

**Sketches for the Recovery of Night Vision:
Re-Orienting Depth Psychology to Engage the Inconvenient Truths of
the 21st Centuryⁱ**

Mary Watkins

The challenge of the inconvenient

Altman (2004) describes psychoanalysis' "night vision" as its precious ability to critique society and to probe its intrapsychic implications from the position of an outsider and critic. Such vision allows us to begin to see what of our psychological suffering is linked with the culture(s) in which we reside. Such vision is required to create processes of needed healing and what Lorenz has called "creative restoration" at the individual, community, intercommunity, and human/environment levels of organization (Lorenz & Watkins, 2003). In this dark time, we need such night vision. Why is it in such short supply in depth psychologies, be they psychoanalytic, Jungian, or phenomenological? How could we re-orient our teaching, training, studying, theorizing, and practicing of depth psychology to regain and strengthen it? I speak of depth psychologies in the plural because this more accurately describes the plurality of psychoanalytic, Jungian, and phenomenological approaches that have evolved. To address these questions we enter the realm of inconvenient truths, the topic of this volume.

Convenient truths can be assimilated into our pre-existing understandings of others, the world, and ourselves. They slip into our habitual daily routines, bolster our assumptions, and require little, if any, self-transformation. Inconvenient truths can only be engaged if we open ourselves to being destabilized, disrupted, and challenged to change ourselves and our relationships in ways that are unfamiliar, unsettling, and even extremely difficult. Inconvenient truths disrupt established certainties, breaking open brittle protective boundaries, disrupting defensive and often entrenched patterns of thought and action. They require processes of re-conceiving ourselves, our understandings, and the commitments that undergird the basic decisions and paths of action in our lives.

At their conceptions depth psychologies understood that psychological health is undermined by defensive clinging to convenient truths. The symptom was understood as

an insinuation from what has been kept at bay, disallowed, extruded, or repressed. Healing was associated with forming a relation to inconvenient truths, allowing them to challenge certainties and invite transformation at the deepest levels.

Living as we do in a time of inconvenient truths--wars, genocides, unprecedented forced mass migrations, accelerating extinctions of whole species of animals, global warming, deepening and sickening economic divides between the rich and the poor—how are we as depth psychologically-minded people to invite these truths to fundamentally challenge our assumptions, conceptions, and daily practices? How are we to understand our history of turning away from such truths, a history of strengthening our defenses against them? Have we been guilty of the form of ego-splitting that Said calls a provincialist's defense against the multicultural, where we reside within a fragment of ourselves in order to remain untroubled by other parts of the larger picture (Bollas, in Said, 2004)? To return to the radical vision of inviting the extruded into relationship with us, we must continually question our own personal and disciplinary histories of defensive processes. We must be open to taking unfamiliar paths that are inconvenient and uncertain, where mastery has not been achieved and understanding is still woefully inadequate.

The fabric of inconvenient truths mentioned above—truths amidst which our lives are currently woven—should not be reduced to the psychological dimension; neither should our engagement with them lack a psychological dimension of understanding. How do we re-orient the study and practice of depth psychology to help create this understanding and the practices that will flow from it? The seeds of depth psychologies have now been dispersed around the globe, taking root in the soil of many different cultures. I am writing from America, and know that some of you are readers from other countries. While some of the specifics regarding the development of depth psychologies in America may not be applicable to your country, I want to suggest that trying to understand what was lost in the translation of depth psychologies to my and your cultures is a necessary starting point. What are the cultural pressures to which depth psychologies succumb in a particular location? What insights does it lose due to the accommodations it makes? What new demands from this moment in history, in this particular place, must

these psychologies face to contribute to the insight and healing that is needed? How can depth psychologies' night vision be regenerated?

Early psychoanalysis and social justice

It would be difficult to tell from much of the contemporary mainstream practice of depth psychologies in America that psychoanalysis was conceived in an atmosphere of acute consciousness of social inequalities and their impact on mental health and the provision of psychological treatment. In its early chapters psychoanalysis understood the deleterious effects of bourgeois conventionality on psychic vitality, and carefully challenged it while also being politically astute about psychoanalysis' need for mainstream support of its practices. In *Freud's Free Clinics: Psychoanalysis and Social Justice, 1918-1938*, Elizabeth Danto (2005) chronicles this now rarely considered early history of the psychoanalytic movement, forged in the aftermath of the economic and social devastation of World War I.

Many early psychoanalytic practitioners were engaged Marxists, socialists, or social democrats,ⁱⁱ whose practice of depth psychology issued from hopes of liberation on social and psychological fronts, fronts which were seen as inextricably intertwined. In the early period of psychoanalysis forged in Red Vienna, psychoanalysts were deeply involved in initiatives for free clinics for psychoanalytic treatment, free clinics for reproductive health care and education for women, initiatives to help women struggle against various forms of domination and control, experimental schools for inner-city children, school-based treatment centers for children traumatized by war and poverty, settlement house psychology classes for workers, the first child guidance clinics, suicide prevention centers, attention to building conditions for peace and stability in Austria and Europe, support of the kindergarten movement, and architectural initiatives for public housing that would help build urban families' sense of community, a sense understood to undergird psychological health (Danto, 2005). Their advocacy for children issued from the great needs of children after World War I, psychoanalytic developmental insight into the importance of early childhood for later psychological health, and awareness of the traumatizing effects of poverty on child development.

In 1918 Freud gave a speech in Budapest on awakening the conscience of society. Freud understood that suffering was not distributed evenly in a society, but was “imposed unfairly and largely according to economic status and position in society” (Danto, 2005, p. 19). In this talk Freud reversed his position that low fees compromised psychoanalytic treatment in the eyes of the patient and he retracted his image of the psychoanalyst as a medical entrepreneur. From this point forward, Freud became an advocate for free psychoanalytic clinics, flexible fees, and lay analysis. He worked to wrestle psychoanalytic practice from the medical establishment and attempted with his colleagues to expand the circle of those who could benefit from psychoanalytic treatment to include the poor. The first psychoanalytic free clinic was in Berlin. It adopted the practice of doing initial intake evaluations that were blind to capacity to pay. If the individual’s difficulties were understood as amenable to psychoanalytic treatment, he or she was taken as a patient. Analysts who were part of the international society agreed to donate a day a week or treatment of an analytic patient to provide psychoanalytic care to those who could not afford it or to contribute the equivalent in funds for the clinics. In a Robin Hood manner, the high fees received from Americans and Canadians in psychoanalytic treatment allowed many analysts to use the money from these analyses to support reduced fee treatment to Austrians whose currency was deeply devalued after the First World War (Danto, 2005).

Jung and his early circle of colleagues did not share the multiple emancipatory advocacies that resulted from early psychoanalysis’ sense of the interdependence between societal and individual well-being. The social and political atmosphere in Zurich was markedly different from that of Berlin and Vienna. Switzerland’s neutrality, economic stability, lack of colonial expansion, and entrenched Protestantism lent a very different societal backdrop to Jungian work. Jung was clear that social factors “have a vital influence of psychic life.” He advised analysts not to “remain aloof from the tumult, the calamity of his time,” but to “step beyond the usual bounds of [our] profession” to help psychologically elucidate contemporary figures and events” (1964, pp. 178-179).

Through his travels and study of other cultures, Jung laid down the possibility of a multicultural depth psychology. Unfortunately, some of his travel reflections on culture were deleted from his autobiography by his editor, Aniela Jaffe, because she did see their

significance (Jaffe, 1977). Jung came to understand that the European psyche was marked by its history of cruel dominations and exploitation of others. During a visit to the Taos Pueblo in New Mexico in 1925, Jung reports a mist lifting from his knowledge of the shadow of the white European-Americans

And out of this mist, image upon image detached itself: first Roman legions smashing into the cities of Gaul, and the keenly incised features of Julius Caesar, Scipio Africanus, and Pompey. I saw the Roman eagle on the North Sea and on the banks of the White Nile. Then I saw St. Augustine transmitting the Christian creed to the Britons on the tips of Roman lances, and Charlemagne's most glorious forced conversion of the heathen; then the pillaging and murdering bands of the Crusading armies. With a secret stab I realized the hollowness of that old romanticism about the Crusades. Then followed Columbus, Cortes, and the other conquistadors who with fire, sword, torture, and Christianity came down upon even these remote pueblos dreaming peacefully in the Sun, their Father. I saw, too, the people of the Pacific islands decimated by firewater, syphilis, and scarlet fever carried in the clothes the missionaries forced on them. (1961, p. 248)

His own focus and that of most of his followers, however, was not predominately on the cultural psyche or on issues of the psychological suffering issuing from injustice. He was most captivated by the inner world's relation to universal or collective themes.

While arguing for an interdisciplinary approach to psychological understanding, he was more likely to name literature, mythology, and religion as necessary to understanding psyche, than sociology, history, economics, and politics. His own remove from more fully engaging the cultural may have been a factor in his collusions at different junctures with the racism and anti-Semitism of his time. Jungian analyst John Weir Perry (1987) remarked that "Jung often mentioned the observation that his formulation of the individuation process, while stressing the inner enrichment and fulfillment of the personality's individual uniqueness, was never intending to overlook the bearing it has on the accompanying experiences of kinship with one's fellow beings. Yet in the handling of individuation processes since, there has been an inclination to focus on this inner unfolding of individual wholeness and to leave relatively blurred the issues of the societal concerns that are involved in the process itself" (p. 176).

The night vision Jung gifted us with is largely of a different kind than that of Red Vienna, one that can see archetypal patterns in deep history, bringing to light the psychological themes of the collective human experience. We are also indebted to Jung

for his articulation of the interdependent relationship between psyche and nature, an understanding that is crucial during this time of unprecedented ecological crisis. Throughout his life his own sense of the interdependent dimension of being unfolded. Before his death, he wrote: “yet there is so much that fills me: plants, animals, clouds, day and night, and the eternal in man. The more uncertain I have felt about myself, the more there has grown up in me a feeling of kinship with all things. In fact it seems to me as if that alienation which so long separated me from the world has become transferred into my own inner world, and has revealed to me an unexpected unfamiliarity with myself” (p. 359).

I imagine depth psychologies which hold together the varying interdependent sensibilities of both the early Freudians and Jungians, which would work to articulate the cultural unconscious of their local surround while aware of the collective dimension of our shared human experience; understanding that both cultural and collective levels of our being are inextricably im-placed in natural and build environments.

The whitening of psychoanalysis

Psychoanalytic understanding of psyche in the context of culture grew dimmer as psychoanalysis was transplanted from Europe to America during and after World War II. The American soil into which the seeds of depth psychologies were sown is suggested by a brief look at the precursor to psychology in the United States: mesmerism. In *Constructing the self, Constructing America: A cultural history of psychotherapy*, Cushman (1995) tracks the early history of psychology in America. In 1836 Poyen brought mesmerism to America from Europe. Mesmerism understood illness as resulting from a lack of connection to the electrical-mystical ground of being. In America mesmerism harnessed its focus on contact with spiritual energy to American optimism and pragmatism, dropping its concern in Europe on fraternity. Recovery was linked with renewed energy, better interpersonal skills, and increasing economic success. Mesmerism in America was “first and foremost an ideology of personal, inner liberation. It emphasized the inherent goodness of the inner self and led to the development and practices that were designed to expand, revitalize, and finally liberate the natural

spirituality—the enchanted interior—of the nineteenth century middle-class American self” (Cushman, 1995, p. 119).

Healing would allow the individual to become re-engaged with the frontier mentality of expansion and progress which was so prevalent in America for those of European descent. Far from the verticality of European depth psychologies’ dives into an “unconscious,” early psychological approaches in the United States were more concerned with the aggrandizement of energy to be marshaled for the expansion of the ego and one’s fortunes.

In the mid-1800’s mesmerist Phineas Quimby proposed that emotional distress is caused by negative and incorrect ideas about life. His healing approach encouraged focus on positive ideas, and is considered a precursor to the New Thought Movement, an American focus on the power of positive thinking, some forms of cognitive psychology, rational psychology, and, recently, positive psychology. It was thought that through positive visualizations and thoughts one could gain access to an abundance of wealth. This focus on the accumulation of personal wealth was starkly different from Red Vienna’s sensitivity to economic divides, provoking Freud in 1926 to call America “the land of the dollar barbarians” (quoted in Danto, 2005, p. 13). The self-aggrandizing focus of American psychologies influenced by Mesmerism did not allow for any focus on the ongoing genocide and culture-cides of Native American groups that had extensive history and culture in the Americas before the “discovery” by Europeans. It also did not permit a recognition that much of the wealth that was being accumulated resulted not from the refreshed efforts of individuals bent on positive thoughts, but on profits gained by white people through the forced labor of African slaves. These two ellipses were built into the early history of psychological healing in the United States. Undoubtedly, the racism that fueled these omissions contributed to the development of a focus on eugenics in the American mental hygiene movement of the first half of the 20th century, a movement that was used by the Nazis to rationalize the sterilization and killing of those deemed different and deficient from their Aryan ideal: gypsies, homosexuals, the mentally retarded, the mentally ill, and the Jews.

Cushman (1995) argues that aspects of mesmerism persist even today in American psychotherapies’ emphases on apolitical interiority, insular cognitive

processes, “the focus on the well-being of the self, and the foundational American belief in the liberation of the enchanted interior” (p. 129). Too often psychology became concerned with helping individuals accommodate to the social milieu, rather than to question it. While Jung was clear that individuation was not synonymous with individualism, the practice of Jungian work in the United States too often reflects the individualism of the American culture, as did American mesmerism. Both image psychological well-being for the individual as possible apart from community and cultural well-being. There is little, if any, inquiry into how the individual may contribute to the suffering of others through unreflected identifications with his or her own social location.

When Freud was invited to give his first lectures in America at Clark University in 1909, he hesitated to accept, suspicious about the fate of psychoanalysis in the cultural landscape of America. He grew contemptuous of medicalized analysis in the United States that was politically conservative, and generative of affluence for its practitioners (Danto, 2005, p. 13). Freud’s critique of America presciently foreshadowed the changes psychoanalysis would undergo in its transplantation to America.

Many Jewish émigré analysts sought refuge in America to escape death-dealing anti-Semitism in Europe followed by the Holocaust. Russell Jacoby (1983) argues that the transplanted analysts suppressed their history of social and political engagement in Europe to avoid delays in the United States’ naturalization process. Many felt this suppression continued to be necessary because of the political climate in America as the Cold War deepened and Mc Carthyism erupted. Those with allegiances to Marxism and socialism were afraid they would be seen as communists and dangerous traitors, as indeed many were.

Altman, psychoanalyst and author of *The Analyst in the Inner City: Race, Class, and Culture through a Psychoanalytic Lens* (1995), argues that when Jewish psychoanalytic émigrés came to America before and during World War II, they were confronted with joining a white profession in America. Many in Europe saw Jews as black (Gilman, 1993). Edward Said argues in *Freud and the Non-European* (2004) that Freud himself understood Jews as non-European. Upon coming to America, many displaced Jewish analysts adopted “unreflectingly a Northern European value system and

[sought] upper-class social status” (Altman, 2004, p. 808). To be assimilated into the psychoanalytic establishment, Jewish analysts, Altman argues, underwent a whitening. Given the personal, familial, and cultural tragedies that had befallen them in Europe, this adoption is understandable. *However, it was to have grave consequences for the practice of depth psychologies in America.* Psychoanalysis became a white thing, indifferent to racial and cultural issues, and unreflective of its own cultural location within a multicultural society (Altman, 1995). Some psychoanalysts were to establish ego psychology, which adopted Northern European and Calvinist undertones, “emphasizing tolerance for frustration and abstention from gratification” (p. 810). Institutes jockeyed for societal prestige by joining the medical establishment and discouraging or outlawing lay analysis, a practice that had encouraged interdisciplinary work and provision of analysis to the economically disadvantaged in Berlin and Vienna. Economic privilege was sought by flight from the kinds of public and socialist initiatives popular in Vienna to private practice models that uncritically embraced capitalism and its brutal divisions in the provision of healthcare.

As psychoanalysis retreated from interest in and commitment to social justice, it took refuge in disease models that undergird the need for individual treatment. Lay analysis was outlawed in America against Freud’s wishes. This pushed psychoanalysis away from cultural criticism toward medicalized practice. Economic stresses on the healthcare system forced a wide adoption of the disease model, requiring diagnosis of psychopathology and systematic treatment of it in order to gain payment from third party insurance. A principal problem with this model is that it locates pathology within individuals, looking only to the most local context of intimate and familial relations for understanding.

The sacrifice of night vision

Altman (1995) laments that because so many analysts “went white” and pursued privilege, psychoanalysis gave up some of its night vision, trading subversive insight for conformity to the status quo. Jacoby (1975) has argued that this trade has laced American depth practices with social amnesia. To the extent that depth practitioners identified with aspects of white American culture that are not conducive to psychological

health, their treatment colluded with the very forces that were causing distress. To the extent that psychology itself conserved the elision of slavery and the Native American genocide, it became part of the defensive structure of the American psyche, rather than a radical movement that could help insight the psychological legacy of these two founding tragedies. Psychoanalyst Harry Stack Sullivan courageously tried to address the racism and militarism of America and found himself ostracized by his own colleagues, and plagued by financial worries during the final decades of his life (Cushman, 1995). Other analysts in the cultural school of psychoanalysis, such as Fromm and Horney, worked with psychoanalytic insights reading from them not universal truths but situated conflicts, descriptive of the impact of culture on psyche. The heart of the psychoanalytic movement in the United States ostracized both Fromm and Horney. Wilhelm Reich, radical advocate for women's reproductive rights and to whom we are indebted for inspiring many approaches to healing that are oriented to the integration of body and psyche, was arrested and imprisoned toward the end of his life, on charges of violating interstate commerce laws. He died in an American penitentiary.

Others, such as Fenichel, took their radical cultural ideas underground. Jacoby chronicles how vague wording began to replace earlier convictions, as European analysts felt pressure to disclaim their past advocacy for social change (Jacoby, 1983). Theorists working with depth psychological insights on issues of liberation, such as Fanon, Memmi, Césaire, Freire, went unclaimed as depth theorists in the United States. African-American writers who could have mightily contributed to a distinctly American and multicultural depth psychology, such as DuBois, Douglas, Wright, and King (Selig, 2004) were left outside outside the readings of a white depth psychology in America.

While depth psychology retreated from an emancipatory focus, other initiatives have emerged since the 1960's that pursue interdependent understanding and approaches, such as community psychology, critical hermeneutics, critical psychoanalysis, critical psychology, engaged Buddhism, ecopsychology and deep ecology, liberation psychology, feminist research, and critical psychoanalytic ethnography. Depth psychologists have a lot to learn from these efforts as they reclaim some of the radical emancipatory roots of their own discipline, and begin to form interdisciplinary alliances to enable them to

understand more complexly the effects of the morph of colonial psychic and societal structures into those of transnational capitalism.

These brief historical sketches suggest the following, interrelated inconvenient truths for us to consider together.

- 1) When our psychologies take root in individualistic cultures, myopia can develop regarding the impact of culture on psyche. Much of the psychological suffering that confronts us cannot be effectively understood and addressed within an individualistic paradigm that fails to understand the psychological in social, cultural, historical, and environmental context (Watkins, 1992).
- 2) When we use our practice of depth psychology for social status and wealth, we sacrifice some critical insight into the psychological harm that sharp class divisions generate. Insofar as depth psychologists and their professional associations have sought affluence and upper-middle class and upper-class status, their cultural myopia increases, diminishing their insight into the relation between social class, mental illness, and human misery.
- 3) When we fail to claim the impact of our social location on the psychologies we are forging, we falsely universalize our understandings and practices. Moreover we fail to read our psychologies as descriptive of our social location. In what ways, for instance, are Jung's ideas about the structure and dynamics of the psyche descriptive of the white European psyche and its position vis-à-vis colonial struggles over the last 500 years (Lorenz and Watkins, 2003)?
- 4) When we routinely do not make efforts to involve ourselves in intercultural dialogues (across ethnicity, race, class, and sexual orientation), our theory and practice reflects unmetabolized ethnocentrism, racism, sexism, and heterosexism that conserves the disempowering and discriminatory aspects of mainstream culture rather than mitigate against the suffering that these "isms" manufacture.
- 5) The depth psychology curricula we are teaching today in the United States, by and large by white Euro-Americans about white Euro-Americans, is not adequate to many of the situations that require our understanding.

Re-orientations

How might we as depth psychologists in our training programs and our daily practice re-orient to more fully engage the inconvenient truths of our new century? These truths will be different according to our social locations and unfolding histories. In an increasingly globalized world what we share is our knowledge that the psychological health of individuals is compromised by the interrelated issues of the erosion of community, severe economic disparities, racism, violence (including torture), war, and genocide, environmental degradation, forced migration, and assaults on human rights.

1. The teaching of depth psychology needs to include careful contextualizing of theories and practices in both the historical periods and the cultural milieus of their development (Cushman, 1995). Such a social constructionist approach to depth psychology will help us to track those aspects of our theory and practice that collude with dominant cultural forces, helping us to conceive alternate possibilities. It will also contribute to our seeing theories and practices as arising in response to local conditions. There will be less of a tendency to think of our understandings as universally applicable, and more of an impetus to be in dialogue with others whose experiences differ from our own.

2. As depth psychologists we need to ground ourselves in an interdependent paradigm, where psychological suffering is understood in the context of culture, history, and the environment. Such grounding will require our work to be interdisciplinary. It will open up many points of approach to facilitating psychological well-being in addition to dyadic analysis and family therapy.ⁱⁱⁱ

3. More of us as depth psychologists need to embrace our vocation as “negative workers” (Scheper-Hughes, 1995). The radical Italian psychiatrist, Franco Basaglia, describes “negative workers” as professionals who give their allegiance not to bourgeois institutions but to those who most need their help. In a world of inconvenient truths, this shift from maintenance of the status quo of a discipline to its engagement with the pressing human needs that surround it may prove to be helpful to others and revitalizing to depth psychology. Such negative work might provide what Said calls a psychic

contrapuntal, where moving away from one's primary place to a new location gifts one with a different vantage point from which to reflect on oneself and others (Bollas in Said, 2004).

Conceiving of ourselves as negative workers could entail increased therapeutic work with the economically disadvantaged, increased partnerships with cultural workers (community members who are devoted to building individual and community resilience), increased innovation in group and community approaches where depth psychologists can serve as collaborative partners. This shift will require an embrace of more collaborative forms of practice with lay people, and dis-identification with expertism. As depth psychologists move into various forms of community work, they need to apprentice themselves to others who have been doing this work for a long time. They also need to be aware of the disempowerment that can flow from identification with being the expert. It will also require increased mindfulness about depth psychologies' relations to affluence, an affluence that has been cultivated and preserved in a world that is sickened by sharp income divides (Samuels, 2001).

4. Depth psychology curricula need to make a commitment to cross-cultural study, focusing on the experiences of the multiple groups that compose our societies, and, in particular, those whose experiences have been left out (Stevens, 2003; Lee, 2007; Alschuler, 2007; Deloria, 2008; Watkins & Lorenz, 2008). To do so we need to include depth psychologically minded authors who have never or rarely been read in depth psychological institute, programs, and graduate schools. Studying these authors needs to include processes of intercultural dialogue and introspective reflection regarding the defensive processes that become energized as we study the psychic and community legacies of slavery, colonialism, genocide, and transnational capitalism.

As we work to further understand the relation between psyche and culture, we need to retrieve the work of writers who have been shunned or ignored, such as those of the cultural school of psychoanalysis, the Frankfurt School of critical theory, and theorists who have worked on a phenomenology of the colonial experience and its racism such as Césaire, Memmi, and Fanon.

5. Depth psychology curricula need to address the psychology of racism, sexism, anti-Semitism (Samuels, 1993), heterosexism and the impact of these on the theories and practices of our discipline. Euro-American depth psychologies need to acknowledge their focus on the experience of white people of European descent and begin to discern through dialogue with people from other cultural groups which of depth psychologies' theories and practices are useful and which are not. This discernment could advance a more probing analysis of the dynamics of the white psyche, forged in history, and affecting so many others throughout the world.

6. Depth psychologists need to widen their understanding of trauma to include cultural and collective trauma and the legacies of these for the individuals and communities with whom we work. We can partner with groups who are working on forms of cultural healing that address these legacies: through the arts, through the reparations movements, through truth and reconciliation work.

7. Depth psychologies need to develop a sustained focus on the interface between humans and the environment (built and natural), as well as human/animal relations, acknowledging and addressing how human patterns of aggression have impacted the environment and animal communities (Bradshaw and Watkins, 2006).

8. To engage the inconvenient truths of our century we need to nourish our relationships with one another, so that we can support each other in taking on work that is unfamiliar and difficult. Training institutes (Wiener & Perry, 2006) and private practice have often bred an isolation that is not conducive to the kind of critical thinking and engaged community participation that is called for.

It is inconvenient to question one's personal economic base, to begin to learn forms of practice not included in one's original training, to acknowledge limitations and prejudices that issue from an insular cultural vantage point. It is uncomfortable to distance oneself from the safety of an assumed stance of expertism, acknowledging its disempowering effects on others that preclude the kind of learning that we need to do to

engage the difficulties we face. It is humbling and unsettling to realize the kinds of social pathology those of us who are whites have often incurred in the wake of colonialism and transnational globalization: dependent on affluence, unsupported by a sense of larger community, caught in competitive mindsets that breed feelings of fluctuating inferiority and superiority, displaced, accustomed to violence and societal divisions.

It is possible for depth psychologies to retrieve their radical beginnings, to critique and extend them, as negative workers, enabling us to orient toward the pressing problems of our time. To develop a set of inclusive approaches in response to the inconvenient truths of the 21st century, we need to integrate Jung's sense of our interdependence with nature and the collective unconscious with depth psychologies that have sought to critique society and understand the intrapsychic dimension of culture. The generation of such night vision can begin to mend our fragmented efforts of understanding and healing that have tried to understand the intrapsychic without adequate attention to its dynamic interrelation with culture and place. Such night vision will catalyze many creative approaches to healing that support and exceed our dyadic models^{iv}, allowing us to engage in the work that is ours to do.

References

- Alschuler, L. (2007). *The psychopolitics of liberation: Political consciousness from a Jungian perspective*. NY/ London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Altman, N. (1995). *The analyst in the inner city: Race, class, and culture through a psychoanalytic lens*. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.
- Altman, N. (2004). History repeats itself in transference and countertransference. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, 14, 6: 807-815.
- Bradshaw, G. & Watkins, M. (2006). Trans-species psychology: Theory and praxis. *Spring 75: A journal of archetype and culture, Psyche and nature, Part. I*. New Orleans: Spring Journal and Books. pp. 69-94.
- Cushman, P. (1995). *Constructing the self, constructing America: A cultural history of psychotherapy*. NY: Addison Wesley.

Danto, E. (2005). *Freud's free clinics: Psychoanalysis and social justice, 1918-1938*. NY: Columbia University Press.

Deloria, V. (2008). *C. G. Jung and the Sioux traditions*. New Orleans: Spring Journal and Books.

Freud, S. (1918/1955). Lines of advance in psychoanalytic psychotherapy. *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*, 17. J. Strachey. Ed. and trans. London: Hogarth Press.

Gilman, S. (1993). *Freud, race, and gender*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jacoby, R. (1975). *Social amnesia: A critique of contemporary psychology from Adler to Laing*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Jacoby, R. (1983). *The repression of psychoanalysis: Otto Fenichel and the political Freudians*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jaffe, A. (1977). *Remembering Jung: Conversations about C. G. Jung and his work*. Video produced by G. Wagner. Los Angeles: C. G. Jung Institute of Los Angeles.

Jung, C. G. (1961). *Memories, dreams, reflections*. NY: Random House.

Jung, C. G. (1964). *Civilization in transition, The collected works of C. G. Jung, Vol. X*. R. F. C. Hull, trans. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lee, G. (2007). *Excavating memories, reconstructing narratives: The Nikkei diaspora and the American transnational experience*. Doctoral dissertation, Pacifica Graduate Institute, Carpinteria, CA.

Perry, J. W. (1987). *The heart of history: Individuality in evolution*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Said, E. (2004). *Freud and the non-european*. NY: Verso.

Samuels, A. (1993). *The political psyche*. London: Routledge.

Samuels, A. (2001). *Politics on the couch: Citizenship and the internal life*. London: Karnac.

Scheper-Hughes, N. (1995). The primacy of the ethical: Propositions for a militant anthropology. *Current Anthropology*, 36, 3, 409-439.

Selig, J. L. (2004). *Cultural therapy: Martin Luther King, Jr.'s work with the soul of America*. Doctoral dissertation, Pacifica Graduate Institute, Carpinteria, CA.

Stevens, M. (2003). *Troubling beginnings: Trans(per)forming African American history and identity*. NY: Routledge.

Watkins, M. & Lorenz, J. (2008). *Toward psychologies of liberation*. London/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Watkins, M. (1992). From individualism to the interdependent self: Changing paradigms in psychotherapy. *Psychological perspectives*, 27, 52-69.

Watkins, M. (2000). Seeding liberation: A dialogue between depth psychology and liberation psychology. In *Depth psychology: Meditations in the field*. D. Slattery & L. Corbett, Eds. Einsiedeln, Switzerland: Daimon Verlag.

ⁱ To be published in *The International Journal of Jungian Studies*, 2008, edited by Robert Romanyshyn

ⁱ Prominent members of the early psychoanalytic movement who were Marxists included Erich Fromm, Otto Fenichel, Gustav Landauer, Wilhelm and Annie Reich; socialists included Bruno Bettelheim, Greta Bibring, Helene Deutsch, Ernst Simmel, and Siegfried Bernfeld; communists included Edith Jacobson, Marie Langer, and Wilhelm Reich; and social democrats included Karen Horney, Paul Federn, and Sigmund Freud (Danto, 2005, p. 9).

ⁱⁱ See www.online.pacifica.edu/depthfieldwork for examples of the varied individual, community, cultural, and ecological work that is currently being improvised in the Community and Ecological Fieldwork and Research portion of the M.A./Ph.D. Depth Psychology Program at Pacifica Graduate Institute, Carpinteria, CA.

ⁱⁱⁱ In the M.A./Ph.D. Depth Psychology Program at Pacifica Graduate Institute, we are working with these initiatives. Students are studying depth psychology outside of formal training for licensure as psychotherapists, although some of our students are already therapists. From our mission statement: "Pacifica Graduate Institute's M.A./Ph.D. Program in Depth Psychology strives to create a 21st century depth psychology which extends beyond the consulting room into working with the individual, community, cultural, and ecological issues of our time. While exploring the traditions and frontiers of depth psychology, students are mentored in engagement with its imaginal, community, and research practices. This program grounds students in the psychoanalytic, Jungian, archetypal, and phenomenological lineages. Euro-American approaches to depth psychological theories and practices are placed in dynamic dialogue with ecopsychology, cultural studies, and psychologies of liberation from diverse cultural settings. Practices arising from depth psychology—such as dreamwork, active imagination, council, community based arts—are used both in the classroom and in a wide variety of

community settings. Hermeneutic, phenomenological, participatory, feminist, and action approaches to research aid students in relation to their own research interests. Community and ecological fieldwork and research are designed to help foster students' capacity to understand psyche, nature, and culture in dynamic relationship, and to develop both theoretical and practical skills of engagement with cultural, community, and ecological issues that affect psychological well-being.” Students create bridges from their academic coursework into depth psychologically inspired community, cultural, and ecological fieldwork and research. In lieu of a clinical placement, they apprentice in a wide variety of community sites (i.e., hospices, prisons, schools, arts based community centers, urban planning boards, ecological preservation projects, hospitals, etc.) or convened small groups for sustained collaborative focus on particular concerns according to their vocational callings.

See www.online.pacifica.edu/depthfieldwork