Küssnacht, 1961: on the eve of his death, Jung has a catastrophic vision depicting the last fifty years of humanity. One of his daughters took notes of the contents of the vision, and afterwards gave them to Marie-Louise von Franz, who kept them in a drawer.¹

Forty eight years earlier, on October 1913, while on a train journey, Jung had had a twice repeated vision, in which a monstrous flood covered all the northern and low-lying lands between the North Sea and the Alps—mighty yellow waves with the rubble of civilization and the drowned bodies of uncounted thousands—, only countered by the rising mountains which protected Switzerland from the catastrophe, and then the whole sea turned into blood.²

Elsewhere, in my “Requiem for Analytical Psychology: a Reflection on Jung’s (Anti)Catastrophic Psychology,”³ I have proposed an interpretation of these visions, leaving aside Jung’s and von Franz’ prophetic-literalist perspective on them, and submitting that they constitute the psychological framework within which Jung’s psychological project was devised and has its purpose and conditions of validity expressed. To summarize in a nutshell my thesis, I maintain that Jung’s psychology is meant to address a very specific modern human form of being-in-the-world, symbolized in the 1913 vision by the remnant of humanity spared from the catastrophe through the

¹ Part of this paper has been presented at the Second International Conference of the ISPDI, held in Berlin, from 19 to 21 of July, 2014. I would like to express my gratitude to FAPEMIG (Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de Minas Gerais) and to CAPES (Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior) for the concession of financial support which allowed me to attend to the Berlin Conference.


protective mountain barriers surrounding Switzerland, and that the final catastrophe portrayed in the last vision completely destroys this circumscribed remnant of the modern notion of “Man,” so that Jung’s psychological project finds its logical end.

In this paper I would like to further clarify and develop the conclusions reached in my interpretation. Due to limitations of space, I could not explain in the “Requiem” what defines the modern notion of “Man” as I use it, and what comes next in terms of the logical configuration of soul. Basically, as a counterpoint to the specific notion of “Man” which is a presupposition of Analytical Psychology (and whose logical destruction is depicted in Jung’s visionary “final catastrophe”), I submit that the new form that replaces this notion after its logical obsolescence, a form which is correlative of the new mode of being-in-the-world increasingly prevalent after the radical changes brought about in humankind’s way of life by the Industrial Revolution, is that of Mass Man. It reaches its most recent contours in medial modernity, in which the form of being-in-the-world is defined by the essential and irrevocable merger of mass-minded consciousness and the technological-cybernetic apparatus which molds the actual environment inside which we all live in the Age of Technique. This corresponds to the last phase in the relations of “human” and “machine” as established in the logic of the Industrial Revolution, the same logic which is responsible for the effective massification (Vermassung), the revolutionary restructuring of humankind as a mass. In the early stages of this process, human beings were integrated into the technical-mechanical productive environment as distinct agents performing specific actions in the production system (much like some horses are coupled to a chariot to make it move). The system could engulf and even seriously threaten the humanity of the agents (see Charles Chaplin’s Modern Times), but there was still a fundamental difference between human agent and technical environment. In the current advanced phase, by contrast, not only technology invades and encompasses all of the human spheres of life, but it also invades very literally the inner human constitution (as is most evident in the interventions made possible by nanotechnologies), so that the concept of “man-machine” (La Méttrie) turns out to be the real truth of the human condition in the Age of Technique. One cannot anymore distinguish between man and machine. As the horses have been sublated into automobile engines as “horsepower,” rendering animal traction obsolete, so human capacities are sublated into the technical environment, rendering the notion of “human nature” (or essence) obsolete.
The end of Man and the birth of Mass Man

Mass Man is a product and an expression of modernity. The coming of a mass age, with the correlative rise of the Mass Man, had already been predicted early in the nineteenth century by thinkers and statesmen who could see and anticipate the consequences of the radical historical changes going on in European life: urbanization on a scale never seen before, explosive increase of population density, of the forces of production, of the volume of commercial transactions, of the means of transport and communications, reconfiguration of the work relations. The new form imposed on the human subjects submitted to the conditions of life in the mass age—the form of Mass Man—presupposed a previous form which would be superseded, and this was the initial form projected and dreamt of by the optimistic pioneers of the modern age: Man as an early modern ideal. What were the main features of this ideal?

Arguably the decisive keyword for introducing us into the essence of the early modern human ideal is autonomy. Early modern Man claims the right to being himself the legitimate source or fundament of his own life and world. Hence, the supportive—and at the same time restrictive—orientations stemming from tradition and social conventions are refused, negated in favor of the undisputable sovereignty attributed to reason, free will and experience in determining one’s choices, values and life projects. As a result, individuality (as opposed to the submission to collective traditional norms) becomes the highest value. And reflexivity is enthroned as the supreme guide in life. All these features are subsumed under the notion of autonomy, which etymologically means the property or capacity of one giving one’s own laws.

The novelty in the early modern conception of autonomy (as distinct from the same notion as lived in antique philosophy) is that those laws are to be found exclusively inside oneself, inside one’s Self. In the ancient form of mind, there was a cosmo-logical ethical and metaphysical significance of nature, so that the reflecting subject achieved his autonomy in rationally grasping the objective laws inscribed in the weft of the cosmos, within which he found his legitimate and ordered place, and in conforming his life to those objective cosmological/natural laws, as applied to his particular situation in the cosmic order. In the modern frame of mind, the notion of cosmos becomes obsolete, losing its former ethical and metaphysical relevance. Consequently, the human guiding laws (nomoi) can only be grounded and reflectively
found inside one’s *Self* or *subjectivity*, which is then the notion that summarizes the early modern definition of *Man*.

In modern philosophy, “*subjectivity*” in general designates “*self-consciousness*, thought of as that which is the most essential in the human being.” Yet subjectivity can be conceived of in two complementary ways: individually, meaning the interiority of the person, all that constitutes his/her individuality, and generically, meaning the pure self-consciousness (or reflexivity) present in every human being, fundament of every possible knowledge. The former definition is usually referred as the “empirical subject,” whereas the latter is commonly known as the “transcendental subject.” These two conceptions of subjectivity are *complementary*, which means that one should not simply oppose them as excluding one another. Dialectically, we could say that the universality of the transcendental subject shines in the singularity of the individual.

The transcendental subject does not express itself only in concrete individuals as empirical subjects; it is found first and foremost in the objective impersonal works and institutions of culture which express the particular *ethos* of a human community. The individual member of a society becomes an *ethical subject* (or *agent*) insofar as his/her empirical subjectivity is consciously and voluntarily informed by the general rules, ideals and values which define the particular ethical profile of his/her community. Beyond this level, in which the historical and cultural particularity of any human society can be observed, one can reflectively establish a phenomenology of the *ethos* in general and afterwards, through a transcendental reflection, disclose the transcendental level which constitutes the condition of possibility of *any* ethical life whatsoever.

As a rule, there is a coordination between the situation of the empirical subject and the cultural avatars of the transcendental subject, so that the individual finds the ways of his/her self-realization within the particular ethical parameters of the social human community to which he/she belongs (even when this self-realization requires *transgression* of given ethical limits, a possibility included in the phenomenology of the *ethos* under the concept of *ethical conflict*). The private, particular life is supported by the social sphere.

---

4 E. Faye, entry “*subjectivité*,” in A. Jacob & S. Auroux (dir.) *Encyclopédie Philosophique Universelle. Les Notions Philosophiques, Dictionnaire, Tome II*. Paris: P.U.F., 1990, p. 2477 (my translation). The philosophical approaches to “*subjectivity*” are extremely complex and diversified. Here I will make only a very meager and simplified *en passant* remark, as my purpose is only to make a bridge to the description of “*Mass Man*.”

5 See ibid.
Now, precisely here we may find the essential articulation which enters in a state of crisis in modernity, giving rise to the predicament that accompanies the eventful history of the modern form of consciousness. For, under the concrete conditions of existence established in the wake of the Industrial Revolution, we recognize not anymore a *coordination* between the spheres of the transcendental I, in its impersonal objective incarnations, and the empirical individual with his/her subjective needs, but a radical *split*, so that the empirical I, surrounded and captured by the great impersonal systems of knowledge, economics and technology, is not able to find room in those systems for a *truly personal* self-realization. Therefore, the individual is confronted with a dramatic dilemma: either sacrificing his/her personhood in order to render possible the adaptation to the world as it is configured, or preserving it but paying the price of living in an artificial uprooted bubble in which the self-realization may be enacted. The first option, which imposed itself historically, means bidding farewell to all the previous conceptions, developed throughout Western civilization, of what a true human existence was. The individuals are now irrevocably thrown into the status of *Mass Man*. In short, this means that the objective form of our industrial and post-industrial world leaves no room for the traditional idea of *Man*. It is *post-humanist* in its very logic. Consequently, the classical and early modern notion of *Man* is rendered logically obsolete. “Man” as subjectivity, self-consciousness and reflexivity is substituted by a new form of being-in-the-world: the end of *Man* is tantamount to the birth of *Mass Man*. This means that the adjective “mass,” as used here, should not be understood as designating a special class—the workers—but instead as referring to “a kind of man to be found today in all social classes, who consequently represents our age, in which he is the predominant, ruling power.” Mass Man corresponds to a form of consciousness in which the individual is utterly generic, and nothing but generic, having on principle no distinctive features which would differentiate it from all the others. The individual thus created is *absolutely identical* to everyone else: Mass Man is wholly and exclusively comprised by the sheer repetition of a generic type. Hence subjectivity and individuality

---

6 Objectively speaking, i.e., from the viewpoint of soul’s *opus magnum*, it doesn’t matter whether one is an enthusiastic functionary of the impersonal systems, or lives in an alternative community avoiding the constraints of modernity, or is the last remnant of an archaic people still not destroyed and/or assimilated by the course of Western modern civilization (for instance, some groups of the Yanomami, of northern Brazil). In all these cases—the happy acceptance of the new status, the hopeless fight against it, or the innocent and blessed unconsciousness of it (which, however, must be protected from it in order to not being destroyed/transformed, as many other non-European “archaic” people have been throughout history)—the supreme modern post-humanist rule dictates the conditions of life.

are simply annihilated. From this perspective, one can see that Mass Man is not a simple differentiation within the status of Man, but a true revolutionary change which throws away the variegated traces of humanism that were constitutive of the early modern ideal of Man.

We could summarize the essential features of mass existence: social *atomization*, extreme *individualism*, complete *loss of roots*, of communitarian bondage, resulting in a deep seated and desperate sense of *superfluousness* and unbearable solitude, and engendering a desire to escape from reality.\(^8\) Masses are eager for the consistency of a system which absorbs them.\(^9\) This is one of the “chief characteristics of modern masses”: they “do not believe in anything visible, in the reality of their own experience; they do not trust their eyes and ears but only their imaginations, which may be caught by anything that is at once universal and consistent in itself.”\(^10\) The psychic gain of all this process is a restoration, on a different level, of what had been lost through massification: in a fabricated world of consistency, imagination properly manipulated gives to the uprooted masses a feeling of being at home, of being protected against shocks coming from real life and real experiences.

The trust in experience, one of the backbones of the modern mind, is abrogated in mass-mindedness in favor of *identification with the consistent fictitious system and total conformism of consciousness*. In fact, the very capacity for experience is numbed and rendered irrelevant in mass existence. Truly spontaneous experience is substituted by *programmed performance*. The more fanatic the adhesion of the individual to the fabricated system, the less can he/she be reached either by experience or by argument. The deliberate refusal of attending to the summons of reality results in the substitution of the living cognitive relation with reality by tightly programmed, standardized and codified forms of expression.

---

\(^8\) In the documentary *Matter of Heart*, Marie-Louise von Franz deplores this tendency of escaping from reality, which she attributes to “young people”. What she could not see was that it was a more universal tendency, rooted in mass existence. According to my interpretation, it is highly significant that she mentions this tendency in the context of Jung’s final catastrophic vision of “the last fifty years of humankind”.

\(^9\) Consistency is the antidote for insecurity and uncertainty. Describing the “spiritual problem of modern man,” Jung stated that “modern man has suffered an almost fatal shock, psychologically speaking, and as a result has fallen into profound uncertainty,” (CW 10, § 155) and that “the upheaval of our world and the upheaval of our consciousness are one and the same.” (CW 10, § 177) No wonder that his psychological project aimed at countering the overwhelming contemporary tendency towards mass-mindedness (as becomes crystal-clear in his essay “Present and Future” included in CW 10), and he presented *individuation* as the way to avoid this tendency.

Along with the decline of the trust in experience, there happens also a subtle or veiled change in another backbone of modern subjectivity: freedom. As Umberto Galimberti states: in the context of the mass society, “the actions of the individual are not read anymore as expression of his/her identity, but as possibilities calculated by the technical apparatus, which not only foresees them, but prescribes even the form of their execution. (...) the personal identity becomes sheer functionality.”\(^{11}\) Hence, the Mass Man is not anymore a man defined by the early modern sense of “self,” becoming instead nothing but a functionary of the system. And as the functioning of the system obeys to fixed rules, freedom does not apply to the activity of its functionary.

Another feature of mass-mindedness is activism, a feature that is preserved from the inner constitution of the early modern form of consciousness and transformed during the rise of mass society. The significant shift that activism receives in the transposition to the new mass form is that it migrates from the subjective sphere and effectively realizes itself in the objective form of the world, becoming thus a structural element of the world’s great impersonal systems. The individuals (as well as the State and the companies) are much more captive victims of the whirlwind of economic and technological activism then its source. The Faustian Streben (a restless aspiration) becomes the omnipresent, impersonal and objective living spirit of our age.\(^{12}\)

As activism is essentially movement, its essential impetus creates impermanence. Conversely, impermanence is the condition of possibility for activism. This circularity between activism and impermanence is the secret of the stability of movement as the deep rule of modern life.

Reflexivity is congealed in a state of suspension and substituted by a standardized (even if very complex) data processing, as spirit becomes information and activism establishes itself as the perpetual-motion logic of the world. The frenetic movement is what renders reflexivity obsolete. The action of reflecting requires a halt and a turning back to an already finished event, or at least to a finished moment of an ongoing event. True reflexive thinking demands time—time for reception, for conception, for maturation, for making of a truth one’s permanent possession, for


\(^{12}\) We could here remember Faust’s bet with Mephistopheles: he is confident that a “poor devil” will not be able to provide him with anything that would satisfy his absolute aspiration (an aspiration of the Absolute, at bottom) so that he would want to stay in that moment forever. Consequently, without a real Absolute to match the Faustian aspiration, one is left with the infinite motion or “bad infinity” (Hegel) of a desire which, to apply Sartre’s famous sentence on man, is a useless passion. In this way, we can see that modern (and contemporary) activism is an effect of metaphysical nihilism.
becoming one with one’s truth. The rule of accelerated movement, change, impermanence, hinders all these constitutive acts of thought. There is no more the required temporal conditions for truly intelligere (to understand, equivalent to intus legere, to read inwardly, to reach the interiority of a phenomenon), but only the increasingly faster and external stimulation by the flow of information. The objective restlessness and speed of the world find their perfect correspondence in the floating nature of consciousness when wholly immersed in the technological dynamisms. As a result, this consciousness deprived of the minimal stability of the past, of memoria, enraptured by the frenetic kind of movement peculiar to our age, simply cannot reflect, cannot think in the traditional sense of the word. The remaining reflexivity is only a logically obsolete private remnant from the superseded previous form of soul as subjectivity, and can be used in the cultivation of a hobby, for instance by those who are inclined to think psychologically in a world in which psychology with soul (or soul as psychology) has become obsolete (just like one can enjoy flying in balloons in the age of spatial aircrafts).

“Human nature” or “essence” was the referent for “true self”—so that one could define self-consciousness or subjectivity as the form of “human essence.” But in the technological contemporary mode of being-in-the-world, which conjugates the transformation of nature into mere raw material to be disposed of by the technological activity, the obsolescence of the category of “essence,” and the increasing (or almost complete) technical fabrication of the human environment (technique invading even the realm of human relations), the “true self” loses its grounding reference: from now on, everything is fabricated, including the self. The basis of the new self is to be found not anymore inside oneself, but in the varied and nevertheless calculated possibilities prescribed by the market.

***

The rise of mass-mindedness was not just a historical accident in the course of Western civilization. As a matter of fact, the end of Man, in the sense here employed, is a logical event already accomplished in the very grounds of the modern form of consciousness. There we can find the logical premise for the later actual historical rise of Mass Man—who, in all regards, is the surrogate of Man as defined in the classical Western notion of human being. This premise lies in the radical recasting of the field of

13 See St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, II-IIae, Q. 8, art. 1, respondeo.
knowledge in modernity, and especially in its incidence in the ethical horizon, as it was established in Ancient Greek philosophy, particularly in Aristotle’s *Nichomachean Ethics*. As is well known, Aristotle distinguished the spheres of *theoria* (“contemplation,” as the disposition of human spirit aiming at pure knowledge, knowledge having as its exclusive goal knowledge itself, encompassing the theoretical sciences of metaphysics, physics and mathematics), *praxis* (“action,” of a specifically human and humanizing kind, aimed at the perfection of the human agents themselves, both individually and as a community, referred to the kind of knowledge oriented to *ta anthropina*, “things human,” in the light of *arete*, “virtue” or “excellence,” and encompassing the practical sciences of ethics and politics), and *poiesis* (“production,” aimed at the perfection of an external work, encompassing all the technical knowledges and skills, in the broadest sense). This classical division of the sciences will suffer a veritable upheaval at the dawn of modern times.

The anthropological turn which inaugurates the modern form of consciousness expresses itself as an inversion with regards to the metaphysical foundation of knowledge. To understand this inversion, we must then first turn back to Ancient Greece in order to grasp the foundation which would be subverted in modern times. We can locate in Greek philosophy a fateful event, which was destined to have a long-lasting consequence: the historical triumph of a core metaphysical position of Plato over the one sustained by Protagoras. As we know from Plato himself (see *Theaetetus* 152a), Protagoras stated that “Man is the measure of all things.” On the contrary, Plato explicitly rejected this anthropological foundation of knowledge and existence, and sustained a quite different position: “Now God ought to be to us the measure of all things, and not man, as men commonly say (Protagoras): the words are far more true of Him. And he who would be dear to God must, as far as is possible, be like Him and such as He is.” (*Laws* IV, 716 c, trans. Benjamin Jowett). God is thus the exemplary measuring model, in relation to which all things are measured, including humankind, which finds its true realization in the likeness of this divine model. Plato’s triumph over Protagoras heralds, on the realm of reason, the theological-metaphysical age of soul, sealing it with the stamp of transcendence.

The modern form of mind (which is made possible by the precedent discussions taking place in medieval scholastics) will be built upon an upheaval of the previous Platonic-Aristotelian metaphysical ground of thought. Subjectivity emerges as a new and valuable notion to express the essence of the nascent form of mind. It receives the
primacy in the modern form of consciousness, and this form progressively imposes itself as the organizing center of modern times in all its distinctive fields. Subjectivity is invested with the logical function of the Absolute, namely, being the metaphysical center around which all truths are established. This is a concise way of explaining the metaphysical meaning of the modern anthropocentric (or anthropological) turn, which precisely inaugurates the distinctively modern metaphysics of subjectivity: the modern notion of “Man,” which is thus equivalent to the notion of “subjectivity,” is the new logical or metaphysical center. Protagoras has resurrected.

In Descartes’ famous “cogito, ergo sum,” which represents the opening act of modern philosophy, we can grasp the radical move implied in the modern anthropological turn. In the Cartesian cogito we discern the inversion of the Platonic metaphysical axis, and the resurgence of a (transformed and logically improved) Protagorian position. True: still in line with the Platonic tradition, Descartes posits God as the fundament of the cogitating subject, after proving the existence of God as a (supposedly) rational requirement to fully account for the cogito (and the innate idea of “infinite”). But, on the other hand, Descartes’s proof of the existence of God is logically dependent on the centrality of the cogitating subject, despite God being thought of as the fundament of the cogito (and as the guarantor of the reality of the physical world), for God is a fundament required and posited by the subject. Be that as it may, from Descartes to Hegel we find the rough line of evolution and fulfilment of the logical requirements constitutive of the truth of the modern form of consciousness. In short: from Plato until the modern times, the metaphysical center (or Absolute) was posited in “God;” the modern form of consciousness will gradually leave “God” aside and enthrone “Subjectivity” in its place (and Kant is the moment in this line of evolution where the anthropological requirement of the metaphysics of subjectivity comes home to itself, reaching the explicit and full consciousness of itself; with Hegel, the inner telos of the metaphysics of subjectivity—the logicization of Being—reaches its complete fulfillment).

However, this new foundation of metaphysics (this new form assumed by soul, or the new logical form of consciousness) has also an essentially different and decisive component: it is not sufficient to describe the logical status of modern consciousness by pointing to the metaphysical centrality assumed in it by subjectivity; one has to add to the primacy of the transcendental subject, the primacy of a new and specific form of rationality. This form can be found in the new scientific spirit arising fully conscious of
itself in Galileo: the new science on principle operates a *mathematization* of the real, and this is definitional to the modern meaning of science. This means that the ancient dialectics of the measuring and the measured, which opposed Plato to Protagoras, is now resumed in the modern New Science, but receiving an essential *mathematical slant of a purely geometrical-quantitative nature*, unheard of before.\(^{14}\)

Equally decisive and innovative is the *instrumental* nature of this modern scientific knowledge: it is not merely *empirical*, but *experimental*, essentially allied to *technique*, and as such powerfully applied to the project announced in Descartes’s *Discours de la Méthode*:

> For they [general notions from physics] made me see that it is possible to reach knowledges which would be very useful in life, and that in place of this speculative philosophy taught in schools, one can find a practical philosophy, by means of which, through knowing the power and the actions of fire, water, air, the stars, the heavens and all other bodies in our environment, as distinctly as we know the various crafts of our artisans, we could apply them, like the artisans do, in all the appropriate ways, and thus make ourselves masters and possessors of Nature.\(^{15}\)

This new “practical philosophy”—or scientific rationality—is thus explicitly *instrumental*: it does not aim at pure knowledge for its own sake, but to knowledge as a *means* for dominating and transforming nature. The theoretical dimension merges with the poietic. It is this essential alliance of science with technique (founding modern *technology*), under the aegis of the project of *domination of nature*, which renders obsolete the Aristotelian division of knowledge, and equally has the above-mentioned impact on ethical life. For, under the primacy now assumed by *techne*, the sphere of *praxis* will be swallowed, so to speak, by the sphere of *poiesis*. This has as an unavoidable consequence the transference of the ethical-practical normative knowledge of action (*praxis*, in the classical sense) to the realm of the technical knowledge of production (*poiesis*), entailing a redefinition of the notion of *praxis* itself, “which starts to be thought of under the basic category of the arithmetic equality that returns upon the agents, making them equal, and only differentiated by the simple number through which

---

\(^{14}\) We should remember that in Plato’s thought we find a kind of meta-mathematics of a distinctively *qualitative* nature, as is evident in his doctrine of *ideal numbers*, which should not be confused with the mathematical entities located at the lowest level of the intelligible realm. The absence of this qualitative dimension in the mathematical quantitative reduction informing the modern scientific spirit should make us take *cum grano salis* Alexandre Koyré’s thesis about the supposedly Platonic metaphysical foundation of the New Science.

they are counted in the sequence of a numeric series.”¹⁶ Here is the deep logical premise which grounds the end of the classical notion of Man and the correspondent rise of Mass Man and mass society. From this logical root, one can see that the mass-minded form of consciousness is not “irrational” at all: it is extremely and one-sidedly rational, informed as it is exclusively by the instrumental and mathematical kind of rationality. And this restricted form of rationality is on principle alien to the whole sphere of ends, meaning that it cannot provide them with a rational justification, it cannot ground them. The ends are simply given to it from outside, and then it finds the best means of actualizing them.

The suppression of the qualitative subjective aspects from the realm of true scientific knowledge and the correlative instauration of the “kingdom of quantity” define the new modern epistemological space. Only what on principle can be quantified and translated into mathematical language counts as a possible object for scientific knowledge. Consequently, also on principle modern science excludes the whole dimension of human intentions, values, virtues, ideals, brief: all what constituted the very specific and distinctive essence of “things human” (ta anthropina) in the classical notion of Man. We may say that the modern transcendental subject hosts a quantitative mathematician who handles only the instrumental kind of reason. This means that, in its very inception, the spirit of modernity brings within itself the self-contradictory tendency to destroy the classical idea of Man.

To be sure, in its historical unfolding modern consciousness has gradually affirmed the humanist position implied in the anthropological turn and tributary of many features of the classical notion of Man. But the logical death blow on Man was from the outset included in its own structure, as a self-negating feature of the logical form of modern consciousness, pointing toward the post-humanist configuration. It is as if modern consciousness was logically pregnant of this new dehumanizing configuration. The occasion for the effective death of (classical and early modern) Man and the birth of its surrogate, Mass Man, presented itself in the beginnings of 19th century—all the external conditions for this radical event were finally achieved: the time was ripe, the historical labour would begin. From the Industrial Revolution onwards the instrumental rationality showed effectively its power in transforming the

world. The impact on all cultural life was summarized precisely in the birth of mass society, with the correspondent mass-mindedness.

Consequently, we have the paradox of modernity: built upon the privilege conceded to subjectivity, it corrodes its own fundament and tends to the post-humanist constellation of the world as technical environment:

The riddle of modernity is summarized in this fact: if, on the one hand, what characterizes modernity is the rise of a radically original subjectivity, on the other hand the growing primacy of techno-scientific rationality, inasmuch as it posits the horizon of technical objectivity as the all-encompassing continent of our being-in-the-world, leads to the forgetfulness of subjectivity itself and, consequently, to the decline of modernity itself. Therefore modernity, which on the one hand states the primacy of the subject, leaves aside the very subjectivity which defines modernity. As a consequence, post-modernity heralds itself in the form of nihilism.\footnote{C. M. Rocha de Oliveira. Metafísica e Ética. A Filosofia da Pessoa em Lima Vaz como Resposta ao Nilismo Contemporâneo. São Paulo: Loyola, 2013, p. 153, my translation. “Modernity” here is used in a sense not entirely coincident with the meaning it has in Wolfgang Giegerich’s writings.}

Nihilism is too broad a theme to be even superficially discussed here. Therefore, I will only recall its synthetic definition: the annihilation of any real Absolute (metaphysical nihilism), and the consequent impossibility of grounding any ethical order in a comprehensive notion of Being (ethical nihilism). After the closure of Hegel’s titanic speculative effort, in which the Absolute was given its last grandiose expression in thought, the realization of the “death of God” from Feuerbach to Nietzsche is correlative of the erosion of the category of the absolute. From now on, no more ground was possible. As Jung clearly saw, before the modern man “there yawns the void, and he turns away from it in horror.”\footnote{CW 9 I, § 28. Also the “catastrophe in progress” in Jung’s 1913 visions, which reduced civilization to rubble, and the “final catastrophe” in his last vision, which depicted the end of humankind, are imaginal expressions of the nihilistic drive of modernity. The “yawning void” is fundamentally destructive.} Nihilism emerges both as the hidden plot and visible destination of the modern adventure.

However, nihilism is not just the final result of the historical unfolding of the modern form of consciousness, in its externalizations through the decisive moments of modern history. It is not due to accidental vicissitudes of historical experiences that the soul’s logic prevalent in today’s opus magnum is nihilistic. Nihilism is the deep seated truth of the modern mind. It springs from its self-contradictory logical constitution. As such it gives the full meaning to those alluded decisive moments of modern history.

The negation of the essential and foundational notion of Man, as a logical act (or moment) of modern soul’s self-negation, bears upon the initial moment of its specific
form of humanist consciousness. Western (Christian) humanism rests on the dignity attributed to the individual human person on account of its essential relation to God, the supreme value, a relation expressed in the theological idea of *imago dei*—the privilege of humankind is thought of as derived from its ontological constitution in the image and likeness of God. Philosophically, we can see the expression of this relation in the structural reference of Kant’s moral agent to the ideas of freedom, immortality of the soul and existence of God (the postulates of practical reason). It can also be verified in the dialectical relation of human subjectivity to the Absolute according to Hegel. After Hegel, the absolute as such is negated in the logical move underlying the industrial phase of modernity. Consequently, the “death of God” is logically correlative of the “death (or end) of Man.”

The former humanist dignity is simply emptied out, with the resulting consequence of the worthlessness of subjectivity, which is definitional in the new logical status of Mass Man. In the human agent we do not find anymore subjectivity as a privileged moment of the Absolute’s self-manifestation and self-relation: the former subject is now nothing but a function in the impersonal systems of economics, knowledge and technique. From the new logical standpoint, the empirical subject is nothing but a functionary of the system—and as such replaceable, discardable, with no value of its own. Of course, there is always the possibility of the individual subject differentiating him/herself from the logic ruling the objective world, so as to become relatively emancipated from it. But this possibility does not affect the objective logical place reserved to humans in the wider sphere, regardless of whether one is privately engulfed and molded by the logic of mass mindedness or not.

The consummation of modernity (or its end) discloses a new level of consciousness, in which the absolute logical sublatedness of subjectivity (both divine and human) appears as constitutive of the fully nihilistic soul truth of the real.

---

19 The Christian *kenosis* of God does not stop at the initial moment of incarnation, in the *birth* as a human being. Within this new status, God has to *die* as a human being, and to *die as a human being*, death here being the total annihilation of the ontological constitution of human *being*. In an informal talk with a Jesuit theologian about the meaning of the Apostles’ Creed passage: “He descended to the dead”, I asked him why there was practically nothing written or thought about it. He answered that this was the darkest spot in all the incarnation process, where effectively and absolutely God dies, and the theological intelligence sort of “trembled” in face of it. Maybe we could understand the annihilation of any trace of human dignity in the form of Mass Man as the “trembling” absolute historical fulfilling of the Christian *kenosis*, when consciousness reaches the bottom of “the house of the dead”.

20 Jung’s final catastrophic vision of the last 50 years of humankind is a dramatic depiction of soul’s abrogating the anti-nihilistic intention of his psychological project as informed by the 1913 catastrophic visions and dreams. The opposition to nihilism—Nietzsche had already taught us—is itself simply a form of confirming nihilism reactively. On the other hand, the “destruction of humankind” portrayed in Jung’s vision corresponds to a *logical* catastrophe, already realized implicitly in the very constitution of the
The end of Man in modern consciousness manifested in soul’s *opus parvum*

The concrete actualization of the end of Man (as a logical feature of the modern form of consciousness in its post-humanist moment) is a soul process occurring at the level of soul’s *opus magnum*. Now, it is commonly held that there is an absolute disengagement between the levels of *opus magnum* and *opus parvum*. Ordinarily, this thesis may be accepted without reservations, as the phenomena belonging to the *opus parvum* level in their entirety have only private and subjective relevance. Furthermore, the thesis does not imply that we could or should think the reality of the individuals as not included in the “big picture”—this would be absurd, as it would mean denying the historicity and worldliness of the empirical individual consciousness, which is entirely formed within and by a certain human mode of being-in-the-world, whose historicity is consensually admitted and whose logic is precisely the logic of the “big picture.” The processes which occur at the level of *opus parvum* are culturally preconditioned. This means that they cannot fall out of the logic of the age, following thus the patterns established in *opus magnum*.

As I said, ordinarily the reference of the smaller private affairs to the broader sphere of culture is negligible on all accounts. For instance: the private experiences of marriage, childbirth, sickness, death, love, work and so on, in all their particular unlimited variations. Even if such human situations are necessarily lived within the particular configurations of the cultural horizon of the individuals, we should not waste our time in trying to establish the connection of this ordinary kind of material to soul’s *opus magnum*, because in the modern form of consciousness they have strictly private subjective meaning.\(^21\)

On the other hand, while it is true that soul “wants to unfold and display its full reality in the empirical world and real life;”\(^22\) it is also true that this refers not only to the great works and institutions of culture, but to the empirical consciousness of

---

\(^21\) Whereas in other cultural contexts some of these same human experiences could in some cases be given soul relevance and be lived according to their mythic or religious meaningful patterns, in the modern form of consciousness, defined by its emancipation from soul, this is not possible anymore: all the events belonging to *opus parvum* receive no soul dignity, being psychologically irrelevant with regards to the broader sphere of soul’s *opus magnum*.

individuals as well, at least to some extent and in varied ways. A soul truth “wants” to be “embodied or incarnated as a personal reality in people,”\textsuperscript{23} it has “to be turned into the very syntax or logical form of consciousness itself.”\textsuperscript{24} To the degree that an individual consciousness may be said to be truly contemporary, it must be informed by the contemporary logic that defines the current status of soul at large. It has to be initiated “into the cultural truth of the age, so that in addition to [one’s] entering [one’s] personal adulthood [one] might also become a truly modern adult.”\textsuperscript{25} In the absence of an explicit, spectacular and ritually exteriorized initiation nowadays, “[w]hen the development happens to be ‘normal’, people simply seem to absorb osmotically the truth of the age.”\textsuperscript{26} “Osmotically” means unreflectedly, unconsciously, or at best semi-consciously. This psychological absorption happens due to the immersion of the all-too-human sphere in the soul of the real, to its irrevocable worldliness, and if this osmosis happens at all, it is because the borderline between the two levels is permeable, permitting the smaller human sphere to be informed by soul’s broader objective logical status. This is what may be called a one-way communication between the two levels.

However, when consciousness is truly initiated into the truth of the age it makes this truth its own conscious and reflected norm, instead of being just informed by it through an unconscious “osmotic absorption.” This is the ultimate goal not only of traditional rites of initiation, but also of modern psychological work or soul-making, in whichever form it takes (art, philosophical thought, psychology etc.) The unconscious “osmotic absorption” is not the whole truth of the initiatory process in the modern form of consciousness. It lacks the self-conscious quality of the final result of the fully actualized initiation. The deepest purpose of true initiation is to make conscious the pervasive status in which consciousness is already unconsciously immersed and lives in, so that the truth of the age comes home to itself in individual consciousness, as its self-conscious syntactical pattern, as the allowed truth of one’s life. We must remember that “[w]hat has factually happened requires, on top of its already being the case, to be explicitly allowed to be the case and thus to become true. It has to be released into its being true. (…) Through a specific logical act of our own we have to own up to what our real situation is in order to make it true and in this way appropriate the factual

\textsuperscript{25} Giegerich, \textit{Collected English Papers Volume V}, p. 76.
situation as our own property, to make it psychologically our own. Psychologically, we have to still get to where we in fact already are.”

At this juncture, we should not ignore that a further problem arises here. Considering that any initiation whatsoever has the same syntactical structure (the move into the psychic other), “no matter in what cultural age under what circumstances, with what utensils and into which particular guise it takes place,” how could we possibly think an initiation into soul’s truth of the age in the modern form of consciousness, once we admit that what characterizes this form is emancipation from soul? At first sight, it would seem impossible, as initiation is the opposite of emancipation, and thus would imply the abrogation of emancipation. Hence initiation, in the modern stance of consciousness, would be an exclusively private subjective process, ruled by the common syntax of any such transformation process, with the peculiarity of being simply and absolutely disengaged from the truth of the real, once modern consciousness is by definition emancipated from soul: “born man” is blind to soul. Consequently there would be no full initiation into the soul truth of the age.

However, fully fledged initiation into the truth of the age does happen in the modern form of consciousness. One does not only become a modern adult, but also a modern adult, and not only unconsciously, osmotically. Accordingly, there are occasions in which we can clearly see an opus parvum event displaying the logic of the opus magnum process and explicitly manifesting the truth of the age in its semantic content. This was the case, for instance, with Jung’s catastrophic visions and dreams in 1913/1914. That raw psychic material was an individual subjective phenomenon which clearly conveyed an impersonal, non-subjective meaning, wholly consistent with and expressive of the objective soul truth informing the historical situation at that time.

Another example may be helpful here to ground my claim concerning this problematic point. In his essay “Psychology as Anti-Philosophy: C.G. Jung,” Wolfgang Giegerich analyzes Jung’s thought experience of the shitting God destroying the cathedral of Basel (a psychic event which could perfectly have happened as a dream

---

27 Giegerich, Collected English Papers Volume V, p. 34. This is homologous to what, on a different (essentialist) historical context of soul, Greek poet Pindar expressed in his famous maxim “γένοι οἶος ἐσσὶ μαθὼν” (“Become such as you are, having learned what that is”, usually abbreviated as “Become what you are”), a maxim which, since Ancient Greece, has been indelibly inscribed within the ethical horizons of Western civilization.

28 Wolfgang Giegerich, personal communication, 20 February 2014.

as well). He sees in that event of thought a (failed) initiation into a truth of the age (namely, the ruin of the concept of God), so that Jung’s “personal development was (implicitly) loaded with the problem of the krisis of two historical ages.”

This is sufficient to prove that a full self-conscious initiation into the truth of the age can happen in modern consciousness, and through an opus parvum event, “as a private spontaneous inner experience,” by means of which the individual reaches simultaneously a logically adult and modern position of consciousness. Additionally, it confirms that the alluded disengagement between opus parvum and opus magnum is not absolute, and the one-way communication between the two levels can be verified and reflected, beyond the mere “osmotic absorption.” In the case of Jung’s inner experience, this communication is grounded in the thought-image of the “shitting God,” which means the very destruction of the notion of “God,” a soul truth of modernity.

Even if such cases are relatively rare, being rather the exception then the rule, they are sufficient to force us to relativize the absoluteness of the disengagement between opus magnum and opus parvum in order to account for such exceptions, but only with regards to their meaning and logic, and not their relevance. Jung’s catastrophic psychic material, for instance, as any other opus parvum event, did not have relevance in itself. It was only an overwhelming and extraordinary psychic occurrence falling on a gifted individual. The (relative) relevance should be attributed to what this gifted individual, pressed by the promptings of soul, made of his private experience of the objective psyche: Analytical Psychology as a legitimate expression of the twentieth century culture. But, on the other hand, the psychological depth of that psychic material revealed an objective meaning which was in direct correspondence with the logic prevalent in soul’s opus magnum. That material can be said to have the same nature of an artistic vision (Anschauung), and as such it is not a product of Jung’s ego concerns, relative only to his private affairs, but a thought produced by and in him as totus homo. Consequently, the consciousness in the individual Carl Gustav Jung was moved through that experience, assimilating itself to its objective logic, positioning itself in relation to this logic, and additionally Jung succeeded in giving it an objectively relevant expression in his work.

As I see it, this exceptionally clear form of communication between the two levels of soul activity is one way that soul itself may take to fully initiate empirical

31 Giegerich, Collected English Papers Volume V, p. 76.
consciousness into soul’s current truth. The consequences of this initiation (whether there will be a transposition to the broader sphere of culture or just a private subjective transformation of consciousness) depend on factors and variables other than the psychic material itself.

As in modernity initiations are “no longer cultural institutions,” they have to happen “as a private spontaneous inner experience.” Now, I submit that this kind of fully fledged initiation process does not have to be manifested only through extraordinary and bombastic psychic events such as Jung’s visions, or his personally dramatic awakened thought experience of the shitting God, but also in some smaller material, in a more discreet and humble way. If this is so, then occasionally we may be able to observe the initiation of consciousness into the broader and deeper fundamentals of modern culture manifested in the personal level, including in dreams. In this case, the subjective psychic material will have to have the same logical form of the objective psychological truth of the soul of the real. This coincidence per se allows for the objective truth of the age to graft itself in the subjective sphere, and this probably would be how the alluded “osmotic absorption” happens. But additionally, this logical coincidence also would have to be verified in its semantic expression (or refraction) in the subjective material, so that a self-conscious status of the truth of the age could be reached in the parvum level. As an illustration of this possibility, I will now present and discuss an ordinary and wholly personal dream in which—I submit—we can see an opus parvum event being informed by soul’s opus magnum, having an objective meaning and being thus a small piece of the potential initiation of the dreamer’s consciousness in soul’s objective logical status. This initiatory potentiality can be seen provided we adequately interiorize the dream image into itself, and envisage it in the light of basic assumptions of psychology as the discipline of interiority.

After an exchange of ideas about the symbolism of extraterrestrial beings (or aliens) as images of the Self, in the classical Jungian sense, a 39 years-old woman had the following dream: the dreamer saw herself in a place with her working colleagues. There was a long queue, the dreamer saw herself in a place with her working colleagues. There was a long queue, and the people were going to be transformed into aliens.

32 Referring to the historical shift from communal, public knowing and truth to felt experience, Wolfgang Giegerich states: “This fundamental shift in the history of the soul that came about with its entrance into modernity (around 1800) had only ‘implicitly’, in the objective logic or syntax of modernity, become a reality. It also needed to become ‘explicit’ and semantic. What had become the logical truth of the individual also needed to be taken over by the empirical personality of the individual and established in it as a positively existing self-definition and way of experiencing itself.” (Collected English Papers Volume V, p. 264) This applies to the situation here discussed.
(E.Ts.), willingly. This was accomplished by each person connecting her/himself through wires to machines. And then they were transformed into compacted bricks of garbage. Seeing that, the dreamer was terrified, but people were calm, placid: that was what they wanted.

The important day residue included in the production of this dream has to be taken into account in its interpretation: it was preceded by an exchange of ideas, in which the image of the alien was envisaged as a “symbol of the Self,” in traditional Jungian parlance. In order to interiorize the dream image into itself, we have to approach it in the light of this connection, i.e., granting that the association alien-self belongs to the dream image, to its semantic content. If the dream action was “people connecting themselves through wires to machines in order to become aliens,” and if that means “becoming self,” then the self should be located both semantically (as a content of the dream text) and syntactically (as corresponding to its underlying logic) in the final result of the transformation presented in the lysis of the dream: in the “compacted bricks of garbage.”

This alien-self is the result of a productive activity, which in the dream is performed by “machines.” What kind of activity the dream machines execute? We could be led to think that it is just a realistic, literal and non-problematic “compacting” activity. However, this is not what is going on in the dream, because in this case the “garbage” would remain unexplained, insofar as we should have “compacted bricks of human meat” instead of “garbage.” Therefore, there is a mysterious non-naturalistic process depicted in the dream, which is precisely the transformation of human beings into garbage.

This transformation happens through people’s “connecting themselves to machines”—and, nota bene, the dream text does not say that they were “compacting machines.” We should not break our rule of “not letting anything that does not belong come in” by assuming any kind of specific compacting machine as the cause of the compacting activity. This is not mentioned in the dream text, it “does not belong.” Moreover, an empirical compacting machine does not work like that, it does not need to have the objects to be compacted connected to it through wires. No. The image is precise, self-sufficient and wholly symbolic. What happens here does not come from an empirical naturalistic referent: we are faced with a true soul process. Hence the connection and the compaction must be understood as what they truly express: a logical act of soul.
The transformation is a psychological deepening from ego as common human form to self as compacted brick of garbage. We must observe that the resulting subjective element itself is wholly affected, circumscribed and determined by the transformation, inasmuch as the garbage is produced by the compacting-transforming activity ensued by the connection to the machines, receiving its formal configuration from this symbolic “technological” process. The form of “brick” and the status of “garbage” are imposed by soul in the transformation process.

The transformation of the human form into some other (“alien”) one is a common syntactical feature of the initiatory processes in general. In the context of shamanistic cultures, for example, the individual submitted to initiation usually is transformed into an animal—an eagle, or a bear, for instance. But in our dream we have a different situation. If the dream image was people being transformed into cyborgs, the initiation would be strictly analogous to being transformed into an animal in the context of shamanistic cultures, as these forms of the psychic other are representative of the higher values and goals of the respective cultures (integration into the spiritualized nature, integration into the technologically conformed world). The received non-human form would accordingly grant a higher value to the individual, raising him/her to the sphere of the soul fundamentals of the community (despite the fundamental difference between initiation in traditional cultures, where it is a public and socially relevant institution, and in modernity, where it is just an inner process, a “private spontaneous inner experience”). But the representation of the psychic other as garbage implies a radical devaluation brought about by the transformation process (even if this image is understood as only the transformation’s first immediacy). In order to understand this particular situation, we must first examine what are the essential aspects contained in the notion of “garbage,” so that we can see the specific nature and moment of the initiation going on.

In the first place, garbage is defined by its worthlessness. It has no value, and hence it is meant to be discarded, thrown away, thrust aside, as it is also useless. Uselessness is an aspect of its worthlessness, and as such is attributed to garbage and constitutive of its concept. Uselessness, on its part, negatively refers to something else, to a context which defines what is valuable and useful, and what is not. In relation to

---

33 See the two dreams analyzed in the Appendix.
this context, that which is considered as garbage is worthless, useless, unassimilated. In other words: garbage is essentially a form of negative relatedness.

We should note that in our dream the production of self as compacted bricks of garbage is the intended goal of the soul process. It is not accidental, and it is a complete transformation. In accordance with the internal psychic otherness which constitutes the terminus ad quem of the movement of transformation in any initiation, the relativity of self-garbage refers in the first place to the initial ego position (the form of people to be transformed). The self is garbage to the dream-I (meaning not only that she sees it as garbage, but mainly that it is offered to her as garbage). Usefulness, in the broader sense, is an essential criterion belonging to the pragmatic ego world. Consequently, the self in the dream as the ego’s psychic other is worthless, useless and is meant to be discarded, thrown out. In its uselessness, “garbage” may thus be read as the semanticized expression of the absolute negativity of the self.

Therefore, we have here the depiction of the psychological difference, and of the avertedness between soul and ego. Strictly speaking, the initiation in the dream is a personal initiation into the soul side of the psychological difference, and at a first glance can be satisfactorily understood within the limits of opus parvum. That which is presented to and refused by the dream-I is a change of the logical constitution of the I (from ego to self), performed through a kind of alchemical putrefactio.\(^34\) Given the range of essential meanings implied in the notion of “garbage,” it is warranted to state that the initiation offered in this dream is an initiation into the self as worthless, useless, in its discardedness.

We know that the self as the internal other of the ego is “not-I,” and “despite its otherness is nevertheless also I (me) (...) [and] is thus not self-identical and self-enclosed like an entity.”\(^35\) In our dream the logical truth (the up to that point “undiscovered self”) of the initial ego position is disclosed and expressed as “garbage.” The transformation in the dream is performed on a multitude of people queued in line, which shows that it is a collective process, it involves a collective or common form of

\(^34\) I am indebted to Wolfgang Giegerich for having called my attention to the alchemical analogy to this dream’s transformation. He also recalled the designation of the alchemical stone as lapis in via ejectus, vilis and exilis, which provides a very good amplificatory context for the self as “compacted brick of garbage.”

\(^35\) Giegerich, What is Soul?, p. 298.
ego consciousness being transformed into self-consciousness (here meaning: consciousness as self-garbage). As the dream-I does not get in the queue, she does not permit herself to be raised (and dialectically lowered) to this self-consciousness. By resisting this transformation, she protects her instinctively highly valued ego position from being submitted to the syntactical putrefaction, dissolution. She rejects the thought of the logical worthlessness and discardedness of the self as a personally valid truth, as the logical form in which she exists. She excludes herself from this truth, denying it. But precisely because of this rejection, she remains tightly chained to what she rejects. She is defined by the rejection, as a rejecting subject. The dream-I only recognizes the truth, but does not let herself be submitted to it: she stays in opposition to it, outside it, not allowing to be affected by it in her subjective constitution. She does not “allow truth to be the case and thus to become true.” Truth is seen only as an alien external reality, from a subject-object position. As such, the dream-I adheres to the untruth of her conscious position, and rejects the full consequences of the real dream-thought: there is no going under of the dream-I.

The self in the dream is presented as a very familiar and ordinary worthless element (garbage) and not in some semantic form which would stress only its otherness (for instance: a monstrous imaginary extraterrestrial form of life). However, the compacted brick of garbage as a version of the alchemical stone is rejected not only because of its outward banal aspect (which leads the ordinary vulgi consciousness to despise it as nothing but an ordinary element of banal reality, and which clashes against the dream-I’s position). Soul itself presents the self as worthless and discardable, as something (“garbage”) whose essence or notion is to be actively rejected and discarded. Consequently, its rejection by the dream-I is not an ego mistake, but a reaction intended by soul itself.\(^{36}\) It is indicative of the unallowed effective realization of the truth in the dream-I, happening though in the dialectical moment of first negation. The possibility of confrontation with this soul truth is reserved to the dream-I, who reacted and negated it. Without this reaction, there would be no truly self-conscious syntactical move. However, she will only logically “die” if she unconditionally submits herself to that truth, fully realizing it in herself.

\(^{36}\) “We know from dreams that the degree of extremeness of an image simply reflects the degree of the dream I’s resistance or lack of understanding. Through its disgusting, unpalatable character the image indicates within itself that this initiation came as one to be rejected.” (Giegerich, Collected English Papers Volume V, p. 86)
Now, this one aspect of the self as compacted brick of garbage— its discardedness— deserves still closer attention. This is a decisive detail of the dream image: the self, in its worthlessness and uselessness (it has no use in the pragmatic stance of the practical I), is produced by soul to be discarded. The rejection is not only in the dream-I’s refusal of the new form produced by the transformation: it is inscribed in the very form produced, as its own essence. On the one hand, the discardedness of the self is correlative of its fundamental alienation in relation to the ego world, of its being not-I. Thus it represents the inner relation of the two relata (I and not-I) constitutive of the psychological difference within the level of soul’s opus parvum. But on the other hand, insofar as “self” is also equivalent to soul as subject as a whole, the dialectical unity in the difference between I and internal not-I, thus comprising the entirety of the psychological difference, we can securely state that the worthlessness of self-as-garbage affects and qualifies the whole subjective sphere, the whole level of opus parvum as self-depicted in our dream. And as “garbage” implies the reference to a context which produces it and from which it is discarded, the discardedness of the self in our dream has a further amplitude: ultimately, it points to the alienation between the whole subjective sphere and the sphere of soul’s opus magnum. In short: soul discards itself as self, and this is equivalent to the emancipation of born man from soul. In a way, an emancipated self is not contained in soul anymore, it has been thrown out, so to speak. But it only can be emancipated if and only if it has been devised by soul to be discarded from soul, if soul “wants” this emancipation (as a self-differentiation within itself), if discardedness is intrinsic to its logical constitution. Discardedness is here equivalent to logical obsolescence: the self is expressed in the dream as irrelevant garbage. But the question is: irrelevant to what? The ultimate answer is: to the objective sphere of soul’s opus magnum.

In other words: self as “compacted brick of garbage” is the truth of the human sphere (at least a moment of this truth), which is thus worthless, useless and discardable in its entirety in relation to the broader objective sphere. The semantic sign of this objective sphere in the dream is in the machines, the technical apparatus which produces the human garbage.

This semantic particularity of the depiction of the self in the dream points to a syntactical or logical specificity: this small dream is decidedly modern in its underlying logic. The obsolescence of the subjective sphere, correlative of its emancipation from
the objective soul, is a distinctively modern feature. In non-modern soul configurations, the self as psychic other can be portrayed as worthless and repulsive in a certain moment of the initiatory transformation, but not as constituted essentially to be thrown away, discarded. The alchemical stone is thrown away (in via ejectus), not because of its essential worthlessness or because it should be discarded, but because the common mind (vulgi form of consciousness) is unable to see its supreme value. Contrarily, in our dream the self is not only worthless and humble (as an ordinary stone), but is constituted to be discarded. This is the semantic expression both of the absolute negativity of the self (within the subjective sphere, in relation to the ego position) and of its logical obsolescence (in relation to the objective sphere).

We know that individuation has become logically obsolete, and that “it occurs only as disconnected, disengaged from what psychologically is really going on in our age.” Our small dream is precisely an imaginal depiction of this logical status of individuation. The disconnection and disengagement of the subjective sphere from soul’s opus magnum is equivalent to the discardedness of the self. As the telos of individuation is the realization of the self, the logical obsolescence of self-garbage necessarily comprises individuation as well. In a paradoxical way, the semanticized expression of this disconnection/disengagement is the sign of the one-way communication between the two levels of soul activity, happening in a reflected way: the objective truth of their disengagement, implying the logical obsolescence of individuation and self as subjectivity, communicates itself to the disengaged subjective sphere through the semantics of self as discardable compacted brick of garbage.

Consequently, given the previously alluded possibility that modern initiation, happening “as a private spontaneous inner experience,” can have a particular broader reach so as to be simultaneously a complete initiation into a soul truth of the age, we can see that the thought expressed in the image of the self as “compacted brick of garbage” allow us to think this particular personal initiation as being in effective and self-conscious communication with the soul fundaments of our world. As this conclusion is liable to raise objections, let me stress once more that it is not only grounded in the dream image itself, but also accomplished in strict observance of two basic postulates admitted in psychology as the discipline of interiority: 1)

“consciousness is, as it were, ‘surrounded’ by [the truth and soul of the real] on all sides as well as permeated and governed by it in all its acts,” so that “all human world experience takes place within the horizon of this truth,” and 2) initiation means the coming home of this truth—which is a cultural truth—to the personal consciousness. I submit that my interpretation is perfectly in tune with the sense of the initiation portrayed in the dream, and rooted in the interiorization of its own elements. It does not distort neither inflates the dream, but only finds its deeper embedment in the real. I will now try to reinforce this argument with further reflection.

Wolfgang Giegerich has called our attention to the fact that what is (consciously or unconsciously) in individual consciousness must before have been in a cultural institution or work (…) Consciousness (…) “de-pends” on or from the cultural products as its “extraterrestrial satellites” shot up into an orbit around the human “Earth.” (…) Everything new comes from outside (“above”) into consciousness. It first hovers “in the sky,” as it were, and is marveled at and revered as something higher (often, however, only after initially having been experienced as something threatening by consciousness, which therefore violently rejected it as a scandalous attack upon the culture’s established familiar truth.) And only slowly can it come down into people’s consciousness as their inner possession (or part of the make-up of their personality), either through a “leap after the throw,” i.e., a long process of integration of what had been “thrown” far ahead and up into the future, or through a gradual accustoming and sedimentation process that results in the new forms and ideas ending up as sunken cultural assets in people’s inner.

We can read one essential aspect of the dialectical dynamism of the historical self-transformation of soul in Western civilization from this perspective. As is well-known, and as I mentioned in the first section of this paper, Western humanism is informed by the biblical and Christian theological notion of Man as imago Dei, and this particular historical notion endows human being with an extraordinary value and relevance, raising it above all other creatures. This value is strengthened by the Christian dogma of incarnation: God’s kenosis deprives “God” of its sublime transcendent value, and at the same time it invests “Man” (the human condition, sarx) with an unheard of privilege. At the dawn of the modern times, the anthropological turn will provide a renewed version of this privilege. But in the logical shift implied in the Industrial Revolution, what formerly was a cultural truth and had been sedimented as

38 Giegerich, What is Soul?, p. 197-198.
sunken cultural assets in people’s inner throughout history (specifically the high value attributed both to God and the subjective human interiority), constituting the individual consciousness, is submitted to putrefaction, is destroyed by soul itself (remember Jung’s thought experience of the shitting God, as well as his final vision of the extinction of humanity), and a new logical profile is established in the level of soul’s opus magnum, which could be expressed as the “death of God” and the correspondent “end of Man.” This new logical post-humanist configuration, which corresponds to the objective truth of our age, in what refers to its realization in “people’s consciousness as their inner possession” is still in the slow process of integration and/or sedimentation, as very often it is still “experienced as something threatening by consciousness” and rejected as “a scandalous attack upon the culture’s established familiar truth” in those cultural loci which are still influenced by the logically obsolete truth of the self as the highest human value. (All the vehement defense of “human rights” in our times is a cultural reaction against the empirical nefarious consequences of the logical obsolescence of subjectivity, of the historical putrefaction of “Man.”)

This highly valued status of human essence is in blatant and shocking contrast with our dream’s depiction of the self as “garbage.” “Self,” as an explicit topic for the dream-I (“transformation into alien-self” is a semantic content of the dream), is implicitly seen from her initial perspective as something valuable—otherwise, why should the dream-I be shocked by the thought of the worthlessness of self and reject it? The ego position, in the present case (as in Jung’s anguished experience of the shitting God), has an underlying implicit correspondence to cultural former established truths,

---

40 An example of this high value is in Augustine’s so-called “metaphysics of interiority,” a forerunner of modern metaphysics of subjectivity. Let us recall the famous passage of his De Vera Religione: “Noli foras ire, in teipsum redi; in interiore homine habitat Veritas.” Whereas in Augustine Truth (Veritas) constitutes human reason but is ultimately transcendent to it, in the modern metaphysics of subjectivity Truth is wholly coincident with immanence. In the modern form of consciousness, Truth does not only dwell (habitat) in subjectivity: it is subjectivity.

41 Jung’s conception of the “true self as the God image inside oneself” leads to the logical consequence that the value of the individual (and of individuation as opposed to massification) only subsists in the personal relation to God (see his essay “Present and Future,” in CW 10). What happens with this value (and with Jung’s notion of individuation) after the ruin of the concept of “God”? It is also ruined. In other words: it becomes logically obsolete.

42 Here it is worth mentioning the divergence between Catholic and Protestant understanding of the consequences of the “original sin.” To Luther, sin has erased all value from human being (the imago Dei was corrupted), whereas to the Catholic understanding sin only obfuscated the essential relation of human being to God, throwing a shadow (umbra) on it. In the Protestant stance, all value of human being was lost through sin; in the Catholic stance, it was essentially preserved. But according to the logic of both cases, if “God” is disinvested of the psychological value, “human being” is helplessly deprived of any possibility of having its value rescued. Therefore, from a theological standpoint the putrefaction of “Man” brought about by the logical obsolescence of “God” is identical to the absolutization of the consequence of original sin.
and it clashes against the new cultural (modern) truth which comes to supersede them. That is the reason of the rejection in the dream. The putrefaction in the dream and the dream-I’s rejection have to be understood in the dreaming consciousness’ Sitz im Leben, with all the historical undertones that are implied in today’s Western reality: the devaluation of self as worthless and discardable is in frontal opposition to the Christian and early modern sources of Western consciousness. Therefore the sedimented subjective asset of Western humanism, in the form of the dream-I’s initial implicit high valuation of self (at least of “herself”), is completely negated in the image of self as garbage. This conflict is at least implicitly hinted at in the dream, if we seriously take into account the postulates of psychology as the discipline of interiority concerning the historicity of consciousness and the immersion of the human sphere in the soul of the real.

Therefore, in our small dream we can discern an objective correspondence with the ruin of the modern humanist concept of Man (the “end of Man”). This problem belongs to the cultural context of the dreaming consciousness, affecting the historical locus in which the dream takes place, inasmuch as the Christian values have been deeply sunken in Western consciousness (no matter whether the empirical individual is a believer or an atheist).

Putrefaction, which in the dream involves the conscious position of the dream-I, is an all-too-common moment in the initiatory process, and there is no a priori need to see it as necessarily connected to an aspect of the soul of the real. Subjectively speaking, the dream’s initiation discloses the immunity of the dream-I against the truth that is already informing her position. But through the semantic singularity of the expression of the self as “compacted brick of garbage” we can discern a kind of intersection of a moment of the universal syntax of initiation (putrefaction, resulting in a devalued form of self) with a feature of the specific logic of modernity (the logical obsolescence of subjectivity and of individuation, with the consequent substitution by mass-mindedness). Consequently, the dream-I’s resistance is directed against a truth that coincides with an objective aspect of the logic of the real, so that this dream must be interpreted as a moment of an all-too-common initiation, but at the same time as an initiation into an essential logical aspect of the modern soul of the real. It has an objective meaning. The putrefactio in the dream reveals the real immersion of the subjective sphere in the truth of modern age: it is a modern putrefaction. The initiation
into the obsolescence, sublatedness, sunkenness of the self is an initiation into the objective logical status of human condition in the contemporary world. What was only an unconscious “osmotic absorption” of the truth of the age, or simply an idea that did not essentially touch the dreamer herself, is consciously reflected in the dream and establishes a conflict with the initial position of the dream-I by summoning her.

Considering that there is a gap or delay between the initial state of personal consciousness and the objective soul truth of the real, the initial relation of the former with the latter is that of an unconscious “osmotic absorption.” And if psychologically “we have to still get to where we in fact already are,” if the implicit logical truth of the individual also needs “to be taken over by the empirical personality of the individual and established in it as a positively existing self-definition and way of experiencing itself,” then with regards to the logical status of human subjectivity in the broader sphere a modern individual subject may have to be initiated into its logical obsolescence, worthlessness, uselessness and discardedness, provided the particular configuration of consciousness in him/her is still fed by a (logically obsolete) humanist pattern. Now, the transformation displayed in the dream represents an initiation of the dream-I exactly into the worthlessness, uselessness and discardedness of self as “compacted brick of garbage.” But this is precisely the logical status of self as subjectivity in the soul of the real today: it has no function or meaning in the broader objective soul context. This means that in the dream one finds a perfect correspondence with the ruin of the modern concept of self (which, being equivalent to subjectivity, was not only highly valued in the early modern form of consciousness, but also its logical center). This ruin may be understood as the truth of the subject as a “particle in the mass,” the truth of the objective logical obsolescence of subjectivity in the mass-minded form of consciousness.

Our dream is rooted in the present cultural and historical condition of the dreamer. This rootedness manifests itself in the first place in its semantic content, which is expressive of today’s reality. As a rule, the images of the process of individuation in our time “do not represent the reality of the present,” due to the logical obsolescence of individuation, which “is the display of a former truth, but this display itself does not have the status of truth anymore.”

44 Ibid., p. 343.
paradoxical exception to this rule: unless we abstract it from its real rootedness in the particular time and situation in which it occurs, closing our eyes to the correspondence between its central image and the objective truth of the logical obsolescence of self as subjectivity and of individuation, we must admit that the whole subjective situation represented in the dream is indicative of the historical locus of which it is expressive, and which on principle carries within itself the historical past, “both in sedimented form as its own present real constitution and as memory”—otherwise that locus could not be thought of as being historical.

We can give support to this conclusion from another angle: by definition “self” is precisely not the private individual, the narrow egoic subjectivity, designating instead the historical locus at which private individuals find themselves. The objective soul is always embodied, and receives its specific, particular form from the real time and place in which it manifests itself. And “self” reflects the condition of the objective soul at a given historical locus, having an internal infinity of its own, an infinity that “does not have a border to the world, but rather within itself extends, and is open, to the community in which it lives, to the historical situation it finds itself in, and to the historical past it carries within itself (both in sedimented form as its own present real constitution and as memory).”45 Consequently, the absolute negativity and internal infinity of self-as-garbage on principle communicates with the community and the historical situation it finds itself in. We could formulate the paradox of this dream by saying that precisely in depicting its own realm (that of opus parvum) as objectively obsolete, the dream is objectively up-to-date, it is a dream of the “public, truly objective ‘objective psyche’.”46 It expresses semantically the obsolescence of the logic of the individual.

Returning to the dream-I’s rejection of the initiation presented through the dream (similar to Jung’s refusal to think the thought of the obsolescence of the notion of God),47 we must admit that its reason (as in Jung’s case) is in the adherence of the I to

45 Giegerich, *What is Soul?*, p. 298-299. On a footnote to this passage, Giegerich states: “The I is its history.”
46 Giegerich, *Collected English Papers Volume V*, p. 354. “Only if a young man’s dream is not his individual dream, but if he is dreaming the Mercurial dream in today’s prime matter, in what is really going on in our time is it a dream of the objective psyche.” (ibid., p. 352)
47 To a modern humanist position of consciousness, it is as shocking to think of a shitting God as it is to think of self as garbage. What is at stake in both cases? A drastic negation of a previous notion of what “God” or “self” means, so that the devaluation manifested in the shocking semantic content is indicative of the ruin, if not necessarily of the notion itself, certainly of a particular expression of it, of a certain configuration of consciousness ruled by “God as sublime transcendent Being” and “self as the highest human value, *imago Dei*.”
an already logically obsolete notion whose accomplished logical destruction is being depicted in the dream, as hinted at above. Looked at from a strictly *parvum* perspective, the dream-I could not endure the objective inner truth displayed in the dream because it meant the destruction of her personal ego position at that moment. The dream-I resists this movement—or this thought—and this resistance is indicative of the moment of first or simple negation in the dialectical movement, in which there is “weeping and gnashing of teeth,” as a result from a “dramatic clash”: “the ego is turned from its partial views and illusions as it suffers what Jung calls the violence that is done to it by the Self.”

But looked at from a deeper perspective, this logical violence is done to the entire subjective sphere, to soul as subject: the dream presents the devaluation of the entirety of the psychological difference in its all-too-human level, and precisely here it communicates with the soul truth of the age.

There is an important detail in the dream image which points to the logical condition of the specific historical locus in which it is produced. For the semantic expression of the *putrefactio* in the dream is not just in “garbage,” but also in the particular form of “compacted bricks,” which semantically moors the dream image in the specific form of life characteristic of *mass society*, giving to the alien-self the status not only of a common despicable matter, but of a *mass-produced* one. Mass production (in whatever form it takes, even in the humble case of compacted bricks of garbage) is characteristic of our times. Therefore, the dream-I’s rejection, directed to the whole process and not only to an aspect of it, reveals an opposition to the intrinsic *mass quality* of the produced self. Conversely, as the obsolescence of modern subjectivity—a stable logical feature of the objective soul in our time—is correlative of the triumph of mass-mindedness, we can confirm from the mass quality attributed to the self-garbage that the syntactical moment of putrefaction in the dream’s private process of individuation coincides with an essential aspect of the soul of the real. Hence, the dream-I is in opposition to the logic of mass mindedness. By extension, precisely due to this opposition, the dream-I must be thought of as being still partially influenced by a previous mindset, arguably of a humanist quality, in which consciousness *cannot* accept that “self”—its former highly valued essence—has logically decayed to nothing but “mass-produced garbage.”

---

From this perspective, one can further understand the negative disgusted reaction of the dream-I: all the projects, values and views which she presumably stands by (in sum: her conscious position) are incompatible with an absolutely devalued discardable obsolete image of self. To follow the proposed path of initiation presented in the dream means “dying” to her present ego position. But dialectically envisaged, the truth of her present position is precisely that of “compacted bricks of garbage.” In the dream she has ineluctably been expelled from the unconscious immersion in and protection from that truth. She is deprived of her initial implicit idealized and obsolete views about (her)self and world. Self-garbage is the deeper truth of the superficial ego-level opinions and desires.

The dream thought exhibits an undeniable correspondence with the objective soul truth of the *logical obsolescence of soul as subjectivity or self*, a definitional feature of the logical form of Mass Man, as we saw in the first section of this text. It is not difficult to establish a parallel between the devaluation implied in transforming people into compacted bricks of garbage and the truth of soul’s *opus magnum* in the age of Technique and consumerism, as the devaluation of personal human dimension is an objective aspect of the soul of the real. Objectively speaking, human individuals are mere “inputs” to an impersonal objective process (which includes the superstructural ideology of presenting this process as existing in favor of those individuals, so that they willingly participate on it). They are *in truth* and from the outset expropriated from their former logically obsolete status (modern autonomous human subjects) and transformed into something new, other, precisely by being ascribed the logical status of Mass Man, *inasmuch as they are participants in the objective systems of the world.* An empirical example may be helpful here.

Suppose the very ordinary situation of a teleseminar. While it happens, the participants are all connected to machines, to the technical apparatus. From the objective viewpoint (the viewpoint of the technical apparatus itself), their individualities

---

49 Jung compares the huge political and social organizations to a cancerous growth, because “they eat away man’s nature as soon as they become ends in themselves and attain autonomy. From that moment they grow beyond man and escape his control. He becomes their victim and is sacrificed to the madness of an idea that knows no master. All the great organizations in which the individual no longer counts are exposed to this danger.” (CW 10, § 719) Characteristically, he not only sees this situation as “madness,” but also indicates his alternative to it: “There seems to be only one way of countering this threat to our lives, and that is the ‘revaluation’ of the individual.” (ibid.) To Jung, the “global village” is nothing but a lunatic asylum, and its logic is helplessly and literally destructive of humankind, or “man’s nature.” The post-humanist devaluation of the individual is categorically opposed in Jung’s psychological project.
are neither here nor there: they are not assimilated or needed by the objective apparatus, and as such they are irrelevant to the technical process going on at that moment. The participants’ using (and giving themselves to) the objective technical process is all that counts objectively: they are merely human impersonal input to this process. The truly personal does not count in it. For instance: the effort in giving clear expression to a determinate thought in the teleseminar is objectively irrelevant if we consider the contents and meaning of the thought (which we may presume to be personal). It could be anything, it doesn’t matter, as long as the effort in itself is sustained and feeds the technical process, making it alive (just as, in this very same moment, hundreds of millions of other human beings are making exactly the same thing, devoting themselves to the technical apparatus). On the other hand, from the subjective viewpoint, what is truly important is the expression of the contents and the production of meaning, or even better, the contents and meaning themselves. This dimension of the effort is part of one’s larger personal movement of “becoming oneself.”

Empirically speaking, by connecting oneself to the technical apparatus one establishes a relation of continuity between oneself and the apparatus. This connection creates a new situation in which the individual is integrated as a part of the technical environment and the technical environment is effectively realized, “brought into life,” so to speak. In this new situation, thought of from the point of view of the technical environment, the personal individuality doesn’t matter at all. It is irrelevant. All that counts are the informations, flowing “through the wires” from the individual to the “machines;” the informations are grasped and algorithmically processed by the technical apparatus, which then executes its specific programmed task. In this way, the “machines” realize themselves, completely fulfilling their essence and purpose.

The personal subjective character of the individual is useless to the informational technical process. It has no function, no relevance. The individual connected as input to the technical apparatus can be anyone, regardless of race, gender, age, sexual idiosyncrasies, nationality, political profile, religious belief, socio-economic status, educational level, profession, personal history, aesthetic preferences, moral character etc. The human individuality is on principle discarded from the technical environment as irrelevant, and could be consistently imaged as “garbage”: it has no use, no value for
the process. Hence we find an empirically available analogy for the logical identity of “connecting,” “compacting” and “transforming” in the dream, of entering in relation to the technical apparatus and being transformed into “compacted bricks of garbage.”

What distinguishes the modern form of consciousness from all other previous forms is its being emancipated from soul, its autonomy, its being equivalent to “born man.” In the dream the self-garbage discardedness can be thought of as correlative of its emancipatedness. Therefore, the dream process may be interpreted as a first moment of an initiation into modern consciousness’ emancipatedness. Correspondingly, from the standpoint of the soul of the real today an emancipated consciousness is superfluous, has no value or function at all, and thus is logically discardable, obsolete. And soul itself produces the conditions for emancipation, so that emancipation from soul does not mean stepping out of soul, but only a differentiation accomplished within soul itself.

Now, in deepening this specific image of the self towards the logical place reserved to humanness in the objective order of today’s world, we can see the paradox or ambiguity inherent to the logical status of Mass Man: it is the logical place where modern autonomous subjectivity finds its death (an empirical individual wholly engulfed by the logic of mass-mindedness is not an autonomous subject anymore). At the same time, this logical place is a gate to emancipation, provided the individual consciousness acknowledges its objective sublatedness, obsolescence (in the language of the dream: is initiated into its objective garbage status) so as to become able to differentiate itself from the logic of modern life, while at the same time participating on it as an atom in the mass. And it is precisely in fully and consciously surrendering itself to this logic that consciousness can be relatively freed of it, emancipating itself. The irrelevantification of all-too-human individual reality, its humiliating devaluation, forces consciousness to recognize the humble condition of the individual self-subject.

50 We could apply here what Wolfgang Giegerich says of information in a different context: “Information in the modern sense is essentially alienated from people, and people are alienated from it” (Wolfgang Giegerich. Collected English Papers. Volume II: Technology and the Soul. From the Nuclear Bomb to the World Wide Web. New Orleans: Spring Journal and Books, 2007, p. 292)—even when this information is extracted from people.

51 “All the new technical and scientific developments do not have to go to our heads. I do not need to personally embrace every new technical possibility and to get enthralled and engulfed by a fascination for it as if it entailed the promise of heaven on earth, nor do I have to personally identify with the logic of modernity and thus forget who I really am and what my real needs as a human being are. But on the other hand, I certainly do want to stay aware of and in contact with the soul’s opus magnum and respect and appreciate it. I see the obsolescence, sublatedness, sunkeness of what may be of great importance to me as private individual. (…) But then again, I also keep my distance from it, distinguish and emancipate
Due to the equivalence of the truth implied in the semantic depiction of self as “compacted brick of garbage” and the modern truth of the logical obsolescence of subjectivity, which precisely imposes the irrelevatification of human being, the logical obsolescence, sublatedness and sunkenness of subjectivity, it seems plausible to state that this small dream is clearly permeated and informed by the soul of the real. Consequently, the deeper psychological purpose of this dream is to self-consciously initiate the dream-I into the modern truth into which the dreamer (and all of us) was born and as which she consequently already existed.

To summarize my argument: my contention is that in the dream here presented arguably there is a disclosure of the hidden nature of the real, and thus in it there is a perceptible communication with the actual current status of soul at the level of opus magnum. As such, in this dream soul comes home to itself through the dream-I, initiating consciousness into an aspect of soul’s objective opus magnum status. Hence, in this case, the correspondence between the two separate levels is explicitly provided and realized by soul itself. While staying completely at the level of opus parvum (insofar as it is a parvum event, having only private relevance), the dream gives semantic expression to a truth belonging to the impersonal reality of soul’s opus magnum status. Hence, the logical obsolescence or sublatedness of soul as subjectivity, the “end of Man”—is a logical feature historically accomplished in modernity, corresponding to the objective fulfillment of mass-mindedness. As such, it is a universal logical presupposition to any psychological event happening in the subjective sphere of soul’s opus parvum today—for instance, in the initiatory subjective inner processes of individuals. The singularity of the dream here analyzed is that this logical presupposition itself, the syntactical change that produced this truth of the age, is explicitly made conscious.

This does not mean that the dream has an inflated or spectacular relevance. No. It remains an all-too-human objectively irrelevant event, as such only relevant to the individual subject living it. Differently from the process of initiation in other cultures, and in a way that is typical for the emancipation of modern man, this initiatory process is irrelevant to the broader sphere of the culture, it is only a private event, and has no public interest. It only follows and displays the logical pattern of the historical locus in myself from where the soul is today, from the new logic of modern life, holding my place and staying down to earth as ‘only that!,’ living my life only as this private individual that I am, in conscious recognition of my human-all-too-humanness and my personal needs as a human being.” (Giegerich, Collected English Papers Volume V, p. 368)
which it occurs (the obsolescence of the subjective sphere), this constituting its interest to us. And this embeddedness in the soul of the real can even have a disinflating effect, insofar as it cannot be seen as being original, one-of-a-kind, but is only that: a normal psychic event liable to happen to many people in this time and age. No big deal.

I have submitted the first draft of this paper to Wolfgang Giegerich and he severely criticized it. He showed me that I was mistaken in many regards, and I gratefully cleansed my argument of those misguided reasonings. However, after a careful examination and reworking of my dream interpretation, I could not manage to reach a different position concerning its main thesis, and so a divergence persists. Giegerich definitely does not agree with me that the initiation in this dream has anything whatsoever to do with the logic of *opus magnum*, and hence he envisages my standpoint here as an attempt of reading into the dream “a theory about modern history or observations of present-day cultural conditions.” The soul process in the dream, according to his stance, would be only aiming at establishing the psychological difference on the private sphere, initiating the dream-I into the soul side of it. Nothing but soul’s *opus parvum*. While I concur with him regarding this restricted parvum telos of the dream, I nonetheless continue to claim that this initiation is simultaneously an initiation into the broader truth of the real. In other words: with regards to this dream, Giegerich maintains the absolute disengagement between the two levels, while I insist on their one-way explicit communication. It follows from his standpoint that the coincidence that I point between the syntax of the dream (putrefaction), as expressed in its particular semantics, and an aspect of the logic of the real (logical obsolescence of subjectivity) is merely casual, applied from outside, and does not legitimately belong to the dream image itself; my contention, on its turn, relies precisely on the semantics of “self-as-compacted-brick-of-garbage,” which, as I have stated, corresponds to the distinctive logical/syntactical feature of modern consciousness: born man’s emancipation from soul (correlative of the logical obsolescence of subjectivity). Moreover, my interpretation is also based on the assumption of the real pervasiveness of the human sphere by the truth of the age, with the resulting consequence that consciousness is truly permeated and governed by it in all its acts—a stance which I take from Giegerich’s thought. To me, the self or subjectivity semantically portrayed as

---

52 Personal communication, 16 February 2014.
compacted brick of garbage intrinsically corresponds to an objective feature of the soul truth of our age. This coincidence should not be seen as merely forced from the outside, but as a proof of the real ruling power of the truth of the age over the individual subjective dreaming consciousness, at least in this particular case.

Maybe, when consciousness is completely divested of its former highest value—Man—and wholly informed by the new post-humanist stance, it will not be so shocking for the empirical individual to see subjectivity represented as garbage in relation to the broader inhuman organization of the world: it may be the humiliating way of reaching now the position of recognizing one’s true size: “I’m only that.” Paradoxically, it may also be the way of breaking the identification with the logic of our new modern life and of returning to the humble human condition, to the logical obsolescence of the subjective truth.

Having in mind the conditions of existence in later modernity, Wolfgang Giegerich has stated that we are again living in the jungle. Given the total logical sublatedness of the human subjective position in this same late modern (or post-modern) world, we can say that “living in the jungle” means that we are living within the logic of totalitarian human sacrifice (to soul), a sacrifice which is total and perfect because it is not performed only on an individual victim, and on a special occasion. It is absolute, realized all the time and on all of us, because it has been interiorized into the logic or syntax of the soul of the real. This, as I have proposed on the “Requiem for Analytical Psychology,” is the soul meaning of “the final catastrophe” seen by Jung on his death-bed. To me, it is also this deeper level of meaning that the initiatory dream here discussed presented before the disgusted eyes of the rejecting dream-I.

Appendix

In order to provide a contrast and a parallel to the dream interpretation just presented and to make clearer what is at stake in my argument, I will now comment on two additional dreams by a 12 years-old girl. The semantics of these two dreams is obviously indicative of the particular historical emplacement of soul in the Age of Technique. Differently from the previous dream analyzed, in the girl’s dreams I can see no explicit semantic clue (as “shocking transformation into alien/self compacted bricks

"of garbage" was) pointing perceptibly to the correspondence between the logic of the dream and an aspect of the logical modern status of soul. Such semantic and syntactical correspondence is needed if one wants to legitimately speak of a potential self-conscious initiation into the truth of the age.

The girl dreams that she is inside a taxi, the windows are open. It starts to rain, and she asks the taxi driver to close the windows. He doesn’t seem to hear and continues to drive ahead. The rain gets stronger, and she asks again the taxi driver to shut the windows, without any answer. Then she sees some lights coming from underneath the clothes of the driver, and as she raises his shirt she sees that he is a malfunctioning robot. She then perceives that the taximeter is running backwards, and that it is in reality a bomb. The bomb explodes.

A most important detail in this dream experience: the dreamer did not wake up in panic from this seemingly frightful nightmare—which means very simply and obviously that it is not experienced as a nightmare. There is no sign of anxiety triggered by any sense of literal psychic alienation or self-destruction. It is probably not irrelevant the circumstance that this girl, being born in a more advanced moment of the technological configuration of the human mode of being-in-the-world, has been far less informed by the previous modern ethical humanist standards than the woman who dreamt of (and felt disgust at) the transformation of human beings into compacted bricks of garbage.

If we envisage dialectically the dream image from the standpoint of interiority, we can say that “rain” and “cab” display an internal relation of soul with itself. We should then ask what is the purpose or telos of this self-relation. In mythologized form: what does the soul want?

The answer should be found in the dream itself. What happens in it? The dream-I perceives her whole situation in the taxi. Hence, in a first moment, we may say that soul produces this insight, it is this insight as the creation of (self) consciousness. This production of consciousness is triggered, precisely, by soul itself (in the form of “rain”) self-negating soul as self-enclosed symbiosis of dream-I and taxi driver. It is soul as “rain” that leads soul as the “dream-I” to find out the mal-functioning in soul as “robot taxi driver.” It thus discloses the position of the dream-I as distinct from that of the malfunctioning robot.

But, is there really a “mal-functioning” of the robot, in the sense of a mistake, of something going wrong which ideally should not happen, and consequently should be
fixed or prevented? The mal-functioning is intended by soul itself, and therefore it is not an accidental mal-functioning at bottom, but a programmed way of accomplishing a certain plan in the production of consciousness as a whole. The first step in this plan is breaking the comfortable protected containment of the dream-I in the cab, through “rain” coming in and then through the realization of the “mal-functioning” of the robot. The mal-functioning amounts to the robot’s not hearing or obeying the dream-I’s request. Hence we have here the pictorial expression of the dialectical moment of first negation: soul as robot taxi driver negates the position of soul as dream-I. This contradiction is sufficient to wake up the dream-I to the realization that soul is not submitted to the ego sphere or intended to supply all the subject’s needs (by isolating her from the “rainy world”). Soul breaks the possible symbiosis of the dream-I with the robot taxi driver.

In other words: the dream makes consciousness through a strong revelation or self-manifestation of the psychological difference, by breaking the containment and identity of the dream-I with the cab and its driver. The pictorial and semantic contrast between external world bringing some discomfort to the subject and the self-enclosed technological environment supposedly protective against the world discloses the dream’s logical initiatory purpose: the destruction of the childlike innocence and dreaming harmlessness “of a seamless transition from reality to fantasy,” opening “the mind of the youngster for the first time to empirical reality” and grounding it “in the earth.”

The second step of soul’s initiatory plan of self-realization in the dream is in the bomb and the explosion. It corresponds to the dialectical moment of negation of negation: the whole opposition between the dream-I and the robot taxi driver is “exploded,” a beautiful example of the “sublating collapse.” The calmness of the dream-I, in contradistinction to the disgust which seized the dreamer in the previous dream, is indicative of the moment of the second-order negation, which aims at and quietly affects the syntactical structure of consciousness (despite being imaged as a bomb explosion). The total destruction is precisely the pictorial expression of this logical shift on the status of consciousness. The explosion is thus intended by soul, it is

---

54 Giegerich, Collected English Papers Volume V, p. 73. Through initiation, the child is “shocked out of innocence, out of the state of dreaming, out of existence in fantasy, and with a rude awakening forced into an awareness of the earth in its relentless empirical reality and in its fundamental difference from fantasy.” (ibid., pp. 74-75)

55 See Mogenson, loc. cit., p. 95.
the apex of soul activity in the dream, and its telos (reached through destroying both the dream-I and the cab with its robot taxi driver) is the overcoming of the relation of 
exernal containment, presumably in order to reach a new dialectical form of unity: “consciousness is humbled to know itself as the unity of the identity and difference of human and [not-human].”\textsuperscript{56} In other words: external containment must be interiorized.

In the dream, the dream-I is initiated into its real position within the whole soul situation. The calmness with which she faces death confirms that the bomb explosion is a form of “initiatory dismemberment,” typical of the negation of negation, which “cannot be accomplished without this resolve of the subject to maintain itself through death.”\textsuperscript{57}

The same girl dreams a few weeks later that she is in the school van, and she is with her legs up on the top of one seat. One of her legs is bionic. Her colleagues look at it with admiration. What could arguably be interpreted, from a personalistic ego-psychological perspective, as a sign of a possible pathological depersonalization, can be better read as an effect of a deeper syntactical change occurred in the constitution of consciousness being implemented in the dream-I. This initiation has indeed a moment of de-personalization, here symbolized by the integration of the psychic other (symbolized by the bionic leg) in her new identity. The resulting position is the dialectical unity of human and not-human (the technical element) in the new status reached, which could be described as the status of cyborg. It seems that the telos shown in the previous dream, namely, the possibility of consciousness reaching a more advanced level, is here accomplished: an unified new position is reached (here I take the two dreams as a single psychological process).

Now, the cyborg is not just an empirical image-concept, a metaphorical concoction of the dream with strictly private and personal meaning. Like the nuclear bomb, the web, the media, the advanced forms of capitalism, the flight to the moon, television, the cyborg is truly symbolic for our time. It is a living concept of highest soul meaning: it points to the irrevocable explosion of former naturalistic limits of soul’s self-presentation, to soul’s abandonment of “nature” as a psychologically relevant dimension. It is an explicit symbol for the post-humanist age, inasmuch as it represents the irrevocable dissolution of the notion of “human nature” and its complete sublation in

\textsuperscript{56} Mogenson, loc. cit., p. 94 (adapted to fit the context of the dream)
\textsuperscript{57} Mogenson, loc. cit., p. 97.
the essential (notional, logical) merger of human and technological. In the symbol of the cyborg is notionally condensed the whole logical revolution which separates modernity from all other traditional forms of culture.

However, from the fact that “cyborg” is symbolic for our time, it does not follow automatically that a dream with a cyborg refers to the truth of our age. Similarly, if one dreams that one is flying to the moon, this does not necessarily have to do with the truth of the age, despite the “flight to the moon” being symbolic for our time. The important detail in the dream image is that it displays a cyborgian dream-I, which here is a semantic sign of a new constitution of personal consciousness (after the explosion of the previous dream). This is confirmed by the admiration the colleagues feel in looking the cyborgian leg. One could say that the girl’s second dream displays an accomplished logical shift in the constitution of the dream-I, which is syntactically analogous to traditional motifs of initiation (for instance: the transformation into an animal representative of an archaic culture’s symbolic heritage).

However, despite the common syntactical form which rules the initiatory process wherever initiation occurs, it should be stressed that there is a significant logical difference implied in a modern initiation. In the context of shamanistic initiations, the non-human form of the self—as a rule an animal—is taken from nature and invested with a sacred value, so that a traditional initiation is not only of communal, public relevance for the tribe, but also is essentially spiritual or religious, which means that it has a high soul objective significance. In a modern initiation, by contrast, the whole process has become nothing but a private experience, with no objective soul relevance.

58 Differently, a simple robot does not have this same soul relevance, as it is nothing but a highly advanced and developed, complex machine. It is in logical continuity with, say, a windmill, or the steam engine which triggered the Industrial Revolution. The cyborg, on the other hand, represents a logical, notional novelty: neither a machine, nor a “natural” human being, it overcomes both.

59 In the same line, in his essay on the psychological meaning of flying saucers (CW 10) Jung examines some expressions of the motif of UFOs in dreams and paintings, and sees in them an objective soul depth, symbolic for an opus magnum soul process, relating them to the collective predicament of Western consciousness. However, in one of the dreams analyzed— that of a young actress (see CW 10, § 704-711, dream 6)—he sees in the UFO dream image nothing but the depiction of an exclusively personal problem, without any objective meaning.

60 The cyborgian dream-I is a novelty in consciousness which causes admiration in consciousness itself, in the form of the marveled colleagues. We could apply to this new subjective constitution what Wolfgang Giegerich says, in a different context, of the insight as an exotic object in front of consciousness: “the more consciousness, full of admiration, looks at this exotic object, the less exotic it will become for it. Consciousness slowly familiarizes itself with it. In addition, the insight is radioactive, it radiates. It infects the consciousness looking at it. Consciousness thus gradually integrates it into its inventory. (...) the object ceases to be an object out there and enters the mode of consciousness’s own thinking, the syntax or logical constitution of consciousness itself.” (Wolfgang Giegerich. Neurosis. The Logic of a Metaphysical Illness. New Orleans: Spring Journal and Books, 2013, p. 313-314)
(due to the logical obsolescence of the human sphere), and additionally it has no spiritual-religious significance, being wholly secularized. The cyborg, in our example, is symbolic for our age, but it has no transcendent value as, for instance, the Great Spirit of the Buffalos had among some Native American Indian tribes. Besides that, being transformed into a cyborg represents an advanced moment in the assimilation of the individual to the soul fundaments of our modern world through “osmotic absorption,” but it has no relevance to the logically mass-minded world itself. By contrast, the initiatory assimilation of an individual to the communal ethos in the context of traditional societies is of vital importance and significance for the culture. Finally: being transformed into an eagle, or a bear, is syntactically equivalent to being transformed into a cyborg. However, whereas the different animals representing semantically the psychic other in different traditional cultures are rigorously and completely equivalent from the syntactical point of view of initiation, the cyborg is at once equivalent to them (as a semantic expression of the psychic other in the initiatory process) and not equivalent to them (inasmuch as notionally it represents the logical rupture which separates the modern form of consciousness from the traditional one: the objective irrelevantification of both the natural and the human spheres with regards to soul’s opus magnum). The common initiatory syntax should not hinder us from seeing the radical logical change produced in and definitional of the modern form of consciousness, which is embedded in the notion of “cyborg.”

Be that as it may, the truth of the age symbolized by the cyborg does not come home to itself in the second dream as truth (as is explicitly the case with the dream of the transformation into alien/self as compacted brick of garbage, in which the shock suffered by consciousness in the dream-I is indicative of the coming home of truth to itself, “home” meaning truth’s self-consciousness of itself in the subjective realm—even if it was rejected, or rather: precisely because it was rejected). Consequently, here the strict interiorization of the girl’s dream-image and its initiatory syntax are not sufficient to allowing the conclusion that the dream reflects explicitly and self-consciously the logic of soul’s opus magnum. The new constitution of the dream-I simply follows the objective pattern established in our culture, but this is a common syntactical feature in any initiatory process whatsoever. For us, from an external point of view, the dream is indicative of the alluded “osmotic absorption” of the objective soul truth, or the distinctively modern logical configuration implicit in the symbol of the cyborg.
To summarize: taken as expressive of an *opus parvum* soul process in the girl, her two dreams have a clearly traditional initiatory nature, using the present day’s material to semanticize itself. Additionally the second dream allows us to think this personal process as a specifically modern initiation, grounded in the truth of the age but only through “osmotic absorption,” being thus only implicitly informed by the logic of *opus magnum*: consciousness in the girl reaches an *adult* status which is simultaneously and implicitly *truly modern*. We should obviously presuppose that consciousness in the dreamer-girl too is wholly embedded in the soul of the real, according to our basic assumptions. Therefore the initiation of consciousness potentially implied in her dreams could also *on principle* include the osmotic assimilation of the specific new modern logic of soul.

Objectively, the post-humanist mode of being-in-the-world is built through the logical putrefaction of the previous early modern and Christian humanist stance. This putrefaction can be explicitly semanticized as happens in the dream of the transformation of people into compacted bricks of garbage, denoting that consciousness in the position of the dream-I has not reached yet the objective post-humanist logical stance and is confronted with it. Or its final result (the total logical worthlessness of the self) can in some cases be already accomplished, so that there is no need of a dramatic initiation into this moment of the objective soul truth. If we would compare the process of initiation as displayed in the instances of these two dreamers, from the point of view of the modern form of consciousness, it seems plausible to state that the moment of assimilation of the logical obsolescence of the human self (the “end of Man”) may be already psychologically accomplished in the girl as a matter of course in her experience of the world, as an already sunken cultural asset, a “part of the make-up of her personality.” Hence, she does not have to go through the same kind of shocking insight such as that of the “transformation into alien/self as compacted bricks of garbage”: this first immediacy is not needed anymore, so that after the explosion of the robot-driven cab (a modern version of initiatory dismemberment) her transformation can proceed to its next stage. The end of Man is the explicit topic of the woman’s shocking dream; it is just the sedimented unconscious background of the girl’s dreams, implicit in the new cyborgian constitution of the dream-I in an archaeological way, so to speak. This is the difference and contrast I find between the initiatory experiences of these two dreamers.