

# A preliminary sketch of a Jungian socioanalysis – an emerging theory combining analytical psychology, complexity theories, sociological theories, socio- and psycho-analysis, group analysis and affect theories<sup>1</sup>

Dorte Odde, Aarhus, Denmark and Arne Vestergaard, Copenhagen, Denmark

**Abstract:** This paper presents a preliminary sketch of what we have termed a Jungian socioanalysis – an emerging theory combining analytical psychology, complexity theories, sociological theories, socio- and psycho-analysis, group analysis and affect theories. Our assumption is that Jungian theory and practice need to attend to and focus more on social contexts, sociality and the influence of societal developments. But also, on the other hand, that analytical psychology, primarily Jung's theory of individuation and the transcendent function as well as the broad complexity perspective of his theory of psyche, can be extended to a 'socio' and not just a 'psycho' perspective. The paper presents five foundational assumptions for a Jungian socioanalysis, with the following headings: 1) A Jungian socioanalysis calls for a complex psychology; 2) (Un)consciousness is social and sociality has a dimension of (un)consciousness; 3) A Jungian socioanalysis explores social fields 'from within' by smaller groups; 4) A Jungian socioanalysis enables and is enabled by emerging metaphors and affect-imagery; 5) Socio-cultural fields have an impulse toward individuation. This is the first of two papers in the present edition of the journal – the second paper gives socio-clinical illustrations of our thesis in this paper.

**Keywords:** affect-imagery, body, complex psychology, group analysis, individuation, metaphors, rhizome, sociality, socioanalysis, socio-cultural field, transcendent function

---

## Introduction

In this paper, we present a preliminary sketch of a Jungian socioanalysis defined as the study of relational, group, organizational and societal dynamics using analytical psychological approaches and concepts – in combination with

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper arose out of a presentation at the IV European Congress of Analytical Psychology: *Bridging the Familiar and the Unfamiliar in the Europe of Today: Cultural and Clinical Perspectives*, 30 August - 2 September 2018. It is also published in the *Revue de Psychologie Analytique*, 2021, n° 10.

sociological, socioanalytic and complexity theoretical perspectives as well as drawing on group analysis, affect theories and more. Many aspects need to be included and many perspectives are necessary in pursuing such an analytic; therefore we suggest a transdisciplinary approach.

This is the first of two papers published in this edition of the journal. The second paper, to which we regularly refer, gives socio-clinical illustrations of our thesis in the present paper.

In a sense, we try to further develop the theoretical perspective of socioanalysis. Outside Jungian circles, socioanalysis has been established for decades. It explores 'larger contextual entities which connect as well as divide people, the restraints and constraints of which are largely unconscious' (Scholtz 2017, p. 33).

Our assumption is, on the one hand, that Jungian theory and practice need to attend to and focus more on social contexts, sociality and the influence of societal developments. And, on the other hand, that socioanalysis as it has been described (e.g. Long 2013), would benefit from adopting some of Jung's approaches to complexity, in particular Jung's theories of individuation and the transcendent function.

Our work builds on the conception that analyses of 'psycho' and 'socio' are different only on an abstract level, and that the process dynamics which a Jungian psychoanalysis and a Jungian socioanalysis explore, are aspects of the same phenomenon. A Jungian socioanalysis is as such not *complementary* to psychoanalysis, but represents a *corrective* of a one-sided separation of sociality and individuality, where the importance of the social world and the embeddedness of individual experience in sociality is downplayed. And a Jungian socioanalysis is at the same time a corrective of the opposite one-sidedness, when found in social and organizational theories that assume the existence of a social world abstracted from intrapersonal and intersubjective worlds.

In short, we understand socio-cultural fields and the individual as emerging from the same dynamic processes of (past and present) interaction and relatedness. This point of departure is analogous to so-called dual-aspect monism<sup>2</sup>, which recently has been brought forward in discussion of the mind-matter relationship in analytical psychology (e.g. Atmanspacher 2012; Hogenson 2019) and of the mind-body relationship in neuro-psychoanalysis (Solms 2019). In sociology, the dual aspects of the body as a part of self and part of the world at the same time, has been proposed (Rosa 2019).

Although Jung did not actually propose a dual-aspect monism, he had similar ideas concerning 'inner' and 'outer' aspects of the individuation process:

<sup>2</sup> Dual-aspect monism (distinct from dualism) is the view that the mental and the physical are two perspectives on the same substance: the mental and the physical are conceived as distinct, yet inseparable and mutually irreducible. The Pauli-Jung conjecture (Atmanspacher 2012) further elaborates this position, showing that different aspects may show a complementarity in a quantum physical sense, that is: there may be incompatible descriptions of different parts that emerge from the same substance.

Individuation has two principal aspects: in the first place it is an internal and subjective process of integration, and in the second it is an equally indispensable process of objective relationship. Neither can exist without the other, although sometimes the one and sometimes the other predominate.

(Jung 1954, para. 448)

From this it follows that Jungian analysis must also have two principal and indispensable aspects: socioanalysis and psychoanalysis – where ‘neither can exist without the other’. Individuality and sociality must be studied as aspects of the same process, and relational and intrapsychic aspects must be integrated in analytical work.

Jungian analysis has included both *psychoanalysis* and *socioanalysis* but, in our view, the analysis of sociality is less explicitly founded and conceptualized, compared to analysis of intrapsychic processes. The first pitfall we want to avoid is that analytical psychology and analytical practice underestimates the influence that the embeddedness in cultural, societal and relational contexts exerts on the life of the individual. The second pitfall is that analytical psychology might have relatively little of value to contribute in understanding change and solving problems in social fields.

Following Singer & Kimbles (2004) we believe that:

collective life more often than not has fallen into the Jungian shadow – so much so that it is easy to feel within the Jungian tradition as if the life of the group and the individuals’ participation in it exists in a no man’s land, suspended in the ether somewhere between the much more important and meaningful individual and/or archetypal realms.

(Singer & Kimbles 2004, p. 4)

Singer and Kimbles develop the notion of cultural complexes to remedy this situation, pointing to the necessity of developing an understanding of the group, linking it with the archetypal and personal realms of the psyche and the outer world. We agree that it is necessary in the Jungian tradition to develop a perspective on sociality, including groups. But for us complexes are always cultural or rather *socio-cultural* as well as expressed bodily, existing in networks interrelated with other complexes. And while Singer and Kimbles develop a perspective on the content of specific cultural complexes, in other words how they *are*, we focus on the theoretical basis for our analysis of sociality. Our interest concerns *how* complexes constellate as defences against complexity, with what affects, images and effects and also how they change and possibly individuate into containment of complexities. We will now proceed to unfold five foundational assumptions for an emerging, transdisciplinary Jungian socioanalysis.

## Foundational assumptions for a Jungian socioanalysis

### 1. A Jungian socioanalysis calls for a complex psychology

Jungian socioanalysis studies sociality and how its constellation in social fields contextualize and affect psychological life. We might say that it studies the *psychological truth* (Bain 1999) of sociality (relationships, families, groups, organizations, societies etc.). Jung's quest for developing a complex psychology had its focus on the negative consequences of one-sidedness – and other ways of attempting to reduce the complexity of psychological experience, however tempting they might be. It has been suggested that reduction, denial or avoidance of social complexity may in fact lead to the constellation of a *complexity complex*, causing our inability to act collectively and effectively in relation to complex, global challenges like climate and migrant crises (Vestergaard 2016).

The form of Jungian socioanalysis we are sketching provides space for reflexivity, where a group of people gather to make sense of conscious as well as unconscious experience and individual and relational forces *in all their complexity*. It aims at finding expressions for the psychological truth of sociality – as it emerges in the group process of the participants and in the larger social field. Affects, images, metaphors and narratives are among the raw material of the Jungian socioanalytic approach. The joint process of inquiry eventually leads to the emergence of sufficiently complex and contextualized images, affects and understandings of the sociality in focus for that particular setting.

Jung's psychology is in many ways well-suited for the foundation of a Jungian socioanalysis. Not least because he explicitly termed his psychology 'complex', namely that 'Complex psychology means the psychology of 'complexities', i.e. of complex psychical systems in contradistinction from relatively elementary factors' (Jung 1954 in Shamdasani 2003, p. 14).

Jung's aim was to formulate a general psychology, not only a psychology on which psychotherapy could be founded. In the above-mentioned quotation, Jung formulated the ambition of a psychology about the psyche in focus without 'the constrictions of compartments' (*ibid.*, p. 15). And we could add, a psychology where one-sidedness, dualisms and tempting abstractions reducing the complexity of the world is avoided.

Similarly, we have been searching for perspectives on and theories about sociality that do not eliminate or reduce complexity. Decades ago, sociologists like G.H. Mead (2015) and Norbert Elias (2000) developed such theories. In their view, subjectivity emerges from intersubjectivity no less than intersubjectivity emerges from subjectivity. They avoid the reduction of complexity that quite temptingly divides an understanding of the person from the understanding of the group; or individuality from sociality. What we call groups, systems and states are emergent outcomes of myriad interactions at the local interpersonal level. What we call personal emerges from

participation in (patterned) socio-cultural interactions. Paradoxically, sociality and individuality is co-produced simultaneously by *one and the same process*.

At the University of Hertfordshire, a group led by Ralph Stacey added complexity theory to these sociological theories, leading to the formulation of a theory about organizations as complex, responsive processes of relating. Organizational patterns, for example, procedures, structures, beliefs and culture, emerge from local interactions by people following their intentions. Patterns may stabilize, even to the extent that they appear to us as structures. Or patterns may change and appear to us more like processes. Stacey's point is that sociality is paradoxically stable and changing, solid and fluid at the same time. Local interactions 'form' global patterns that simultaneously have a 'forming' effect on local interactions (Stacey 2007).

From this complexity theoretical view, sociality (as constellated in a group, an organization, a society) cannot be analysed from an objective stance, or from a distance. In processes of investigation/researching, consulting or intervention there are no privileged points of view, where we as researchers and consultants among others can be objective and unaffected by the process. The often-used term the '*system-as-a-whole*' among systems thinking, referring to an organization as an object to be analysed, may be leading us wrongly into relating to and communicating with sociality as an object, not a process. The only possible way to research and intervene in complex processes of relating is through subjectivity, that is, by participating, interacting and being with people in the everyday politics of an organization.

For this reason, Jungian socioanalysis explores sociality by letting oneself be affected by the experience of 'being with' others – whether one is the consultant, the researcher or working for the organization. The possible knowledge emerging, for example, from an image or hypothesis, arises from within the field of inquiry itself, and its validation stems from the process itself and its participants, including the researcher/consultant. This eventually leads to knowing from *within* the social field as contrasted to an objective inquiry with a possible ideal of not being involved.

We have so far avoided the often-used term 'system' about the phenomena of sociality. The reason for this is that we suspect the metaphor 'system' leads to the aforementioned separated and 'thing-ish' perspective of sociality. As an alternative, the metaphor of the *field* has been developed in the social sciences. Social psychologist Kurt Lewin (1951) defines the psychological field as the combination of all the factors that influences a person's behaviour at any time. In sociology, Bourdieu (1993) examines how individuals construct social fields, and how individuals are affected by such fields. In psychoanalysis the concept of the analytic field has been put forward by several authors in a non-reductive attempt to encompass the complexity of the interplay in the analytical relationship (one of them being Winborn [2018]). The truth of the analysis is no longer something only the analyst arrives at, and it cannot be fixed or possessed; the truth of analysis is

the experience (Civitaresse & Ferro 2018). In organizational psychology the psychodynamic field is a central concept (e.g. Heinskou & Visholm 2016) and finally, field thinking was brought into socioanalysis by Susan Long:

The social field (or parts of it) are ‘in the individuals’, which gives an impression altogether different from the individual being ‘in the social field’. The social field of the unconscious is in each individual in the sense that it is in the connections and the mental associations between them.

(Long 2013, p. 8)

For us, the importance of the field metaphor lies in its non-reductive and non-dualist process character, encompassing the paradox of sociality being fluid and solid at the same time. As mentioned in the introduction, we assume that self and sociality are aspects of the same processes, continuously and mutually co-created and maintained. As individuals, we are paradoxically forming and being formed by the social and cultural processes of which we take part. It is precisely by embracing these paradoxes that the door is opened to the Jungian socioanalysis we are developing.

## 2. *(Un)consciousness is social and sociality has a dimension of (un)consciousness*

In the perspective of a Jungian socioanalysis, we search for ways to explore unconscious aspects of sociality and we approach (un)consciousness as a social phenomenon. The individual is always already connected to other individuals and embedded in sociality.

In our approach (un)consciousness can both be collective and universal, as well as specific and local – and both at the same time. Here (under the second assumption) we will primarily describe how unconsciousness is social, and in the third assumption we explore how a Jungian socioanalysis can understand and go about investigating the unconscious dimension of sociality.

Socioanalysis, as well as psychoanalysis, aims at facilitating a transformation in the configuration of what is conscious and what is unconscious; typically to create more consciousness. We do not subscribe, however, to the notion of a strict border between consciousness and unconsciousness; for us these two notions are two extreme points in a dimension of unconsciousness-consciousness ((un)consciousness). (Un-)consciousness is simultaneously current processes, entangled and confused and on the same spatial level; often unconsciousness is placed underneath, i.e. in the cellar, whereas consciousness is placed in the sky or is seen as the symbol of the sun. This is not wholly wrong; Lakoff and Johnson (2003) have shown that this is the way we as human beings metaphorize, but we need to be open to (un-)consciousness appearing in unexpected ways and forms. (Un-)consciousness is not localized in one particular place, as the notion of *the* unconscious seems to suggest – or

perhaps we should rather say, that (un-)consciousness is localized everywhere and nowhere. But it can and will appear and emerge in a particular place, and we should be alert to what particular place that would be.

Jung invented the term the *collective unconscious*, and his focus was on universality – the common unconscious ground for humanity, and by demonstrating universality, he wanted to prove his theory of the archetypal. Our focus is different, even though we agree on the potential universality of (un)consciousness – not least because of the enormous development in mass media and the internet in general, as well as the process of globalization. We understand unconsciousness as relational and as an aspect of living in a number of local socio-cultural fields, rather than a personal possession. Jungian Socioanalysis focuses on patterns, images, symbols, and metaphors connected with affects. Images emerge on different levels, some more existential than others as well as following more universal patterns – one of them being an archetypal level of existence (Odde 2020).

In the following, we will substantiate the above notions with the help of three concepts from the group analytic tradition, as well as socioanalysis and modern continental philosophy: the *matrix*, the *associative unconscious* and the *rhizome* – concepts that all point to the relationship between sociality and (un)consciousness. These concepts contribute to the foundation of a complex psychological understanding of individuality and sociality as aspects of one and the same process.

The group analytic concept of the matrix relates sociality and (un)consciousness and is of central importance for the purpose of this paper since it points to the fundamental interconnectedness of humans and the social embeddedness of the individual. From this tradition stems the already-mentioned notion of the individual and the group as paradoxically, mutually formed by and forming at the same time:

The matrix is the hypothetical web of communication and relationship in a given group. It is the common shared ground, which ultimately determines the meaning and significance of all events and upon which all communications and interpretations, verbal and non-verbal, rest.

(Foulkes 1964, p. 292)

In the course of developing the idea, Foulkes differentiated between two dimensions of the matrix, the foundation and the dynamic matrix:

I have accepted from the beginning that even a group of total strangers, being of the same species and more narrowly of the same culture, share a fundamental mental matrix (foundation matrix). To this their closer acquaintance and their intimate exchanges add consistently so that they also form a current, ever-moving, ever-developing dynamic matrix.

(Foulkes 1990, p. 228)



The foundation matrix is a living network shared by our species, and from which local and temporally-specific social fields, the dynamic matrices, emerge.

In our perspective, we would say that (un)consciousness is constituted as an aspect of the social order that connects and is shared by persons and groups, which take part in the organizational or societal process in focus. (Un)consciousness is conceived as social, or as relational communicative processes belonging to the life of the group, family, organization or community etc. We are not only referring to what is repressed or rejected in a social order, but also what is not yet known or sensed and cannot yet be expressed, following the Jungian conception of the unconscious as the basic foundation for life and creativity. A Jungian socioanalysis attempts to get access to and express the psychological truth of that aspect of our social experience that is 'volatile, unsymbolized, dismissed, or confusingly complex' (Long 2013, p. 309).

The socioanalyst Susan Long (2013) coined the term the *associative unconscious*. She compares the associative unconscious with the World Wide Web, which is on a single computer as much as that single computer is on the Internet. The associative unconscious is: 'that network of thoughts, ideas and feelings that create the social system as it is and, more creatively, as it might become' (*ibid.*, p. xxiii).

Jung's expression about (un)consciousness as *reality in potentia* comes to mind. The unknown, dark, mute and shadowy aspects of social experience are thus a potential source for renewal or innovation, when confronted with new challenges in life. It may also be paradigmatic for psychological understanding and the ground on which Jungian psychoanalysis stands. As Jungian analyst and group analyst Amelie Noack expresses it: 'To consider an underlying human matrix as the basis of all our thinking and dreaming, which encompasses individual and collective processes, akin to Jung's "unus mundus"' (Noack 2010, p. 687).

Group analyst Regine Scholtz has portrayed the matrix and unconscious connectivity as an underground network, a *rhizome* (Scholtz 2017). The metaphor of the rhizome has also been employed in the Jungian tradition – Joe Cambrey uses the metaphor (following Jung) to challenge the Western idea of the individual mind. What appears to us to be individual is only the visible expression of a network of connectivity underground, that we easily fail to count on:

A contemporary psychological application derived from Jung's use of this simile is the study of the complex networks of unconscious connections which extend and support various individual representations above ground, e.g. ordinary conscious perceptions of self emerge from a non-local psyche.

(Cambrey 2017, p. 21)

Cambrey includes recent studies of trees and forests as another metaphor that helps us to imagine how illusory individuality can be, and how deeply



‘social’ the life of trees can be. Trees communicate, share nutrition and cooperate – the invisible ‘hidden life of trees’ as forester Wohlleben (Wohlleben & Flannery 2016) calls it. We don’t see the forest – only the trees, as the old saying goes. Backed by scientific research, Cambray and Wohlleben compare the tree in the forest network with the individual in its social network. What is a tree, one may ask, is it the single sample – or is a tree the forest? What is a human being? Is it an isolated person – or one expression of a radically connected humanity? The latter seems also to have been in Jung’s mind:

Life has always seemed to me like a plant that lives on its rhizome. Its true life is invisible, hidden in the rhizome. The part that appears above ground lasts only one summer ... what we see is the blossom, which passes. The rhizome remains.

(Jung 1963, p. 4)

The metaphors of the rhizome and the ‘social’ life of trees help us to recognize the invisible connectedness and the compelling illusion that a human being is an isolated individual. But we may also see the individual as one local, temporary expression of humanity, a single and relatively simple expression of a vast interconnectivity and complexity. The rhizome metaphor helps to avoid the misunderstanding of seeing it as separate life processes, and instead as two aspects of one life process, and one world.

As already mentioned, we are critical of the spatial aspect of the metaphor: the idea of the dichotomy of life consciously existing ‘above ground’ and unconsciously existing ‘underground’ – even though the two of them are connected. Dichotomies leave us with the potential danger of a simplified either-or concept. Instead we prefer the already-mentioned metaphor of the rhizome, building on Deleuze’s and Guattari’s conceptualization (1987). Seeing (un)consciousness and sociality as rhizomatic, means that they are endlessly open-ended, unpredictable and without any perspective of centrality. The concept of the rhizome in this philosophy stands in opposition to hierarchical meaning systems. From one little element of a rhizome, disconnected from the mother root, it is possible to create a new plant. (Un)consciousness must, in this light, be conceived as a never-ending process in social fields. In the next assumption we deal with including unconsciousness in the study of sociality.

### 3. A Jungian socioanalysis explores social fields ‘from within’ by smaller groups

Applying a Jungian socioanalysis, we assume that a group of people can make sense of processes in the social fields in which they live or work, for example, in an organization or a society. We assume that a socio-cultural field can be

created, through which aspects of the wider society can be explored.<sup>3</sup> The group becomes an aggregate, dedicated to transforming sensory and emotional experiences into meaning by sharing emerging thoughts, metaphors and image-affects. A Jungian socioanalysis eventually contributes with aspects of the psychological truth that other approaches may happen to leave out. As an example of this intention, with the method of a Jungian socioanalysis, we, the authors invited participants to a social dreaming series in 2017 in an attempt to set a stage for a Jungian socioanalytic inquiry into 'Europe in transition' (Vestergaard & Odde 2021).

To a large extent, this third assumption is shared by the group analytic tradition. When a group of people from different other groups meet and make sense of that experience of meeting, they also make sense of some aspects of the larger social field to which they all belong. According to Foulkes, this happens through unconscious, transpersonal and parallel processes such as resonance, displacement, mirroring etc.

As human beings, we live in co-created, ever-emerging social fields – invisible processes of connectivity that constitute forming and sharing of, for example, culture, ideologies, symbols, anxieties, fantasies, defences, myths and memories with others living in the same field. The process of being human with other humans is interactive and transpersonal at the same time.

(Un)conscious connectivity can be meaningfully metaphorized as a 'fractal' or 'holographic' phenomenon. In both cases we see that the patterns of the whole are also found in the parts. Studying parts is at the same time a study of the whole. The smaller the part is, the weaker you see the overall pattern. With more parts of a hologram, with more fractal examples, the clearer the larger pattern presents itself. Through a Jungian socioanalysis, a small group gathers to make sense of the socio-cultural field with the help of several 'cases' or dreams etc. In a process similar to what Jung called amplification and also circumambulation, the image of the socio-cultural field in focus is gradually enriched, and eventually a sufficiently complex imagination emerges from the work of the group.

Susan Long has suggested the metaphor of the jigsaw, pointing to the same phenomenon of connectivity. Each member of the socioanalytic group resonates with the associative unconscious in his or her particular way of being in the world. No one member can resonate with the whole totality, just one part of it, which gives only a vague or partial access to the associative unconscious. But when being with, communicating and sharing with others, placing all our pieces together on the table, trying to make sense of the emerging pattern, we constitute the potential for a glimpse of the total jigsaw (Long 2013). This metaphor portrays the direct experience of collective

<sup>3</sup> In the social sciences a parallel assumption is made in qualitative studies, particularly in case-studies, see for example Yin (2009).

engagement in the Jungian socioanalytic process and what, from a Jungian perspective, we might call a joint amplification or associative thinking process.

An example may be helpful here. We sometimes apply the Jungian socioanalytic approach to group supervision. In one such instance, a group of supervisors (colleagues) met for a half-day for group supervision. The group organized their chairs in a particular order, or rather disorder – they were sitting close to each other, but without eye contact. The purpose was to encourage transpersonal, rhizome or matrix modality, and to release the case presenter from the attention of all the others. We invited participants to focus on the cases and their embeddedness in a larger social world – rather than the person bringing the case. We furthermore invited them to both focus on 1) the nature and inherent dilemmas of the work and work context, and 2) on the needs of a single case/single professional person.

The process is an open, self-organized, free-floating dialogue, where cases, associations, and amplifications are shared in an un-facilitated way. In contrast to much group supervision, several cases are shared and attended to simultaneously. It is an attempt to create and explore a socio-cultural field through a joint exploration of cases. In his chapter on social dreaming, Julian Manley emphasizes the associative process that links the image-affects appearing in the course of the socioanalytic process: ‘The creation of this collage of associations between the image-affects of the matrix is like a Foucauldian heterotopia, where disparate elements find form and meaning through the links and connections made by the participants of the matrix’ (Long & Manley 2019, p. 39).

In the group supervision, this association and amplification process enabled an emerging understanding of their common work, including the complexity of the organizational and societal work context. A collage of cases and associations is co-created, and disparate unrelated elements are linked and connected by the creative will of the participants. They access the unconscious, rejected or unnoticed aspects of their shared world of work. And they come closer to giving form and meaning to the social order in which their work takes place.

Gradually the psychological truth of the work and its context is brought into light and felt in the body as emergent affect-images. Such images provide starting points for amplifying and containing the emerging meaning until the professional story, identity and vocabulary starts to transform. A Jungian socioanalytic approach embraces the plurality of perspectives and of foci: it is *socio-*, not only in its focus, but also, and more fundamentally, in its approach. Socio-analytical inquiry is therefore organized in smaller groups.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Whether the group gathers physically or online makes a big difference to the process concerning the way we relate to each other – the way we can or cannot make sense of our habitual knowledge of bodies being together physically differs in these two settings. But this is an under-researched area.

When coming together for a Jungian socioanalytic meeting, plural subtle bodies (see the next assumption, number 4) are brought into awareness. Several contexts are thus co-present and, eventually, imagery of context emerge that include, as well as contain, the present subtle bodies and their differing intentions and perspectives on the social field in focus. When we gather to make sense of several occurrences (cases, dreams etc.), a socio-cultural field will emerge, through which we may gain access to silent, and perhaps silenced, aspects of larger social and societal processes of which we have always been participants.

#### *4. A Jungian socioanalysis enables and is enabled by emerging metaphors and affect-imagery*

Emergent imagery (metaphors, symbols) are central to our theory of a Jungian socioanalysis. Dreams, daydreaming, symbolic manifestations in image-affects, metaphors and mythopoeic material that ‘pop up’, are resources for a Jungian socioanalysis – as well as for psychoanalysis. Jung named this transformation the transcendent function: when the complexity (tensions and uncertainty) of the situation is contained, potential energy rises and finds expression in emergent affective imagination and symbols, eventually leading to new meaning. For a complex world to be contained, we need sufficiently complex images, metaphors and symbols.

A central aspect of social complexity that needs mentioning, is its process quality. To call or name something ‘social’ is actually to point to the finished results of complex processes of interactions, both between individuals and amongst the single individual and that conglomerate of interactions. We might therefore, as Bruno Latour (2007) argues, instead talk about ‘associology’ in order to stick to the processuality of the phenomena, instead of turning the process of sociality into a thing, an object to be controlled, or in other words: to reify the social domain.<sup>5</sup>

Basically, sociality is a process<sup>6</sup>, never static, always in the process of becoming or changing. According to Manley (2019), writing about Latour’s position, the notion ‘social’ has outlived its usefulness and has instead become a restricted object defining something, a thing that does not really exist.

<sup>5</sup> The French cultural sociologist, Michel Maffesoli, is also critical of a traditional sociology (Maffesoli 1996a). According to him, sociologists have too often succumbed to analytical formalism and dualistic thinking. Instead, he has developed an approach capable of analyzing all the nuances and contradictions in new forms of social life, particularly everyday life emerging in the late 20th century, which opposes the tendency to understand society as a finished product.

<sup>6</sup> We understand processuality as existing in a spectrum from fluid to solid – including all the ‘shades’ in between; consequently, we might see habits, traditions, continual practices as being in a very slow process, whereas a changing society (e.g. the ongoing coronavirus pandemic) is in the fluid and rapidly-changing end of the spectrum (see also Scholtz 2017).

What Latour is attempting is a new, contemporary and more valid understanding of the word 'social' as being equivalent to or better expressed as a network of associations that, like the associations in social dreaming, are in a constant state of flux.

(Manley 2019 [in Long & Manley 2019], p. 30)<sup>7,8</sup>

Jungian socioanalysis portrays the psychological truth of our affectedness by these processes of sociality. The process of sociality is digested and processed through affective understanding and metaphoric (body)language. This creative and imaginative capacity captures the psychosocial as well as the psychophysical reality *as it is emerging* (Atmanspacher & Fuchs 2014).

Through his research of alchemical texts, Jung conceived of a 'subtle body' or a somatic unconscious (Jung 1988). This idea is further developed through the method of Bodydreaming by Marian Dunlea (2019). The subtle body can be experienced as a kind of energy field extending outward from one's physical being in the world. It is possible to feel or sense this energy field, and this is amplified by proximity. In contemporary sociology, a similar understanding of the role of the body is brought forward by Rosa (2019).

In the Jungian socioanalytic approach, our understanding is that we know about the socio-cultural field through our body. The field 'inscribes' in the body, and through the body we participate in, and enact, the field. In this way the body is the border between self and sociality. We are a body and have a body. We are socialized as bodies sensing other bodies, finding our way by reading the intentions and the contexts of others. Individual life is always already embedded in social fields, and we affect and are affected in numerous ways and levels. But because our embeddedness and connectedness is most often unconscious, we tend not to experience ourselves as such, but rather as isolated individuals. Certain situations

<sup>7</sup> A similar perception of sociality can be found in Maffesoli (Maffesoli 1996b), who writes about sociality as a fluid and ever-changing entity, but with clusters of groups developing, which he terms neo-tribes or neo-tribalism. According to him, a central tendency of our times is an aesthetization of existence. By aesthetics he refers to the original meaning of this concept as emotions and tactility. He believes we are in the process of transforming into an aesthetic episteme, that is: away from the functionality of the industrial area. In this new culture, work as usefulness is exchanged for creativity/creative productivity and the rational attitude to life will change in favour of a more aesthetic and tactile attitude. In a sense our socio-cultural analytics is drawing on this new tendency, making it possible to connect aesthetics with sociality.

<sup>8</sup> The classic French mass psychologists, Gabriel Tarde and Gustave Le Bon, wrote about this uncontrollable and unpredictable aspect of sociality, using concepts such as contagion, repetition, imitation and innovation. Their agenda was to find a way of controlling the masses and the crowds. But in their work, one can deduce a perspective on sociality consisting of the irrational, the aesthetic and tactile: attraction and repulsion as the basic mechanism making up sociality (Odde Sørensen 1992).

however can make us aware of our connectedness – for example, a world crisis, like the COVID-19 pandemic. And we do understand that we are not isolated, but (in this particular case) dangerously connected if we don't behave in certain, restricted ways.

In other words: most of what is happening in sociality is unconscious, it just happens. Knowing that, changes the way we are working with sociality; not only in professional practices like group supervision or family therapy, but also when politicians make laws and when we try to understand socio-cultural processes. Sociality processes are not rational, but irrational, governed by affect and images and contagion. Sociality, and the socio-cultural field, is rhizomatic, not linear.

The practice of a Jungian socioanalysis eventually leads to surprising – and even unsettling, surrealistic, challenging and subversive realizations, for example, in the form of provocative or enlightening narratives, questions, understandings and hypotheses. In emergent imagery, metaphors stand central, as they:

transfer meaning between domains of experience (e.g. conscious to unconscious, cognitive to somatic, somatic to affective, past to present, or present to future), linking realms in ways not previously seen, and transforming meaning by means of novel re-combinations between domains.

(Winborn 2018, p. 37)

Metaphors present unexpected linkages. They are placed in-between, and this is probably their connecting force and what makes them bring experiences alive. Metaphors can bridge image, language and body and have the capacity to integrate and engage feelings and thoughts. We may think about metaphors as belonging to the intellect, because it is linguistic, but 'it reaches more deeply – making connections on emotional and imaginal levels – rather than solely cognitive. Metaphor is the process that allows sacred texts, music, art, poetry, dance and film to move us, bringing our imaginations to life' (Manley 2019 [in Long & Manley 2019], p. 38).

The transcendent function and emergent affect imagery follow the abductive logic which characterizes socioanalysis (Long 2013), being explorative. Abduction is about groping in the dark before any formulation and testing of a hypothesis is tenable. It demands from the people involved that they let go of looking for certainty, the well-known and the truths of the time. In the psychoanalytic tradition, the state of mind called for is *reverie* (Bion 1988). Reverie is close to dreaming, only it takes place in daylight as an unfocused and non-directed state, attending for something unexpected to emerge. Instead of interpreting, one is containing, waiting, and looking (reverie) for images or emotions to emerge. This is the 'raw data' of a Jungian socioanalysis, and fuels the urge towards individuation (see also the presentation of assumption number 5 in this article). This ability is often

referred to as ‘negative capability’ (Bion 1995) – the ability to tolerate not-(yet) knowing, without premature and irritable reaching out for conclusive certainties and agreements.

Meaning eventually emerges from the tensions and uncertainties of affective socioanalytic processes if we manage to *let it happen*, and if we refrain from forcing or trying to *make it happen*, which thus moves too fast towards concluding *what it means*. Clare and Zarbafi formulated this paradox very well in their characterization of the mindset necessary for social dreaming: ‘By not trying to get anywhere, we do in fact arrive to somewhere new’ (Clare & Zarbafi 2009).

### 5. Socio-cultural fields have an impulse toward individuation

We suggest that Jung’s theory of individuation, together with the idea of emerging meaning as described by complexity theory, illustrates the way in which humanity has evolved as a species, being able to collaborate in small groups to make sense of increasingly complex life circumstances. It is the simultaneous scanning of inner states and contextual factors, and the integration of these multisensory inputs, that enable ‘sufficiently complex models’ of the situation to emerge in consciousness. Neuropsychologist Mark Solms argues that consciousness is affective, constituting the ability to ‘feel our way through’ the uncertainties and complexities of life (Solms 2019, p. 10).

When we move from one context to another, our experience and expression of self changes. As we live in (and co-create) many contexts, we may talk about one self but the reality is that the self is a conglomerate of selves that are context-sensitive or context-dependent: family, work, romantic, ecological, economic, political, digital etc. Individuation, in the Jungian sense, is a life-long self-reflection and defragmentation of personality:

Self-reflection, or – what comes to the same thing – the urge to individuation, gathers together what is scattered and multifarious. ... In this way our existence as separate beings, our former ego nature, is abolished, the circle of consciousness is widened, and because the paradoxes have been made conscious the sources of conflict are dried up.

(Jung 1958, para. 401)

The principle of individuation is central to our project of developing a Jungian socioanalysis. According to Saban, individuation is the central idea in Jung’s work, pointing to its transformational, process-oriented nature – and this applies also to groups, movements, cultures, and nations (Saban 2020).

The transformative process of individuation is about transcending any one-sidedness in the personality. The process of individuation leads towards



ever more complex images of self – what has also been called an increasing ‘Self-complexity’<sup>9</sup>. This applies whether individual or social aspects are most in focus.

For us, the self as well as sociality is conceived as a never-ending process, not as things or structures. Analysts (psycho- or socio-) dive in as companions on a journey *with*, rather than determining objective truths *about*, what they analyse. Analysts make themselves available to be affected by the process and orient themselves, feel their way through, on the basis of this affectedness. A Jungian socioanalysis, rather than being defined primarily by its object, is defined by its specific relational approach, as is expressed in the following passage from Mark Saban:

psychological life – and indeed the dynamic unconscious itself – needs to be sought not only inside the individual, but within and through the living relations shared between persons. The crucial emphasis thus shifts from individual to individuation, a process occurring not only through outer and inner relations but within the relations between those relations.

(Saban 2019, pp. 110–11)

Psychological life has social and individual aspects; social life has individual and social aspects. Individuation includes the on-going processes of individuality and sociality coming to terms with each other. A Jungian socioanalysis studies these processes by engaging emotionally in them.

### Summary and conclusion

In this paper we have presented a first sketch of a Jungian socioanalysis in the form of five assumptions. In the course of this journey we have come to realize that we need a complex psychology, where one-sidedness, dualisms and tempting abstractions reducing the complexity of the world are avoided. Jung endeavoured to develop such a psychology, one with no constrictions of compartments. A complex world needs images, metaphors and symbols with sufficient complexity to contain that complexity.

A Jungian socioanalysis explores social fields ‘from within’ by smaller groups. It is designed to help groups, societies and organizations to develop and capture those image-affects that bring the truth of that particular sociality to the foreground – also the potential knowledge, which has been suppressed, denied or not yet realized. (Un)consciousness is social and the independent

<sup>9</sup> The self-complexity theory (Linville 1985) posits that individuals have multiple aspects – context-dependent social roles, relationships, activities and goals – and we find the variety healthy. When these aspects are reduced, we become more vulnerable to negative affects.

individual is an illusory reduction of complexity, based on ignorance of unconscious aspects of the individual's embeddedness in social fields.

The process of sociality is digested and processed through affective understanding and metaphoric (body)language. This creative and imaginative capacity captures the psychosocial as well as the psychophysical reality *as it is emerging*. We know about the socio-cultural field through our body. The field 'inscribes' in the body and through the body we participate in and enact the field. We are socialized as bodies sensing other bodies, finding our way by reading the intentions and the contexts of others.

Individuation is the on-going processes of individuality and sociality coming to terms with each other. The process of individuation leads towards ever-more complex images of self: self-complexity, but also of sociality. The process of the socio-cultural field enables relating to what has been rejected, to what is other, and to what is confusing or causing pain in the world and in oneself. This can take a lot of courage, curiosity and hard work, but it is our experience that it is possible to do this work in small groups with dedication, mutual support, bodily proximity and patient cooperation.

This more rounded and holistic way of understanding sociality gives us a richer understanding of the complexities of real-life situations as well as of human connectivity; and consequently, it clears the way for more effective choices and decision-making, whether that is by politicians, parents or leaders or in one's own life.

## References

- Atmanspacher, H. (2012). 'Dual-aspect monism à la Pauli and Jung'. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, Vol. 19, Issue 9-10, 96-120.
- Atmanspacher, H. & Fuchs, C.A. (eds.). (2014). *The Pauli-Jung Conjecture and its Impact Today*. Exeter, UK: Imprint Academic.
- Bain, A. (1999). 'On being frozen in time'. *Group Relations, Management and Organization* 1999, 127-42.
- Bion, W. (1988). 'Notes on memory and desire'. In *Melanie Klein Today: Developments in Theory and Practice, Vol. 2: Mainly Practice*, ed. Elizabeth Bott Spillius. New Library of Psychoanalysis, 8, 17-21. London: Routledge.
- (1995). *Attention and Interpretation*. New e. edition. Lanham, Md.; Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. First edition. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Cambray, J. (2017). 'The emergence of the ecological mind in Hua-Yen/Kegon Buddhism and Jungian psychology'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, Vol. 62, Issue 1, 20-31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5922.12277>
- Civitaresse, G. & Ferro, A. (2018). *The Analytic Field and Its Transformations*. Abingdon, Oxon. & New York: Routledge.
- Clare, J.N. & Zarbafi, A. (2009). *Social Dreaming in the 21st Century: The World We Are Losing*. London: Karnac Books.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

- Dunlea, M. (2019). *BodyDreaming in the Treatment of Developmental Trauma: An Embodied Therapeutic Approach*. London & New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Elias, N. (2000). *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*. Rev. ed. Oxford & Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishers.
- Foulkes, S.H. (1964). *Therapeutic Group Analysis*. London & New York: Routledge.
- (1990). *Selected Papers: Psychoanalysis and Group Analysis*. First edition. London & New York: Routledge.
- Heinskou, T. & Visholm, S. (2016). *Psykodynamisk organisationspsykologi. På Arbejde Under Overfladen [Bind 1]*.
- Hogenson, G.B. 2019. 'The controversy around the concept of archetypes'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, Vol. 64, Issue 5, 682-700. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5922.12541>
- Jung, C.G. (1954). *The Practice of Psychotherapy: Essays on the Psychology of the Transference and Other Subjects*. CW 16.
- (1958). *Psychology and Religion*: West and East. CW 11.
- (1963). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Rev. ed. New York: Vintage Books.
- (1988). *Nietzsche's 'Zarathustra': Notes of the Seminar Given in 1934-1939*. Vol. 1, ed. James L. Jarrett. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Latour, B. (2007). *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory. Clarendon Lectures in Management Studies*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers*. ed. Dorwin Cartwright. Oxford: Harpers.
- Linville, P.W. (1985). 'Self-complexity and affective extremity: Don't put all of your eggs in one cognitive basket'. *Social Cognition*, Vol. 3, Issue 1, 94-120. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.1985.3.1.94>
- Long, S. (2013). *Socioanalytic Methods: Discovering the Hidden in Organisations and Social Systems*. Karnac Books Limited.
- Long, S. & Manley, J. (2019). *Social Dreaming: Philosophy, Research, Theory and Practice*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Maffesoli, M. (1996a). *Ordinary Knowledge: An Introduction to Interpretative Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (1996b). *The Time of the Tribes: The Decline of Individualism in Mass Society. Theory, Culture & Society*. London & Thousand Oaks, CA, & New Delhi: Sage.
- Mead, G.H. (2015). *Mind, Self, and Society: The Definitive Edition*. First edition, enlarged edition. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- Noack, A. (2010). 'Social dreaming: competition or complementation to individual dreaming?' *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, Vol. 55, Issue 5, 672-90.
- Odde, D. (2020). 'Some reflections on archetypal sexuality, imaginatio, the subtle body and the psychoid'. In *Forthcoming*.
- Odde Sørensen, D. (1992). *Massekultur mellem distance og beherskelse: om massen, det sociale og identitet i det moderne*. Kbh.: Institut for Kultursociologi, Københavns Universitet.
- Rosa, H. (2019). *Resonance: A Sociology of the Relationship to the World*. Medford, MA: Polity Press.
- Saban, M. (2019). 'Two Souls Alas': *Jung's Two Personalities and the Making of Analytical Psychology*. The Zurich Lecture Series, Vol. 2. Asheville, North Carolina: Chiron Publications.
- (2020). 'Mark Saban's "Two Souls" – what is it about?' International Association for Jungian Studies (IAJS) online seminar.

- Scholtz, R. (2017). 'The fluid and the solid – or the dynamic and the static: Some further thoughts about the conceptualization of foundation matrices, processes of the social unconscious, and/or large group identities'. In *The Social Unconscious in Persons, Groups, and Societies*, Vol. 3: *The Foundation Matrix Extended and Re-Configured* (2017). London: Karnac Books.
- Shamdasani, S. (2003). *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology: The Dream of a Science*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Singer, T. & Kimbles, S.L. (2004). *The Cultural Complex*. East Sussex & New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Solms, M. (2019). 'The hard problem of consciousness and the free energy principle'. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 30 January 2019. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02714>
- Stacey, R.D. (2007). *Strategic Management and Organizational Dynamics: The Challenge of Complexity to Ways of Thinking about Organizations*. Fifth edition. Harlow: Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- Vestergaard, A. (2016). 'Jungian socioanalysis. Coming to terms with complexity'. Proceedings, International Association for Analytical Psychology Congress, Kyoto.
- Vestergaard, A. & Dorte, O. (2021). 'Jungian socioanalysis, social dreaming and the emerging complexity of Europe'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, Vol. 66, 2, 323-344.
- Winborn, M. (2018). *Interpretation in Jungian Analysis: Art and Technique*. Abingdon, Oxon. & New York: Routledge.
- Wohlleben, P. & Flannery, T. (2016). *The Hidden Life of Trees: What They Feel, How They Communicate – Discoveries from a Secret World*, trans. Jane Billinghurst. First English language edition, eighth printing edition. Vancouver & Berkeley: Greystone Books.
- Yin, R.K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Fourth edition. New York: Sage.

---

 TRANSLATIONS OF ABSTRACT
 

---

Cet article expose une première ébauche de ce que nous avons appelé la socioanalyse Jungienne - une théorie émergente qui combine la psychologie analytique, les théories de la complexité, la sociologie, la socioanalyse et la psychanalyse, l'analyse groupale et les théories de l'affect. Notre postulat est que la théorie et la clinique Jungienne doivent plus tenir compte des contextes sociaux, de la socialité et de l'influence des évolutions sociétales et y accorder plus d'importance. D'autre part, nous soutenons aussi que la psychologie analytique - principalement la théorie de Jung sur l'individuation et la fonction transcendante, ainsi que la perspective de vaste complexité de sa théorie de la psyché - peut être élargie à une perspective 'socio' et pas confinée à une perspective 'psycho'. L'article présente 5 postulats fondamentaux pour une socioanalyse Jungienne, avec les intitulés suivants: 1) Une socioanalyse Jungienne nécessite une psychologie complexe; 2) L'(in)conscience est sociale et la socialité a une dimension d'(in)conscience; 3) Une socioanalyse Jungienne explore les champs sociaux 'de l'intérieur' en petits groupes; 4) Une socioanalyse Jungienne est facilité par, et facilite, des métaphores émergentes et une imagerie de l'affect; 5) Les champs socio-culturels possèdent un élan vers l'individuation. Ceci est le premier d'une série de deux articles publiés dans ce volume – le second article donne des illustrations socio-cliniques de la thèse exposée dans cet article-ci.

*Mots clés:* socioanalyse, analyse groupale, champ socio-culturel, fonction transcendante, métaphores, individuation, psychologie complexe, imagerie de l'affect, socialité, rhizome, corps

Dieser Aufsatz präsentiert eine vorläufige Skizze dessen, was wir als Jungianische Sozioanalyse bezeichnet haben – eine im Entstehen begriffene Theorie, die Analytische Psychologie, Komplexitätstheorien, soziologische Theorien, Sozio- und Psychoanalyse, Gruppenanalyse und Affekttheorien kombiniert. Wir gehen davon aus, daß Jungianische Theorie und Praxis sich stärker um soziale Kontexte, Sozialität und den Einfluß gesellschaftlicher Entwicklungen kümmern müssen. Aber andererseits kann diese Analytische Psychologie, vor allem Jungs Individuationstheorie und die der transzendenten Funktion sowie die breite Komplexitätsperspektive seiner Theorie der Psyche, auf eine 'soziale' und nicht nur eine 'psychologische' Perspektive ausgedehnt werden. Der Beitrag präsentiert fünf grundlegende Annahmen für eine Jungianische Sozioanalyse mit den folgenden Überschriften: 1) eine Jungianische Sozioanalyse erfordert eine Komplexpsychologie, 2) (Un-) Bewußtes ist sozial und Sozialität hat eine Dimension von (Un-) Bewußtem, 3) eine Jungianische Sozioanalyse untersucht soziale Felder 'von innen' durch kleinere Gruppen, 4) eine Jungianische Sozioanalyse ermöglicht und wird durch aufkommende Metaphern und Affektbilder ermöglicht, 5) Soziokulturelle Felder haben einen Impuls hin zur Individuation. Dies ist der erste von zwei Artikeln in der vorliegenden Ausgabe des Journals - der zweite Artikel enthält sozio-klinische Illustrationen unserer These in diesem Artikel.

*Schlüsselwörter:* Sozioanalyse, Gruppenanalyse, sozio-kulturelles Feld, Transzendente Funktion, Metaphern, Individuation, Komplexpsychologie, Affektbilder, Sozialität, Rhizome, Körper

Questo articolo presenta un abbozzo preliminare di quello che noi abbiamo definito socioanalisi junghiana –una teoria emergente che combina la psicologia analitica, le teorie della complessità, teorie sociologiche, socio- e psico-analisi, analisi di gruppo e teorie degli affetti. Il nostro presupposto è che la teoria e la pratica junghiana necessitano di occuparsi e focalizzarsi di più sui contesti sociali, sulla socialità e sull'influenza degli sviluppi sociali. Ma anche, dall'altra parte, crediamo che la psicologia analitica, in primo luogo la teoria di Jung dell'individuazione e della funzione trascendente, così come l'ampia complessità della sua teoria della psiche, possano essere estese ad una prospettiva 'socio' e non solo 'psico'. L'articolo presenta cinque assunzioni fondamentali per una socioanalisi junghiana, con i seguenti titoli: 1) Una socioanalisi junghiana richiede una psicologia complessa; 2) L'inconscio è sociale e la socialità ha una dimensione di inconscietà; 3) Una socioanalisi junghiana esplora i campi sociali "dal dentro" attraverso i piccoli gruppi; 4) Una socioanalisi junghiana facilita ed è facilitata dalle metafore emergenti e dalle immagini degli affetti; 5) I campi socio-culturali hanno una spinta verso l'individuazione. Questo è il primo di due articoli nel presente numero del Journal – il secondo offrirà illustrazioni socio-cliniche della nostra tesi.

*Parole chiave:* socioanalisi, analisi di gruppo, campo socio-culturale, funzione trascendente, metafore, individuazione, psicologia complessa, immagini degli affetti, socialità, rizoma, corpo

В статье представлен предварительный очерк дисциплины, которую мы назвали юнгианским социоанализом – зарождающуюся теорию, соединяющую аналитическую психологию, теории сложных систем, социологические теории, социо – и психоанализ, групп анализ и аффективные теории. Наше предположение состоит в том, что юнгианская теория и практика должны уделять больше внимания социальному контексту и социальным процессам. Но, с другой стороны, аналитическая психология, в первую очередь теория индивидуации и трансцендентной функции, а также комплексный подход к теории психики, нуждаются в доработке до «социо», а не только «психо» перспективы. В статье представлено пять основополагающих посылок юнгианского социоанализа под следующими заголовками: 1) юнгианский социоанализ требует комплексной (сложной) психологии, 2) (Бес)сознательное – социальное, а социальность имеет измерение (бес)сознательного, 3) юнгианский социоанализ изучает социальные поля «изнутри» с помощью малых групп, 4) юнгианский социоанализ делает возможным появление метафор и аффективных образов, а также приводится в действие их появлением, 5) социо-культурные имеют импульс к индивидуации. Это первая из двух статей в этом номере журнала, во второй статье приведены социо-клинические иллюстрации наших тезисов.

*Ключевые слова:* социоанализ, групп анализ, социо-культурное поле, трансцендентная функция, метафоры, индивидуация, комплексная психология, аффективные образы, социальность, тело

El presente trabajo presenta un esbozo preliminar de lo que hemos denominado Socio análisis Junguiano – una teoría emergente combinando psicología analítica, teorías de la complejidad, teorías sociológicas, socio y psicoanálisis, análisis de grupo, y teorías de las emociones. Nuestra presuposición es que la teoría y la práctica Junguiana necesita atender y focalizarse más en los contextos e influencias de los desarrollos sociales. Pero, además, se sostiene que la psicología analítica, principalmente la teoría de la individuación y la función trascendente, así como también la amplia y compleja perspectiva de su teoría de la psique, puede extenderse a una perspectiva ‘social’ y no solamente ‘psicológica’. El trabajo presente cinco fundamentos para un socio análisis Junguiano con las siguientes temáticas: 1) un socio análisis Junguiano requiere de una psicología compleja; 2) Lo (In) consciente es social y lo social tiene una dimensión (in) consciente; 3) Un psicoanálisis Junguiano explora campos sociales ‘desde adentro’ a través de pequeños grupos; 4) Un socio análisis Junguiano posibilita y es posibilitado por metáforas emergentes e imagería emocional; 5) Campos socio-culturales tienen un impulso hacia la individuación. Este es el primero de dos ensayos en la edición presente del Journal – el segundo trabajo ofrece ilustraciones socio-clínicas de nuestra tesis.

*Palabras clave:* socio análisis, análisis de grupo, campo socio-cultura, función

---

trascendente, metáforas, individuación, psicología compleja, imagería emocional, social, rizoma, cuerpo

---

荣格学社会分析的初步画像:整合了分析心理学,情结理论,社会学理论,社会和心理分析,团体分析及情绪理论的新兴理论

文章初步侧写了荣格学的社会分析,一个整合了分析心理学,情结理论,社会学理论,社会和心理分析,团体分析及情绪理论的新兴理论。我们的假设是荣格的理论与实践,需要更多关注和参与社会的背景,社会化和对社会发展的影响。同时,分析心理学,主要是荣格关于自性化的理论、超越功能及其关于心灵的理论的复杂视角,可以被拓展到社会学,而不仅仅是心理的角度。文章呈现了五个关于荣格社会分析的基本假设,如下:1)提倡情结心理学的荣格学社会分析;2)(无)意识是社会化的,社会性具有(无)意思的层面;3)荣格学社会分析由更小的群体来从内部探索社会场域;4)荣格学社会分析促成新型的隐喻及情绪的意象,同时也由它们促成;5)社会文化领域有自性化的冲动。这一期杂志发表了两篇系列文章,这是其中的第一篇,都给出了社会临床主题的描述。

关键词:社会分析,团体分析,社会文化领域,超越功能,隐喻,自性化,情结心理学,情绪的意象,社会化,根基,身体

---