



Future Academy®'s Multidisciplinary Conference
The Phenomenology and Ontology of Complexes

Matthew Gildersleeve^{a*}

^a University of Queensland, St Lucia, Brisbane, 4072, Australia

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to illustrate the congruency between the work of philosopher Martin Heidegger and psychologist Carl Jung. Specifically, this article will focus on providing a phenomenological description of Jung's complex theory with the use of Heidegger's ontology. In addition, this article will demonstrate how a Daseinsanalytic description of narcissism is significantly elucidating when read with a phenomenological understanding of complexes. In particular, this article argues that the meaning of a complex is phenomenologically disclosed when Dasein's world is conspicuously experienced as unready to hand and "not-being-at-home". In the experience of a complex, angst, conscience and guilt are saliently disclosed in a moment of conspicuous obstructiveness and obstinacy, which results in the ready to-hand losing its readiness-to-hand in a certain way. The authentic and inauthentic understanding of the meaning of complexes as a consequence of this moment will be described and related to Jung's psychoanalysis.

© 2016 Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Peer-review under responsibility of Future Academy® Cognitive Trading

Keywords: Jung, Psychoanalysis, Complexes, Phenomenology, Heidegger, Daseinsanalysis

Introduction

The purpose of this article is to provide a phenomenological description and explanation of Jung's complex theory which can be incorporated into the Daseinsanalytic literature. This article is possible because of the work by Heidegger in *Being and Time* and also Kastrinidis in his paper "the phenomenology of narcissistic neurosis" (Kastrinidis, 1988). Complexes will be explained to be arise when Dasein's understanding of existence is inauthentically narrow and dogmatically averse to the authentic meaning of the call of conscience which discloses the truth of Being. This article will highlight that complexes indicate Dasein has fallen prey to its being in the world due to a resolute fleeing from an authentic existence which is disclosed by angst, guilt and the call of conscience. Complexes can be phenomenologically and ontologically understood as signposts to assist Dasein toward its authentic being in the world, but complexes threaten Dasein's being in the world when these signposts have

* Corresponding author: Matthew Gildersleeve
E-mail address: m.gildersleeve@uq.edu.au

not been understood authentically. An authentic understanding of the meaning of a complex requires the resolute listening to the call of conscience which discloses the truth of Dasein's Being to itself as a call of guilt when angst is encountered within the world.

Consequently, the primary task of this article is to phenomenologically disclose the fundamental characteristics of the lived experience of a complex. Kastrinidis paper on narcissism will provide a useful platform to describe and explain the phenomenology of complexes. This article will also argue that complexes are maintained from an inauthentic understanding of the meaning of their experience which involves a projection of Being-perfect. Being perfect is a projected inauthentic understanding by Dasein that understands itself to have developed to the very apex of its potential and is coupled with closedness to other possibilities (e.g. imperfection, failure and guilt.) As a result, instead of authentically understanding the experience of a complex as the call of guilt from conscience which discloses the truth of Dasein's "not being at home", a Being-perfect projection resolutely flees facing the truth of guilt from falling prey and therefore lacks the discovery of new possibilities for being in the world. Conversely, if Dasein is resolute to authentically listen to the call of conscience to exist in the truth of Being, Dasein can authentically confront complexes and develop an interpreted understanding of new possibilities to expand the meaning of its being in the world. This understanding is essential to fulfil Dasein's authentic potential for being in the world and to avoid inauthentically falling prey to complexes which leads to an incomprehensible, insignificant and obstructive existence.

Individuation and Authenticity

Jung says "Individuation culminates in a develop-mental process which is peculiar to the psyche and consists in integrating the unconscious contents into consciousness. This means that the psychic human being becomes a whole," (Jung, 1969, p.223). This concept of wholeness is fundamental to the theme of this article. This article will explain that complexes arise when an individual lacks the openness to the process of becoming whole which means to be ontologically authentic. Instead of authentically and resolutely reflecting on the ontological meaning of the experience of a complex which is disclosed through the call of a guilty conscience and an attunement to angst; an inauthentic Being-perfect projection in response to the complex prevents individuation to psychic wholeness and the development of new possibilities for existing that allows the obstructiveness of a complex to being in the world to be overcome. An inauthentic Being-Perfect projection allows the guilt and call of conscience from falling prey from an inauthentic understanding of existence to be ignored but prevents the truth of Dasein's being in the world from being discovered. Ultimately, this inauthentic projection culminates in complexes alienating Dasein from the truth and meaning of Being which results in Dasein falling prey once again as Dasein's world becomes conspicuously and obstinately obstructive. The more resolutely and inauthentically the ontological meaning of a complex is denied an indication of guilt, the more likely the inauthentic understanding of the complex will assert itself with violent outbursts toward the obstructive world it encounters, thus further perpetuating Dasein's alienation from a true whole and authentic understanding. Alternatively, if the complex is authentically understood, the unconscious complex can be "made conscious, it results not only in their assimilation to the already existing ego-personality, but in a transformation of the latter" (Jung, 1969, p.224).

Jung says that the individuation process is a rare occurrence, "which is experienced only by those who have gone through the wearisome" (Jung, 1969, p.223). Individuation involves the process of integrating the unconscious components of the personality with consciousness. This article will highlight the phenomenology of what Jung says about unconscious complexes and why there is a tendency to inauthentically flee the process of individuation. Additionally, this article will explain that for individuation to take place, the wearisome process of individuation involves what Heidegger calls resoluteness, which is an authentic understanding of existence that avoids falling prey to an inauthentic existence. Falling prey occurs when Dasein has inauthentically fled from the ontological truth of existence disclosed in the experience of angst, guilt and conscience. As a result, the process of individuation can be understood to require the integration of irruptions of unconscious contents into consciousness. However, since the experience of the integration of the conscious with the unconscious complex are new to consciousness, a resolute projection toward this experience is required to avoid fleeing this experience which will prevent the truth of Being from being authentically unconcealed.

The Phenomenology and Ontology of Complexes

The first part of this article will explain and describe the ontological meaning and the phenomenology of complexes. The next section of this article will then explain and describe that a complex can remain unconscious by inauthentically understanding its ontological meaning. Finally the last sections of this article will provide a description and explanation to the process of authentically understanding the meaning of a complex which can result in its assimilation into consciousness for individuation to take place.

Jung presents his concept of a complex by saying that the ego is "frequently disturbed by strong feeling tones" (Jung, 1907, p.39) and "A situation threatening danger pushes aside the tranquil play of ideas and places in its stead a complex of other ideas of the strongest feeling-tone." (Jung, 1907, p.19) Jung describes his theory about the feeling tones of complexes through his experimental work on word association tests. Jung says that "we have proven that complexes disturb association experiments in a characteristic and regular manner." (Jung, 1907, p.42). Jung says "Indifferent reactions follow smoothly and generally have very short reaction times. They are always at hand for the ego-complex to dispose of at pleasure. It is different with the complex reactions!" (Jung, 1907, p.43).

Jung continues by saying "It would be expected that an educated subject would react easily, but indeed this is not the case. At the very simplest words there appear obstructions and other disturbances which can be explained only by the fact that the stimulus word has excited a complex. The emotional inhibition must be cited as the main hindering cause." (Jung, 1907, p.43). The experience of a complex also creates problems in reacting to stimulus in daily life, exerting hindrances and disturbances. Jung says an individual's self-control of thought and actions is disturbed in proportion to the strength of the complex.

Jung provides an example of the effect of a complex by saying "I was taking a walk with a very sensitive and hysterical gentleman. The village bells were pealing a new and very harmonious chime. My companion, who generally displayed great feeling for such tunes, suddenly began to rail at it, saying that he could not bear the disgusting ringing in the major key, that it sounded abominably, that this was an especially disagreeable church and unsightly village. This remarkable and inadequate affect interested me and I continued my investigation. My companion then began to

abuse the local parson. His reason for the abuse was that the minister had an ugly beard and wrote very bad poetry. My companion, too, was talented lyrically. The affect then lay in poetic rivalry.” (Jung, 1907, p.38).

With these descriptions by Jung on his theory of the complex, Heidegger’s phenomenology can be integrated to explain and describe the ontological meaning and the lived experience of a complex. To achieve this integration it is important to explain Heidegger’s work on being-in-the-world. Heidegger says Dasein exists within a totality of significance, or ‘situation’ which Heidegger calls facticity. “The factuality of the fact Da-sein, as the way in which every Da-sein actually is, we call its facticity” (Heidegger, 1996, p.52). In Heidegger’s section on the worldliness of the world he describes the ontological structure of the world, which allows Dasein to care and transcend its situation. One aspect of the worldliness of the world is that “There always belongs to the being of a useful thing a totality of useful things in which this useful thing can be what it is” (Heidegger, 1996, p.64). As a result “A useful thing is essentially “something in order to . . .” and “The structure of “in order to” contains a reference of something to something.” Heidegger explains that Dasein understands the totality of “relations in a preliminary disclosure” (Heidegger, 1996, p.81) of its own being-in-the-world. Dasein becomes familiar with the relations of beings in the world and “Da-sein “signifies” to itself.” It gives “itself to understand its being and potentiality-of-being with regard to its being-in-the-world” (Heidegger, 1996, p.81). Dasein discovers its potentiality of being-in-the-world through the “freeing of beings for a totality of relevance” (Heidegger, 1996, p.102). However if Dasein neglects possibilities that are unfamiliar to its average everydayness, Dasein can become alienated from its authentic being. In other words, if new possibilities are ignored and not interpreted by leaving a complex unconscious, the process of individuation cannot take place.

Heidegger also says; to the everydayness of Being-in-the-world there belong certain modes of concern. These permit the entities with which Dasein concerns itself to be encountered in such a way that the worldly character of what is within the world comes to be faced. When Dasein is concerned with something, entities which are ready-to-hand may be met as something unusable and not appropriately modified for the use that has been chosen. As a result, when unusability is discovered, equipment becomes conspicuous. “This conspicuousness presents the ready-to-hand equipment as in a certain un-readiness to hand” (Heidegger, 1962, p.103). This explanation of Dasein’s being in the world is very informative to Jung’s concept of the complex since Jung recognises the similar disturbance a complex has on a person “At the very simplest words there appear obstructions and other disturbances which can be explained only by the fact that the stimulus word has excited a complex” (Jung, 1907, p.43). The similarity between Jung’s descriptions of the experience of a complex on a person’s consciousness is very much the same as Heidegger’s description of Dasein encountering the world as conspicuous and unready to hand. Due to this connection between Jung and Heidegger’s work, Jung’s concept of the complex can be phenomenologically and ontologically developed and clarified.

The ontological meaning of the experience of a complex can be further understood by recognising that “In our concerned dealings, however, we not only come up against unusable things within what is ready-to-hand already : we also find things which are missing which not only are not ‘handy’ but are not ‘to hand’ at all” (Heidegger, 1962, p.103). When Dasein notices the un-ready-to-hand, the world of entities ready-to-hand becomes obstructive, which means the world “cannot be budged without the thing that is missing” (Heidegger, 1962, p.103). Consequently, anything which is un-ready-to-hand is disturbing to Dasein, and enables Dasein to see the obstinacy of that with which Dasein must concern itself (the complex). “With this obstinacy, the world makes itself known in a new way as the Being of that which still lies before us and calls for our attending to it” (Heidegger, 1962, p.104). In other words, the ontological meaning of the experience of a complex calls for Dasein’s attending to its obstinate obstructiveness to being in the world.

Now as Jung’s writing highlighted before, the experience of a complex disturbs and hinders daily life just in the same way Heidegger phenomenologically describes the world as unready to hand. As a result, what should now be apparent from the introduction of Heidegger’s writing is that the experience of a disturbing complex is an important moment to Dasein because it not only indicates that the current way of existing is unsuitable because of conspicuous obstructiveness of the world but it also indicates its obstinacy and need for attention to remove this obstructiveness from being in the world. Heidegger also says that the “structure of the Being of what is ready-to-hand as equipment is determined by references or assignments” (Heidegger, 1962, p.105). As a result, when the world of Dasein becomes conspicuously unready to hand, the reference or assignment has become explicit and the obstructive environment has been disclosed which means it has been opened or unconcealed. This opening of the obstructiveness of the world is a fundamental step in the process of making the unconscious complex, conscious in the process of individuation. A phenomenological explanation of the process of authentically understanding the complex and assimilating it into consciousness will be presented in the last third of this article, under the heading “authentic understanding of the experience of a complex”.

In other parts of Jung’s writing when he discusses complexes, Jung highlights they can “produce a fragmentation of the experience and wholeness of life” (Jung, 1969, p.98) as the complex disturbs consciousness. In addition, when a complex becomes active Jung says “The unity of consciousness and memory is disrupted and the intentions of the will are impeded or made impossible” (Jung, 1969, p.96). As a result, Jung postulates that the unconscious complex can possess an energy value more than consciousness. In addition, the complex is also described by Jung as “strongly accentuated emotionally and is, moreover, incompatible with the habitual attitude of consciousness” (Jung, 1969, p.96). This further highlights the connection between Jung’s description of the experience of a complex with Heidegger’s description of the conspicuous world that can turn from the everyday, habitual and familiar ready to hand being in the world to the unfamiliar obstructiveness of the unready to hand being in the world.

As a result, it is reasonable to argue that the experience of a complex can have an “uncanny” feeling that is completely different to the tranquilized feeling of average everydayness of habits. From Jung’s writing the complex displays the characteristics of individualising a person from other beings and in the same moment there appears to produce a feeling of “not-being-at-home” in the world. The uncanniness of this individualised ‘not being at home’ event of the experience of a complex reflects the writing of Heidegger’s description of Dasein’s experience of angst. Jung recognises that the feeling of a complex disrupts consciousness in the same way Heidegger explains angst disrupts Dasein’s being in the world. This similarity of emotion linking the complex with angst is evident when Jung suggests the “The emotional inhibition must be cited as the main hindering cause” (Jung, 1907, p.43) to consciousness. Thus emotion or angst inhibits the habitual and familiar everydayness for being in the world. With this connection established between Jung and Heidegger, later parts of this paper will explain that when a person allows

a complex to remain unconscious, this is a mode of inauthentically understanding the experience of being-in-the-world with others and covers up the authentic meaning of guilt, conscience and angst of complexes which results in a neglect of the truth and meaning of its Dasein's existence.

Heidegger says "that in the face of which one has anxiety is Being-in-the world" (Heidegger, 1962, p.231) however that in the face of which one has anxiety is not an entity within-the-world. To understand the ontology and phenomenology of complexes it is important to note that Heidegger also says that in the face of which one is anxious is completely indefinite and this tells Dasein that entities within-the-world are not relevant at all. Thus, when something threatening brings itself close, the experience of the anxiety of a complex "does not 'see' any definite 'here' or 'yonder' from which it comes" (Heidegger, 1962, p.231). The complex is unconscious and therefore "that in the face of which one has anxiety is characterized by the fact that what threatens is nowhere" (Heidegger, 1962, p.231). The experience of an unconscious complex results in conscious understanding not knowing what the cause of the anxiety is. This experience of a complex indicates anxiety about in Being-in the world and thus takes away from Dasein the possibility of understanding itself, in the way things have been previously interpreted. Thus the experience of a complex can be authentically recognised as Dasein feeling "not-at-home" due to an experience of an uncanny, obtrusive and unfamiliar world.

In addition to this attunement to anxiety in the experience of an unconscious complex, reasons suggest that conscience would also take part in this experience. The experience of a complex appears to also reveal the call of conscience as an appeal to Dasein. Heidegger says the call of conscience calls Dasein back to be called forth to an authentic projection in the face of anxiety from "not being home in the world". Conscience calls conspicuously and indefinitely to disclose that the world cannot be understood in the current familiar everydayness mode of being. The call of conscience's indefiniteness positively shows that Dasein has been inauthentic in its understanding of the world and calls Dasein forth to understand the truth of the meaning of the world which it is anxious about. Therefore the experience of a complex can also be ontologically understood as the call of conscience discoursing in keeping silent and calls Dasein back from falling prey by being inauthentic. The call of conscience pursues Dasein and is a threat to the lostness in everydayness which has forgotten itself.

As well, Heidegger's explanation of conscience has a strong resemblance to Jung's description of the autonomy of complexes. This can be appreciated when Heidegger says "Indeed the call is precisely something which we ourselves have neither planned nor prepared for nor voluntarily performed" (Heidegger, 1962, p.320). In addition, there are many similar meanings between Heidegger's phenomenology of angst, conscience and guilt and Jung's description of complexes and emotions. For example, Jung says "Emotions are instinctive, involuntary reactions which upset the rational order of consciousness by their elemental outbursts" (Jung, 1981, p.278) and "In a state of affect a trait of character sometimes appears which is strange even to the person concerned" (Jung, 1981, p.279). Heidegger likewise points to the alien nature of conscience by saying "'It' calls, against our expectations and even against our will" (Heidegger, 1962, p.320) and "The call comes from me and yet from beyond me" (Heidegger, 1962, p.320).

Finally, the last component of providing an ontological explanation of the meaning of the experience of a complex involves Heidegger's work on guilt. Heidegger says that the 'voice' of conscience speaks of Dasein's 'guilt'. The call of guilty by conscience means "having responsibility for- that is, as Being-the basis for . ." or "Being the- basis of a nullity" (Heidegger, 1962, p.331). Thus the experience of a complex can now be appropriately phenomenologically elucidated with Heidegger's ontology of guilt. The experience of a complex points to conscience calling Dasein guilty for being the basis for its unfamiliar and obstructive "not being at home in the world" (Heidegger, 1962, p.233). As a result, the experience of a complex is argued to consist of anxiety, conscience and guilt which is authentically understood as a call of care from Dasein to itself.

Understanding that Dasein has been called guilty by itself in the experience of a complex constitutes Dasein's care for its authentic being in the world. In the experience of a complex Dasein stands together with the truth of its primordial being and the emotionally charged complex is a call to Dasein to understand that it is not at home so to call Dasein forth to the possibility of authentically finding its home within the truth of Being. Consequently, the keeping silent of the call of conscience as the world loses its relevance in the experience of a complex summons Dasein into the stillness of itself, and Dasein is called "back as something that is to become still" (Heidegger, 1962, p.343). This stillness can be seen in Jung's work when he says "The emotional inhibition must be cited as the main hindering cause" (Jung, 1907, p.43) of consciousness. Therefore, the experience of a complex can be phenomenologically and ontologically understood as angst at not being at home in the world with a call of conscience that Dasein is the basis for the nullity for the unfamiliar and obstructive world it encounters. The world in its unfamiliarity is disclosed by its conspicuous, obstructive and obstinate character, which shows the world to Dasein as insignificant and in need of attention and care which leaves Dasein searching for authentic possibilities to find its being at home in the world.

In summary, the experience of a complex is an important moment for being in the world because it has the potential to liberate Dasein to turn toward its authentic meaning for being, with the disclosedness of by angst, conscience and guilt. If Dasein understands itself authentically in the experience of a complex, this allows Dasein to critically interpret its being-in-the-world to determine those unfamiliar and obstructive elements that have been neglected and so threaten its Dasein's care while being in the world. By falling prey to a complex which discloses an unfamiliar, absurd and meaningless world, Dasein encounters an obstinate and obstructive existence which calls Dasein forth to individuate "to its ownmost being-in-the-world, which as understanding, projects itself essentially upon possibilities" (Heidegger, 1996, p.176). Importantly, the positive nature of the experience of a complex can bring Dasein face to face with the concealed authentic possibilities of existence which have the potential to appropriate the unready to hand and obstructive world in the act of individuation. This will be discussed in part three of this paper "authentic understanding of the experience of a complex".

Inauthentic Understanding of the Experience of Complexes

This section of this paper outlines the phenomenology and ontology of an inauthentic understanding of complexes. To begin with, Jung states that complexes are psychic contents which are outside the control of the conscious mind. "They have been split off from consciousness and lead a

separate existence in the unconscious” (Jung, 2001, p.81). Therefore it is now important to provide a phenomenological description as to how it is ontologically possible for complexes to be split off from consciousness and to exist unconsciously.

Firstly, it is essential to recognise that by its ontological nature, Dasein is always projecting as long as it is and therefore can flee the possibility of living authentically. If Dasein follows an familiar average everydayness which turns away from authentically understanding the unfamiliarity of a complex, the care for its being in the world project goes astray which Heidegger calls “the entanglement of Da-sein” (Heidegger, 1996, p.164). Heidegger says entanglement leads to Dasein “Falling prey to the “world”, its absorption in being-with-one-another guided by idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity” (Heidegger, 1996, p.164) instead of an authentic understanding of the experience of a complex. Falling prey is the constitution of inauthentically turning away from understanding the meaning of the experience of a complex and falling prey to familiar average everydayness “tears understanding away from projecting authentic possibilities” (Heidegger, 1996, p.167) which leaves the complex covered within the unconscious. As a result of Dasein falling prey from inauthentically understanding the meaning of the experience of a complex, the truth of its possibilities of care for its ownmost authentic being-in-the-world are limited. This limitation and narrow outlook can lead to a neglect and loss of meaning to Dasein’s existence resulting in obstinacy of complexes and the obstructiveness of being in the world.

To further explain how complexes come to be experienced in the world of Dasein and obstinately prevalent, it is important to note that Heidegger says “The absorption of Da-sein in the ‘they’ and in the world taken care of reveals something like a flight of Da-sein from itself as an authentic potentiality for being itself” (Heidegger, 1996, p.172). In this flight, Dasein avoids a confrontation with its authentic existence which contains facing the obstructiveness and obstinacy of complexes which are disclosed through guilt, angst and conscience. Through an inauthentic understanding of the meaning of the experience of a complex, Dasein flees the truth of its authentic self and the complex remains undiscovered in the unconscious. Dasein is entrusted with and concerned about its being-in-the-world but can cover over its authentic possibilities for care which remain unconscious or undiscovered. Dasein’s essence as being-in-the-world is care, but if an inauthentic understanding of its being is present, Dasein can be said to be “fleeing from it and of forgetting” (Heidegger, 1996, p.41) it’s authentic being which is disclosed in the experience of a complex.

To add to this, Jung explains that complexes originate and always contain something like a “conflict-they are either the cause or the effect of a conflict” (Jung, 1969, p.98). The conflict which complexes represent have been inauthentically understood and Dasein has attempted to flee the truth of their existence by denying the authentic meaning they contain, which is that Dasein has fallen prey to encountering an obstructive world because it has not discovered an understanding of the truth of being. Jung’s work can be helpful to understand why Dasein is inauthentic when he says “Certainly one of the commonest causes is a moral conflict, which ultimately derives from the apparent impossibility of affirming the whole of one’s nature. This impossibility presupposes a direct split, no matter whether the conscious mind is aware of it or not” (Jung, 1969, p.98). In addition, since Dasein has fled from accepting the truth that complexes reveal, complexes “are “vulnerable points” which we do not like to remember and still less to be reminded of by others, but which frequently come back to mind unbidden and in the most unwelcome fashion” (Jung, 2001, p.81). Heidegger’s phenomenological description of uncanniness also highlights what Jung is saying, which is that the truth of being that has been attempted to be escaped, can only be escaped inauthentically “This uncanniness pursues Dasein constantly, and is a threat to its everyday lostness, though not explicitly” (Heidegger, 1962, p.234).

Consequently, for Dasein to exist authentically, Dasein requires a discovery of its authentic potentiality of being-in-the-world through developing an authentic understanding of its attunement to complexes. The necessity of Dasein’s attunement to being, to exist authentically is clearly elucidated by Heidegger when he says “In attunement lies existentially a disclosive submission to world out of which things that matter to us can be encountered” (Heidegger, 1996, p.130). Through attunement to a complex Dasein is moved and affected by the world by “Letting things be encountered” (Heidegger, 1996, p.129) which makes its authenticity and inauthenticity in relation to complexes ontologically possible. As a result, complexes ontologically represent the truth of being which Dasein does not want to face, however inauthentically fleeing is ineffective as the truth continues to exist even if Dasein inauthentically flees the truth of being. Since the truth of being persists although Dasein inauthentically prefers otherwise, complexes “always contain memories, wishes, fears, duties, needs, or views, with which we have never really come to terms, and for this reason they constantly interfere with our conscious life in a disturbing and usually a harmful way” (Jung, 2001, p.81). These reactions to the factual situation that led to the experience of a complex support the proposition that Dasein has inauthentically turned away from the truth of existence which does not disappear.

As a result, this highlights the necessity of resolutely and authentically understanding the meaning of the complex which will be explained in part three of this paper. Without this mode of being authentic, Dasein’s being is constantly threatened because it is in the untruth of being and therefore cannot appropriately or realistically care for its being in the world. Complexes contain the truth of Dasein’s undiscovered possibilities for being authentic and although “Complexes represent a kind of inferior consciousness” (Jung, 2001, p.82) they contain “an opening to new possibilities of achievement” (Jung, 2001, p.82) and “Complexes are therefore, in this sense, focal or nodal points of psychic life which we would not wish to do without” (Jung, 2001, p.82). Jung further explains that the genesis of a complex “arises from the clash between a requirement of adaptation and the individual’s constitutional inability to meet the challenge” (Jung, 2001, p.82) and Jung suggests that “Naturally, in these circumstances there is the greatest temptation simply to follow the power Instinct and to identify the ego with the self outright, in order to keep up the illusion of the ego’s mastery” (Jung, 1969, p.224).

When this aspect of Jung’s writing is analysed phenomenologically, it can be appreciated that identifying with the ego means Dasein has fled from an authentic understanding of the experience of complexes to identify with inauthentic familiar everyday being in the world. Identifying with the ego and the inability to adapt to life’s challenges can be phenomenologically described as fleeing into the average everyday familiarity with the world so as to tranquilize the angst, guilt and conscience of a complex. By fleeing into the familiarity of the “at-home” Dasein avoids the truth of facing the “not-at home” (Heidegger, 1962, p.234) which is disclosed by the experience of a complex. In addition, by leaving the self, unconscious, means to cover over the truth of Dasein who does not understand the meaning of guilt, conscience and angst for existence.

By inauthentically understanding the experience of a complex Dasein “does so by turning away from it in fleeing; in this turning-away, the “not-at-home” gets ‘dimmed down’” (Heidegger, 1962, p.234). By identifying with the “at home” of the familiar, Dasein flees to the “relief which comes with the supposed freedom of everydayness” (Heidegger, 1962, p.321). In Jung’s own words he says the complex can be “fled from with an effort of will, but not argued out of existence, and at the first suitable opportunity it reappears in all its original strength” (Jung, 1969, p.96). Thus Dasein can flee to the familiar and tranquilising feeling of “being at home” but the truth of “not being at home” remains in existence, it has just been covered over. The antithesis to fleeing the “not at home” is to want to have a conscience. In wanting to have a conscience lies “the choosing to choose a kind of Being-one’s-Self which, in accordance with its existential structure, we call “resoluteness”” (Heidegger, 1962, p.314). Resoluteness will be discussed in length in the third section of this paper.

Jung also points out that although complexes can try to be ignored they cannot be discounted in dreams “It is a negative admission of the instinctive fear which primitive man has of invisible things that move in the dark. Complexes are swamped by day, but at night raise their voices all the more clamorously, driving away sleep or filling it with bad dreams” (Jung, 1969, p.100). In addition, Jung says the fear of a complex prevents the unconscious from being known. “Fear of complexes is a bad signpost, however, because it always points away from the unconscious and back into consciousness.” (Jung, 1969, p.101) and if Dasein has an inauthentic understanding of complexes they “are something so unpleasant that nobody in his right senses can be persuaded that the motive forces which maintain them could promise anything good” (Jung, 1969, p.101). The previous sections have described and explained that the understanding of a complex can be inauthentic which means to not understand the ontological or authentic meaning of angst, guilt and conscience. This final section of a description of an inauthentic understanding of complexes will be focused on integrating the Daseinsanalytic work of Kastrinidis (Kastrinidis, 1988).

In his paper on the phenomenology of narcissism, Kastrinidis says the narcissistic individual carries out existence with a distinctive concern for perfection and wholeness and this colours all their behaviours. Kastrinidis says that narcissistic individuals require that all situations of their lives provide them with a tangible, certain sense of being perfect and whole. Although, Heidegger highlighted Dasein exists as potentiality-for-Being-a-whole (Heidegger, 1962, p. 349), it is not possible to exist factually as a whole since Dasein perpetually transcends itself, which means Dasein can never factually catch up with itself while existing. As a result, Heidegger says Dasein can only realize this potentiality-for-Being-a-whole by dying. As long as Dasein exists, Dasein can never be finally, factually complete because all that Dasein has not yet been, still exists as not actualised.

Kastrinidis analysis of narcissism is important for a phenomenological interpretation of Jung’s complexes as his work highlights a possible mechanism that a complex can be inauthentically concealed within the unconscious. Jung notes that “The conscious mind is invariably convinced that complexes are something inappropriate and should therefore be eliminated somehow or other” (Jung, 1969, p.101) and Kastrinidis work can assist in providing a phenomenological explanation to this statement of Jung’s. In addition, Kastrinidis can help explain why Jung tacitly recognises the resistance to an authentic understanding of complexes when he says “complexes have always existed and are ubiquitous, people cannot bring them- selves to regard them as normal phenomena of life” (Jung, 1969, p.102).

A phenomenological explanation for this behaviour can be constructed from Kastrinidis, specifically when he focuses on describing a phenomenological characteristic of the narcissist called Being-perfect, “which means narcissistic individuals have a special openness to projecting themselves as a Being-perfect” (Kastrinidis, 1988, p.172). Kastrinidis says “the German word for perfect is *vollkommen* and comes from the words “full” and “to come”, thus suggesting something which has “come fully” into its being, which has fully arrived, which has fully developed, and which, therefore, has come as far as it possibly can. Such a fully arrived, perfect response is one to which nothing can be added. An individual can do no better. It is this perfection, this indubitably ideal response in which nothing is lacking, that narcissistic individuals require of themselves in their relation to others, to things, to the world as a whole” (Kastrinidis, 1988, p.173). Through this inauthentic understanding, a being perfect projection allows complexes to be understood as insignificant or untruthful for Dasein’s being in the world. Consequently, a being perfect projection can act as a mechanism against authentically understanding the experience of a complex and thus the fear and fleeing of a complex and Dasein’s inauthenticity continue to exist. Jung also says “There is plenty of evidence to show that consciousness is very far from covering the psyche in its totality” (Jung, 1981, p.276) and this is an important part of Jung’s writing to be connected to Heidegger and Daseinsanalysis as this statement highlights the problem of a Being-perfect projection since any human understanding of being is very far from understanding its totality.

Jung says “This fear provokes violent resistance whenever complexes are examined, and considerable determination is needed to overcome it. Fear and resistance are the signposts that stand beside the entrance to the unconscious, and it is obvious that what they primarily signify is a preconceived opinion of the thing they are pointing at” (Jung, 1969, p.102). Therefore, since a being perfect occurs from the belief that Dasein “has developed to the very apex of its potential” (Kastrinidis, 1988, p.173) it conceals the entrance to the unconscious truth of Dasein, and is therefore “coupled with a radical closedness to other, equally human possibilities, namely, possibilities for imperfection, failure and, especially therefore, guilt” (Kastrinidis, 1988, p.173). Consequently, if Dasein projects perfection there is no possibility of unconcealing more of the truth and meaning of beings because being perfect means to be without guilt and “every response to the world must be “guiltless, complete, beautiful and whole” (Kastrinidis, 1988, p.173). Thus the authentic meaning of the complex remains concealed as Dasein does not understand guilt, angst or conscience authentically and Dasein’s world continues to be encountered as obstinately obstructive.

Thus being inauthentic towards a complex means to project a “feeling of fear” and a “feeling of resistance something repellent” (Jung, 1969, p.102). Also, through this projection of fear toward the complex an inauthentic existence by Dasein may involve gathering “people around who will serve as mirrors for reflecting the beloved image of self” (Kastrinidis, 1988, p.175) which prevents the guilt, angst and conscience which is disclosed in the experience of a complex from being encountered or unconcealed. This mirrored image of wholeness, oneness and perfection allows the complex to be concealed from existence for inauthentic Dasein. Without this mirror it would mean a readiness to accept the authentic meaning of a complex.

In contrast to an inauthentic being perfect projection, an authentic projection involves “a readiness to receive whatever it is that wants to show itself, to serve as an opening for the gathering of Being through a calm, self-composed waiting upon or attentiveness to Being” (Kastrinidis, 1988, p.180) which is called anticipatory resoluteness. However, unavoidably, inauthentic existence leads to falling prey when the truth of being which is temporally concealed by the complex, cannot be evaded. For example Jung says “the slightest remark touching the complex even remotely, immediately excites violent anger and painful outbreaks” (Jung, 1907, p.46). In such experiences of a complex, the possibility fleeing the truth of being and experiencing oneself as Being-whole or perfect evaporates. These are the very situations in which inauthentic individuals have the possibility to learn an authentic new basis for existing. However, if an inauthentic understanding exists and the experience of a complex threatens the being perfect projected illusion, the mood of Dasein can turn to “a sense of disappointment in the world which includes a violent rage at those elements of the world which are perceived as having failed to provide the palpable sense of wholeness” (Kastrinidis, 1988, p.175). With this resistance to an authentic understanding of the experience of a complex, Dasein closes itself off to the truth of Being and dictates its own inauthentic truth. Therefore, as long as an inauthentic understanding of complexes persists “there is a marked unconsciousness of any complexes, and this naturally guarantees them all the more freedom of action” (Jung, 1969, p.98). Consequently, if the being perfect projection is identified with as being authentic “the result being a momentary and unconscious alteration of personality known as identification with the complex” (Jung, 1969, p.98).

As a result of the work presented in this section it has become clear that Kastrinidis consideration of the existence and phenomenology of the narcissistic individual, reveals a basic structure of the phenomenology of Jung’s complex theory. What has been phenomenologically revealed is that complexes can be described as inauthentically absorbing an entire human existence in only one of its human possibilities, which is perpetuated through an inauthentic turning away from angst, guilt and conscience through a being perfect projection. In the next section of this paper, a discussion of the authentic understanding of a complex will now be presented.

Authentic Understanding of the Experience of Complexes

This section of this paper outlines the phenomenology and ontology of an authentic understanding of complexes which allows them to be conscious and integrated with the ego. From Jung’s writing about bringing the complex into consciousness he says if the ego integrates the complex there is an alteration of the ego and “Although it is able to preserve its structure, the ego is ousted from its central and dominating position and thus finds itself in the role of a passive observer who lacks the power to assert his will under all circumstances” (Jung, 1969, p.224). For this process to be adequately described ontologically, this section of this paper will explain the phenomenology of the ego integrating an unconscious complex which results from an authentic understanding of the experience of a complex.

To begin with explaining the phenomenology of an authentic understanding of complexes it is important to note that Heidegger says, “Being-in-the-world, amounts to a non-thematic circumspective absorption in references or assignments constitutive for the readiness-to-hand of a totality of equipment. In anything ready-to-hand the world is always 'there.'” (Heidegger, 1962, p.107). Furthermore, “An entity is discovered when it has been assigned or referred to something, and, referred as that entity which it is.” (Heidegger, 1962, p.115). This is important to be connected to what was said earlier about the world becoming obtrusive when Dasein has inauthentically understood complexes and being in the world. When Dasein encounters a complex the world becomes obtrusive and Dasein feels “not at home” from an experience of angst, guilt and conscience. The ontological meaning of these components of the experience of a complex were explained earlier as angst at not being at home in the world in the face of an obtrusive and insignificant world. In addition, conscience calls Dasein forth to its authentic understanding of complexes which it has fallen prey to. The call of conscience discloses Dasein as being the basis or being guilty for the obtrusiveness of not being at home in the world. Hence, this points to what Dasein is guilty of which has brought the obtrusiveness of the world into being. With the experience of a complex its authentic meaning is to be understood as being the basis for not discovering an entity to be assigned or referred to in Dasein’s world. This entity is undiscovered and missing from its world and thus the world falls into unreadiness to hand which is experienced as a complex.

Heidegger also says “With any such entity there is an involvement which it has in something. If something has an involvement, this implies letting it be involved in something.” (Heidegger, 1962, p.115) “and this letting something 'be' involved means rather that something which is already an 'entity' must be discovered in its readiness-to-hand, and that we must thus let the entity which has this Being be encountered. This 'a priori' letting-something-be-involved is the condition for the possibility of encountering anything ready-to-hand”. (Heidegger, 1962, p.117). Thus to discover the entity which is missing that brings Dasein to experience obtrusiveness of a complex means to let it be involved in its readiness to hand. As long as Dasein inauthentically understands the meaning of the experience of a complex, the entities which are missing cannot be involved in the readiness to hand and thus remain undiscovered and unconscious.

Heidegger also says entities have a definite place in the world which he calls a “region” which he explains by saying “When equipment for something or other has its place, this place defines itself as the place of this equipment-as one place out of a whole totality of places directionally lined up with each other and belonging to the context of equipment that is environmentally ready-to hand.” (Heidegger, 1962, p.136). Also, “Dasein, in its very Being, has this Being as an issue” (Heidegger, 1962, p.67) and Dasein discovers some regions of being and leaves others undiscovered. Heidegger says the readiness-to-hand of the world belongs to any region that has been discovered and “has the character of inconspicuous familiarity” (Heidegger, 1962, p.137). Importantly for the arguments concerning the phenomenology of complexes presented in this paper he also says “The region itself becomes visible in a conspicuous manner only when one discovers the ready-to-hand circumspectively and does so in the deficient modes of concern.” (Heidegger, 1962, p.138) and “Often the region of a place does not become accessible explicitly as such a region until one fails to find something in its place” (Heidegger, 1962, p.138). Therefore it can be phenomenologically explained from this discussion that when Dasein has an inauthentic understanding of the meaning of a complex, the region where the complex is experienced is left undiscovered and thus remains conspicuously obtrusive to being in the world. Alternatively, when Dasein has an authentic understanding of the meaning of a complex, Dasein has the possibility of discovering the unconscious involvements required for Dasein to unconceal the truth of being and find its authentic home in the world. Finally, it is important to explain that for Dasein to discover the truth of a region that has been inauthentically concealed, Dasein must give entities space in the world. Thus to bring the region that is conspicuously obstructive in the

experience of a complex into being inconspicuous, means to “move things around or out of the way or 'make room' for them” (Heidegger, 1962, p.146).

The disclosure of the entities that have been involved in the world amounts to an understanding of the world and in understanding a context of relations and Dasein has assigned itself to an ‘in-order-to’, and it has done so in terms of a project for being in the world. Thus by authentically understanding the meaning of a complex Dasein can discover and understand a context of relations for being in the world. In its character of projecting, understanding creates the ontological horizon or sight for Dasein. This sight in the project is characterized as taking care of things and the considerateness of concern for-the-sake-of-which Dasein exists. As a result, the meaning of Dasein’s existence is disclosed as the for-the-sake-of-which, which Heidegger calls understanding. Dasein ‘understands’ a potentiality for being-in-the-world, as something being possible. As Dasein discloses possibilities in a factual world to itself understandingly, Dasein not only discloses its ownmost potentiality for care of being but other beings are also disclosed and “freed for their own possibilities” (Heidegger, 1996, p.135). Therefore, to understand a complex authentically also means to free other beings for their own authentic possibilities by letting them be involved by making room for them to be part of Dasein’s being in the world in the region of the experience of a complex.

As it was said earlier, Dasein’s understanding of existence projects its being-in-the-world upon possibilities. Dasein’s projecting of understanding its being-in-the-world also has the possibility of development which Heidegger calls interpretation. Dasein’s interpretation of being-in-the-world is the development of possibilities projected in understanding. This means that when Dasein authentically frees other beings for their own authentic possibilities by letting them be involved by making room for them, there is the possibility of the development of this involvement to unconceal more of the truth of being. In this projecting of understanding, beings are disclosed to Dasein in their possibilities. With interpretation, Heidegger says “innerworldly beings are discovered, that is, have come to be understood, we say that they have meaning” (Heidegger, 1996, p.142). Therefore by authentically understanding the experience of a complex, Dasein has the possibility to understand the meaning for the obtuseness of the complex once beings have been freed for involvement through the developed interpretation of their possibilities. As a result, Dasein can be meaningful if Dasein is authentic in the face of the experience of a complex or meaningless when Dasein has inauthentically understood the experience of a complex. “This means that its own being and the beings disclosed with that being can be appropriated in understanding or they can be confined to incomprehensibility” and “only what is unmeaningful can be absurd” (Heidegger, 1996, p.142). Consequently, Dasein can encounter the absurdity of the world when Dasein is alienated from the truth of being and this absurdity is highlighted in the experience of complexes which disclose “not being at home” in the face of an obstructive world.

When Dasein has been individualised by the experience of a complex and in the understanding of not-being-at-home-in-the-world, Dasein has the possibility to authentically understand the truth of being to care for being because the region of the world that is obstructive has been made explicit. To assimilate the complex by understanding its meaning through an interpretation of possibilities and to remove its obstructiveness to being in the world, Heidegger’s work on truth is important. Heidegger says Being-true “means to-be-discovering” (Heidegger, 1996, p.201) and the being true means to let beings be seen in their unconcealment (discoveredness), taking them out of their concealment. As a result, the process of understanding the unconscious complex can be understood in Heideggerian terms as taking being out of concealment, which results in a new understanding of possibilities for being in the world when the truth of a being is authentically discovered. Heidegger says, “it is discoveredness of authentic disclosedness of Da-sein the most primordial phenomenon of truth attained. Dasein is in the truth means the disclosedness of its ownmost being belongs to its existential constitution” (Heidegger, 1996, p.203). Consequently, the truth of discoveredness, to care for one’s ownmost potentiality of being, is disclosed in an authentic understanding of the experience of complexes.

With Heidegger’s definition of truth outlined it becomes clear that Dasein’s authentic project towards complexes occurs “when Da-sein discovers the truth it discloses itself to itself in its ownmost potentiality-of being” (Heidegger, 1996, p.204). Discovering the truth through an authentic understanding of Dasein’s disclosedness is in contrast to the untruth of falling prey which misunderstands the ontological meaning of complexes. The authentic truth which “must always first be wrested from beings. Beings are torn from concealment” (Heidegger, 1996, p.204) can then be discovered, thus allowing the obstructiveness of a complex to be removed from being in the world. This distinctive and authentic understanding “is attested in Dasein itself by its conscience-this reticent self-projection up on one’s ownmost Being- guilty, in which one is ready for anxiety-we call “resoluteness”” (Heidegger, 1962, p.343). Thus an authentic understanding of complexes means to be resolute in the face of the experience of guilt, angst and conscience when not being in the world has been disclosed by an obstinately obstructive world.

Thus, to be resolute means to authentically understand the meaning of the experience of a complex. This means Dasein must understand it constantly lags behind its possibilities and therefore is constantly responsible for the nullity of itself in its existence. Therefore, resolute authenticity means Dasein must realise it is the ground for the care of its being-in-the-world and so must acknowledge its guilt for the nullity of what it is not. The call of conscience discloses Dasein as being guilty for the nullity of its existence and is a call to authentically care for existence in the experience of a complex. As a result, for complexes to be assimilated into the understanding of consciousness, Dasein must resolutely face the truth of its guilt in the experience of a complex. With an authentic understanding of the meaning of a complex, Dasein has chosen itself. Understanding the meaning of a complex means to choose to discover the truth of being and “becomes a readiness for anxiety.” (Heidegger, 1962, p.342). When Dasein understandingly responds to this possibility of authentically understanding a complex, Dasein has a readiness for “projecting oneself upon one’s ownmost authentic potentiality for becoming guilty” (Heidegger, 1996, p.265). In summary, when Dasein understands the authentic meaning of a complex this is called resoluteness, and resoluteness “is interpreted existentially as primordial truth” (Heidegger, 1996, p.273).

The authentic disclosedness of resoluteness modifies the experience of a complex in “both the way in which the ‘world’ is discovered and the way in which the Dasein-with Others is disclosed.” (Heidegger, 1962, p.344). As a result, The ‘world’ which is ready-to-hand does not become another one ‘in its content’, nor does the circle of Others get exchanged for a new one ; but both one’s Being towards the ready-to-hand understandingly and concernfully, and one’s solicitous Being with Others, are now given a definite character in terms of their ownmost potentiality-for-Beingtheir- Selves.” (Heidegger, 1962, p.344). Since Dasein has authentically understood the meaning of a complex and Dasein has been resolute to unconceal the truth of being, Dasein let’s being be free for its involvement in the ready to hand which removes the

obstructiveness from being in the world through understanding the meaning of the complex. By understanding the authentic meaning of a complex Dasein “makes it possible to let the Others who are with it ‘be’ through solicitude which leaps forth and liberates.” (Heidegger, 1962, p.344) because Dasein understands the truth of being instead of inauthentically projecting being perfect in the face of the experience of a complex as the world becomes unready to hand.

The experience of a complex is also always a specific circumstances and therefore authentically understanding the meaning of a complex “is always the resoluteness of some factual Dasein at a particular time.” (Heidegger, 1962, p.345) which Heidegger calls a “situation”. Through authentically and resolutely understanding a complex, the untruth of the situation is appropriated through an interpretation which “discovers first what is factually possible” (Heidegger, 1962, p.345) for being in the world. Therefore this resolute projection brings Dasein to the truth of its being in the world which allows a complex to be authentically understood and unconcealed because Dasein has chosen itself. Thus “resolute, Dasein is revealed to itself in its current factual potentiality-for-Being, and in such a way that Dasein itself is this revealing and Being-revealed.” (Heidegger, 1962, p.355). In other words, resoluteness allows Dasein to reveal the unconscious complex to itself to remove its obstructiveness to being in the world. Complexes or the truth of Dasein’s being can temporarily remain unconscious “in a dormant condition, it seems as if there were absolutely nothing in this hidden region.” (Jung, 1981, p.279). However the truth of being remains even though Dasein inauthentically denies the truth through a being perfect projection. By ignoring the truth of Dasein’s authenticity disclosed by angst, guilt and conscience, complexes cannot be understood as real and “Hence we are continually surprised when something unknown suddenly appears “from nowhere.”” (Jung, 1981, p.279). Alternatively, an authentic resoluteness which understands that angst, guilt and conscience reveal Dasein’s primordial truth to itself may allow Dasein to understand that “possibilities of future development may also come to light in this way, perhaps in just such an outburst of affect which sometimes radically alters the whole situation” (Jung, 1981, p.279). By being authentically resolute, complexes can be assimilated into consciousness when Dasein does not become absorbed in only one of its possibilities for being and has instead interpreted new possibilities for being in the world.

Daseinsanalysis

Now that this paper has outlined the phenomenology of complexes as well as inauthentic and authentic understanding of the meaning of complexes, this work can be integrated into Daseinsanalytic practice. The foundation of understanding psychopathology in Daseinsanalysis is that “whenever the fraction of carried out- possibilities is too low in relation to the full range of human possibilities the face of human illness shows.” (Kastrinidis, 1988, p.174). Which means human psychological illness is thought to take place when Dasein “loses its freedom to take up its full inheritance as a diverse, ever evolving presence in the world.” (Kastrinidis, 1988, p.174). Therefore it is clear that complexes require an authentic understanding of their meaning so Dasein has the freedom to “to take up its full inheritance as a diverse, ever evolving presence in the world”. (Kastrinidis, 1988, p.174). The inauthentic characteristics of being perfect and fleeing the meaning of a complex indicates the Dasein’s lack of freedom to take up such basic human characteristics as guilt angst and conscience and to evolve and open new possibilities for understanding the truth of being in the world.

Authentic wholeness can only be achieved at the very end of one’s existence, but by being inauthentic Dasein wants its complete entire future now while still existing. As a result, Dasein cannot anticipate possibilities for growth and paradoxically, inauthentic individuals have no future when a complex is inauthentically understood. This points directly to what inauthentic Dasein does not do but do to authentically find a sense of being at home in the world. As a result, when a therapist encounters a client who inauthentically understands complexes, Kastrinidis suggestion is helpful. Kastrinidis says the primary task of the psychotherapist is gradually to invite the client “to stand squarely in the face of their own humanity, their inevitable unwholeness and imperfection.” (Kastrinidis, 1988, p.182). For only with the awareness of this may inauthentic Dasein be destined to confront their unconscious complexes and fulfil its ownmost potential. When Jung clarifies his concept of individuation which he says takes place by making unconscious complexes, conscious, it is clear from the following description that individuation is exactly the opposite to a being perfect projection that Kastrinidis has described. “I note that the individuation process is confused with the coming of the ego into consciousness and that the ego is in consequence identified with the self, Individuation is then nothing but ego-centredness, the self comprises infinitely more than a mere ego . It is as much one’s self, and all other selves, as the ego. Individuation does not shut one out from the world, but gathers the world to oneself.” (Jung, 1969, p.226). This sentence highlights that individuation is the process of expanding consciousness by integrating unconscious complexes or in Daseinsanalytic terms, expanding possibilities for being in the world.

In summary, the task of the therapeutic relationship is for inauthentic Dasein to discover the unrecognized possibilities that are disclosed in the experience of a complex and to allow them to find their place and come into being in the world. It is therefore the psychotherapist’s task to assist inauthentic patients to become exposed and imperfect in relation to the therapist and to withstand the truth of existence which is disclosed by resoluteness in the face of the experience of a complex. As a result of this assistance, inauthentic Dasein has the possibility to become aware of and to accept their own inauthenticity and to authentically understand the meaning of the experience of a complex which is necessary for complexes to be assimilated into the being at home in the world and “does not shut one out from the world, but gathers the world to oneself.” (Jung, 1969, p.226).

Conclusion

In conclusion, this paper has built on the work of the previous paper which has illustrated the further congruency between Heidegger and Jung’s work. Specifically, this paper focused on providing a phenomenological description of Jung’s complex theory with the use of Heidegger’s ontology. In addition, this paper demonstrated how a Daseinsanalytic description of narcissism is significantly elucidating when read with a phenomenological understanding of complexes.

This paper explained that when Dasein encounters a complex the world becomes obtrusive and Dasein feels “not at home” from an experience of angst, guilt and conscience. The ontological meaning of these components of the experience of a complex were explained as angst at not being at home in the world in the face of an obtrusive and insignificant world. In addition, conscience calls Dasein forth to its authentic understanding of

complexes which it has fallen prey to. The call of conscience discloses Dasein as being the basis or being guilty for the obtrusiveness of not being at home in the world.

With the experience of a complex its authentic meaning is to be understood as being the basis for not discovering an entity to be assigned or referred to in Dasein's world. This entity is undiscovered and missing from its world and thus the world falls into unreadiness to hand which is experienced as a complex. By authentically understanding the experience of a complex, Dasein has the possibility to understand the meaning for the obtrusiveness of the complex once beings have been freed for involvement through the developed interpretation of truth of their possibilities. Thus an authentic understanding of complexes means to be resolute in the face of the experience of guilt, angst and conscience when 'not being in the world' has been disclosed by an obstinately obstructive world. By being authentically resolute, complexes can be assimilated into consciousness when Dasein does not become absorbed in only one of its possibilities for being and has instead interpreted new possibilities for being in the world, which is argued to be the foundation for understanding psychopathology in Daseinsanalysis since "whenever the fraction of carried out possibilities is too low in relation to the full range of human possibilities the face of human illness shows." (Kastrinidis, 1988, p.174).

References

- Heidegger, M. (2000). *Being and time*, (Macquarrie, J and Robinson, E, Trans.). Harper Collins.
- Heidegger, M. (1996). *Being and Time*, (Stambaugh, J, Trans). SUNY series in contemporary continental philosophy
- Jung, C. G. (1907). *The Psychology of Dementia Praecox*. (Peterson, F, Trans). New York: Nervous and Mental Disease Publ. Co.
- Jung, C. G. (1969). *The structure and dynamics of the psyche* (Hull, R Trans.). *The collected works of CG Jung*, 8.
- Jung, C. G. (1981). *The archetypes and the collective unconscious*. (Adler, G & Hull, R, Trans). Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (2001). *Modern man in search of a soul*. (Dell, W, Trans). Psychology Press.
- Kastrinidis, P. (1988). The phenomenology of narcissistic neurosis. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 16(1), 166-185.