



# MAGNUM OPUS: NIGREDO

Module 4: Complex Theory Part 2

## QUOTE

*'a 'feeling-toned complex' ... is the image of a certain psychic situation which is strongly accentuated emotionally and is, moreover, incompatible with the habitual attitude of consciousness. ... it has a relatively high degree of autonomy, so that it is subject to the control of the mind to only a limited extent, and therefore behaves like an animated foreign body in the sphere of consciousness' (CW 8, para 201).*

Complex Theory Part 2

Compiled by The Centre for Applied Jungian Studies

Table of Contents

**Transcript of Podcast .....2**

**Complex Theory Part 2: The Merits of an Obsession .....2**

**The Merits of an Obsession ..... 2**

**The Ego ..... 3**

**What Drives Obsessions? ..... 10**

**Being Reflective ..... 14**

**Application.....20**

**Example..... 21**

1 <http://appliedjung.com>  
<http://facebook.com/Appliedjung>

## **Transcript of Podcast**

Hello, and welcome to the fourth lecture of the Nigredo programme. This is the second lecture on complexes.

## **Complex Theory Part 2: the merits of an obsession**

### **The Merits of an obsession**

There are two issues that I want to address in this month's lecture. The first one is the merits of an obsession. Although I'm making an argument that the ego is distinct from a complex, and I'm identifying you with your ego, it is not a perfect distinction, because the ego is also a complex. In other words, in the development of your personal identity, you've made certain choices but also, depth psychology would suggest that there have been certain influences in your upbringing, in your environment, and in your genetic and psychic constitution that have given you certain predispositions, prejudices etc., and you have identified with these. And these have become the way you identify yourself, and who you consider yourself to be. This, in psychoanalytic terms, is what we refer to as the ego; it's your conscious sense of identity.

Now why is it a complex? I'm using the word "complex" loosely here, but why is it a complex? *It's a complex because it is also an autonomous personality in your psychology.* So you've got this complex at the centre, hopefully at the

centre, of your psychology, which we call ego. But this idea of complex theory suggests that there are other autonomous personalities that exist in your psychology, that are competing with the ego. They are competing with the ego, for control; for control of your actions, your behaviour etc. And the ego is not entirely distinct from those complexes. It does have some important distinctions. I want to try to draw those distinctions out for you, in the next point, but I want to address this issue first.

## **The Ego**

The ego is archetypal. Everyone has an ego; every sane person has an ego, so that of course is universal and it is dynamic. And the truth is – the terrible truth is this: I would suggest - and I think depth psychology would suggest - that actually, you cannot explain why you are who you are and why you care about the things you care about. In other words, you have certain desires, fears, anxieties, dreams, aspirations, ways of behaving etc., and you know they're part of you but they're not so completely part of you that you've got absolute knowledge of them. You just know, "This is how I feel and this is what I want". But you cannot truly answer the questions, "Why are you like that?" and, "Why do you want what you want?" You can rationalize and justify and all that nonsense but the truth is, you don't know. So even though you've got this conscious ego, it also has these components in it which constitute it and which have unconscious roots.

So you can see that, in a sense, the ego is not entirely different from any other complex in your psychology. It's simply the one that has the most airtime

You see, even though you make choices, you often still come undone. You say, "Look, I'm going to do this" and, "This is what I want" and, "This is how I want to be in the world", but I don't believe that means that is how you will be or that is what you're going to achieve. Sometimes it is as if, as the Arabs say, "Insha'Allah" - if God wills it. Who's this God that wills it or doesn't will it? The point is that the tension can be healthy because it keeps a certain dynamism in the psyche, but simultaneously it can also fragment the psyche. And the ideal that we are pursuing in Jungian psychology is to try and strengthen the ego; to try and integrate these complexes into the ego, so that we create a unity.

Now, Jung's idea here, lest it sound as though I'm really preaching ego psychology, is the idea that you have two psychic centres. You have the unconscious and you have consciousness. And in the centre of consciousness is the ego. Jung's idea is that the way we should proceed is to create a dialogue between these two distinct centres. The unconscious talking to the conscious ego and the conscious ego talking to the unconscious.

His idea is that the process of individuation is one that brings these two diverse aspects of self into a synthesis. Because what happens a lot of the time, is that these two aspects of psyche are split, and consciousness completely ignores the unconscious or doesn't even know that the unconscious self exists.

When consciousness is frustrated it says, "That was unlucky – I can't believe

that happened, it was most unfortunate,” or it says, “If only my partner wasn’t such a bastard,” or some such lamentation.

The idea in depth psychology, and the idea in Jungian psychology, is to say, “Well, look. Yes, maybe there was a bit of bad luck, but let’s consider why you seem to have this bad luck. It seems to revisit you again and again. Is there something in you that is attracting these circumstances into your life; that is making you feel this way; that is robbing you of energy etc.?”

So it is about getting this conversation going, where the ego recognises the unconscious as a real force in its psychology. Where you don’t only have the unconscious communicating with the ego through affects and through neuroses, but where a conscious conversation between the ego and the unconscious exists. Now Jung’s idea is that – the ideal is that – through this conversation ultimately something new is born, and this is the transcendent third. And this transcendent third – what Jung sometimes refers to as the second personality – is what the integration of the unconscious and the ego is ideally meant to lead to. So his perspective is that there’s a certain wisdom in the unconscious and there is a certain wisdom in the ego, and that if these two can enter into a meaningful dialogue and a meaningful discourse, there is the possibility of something new being born that is greater than the old ego identity; that is an evolved way of being in the world, but it is still conscious.

So he doesn’t suggest, for example, that when one starts this dialogue that one should just put a massive cross through the conscious ego and say that, “You know, from now on I’m going to be true to myself irrespective of the consequences,

and whatever I think, I'm going to say, and whatever I feel, I'm going to do. It's not about throwing the baby out with the bath water – no. There needs to be *reflection*.

In this process – this overarching process of conscious-unconscious dialogue –, what complex theory suggests is that this unconscious is made up of complexes.

The unconscious, however, is not a unity. It is not one single thing. It has a number of components that, in complex theory, we refer to as complexes. So that actually, this process - this discourse - happens through the ego entering into a conversation with one complex at a time. And then, when integration happens between the ego and this complex, the ego evolves into a new state. Then there is a conversation between this new ego and another complex. Once again, if that integration is successful, a new ego emerges. So the ego develops, and matures, and becomes an increasingly authentic representation of the Self.

That is the idea, that actually, when we talk about entering into a conversation with the unconscious, what we really mean is entering into a dialogue with the unconscious, one complex at a time. So it's not just like one thunder clap and you integrate the unconscious -- it is a process. As long as you're alive, it's going to go on. You are never going to exhaust the unconscious.

Now, what I'm trying to get at, is to come to the point about this obsession. Essentially, what you need to recognise in this model, is that what you consider to be "ego", finds its material, and is constituted by, these assimilated complexes. That's what the ego is. It's just that the ego has a certain faculty, and I'm going

to tell you about this faculty now. This faculty, according to Jung – and I think he defines it very nicely – is that only the ego is capable of reflecting, and only the ego is capable of seeing the opposites. You see, the characteristic of unconsciousness is that it's one-sided. That is how it is -- there is no opposite: "It's like *this*. This is *right*. Anything else is wrong".

Really, that's the essential faculty that the ego has. In the last lecture, I spoke a bit about Greek philosophy. If you go back to Plato, Socrates and Aristotle, they would speak about it as the rational soul. So the rational soul was seen as being supreme over the feeling and the willing soul. And in "*The Republic*," Plato draws an analogy between the Athenians and the rational soul. So, philosophy is seen as being the activity of the rational soul.

Now, specifically in Jungian psychology, because I think in some sense Freud is quite true to that notion of the rational soul being equivalent to consciousness, but Jung doesn't want to make it so narrow, so here, Jung says, "Look, we as human beings are capable of reason; we're capable of feeling; we're capable of sensing and we're capable of intuiting." He has these *four faculties* as the *faculties of consciousness*. He doesn't want to elevate reason over the others. He says they are all components of consciousness. There is no reason to elevate rationality over the others. But the point is that it's this process of *being able to reflect*, and of *being able to see the opposites*, that is unique to ego-consciousness. That is what makes the ego fundamentally different from these unconscious complexes.



So when we talk about consciousness and reflectivity, that is what we mean. It is this capacity to reflect on our behaviour. Maybe some more should be said about that, but let me first continue with this idea of *the obsession*.

The question is this, then: “What complex (obsession) or complexes are you going to form an alliance with?” That is, in a sense, what being conscious means. It’s not as though you can get rid of these complexes. You can’t wish these complexes away. As my late teacher was fond of saying, a complex cannot be extracted like a tooth. You need to identify your complexes and then you need to ask yourself a question: inasmuch as I’m capable of choosing, because sometimes you might feel as though you don’t have a choice, but inasmuch as we believe that consciousness has a choice, then you ask yourself the question, “What complexes am I going to form an alliance with?”

You can change your mind. Yes, you can change your mind, and you do. But as my teacher used to say, and I like this analogy of his, “Look, if you’re building little houses in parallel, along a continuum, you build one, and then you build another one, and another one, and another one. You don’t build very tall structures. So the idea that I actually want to *do* something in this world seems to require making a commitment to another way of being in the world - a vertical structure.” Now that is not to suggest that one needs to be completely dogmatic about it, but you want to enter into that dialogue as authentically and sincerely as possible, because ideally, you would like to enter into long term alliances with those complexes. You’re not looking for a flirtatious kind of, “Today I’m going to be the entrepreneur and tomorrow I’m

going to be a snowboarder and then I'm going to be a rock star and then I'm going to be a..." No, it's really sincerely reflecting on, "How am I going to identify myself?"

It's about an overarching, moral belief and ethic. This is what I think Kierkegaard is referring to when he speaks of the birth of a "self"; that very few people really have a "self". Naturally he doesn't mean they don't exist. I suggest rather that what he means is that they don't exist consciously.

But the point is, to do *that*; to enter into such an alliance. Think of the classical example of climbing a mountain. "What possesses someone to do such a thing?", we might ask. We also use that as a metaphor for many other things. It's an obsession; you need to be insane, in a sense. It's a kind of insanity, alright. Now I've really started to think more and more – I mean this is quite funny, but I've started to think - that if there weren't insane people in this world, nothing would ever happen. If you think about things enough, it's almost as if you need to be a little insane to do anything, because if you really reflect on it enough you're going to be, like the yogi that goes into the cave and says, "I'm going to do nothing", because everything comes at a price -- everything accrues karmic debt and there's a shadow and there are consequences and so on.

I think that summiting Everest is a very nice example, but then think also about becoming a CEO of a big corporate, or a rock star, or an Olympic athlete, or a great artist, or whatever. These are obsessions. These, in a sense, are a form of

insanity, because what you've got is this hugely powerful desire that is irrational.

## **What Drives Obsessions?**

I think we're all born with these obsessions. Maybe not in equal measure and maybe not to the same degree, but in all of us, there are these irrational, very strong desires. These are complexes. When we talk about complexes, that's what we're talking about. What happens in people who achieve a lot in the world, is that they form an alliance with one of these complexes – one or more of these complexes. Now they don't usually do it in a conscious way. They don't say, "Look, this is not me, it's a complex and I know it comes at a price but I'm going to form an alliance with it." They just say, "This who I am; this is what I want to do." In psychoanalytic terms – in psychological terms - we would say they've formed an alliance. The ego has formed an alliance, with the complex.

And it's only through forming an alliance with complexes that you're ever going to do anything in the world. If you don't have alliances like that, you're not going to do anything. You'll watch a lot of TV instead. Okay the TV's a bit of crap, because you don't want to work hard enough to buy a new TV, but it's okay - you watch the *old* TV.

It's a safe place; it's a very peaceful place – but it can get a bit boring as well.

So, what drives us - what drives us to do things - are these obsessions. It is these irrational aspects of our psychologies; and I would suggest that individuation involves forming alliances with some of these key complexes. When we talk about individuation, when we talk about becoming who you authentically are in the world, we mean expressing some of these aspects of yourself.

The challenge of course is that we have opposing complexes to deal with, as well. I might say I want to become a CEO of a Fortune Five Hundred company, but I also have a complex that says, “Hell! I love TV. I love watching series, and I love sport, and I love watching World Soccer Cup, and I’ve got a PVR.” The problem is that it’s very difficult to become the CEO of a Fortune Five Hundred company, if you watch TV every night, as you know. You’ve got to be taking one of those pills like Concerto or Ritalin. You’ve got to be working eighteen hours a day, etc.

So you have a problem, because these two complexes are actually opposing each other. The irony – or the joke – of it is, that the perverse nature of our psychologies means that our complexes are often at loggerheads with each other. There was a wonderful scene in *The Devil’s Advocate* with Charlize Theron and Keanu Reeves and – who played the devil? – Al Pacino. There was a wonderful scene, in which he’s talking about God and he says, “He gives us appetites,” but then he says, “But don’t actually act them out in the world. You are a sexual being, but don’t be sexual. You love food, but don’t overeat; You like to drink, but don’t drink too much.” It’s that kind of a problem in a sense. It’s not simple; there is this tension. There are these things pulling in opposite directions.

It's a tragic example, but some of you may know the story of Alan Knott-Craig who left Vodacom<sup>1</sup>. As you may know, he retired a few years ago, and then he took over CellC; he was made an offer which he felt he couldn't refuse, and he took over CellC about five years ago. I'm not sure exactly how old Alan is, but he's in his early sixties, and a few years into his tenure there, he had a very severe stroke. He was completely incapacitated by the stroke, unable to communicate, unable to write, unable to talk. So he had an obsession, but he paid a very high price for that obsession. He had great success, but he was prone to cardio-vascular disease, even though he had been unbelievably fit. He had done everything he could to actualise his vision, but ultimately he suffered a stroke which ended his professional career.<sup>2</sup>

He had achieved a lot before he had that stroke, but the point that I'm trying to make is that, yes, we have to deal with these complexes and sometimes we have to go to war with them. It is not always a friendly alliance that is formed. Sometimes you end up having to oppose certain complexes, as you choose other complexes over them. So I say, "Look, I love TV, but I've made a decision! I want to get to the top of my game, so every night I'm going to be working, or studying, or doing whatever it is, because that is what I want." And Alan, for example, made his choice. I'm sure he didn't anticipate the outcome that it had, but he effectively gave his life to what he believed in.

---

<sup>1</sup> The South African chapter of Vodaphone Mobile Network.

<sup>2</sup> At the height of his success Allan published book titled "Second is Nothing", psychologically a particularly poor choice of title and stance, indicative of unconscious one sidedness. The psyche has this nasty habit of cutting us off at the knees when inflation takes us into the non-human realm, the realm of the gods.

Now, I guess that all sounds a bit grim – I don't mean to be that grim – but the point that I'm trying to make is this: that one of the ways of doing this is by forming an alliance with an obsession. It's that obsession that will give you the energy and the vitality and the desire to achieve things in this world. It can also destroy you, as it did in Alan's case. Meaning is not something that comes from consciousness. Meaning is irrational.

It's craziness; it is like being crazy. When I get up in the morning, and it's a beautiful winter's morning, and I go outside into the sun, and it's the most magnificent day, and I feel enormously joyful and happy -- there's nothing rational about that. It's not that I've decided to be happy, or that I've decided to feel joyful. I just *am* joyful. There's a response to this beauty that I'm beholding, that evokes a joy in me. That is something completely unconscious and completely irrational. Why should the sun make me happier than rain? What's the difference rationally? It is irrational. Meaning only comes from that irrational aspect of your psychology. It's that, which makes life worth living.

So, there's a very good argument for forming an alliance with your obsession; for entering into a strategic alliance, where you say, "Look, I know this is going to cost a lot. I know it's going to take a high price from me, but that's why I want to be alive. That's what makes being alive worthwhile."

It's different from an addiction, because you consciously choose it. It is not compulsive, but you choose it, and you have to keep choosing, because every step of the way there are lots of reasons to say, "Fuck it! I'm not doing this anymore." You have to keep choosing to do it. It's the fact that you keep

choosing to do it, that makes it conscious. If you weren't choosing, it would be an unconscious complex.

Now, yes, it also has a shadow. Climbing mountains is a dangerous business. So the point is that, it can kill you, but to be "alive" is a dangerous business. If we didn't ignore reason sometimes, nothing would ever happen

You integrate these complexes only to a certain extent because, of course, a certain portion of it remains unconscious. I mean, you cannot honestly answer why it makes you feel so alive; why something makes you happy. You just know that it does. This means, of course, that it has an unconscious component. But there is a conscious awareness of, "This is what I love and this is what I choose. This choice comes at a price. I recognize the price and, recognizing the price, I still choose to pursue it".

## **Being Reflective**

So, this brings us to the second issue I want address in this lecture: *reflectivity*.

What does it mean to act outside of a complex? What does it mean to *be* conscious, as opposed to being in the grip of a complex? And I think one of the ways we might define that is, that it is about having to make choices on an ongoing basis. *The moment you stop having to make choices, it's a complex.*

Another way of putting it is that, you could say it's a habit. If we didn't form habits, life would be incredibly difficult - do you know what I mean? If

every morning you had to wake up and say, “I wonder if I should brush my teeth this morning? I know I brushed them yesterday, but today I want to rush – do I really need to do it?” Life would become an exhausting business.

So you could say that forming an alliance with a complex is about allowing it to be a complex, in a sense. You might say something like, “I’m going to be a Vegan, and I’m going to eat raw food.” For the first year, or maybe for the first first five years, it is hell because, of course, you’re just dying to have a steak. But after five years or so, at some point it becomes a habit – it becomes a lifestyle – and you don’t have to, at every single meal, say, “I’m dying for a hamburger.” Eventually, with time, it becomes a habit.

So of course, it does become autonomous in a sense, and it does take on a life of its own, as any complex does. You could say that, at the point at which you made the ethical decision to be a vegan, you entered into an alliance with that complex - or even gave birth to a new complex - through your choice. The thing is that it’s a really good idea sometimes to go back and ask the questions, “Why exactly am I doing this? Do I still know why I’m doing this? Is this something that I really want to do?”

*Let us now take a slightly closer look at this process of ego identity and making conscious choices.*

So let us consider the hypothetical set of beliefs, of the subject, ‘G’:

- I believe in the wrath of god.
- I believe it’s very important to be accepted by society.
- I’m afraid of being poor.



- I'm afraid of being sick.
- I have definite beliefs about what I need to do to stay healthy.
- I believe that my actions have certain karmic consequences.
- I believe that I need to behave in a certain way, in order to remain popular or to become popular.
- I believe it's very important for me to be unique and different.
- I have a fear of dying.

In other words, these are the beliefs and the thoughts that constitute G's sense of personal identity: his ego. Simultaneously, you should recognize that individually these are all complexes as well. These are all complexes that have been assimilated into G's ego, and by which G identifies himself.

Now let us consider one of these beliefs or complexes. Let's use the, 'fear of poverty.' Let us look at that one. So, G enters into a reflective space and focuses his attention on his fear of poverty and says, "I really am afraid of being poor. I come from a poor family. There is a lot of poverty in the country around me. I have certain things I want to do with my life, which means that I have to have a certain, minimum level of wealth, or more modestly, "income", but I can't be poor, or I don't want to be poor. I want to study maybe, I want a house, I want to have children, etc."

So now G asks himself, "Okay, so what am I going to do about this? What are my options?"

One option would be to, in fact, be poor. Other options may include:

- Be poor
- Work hard
- Steal
- Stop caring about poverty
- Marry into wealth
- Trust god
- Prostitution
- Gamble

So I've got these options, alright? Let's take the first one, "Be poor". What does it mean to reflect on being poor? G necessarily can only reflect on this question through the evaluative lens of his other beliefs or complexes. He asks, "Will God punish me if I'm poor?" And he might answer, "Probably not, he loves the poor, he has already punished me with poverty. God loves the poor: he accepts the poor, it's easier for camels to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to go to heaven." So, okay that one seems good - no problem there. God will be happy.

Then the next belief or complex, "societal acceptance", is a bit more difficult, because my impression is that people tend to think better of the rich. If you're poor, they're not too super-impressed, so this is a problem.

Then, "I will be sick". That could be a problem because it could go both ways; G could say, "If I worked hard I could be sick, but I could also say, that if I don't have money to eat right and stay warm, etc., that I might be sick as well." So maybe that would be a problem.

“Karma”? It depends how you look at it. G might say, “It’s good to be poor, because then I’m paying a Karmic debt from another life. If I trample on too many people’s throats to make money, I might create a new karmic debt.” Alternatively, he might say, “I don’t want to have a Karma of poverty; I want to change my Karma for my children, or my future generations, or whatever.” So this is an open question.

“Being unpopular” --usually being poor doesn’t make you popular, so that’s a problem.

“Being unique and different”? Neutral.

“Respect”? G definitely won’t get respect.

Okay, so, what we mean is that G looks at the merits of each complex against all of the other beliefs that he has on board, and weighs them. He weighs his options with respect to a single complex against all the others. Then he makes a choice. His conclusion may be something like this: “I think that it’s important to make money, because I want society’s acceptance, I want to be popular, I want to be healthy, I don’t want to feel shame, I want respect, etc. And I cannot have those things if I’m poor.” So being poor or staying poor is not an option, it necessarily must be opposed.

I trust you get the idea.

There’s a useful analogy, from a philosopher, which has to do with our beliefs about reality. It is from Willard Van Orman Quine, a famous American philosopher. He describes the situation as like being at sea in a ship. We have a

certain belief system, and that is like being in a ship. We're on the sea, so we can never completely deconstruct the ship, at least not without sinking. You can repair or replace certain parts of the ship, the helm, the stern, etc., but the other parts need to remain intact as you make these repairs.

Now over a period of time, I can replace all of the parts, but every time I do it need to measure them against the rest of the ship; against the rest of the beliefs. There is no way for me to jump out of the ship and make the choice from outside the ship. That is the thesis, and in philosophy it is generally accepted as axiomatic. In psychology, we might suggest there are one or two ways to abandon the ship and achieve the unachievable: one is you can become insane, or allow the unconscious to completely overwhelm you; give up your sense of personal identity altogether.

There are certain radical things you can do to reset the system such as the use of powerful hallucinogenics. In the old days, there was electric shock therapy. You know, there are things that can be done to completely reset the system; but when we talk about becoming conscious in this sense – in this Western sense - we're not really talking about completely allowing the unconscious to overwhelm the consciousness. It's rather that, we have this thing called the ego. It has some good things and it has some bad things in it. What we want to do is constantly re-evaluate it, and try to have a sense of what is working and what is not working. We want to try and build it into something, that becomes increasingly authentic, powerful, and a more meaningful expression of 'me', but we don't actually want to forego it.

The psychoanalytic process - the process we're going through here – is not to deify the ego and say, “the ego knows all”, no - we don't. What we say is, “work from the ego perspective.” We accept the ego as our identity – our personal identity – and as having value, and we try to work within that progressive sense, and to evolve it over time.

## **Application**

Over the course of the last few weeks you have (or should have 😊):

- 1) identified and described the central phylogenetic (inherited) archetypes in your psychology; and
- 2) identified and described six central complexes in your psychology. The work we are going to do this week builds on, and synthesizes, the work from these applications.

If for any reason you have not yet completed these applications, my suggestion is to complete these, before attempting this week's applications. “Completing”, in this context, does not mean an exhaustive and final archetypal-complex model, rather a reasonable approximation. Part of our work necessarily remains incomplete. We do not pretend to exhaust our personhood, only to gain a degree of perspective.

***This first part is actually a repeat of the last application, so ignore it and move on to #1 and #2 below, if you have done this.***

Consider very carefully what binaries, tensions or antagonisms, and collaborations exist in the relationships of the six complexes to each other. Note, you should have done this with your archetypes as well.

### **Example**

*Consider the following set of (four for simplicity) complexes:*

- a) William – the ultra will to power corporate climber
- b) Larry the lounge lizard – the hedonist and sometimes addict
- c) Lorenzo the Latin lover – “music and dance fill my soul and with the right woman at my side heaven is ours”
- d) Bravos the brave, fierce warrior always in search of a just cause; fearless, fierce and relentless.

a) and d) exist along a continuum wherein they can be fiercely opposed, a)’s absence of a moral compass can be the very thing that d) stands against – everything that is wrong in the world. Similarly, a) may be (secretly) nauseated at d)’s doe-eyed naiveté and optimism about the human condition. As such, they may create an almost unbearable polarity in the subject. Alternatively, in a different set of circumstances, when a) for example, is able to enroll d) in his project, because the context is one that speaks to d)’s sensibilities, they may become unstoppable allies.

a) and c) also exist on a continuum where b) is the shadow of c). This noted, one must recognize that b)’s sensual pleasure (or ability to

experience intense sensual pleasure) is just that which elevates c) beyond a spiritualist abstraction, and fills him with life and pathos.

An analysis like this, even with these four rather elementary examples, can go on and be very, very detailed and complex (no pun intended). Because not only do the binaries matter, but we must also consider the relationship of each complex to the other three. However, as already noted, do not attempt to exhaust the model: a sincere reflective engagement is all you should be aiming at.

1. Consider the relationship and presence (or absence) of your archetypes within your complexes:
  - a. Are they present? Any missing? Any missing that disturb you by their absence?
  - b. Consider convergences and divergences between your archetypes and complexes.
  
2. Identify, and describe in as much detail as possible, one “killer” complex. A complex that has a numinous, enchanting and/or highly-charged character. But very, very importantly, one that it is at least conceivable for the ego to enter into alliance with, or service to. Referring back to this module's lecture, this is the “obsession” or “craziness” I address, in the notion of “the merits of forming an alliance with an obsession”. Consider:

- a. The character and content of this complex.
- b. Its archetypal root or roots.
- c. Its feeling tone (emotional) quality<sup>3</sup>.
- d. Its Telos (trajectory)- where does it want to go?

Once you have done this, name and imagine the complex such that you can describe its “physical” existence in some detail.

Finally, ask the complex just one question. For the purposes of this exercise I want you to imagine that you will only ever get to ask this complex a single question, a critical question, a question that reveals the essence of the complex.

This brings our lectures on Complexes to an end.

---

<sup>3</sup> My thanks to Thys de Beer, or rather Thys’ analyst, for emphasizing this<sup>3</sup>. Jokes aside, this is an important point, the emotional (or feeling) quality of a complex.