

Summary: Philosophy of C.G. Jung – postsecular reading

In my doctoral thesis I would like to present how it is possible to interpret the thought of C.G. Jung in postsecular and postmodern perspective. I start with a presentation of the silhouette of Swiss psychologist/philosopher, describing Jung on account of his point of view concerning religion (with special exposition of his opinions about Christianity). Further, I discuss a wide range of postsecular and postmodern theories, to be finally able to create postsecular/postmodern/hermeneutic *variations* about Jungian philosophy. Hermeneutics and postmodernism - as I recognize these currents - are rather endeavoring to psychoanalytically overwork religious *traumas* and to lead contemporary man (of Western culture) to a new *enlightenment* and (*post-*) modern opening, instead of animating religious imagination.

From among the most important figures of Jungian *imaginarium* susceptible to postsecular interpretation, I would like to enumerate depiction of *God*, who/that is intrapsychic mighty power preceding conscious human will. This God is good and evil in one *person*. Another postsecular thread in Jungian thought is anthropological imagination of man as a cultural Christian; as cultural protestant or catholic or finally mix of these both mental shapes. The end of these cultural-religious formations will come with the end of present Christian Era and beginning of the New Age. Jung wasn't orthodox and his Christianity resembles contemporary *private religion*. Actually, it's a fusion of many religions, philosophical, oriental and spiritual currents. Jung's religion finds its most mature example in his formula of Gnosticism that supplements Christianity with a lot of important motifs (including deep awareness of the evilness in human psyche), nonetheless it is a part of conservative and sometimes brutal political views as well (acceptance of social inequalities, some kind of economic liberalism based on social Darwinism). We can speak about *Jungian postsecularism* also in the case of *quasi-messianic*, Christian concept of *individuation* understood as a heroic, all-life process of human development.

Because this book has political intentions, I try to criticize not only Jungian philosophy in his religious views, but also postsecularism, finding in both currents a danger of political theology (which I regard as radical contrary to liberal-democracy's values). Kind of dangerous ideas I find in the works of communist postsecular thinkers like S. Žižek, T. Eagleton, A. Badiou, but also in the oeuvre of such seemingly moderate author as J. Habermas, who seems to be too much compliant to religious citizen's demands, creating social theory actually dangerous to modern project that Habermas is trying to support. I declare a necessity of return to J. F. Lyotard's conception of *the differend*, because of its

postmodern potential of noticing differences between people, discourses, cultures and of preparing tools to produce such model of social compromise that is not promulgating easy, idealistic reconciliation between the opposite sides of the conflict (modernists and religious people), underlining the importance of constructive conflict and state of permanent battle between incoherent mental constitutions (liberal and conservative) instead. Agreement should be the aftermath of this *differend*, but never a basis of social/philosophical, liberal/leftist theory.

Jerry Butterfield