

Friendship and its Paradoxes

Friendship and its Paradoxes:

*Essays from the VI Latin
American Congress of
Jungian Psychology*

Edited by

Gustavo Barcellos

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Friendship and its Paradoxes:
Essays from the VI Latin American Congress of Jungian Psychology

Edited by Gustavo Barcellos

This book first published 2017

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2017 by Gustavo Barcellos and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-8608-4

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-8608-6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introductory Note	viii
Gustavo Barcellos	
Chapter One.....	1
Friendship in an Interconnected World	
Ana Lia B. Aufranc	
Chapter Two	12
Death and its Paradoxes: Friend/Enemy, Enemy/Friend	
Maria Odila Buti de Lima	
Chapter Three	22
Tolerance vs. Intolerance: Can there be Friendship between Rivals?	
Célia Brandão	
Chapter Four.....	31
“Thank God I am Jung and not a Jungian”: Reflections on Friendship	
Relations among Jungians	
Claudia Grez Villegas	
Chapter Five	36
The Beloved Enemy	
Pablo Gelsi	
Chapter Six.....	43
The Mirror: The Other	
Victor Palomo	
Chapter Seven.....	52
Friendship in Conjugal Relationships	
Nairo de Souza Vargas	

Chapter Eight.....	59
A Sweet Friend	
Margareth Gaban de Noni	
Chapter Nine.....	65
A Cordial Relation: Constituted, Separated, Reconstituted Families	
Ceres Alves de Araujo	
Chapter Ten	71
“All Good Things Must Come to an End”: Dilemmas and Ruptures in Friendship	
Acaci Alcantara	
Chapter Eleven	78
Tears of the Soul: An Outline of the Dark Side of Friendship	
Mario E. Saiz	
Chapter Twelve	90
Mythology, Psychopathology and Divine Punishment	
Maria Zelia de Alvarenga	
Chapter Thirteen.....	98
Friendship between Men and Women and Sexual Identity: A Contribution of Jungian Symbolic Psychology	
Carlos Amadeu Botelho Byington	
Chapter Fourteen	106
Sympathy, Self-esteem and Envy	
Axel Capriles M.	
Chapter Fifteen	111
Dear Friends	
Iraci Galiás	
Chapter Sixteen	119
Mythological Records of Friendship	
Rubens Bragarnich	
Chapter Seventeen.....	127
Transference, Empathy and Attachment	
Alvaro Ancona de Faria	

Chapter Eighteen	135
The Borders between Creativity and Madness in <i>Liber Novus</i>	
by C. G. Jung	
Walter Boechat	
Chapter Nineteen	143
Opening up to the Different: <i>Liber Novus</i> , a Photographer and a Musician	
Laura Villares de Freitas and Maria Helena de Oliveira Richards	
Chapter Twenty	152
Friendship within Psychotherapy	
Pilar Amezaga	
Chapter Twenty One.....	160
Changes in Current Emotional Relationships and the Importance	
of the Related	
Paula Pantoja Boechat	
Chapter Twenty Two.....	170
Friendship and its Metaphors	
Gustavo Barcellos	
Contributors.....	177

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

In September 2012, in Florianópolis, Brazil, we had the VI Latin American Congress of Jungian Psychology. The history of these meetings goes back to 1998, when the first of these congresses happened in Punta del Este, Uruguay, sponsored by the Brazilian and Uruguayan Jungian Societies of the International Association for Analytical Psychology, mainly with the idea of congregating the Jungians of Latin America, primarily around the challenge of discussing our psychological identity as a continent. Every three years since then we have kept meeting, with different themes, in different places such as Uruguay, Chile and Brazil, to share discussions and reflections on issues pertinent to our social and cultural climate, as well as the ever challenging questions of psychotherapy. The sixth iteration in Florianópolis had as its theme “Friendship and its paradoxes: fraternity, conflicts, (in)tolerance”.

All the chapters in this book are papers written and presented at the congress by our colleagues from different parts of Latin America, who were invited to submit their essays for this book. We have contributions from Brazil, Chile, Venezuela and Uruguay.

The editors of the book are the members of the group who served as the Scientific Committee to the congress: Acaci de Alcantara, Leniza Castelo Branco, Célia Brandão, Iraci Galiás, Maria Odila Buti de Lima, Nairo de Souza Vargas and myself. I revised the material and prepared it for publication.

Gustavo Barcellos

CHAPTER ONE

FRIENDSHIP IN AN INTERCONNECTED WORLD

ANA LIA B. AUFRANC

Friendship relationships are to be found in all human societies, independent of their degrees of social complexity. Anthropological research shows that the basic behavior characteristics between friends are mutual goodwill, support and help.

Friendship takes on different characteristics depending on the historical moment. In France, for instance, in the 15th century, friends could sign contracts to establish a friendship; in these contracts they proposed to share all goods and to live together with their respective families — the *motto* was: “one bread, one wine, and one purse”. Other ceremonies appear throughout history, for example, the sharing of blood as a commitment to friendship, especially in Africa and some places in Asia.

Recent studies carried out in the most diverse countries and continents show that some friendship traits can be more valued than others depending on the cultural context. For instance, there are differences in the value given to material support and to discussing personal matters in friendships. In Asian countries such as Korea, Japan, China and Indonesia, friendships are maintained on the basis of mutual support and care, but with hardly any disclosure of feelings. For the Chinese, for example, there is the value of *Hanshu*. *Hanshu* is a communication ideal that is contained, reserved, implicit and indirect; according to an old Chinese proverb, “mutual understanding lies in the heart not in words”. Some research shows that these values persist in the descendants of immigrants. A study with American university students on stress reduction, including a group made up of white students and another of Asian origin, revealed how explicit verbal support had opposite effects on the two groups. For the white students, explicit verbal support led to a reduction in stress and levels of cortisol in the body, while for the group of Asian descendants the effect was quite the opposite: explicit verbal support increased stress and concomitantly, levels of cortisol.¹

“One loyal friend is worth ten thousand relatives” - Euripides. In fact, comparative studies on conflict resolution among family relations and in friendships show that, between relatives, rupture due to conflict is more frequent than between friends; friends tend to reflect more on misunderstandings and seek solutions through dialogue.²

We live in times of great changes; as I see it, we are experiencing a shift in paradigms. The materialist paradigm on which our view of the world and social insertion is based is coming to an end and a new paradigm begins to emerge. Where does friendship stand in such times?

We are at the start of a new *aion*, the Platonic month of a little over 2,000 years: we are entering the aion of Aquarius. Aquarius is the sign of the 11th house in the Zodiac, the sign of friendship and fraternity, having as its characteristics cooperation and humanism, associated with creative, collective movements formulating goals for the future.

However, what we observe is a world in which profit and taking advantage of the other prevail. A globalized world ruled and measured by the consumption of material goods. According to Dawkins, for example, we are little more than survival machines. And to a survival machine, another survival machine, that is, the other, is only a part of the environment, like a rock or a river. It is anything that comes up and gets in the way, or that can be exploited.³ The materialist paradigm is yet very present and through it we view the world, the other and our own selves.

And in such way we have built our history.

Victor Lebow, economic analyst and adviser to President Eisenhower, in an article from 1955 entitled “Price Competition”, writes:

Our enormously productive economy demands that we make consumption our way of life, that we convert the buying and use of goods into rituals, that we seek our spiritual satisfactions, our ego satisfactions, in consumption. The measure of social status, of social acceptance, of prestige, is now to be found in our consumptive patterns. The very meaning and significance of our lives today is expressed in consumptive terms. The greater the pressures upon the individual to conform to safe and accepted social standards, the more does he tend to express his aspirations and his individuality in terms of what he wears, drives, eats — his home, his car, his pattern of food serving, his hobbies. These commodities and services must be offered to the consumer with a special urgency. (...) We need things consumed, burned up, worn out, replaced, and discarded at an ever increasing pace.⁴

We left off being individuals to become consumers. In our means of communication we hardly ever find the term individual, or even citizen, but with great frequency the consumer is spoken about.

Marketing techniques have been highly developed and communication means have been used to spread consumerism across the planet. We are bombarded with advertisements through the most diverse media. In a year we see more adverts than people 50 years ago saw in a lifetime.

Planned obsolescence and psychological obsolescence were created. In planned obsolescence, consumer goods are created to be used up as fast as possible so they are thrown out and new ones bought quickly. Everything is becoming disposable, and it is much cheaper to buy something new than to try to fix what we have. Styles and designs are also idealized so as to create a need for the new. This is so-called perceived or psychological obsolescence, wherein we are led to throw out perfectly usable things, for as fashion changes vary rapidly and our worth as people is linked with what we have, we feel very bad if we own something out of style.

Within this materialistic perspective, the ecological notion finds no room.

In the USA it is calculated that no less than 99% of consumer goods, six months after being bought, turn to garbage.

Electronic scrap in its turn is incinerated, producing dioxin, which is one of the most toxic substances created by human beings, responsible for fetal malformation and disorders of the immune system. It is sent either to underdeveloped African countries or to India, supposedly to be recycled. In truth, this material, when inadequately disposed of, is a serious risk to people and the environment, being made up of heavy metals that contaminate groundwater and people who handle them without protection.

In the ocean between California and Hawaii there is a plastic island of approximately five million tons of plastic trash. There are at least another four oceanic garbage patches as well as a few smaller formations on both poles.

Another problem linked with consumerism is the pandemic of obesity and linked diseases, such as diabetes, hypertension and cardiovascular diseases. Unlike other consumption stimulated by advertising and with no limits, always able to increase, food consumption posed a hardship. How to increase consumption beyond population growth? The human being has a natural limit regarding the quantity of food he/she can consume (close to 680kg of food per year). To this was given the name "fixed stomach", or for the economist, inelastic demand.

The consumption of foods was increased in the 1980s by the offer of enormous food portions. Researchers discovered that people and animals presented with gigantic portions of food eat close to 30% more than otherwise. Thus the supposedly fixed stomach of the human being was expanded.⁵

During the same period, the production and consumption of ultra-processed foods increased immensely and concomitantly there was a worldwide rise in obesity. Ultra-processed foods, ready to be eaten or heated, are densely caloric and have little nutritional value. They are formulated to be habit-forming and even addictive. Overconsumption is prompted by advertising their practicality; the foods can be consumed anywhere at any time - on the streets, at work, driving, watching TV. The lack of advertising regulations enables identifying the ultra-processed as necessary and an integral part of a healthy life. Often products are apparently enriched with micronutrients and sold as essential for the growth, health and well-being of children. Up until the 1970s, in Brazil, infectious diseases and malnutrition prevailed. Between the first nutrition research, in 1975, and the latest, in 2009, overweightness and obesity more than doubled among adults, from 23.6% to 49.1%, increasing fourfold among adolescents, from 4.2% to 16.8%, and children, from 6.0% to 25.5%.⁶

We degrade our planet, using up resources equivalent to those of a planet and a half to maintain our present level of consumption. The search for profit and the manipulation of information put at risk the health of individuals and the survival of the human species on earth.

Our aspirations and desires have come to be referred to as the “consumer dream”. We began to believe that if we realize these consumer dreams we would have prestige and happiness.

What we are actually facing is a lack of meaning and existential emptiness. Spiritual and emotional needs cannot be met by material consumption, so consumption has led to consumerism.

The patient at times comes to us in full animal betrayal, depressed, dissatisfied with his/her own life and still feeling guilty for the dissatisfaction which supposedly he/she should not feel: I have everything; I should not feel this way.⁷

Anxiety, stress and depression have been a constant in our world. According to research by the World Health Organization (2006), depression is the factor that most leads to suicide and the average of suicides has risen 50% over the past 50 years. One million people commit suicide per year, more than the number of people who die as victims of murder or war. This corresponds to one death by suicide every 40 seconds somewhere on this planet.

Such a reality is in keeping with the materialist paradigm in which we live.

We need to remember that paradigms are like lenses through which we see the world, but we must not confuse these lenses with reality. The fact that we consider something obvious and out of the question means only

that it is obvious from the lenses that we use to look at reality. If we lived 500 years ago we would consider out of the question the fact that the earth was the center of the universe; all we would need was to look at the sun setting. To imagine that a ship could, going always forward, reach the place it had left would be viewed as absurd, seeing as the world was flat. Even the most reliable paradigms must be seen anew as time progresses. For example, the Newtonian concept of physical reality led to important developments in science. Nevertheless, at the start of the 20th century these parameters were deeply questioned with the appearance of quantum physics.

Even so, we continue to believe in an external, objective world which exists independent of our conscience, that is, in objectivity. However, we know from quantum physics that there is not an objective reality independent of the interference of consciousness; atoms and molecules do not have an objective reality, they are only potentialities. This does not apply only at the atomic level; the quantum perspective is the basis of all natural sciences, from chemistry to cosmology.

Quoting Heisenberg: "For the smallest units of matter are in fact not physical objects in the ordinary sense; they are forms, structures, or — in Plato's sense — Ideas..."⁸

It is only upon observation that the collapse of the wave function happens, which is the transition from potentiality to actuality. Quantum physics is intrinsically psychophysical. This is completely different from the materialistic vision wherein the psyche is merely a sub-product of the brain.

If I say that two objects distant one from the other are interdependent, without there being any possible communication between them, this may sound like magic, when actually it is another parameter of quantum physics: non-locality. At the quantum level, objects do not exist independently of one from the other; there is a true web of interconnections. Based on the most widely accepted theory about the origin of the universe, the Big Bang, what follows is a totally interconnected cosmos. According to Stapp:

...the mechanistic mindless concepts of classical physics (transforms) over to a highly tested, useful, and accurate mathematical picture of a nonlocal reality in which our streams of consciousness are naturally and efficaciously imbedded.⁹

These parameters should not sound so strange, at least not to us Jungians. After all, what Jung describes is no less than a psychophysical and interconnected world.

Analytical psychology, which developed along with quantum physics, inaugurates a new paradigm which is yet being born and very little assimilated by the collective consciousness.

When Jung describes the collective unconscious and the archetypal perspective, he is describing no less than the possibility of actualizing archetypal potentials, in reality, through consciousness. Time and space are conscious categories that are not present in the collective unconscious, just as they are not present in quantum mechanics. The archetype indicates psychic and physical potentialities that can be actualized if there are suitable conditions.

Jung called the non-representable essence of the psychoid an archetype, once it goes beyond the sphere of the psyche and forms the bridge to matter in general.¹⁰ The psychoid nature of the archetype is at the origin of the psyche and matter, and therefore at the origin of the basic structure of the universe.¹¹ When the archetypes operate simultaneously in the spheres of the psyche and matter they give rise to the phenomenon of synchronicity.¹²

Jung uses the term *unus mundus*, taken from alchemy, to describe the existence of a potential unified reality underlying the mind and matter duality.¹³ Our psyches are not isles; we are part of an interconnected whole. Within the mechanical materialist paradigm, the individual finds himself isolated in a world without meaning.¹⁴ The archetypal perspective brings evidence of deeper cosmic order which includes psyche and matter and allows the experience of the numinous. The experience of synchronicity enables the paradoxical experience of being at once singular and one with the universe. As I see it, the experience of synchronicity is the human experience of quantum connectedness.¹⁵

We see how, rising from different fields, physics and psychology converge to form the basis of a new paradigm.

Archetypes are potentialities; a change in consciousness alters the archetypal probabilities constellated in our unconscious, or in the language of physics; from the collapse of the wave function there is a change in the background of potentialities. As such we go about forging our destiny. Based on our conscious choices we go about forging our individual destinies as well as the destiny of humanity.¹⁶

The possibility of being aware of ourselves at once as individuals and as part of something larger, the consciousness that we are all interlinked and that our actions have repercussions for the whole, prompts an enormous change in our being in the world, our care of our own selves, the other, and the planet.

In 1989, CERN (the European Organization for Nuclear Research) created the hypertext that allowed working together and sharing knowledge among scientists on the World Wide Web project. In 1991, the web was made available worldwide. At the same time, cell phones came on the scene and later, with smartphones, the phone system linked up to the internet.

It is the first time in the history of humanity that we have experienced collectively the fact that we are interconnected.

Communication and information happen in the present instant; exchanges are instantaneous. Over a very short time, the reality in which we live has changed totally.

Of course, marketing is making good use of these new means of communication. Facebook, for example, leads the advertising market: everything the net knows about you, and that you make freely available on the net, is used towards the site's profit. Google registers the intention of a user to purchase even when the purchase is not carried through. This information is used to create the customer's market profile; segmented advertising, addressed directly to the potential consumer, has higher value.

Other criticisms have been made about this instant communication; with the avalanche of information we receive daily and with immediate communication, time for reflection can be at peril.

Besides superficiality, there is much room for exhibitionism. That is, this interconnection we live can yet be used for the ends of consumption and self-promotion based on appearances.

But not only to such ends, there is also the unprecedented possibility for transparency and participation. In June 2010, a person received via Facebook the photo of a 28 year old man who had been beaten to death by the security guards of Mubarak; the horror of the image was such that he mobilized and created a protest page on Facebook: Kullena Khaled Said (We are all Khaled Said). In two minutes he already had 300 followers; in three days, 100 thousand. People who sought information on Google would find the page. At that time the revolution in Tunisia happened. The Egyptians marked, via the internet, the protest march. As the page was not linked to any ideology or political group, everyone spread the call, and that is how the Arab Spring started in Egypt in January 2011. A month later the Egyptian dictatorial regime, which had lasted in power for 30 years, fell. Those dissatisfied with the dictatorship found a means of spreading information and of rapid articulation. In various countries with totalitarian regimes, access to internet is censured as a means of control.

Recently, a girl of 13 from a public school in Florianopolis, Brazil, created a page that she called Class Diary, denouncing through text, photos and videos the terrible conditions of her school. The school's manage-

ment tried to stop her, calling in her parents and asking that they remove the page. The parents supported the girl's initiative and the Class Diary had national repercussions. The school was improved and some teachers fired.

In Brazil, the Law of Access to Information, recently promulgated, though not yet totally implemented, allows each and every citizen to have access to public information on how public bodies use public money, revenues they have at hand, and the ongoing political actions of the three powers, federal, state and municipal.

With traditional media, the individual is little more than a passive consumer, subject to the manipulation of information and even to censorship of information. People now have the chance to leave off being mere consumers on the net and taking on a more active role and attitude, being able to create and collaborate with one another.

It is my understanding that we are living in a historical moment in which the very concept of friendship is widening.

In the history of humanity, friends interacted in two ways: through personal contact and at long distance, through letters, after the advent of mail. With the invention of the telephone during the 19th century, communication became easier. In 1926 the Catholic congregation Knights of Columbus brought up in all their meetings in the USA the question of whether the telephone might be damaging family relations and destroying the good habit of visiting friends. Today, critics of the internet also point to the risk of social isolation and of personal contact being substituted by virtual relations. However, recent research from 2004 revealed that time spent on internet did not take away from family or friend relationships, but rather from time used watching TV.¹⁷

Now the possibility arises of individuals intercommunicating and organizing information and actions aiming for the common good in a shared, non-hierarchical way, beyond the political representations as we know them. There is a good chance that dialogue between governments and communities can be transformed so as to reinvent democracy; the possibility emerges of a new type of participative democracy.

The average citizen can now express himself/herself publicly, share information and create collaborative endeavors, and carry out joint projects without geographic barriers. The new media has afforded the conditions for the expression of joint efforts that do not involve money, profit, organizations or hierarchies, but rather participation, generosity, sharing and altruism. All these human attitudes lost their dignity when we looked at the world through the prism of the materialist paradigm, when we recognized ourselves only as consumers and carriers of egotistical genes, as

mere survival machines; in this context, altruism itself was seen as a survival strategy.

Social networks have promoted meetings between people. Recent studies show that people who meet over the internet, when they realize they have values and interests in common, set dates to meet each other personally.¹⁸ People who have met but who live far from each other geographically have a means which helps them keep up these relations. There is the possibility of recovering old friendships that have been lost over time.

Wikis were also created, the collaborative software. A wiki is different from the other pages on the internet because it is edited by users, who add information, correct mistakes and complement ideas so that an article is updated through a collective effort; it is a collective construction. That is, people collaborate actively for the building and spreading of knowledge. The best known example is Wikipedia.

All types of networks have appeared, and it is possible, for instance, for people in the most diverse places in the world to synchronize a meditation session for world peace at a given moment. Networks have appeared to share common interests, such as those that help people find a ride, or via which people who suffer from a certain illness exchange information and support. There are social networks of help, which aim to create real interactions and collaborations between users. Networks have been created through which the public has the chance to promote an artistic event, for example crowdfunding. The artist, of whatever artistic segment, puts a project on the net, which could be a show, an exhibit, the making of a film etc., and the public invests directly, receiving a bonus for their participation. That is, people participate actively in the choice of what they want to support rather than remaining subject to what the cultural industry wants to promote.

I understand that support and collaboration, which happen in small groups, can be broadened without geographical barriers. We still have enormous cultural differences that allow projections of the shadow, but I believe that more and more we will have the conditions to form new contacts, and through them, learn to respect differences and find what unites us and brings us closer as human beings.

In this globalized world we can remain a mass, with a loss of identity and meaning, manipulable consumers moving inexorably towards the infeasibility of the next generations on the planet. Or we can, through this historical moment where we have, collectively, for the first time, the experience of being interconnected and of the importance of each one of us in the transformation of the whole, reinvent the relations of friendship. We

know within the new paradigm that on our conscious choices depend the world we create and the possible configurations of our future.

The basic characteristics making up friendships, which are mutual good will, support and help, have stopped being confined only to a small group of friends and can now be experienced in creative collective movements of cooperation, and of consideration for the other and the whole. On us depends the building of the new aion of Aquarius.

References

- Aufranc, A. L. "Saúde e desenvolvimento na psicologia analítica". In Bloise, P. (org.). *Saúde integral: a medicina do corpo, da mente e o papel da espiritualidade*. São Paulo: Editora Senac, 2011.
- . "A psique e o universo". In Revista *Junguiana* da Sociedade Brasileira de Psicologia Analítica, nº 24, 2006.
- . "A dimensão espiritual na atualidade". In Revista *Junguiana* da Sociedade Brasileira de Psicologia Analítica, nº22, 2004.
- . "A questão do sentido no mundo do acaso". In Revista *Junguiana* da Sociedade Brasileira de Psicologia Analítica, nº27, 2009.
- Dawkins, R. *O gene egoísta*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2007.
- Hruschka, D. J. *Friendship Developments, Ecology, and Evolution of a Relationship*. California: University of California Press, 2010.
- Jung, C.G. "On the nature of the psyche". In *Collected Works*. Vol. 8, "The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche". London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.
- . "Synchronicity: An Acausal Connecting Principle". In *Collected Works*. Vol. 8, "The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche". London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.
- . "The Conjunction". In *Collected Works*. Vol. 14, "*Mysterium Coniunctionis*". London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.
- Mallins, S. *Nature Loves to Hide: quantum physics and the nature of reality, a western perspective*. New Jersey: World Scientific publishing Co. Pte. Ltd, 2012.
- Pollan, M. *O dilema do ontívoro*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Intrínseca Ltda, 2006.
- Staap, H. P. *Mindful Universe Quantum Mechanics and the Participating Observer*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 2007.

Notes

¹ Daniel J. Hruschka, *Friendship: Developments, Ecology, and Evolution of a Relationship*, California: University of California Press, 2010, p.172.

² *Ibid*, p.166.

³ Richard Dawkins, *O gene egoísta*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2007.

⁴ Journal of Retailing Spring 1955, in ablemesh.co.uk

⁵ Michael Pollan, *O dilema do onívoro*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Intrínseca Ltda, 2006, p.119.

⁶ http://www.wphna.org/wn_commentary_ultraprocessing_nov2010.asp, p. 9.

⁷ Ana Lia Aufranc, “Saúde e desenvolvimento na psicologia analítica”, in Paulo Bloise (org.), *Saúde integral a medicina do corpo, da mente e o papel da espiritualidade*. São Paulo: Editora Senac, 2011, pp. 219-235.

⁸ Quoted in Shimon Malin, *Nature Loves to Hide*. New Jersey: World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte.Ltd. 2012, p.174.

⁹ Henry P. Stapp, *Mindful Universe Quantum Mechanics and the Participating Observer*, Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 2007), p.186

¹⁰ Carl G. Jung, “On the Nature of the Psyche” in *CW 8, The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981, §420.

¹¹ Ana Lia Aufranc, “A Psique e o Universo”, in *Junguiana*, nº 24, 2006, pp. 7-14.

¹² Carl G. Jung, “Synchronicity: An Acausal Connecting Principle” in *CW vol. 8: The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.

¹³ Carl G. Jung, “The Conjunction” in *CW 14*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.

¹⁴ Ana Lia Aufranc, “A Dimensão Espiritual na Atualidade”, in *Junguiana*, nº 22, 2004, pp. 17-23.

¹⁵ Ana Lia Aufranc, “A Questão do Sentido no Mundo do Acaso”, in *Junguiana*, nº2 7, 2009, pp. 41-50

¹⁶ *Ibid*.

¹⁷ Daniel J. Hruschka, *ibid*, p.191.

¹⁸ *Ibid*, p.190.

CHAPTER TWO

DEATH AND ITS PARADOXES: FRIEND/ENEMY, ENEMY/FRIEND

MARIA ODILA BUTI DE LIMA

I can assure you that being here today is not a particularly easy and pleasant task; therefore, thank you very much for coming, on behalf of friendship, to listen to such a sad subject.

I am quite conscious that talking about Death was my choice, and aspects of the shadow kept actually appearing with great awareness.

As it happens, I thought it would be easy, given that I had had some written discussions on the subject, and then – lalala lalala – all would be right! Quoting Chico Buarque, Brazilian composer, singing about finding a new love:

No way!

No new love, no lalalala with this archetype.

Actually, quite the opposite.

If it was already written and elaborated, why come into contact with this subject again? What a paradox!

Calling upon the dictionary, I sought the meaning of paradox, given that, as well as being a congress theme, it might explain why I was feeling like I was living one. Paradox:

1. Concept that is, or seems to be opposite to the ordinary: nonsensical, absurd, foolishness.
2. Any person, thing or situation exhibiting an apparently contradictory nature.

I identified with practically all those meanings. Nonsensical, absurd, foolishness.

Absurd: what we think we are dealing with when we face the Archetype of Death throughout our lives.

Nonsensical: to consider absurd the only certainty we have in life, except the fact that we were born.

Why did I not choose to talk about friendship at the table (a subject to be discussed at one of the congress's tables), which was what happened during the extenuating, almost weekly meetings we had so that, together with the Organizing Committee, we could come to this congress and be able to celebrate the beauty of life and connections, when we are such a big group, to talk about such a broad subject?

In reality, it is starting with friendship that I will speak of Death. I will start with some considerations I developed together with my brother, a philosophy historian, who wrote to me with a summary of what ancient scholars thought about the subject. From this summary I will pick out some thoughts about friendship that may serve as background to what I will say later.

I make use of some of his considerations on the Greek word *philia*, originator of friendship and love, and on *philosophia*, as love or desire to know. I think this may guide us through my chosen subject.

After all, using a sophism, every philosophy ultimately deals with the question of death. Would ancient philosophers accept talking about *philia* between life and death? "The idea of friendship, in Greek *philia*, is extremely broad, and was the subject of study of several ancient philosophers, such as Plato and Aristotle.

These philosophers considered whether not only relations among citizens, equals, but also family relations are friendship relations, as well as all relations where there is not or, at the time, was not, equality and reciprocity: between old and young, men and women, governors and governed. They also discussed whether the erotic relationship differs from the friendship relationship only in its level of desire or in its nature.

Reciprocity seems essential to a friendship relationship, whereas in an erotic relationship, we have on one side one that loves, and on the other, the object of love. Though in principle we are friends to those that befriend us (*philia* seems to presuppose a reciprocal relation), we may "love" without it being returned. Even so, there is no clear distinction, for, if the Greek word *philia* approximately corresponds to what we call "friendship", the greek verb *phileîn* is usually translated as "to love" (and philosophy as love or desire to know). Then, would the distinction between *philia* and *Eros* be only a distinction of desire intensity? Well, specifically regarding erotic relationships, in the Greek world, it was traditionally accepted between unequals: adult man and young man, or

man and woman. It was not so clear whether the same happened with friendship, or whether it could happen only among equals (citizens, therefore, in the political circle.)

But what seems more relevant to the theme I have chosen is that Greek philosophers developed theories about the whole universe according to an attraction/repulse relationship between similarity or dissimilarity: does similarity attract similarity or repel it? Or does attraction exist between opposites and repulse between equals?

This approximation between similars (or opposites) was called *philia*, friendship. And what caused distance (either similar or dissimilar) was enmity, discord.

The underlying question about friendship is whether it exists between equals or opposites. That is, are we friends of those who resemble us or of those who are different from us? Apparently, friendship occurs between equals, but soon a problem appears: actually, it is impossible for two bad people, two *equally* bad people to be friends. Hence, one may suppose that friendship always relates to good, and cannot happen between perverse individuals

However, friendship presupposes some *lack*. A perfectly virtuous man would be self-sufficient, and, therefore, would not need friends. Why would a perfectly good man, whose relationship with good comes from himself, from his own perfection, need others, as if something was missing? We may conclude that to Greeks, friendship also had to do with our *imperfection*, with our needs, with the fact that we are incomplete, and not enough for ourselves. Friendship makes us face what is human, and distances us from gods. After all, friendship, as well as death, makes man face his *limits*.

But there is another path by which the considerations of ancient people makes us face what is precisely human, and therefore also death. This is the paradox that comes from the notion of friendship to oneself, that Greeks called *philautia*, and that we should separate from selfishness, a word created much later. We must all be friends to ourselves. To Aristotle, this means that everything one says about friendship to others may be said about friendship to us. We may be friends because of the pleasure deriving from it (according to Aristotle, this is how particularly young people are friends). Or we may be friends because of our interests (mostly old people would be this kind of friends). Ultimately, we may be friends *because of good*, and only this friendship separates man from other animals, that also seek pleasure or interest, but have no idea of good.

The same happens with friendship to oneself. Its objective may be pleasure or interest. But to be more humanlike, to be more human, it

should aim for good. In any case, this friendship to oneself is not considered negative. Only later, with Hebrew-Christian philosophies, did the negative value of love to oneself, as opposed to renouncing oneself to divinity, increase.

Friendship between equals or unequals, friendship as need and limit, friendship to oneself or renunciation: these paradoxes that Greek philosophers developed little by little lead us back to our subject, and may remain at the heart of the considerations that I make once again about other paradoxes, this time on Death.

According to Jung, when we talk about symbols and a deep psychology based on what we actually live, abandoning the field of ideas, we may not only think about concrete death, the end of life, but also about its *symbolic* sense.

“Birth and death accompany a person’s life and form the genuine content of self-development germ. Light and darkness are an integral part of this way” (Liliane Frey-Rohn).

When well understood, the individuation process is not a preparation for life, but rather for death. “Living, we learn, but what we learn most is only to ask other major questions” (Guimarães Rosa).

And then we may speak of the Death Archetype and the apparitions with which he shows us his dear Great Lady. What can we do, it is inevitable...

Why consider endings to ALWAYS be bad? There are necessary and inevitable endings. Friendship may signify an approximation of equals (or opposites).

To use a commonplace phrase, death and life are opposites, but two sides of the same coin. Death and Life, Life and Death! Friend/Enemy, Enemy/Friend!

We then reach the paradox. Death and its paradoxes: Enemy/Friend/Friend/Enemy!

All right, better to be alive than dead, let us not use defensive equivalences such as “better to be happy than sad”. For fear of the unknown, we often avoid terminations, death.

We know nothing about what represents this sector, this interval of existence between eternity and eternity and eternity. The mystery of Before and After also hides the meaning of life..

—Aniela Jaffé

Interesting how, for the unknown, we always establish a 50/50 percent probability of being positive or negative. And that is provided we are optimistic. In practice, this rarely balances. In our classic pessimism, we

associate the unknown with death and with disgrace and the damnation of the Final Judgment.

Wilderness: these emptinesses of yours.

—Guimarães Rosa

Could endings be positive, friendly? Certainly, in the combat between Eros and Thanatos we hope our lively mythological youth, god of love and connections, may always win. We always consider life a friend and death an enemy. Will it always be like this? Can life be an enemy? From this angle the scale obviously favors the side of the friendly life!

Crazy life, life!

Brief life!

If I cannot lead you,

I want you to lead me!

—Lobão

After all, life is not even ours!

—Guimarães Rosa

I shall now try to make some observations about this binomial/paradox, and think about that mysterious moment in life when we meet this powerful archetype.

When was the first time the “Unwanted by all People” appeared in our lives? You, who are listening to me, what and how was your first time? What was activated in your psyche? Was it possible to elaborate upon it positively as years passed?

Because of life and clinical practice we know that to lose important people at a tender age complicates one’s development. We all empathize with children who lose important close figures. Early orphanhood, abandonment or trauma mark our psyches. We may either get stuck and paralyzed in our psychological growth, or, with some luck, activate our resilience capacity and jump development stages. This way, we might transform the pain of loss, if not into well-being, which would be highly unlikely, into wisdom and alterity.

Loss of childish innocence, the positive death of narcissistic innocence, is positive as it helps us to realize that the world is not a big idealized mother’s lap, ensuring us the satisfaction of all our needs. These symbolic losses put us in contact with a reality that shows us the human side, ours and another’s, the need, the original imperfection of the Other, and ultimately also ours. But, telling the truth? Hm...

As of today and forever more, shall we omnipotently declare Thanatos, the bogey man, with his terrible, abusive aspect, forbidden to appear in the lives of our children?

Let us agree that childish PQ will be constituted only by biological etiology, not derived or made worse by abuser/abused relatives, turning this chain into links with an endless sequence of prisons, abuses and abandonments?

Must the Big Gatherer so precociously amputate so many dreams, hopes and legitimate desires to love/be loved?

Shall we agree that in childhood, losses will be only those inherent to the process of change and transformation, and that Death's friendly, transforming side can appear?

Because sometimes she comes so precociously, killing so many children, leaving so many mothers with a dead child in their arms, renewing the pain caused in us by Michelangelo's *Pieta*.

I confess that it is very hard to find the friendly side of death; life is sovereign.

Everything that once was, is the beginning of what will come, every time we are competing. I think that is how it is, in equality. The devil in the street... Living is very dangerous.

—Guimarães Rosa

During adolescence, the hero archetype takes central stage.

Solar heroes in ancient mythology always had double parentage, the sons of gods and humans. We may feel like sons of gods to have the necessary courage to face the trajectory of life and make the necessary changes, letting the farewell archetype establish himself and opening space to live new challenges, to meet the other, to feel man/woman, to enter the world of sexuality, of life away from the family.

And then, feeling like sons of gods, we must kill! Symbolically we must commit matricide and patricide to differentiate ourselves from our biological family. This leads to suffering for parents, who often do not understand what has become of that sweet little girl, or that obedient little boy, who has given place to this other being full of crisis and complaints, demonstrating that he hates to love and need them! Why don't you die? Only a little? Why do you exist? Is it only to annoy me? And soon after you come asking for help and tenderness. Can one understand?

Love deceptions also activate the Big Lady's space. We know about the death wish and senselessness we experience with the loss of a loved one! How many times do we not call them Deceased?

What now? If we were still children, living the illusion of a single truth, we might ask: are relationship endings about Good or Evil? Friend or Enemy?

Friends rejoice, considering it good, but cannot stand anymore the suffering or accommodation one puts oneself in, or is put in by one's own complexes and dependences. The Deceased's Living suffers, wants to die, since one cannot kill the inside of oneself. Ultimately, at least in the first moments, it is impossible to consider and not to think that, although death is difficult and disagreeable, the ending is not necessarily the equivalent of evil.

We reach adulthood. Except for in exceptional circumstances, we suffer natural losses; the older generation. Although having the same capacity for suffering, we still relativize those deaths as being part of a distant and natural process. We miss the other, we suffer for him. The possibility of being visited by the still distant Lady does not frighten us. We have so much to do, so many projects to carry out, so many things not yet done, that it is almost a luxury to dedicate oneself to this subject, still considered in the philosophic scene.

Should we, with some psychic development, become able to enjoy the deliciousness and anguish of the dynamism of alterity, we would realize that except for ethics, universal matters, the unique, absolute truth does not exist; we are in the eye of a paradox.

Friend? Enemy? "Maybe yes, maybe no" (the analysis of a great friend).

When did you experience for the first time the Death Archetype in yourself and not in the other? How was this meeting? Has it already happened to you?

Yes, then we realize that Death may be concrete.

*What now John?
The party is over,
Lights are off,
people are gone,
evening got cold.
What now John?*

.....
*You walk John!
John, where to?*

—Carlos Drummond de Andrade

After the first moments of fright, one gets into a "big wave", the one that has swallowed so many surfers. One difficulty after another. One does not even get up to fall back again. A new order appears and the hero

archetype must work at full force and activate anger, fright and any other feelings that can be transformed into strength in the vast cause of Life.

Jung's postulate becomes clear when he says: "The individuation process is a preparation for death." This meeting may include something grand and revealing.

*Pain isn't more powerful than surprise! I climbed up from the abyss!
I crossed my phantoms!*
—Guimarães Rosa

The opposite side of life appears, the opposite side of light. Everything becomes random, gets lost, the stuff of dreams, of nightmares. It gets solved day after day.

We must ask for Sisyphus's help, the one who, after death, was condemned to carry a stone forever. However, as we still live, we go looking for the living Sisyphus. What does that mean and how is it done? When alive, Sisyphus was a great negotiator. Very clever, a skillful strategist, good at preventing future occurrences, he fooled death twice. He was one of the few mortals mentioned in the *Odyssey* that supposedly came back from Hades.

And we enter the dark side of light, the underground.

Sisyphus, the stone carrier, helps us with the necessary patience to rebuild a new order. A Japanese psychiatrist who treated tsunami victims said that, for them, the most difficult part was realizing that they could not go back to the past, and that this new order had to be created.

All this is part of the negotiating process. A chess game begins, or continues, as Bergman so well demonstrated in his movie *The Seventh Seal*. In it, a crusader knight, in Europe, devastated by plague, starts a chess and power game with the Big Gatherer, which appears in several disguises. They play and negotiate with the time factor, knowing that both will be winners: on the one side, more lifetime; on the other, the certainty that ultimately She will be the great winner.

When we face losses we do not consider part of life's natural process, we ask ourselves: "Why did life fight me?" However, I have also heard this question and realized how profound it is: "Why did death fight me?"

And how often would we like to give her a new watch that does not have to be so precise. Who knows if, slightly better oriented, the Undesired would not come so early to the party of Life and would not disappear during the difficult terminal hours, full of thorns and physical and psychic pain!

But it is interesting to notice that it is always the negative, the somber, that is projected onto her. The one that comes to gather the last breaths

could give us an answer: “I have insisted in every possible manner, but Life does not open doors for me!”

It is redundant, but necessary to speak about the useless lengthening of people’s lives: in the name of an ethical and modern medicine, people endure much suffering and relatives agonize. There are so few examples where the Great Lady may be desired, adored, that even then we transform her into “Geni”, like in Chico Buarque’s song.

This line of the vampire in the movie *Nosferatu* is very touching: “Have you ever imagined the anguish of never to die?”

However, not everybody faces their death when ill. Sometimes she shows up subtly, when we realize we are old.

My youth is gone... Is it Good or Bad? Friend/enemy, enemy/friend!

Fortunately, the dynamism of alterity allows us to relativize and, although the fact that being old and active is new, we do not accept readymade molds in which we do not fit, but the current collective conscience prevails.

How can we let death take the old, battered, ancient, obsolete in each one of us, so that new may reappear?

I wanted to understand fear and courage, and that which pushes us to do so many things, give form to what comes next.

—Guimarães Rosa

Wim Wenders, in the film *Palermo Shooting*, presents to us a photographer in Palermo, port of all arrivals and departures, who elaborates upon his mother’s loss and an apparently failed marriage by finding and confronting death, and by discovering a new love. And then Finn, the photographer, asks death: “Which is your face?”

Here, she impersonates a sweet, seductive and kind old man with wise observations.

All faces are mine...

The day to day of Death: this should be the name of a profession.

.....

I am the one that opens doors, I am the beginning, the connecting door, not the ending.

I am the only way out.

I love life, I celebrate it. Without me there would be no appreciation of life.

I must be the world’s biggest misunderstanding.

And when the photographer asks what he knows of Life, and what he, Finn, can do for Death, the answer is this beautiful line:

*You are afraid of real life, real darkness, you try to recreate.
 You are afraid of death, but you are afraid of life.
 Show me to the people.
 Let them see myself in them.
 Show them I am the arrow.
 The ugly side of death is what they build.
 Take care from now on.
 Slow down.
 We will meet at least one last time.*

And regarding death as a friend or enemy, I would like to remember one of our greatest poets, and how he envisages such a meeting – and his somewhat friendly dialogue – with death:

Special dinner

*When the undesirable of the people comes
 (I don't know if tough or gentle),
 Maybe I will fear.
 Maybe I will smile, or say:
 - Hello, uncheatable!
 - My day was good, the night can fall.
 (The night with its mysteries.)
 It will find the field plowed, the house clean,
 The table prepared
 With each thing on its place.
 —Manuel Bandeira*

We come to the end of our talk. I confess it was a difficult pregnancy and delivery. “I was told, and did not want to see!”

But in the symbology of birth, a boy was born, the world started again! (G. Rosa).

I leave with you the last paragraph of Guimarães Rosa’s “The Devil to pay in the Backlands”. We may observe and conclude how there is an implicit relationship between love and friendship.

Cerro, you see... To old age I go, with order and work. I know of myself? I do..... Friends we are. Nothing..... It's what I say, if it is...Exists, it's a human man. Crossing.

I would like to thank the friends, moviemakers, writers, musicians and poets, who helped me, with their beautiful words, to write about the most uncertain of certainties.

CHAPTER THREE

TOLERANCE VS. INTOLERANCE: CAN THERE BE FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN RIVALS?

CÉLIA BRANDÃO

Introduction

In a society driven by immediacy, a conflict occurs between the time of the psyche and the time imposed by the constant need to adapt to the competitive world. In this context, we sometimes identify aggressors as those who challenge hegemonic values and tradition and at other times as those who cling to traditional values and common sense as their only reference of security. Two sides of the same coin — sense and nonsense, tolerance and intolerance — condition the clashes of the search for meaning in a world that has become adverse.

Faced with the inhumanity of World War I, Jung immersed himself in the paradox of sense vs. nonsense, poring over the images of the collective unconscious and contents of the personal unconscious. This paradox did not die in time and stands in the globalized world because of its complexity and interfusion of meanings. In it, individuals oscillate between the desire for fusion — the experience of primal unity (of belonging to all) — and the desire for separation — driven by the process of individuation. The duel between these two forces can be experienced as a threat to identity; however, the ability of symbolic representation requires the simultaneous experience of self and non-self, and the understanding of life as one among infinite possibilities.

Every transformative process involves the birth and death dyad, the detachment of ancient symbols for the birth of new ones in the processing chain. Due to this, the fear of facing life often returns, transmuting into the fear of facing death. The "reverse" of fear, the denial of one's own limits, is also the negation of the other; our partner or the other within us, the dark side of the personality. According to James Hillman (1984), the *opus* that defies the creative, which limits its potential, and ultimately tests it, is al-