence the line dividing the extrovert consciousness in their sense from the introvert is still further on the objective side than the axis of sleeping and waking. This third axis would be something like the median line of the average waking consciousness of western man. Such an axis for the East Indian would naturally be no so far out on the objective side as in the case of the western. Hence, a man called predominantly introvert by the western standard might very well appear as mostly extrovert to the East Indian. It is really a question of relative degree. By establishing our axis in this manner there are necessarily as many introverts as extroverts, though in the absolute sense nearly all living men and most who have died to this plane would have to be classed as extroverts. But in our practical discussion we will take the median line of the average of our race and culture.

The world has quite a different appearance or meaning to representatives of the two attitudes. Each takes his primary truth-base or valuation-base at a different level. Typically he is not aware of the fact that his base is not the same as that of all other individuals. Usually he is not even conscious of the fact that he stands on a base which determines the whole perspective of the universe. Especially is this true of the predominantly extrovert attitude, for the latter focuses his attention upon what is before him and not upon the ground on which his consciousness rests. Now, difference

of base is a fundamental determinant with respect to what is conceived as important, what is real, what is true, what is valuable, etc. Common facts, common logic and other common standards are not sufficient to resolve these differences. The result is that one man may think another is stupid, immoral or careless because he takes a different attitude toward a common situation, whereas both may be substantially equal in intelligence, morality and carefulness. It is the difference of base that lies as a barrier to mutual tolerance as well as of mutual understanding. Now, it is the duty of every man to be true to his own base, for that defines his dharma in a fundamental sense. At the same time it is his duty to respect the loyalty of another to a base that is different. This is a thing that is very poorly understood in the West, especially among those people who are devoted to the democratic ideology. For this ideology naively assumes that all men are of the same type and thus equal justice for all can be achieved by producing, as nearly as possible, the same conditions of life for all. This is the Procrustian ideal which becomes very cruel, at times, for those who differ widely from the norm of the average man. A really just society requires a much more elaborated structure if anything like an approximate equality of happiness is to be attained.

The study of differences in human attitude and functional types is liable to have two effects of an opposed character upon the individual. In some respects it will have a freeing and expansive effect, but there is also produced a sense of the restricted validity of one's own primary outlook, and this may come with something of a shock. There is some danger in this. The expansive and freeing effect comes in so far as the individual begins to understand his own necessities which the norm of his group may have led him to suppress. He may find that he does not and should not conform

to the current norm, since his private norm is grounded on a different base. An example of this is found in the case of the introvert who suffers under the charge of being anti-social. This is typically a charge based upon an extrovert morality. But the introvert has a duty more related to the subjective domain which causes him to appear externally as reserved, withdrawn, cold, etc. Actually, if he is an individual of superior power, he may be working effects on the collective subject of his race that will ultimately have profound beneficent effect upon his race. But the real effect may not appear in his life-time and may, in fact, never be traced to him by others on the objective plane. Such an individual will be freed from any mistaken effort he may have made to adapt himself to an extrovert code and thus come to be truer to his real nature and mission. In particular, the intuitive types, especially of the introvert attitude, stand to gain in social valuation. But, on the other hand, the individual may find that an outlook which he took very seriously because he thought it was universally valid and therefore deserved the highest devotion on his part, may be shocked to find that it has only a partial validity. This might lead him to relax his effort in undue degree and even through up his hands completely. In addition each one finds that he, not only has strong points, but as well typically weaknesses. All of this may lead to a doubt that can be disruptive. On the other hand, the need for cross-understanding is so great, as is revealed by the present world-condition, that it is highly necessary to arrive at a true appreciation of one's self and of his fellow-men. It is a process of becoming adult in ways that nearly all of us have remained children, and this is far from an easy task. Yet we must some day become truly mature.

Yogagnani.

Human Types (Series VI)

(In this paper we will continue the general discussion of attitude types and is thus a continuation of Series V.)

Outstanding examples of extroversion combined with superior ability is afforded by the great conquerors and rulers. Alexander the Great, Julius Ceasar, Napoleon, Frederick the Great, and Bismark are notable instances. Typically these men deal with the objective situation as it is and mold it by objective external action. They focus on 'making over' the external situation. Their motivation may or may not be the achievement of a general good. This is a matter that has to do with ~~type~~ moral attitude rather than type attitude ^{the latter being} which is manifested in the method of procedure. Their action is obviously socially oriented whether in a good or bad sense. If such a man were working toward a world-ideal his tendency would be first to conquer the world and then form it toward the ideal he sees, but adapting his action always to the external situation.

The extreme example of the introvert attitude is afforded by the ^{Yogi} ~~introvert~~ who is seeking the Nirvanic realization as his goal. He tends to abstract his life-force from the external world, even including his physical body, as far as possible without interfering with his inward penetration. He abandons possessions, not so much as an austerity as because possessions are a burden which interfere with his inner activity. He tends to adapt his organism to the external situation rather than forcibly making over that situation. Essentially all he asks of the external world is that it should leave him alone and not distract him as far as that is possible. If he is an altruist of sufficiently high degree he will be led to renounce his Nirvana when attained and seek to function as a world Saviour. In this he tends to disregard external situations in the social body and operates directly upon the consciousness of men,

seeking to transform their inner bases.

Tradition tells of Alexander meeting some of the Yogis when in India. On the field of battle he was easily master of the Indian situation but when he met the Yogis he was impressed with the presence of a power over which he had no control. His potential threat to the bodies of these men left them unmoved and had no effect upon their persistence in their purposes. This was something so strange to Alexander that it intrigued his interest and he wished to be possessed of their values. But he proceeded by the typical dominant extrovert method of commanding them to a place in his entourage. In this he was quite powerless. They refused and he could do nothing about it as neither promise of reward or threat could move them. As, on the other hand, he was unable to come to the Yogi and seek from them in the attitude of a Chela, the world of the Yogi remained sealed to him. Here we have a meeting of two opposed principles of power at a high level of development. The result was a kind of stalemate.

In the foregoing illustrations we have exemplified the contrast between the extrovert and introvert types in the form of the higher development of their characteristic powers. Another strong contrast is afforded by the typical neurotic form each assumes when it becomes abnormal. The typical neurosis of the extrovert is hysteria, of the introvert psychoasthenia. These two forms of neuroses have many symptoms which are not our special concern here. The outstanding contrast between the two forms may be given in the following way: Hysteria has a character which is more or less explosive, with a marked emotional quality. It seems as though an excess of uncontrolled and, often, uncontrollable life-energy suddenly bursts through. In contrast, psychoasthenia involves inner wastage and brain exhaustion. Hysteria tends to disruption by a psychical explosion, while psychoasthenia tends to be a fading out by a dying

down of the psychical energy. In their more moderate forms the relatively normal individual may note one or the other of these tendencies within himself when under stress and in this finds an aid to his own classification and even a key to self-protection.

The extrovert has more immediate influence upon his environment than the introvert. The visible world is his kingdom in a peculiar sense. He can effect changes in outer life, in nature and in society in his own time. He is master of external organization. His sense for beauty leads him to transform the environment so that it has a superior beauty of order. He produces and understands the machine. He knows how to achieve efficiency in external functioning. He has the superior sense for making money and a larger need for money to command the resources necessary for his external manipulations.

All of this is reversed in the case of the introvert. In his immediate relationship to the world, especially in the sense of society, he is ineffective. He has little direct power over the object, particularly when the object has an animate power of its own as in the case of human beings. His kingdom is an unseen world through which his influence acts upon men indirectly. If he is of superior importance he will, perhaps, become socially significant several centuries after his death. He may affect men by changing the base of their world-view, but not by producing changes in the environment as by the making or arranging of things, organization, etc. The beauty he values is unseen and is but little affected by external arrangements. The result is that outwardly he gives the effect of being disorderly both with respect to his environment and his own person. In fact his valuation is posited on another level and he is satisfied if the environment interferes with him as little as possible. Since the relatively inanimate nature of

rocks and trees interfere with his inward function least, he prefers them for environment. Typically he has little sense for making money and has only a moderate need for the resources for which money is necessary. Money simply cannot buy the tools with which he works primarily.

Life in this world belongs to the extrovert in an especial degree. His is a sure hand within the field of his experiences. He is by no means sure of the domain beyond the veil of death. He sees the phenomena of life and consciousness always associated with visible form and constantly experiences the fact that specific form is subject to decay and death. On the basis of experience it is impossible to build a convincing case for continuance of life and consciousness after physical death. Hence he does not find in his own consciousness any adequate ground for assurance relative to continuation after death. In this direction he can maintain a positive attitude only on the basis of a largely blind faith reinforced by religious institutions. On the religious side of his nature he has a real dependence upon visible symbols and forms. The more metaphysical religious thought does not make an effective appeal to him, and is far from convincing since it is not grounded on an external basis. It is hard for him to grasp the reality of after-death states and so is peculiarly dependent upon the assurance given by others.

With the introvert all of this is reversed. He is at a disadvantage in dealing with the multiplicity of external phenomena. An environment of too-much happening presses upon him with a force of suffocation. It may even constitute a threat of disruption of his psychical integrity. To meet this he must build a defense mechanism or he will be destroyed. But if his capacity as an introvert is well developed he knows with immediate assurance his security in the

realm beyond death, since his knowledge is ~~not~~ grounded in a level not dependent upon external forms. He easily understands that life and consciousness as such are not dependent upon bodies. In this it is less a question of faith and wishful thinking, but of knowledge. Hence he tends to view death as a freeing and begin^{ing} of a richer kind of life. The more developed he is as an introvert the less importance specific religious observance is for him. While more than any other he develops the use of the symbol as a vehicle of expression, yet less than any other does he need the symbol for himself. For he tends to have direct acquaintance with that which the symbol represents.

The practical sense is the mark of the extrovert. The mystical sense is the mark of the introvert, when the power of introversion is developed in exceptional degree. However, most introversion with us in the West does not reach far enough to become genuinely mystical. Thus Immanuel Kant, who was in many respects a well developed introvert did not reach on into the mystical depths. There is a clear conflict between the mystical and practical sense. To the highly developed extrovert the mystical side of introversion seems like a kind of insanity, a being caught in a meaningless phantasm. In his turn, the introvert may return the complement by charging the strongly extrovert consciousness with being occupied too much with essentially unreal phenomenal shadows. When these two types are each exclusively developed in his predominant attitude, it is impossible for the one to have any understanding of the other. When there is a degree of cross-understanding we have evidence that one or both have a degree of development in the counter attitude in the case of one of his functions.

A typical contrast of the extrovert and introvert way of functioning in a situation of the same type is illustrated in the following case. Let us suppose that an introvert and an extrovert are both

faced by the problem of building a trail through a rough mountainous country. In this case the extrovert method is shown best by an engineer. He plans by a preliminary survey the best grade and course for his trail. He then forces nature to conform to his plan in detail. He makes use of the best instruments and tools available, removes barriers forcibly, but at considerable cost of labor and money, and, in the end, delivers a very fine piece of work. Without tools of an adequate sort and resources he is greatly crippled, but with them produces superior results. On the other hand, the introvert tackles the problem in the spirit of securing the maximum amount of essential results with the minimum effort. He continually adjusts his plan to the obstacles before him, taking the easier route compatible with his main objective. He adjusts himself to the tools that he has, and often makes them serve his purpose by finding new ways of using them, rather than insisting upon the best designed tool. He continually seeks to reduce the amount of physical effort necessary through much thinking. In the end he produces a trail that will do, but which has much deviation and imperfection in it. It will not compare at all with the structural beauty of the extrovert engineer's product. But its cost in physical labor and money will be only a fraction of that entailed in the engineer's product. In the end he will have done much more work than the extrovert engineer in terms of thought, but much less with his hands. Further, he is at best advantage when he does the work himself, while the engineer operates best through managing others in the practical operation.

Wealth is often an important ingredient in the success of extrovert effort. With the introvert it is largely unimportant. The successful extrovert commands his environment through the appropriate agencies which nearly always cost money in considerable amounts, but which can be commanded by money. On the other hand,

- 1 - Human Types

the introvert deals typically deals with tools that cannot be purchased. For these are tools only to be found in the inner resources of consciousness. Only by great inner effort does he find his resources, and no amount of wealth can reduce the effort needed. The extrovert may achieve his results early in life, while the introvert, because of the enormous inner labor required in his construction, achieves usually only during the mature years of his life, and may even prove effective only in the social world only after many years have passed, possibly even in another generation.

The temperament of the two types is radically contrasted. The extrovert is open, sociable, friendly, accessible and extends his life throughout his surrounding world. In general it is not difficult to see his value. In contrast the introvert is taciturn, impenetrable, shy and withdrawn. He gives a fundamental effect of being cold and indifferent to those who meet him, even though he may act in an affable way. He seems not to be concerned with people as persons, and this is true. For as persons they are to him more or less unreal and not significant. If he is an altruistic type to be concerned with their ultimate good in an impersonal sense, and face the severest cost to accomplish this end. But for him the person hides the man he really cares for, more than it reveals it, and so he is naturally not fond of the persona as such. His real interest is much more in the durable soul. In vivid contrast the extrovert, when altruistic, spreads himself among his friends and gives them the feeling of being valuable as persons. He helps them as persons, and in turn is helped by them. ~~as persons~~ He may not be sure that there is such a thing as the soul, but if he grants that it may exist, he is quite likely to say that we need not concern ourselves about the good of the soul as it will take care of itself. The real problem, as he sees it, is that which is here and now in the visible world and concerns living persons.

The introvert does not give those whom he meets a sense of being important as persons. He does not spread himself among his friends nor are they able to do much for him. His instinct in illness is to seek solitude where the pressure of objects is reduced and he can draw upon inner resources without the necessity of sustaining a defense against the world. He is not a good doctor, nurse or teacher. In all these respects the extrovert is far better. The introvert may help medicine by research and by offering himself for experiment, all the while disliking direct contact with those he means to help. He is the researcher rather than the propagator. He would rather sacrifice for a cause than be active in it. All of this contrasts radically with the extrovert, who promotes himself and his cause. Also, the latter if ill seeks the help of those about him, and gladly gives his aid if others are ill.

To justly appreciate the ultimate relative value of these two types is very difficult. In visible situations and problems it is easy to see the superior value of the extrovert. For he is open and essentially clear before the observer. Yet today our life is often richer because of the little known work of an introvert who lived long ago, and is unknown except to historical specialists. The introvert is, in large measure, an unseen impregnating force, while the extrovert is embodied manifestation. It is natural that the latter should receive the greater praise. The introvert is quite willing to forego this, provided society does not rob him by its demands of his necessary inner freedom. He is then entirely willing to offer his best and remain forever unknown, and withall, be quite grateful to society for granting him what he values most from it, i.e., being let alone to fulfil his function. For society cannot help him in any other way.

I have given the above types in more or less strongly marked form. Most individuals have a more modified type character.

Yogaganni.

Human Types (Series VII)

We have now to consider the attitude of the unconscious in the case of the two attitude types. Heretofore we have treated largely of the conscious state of the introvert and extrovert. It has been noted that in each case a partial aspect of the whole of consciousness is manifested. As a consequence of this other aspects and functions are submerged in the unconscious depths of the psyche. Largely this is unavoidable and therefore quite normal, but when the extroversion or introversion become too intense and one-sided the neglected functions and attitudes rise up as powers over which the individual will has little or no control. In this case the repressed functions or attitude begin to assume a greater or less degree of control over the individual's conduct without his being aware of it. However, this action of the unconscious may become painfully obvious to the observer, and may even afford the principle basis of valuating the individual in question. He is judged as a whole by the character manifested by his unconscious. Such a judgment is not just or, at least, only partly just. Thus the action of the unconscious may give the individual the appearance of being very selfish, while such is not true of his own conscious attitude and motivation. If others criticise him on the basis of his apparent conduct he is unable to accept the criticism as being true to what he actually finds within himself. And it may not be true of the portion of his motivation which he can note introspectively. As a result the judgment of the critic is of no help to him. What he is manifesting to the view of others is something that just happens like events in nature, and he has no control of this until he becomes conscious of it. Hence the primary step in rendering help is not moral criticism, but the doing what may be done to render the unconscious conscious for the given individual. Then, and only then, can he proceed to make the necessary changes in his apparent

character.

It is not always true that the unconscious determinants have an inferior character. Modern analytic psychology does not seem to have discovered this fact. Real superiorities, that have been developed in previous incarnations but which have been placed in the background in the current incarnation so that some other function may be brought up in its development, may manifest in an individual's subtle and visible conduct so as to be quite apparent to others. The individual himself may be wholly or largely unconscious of this, and thus may find himself praised and credited with virtues which he cannot honestly accept because through introspection he does not find them in himself. Hence the significance such an individual has for his entourage may be quite different from that which he himself conceives it to be. Thus, whereas in the former case, the individual may feel that his friends are unjust critics, in the latter case, he may feel that he is valued too highly. Either position can be quite embarrassing.

The difference between inferior and superior elements manifesting through the unconscious attitude is, in large measure, connected with the difference between the personal ego and the true Subject. When we say 'I' we may be meaning the ego, the Subject or a combination of the two. If, when we say 'I' we really mean something that is exclusive and private, distinct and separate from other persons, then it is the personal ego to which we refer. This is, by far, the most common meaning that attaches to 'I'. If, on the other hand, we mean the mystical 'I', then we are referring to the true Subject which, as I have already pointed out, is a kind of Space which is a common field for all just as objective space is. This 'I' is not exclusive and merely private. It does not carry an egotistical meaning. It is the 'I' of the mystic and when used by such a one does not imply any personal over-valuation. It is

an 'I' that is just as universal and impersonal as objective space. If then, John Doe, a mystic, expresses himself through a large use of the first personal pronoun it is not the person John Doe to whom he is referring. It is rather something from the 'I' of the reader or listener that is really speaking. The John Doe is merely a Voice proclaiming a part of the Message from the mysterious archana of the Self. This Message is actually just as impersonal and universal, as far as it goes, as a treatise on mathematics. Now, the unconscious attitude may come from the personal ego, in which case it is inferior and often destructive. But it may also come from the mystical 'I' or Self, and then genuinely superior qualities are manifested. In both cases, however, the individual is largely or wholly unconscious of this side of himself.

In the case of the strongly developed extrovert the consciousness of the 'I' in either the egoistic or mystical sense is largely, and possibly wholly, suppressed. When extroversion has gone too far, so that the subjective side is unduly neglected, thus becoming quite unconscious, it develops as a force that takes over control of conduct in greater or less degree. But in this case the subjective attitude reflects the personal ego and not the mystical Self. Such a one appears, then, a very egotistical. Further, since subjective side has been neglected, it is primitive and infantile in character. We find the strongest manifestation of this character among the dictators. Thus, in the case of Napoleon who, in the early part of his career was a genuine instrument of destiny in the true sense, failed, toward the end, through taking the egotistical turn. This side of him does manifest as distinctly childish, even to the extent of giving a pouting-like appearance to his mouth. At this stage if we abstract the genius from him, we have lefted merely a sort of badly spoiled boy. But because he was actually a superior extrovert genius, the spoiled boy was able to make all of western

Europe his play-ground in which he worked untold mischief. But the penalty was that he began to lose his genius, and then followed Waterloo. If we look at the modern dictators in Europe we can see this childish side very strongly marked. When this sort of thing happens to a ruler we have one of the most disgusting exhibitions which it is possible for a human being to manifest. Also such men are peculiarly dangerous to culture, when their childish egoism comes to the surface.

It is the extrovert who becomes egotistical when the revolt of the unconscious causes an over-turn. The effect in the case of the introvert is the reverse. When the attitude of introversion is developed to far or too exclusively, the power of the object grows in the unconscious. When this power effects the over-turn then the introvert finds his ego submerged by the power of objects. He loses his moral and self-determining superiority over the object and becomes submerged under its ^{magical} ~~mystical~~ influence. The effect is one of greater or less helplessness. Objects, particularly in the form of other human beings achieve a progressive dominance over him and tend to effect ~~his psychical~~ a dissipation of his psychical integrity. This may finally take the form of submergence by narcotics or sex, particularly the latter, since the object which carries the greatest threat to the introvert is woman. Here we can see the rationale of the monastic ~~regime~~ and recluse regime, in connection with those who are under intensive training for Yoga. This regime when scientifically applied is designed almost exclusively for masculine introverts. Such neophytes during the intermediate period before attainment are vulnerable in the respect outlined above, and the regimes are designed for their protection. Once they have fully mastered egoism and are solidly centered in the genuine Subject, these regimes are no longer requisite. They have become

united with universal powers that render them invulnerable.

An important fact to be born in mind is that when the unconscious takes command whether temporarily or permanently and is of the inferior or egoistic type, it tends to be destructive. The psychical forces which Freud's researches uncovered are almost wholly of this type. These forces reveal the man at his worst. The primary key for dealing with them is to render them conscious, and then they begin to come under the control of the individual. The technique for rendering them conscious is often quite involved and there are no clear-cut rules which are infallible. The main practical problem of psycho-analysis is concerned with this. There are various forms of technique such as dream-analysis and free association. The purpose in every case is to bring the voice of the unconscious to the surface and then translate it so that its meaning may be made manifest to the conscious aspect of the individual. Sometimes simple recognition fails to do the work and in that case further steps are required such as interpretation by the psychologist, education and sublimation. All of this is to be regarded from the occult point of view as a process of purification.

It is possible for the individual to guard against the destructive effects of the extreme development of his characteristic attitude, provided he has the understanding which the study of attitude and functional types is designed to give. Over-development of an extrovert or introvert attitude should be balanced by a compensating functioning in the opposite attitude. On the other hand, this should never be carried so far as to be equivalent to a forced predominant functioning in the opposite attitude. His psycho-physical organism is opposed to this, and so the forcing of the wrong attitude too far tends toward neurosis and even physical ailment. There fore,

the compensation should be judicious and moderate. This compensation should be attempted under the conditions of a particularly favorable milieu. This is true for the reason that the individual is undertaking to function on the side of his nature that is more primitive and childish. He would therefore be in a more or less vulnerable position in an unfavorable milieu, whereas when functioning on the side of his more developed attitude he has better resistance to unfavorable conditions. In the case of the introvert the favorable milieu is clearly in the environment where the power of the object is weakest. Here he can shift more easily to the extrovert attitude because there is less necessity of a defensive attitude. On the other hand, he should never depart from his developed introvert defensive technique in the midst of crowds or in settings where the impression of the object is very strong, as in city life. By inverted correspondence it follows that the extrovert would find the most favorable condition for introvert functioning when in an environment where the force of the object is strong, since the extrovert gains sustenance from the object. This affords a more favorable condition for developing the weaker attitude. In any case the inclination of the individual should be used as a guide in this, and when he is in the milieu he prefers to be in he is less under the necessity of living in the form of his dominant attitude.

A similar problem arises in connection with an over-development of a functional attitude. But this will be discussed in connection with functional types.

Both the introvert and the extrovert have characteristic strong points and weaknesses. The type of the individual who is forming the judgment of valuation tends to act as a prejudicial factor. Thus an extrovert tends to appreciate the extrovert virtues in others and to excuse his faults, while undervaluing the introvert virtues and too severely condemning the latter's faults. The

complementary weakness tends to be present in the valuations of introverts. However, western culture having a strong predominance of the extrovert attitude, the general social pattern of judgment and valuation favors the position of the extrovert. So much is this the case that often introverts feel themselves constrained to take the extrovert view of themselves, and thus are led to be untrue to their own type. Dr. Jung says that he has never found an extrovert who was guilty of this being untrue to his own type. He dominates the articulate social standpoint. Thus we have the univervally applied ideal of the dominant individual who fights his way through the problems of the environment and outer life and wins to command of situations objectively. Though we may deplore the ~~characteristics~~ negative characteristics of such a type, we rarely despise them. But the introvert who tries to live this way must fail and takes on the appearance of a weakling. His faults we tend not merely to deplore but also despise. For the most part the West is ignorant of the domain in which he has strength and can function with power. What is sorely needed is a more ~~subjective~~ intelligently realistic appreciation of the two types of strength and weakness.

Yogagnani.

Human Types (Series VIII) VII

Heretofore we have considered principally the characteristics of the two fundamental attitudes of introversion and extroversion and given only passing attention to the four principle functions of consciousness. Men are differentiated by predominance of function as well as by a predominance of one or the other of the attitudes. I have already given the schematic ~~and~~ classification of the functions. There remains to be considered the specific character of each function as such and then its manifestation as modified by the two attitudes.

The first function we will consider will be that of thinking. This will be handled with more adequacy than any of the other functions for two reasons: In the first place, a classification and an analysis, such as these papers necessarily are, is a manifestation of the thinking function. And naturally the thinking function can be truer to its own nature than it can be to the other functions. In the second place it is the writer's predominant function, and is therefore that which he understands most completely. Thinking is that function which takes the contents of consciousness, whether from the senses (experience) or from intuition and organizes them in an order of concepts. This function ~~thereby~~ inheres first of all in the unconscious root or the Subject, though it is started into action by experience and may deal exclusively with a content given by experience. It is a judging or organizing function. Thus it is not a mere reception of something presented, as is true of pure sensation and intuition. It ties one concept with another, and, in its pure form, aims at the ideal of an interdependent system of concepts such that each concept is necessary to the whole system. The system is subject to a law of connection such that no part can be arbitrarily added or subtracted, except the initial contents with which the system starts. The great law of thinking

is the law of implication. Every judgment and every combination of judgments leads to implications, and these implications are conceived as having just as much truth as may apply to the original judgments with which the process of implication begins. Thus, if implication leads to a conclusion which is recognized as an error then that error is not introduced by the process of reasoning but lies in the initial judgments. Hence, to accept as true the initial judgments and then to refuse to accept the consequences which follow by implication is to violate the laws of thought. Thus, in so far as truth is determined by a thinking process, such an act is a violation of truth.

Thinking which consistently conforms to the laws of its own nature is attained only by protracted training and effort. In this sense thinking is an art that is at least as difficult to master as any of the fine arts such as music. Mastery of thinking is as ~~at~~ difficult to attain as the mastery of a superior musical vehicle such as the pipe-organ, the violin or a symphony orchestra. The interference of antagonistic functions must be rigidly excluded, in so far as they are antagonistic. The untrained consciousness of man is a mixture of the four functions even though one of them is predominant. Thus ordinary thinking involves many violations of the laws of thought that are introduced through the action of one or more of the four functions, such as feeling or intuition. The resulting complex is not an intelligent synthetic product but a confused product that is not true to the nature of any one of the functions. An idea of the real quality of ordinary thinking may be secured ~~we~~ if we conceive the thinking of the average man being about as well developed as his skill with one of the musical instruments. The average man plays very poorly, and his thinking has just about the same degree of merit.

In this discussion I shall make no absolute valuation of the four functions, leading to the conclusions that any one is essentially superior to all the others. Nor shall I affirm that all are equal. I leave this question entirely open. However, it is clear that for some purposes one function is superior, while for other purposes another function is more important. If our concern, in any given connection, is with a conceptual determination, then thinking must take the dominant position and the other functions enter into the picture in such manner as will not violate the laws of thought. If, on the ~~xxx~~ other hand, the main concern is a felt valuation, the laws of feeling judgment must dominate, and so on throughout the series. But we must strive to avoid the extremely common mistake of giving a valid conceptual value to that kind of thinking which is not true to its own laws. I consider no aspect of purification more important than this.

It must not be thought that I do not recognize the importance of a synthetic consciousness. Synthesis of the consciousness-value of all functions we must have ultimately in order to have full consciousness. But synthesis may be primitive and impure, or it may be discriminative and pure. The former leads to confusion, the latter to crystalline clarity. To reach the latter we differentiate between the functions and thus learn their essential nature and contribution to consciousness. Then we proceed to find a combination which does not involve compromise of the laws of any one of them. This is the highest art and represents culture at its peak. Almost certainly it cannot be realized in our present limited organisms, but requires a more comprehensive subtle form. It is possible to realize in this world a high degree of purity in one function and, perhaps, in two functions, provided one of the functions is from the judgment group and the other from the perception group. In the

latter case, something of the superior type of synthesis is possible. For the rest it seems we must be reconciled with some inferiority in our selves as compared with others who are predominately of another type.

When thinking is dominant it is of the active type. By this is meant that it is consciously controlled by the will. It is not something that just happens. Further, it functions best when in an affective field of dispassion or indifference. This state of indifference is often spoken of as the state of mind like a perfectly calm body of water. Thinking under such conditions is most likely to be true thinking that can lead dispassionately to conclusions that are either in agreement with one's wishes or diverge from them. To think soundly one must be able to disregard his likes and dislikes until the final conclusion is reached. In other words, he must be indifferent as to whether the results are agreeable or disagreeable. When the feeling function is dominant in an individual this kind of thinking is impossible. So the competent thinking judgment requires the repression of feeling until such time as a level is reached whereon a rational harmony between the two functions is possible.

Most thinking is of the passive or of a subservient type. In this case it is the servant of or slave to another function which is dominant. When thinking is passive it just happens. This is most apt to be the case where intuition is dominant and draws out of the unconscious a thought form for its enrobement. In this case the individual may feel that he is being thought through rather than thinking himself. The thought is brought to birth without effort on the part of the individual's consciousness. However, this does not necessarily imply that some other being did the thinking (though that is one possibility) but it may be an old thought power of the individual which in the current incarnation is repressed in the

unconscious and has been drawn forth through the active power of intuition. If the characteristic thinking of an individual is of this type, the collection of all his formulations is most likely not to make a systematic whole. Even though his intuitions as a whole are highly pure and therefore reliable, it does not follow that the embodiment of these intuitions as thought will have the same reliability. He may and, typically does, quite often contradict himself. Thus the real meaning of the intuition lies behind the intellectual form in which it is expressed, rather than in the systematic meaning of that form itself. When a dominant thought is united with intuition the development will be systematic and consistent with itself, at least in high degree. But when intuition dominates the embodying thought is almost certain to be inadequate. This passive kind of thinking is very common among mystics. They often interpret their thought as having an origin outside themselves as from a Divine Being. However, it may be their own thought in a deeper sense, only its source is in the unconscious. I have some familiarity, especially of late, with this kind of thinking, though my predominant thinking habit has been of the consciously determined type. In certain states I find that the pat word or phrase seems to be born into my mind without any mental labor on my part. On the whole I find that my subsequent critical judgment sustains these formulations, even when they come as a surprise. At times thoughts of this type run counter to my prior wishes and also to my rational expectations. They come with a strong sense of authority, and for the greater part, they do stand up under subsequent critical examination. However, I find that error can creep in and therefore rational criticism is important. Yet the critical attitude should be deferred until after the intuitive thought is completed and the field of assurance has ebbed. Otherwise the critical attitude serves to inhibit the function. It takes real art to secure a high order of

team-work between intuiting and thinking. (When later we discuss the feeling function we will have to consider the conjunction of intuiting and feeling which is a combination that produces totally different effects.)

Subservient thinking is not necessarily passive, but may require conscious effort. It is distinguished from dominant thinking in that it is entrained after another function, such as feeling. In this case the feeling sense of order leads and thoughts are used as foils for it. Such thought rarely or ever stands the test of logic. A series of ideas are given that are not logically tied together, and even when direct contradiction is not involved, a real thinker finds much irrelevancy in the series of ideas. The uniting thread in this case is a felt order, which may be highly cultured. In such a case, the true meaning of the writer or speaker does not lie in the significance of the conceptual forms but in the feeling order that is veiled within them. The outstanding example on a high level of this kind of thinking is found in poetry. In the field of genuine exposition this kind of thinking is negative and weak.

Dominant thinking may have feeling entrained after it. In this case thought is master and feeling servant or slave. Thus a particularly pure piece of logical reasoning may arouse in one a genuine sense of beauty, but the felt value was not determinant in the thought process. The feeling of beauty comes as an incidental effect after the accomplished fact. After considerable practice an individual may have so trained his feeling sense that it conforms readily to the logical form. In that case the logical sense and the feeling for beauty become almost identical so that they are largely interchangeable. Such an individual can shift to the feeling for the beautiful to guide his logical process and sometimes this aids

valid thinking. But it is only feeling that has been disciplined to conformity with the logical form that can do this. The feeling has been adapted to another function, rather than been allowed to operate determinately according to its own order. The thinking type will tolerate feeling in his consciousness only in so far as it is adaptable to the demands of thought, otherwise he represses it, with the result that it remains undeveloped in the unconscious.

A thinking type will have his moments when the repressed and undeveloped phase of his feeling will take hold of the reins of his conscious life. At such times he manifests a distinctly inferior order of feeling, having a primitive and childish quality. There may be a lot of force in the feeling, but it is uncultured and, therefore, lack effectiveness. To one in whom feeling has held the central place in culture, this primitivity and childishness is painfully evident. Because men are generally more primitive and childish in the feeling function than women, the latter typically view the former as boys no matter how old they may be. Correspondingly men typically view women as girls because they latter are judged by the quality of their thinking which has the same primitive and childish quality that is true of the ~~thinki~~ feeling of men. Each sees the other in terms of his conscious judgment more in the light of his more predominant function. Yet each needs the other to suppliment his less developed function. The force which draws these two together is mainly a need grounded in the unconscious and which is therefore all the more compulsive. They clash in the fields where they are most conscious. Thus we have the affinity and the war of the sexes. If men could realize that, on the average, their own feeling is as uncultured as the thinking of women, and if women could realize that their own thinking is as uncultured as the feeling they see manifested by men, then we would have a better basis for mutual objective valuation.

Yoganani.

Which ever function in an individual that is dominant is the function that carries into objective manifestation the predominant portion of the life-energy. Hence, with normal types, the individual is constructive when functioning along the lines of his dominant function. On the other hand, the repressed functions having been largely robbed of life-energy produce inferior and even destructive results. As a consequence a representative of the thinking type tends to regard feeling as inferior and destructive. This conclusion is reached by his own immediate experience of the feeling function as it manifests in his consciousness. A feeling type has the reverse experience. For her the feeling function carries the larger portion of the life-energy and is therefore constructive and positive in its effects, while the intellectual function, being largely robbed of energy, produces inferior and negative results. For such a one, then, the intellectual function is judged as a whole as being inferior, and therefore is depreciated. The important point to bear in mind is that such truth as lies in these judgments is valid only with respect to the perspective of the respective types. The universalized form which is characteristically given to the judgment is not justified. Either function, as such, can be positive and constructive, and either can be destructive and negative. It is all a question of which function carries the preponderant portion of the life-energy.

How are we to know when an individual is a representative of the thinking type? The answer to this question can be approached by both a subjective and an objective route. Subjectively it is determined by a positive answer to the question: Is the individual's life ruled by reflective thinking? In an important situation does action proceed from intellectually considered motives? Does he place the concept above ^{feeling} ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~in~~ determining a course of action ?

In situations that the thinker regards as relatively unimportant he may permit feeling or intuition to play the determinant role, but as the situation becomes serious he returns to thought as his main reliance. On the objective side we can determine the thinking type of individual by the answer to the question: Does he produce his best and most positive results when thinking in a state of affective dispassion or coolness? Does he lose ^{effectiveness} power when he becomes emotionally aroused? Does he tend to alienate people when he speaks or acts under an emotional complex? Does he tend to win respect when thinking dispassionately?

The thinking type may have a predominantly extrovert or introvert attitude, but in either case the idea tends to have predominance over facts and feelings. Both introvert and extrovert thinking can be concrete or abstract. In the former case inner and out facts have a higher order of importance than in the latter, wherein the idea has a progressively superior importance as the abstract quality of the thought increases. In the more concrete extrovert thinking type the thought is strongly polarized to external facts and experience. The thought arises in connection with the object and leads again to the object as a conclusion. To this attitude the objective world is not a mere symbol, but is conceived as being reality. In contrast, while introvert thinking is started originally by the object acting as a stimulus, yet the object has little more than the significance of a catalytic agent. An inner subjective fact is the real starting point of the thought, and the conclusion returns to a subjective reality. For this attitude objects in the external world have only the value of symbols and are otherwise essentially unreal.