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ABSTRACT

Through agriculture, humans have an intimate relationship to the land. Agriculture provides people with a link to the fertility of the earth in the production of resources for food, clothing and shelter. However, despite the fundamental dependence of humans on the earth’s fertility, people throughout history have transformed and degraded the natural landscapes of their agricultural lands. Continuation of this degradation will threaten the land’s ability to sustain the world’s increasing human populations.

This thesis investigates how agriculturalists might use the land without degrading it. The investigation focuses on the nature of the human–land relationship and begins with an examination of myth as an expression of the human relationship to the cosmos, including to the gods and the earth. Jungian psychology is examined for its explanation of symbolic perception and psychological attitude. Theological views on the human relationship to God are examined. These examinations of myth, psychology and theology identify two fundamental motifs in human thought about relationship to the cosmos: the Eros motif which derives from an egocentric attitude, and is associated with domination of nature; and the Agape motif which derives from the psychically reintegrated attitude, and is associated with creativity through the development of fertility. The examination of background theory is followed by motif-analysis of theories of the human–land relationship, and of two case studies—the historical development of agriculture in Australia, and a comparative study of soil conservation and keyline farming. The analyses indicate that most theory and practice of agriculture is conducted within the Eros motif which leads to land degradation and responsive attempts at remedial actions. In contrast, keyline farming is indicative of the Agape motif in its development of the natural fertility of the land.

The thesis concludes that the humanised landscapes of the world follow symbolic patterns generated by psychological attitudes. The egocentric attitude leads to the human domination of the land and its degradation through the transformation and simplification of the land’s ecological structure, and the superimposition of centralised settlement
patterns which are often incompatible with the natural systems. Alternatively, people with
the reintegrated attitude would nurture the land’s natural fertility through the integration
of land utilisation and settlement patterns with the landscapes’ natural configurations and
processes. Western thought is dominated by the Eros motif, inherited through religious
mythology and perpetuated through Western education based on rationalism,
reductionism and induction. This ethos tends to divorce humans from psychical and
physical nature, and leads to a fragmentary and distorted view of the world. Education is
necessary to bring the Agape motif into the consciousness of people and societies. People
might then recognise and experience their direct relationship to the world and to have a
creative relationship to the land.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT

The Australian continent supported aboriginal tribes for tens of thousands of years before it experienced Western agriculture introduced by the British settlers towards the end of the eighteenth century. After two hundred years of European-style agriculture in the continent, degradation of agricultural land has become one of Australia's most serious environmental problems (New South Wales Landcare Working Group 1992, p. 13; cf. Kerin 1983). Degradation, manifested largely as soil erosion, was noticed even in the initial decades of the settlement. Early governors regulated against the obvious land abuses, but the general community accepted degradation as incidental to the opening and development of new land. By the 1930s, following a series of severe droughts, soil erosion in south-eastern Australia had wreaked such economic, social and environmental damage that governments were forced to act (Macdonald Holmes 1946, chs 4, 16). State governments established soil conservation authorities which began their programs in earnest after the end of the second world war. However, despite the existence of these programs for more than fifty years, the degradation problem is worsening (Woods 1984, p. 101).

The Australian situation is not unique. History is littered with examples of collapsed civilisations in which degradation of the agricultural land was a factor, and perhaps the major cause, of the collapse. These incidents, however, occurred within particular societies and affected only their local land areas. European colonisation of the 'new world' over the last few centuries has radically altered this pattern. The Europeans changed the indigenous forms of subsistence agriculture to mechanised and commercial agriculture oriented to the export markets of Europe. Soil erosion has followed the introduction of European agricultural practices to the
new lands. With the widespread adoption of Western agricultural methods, degradation of agricultural land has now become a global phenomenon. Human societies depend on agriculture and yet they continue to degrade their soils. In the long term, individual regions and even the whole world could become incapable of sustaining human societies at existing or increased population numbers and living standards.

Degradative practices persist in agriculture despite the investment, in Australia and overseas, by individuals, organisations, academic institutions and governments, in research and development directed towards sustainability of agriculture. Even in ancient times individuals warned against the degradation and advocated care for the land. More recently, writers such as Aldo Leopold in *A Sand County Almanac*, published in 1949, and Rachel Carson in *Silent Spring*, published in 1962, have awakened the Western conscience to the dissociation between the human utilisation of land and the land as an ecological system. But it was Lynn White Jr's paper *The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis*, published in 1967, which struck a fundamental chord in the Western psyche. White addressed the question of why people and societies behave in a degradative way towards the land, and added a new dimension to the debate when he concluded that people's thoughts and actions are determined by their religious beliefs. He suggested that the world ecological crisis has its roots in the Western Judeo-Christian religious viewpoints of an evolutionary progressive teleology and a single God transcendent of nature. This represents a radical shift from pagan animism which saw nature as permeated by the different spirits, and time as being cyclical. The Judeo-Christian shift, wrote White, opened the way for the attitude that humans, in God's image, had dominance over nature and had the divine task of achieving scientific understanding and technological superiority over nature. Conquest, however, has brought degradation and, according to White, the solution lies in a reinterpretation of religious tradition.

White's drawing of the link between people's religious belief and their thought and action has been seminal to the debate on the human role in the ecological world, and his paper is widely included in environmental anthologies. He has evoked responses from those who want to deny religion, those who, like
White, are disillusioned by the failure of the common interpretation of the Christian tradition to address the dichotomy between people and the world, and from theologians who are rethinking their religion in the ecological context. As yet, however, no theory has been formulated to help us to overcome the brokenness of relationship between humans and the land and to establish a basis for a relationship of union and mutual support. This is a fundamental gap in land theory.

1.2 AIM

The aim of this thesis is to formulate a theory of the human relationship to land that will provide a basis for non-degradative agriculture.

1.3 RESEARCH APPROACH

To achieve this aim the thesis is presented in the following way.

Part I investigates various ways in which people have expressed their theories about their relationship to the world or the cosmos. The earliest formulations of these theories occurred in myths in which landscape phenomena were attributed with sacred symbolism which perceptually linked the divinity and the land. Psychology seeks to understand the functioning of the psyche, including the significance of myth, and offers insight into how the human personality perceives its relationship to the cosmos. Theology theorises on the relationships between the god or gods and people and the created world. Theology should, therefore, shed light on the relationship between creature humans and the created world. Consequently, myth, psychology and theology are reviewed, because they are fundamental attempts by society to theorise about not only the physical aspect, but also the divine, psychic or spiritual aspect of the human–cosmos relationship. Theories of the human–cosmos relationship might also be manifested in fields such as literature and art, but the focus in this thesis is on how they might be manifested in the theory and practice of use of agricultural land.

There are myths for every aspect of human existence, ranging from relationship to the gods, to the world, to society and to the individual journey through life and even the after-life. Creation myths, the Judeo-Christian example of
which is contained in the first chapters of the book of Genesis, portray an understanding of the coming into existence of the world and humankind. Creation myths are a form of theorising about the human relationship to gods and nature. The Hero myth portrays symbolically an individual’s psychological development through life, the journey towards salvation, and hence brings the global creation myth into a personal perspective. Myth uses symbolic imagery to describe landscapes, and these images portray how people think about their relationship to the land. Chapter 2, therefore, reviews myth as a means by which societies formulate their understandings of their place in the cosmos. The chapter discusses creation myth, hero myth and the mythical perception of the landscape.

During this century, psychology has progressed to the stage where it has much to say about the relationship between the human personality and the spiritual and earthly aspects of cosmic life. In particular, Carl Jung found that the symbolism of myth and religion was fundamental to his scientific investigation of the operation of the human psyche. These insights of the human psychological relationship to the cosmos are reviewed in chapter 3.

Chapter 4 extends the examination of how people think about their cosmos to the field of theology. Ideas on the nature of god or the gods form the core of religious systems and influence how people think about the divine and the world. As Australian agriculture has grown out of Western culture, this chapter concentrates on Western theology. It includes, also, comment on Australian Aboriginal theology, because of its relevance to the Australian landscape.

Part I is arranged in such a way that the discussion of myth provides a basis for the discussion of psychology, both of which involve the symbolic perception of land. This is followed by the discussion on theology which focuses on the relationship to God, the implications of which, for relationship to the land, are picked up in part II. The examination of theory in this part allows two fundamental motifs or ways of thinking about the world to be identified, the motifs of Eros and Agape. These are associated with two distinct stages of individual psychical development. Chapter 5 describes the design of a research method based on motif research in which the motifs of Eros and Agape, or rather the systems of symbolism associated with the motifs, are used as the basis for analysis of
examples of theory and practice in agriculture. The aim of part II is to investigate the religious motifs underlying the selected theories and practices of agriculture. This should shed light on whether either or both of the motifs can be used to formulate theory on the human–land relationship as a basis for non-degradative agriculture.

Chapter 6 analyses the motif symbolism of theories on the human–land relationship. This is followed by two case studies of the motif symbolism of the use of agricultural land. Chapter 7, the first case study, analyses the agricultural utilisation of the Australian continent by the Aboriginals and the European settlers. This allows the relationship of the two cultural groups to the same landscape to be compared. The second case study, described in chapter 8, comprises a comparative analysis of the theory and practice of soil conservation and keyline farming during the middle of the twentieth century in south-eastern Australia.

In part III, chapter 9 synthesises the insights from the background theory of part I and the findings from the motif-analysis of the examples of theory and practice of agricultural use of the land contained in part II. In chapter 10, the conclusions present a theory on the human relationship to land aimed at providing a basis for the development of non-degradative practices in agriculture.
PART I

REVIEW OF BACKGROUND THEORY

Myth, psychology and theology are examined in this part as expressions of theory on the human relationship to the cosmos and the land. The author is not qualified in any of these fields and does not attempt a comprehensive treatment of them. Illustrative sketches are drawn from the general literature and from the writings of particular authorities in each of the fields for the purpose of identifying commonality between their ideas and themes. This commonality will provide a basis for the analysis of theory and practice in agriculture which is contained in part II.
CHAPTER 2
THE HUMAN–COSMOS RELATIONSHIP
AS EXPRESSED IN MYTH

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Myth is the formulation in story form of a society's understanding of the relationship of humans to the cosmos, that is to the creator gods and to the spiritual and natural worlds. Myth is the earliest spoken or written expression of people's position in the world. Accordingly, it is the foundation upon which the systematised theories of religion and science are built. Thus, this chapter provides a basis for the investigations of psychology in chapter 3 and theology in chapter 4.

The aim of the chapter is to investigate the ways in which the human–cosmos relationship has been and continues to be expressed in myth.

The chapter does not attempt a review of the field of mythology, but rather looks at examples of myth which portray relationships between people and the cosmos. Section 2.2 outlines the concept of myth and its fundamental function of expressing the human–cosmos relationship. Section 2.3 outlines examples of creation myths, which represent the earliest systematised thinking about the cosmos and the relationship of the human race to both the creator gods and the created world. The various forms of creation myth indicate different theories about the relationships between the creator and the creation. Section 2.4 narrows the global scale of the creation myth down to the personal scale of the Hero myth, stories which portray the personal journey through life in the symbolic imagery of a larger-than-life legendary person. Hero myth indicates an evolution of the human personality through life and an associated development in relationship to the cosmos. Since early times, peoples have sought to reconcile their lives within the world of nature with the idea or experience of the transcendent. They have
attempted this through myth by investing images of the landscape and of nature in general with symbolic meaning. That is, sacred meaning is associated with the objects and processes of nature. Consequently, section 2.5 reviews how myth portrays the human relationship to land through particular symbolic images.

2.2 THE ROLE OF MYTH

Morford and Lenardon (1991, p. 1) write, ‘Webster’s Third New International Dictionary gives the following definition of myth: “a story that is usually of unknown origin and at least partially traditional, that ostensibly relates historical events usually of such character as to serve to explain some practice, belief, institution, or natural phenomenon, and that is especially associated with religious rites and beliefs”.’ Morford and Lenardon add that, ‘according to Gayley, “myths are born, not made”’ (p. 1), and ‘For [Rose], true myth...is ultimately “the result of the working of naïve imagination upon the facts of experience”’ (p. 2).

Morford and Lenardon write:

*Myth* is a comprehensive (but not exclusive) term for stories primarily concerned with the gods and man’s relations with them; [whereas] *saga,* or *legend*...has a perceptible relationship to history (p. 2).

As Kirk points out, this phrase [‘traditional tale’] emphasises that ‘a myth is a story, a narrative with a dramatic structure and a climax,’ and that myths ‘have succeeded in becoming traditional...important enough to be passed from generation to generation’ (p. 3).

For early societies, myth fulfilled the functions of ‘history, philosophy, theology, or science’, as well as providing ‘the basis for rituals by which the ways of humanity and those of nature could be psychologically reconciled’ (Leeming 1990, p. 4). However, Western scholars have adopted two fundamentally different schools of thought on the meaning of myth, dependent on whether or not myth is attributed with transcendental meaning. Since the Enlightenment, one school has sought to deny any transcendental meaning in myth or religion. Ries (1994) outlines how this school of thought developed. For example:

...A. Comte (1798–1857) argued that the law of the three states (theological, metaphysical and positivist) is the law of the evolution of the mind and of
society. Once free of myths and speculation about God, man could finally fully devote himself to science and the cult of humanity... (p. 22)

Herbert Spencer (1820–1902) was interested in the relationships between science, society and religion, and adopted biological evolution as a model... he explained how initial atheism gave way to primitive religion founded on ancestor worship, in its turn supplanted by polytheism and then monotheism, which were followed by positivism (p. 22).

Ries comments that Tylor (1832–1917), ‘the founder of British anthropology’, formulated a theory based on evolutionary determinism in which:

The primitive mentality applies this notion of soul to all the beings of the cosmos: thus we have animism, which begins with ancestor worship and then spreads into polytheism. Polytheism then generates the pantheon of great cultures, and ends up by flowing into monotheism (Ries 1994, p. 22).

Ries notes that Tylor’s theory led to evolutionism becoming a dogma which influenced such people as Frazer, Freud and Durkheim:

[Durkheim] envisaged society as a superior metaphysical reality, a mechanism that transcends the individual and is animated by a collective consciousness created by the set of beliefs and feelings common to a community. Religion he thus conceived as a natural manifestation of human activity. As a positivist, Durkheim maintained that the religious phenomenon was shaped by social behaviour and was therefore bound to exclude the supernatural, mystery, and the divinity (Ries 1994, p. 19).

Evolutionary determinism fostered the view that the modern human psyche had risen beyond that of early and traditional peoples, and thus had developed a new religious perspective. Ries points out that Lang, in 1898, ‘made a crucial break with evolutionist theory [on religion]’ when he hypothesised that traditional people, in general, held beliefs of a Supreme Being (p. 25). Schmidt (1868–1954) undertook field research to test this hypothesis, and his work led to the growth of a school of religious ethnology which held the view that the belief in a supreme being was at the origin of the traditional people’s religions (Ries, p. 25). The second school of thought, then, is characterised by the view that there is commonality in religious experience between traditional peoples, and that myth constitutes the expression of the perceived reality of integration between the worlds of sense and transcendence.
Included in this school might be, for example, Müller, Lévy-Bruhl and Eliade. Müller (1823–1900) believed that peoples have always had ‘an intuition of the divine and an idea of the infinite’, and have seen objects of nature as symbols of the transcendent (Ries, p. 14). Lévy-Bruhl (1857–1939) posited the concept of collective representations, whereby traditional people viewed their natural world through the images of symbolic figures which enabled them to feel an emotional attachment to the natural world: he saw symbolism as providing the link for the early peoples to participation with the sacred powers, and as the basis for sacred sites and all religious art (Ries, pp. 14f.). Ries, however, credits Eliade with bringing out the full meaning of myth as religious symbolism (pp. 25, et al.).

Eliade offers the insight that myth provides the paradigm for all meaningful human behaviour:

If we observe the general behavior of archaic man, we are struck by the following fact: neither the objects of the external world nor human acts, properly speaking, have any autonomous intrinsic value. Objects or acts acquire a value, and in so doing become real, because they participate, after one fashion or another, in a [mythical] reality that transcends them...

Now let us turn to human acts...Their meaning, their value, are not connected with their crude physical datum but with their property of reproducing a primordial act, of repeating a mythical example...they are repeated because they were consecrated in the beginning (‘in those days’, in illo tempore, ab origine) by gods, ancestors, or heroes (1971, pp. 3f.).

Hence [myths] constitute absolute values, paradigms for all human activities...Myths are the most general and effective means of awakening and maintaining consciousness of another world, a beyond, whether it be the divine world or the world of the Ancestors. This ‘other world’ represents a superhuman, ‘transcendent’ plane, the plane of absolute realities. It is the

1 Ries notes that Lévy-Bruhl considered the mystical as ‘the supersensible’ and not as the transcendent, and that despite the usefulness of his conceptions of symbolism, his position ‘is undermined by his positivist presuppositions and the corresponding view that all religion is mere superstition’ (Ries 1994, p. 15). However, it is interesting that Jung frequently uses Lévy-Bruhl’s concept of the collective representations to illustrate his idea of the archetypal images derived from the unconscious—and hence from the transcendent (e.g., Jung 1968b, CW9(i). paras 5, 89). In the present study, therefore, the concept of the collective representations is taken to be characteristic of the transcendental view of myth. This stance is supported also by the closeness between the emphases placed on symbolism by Lévy-Bruhl and Eliade.
experience of the sacred—that is, an encounter with a transhuman reality—which gives birth to the idea that something really exists, that hence there are absolute values capable of guiding man and giving a meaning to human existence. It is, then, through the experience of the sacred that the ideas of reality, truth, and significance first dawn, to be later elaborated and systematized by metaphysical speculations (1963, p. 139).

Eliade emphasises that people in modern societies also behave according to mythological models, notwithstanding that their rational minds have repressed these models into the unconscious (1959, pp. 201ff.).

Jung provides further insight into the importance and understanding of myth:

The collective unconscious—so far as we can say anything about it at all—appears to consist of mythological motifs or primordial images, for which reason the myths of all nations are its real exponents. In fact, the whole of mythology could be taken as a sort of projection of the collective unconscious (1969b, CW8, para. 325).

Joseph Campbell (1949) also adopts the view that the symbols of myth are generated from within the unconscious and that myth has a fundamental influence on human life:

myths...have been the living inspiration of whatever else may have appeared out of the activities of the human body and mind. It would not be too much to say that myth is the secret opening through which the inexhaustible energies of the cosmos pour into human cultural manifestation. Religions, philosophies, arts, the social forms of primitive and historic man, prime discoveries in science and technology, the very dreams that blister sleep, boil up from the basic, magic ring of myth. ...the symbols of mythology are not manufactured; they cannot be ordered, invented, or permanently suppressed. They are spontaneous productions of the psyche, and each bears within it, undamaged, the germ power of its source (Campbell 1949, pp. 3ff.).

Campbell states that the symbols from which myths are composed ‘touch and exhilarate centers of life beyond the reach of vocabularies of reason and coercion’ (1968, p. 4). He goes on to say:

The first function of a mythology is to reconcile waking consciousness to the mysterium tremendum et fascinosus of this universe as it is; the second being to render an interpretive total image of the same, as known to contemporary
It is the revelation to waking consciousness of the powers of its own sustaining source.

A third function, however, is the enforcement of moral order: the shaping of the individual to the requirements of his geographically and historically conditioned social group... And not nature, but society, is the alpha and omega of this lesson. Moreover, it is in this moral, sociological sphere that authority and coercion come into play... (pp. 4f.)

The fourth and most vital, most critical function of a mythology, then, is to foster the centering and unfolding of the individual in integrity, in accord with (d) himself (the microcosm), (c) his culture (the mesocosm), (b) the universe (the macrocosm), and (a) that awesome ultimate mystery which is both beyond and within himself and all things (p. 6).

The consistency between Eliade's view of the religious symbolism of myth and the views of Jung and Campbell that myth is a product of the unconscious part of the psyche gives strong support to the transcendental meaning of myth. The present study adopts this view of myth.

2.3 THE MYTHICAL CREATION

Creation myths describe in the 'contemporary consciousness' of a society the coming into existence of its world and people. This section reviews examples of creation myths from the traditions most relevant to the indigenous and European habitation of Australia, namely the Australian Aboriginal, the ancient Greek and the Judeo-Christian.

**Australian Aboriginal Creation Myth**

Ronald and Catherine Berndt recount this example of a creation story from one group of Aborigines in north-eastern Australia:

...the two Djanggau Sisters, Daughters of the Sun, came in their bark canoe with their Brother from the mythical land of the dead, Bralgu, somewhere in the Gulf of Carpentaria. They travelled from east to west on the path of the Sun. When they reached the Arnhem Land mainland they created special trees complete with foliage and birds. They shaped the country, named places, interacted with other mythic characters, and instituted the traditional customs of Aborigines of this cultural area. Most importantly, the two Sisters
gave birth to the first people, the ‘Children of Djanggau’, and put them in appropriate places. Then they disappeared westward into the setting sun (Berndt & Berndt 1989, p. 16).

Berndt and Berndt (1989, p. 15) describe the Australian Aborigines’ understanding of creation in the following way. The Aborigines knew the creation time as the ‘Dreaming’. Before the Dreaming, ‘there were only land, the waters and the elements: nature itself, untamed...It was a world latent in its potentialities, waiting to be awakened’. The mythical ancestors of the Dreamtime were spiritual deities. ‘Their role was essentially that of humanising the whole of the natural environment, harnessing everything within it,’ and of creating the human group who, through their descendants, would continually inhabit that place. The Dreamtime deities were many and varied, and were relevant only to specific locations. They had come from particular cosmic locations, either from different directions, from the unknown, the sky, or the earth. Each ancestor created particular forms in nature and moral values in its discrete geographical area by, for example, moving along specific routes, shaping the topography and infusing spiritual value into features. When the creation was complete the ancestors either metamorphosed into topographic features or into plant and animal species, or disappeared into the unknown. The physical creations of the Dreamtime constituted a once-for-all-time creation never to be repeated. The spiritual essence of the deities is, however, eternal. The role of human beings is to activate this spiritual essence through ritualistic re-enactment of the Dreamtime creation activities. This is what Mircea Eliade calls the ‘myth of the eternal return’ (Eliade 1971, pp. xiiiif.). Elkin (1979) writes that, for the Aborigines, ‘the present is the “past” latent and potential now. Through ritual and behaviour it is realized’ (p. 234).

Berndt and Berndt (1989) explain that the Dreamtime deities are the source of the life-force of all nature. They infused nature with this force in the Dreamtime, and provided the ‘instructions and guidelines’, manifested in human rituals, for the periodic reactivation of the life-force in an ‘everlasting’ world (p. 18). According to Berndt and Berndt (1989), the Aboriginal creation myths portray the Dreamtime deities as having moulded the features and processes of the natural landscape for the purposes of themselves and their human counterparts:
Mythic beings ensured, through their re-interpretation [transformation] of nature in human terms, that they would always have control over it. As mythic beings, they stood between nature and human endeavour. They bent nature to their own will. And they maintained their control through being the purveyors of a life-force through which they were able (with the ritual aid of human beings) to generate and re-generate all living forms (p. 19).

The Dreamtime myth established the belief in an autonomous but interdependent relationship between the ancestors, humans and the natural world in which humans had to initiate the re-activation of the ancestral creativity to allow the continuation of nature's cycles. Elkin (1979) explains that the Aborigines saw their ritualistic influence over nature not as an ability to magically conjure up extraordinary events, but rather as a means to cooperate with nature to maintain its seasonal patterns (p. 228). The Aborigines thus maintained nature in a status quo (p. 235). The Aborigines believed they shared a common life with all nature, and that people were created of the same spirit and flesh as their 'totem' animals (ch. 7 and p. 228). They believed that their initiative was essential to the continuous generation of life-force by the deity. There was no direct communion between people and the deities, and in post-dreaming time the ancestor deities had no direct contact with the people.

Aborigines have inhabited Australia for up to 50,000 or 60,000 years (Blainey 1982, p. 6). It is impossible to know how old the myths are, but it can be assumed that their original forms far predate the myths of classical Western civilisations. The Aboriginal creation myths assume a land pre-existing the Dreamtime creation, and both the land and the creation activities occurred within a defined geographical area.

**Ancient Greek Creation Myth**

The ancient Greek creation myths, described for example by Hesiod in 700 BC (see Morford & Lenardon 1991, p. 41), extend the creation concept to a cosmic scale and a pre-creation state of chaos. Morford and Lenardon write that 'the Greek word chaos suggests a "yawning void" ', but Hesiod's exact meaning is unclear (p. 43). It might be inferred that chaos means the elements of the earth in an unformed and
undifferentiated agglomeration. Guerber (1916, p. 2) describes chaos as 'a great confused mass', following the Roman poet Ovid who wrote seven hundred years later than Hesiod:

Ere earth and sea, and covering heavens, were known,
The face of nature, o'er the world, was one;
And men have called it Chaos; formless, rude,
The mass; dead matter's weight, inert, and crude;
Where, in mix'd heap of ill-compounded mould,
The jarring seeds of things confusedly roll'd
(Guerber, quoting Ovid, p. 2).

Morford and Lenardon (p. 44) note that neither the Greek nor the Roman tradition contained 'the concept of God creating something out of nothing.' The inference from this is that the ancient concept of chaos constituted a duality between already existent matter and the mythical form-creating gods. This might be extended to the view that matter per se had no value and, as in the Australian Aboriginal mythology, came to have value only by the differentiating and life-giving creation activities of the gods, who transformed matter into a form capable of sustaining human life.

Guerber (1916, pp. 2-10) summarises Hesiod's view of creation in the following steps. The 'shapeless mass' was ruled in darkness by the deity Chaos and his wife Nyx, the goddess of night. Their son Erebus (Darkness) dethroned his father, married Nyx and had two children Aether (Light) and Hemera (Day) who, in concert, seized power from their parents. Through their son Eros (Love) they created Pontus (the Sea) and Gaia (the Earth) and brought beauty to the land by the creation of vegetation, bird and animal life. Gaia then created Uranus (Heaven).

Despite the dated nature of this reference, its clear and concise description of the relevant topics makes it suitable for use here.

Morford and Lenardon (1991) note the significance of the female earth being the creator of the male sky: 'For Hesiod, it appears, the first deity is female, a basic matriarchal concept of mother earth and her fertility as primary and divine: comparative studies of iconography from primitive societies provide abundant evidence to confirm this archetype of the primacy of the feminine. The male sky god Uranus (another fundamental conception), produced by Earth herself, emerges, at least in this beginning, as her equal partner; in matriarchal societies, he is reduced to a subordinate, in patriarchal societies he becomes the supreme god' (p. 45).
Guerber (p. 4) writes ‘Another popular version stated that the first
divinities, Erebus and Nyx, produced a gigantic egg, from which Eros, the god of
love, emerged to create the Earth’. Eliade (1974) states that the symbol of the
cosmogonic egg is culturally widespread (pp. 413ff.) and derives its power as a
symbol to the human mind because it evokes a psychological meaning not merely
of a single creative act of the gods to bring the world into being in illo tempore (in
those mythical times, in the beginning), but of the idea of rebirth through which
humans can, by ritual re-enactment of the mythical creation, bring the eternal life-
giving power of the creation deities into communion with temporal life. Life then
becomes real and sacred because it is ‘the repeating of the archetypal birth of the
cosmos, the imitation of the cosmogony’ (Eliade 1974, p. 414). Eliade states:

The cosmogonic myth thus serves... as an archetypal model for all
‘creations’, at whatever level they occur: biological, psychological, spiritual.
The main function of myth is to determine the exemplar models of all ritual,
and of all significant human acts (p. 410; cf Tarnas 1993, pp. 3–15).

Eliade explains that this leads to a belief that, in accordance with the
society’s myths, the people should imitate what the gods did in the beginning (p.
417). The mythical conception of the human relationship to the gods therefore
determines the people’s total outlook to life and their mode of communication with
both the gods and the natural world.

Greek creation myth is based on a dualistic view of the cosmos in which
reality is perceived as comprising two different and opposing elements co-existing
in tension. Each element strives for superiority through the conquest of the other.
Initially, the deity Chaos and his wife Nyx (night) ruled over unformed nature.
Within the deity, each generation conquered the parent, usurped the cosmic
rulership and introduced new qualities to the cosmos. Erebus (darkness) dethroned
his father Chaos and fathered, by his mother Nyx, Aether (light) and Hemera (day).
They seized the rulership but were themselves overthrown by Gaia (earth) and
Uranus (sky) who produced the Titans, one of whom was Cronus, the father of
Zeus. Ultimately, Zeus conquered the rebellious Titans and the monsters sent by
Gaia, and assumed the role of the supreme (male) god, ruler of heaven and earth:
‘Peace now reigned throughout all the world’ (Guerber 1916, p. 14).
The Greek myths are based on the ethical values of power, conquest and possession. Humans inhabited a world controlled by the gods, and consequently human life was conducted in propitiation to the gods to win their favour and avoid their wrath. Nature was a pawn given by the gods in return for ritualistic propitiation. People used nature only under the sufferance of the jealous gods. Natural features were used to divine the will of the gods, and natural objects were sacrificed to appease the gods. The myth of Prometheus illustrates these points. Guerber (pp. 14-22) describes how Prometheus `longed to bestow upon [man] some great power, ...which would raise him far above all other living beings, and bring him nearer to the perfection of the immortal gods' (p. 15). Knowing that the gods would never willingly share the benefits of fire with humans, Prometheus risked death to steal it from Olympus, the home of Zeus, and gave it for the use of humankind. In retribution, Zeus demanded Prometheus’ body as a permanent living sacrifice and broke asunder the blissful human existence of the paradisal Golden Age because of the human acceptance of Prometheus’ gift, by sending the evils contained in Pandora’s wooden box. Zeus sent the evils into human life as a continuous penance because of humankind’s assumption of the divine power of control of fire and for Pandora’s insatiable desire to look inside the divine box to acquire the secrets of the gods. But Zeus had included Hope also in the box and this kept alive the human desire to appease the gods and thereby lighten the burden of sacrifice and suffering, and even perhaps achieve harmony in the earthly life or the after-life.

Judeo-Christian Creation Myth

The Old Testament contains a series of creation myths in the first eleven chapters of the book of Genesis. Westermann (1974) explains that the myths should be interpreted as a whole to understand the relationships between the creator, humans and the world. Westermann (pp. 5f.) writes that the book of Genesis contains an earlier version of a creation myth from the tenth-ninth centuries BC (Gen. 2: 4b–24) and a later version from the sixth-fifth centuries BC (Gen. 1: 1 – 2: 4a). These versions show an evolution in cosmological thinking. The older myth focuses on the creation of humankind and nature in a pre-existent world of water and earth in a primeval, formless and lifeless state. The myth is therefore structurally
consistent with the Aboriginal Dreamtime myths. In the older Genesis myth, God created by action: He gave life and form to 'the earth and the heavens' (Gen. 2: 4b) and 'formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life' (Gen. 2: 7). God watered the land to generate vegetative life (Gen. 2: 5f.). This myth, similar to the Dreamtime myths, did not describe the creation of the cosmos but a particular location, the Garden of Eden. The first-created man and woman, Adam and Eve, and all the creatures were placed in the garden. The human function was to till and keep the garden (Gen. 2: 15). The myth describes how the serpent led Eve to recognise self-interest, but only at the cost of her disobedience of God's command. Eve saw that, if she turned away from God, she might benefit from the utility of nature, the pleasure of beauty and the gaining of wisdom. She then led Adam in jointly disobeying God by eating of the tree in the middle of the garden in the hope of realising the serpent's promise that they would not die but would become like God, knowing good and evil (Gen. 3: 1–7).

The older Genesis story continues the ancient belief that there is a dissociation between the creator, humans and the natural world and that each is autonomous. The image of the Garden of Eden suggests a paradise of bliss and harmonious relationships. Westermann, a modern interpreter, argues that no such paradise ever existed (and that human work, for example, was always part of God's creation). He notes that the ancient paradise myth has tenaciously retained a place in Christian belief (pp. 80f.). Augustine, a Christian church father writing in the early fifth century, held the view that humankind originally existed in a blissful paradise (Augustine 1972, pp. 534, 567, 590). Belief in paradise allowed the mythical explanation of the perceived dissociation between humans and God. Human disobedience invoked God's vengeance. People held the unknown and nature in awe, and that existence was tenuous and required continuous propitiation to the cosmic spirits. God's anger was described as a curse. God was said to have established an enmity between the serpent and humankind, the pain of childbirth and a cursed land in which man had to toil among thorns and thistles all the days of his life (Gen. 3: 14–19). Life had become degraded from the paradise ideal. God, people and land had become dissociated. Suffering and toil was the human penance required because of the human uncertainty of the boundaries between the permitted
and the prohibited (cf. Bonhoeffer 1985, pp. 9f.). The motif of dissociation is continued with Cain's jealous murder of his brother Abel and God's repeated curse:

And now you are cursed from the ground... (Gen. 4: 11) When you till the ground, it will no longer yield to you its strength; you will be a fugitive and a wanderer on the earth (Gen. 4: 12).

The relationship between man and the land is here so broken that it is as though the land itself is degraded whenever man works it. Westermann points out that the dissociation from God is manifested not only in the broken relationship to the land and between brothers and within the community, but also in the community's separation from God as told in the story of the people's building of a city with a tower reaching to heaven (Gen. 11: 1–9). The penance imposed by God for this arrogance was a scattering of humankind over the earth and the confusion of their communication.

The later Genesis version (Gen. 1: 1 – 2: 4a) shows a fundamental change in thinking about the cosmos. Creation here is by word, not action. From this, it might be inferred that an evolution of consciousness was occurring towards an awareness of the distinction between spirit and matter and even perhaps between the conscious and the unconscious psyche. Creation is now of the cosmos in its totality, which introduces the concept of the void, which is taken up by early Christianity as creation ex nihilo, i.e. out of nothing. The story is based on the motif of relationship, which is emphasised through a sequence of contrasts between opposites. After the creation of each pair of opposites, God saw that it was good, meaning that in God's eyes the pairing comprised a whole in which the opposites were integrated in relationship. The opposites include the wind sweeping over the waters of the deep, the dome of the sky and the ocean deep, light and darkness, the seas and the land, the waters above and the waters beneath, male and female, and each species according to its kind contrasted with the relationship of dominion. The integration is confirmed by God's creation of humankind in the divine image, the Imago Dei, establishing for what seems to be the first time in mythical history a

---

4 The concept of creation ex nihilo will be discussed in chapter 3, section 3.2.
direct relationship between creator and creation. This myth is seeing a different cosmos to that of the earlier myth. Humankind in the *Imago Dei* is not that which was led into dissociation with God by the serpent. The link through the *Imago Dei* puts humankind into communion with God, and God’s subsequent granting of his dominion to humankind⁵ puts it also into direct relationship with the world.⁶

The contrast between humankind in dissociation and in relationship is shown later in the myth when God decides to destroy humankind and the creatures because of human wickedness (Gen. 6: 5–7), except for the righteous Noah and his family and breeding pairs of all the animals. The flood was caused by the coming together of the waters beneath with the waters above, representing a reversion of creation to the state of chaos. The flood destroyed all life on the earth except for the people and creatures preserved within the ark. The end of the flood is signalled by the dove returning to the ark with an olive leaf.⁷

The flood destroyed the Adamic people turned against God but created humankind anew in the Noahic pattern.⁸ God repeats to Noah the command previously given to the original humans in Genesis 1 to ‘Be fruitful and multiply, and fill [or replenish, in the King James Version] the earth’ (Gen. 9: 1). However,
the command to have dominion is now strengthened. God clarifies that humankind is his creation and he will demand a reckoning for transgression against the divine role of dominion in fulfilment of the *Imago Dei*. The command is now stated as: ‘... be fruitful, and multiply; abound on the earth [bring forth abundantly in the earth, KJV] and multiply in it’ (Gen. 9: 7). God confirms that the human dominion now means the bringing of God’s fertility abundantly into the world. This is a new cosmology of integration where God’s creativity can flow through the earthly *Imago Dei* to bring abundance to the land. God even makes propitiation redundant by promising to never again destroy the life on earth and to maintain the cycles of nature (Gen. 8: 21–22; 9: 8–17). The rainbow symbolises the ‘covenant’ or union between the rain and the earth, not as destructive flood but as creative fertility, and between God and all creatures. Thus the heavens and the land, the rains and the plants symbolise the new union between the male-female God and the people in dominion whose task is to bring the land to abundant fertility.

Thus, the Genesis creation myths represent two fundamentally different motifs or modes of thinking about the cosmos. The earlier motif is dissociation between the creator, humans and world. This causes a cursed relationship to the land which necessitates penitential toil and propitiatory ritual to maintain the production of nature’s goods. The later motif is relationship, which allows the cosmos to be seen as a unity. Opposition to God is replaced by obedience, and creativity can then be seen as continuous and evolutionary, bringing increased abundance from the earth.

Why are there two motifs? Have the Genesis authors mistakenly amalgamated stories from two different times which represent different and incompatible modes of thinking about the human position in the cosmos? No, the myth also states that the human heart, in youth, is inclined to evil (Gen. 8: 21), thus suggesting that Adam’s behaviour represents the youthful and immature stage while Noah’s position represents the mature stage of re-integration with God. The myth indicates that re-integration is a re-creation initiated by God by means of the flood, which is a mythical prototype of the ritual of baptism (cf. 1 Pet. 3: 20–21).

---

9 Noah was a worker with the soil and the first to plant a vineyard (Gen. 9: 20).
Because the whole of humankind had assumed autonomy from God, the flood had cosmic significance, but it might also be seen to apply to the individual, whereby the water symbolises the creative activity of God in transforming a person from Adamic dissociation to Noahic re-integration. Individuals such as Abraham and Moses follow the Noahic pattern and receive the resources and direction for life from God. Within the Christian tradition, creation mythology reaches its zenith with the Christ myth in the New Testament. Christ symbolises the integration between God and the world and shows that God gives of himself utterly for the world. Propitiation by humans might thus be seen to be redundant, as God is within every part of the creation and is the essence of the world’s continual creation.

The two motifs, dissociation and relationship, represent an immature and a mature cosmic understanding. Joseph Campbell illustrates this when he explains that the tree in the Garden of Eden is the tree of knowledge of good and evil when understood from the viewpoint of human autonomy, and the tree of life from the viewpoint of relationship with God (Campbell 1990, p. 207). Campbell states that the Babylonian creation myth can also be seen from two perspectives: either the warrior Marduk conquers and slays the chaos-monster Tiamat from whose severed parts he creates the world, or Tiamat gives of herself willingly and uses Marduk as the creating agent (Campbell 1949, pp. 288f.). Transformation from the autonomous person to the re-integrated person is a difficult task, and is the subject of the life journeys described in the Hero Myths, discussed in the next section.

2.4 THE MYTHICAL HERO

The myth of the Hero personalises the creation myth and illustrates a society’s understanding of the changing nature of an individual’s relationship to the cosmos as the personality matures through life. The hero myth portrays an individual’s adventures to win the prize of divine wisdom. The prize constitutes a re-creation or re-birth, so that the hero is twice-born—physically from the mother’s womb and spiritually through union with the sacred world. The hero’s adventures are allegories for psychological encounters with the spiritual and unconscious world. The subject of the myth is masculine, as the myth is a generic representation of the individual’s relationship to the cosmos. The cosmos is the generator and nurturer
of life, and hence is symbolised as female. The individual in (a dualistic) relationship to the cosmos is symbolised as the female's opposite or consort, and hence as masculine. Thus the stories are portrayed as hero myths.

Campbell (1964, pp. 158–162) and O'Connor (1993, p. 110) distinguish between heroes who, in undertaking their adventures, depend solely on their own attributes, and those who accept the assistance of a female guide. The hero's relationship to the feminine can range from autonomy, to accepting the advice from a human female companion, to being directed by a spiritual feminine guide. These variations represent, respectively, the struggle for independence from the mother, compliance with a consort, and union with the inner spirit. The variations can occur between myths and within myths. The autonomous hero who fights against the world to achieve independence is best symbolised by the characteristically masculine attributes of strength and brute power: the hero who is guided by the spirit might be seen to have more or less feminine characteristics. Nevertheless, the hero is masculine because of the over-riding symbolism of the individual in relationship to the feminine cosmos. Discussed below are examples of hero myths from the Australian Aboriginals and the ancient Greeks to illustrate the variations in the relationships of heroes to the feminine, and the similarity in the mythical imagery and motifs between different cultures.

Aboriginal Hero Myths
Berndt and Berndt (1988, p. 393) record the following myth from the central coast of Northern Territory, Australia:

At Unganba, between Sandy Creek and Junction Bay on the north-west coast of Arnhem Land, a group of people were travelling along. Eventually they came to Inimeiarwilam, meaning 'He pulled a bark canoe', at the mouth of the King River. The name commemorates their actions at this place, where they pulled a bark canoe down to the water and started to ferry people across. They had to make several trips. One man kept asking to be taken over, but each time he was refused. When most of them had crossed he was still sitting there, brooding. 'I'll turn myself into a crocodile', he thought. So he swam over to the other side — but he was not entirely a crocodile yet. 'I'll do something to make myself into a real crocodile'. He went to Aniwungalainjun, a little further upstream.
There he heated some ironwood roots over a fire, peeled off the bark and pounded it until it became soft, then went on pounding and moulding until it was like hard wax. He placed this on his nose, making it longer and blunter, like a crocodile’s, then plunged into the water and became a real crocodile. By this time the bark canoe was bringing over another load of travellers. The man-crocodile swam toward it, capsized it, killed them and ate them. Then he emerged and spoke to everyone: ‘I’ll do the same to all the people I catch, I’ll kill and eat them’. His spirit went up into the Milky Way...

Berndt and Berndt (1988) consider the story to be essentially ‘non-sacred’ and state that ‘stories like this account for the behaviour of creatures harmful to man by tracing it back to some grudge, or grievance, which left an enduring bitterness’ (p. 392). The story appears, on the contrary, to be deeply symbolic. It portrays the masculine way of achieving sacredness. Crossing the water symbolises a return to the pre-creation primeval deep. This represents a return to the watery world of the human embryo and is symbolically similar to Noah’s immersion in the flood. Campbell describes this stage of the Hero journey as ‘a transit into a sphere of rebirth...symbolized in the worldwide womb image of the belly of the whale’ in which the Hero endures a night-sea journey during which he ‘is swallowed into the unknown’ in a form of ‘self-annihilation’ (Campbell 1949, pp. 90f.).

The people who crossed the water by the canoe had only superficial contact with the water (the unknown, sacred world). The man who desired a spiritual rebirth was refused by the world. He had to enter the water and change his relationship to the world. Depending on his own initiative, he used fire and force to remould his nature to reconnect with the spiritual world. He brought to his people the sacred wisdom that they also would have to die and be reborn in the unknown to be united with the cosmos.

Langloh Parker (1953) collected the following aboriginal myth in the late nineteenth century. It is worth recounting here at length:

In the very beginning when Baiame, the sky king, walked the earth, out of the red ground of the ridges he made two men and a woman. When he saw that they were alive he showed them such plants as they should eat to keep life, then he went on his way.

For some time they lived on such plants as he had shown them; then came a drought, and plants grew scarce, and when one day a man killed a
kangaroo rat he and the woman ate some of its flesh, but the other man would not eat though he was famished for food, and lay as one dead.

Again and again the woman told him it was good and pressed him to eat.

Annoyed, weak as he was, he rose and walked angrily away towards the sunset, while the other two still ate hungrily.

When they had finished they looked for him, found he had gone some distance, and went after him. Over the sandhills, over the pebbly ridges they went, losing sight of him from time to time. When they reached the edge of the coolabah plain they saw their mate on the other side, by the river. They called to him to stop, but he heeded them not; on he went until he reached a huge yaraan, or white gum-tree, beneath which he fell to the ground. As he lay there dead they saw beside him a black figure with two huge fiery eyes. This figure raised him into the tree and dropped him into its hollow centre.

While still speeding across the plain they heard so terrific a burst of thunder that they fell startled to the ground. When they raised themselves they gazed wonderingly towards the giant gum-tree. They saw it being lifted from the earth and passing through the air towards the southern sky. They could not see their lost mate, but fiery eyes gleamed from the tree. Suddenly, a raucous shrieking broke the stillness; they saw it come from two yellow-crested white cockatoos flying after the vanishing tree. Mooyi, they called them.

On went the Spirit Tree, after it flew the Mooyi, shrieking loudly to it to stop, so that they might reach their roosting-place in it.

At last the tree planted itself near the Warnambool, or Milky Way, which leads to where the sky gods live. When it seemed quite still the tree gradually disappeared from their sight. They only saw four fiery eyes shine out. Two were the eyes of Yowi, the spirit of death. The other two were the eyes of the first man to die.

The Mooyi fly after the tree, trying always to reach their roost again.

When all nature realized that the passing of this man meant that death had come into the world, there was wailing everywhere. The swamp oak trees sighed incessantly, the gum-trees shed tears of blood, which crystallized into red gum.

To this day to the tribes of that part, the Southern Cross is known as Yaraan-doo, the place of the white gum-tree. And the Pointers are called
Mooyi, the white cockatoos.

So is the first coming of death remembered by the tribes, to whom the Southern Cross is a reminder (pp. 9f.).

The story starts as a creation myth before following the personalised journey of the hero. Like the Genesis myths, the story contrasts two stages of development of personality. The first man (Adam) and the woman (Eve) counteracted Baiame’s instruction; the second man (Noah) was obedient to Baiame and embarked on a journey of transformation to spiritual rebirth. The first man was autonomous in relation to the world. He was neither in relationship to his Dreamtime ancestors, the land and its animals nor to the woman. And yet he could lose his independence of personality by becoming enveloped by the woman’s point of view. This took him further from Baiame. The second man refused the autonomous path. He journeyed across the river to the sacred tree where he encountered the black figure, which is the same image as described by Carl Jung (e.g. 1968c, CW12, para. 334)—the ‘nigredo’ seen by the medieval alchemists as the first stage of transformation of matter by fire which represents symbolically the spiritual rebirth of the human soul. The nigredo placed the man in the hollow of the tree symbolising the aboriginal sacred hollow log or ‘ubar’, the womb of the earth goddess or rainbow serpent (Elkin 1979, pp. 255ff.) from which he could be reborn. Self-annihilation or the return to the pre-creation was necessary to allow the man’s spiritual re-creation. This man was living in obedient relationship to the Dreamtime spirits.

Eliade (1971) notes that ancient myths portray thunder as the voice of the sky-god (pp. 38ff.; cf. Jung 1967, CW5, para. 421). It has been suggested that the sound of thunder might have been early humanity’s first perception of a spiritual ‘other’. In the above myth, thunder preceded the ascent of the sacred tree to the heavens. The cockatoos symbolise the link between heaven and earth. The trees on the land are also aware that death had become a part of existence. The first man, like Adam (Gen. 3: 19), showed there was a kind of death in the broken relationship with the creator but the second man, like Noah, showed that there was another type of dying when the personality undergoes an ‘annihilation’ and is re-created as a new spiritual being.
Greek and Roman Classical Hero Myths

O’Connor (1993, ch. 4) cites Hercules (Heracles) as an example of the autonomous and unaided masculine motif in the hero myth, in contrast to Aeneas, the Trojan hero in Virgil’s Aeneid, whose adventures into the unknown portray the motif of the hero’s direction by the female guide. The myths of Heracles and Aeneas are outlined below to illustrate these different motifs of relationship to the world.

Heracles

Heracles, the son of Zeus and a human mother, fought a life of challenges, initiated by the envious goddess Hera. His primitive lion skin cloak and rough-hewn club symbolise his animal instinctuality and one-sided masculine nature. Hera cursed Heracles’ life by imposing on him a series of arduous and dangerous tasks. In each task, Heracles used strength, brutality and guile to conquer the mythical monsters and threatening situations. Guerber (1916, p. 201) writes that after Heracles’ main conquests, the gods condemned him to be a slave to Queen Omphale who made him do feminine tasks and mocked his heroic virtues. Heracles, however, fell in love with Omphale and ‘seemed to wish nothing better than to remain her slave for ever, and end his days in idleness and pleasure’ (Guerber, p. 201). This was enslavement to a consort, involving denial of life and quite different to living in communion with a nurturing spirit. Heracles was subsequently sent by the gods on further deeds. He married but let down his wife who in jealousy poisoned him. Heracles is the story of the male fighting against the female throughout life in the hope of attaining an after-life paradise. Heracles personally had no sense of destiny on earth. His life comprised continual torment and frustration because of Hera’s ‘curse’: ‘I was a son of Zeus, but infinite was my suffering’ (Morford & Lenardon 1991, p. 462). Heracles’ prize (p. 462) for his labours was to ‘win rest’ (p. 461), but only after death and reaching his immortal home on Olympus. Heracles, maintaining his autonomy to the end, constructed his own funeral pyre from the forest oaks. Only after the flames destroyed his body did Zeus come to carry his soul to Olympus, the home of the gods (Guerber 1916, pp. 206f.):

Unto this thy son it shall be given,
With his broad heart to win his way to heaven:
Twelve labours shall he work; and all accurst
Heracles’ life appears to have comprised a series of dangerous challenges undertaken as unconscious propitiatory responses to an unknown threatening earth goddess. The challenges materialised as a continuous conquest of nature, including ultimately of his own body.

**Aeneas**

Virgil wrote the Aeneid during the second half of the first century B.C. (Morford & Lenardon 1991, p. 323), approximately seven hundred years after Homer’s Odyssey, on which it is broadly based. The Aeneid tells the mythical story of Aeneas leaving Troy after its destruction by the Greeks and travelling through many adventures before settling ultimately in Latium (Italy) in the district where Rome was subsequently established by his son (Morford & Lenardon, pp. 584–589).

The story of Aeneas is in fundamental contrast to that of Heracles. Aeneas lived in communion with the feminine throughout his life. His divinity derived from his mother Venus, the goddess of beauty, love and spring, who was the advocate among the gods for Aeneas’ fate (Virgil 1986, bk I) even against Hera’s antagonism. The bond between Aeneas and Venus meant that Aeneas knew of his earthly fate, illustrated, for example, when he said: ‘...my mother, a goddess, showing the way. I followed destiny’s bidding’ (bk I, ll. 381–382). This divine bond materialised into a physical bond when Aeneas’ group of Trojans survived the devastating Hera-invoked storm at sea and landed at Carthage where, through the manipulation of fate by both Hera and Venus, Aeneas and Queen Dido fell in love and married. Their passionate love consumed them and Aeneas forgot his destiny of establishing the Roman nation (bk IV).

Aeneas’ relationship to his fate now experiences a radical change. Jupiter’s messenger, Mercury, appears to Aeneas in a vision and reminds him of his ‘own
high destiny’ (bk IV, l. 272) which his passionate married life in Carthage is jeopardising. Also his father, Anchises, appears to him in dreams and warns and frightens him. Aeneas responds to his calling by leaving Dido, ‘God’s will, not mine, says “Italy”’ (bk IV, l. 361).

Aeneas is then led to Cumae where he meets the prophetess Sibyl, his guide to the underworld. The Sibyl warns Aeneas against pride by saying ‘...Night and day lie open the gates of death’s dark kingdom: but to retrace your steps, to find the way back to daylight—that is the task, the hard thing’ (bk VI ll. 127–129). Aeneas is told he must first pluck the golden bough:

Just pull it out: that branch will come away quite easily
If destiny means you to go; otherwise no amount of
Brute force will get it, nor hard steel avail to hew it away
(bk VI, ll. 146–148).

The Sibyl is teaching a way contrary to the Herculean masculine way. Aeneas follows the Sibyl into the ‘enormously gaping’ mouth of the ‘deep, deep cave’ (bk VI, l. 237). Echoing the Aboriginal mythical theme of crossing the river, Aeneas and Sibyl meet the squalid ferryman to cross the seething, murky waters of the underworld water of chaos. By showing the golden bough they are ferried across the water to see the hell of Tartarus and the Elysian Fields of the Blessed. Aeneas meets the shade (shadow) of Anchises who describes Aeneas’ role in the establishment of the future Roman Empire and shows him the images of the people who will be, after their re-entry to the visible world, the glory of Rome. Anchises states that while the Greeks are skilled in art, oratory and science, Aeneas and the Romans have a different mission:

But, Romans, never forget that government is your medium!
Be this your art:—to practice men in the habit of peace,
Generosity to the conquered, and firmness against aggressors
(bk VI, ll. 851–853).

Aeneas is shown the two gates by which re-incarnated spirits can pass back to the physical world: the gate ‘made of horn’ which ‘affords outlet for genuine apparitions’ and the gate of ‘brightly-shining ivory’ used by those of ‘false dreams’. (bk VI, ll. 993–996) Aeneas is issued out the ivory gate in a portent for false actions.
Aeneas travels to Latium where the Trojans were engaged in war with the indigenous Latins. The war concluded with the fight between the two leaders, Aeneas and Turnus. When caught and wounded, Turnus knowing that death is his and ceding victory to Aeneas, nevertheless talks of their fathers, of compassion, and says, 'Don’t carry hatred further' (bk XII, ll. 931–938). Aeneas, remembering his father’s advice, becomes indecisive but, thinking of a dear friend, Pallas, whom Turnus had killed, he yields to passionate revenge. Seeking, however, not to betray his father, Aeneas tried to step beyond the responsibility of his action (as Adam had passed the responsibility to Eve):

Rage shook him. He looked frightening. He said:
Do you hope to get off now, wearing the spoils
You took from my Pallas? It’s he, it’s Pallas who strikes this blow—
The victim shedding his murderer’s blood in retribution!
So saying, Aeneas angrily plunged his sword full into Turnus’ breast
(bk XII, ll. 946–951).

Notwithstanding Aeneas’ life-long communion with feminine influences and his awareness of his divine destiny, in the end at the moment of testing of his personal divinity and link with the cosmic ‘immanent Mind’ (bk VI, ll. 724–729) explained to him by Anchises, Aeneas held fast to passion and the Herculean masculine brutality. This was foreshadowed by Virgil when he described the Trojans’ desecration on the Latin battlefield of a sacred wild olive tree and the lodging of Aeneas’ spear in its remnant stump (bk XII, ll. 766–772).10

***

Hero mythology describes the human quest for reconnection with the cosmos. In most myths, as exemplified with Heracles and Aeneas, the quest depends on human initiative, notwithstanding the involvement of a female guide. However, the Aboriginal myth of the Southern Cross appears to provide an example of a hero journey based on total obedience to the guidance of the spirit. This motif appears to link with the Noah myth in which the reconciling action is

---

10 It might be speculated that Virgil was aware of the Christian view emerging in the first century AD of loving your enemy, and was indicating that Aeneas, despite his communion with the gods, could not live up to this ethos.
initiated by God, and Noah acts in response to it. This motif of God's initiative is taken up in chapter 3.

2.5 **THE MYTHICAL EXPRESSION OF THE HUMAN–LAND RELATIONSHIP**

The previous sections have reviewed the myths of creation of the world (section 2.3) and of the individual's mythical journey through life (section 2.4). This section reviews how myth portrays the human relationship to the earth and to particular landscapes. From the earliest human societies, people have perceived themselves as separate from the gods, and as living in a landscape activated by demons and spirits. Societies have developed mythical rituals to propitiate the gods and gain their protection against the threatening spirits. The locations where contact can be made with the gods are the sanctuaries or sacred sites. This section looks at how people have perceived the differentiation between sacred land and wilderness or chaos land.

**Mother Earth**

Campbell notes that creation myths often describe how 'demiurgic forces' are responsible for creation within the world (Campbell, 1949, p. 282ff.). These forces bring to the cosmos particular creative abilities which allow them to transform and bring new life to an already existent nature. They are not the cosmic creator but the forces which maintain the earth's fertility and the cycles of nature. Greek myth afforded Gaia the position of Mother Earth, who carried the power of all earthly fertility. Eliade explains that to the 'primitive religious consciousness' the 'mere existence' of the earth had cosmic significance (Eliade 1974, p. 239). He describes rituals from many cultures, some of which have persisted to modern times, based

---

11 The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary 1993 defines demiurge as: 'In Platonic philosophy, the fashioner of the world. In Gnosticism etc., the being subordinate to the supreme being, who is responsible for the existence of the world'.

12 Eliade quotes the following Homeric hymn: 'It is the earth I sing, securely enthroned, the mother of all things, venerable ancestress feeding upon her soil all that exists...To thee it belongs to give life to mortals, and to take it from them...Happy the man favoured with thy good will! For him the soil of life is rich with harvest; in his fields, the flocks thrive, and his house is full of wealth' (Eliade 1974, p. 239).
on the belief in the magical or healing powers of the earth (Eliade, ch. 7). Eliade illustrates the reverence given to the earth in the Mother Earth traditions by quoting Smohalla, a native North American prophet:

You ask me to plough the ground? Shall I take a knife and tear my mother's bosom? Then when I die she will not take me to my bosom to rest. You ask me to dig for stone? Shall I dig under her skin for her bones? Then when I die I cannot enter her body to be born again. You ask me to cut grass and make hay and sell it, and be rich like white men! But how dare I cut off my mother's hair? (Eliade, p. 246)

Greek mythology provides a dramatic example of the Mother Earth belief in the figure of Antaeus in the Heracles stories. The Pygmies of Africa were of such small size that they were in continual threat from their neighbours and the animals. Accordingly they accepted the help of Antaeus, the giant son of Gaia (Mother Earth). When Heracles ventured into their land, the Pygmies, in mistaken fear, asked Antaeus to ward him off. Heracles was in danger of defeat until he noticed that Antaeus lost his strength whenever he was not in contact with the earth (Guerber 1916, p. 198). Antaeus epitomises the myth that all creative power is generated by the maternal earth.

**Sky Gods**

Creation mythology shows how by differentiation the Mother Earth gives birth to or is separated from the sky or heavens. For example, Gaia gave birth to Ouranos (Uranus, sky). This division of the divinity introduces a fundamentally new perception of the creation process. The cosmic mother is replaced as the source of all generative power by the dichotomy of the masculine sky god and the feminine earth goddess. The sky god then became, in some cultures, the initiator of the fertilisation process, and the earth goddess adopted the passive role of the potential bearer of new life (Eliade 1974, chs 2, 7, esp. p. 242). What Campbell (1949, p. 281) describes as the 'miraculous spontaneity about the shaping of the universe' by the one supreme creator is fundamentally altered to a creation based on mortal battle and the transformation of the body of the slain combatant when the divinity is perceived mythically as a dichotomy of the warrior sky god and the earth monster (see for example the Marduk—Tiamat conflict, Campbell 1949, pp. 285ff.).
Differentiation occurred not only between the deities but also between the characteristics of a single deity. Eliade notes that:

Ouranos was supremely the male-who-makes-fruitful, as were all the sky gods...

But, unlike other sky gods, Ouranos' fecundity was dangerous. His creatures were...monsters (with a hundred arms, fifty eyes, immensely tall and so on). As he 'hated them from the very first day' (Hesiod), Ouranos hid them in the body of the earth (Gaia)...(Eliade 1974, p. 75f.).

Ouranos thus has a dark side which is contrary to the usual sky god attributes of the 'good golden light from on high', 'the wise master creator' etc. (Eliade 1974, p. 61). Ouranos personifies the primitive's fear of the spiritual world, but he himself feared his twelve children, the giant Titans, whom he imprisoned in the underground hell of Tartarus. This provided the basis for the later differentiation between the dark, evil, feminine earth and underground, and the light, good, masculine sky and heavens (when Zeus became the chief of the gods). The Ouranos story is significant in another way: his divine consort, Gaia, being dissatisfied with Ouranos' treatment of her children, the Titans, conspired against him and initiated his downfall (Guerber 1916, p. 7). This indicates that the earth mother who had begotten Ouranos was not merely the passive partner in cosmic creation but had retained a fundamental, and in this case malevolent, initiative (the psychological significance of which will be taken up in chapter 4). Once the divinity was seen as split between male and female, the act of creativity was seen as comprising a re-connection, whether as a violent conflict or as a hieros gamos (sacred wedding) but, just as rain fertilised the earth to produce new life, so the male sky god was perceived as the initiator and maker, if not the material bearer, of new life. This differentiation between fertilisor and fertilisee has fundamental significance for the perception of the human relationship to the earth, as will be described below.

The strength of the perceived differentiation between the spiritual divinity of the sky and the material divinity of the earth is illustrated by the example given by Frazer (1933, pp. 593ff.) of the ancient kings who were not allowed to set foot upon the ground for fear that their sacred spirituality might flow through them into the earth. The king was seen as the embodiment of the sky god's powers upon which the welfare of both the people and the seasons and the fertility of nature
depended. Loss of this power from the sky-god king to the earth was thought to lead to the destruction of order and a return to pre-creation chaos (cf. Frazer, p. 595).

The differentiation of the divinity into male and female progressed further with the transition from the single sky deity to the group of sky gods. The Australian aboriginal tribes generally had a supreme father sky god but everyday life and the more common rituals were related to the derivative Dreamtime ancestors and the totem figures of nature. Only in the most sacred ceremonies and in times of desperate need was the supreme father invoked (Eliade 1974, ch. 2, esp. p. 50; cf. Elkin 1979, pp. 252–261). In Greek mythology Ouranos’ inheritance fell to Zeus, the chief of the many sky and earth deities. Eliade explains that Zeus epitomised the idea of the sky god who was not the creator of the cosmos but was, instead, the Father and creator on the ‘bio-cosmic level’:

...he governs the sources of fertility, he is master of the rain. He is ‘creator’ because it is he who ‘makes fruitful’...And his ‘creation’ depends primarily on what the weather does, particularly the rain. His supremacy is at once fatherly and kingly; he guarantees the well-being of the family and of nature both by his creative powers, and by his authority as guardian of the order of things (Eliade 1974, p. 79).

The sky gods’ function was to rule over chaos and destruction, by the institution of order. Order was, and is, fundamental to human life because of the universal human emotion of fear (cf. Eliade 1959, pp. 8ff.).

Writers like Eliade, Frazer and Jung describe the manifestations of fear on the ancient mind (Eliade 1959, p. 9; Frazer, chs 56–58; Jung 1964, pp. 6, 17, 71, 88). Ancient humans were fearful, sometimes to the point of terror, of the night, the dark, the unknown, the distant, the stranger etc., and also feared that the cycles and fertility of nature would not continue. They saw the gods of the sky as the intermediaries between the worlds of (a) chaos, darkness, wildness, uncertainty and destruction; and (b) order, light, nature, predictability and survival. The unknown was inhabited by spirits of the dead and demons threatening to human life. Eliade explains that ancient life, in everyday activities as well as in special ceremonies, was a ritual seen as imitation of the activities of the mythical gods with the purpose of conjoining the mythical time of creation with daily life. Temporal time would be
enveloped by eternal time. Every ritualistic act would link with and be a continuation of the mythical creation when order was brought forth from chaos (Eliade 1971, ch. 1).

**Sacrifice**

Sacrifice is a fundamental motif in mythology. It is discussed here to provide a basis for the discussion in the subsequent sections of the process of making land sacred. Many creation myths involve sacrifice. For example, the Babylonian myth tells of the sky (or sun) god, Marduk, engaging the cosmic serpent or dragon, Tiamat, in battle and slaying her, with the subsequent dispersal of her parts to the regions of the world (eg. Campbell 1949, pp. 285ff.). Indra, the Indian sky god, fulfils a similar role to Marduk.\(^\text{13}\) Eliade states that Indra exemplifies the ‘fundamental oneness of all abundant manifestations of life’ and the ‘generative and vitalizing’ function (Eliade, p. 85f.). Indra, like Marduk, mythologises the masculine dominance over the feminine function in the creative process. Zeus also had to conquer the monster Typhon and the giant Enceladus, both sent by the vengeful Gaia, before he could assume leadership and bring peace to the world (Guerber 1916, pp. 12–14). There are two elements in these creation myths, conquest and creation. The conquest comprises the seizure of cosmic power from the earth by the sun god. Then the god transforms the slain body of the earth monster into an ordered form, and transforms the dark, threatening and overwhelming world into the natural world of light and human compatibility. Eliade writes, ‘The sky is the archetype of universal order’ (p. 62). Thus the sky god creates order out of chaos.

There is, however, a second type of sacrifice which is directed towards maintaining the efficacy of the sun god. Frazer (1933, p. 264f.) notes that many

---

\(^\text{13}\) Eliade (1974) writes: ‘Indra is supremely the ‘hero’, the brave warrior of indomitable energy, the conqueror of the [cosmic serpent] monster Vrtra...Everything Indra does seems to overflow from his strength and bravado. He is a living personification of the exuberance of life, of cosmic and biological energy: he makes the sap in things circulate and the blood, puts the life into seeds, gives free play to rivers and seas, and bursts open the clouds. A thunderbolt is the weapon he uses to kill Vrtra...Storms are the supreme unleashings of creative force; Indra pours down the rain and governs moisture of every kind, so that he is both god of fertility and the archetype of the forces that originate life. He is ... ‘master of the fields’ and ... ‘master of the plough’. he is ‘the bull of the world’, he makes fields, animals and women fruitful...’ (Eliade 1974, pp. 84f.)
cultures believed their gods to be, like humans, mortal. He provides many examples of societies which ritually sacrificed their divine kings when the king became old or otherwise in danger of death (1933, chs 24–26). In some societies the ritual occurred after a set number of years, or was performed on a deputy such as a son or other member of the royal family, or a captive from war or other chosen person. The sacrifice was invariably followed by the succession to the kingship or royal deputyship by another person. Frazer suggests that these rituals represent a divine death followed by a divine resurrection (pp. 591f.). Thus, by continual death and resurrection the power of the sun god could be maintained. While Frazer comments that societies like the Aztecs sacrificed victims as propitations to their sun god (ch. 59, esp. p. 589), his main hypothesis is that the sacrifices were of the sun god through the killing of a substitute idolised as the actual sun god (ch. 59).

The motif of resurrecting the creator sky god seems to be in accord with Eliade's view that the purpose of ritual was to 'revolt against concrete, historical time' and to 'return to the mythical time of the beginning of things, to the "Great Time"' (Eliade 1971, p. ix). Elkin also (1979, pp. 181f.; ch. 9) explains that the Australian aborigines saw themselves as responsible for bringing their (divine) ancestor spirits back to life through the performance of ritual. Eliade's view that people seek to escape from temporality and its inevitable death suggests that the human personality has an inherent urge to connect with the eternal and 'the other'. Manifestations of this urge to transcend the profane might be seen in, for example, the ritually induced trance, the use of drugs, and in the extreme form of confronting death in warfare or suicide. Each manifestation is centred on the idea of sacrifice. This is illustrated by the Catholic interpretation of the Christian Mass in which the priest re-enacts the sacrifice of Christ, symbolically through the bread and wine, to effect a renewal of the slain God's resurrection. Those who partake in the eating of the bread as the body of Christ and of drinking the wine as the blood of Christ sacrifice their temporality to be enveloped in God's eternity. These rituals highlight two important mythical beliefs that: (a) human initiative is necessary to maintain or re-activate the power of the sky gods, and (b) the sky gods are not the totality of the spiritual world but the mediators between people and the natural world and the chthonic world, symbolised by the cosmic dragon, the phenomenon beyond human
knowing which generates fear and terror.

The purpose of sacrifice of this second type is to maintain light over darkness, order over chaos, and human survival in the world of threatening nature. It implies that the slaying of the earth monster gave the sun god only temporary power over the monster’s soul, a power that requires continual renewal. Thus, sacrifice for the purpose of renewal of the sun god’s power is directed, ultimately, at protection from the progenitor of the sun god. namely the earth goddess or the monster of the primordial chaos. Sacrifice (Latin *sacer*, holy; *facere*, to make), therefore, makes sacred or holy through maintaining communication and influence with the gods who mediate between people and nature.

The two aspects of sacrifice, the slaying of the earth dragon, and the sacrifice for the renewal of the sun god, have implications for the landscape. The first sacrifice is of the chthonic spirits and is symbolised by the taming of nature so that it can be put to human use. This is the repetition of the mythical hero’s slaying of the dragon, and comprises what Eliade calls cosmicisation of the landscape (1971, pp. 10f.). The second sacrifice is to acquire or renew the creative power of the sun god. This sacralisation process is performed in a location or centre which symbolises the *axis mundi*, the centre-of-the-world.

**Cosmicisation of Land and the Centre-of-the-World**

According to Eliade, pre-modern people lived in awareness of the continual presence of ‘the other’ or the sacred in nature. For them, he writes, ‘the sacred is pre-eminently the *real*, at once power, efficacy, the source of life and fecundity’ (1959, p. 28). Life acquired its reality, that is its sacrality, by seeing each action as a repetition of the actions of the gods in the time of the mythical creation (Eliade 1971. pp. 4f.). This section looks at the relationship of early societies to land through the symbolism of cosmicisation and of the centre-of-the-world.

Eliade writes that the pre-modern societies differentiated between their ‘inhabited territory and the unknown and indeterminate space that surrounds it’ (1959. p. 29). The differentiation arose because the people consecrated the habited space by ritually repeating the mythical creation by their gods, at the centre or navel of the world, of the world of form from the unformed chaos. The mythical sun gods are exemplified by Marduk and Indra. Marduk killed Tiamat and Indra killed
Vrtra. Thus each had to sacrifice the earth monster to seize control of the cosmos. Only then could they begin creation of the world from the mythical centre or navel of the world (cf. Eliade 1959, ch. 1). Eliade describes the Indian ritual of laying a building foundation stone as an example of the repetition of this mythical symbolism (1959, pp. 54f.): the astronomer divines the location for the mason to drive a stake into the ground and thereby fix the head of the snake (i.e. the earth monster), thus repeating Indra's defeat of Vrtra. Eliade comments:

The theory that these rites imply comes down to this: nothing can endure if it is not 'animated', if it is not, through a sacrifice, endowed with a 'soul'; the prototype of the construction rite is the sacrifice that took place at the time of the foundation of the world (1971, p. 20).

Settlement of new land is similarly consecrated through the ritualistic significance given to the clearing and tilling of the land (Eliade 1959, pp. 31f.), which simulates the slaying of the dragon—and it might be inferred, the bringing of the dragon's soul under the control of the sun god. 'Cosmicizing' the land is the term used by Eliade (1959, pp. 29–32; 1974a, p. 10) for the process of consecration which comprises the slaying of the earth spirit and the transformation of profane, wilderness or chaos land to sacred, ordered or cosmos land. Creation occurs from a centre, consequently the concepts of cosmicisation and centre-of-the-world become associated:

...we have a sequence of religious conceptions and cosmological images that are inseparately connected and form a system that may be called the 'system of the world' prevalent in traditional societies: (a) a sacred place constitutes a break in the homogeneity of space; (b) this break is symbolized by an opening by which passage from one cosmic region to another is made possible (from heaven to earth and vice versa...; (c) communication with heaven is expressed by one or another of certain images, all of which refer to the axis mundi: pillar..., ladder (cf. Jacob's ladder), mountain, tree, vine, etc.; (d) around this cosmic axis lies the world (= our world), hence the axis is located 'in the middle', at the 'navel of the earth'; it is the Centre of the World (Eliade 1959, p. 37).

Sacrificial ritual occurs firstly with the death of the earth monster and secondly with the death (and resurrection) of the sun god. The first establishes sacred space, the second renews the divine control over the earth and the power to
create—a power effected through the *axis mundi*. Hence, the establishment of sacred space and centres-of-the-world through which societies can communicate with the gods is the fundamental religious symbolic use of land, as exemplified by the temple but manifested also in any cosmicised land with its incorporated centre. In religious ritual, the altar is the *axis mundi* where the sacrifice resurrects the (dead) sun god and allows infusion of his creative power to the people.

Once the divinity had been perceived as differentiated into the heavenly and the earthly divinities, the mountain was seen as the pre-eminent location of communion between them. Eliade describes how each ancient culture had its cosmic mountain, e.g. Mt. Olympus in ancient Greece (Eliade 1974, pp. 99ff.), which was seen as the closest land to heaven. The axis running through the mountain summit, and joining heaven, earth and underground, is the *axis mundi*. The cosmic mountain has great mythical significance because, as described by Eliade, it is seen as the location where the creation of the natural world began. It is the navel (or *omphalos*) of the world from which the rest of the world was made. The cosmic mountain is thus the landscape most ordered and differentiated from the primordial ocean of chaos, and was not submerged in the mythical universal flood (Eliade 1971, p. 100). The *axis mundi* and the cosmic mountain thus become the ‘centre-of-the-world’ (Eliade 1959, pp. 36ff.) to which all other land is related as a hinterland. Eliade describes this centre as numinous, having the qualities of the ‘other’, that is of the transcendent spiritual world (Eliade 1959, pp. 42ff.). Land, then, is differentiated between the centre where the divinity is present and the periphery where the divinity is absent. In primitive cultures, however, all land is alive with spirits, but those away from the centre are evil spirits or demons to which propitiation must be given.

Does a centre exist *per se* or does a community establish a centre? Each community perceives a unique centre in its own landscape. Furthermore, each subgroup within the community establishes, by devolution, its own local centre, whether this is in their homeland or in a distant colonised land (cf. Eliade 1971, pp. 10f.). The art of geomancy, including the Asian Feng Shui, suggests that land can be divined so as to locate the sites where the spirits of the earth are favourable to particular human use of the land. The concept of the sacred, however, suggests that
the sites perceived as centres have landscape features which best symbolise locations where sacrifice will be most likely to effect a linkage to the deity. The words *sacred* and *sacrifice* are linked etymologically to the word *sacrum*, the name of the triangular bone at the base of the human spine. *Sacrum* is the Latin translation of the Greek name for this bone, which the Greeks believed to be the location of the soul. The link between *sacrum* and *sacred* indicates that the idea of the sacred derives from the ritual of sacrifice which frees the soul from its entrapment in the body of a human or animal, so that it can be infused by the sacrificer for the renewal of power over nature. Thus, each ritualistic sacrifice replicates the sun god's sacrificial issuing of the earth monster's soul at the creation-time. The site where the sacrifice is performed acquires its own sacrality, because it is the centre where people can renew their (divine sun god) power over nature. It appears that the sacrum bone came to symbolise the sacrifice because it conforms with two mythical images, the *axis mundi* or sacred column, and the centre-of-the-world. The sacrum is both the base of the human spine, and the centre of the skeleton when arms and legs are extended. It seems, therefore, that ritualistic sacrifice is the basis to the idea of the sacred sanctuary or 'centre-of-the-world' where human habitation might invoke the sky gods to protect them from the demons of the unsanctified wilderness.

According to Eliade (1959, pp. 42ff.), traditional people sought to live at the centre-of-the-world *always*, and this was done by perceiving the world as a hierarchy of integrated centres where the centre at each 'level' (or scale) of the hierarchy was attributed with the numinous quality of the cultural navel of creation or cosmic mountain:

...the true world is always in the middle, at the Center...Whatever the extent of the territory involved, the cosmos that it represents is always perfect. An entire country (e.g., Palestine), a city (Jerusalem), a sanctuary (the Temple in Jerusalem), all equally well present an *imago mundi*...It is clear, then, that both the *imago mundi* and the Center are repeated in the inhabited world. Palestine, Jerusalem, and the Temple severally and concurrently represent the image of the universe and the Center of the World. This multiplicity of centers and this reiteration of the image of the world on smaller and smaller scales constitute one of the specific characteristics of traditional societies.
Cosmicisation thus introduced a hierarchical pattern of centralisation over the landscape—a pattern which geomancy sees as sacred patterns inherent in the land, but which the above consideration of ritual sacrifice indicates as a human construction and a superimposition on the land.

Eliade’s work suggests that every settlement of new land and every construction on the land is a ritualistic repetition of the paradigm set by the society’s cosmogonic (i.e. creation) myth. Each myth has a visual and spatial quality, comprising geographical and design elements. Ancient cultures believed that for every phenomenon on earth, whether concrete or abstract, there was a pre-existent heavenly prototype (Eliade 1971, pp. 6ff.). This applied to landscape, temples, cities, ideas, behaviour—everything on earth replicated a celestial prototype. He cites Mesopotamian, Egyptian and Iranian beliefs as examples of perception of the patterns of the constellations in the heavens as the eternal prototypes of the terrestrial topography (1971, p. 6). The architectural and geometrical prototypal designs, however, are described in the myths as having been shown or revealed by the ancestor gods during the creation (Eliade 1971, pp. 7, 32). Pyramids, the ziggurat and temples replicate the cosmic mountain, but they have the added characteristic of following a ground plan based on a cross, a square, a circle or combinations of these, and the orientation of the linear elements was generally to the four cardinal directions of the earth’s cosmic orientation, north, south, east and west. Village and city plans also followed these celestial ground plans so that the axis mundi could join heaven, earth and underworld at the centre of the urban area at the location of the temple-palace complex, and the square or circle centred on the axis mundi represented an imago mundi (Eliade 1959, pp. 45ff.). Eliade suggests that urban design is so fundamentally symbolic that:

It is highly probable that the fortifications of inhabited places and cities began by being magical defences; for fortifications—trenches, labyrinths, ramparts, etc.—were designed rather to repel invasion by demons and the souls of the dead than attacks by human beings (Eliade 1959, p. 49; cf. Mumford 1961, p. 37).

The axis mundi image thus symbolises the centre where the sacrificed earth-dragon was transformed into the created world, and where the sun god is ritually
sacrificed. The creation and the renewal of creative power symbolise the cycle of death and resurrection of nature, as exemplified by the sun’s evening death and morning renewal.

**Sacred Paths**

Centralised sacred sites are not the only symbolically transformed landscapes. The routes interconnecting the sites were also sacred. Elkin (1979, pp. 69f., 176ff.) describes how the Australian aborigines walked through their country, from sacred site to sacred site, via paths which themselves were sacred because the ancestor heroes had travelled these paths in the Dreamtime. Along the paths the ground recognised its people as belonging to its creation ancestors and therefore offered sanctuary against the non-sacralised, distant and unknown land inhabited by unfamiliar and potentially lethal spirits. The aborigines sang their myths while walking to continually remain in mythical time and to remain in contact with the ancestors. Accordingly, the paths are often referred to as songlines.

Pennick and Devereux (1989, pp. 245-262) studied the occurrence and the significance of the constructed straight line in the landscape. They concluded that the phenomenon had sacred meaning and suggested that the ideas of royal kingship and straightness and regularity of form have the same etymological root ‘reg’, probably originally because the king was equated to the sun and the function of kingship was like the (straight) rays of the sun bringing light into the magically demonized landscape. Straight lines were associated with sacred centres either radiating from them or linking the different centres. Regularization of the landscape by the straight line, whether as ceremonial way, roadway or rectangular survey was, according to Pennick and Devereux, a transformation of chaos space into sacred space. The line may be considered to be a carrier of divine power from the central *axis mundi* into the surrounding landscape, thereby making it suitable for human habitation.

**Agriculture as Ritual**

Agriculture also provides an example of the land being perceived and used in symbolic representation of the creation myth. Frazer (1933) cites many sacrificial rituals associated with the growth of vegetation and the fertility of the land. Eliade
extends this work and provides the following insights. Agriculture, like any settlement of land, was conducted as a sacred rite in repetition of the mythical creation (Eliade 1974, p. 331). It was therefore seen as equivalent to the masculine god’s conquest of the feminine earth and the transformation of the conquered into a new, tamed force of potential creativity which required fertilisation by the male for the realisation of actual fertility. But the sun god’s seizing of the initiative power of fertilisation from the earth goddess brought retribution in the form of the renewal rituals of self-sacrifice, originally of the sun god, thence, by devolution, of the sun king, and of people, animals and vegetative effigies as substitutes for the king. The mortality of humans and of the sun god could only be brought into union with the immortality of the cosmic chaos by propitiatory ritual which produced renewal out of death and thereby opened the way for the continuation of the cycles of nature and the fertility of the earth. Eliade writes that ‘“Primitive” man lived in constant terror’ that the forces of nature would wear out or cease altogether. This fear:

...was particularly acute when faced with such seasonal manifestations of ‘power’ as vegetation, whose rhythm includes moments of apparent extinction. And the anxiety became sharper still when the disintegration of the ‘force’ appeared to be the result of some interference on the part of man...(Eliade 1974, p. 346)

As a result, propitiation became an integral part of the use of nature.

Agricultural land, just as with the temple and the city, had to be transformed into sacred space. Pennick (1979) describes the Roman process of centuriation, that is of division of agricultural land into a geometrical pattern of the square grid, as an example of bringing agricultural practice into harmony with the spirits of the land and with the mathematical basis of cosmic order. The order of the sacralised urban centre was thereby extended into the agricultural hinterland. Pennick notes that this pattern of agricultural land subdivision occurs in many cultures and persists into modern times (1979, pp. 145-148).

**Modern Mythical Symbolism—Uluru**

Eliade (1959, ch. 4) distinguishes between the mind of the ancient or traditional person and the mind of the modern person. The traditional person lives in constant relationship to the spiritual world which is integral to every part of the physical...
world and which is understood through the myths that have been revealed by the ancestral gods. Eliade (1959) accordingly describes the traditional peoples as *homo religiosus*. By contrast, the modern has developed a greater understanding of the natural world and consequently has 'desacralized' or de-mythologised nature. The modern, whom he calls 'nonreligious', seeks to rationalise or intellectualise the world and, as a result, 'religion and mythology are "eclipsed" in the darkness of their unconscious' (Eliade 1959, p. 213). Nevertheless, the modern person is not divorced from the human mental inheritance and, although consciously unaware of the phenomenon, still behaves in a fundamentally religious way in accordance with the cultural cosmic mythology (Eliade 1959, esp. pp. 50, 204, 211ff.).

An example of modern thinking being influenced by mythical symbolism is contained in the Australia Day address, 1996, by the Governor-General, The Honourable Bill Hayden, AC. The speech states that the Uluru—Kata Tjuta National Park, formerly known by non-aboriginals as Ayers Rock and the Olgas:

...is country of great spiritual significance to the Aboriginal people of Central Australia...It is also a place of significance to all of us as the hundreds of thousands of Australian and overseas visitors attest. It is a symbol of the mysterious heart—the living heart—the spiritual heart of this ancient continent. I mention it...because I think it reflects a profound change taking place in our hearts.

The speech continues by mentioning the growing sense of coming together between Aboriginal and non-aboriginal people and how Aboriginal culture is being expressed in Australia and overseas:

Aboriginal creativity has taken its place as a major influence in our national consciousness...In a very real sense they are helping to reshape our own concept of self and of country...It is a response that is taking many forms. One obvious way is in our attitudes to the land. We're all aware how important it is to protect this fragile environment from further degradation. The Aboriginal concept of belonging to the land—of the duty of care to one's country—makes a powerful call on us.

But it is more than that. We're also beginning to understand how richly layered the land is with story and with meaning...to Aboriginal people, every feature has significance. It is trafficked with the ancestor spirits...every story
is part of a greater whole...It is the spirit of living.

We will never know all these secrets. Yet through...[Aboriginal] art, we're becoming sensitive to the power of myth and symbol which invest this landscape (Hayden 1996).

The Governor-General seems to be reflecting the increasing community consciousness of Uluru, a sandstone monolith approximately at the geographic centre of Australia, not only as a spatial centre but also as a spiritual centre—that is, the community is responding to the mythical concept of the *axis mundi* in the form of a continental cosmic mountain.

### 2.6 CONCLUSIONS

People relate to the land through the symbolic images and motifs of their myths. Myth shows two types of human relationship to the cosmos. The first type is shown by the creation and hero myths which are based on the motif of dichotomy—between people and gods, people and land, and gods and the earth. In these myths, people relate to the land only indirectly through two kinds of ritualistic sacrifice. The first sacrifice is in repetition of the gods' conquest and sacrifice of the earth monster at the cosmic creation. In accordance with this myth, people identify themselves with the sun god and slay the natural life in the land to establish sanctuaries within the wilderness. Thereby, they establish sacred land where the people might gain the protection of their gods against the annihilating spirits of nature.

The second kind of sacrificial ritual is directed at the renewal of the power of the sun god to create order out of chaos, that is to create a cosmicised nature, which he achieved at the mythical creation. The people sacrifice the sun god or his deputy so that, through death, the god might be continually resurrected into temporal life. The resurrection renews the numinous quality of the *axis mundi* or centre-of-the-world through which the sun god again has power to create order in the natural world, and the people can communicate with their gods through ritual and invoke them to ensure the continuity of the cycles of nature. People, therefore, transform their land from wilderness in two ways: firstly by taming nature through the cosmicisation of the land from chaos, and secondly by creating order
through the establishment of centres-of-the-world. Land is, thereby, differentiated between sacred and wilderness, and the sacred land is centralised around the *axis mundi*. Centralisation gives rise to landscape designs based on radial axes and enclosing circles and squares. Agriculture is a continual ritual to maintain the sun god’s power to bring order, through the continued fertility and cyclical pattern of nature, to the untamed wildness of the earth spirit.

A second type of relationship to the cosmos is indicated by the more recent of the two Genesis creation myths together with the Noah myth. Here the initiative in forming the relationship derives from God who makes humankind in the *imago Dei* and grants it dominion for the purpose of bringing nature into abundance. The *imago Dei* indicates an integration and hence a direct relationship between people, God and the created world.
CHAPTER 3

PSYCHOLOGY OF THE HUMAN—COSMOS RELATIONSHIP

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In chapter 2, myths were discussed as expressions of understanding of the position and function of humans in the worlds of gods and nature. In ancient times, myth functioned as both religion and theoretical knowledge or science. However, in modern times psychology has been developed as a science of the human psyche: it offers insight to the structure and mode of operation of the psyche, to the relationship between the psyche and the material world, and to the psyche's way of perceiving the visible world.

The purpose of this chapter is to review the ideas and themes of psychology relevant to theorising on the human relationship to the cosmos and to the land. First, section 3.2 outlines how modern psychology came to introduce the concept of the unconscious as a counterbalance to the pre-eminent position of the intellect in the prevailing scientific rational world view. The contributions of Freud and Adler to psychological theory are discussed briefly to provide a basis for the subsequent contrast between their theories and those of Jung which are central to the analysis of theory and practice of relationship to the land, described in part II of the thesis. Section 3.3 discusses Jung's radical psychological work, which extended the ideas of Freud and Adler, particularly in relation to the role of the unconscious. Jung's ideas are fundamental to the case study research contained in part II of this thesis, as they provide a scientific basis for understanding the relationship of people to the cosmos, the psychological symbolism of myth and religion, and the human perception and use of land. Finally, section 3.4 outlines Jung's theory of symbolic perception of the external world, and considers its implications for the human—land
relationship.

### 3.2 Views of the Unconscious

An awareness of an inner essence of human existence deeper than human consciousness is not restricted to modern scientific knowledge, as is illustrated by the following quotation, cited by Jung, from the Roman tragedian Seneca writing in the middle of the first century AD:

You are doing an excellent thing, one which will be wholesome for you, if...you persist in your effort to attain sound understanding; it is foolish to pray for this when you can acquire it from yourself. We do not need to uplift our hands towards heaven, or to beg the keeper of a temple to let us approach his idol's ear, as if in this way our prayers were more likely to be heard. God is near you, he is with you, he is within you. This is what I mean, Lucilius; a holy spirit indwells within us, one who works our good and bad deeds, and is our guardian. As we treat this spirit, so we are treated by it. Indeed, no man can be good without the help of God. Can one rise superior to fortune unless God helps him to rise? He it is that gives noble and upright counsel. In each good man 'a god doth dwell, but what god we know not' (Jung 1967, CW5 para. 114n.).

Seneca sees the centre of human life in the inner counsel beyond the reach of rational knowing. In contrast, Descartes, writing in the first half of the seventeenth century, deduced that the rational mind is the centre of human existence (Tarnas 1993, p. 276). *Cogito ergo sum* (I think, therefore I am) was the basis of Descartes' search for certain and unshakeable truth (p. 277). Descartes rejected the perceptions of senses, dreams and imagination as contributing any truthful knowledge about the nature of the human individual (Descartes 1986, pp. 16ff.; Tarnas 1993, pp. 275ff.). Descartes reasoned that the thinking mind was dissociated from the natural world of matter: sense, imagination and emotion are 'irrelevant for certain rational comprehension' (Tarnas p. 278). Tarnas comments that Descartes saw the world dualistically, saw matter as 'nonvital', and thought that it 'was best understood in
mechanistic terms, reductively analysed into its simplest parts' (p. 278). Descartes saw rational thought as the bridge between mind and matter.¹

Descartes was a philosopher and a mathematician. His mathematical views influenced his understanding of the world, and his writings in both fields were an integral part of the Western scientific and philosophical revolution which commenced in the sixteenth century. Rational thinking became the cornerstone of knowledge, and replaced the emphases of classical and medieval times on metaphysical speculation, mysticism and religious dogma (cf. Tarnas, p. 272). The Copernican scientific revolution, which postulated a heliocentric instead of an earth-centred universe, received support from the astronomer Galileo and mathematicians Kepler, Descartes and Newton.²

The mathematical understanding of the heliocentric universe was completed by Isaac Newton's explanation of the law of gravity as a universal force (Tarnas, p. 269). Tarnas comments:

Newton had struggled to discover the grand design of the universe, and had patently succeeded. Descartes's vision of nature as a perfectly ordered machine governed by mathematical laws and comprehensible by human science was fulfilled...

¹ Tarnas writes, 'Thus human reason establishes first its own existence, out of experiential necessity, then God’s existence, out of logical necessity, and thence the God-guaranteed reality of the objective world and its rational order. Descartes enthroned human reason as the supreme authority in matters of knowledge, capable of distinguishing certain metaphysical truth and of achieving certain scientific understanding of the material world. Infallibility, once ascribed only to Holy Scripture or the Supreme pontiff, was now transferred to human reason itself...[Descartes’s] mode of reasoning suggested that God’s existence was established by human reason and not vice versa...In the ultimate religious question, not divine revelation but the natural light of human reason had the final say...by his assertion of the essential dichotomy between thinking substance [mind, imagination, emotion] and extended substance [physical matter], Descartes helped emancipate the material world from its long association with religious belief, freeing science to develop its analysis of that world in terms uncontaminated by spiritual or human qualities and unconstrained by theological dogma. Both the human mind and the natural world now stood autonomously as never before, separated from God and from each other' (Tarnas 1993, pp. 279f.).

² Tarnas writes: '...Descartes’s image of nature [was] an intricate impersonal machine strictly ordered by mathematical law...Descartes assumed that the physical world was composed of an infinite number of particles, or ‘corpuscles’, which mechanically collided and aggregated. As a Christian, however, he assumed that these corpuscles did not move in utterly random fashion, but obeyed certain laws imposed on them by a providential God at their creation...The basic principles...he set out to establish by intuitive deduction' (Tarnas 1993, p. 267).
The Newtonian-Cartesian cosmology was now established as a foundation for a new world view. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, the educated person in the West knew that God had created the universe as a complex mechanical system, composed of material particles moving in an infinite neutral space according to a few basic principles, such as inertia and gravity, that could be analysed mathematically...

It also seemed reasonable to assume that after the creation of this intricate and orderly universe, God removed himself from further active involvement or intervention in nature, and allowed it to run on its own according to those perfect, immutable laws. The image of the Creator was thus that of a divine architect, a master mathematician and clock maker, while the universe was viewed as a uniformly regulated and fundamentally impersonal phenomenon. Man's role in that universe could best be judged on the evidence that, by virtue of his own intelligence, he had penetrated the universe's essential order and could now use that knowledge for his own benefit and empowerment. One could scarcely doubt that man was the crown of creation (Tarnas, pp. 270f.).

The scientific-philosophical revolution of 'The Enlightenment' made reason the Promethean gift of salvation, the conscious mind the centre of human existence and the source of all knowledge, and the human individual the director of his/her destiny.

The study of psychology developed slowly in the nineteenth century as a specialist part of the rational scientific movement. Recognition of the importance of the unconscious to the functioning of the human conscious mind was developed by philosophers, psychologists and medical investigators such as Herbart, Fechner, Brucke, Greisinger, Liupps and Meynert (Mack & Semrad 1967, p. 289). But, write Mack and Semrad (p. 269), it was Sigmund Freud who founded psychoanalysis, which may be considered the basis of modern psychology.³

³ Mack & Semrad (1967) write, 'Psychoanalytic theory, like all personality theory, is concerned primarily with the elucidation of those factors which motivate behaviour. Psychoanalysis is unique, however, in that it considers these motivating forces to derive from unconscious mental processes. Freud's demonstration of the existence of an unconscious mind and, concomitantly, his concept of psychic determinism, are generally regarded as his greatest contributions to science, and these remain the fundamental hypotheses of psychoanalytic theory' (pp. 269f.).
Freud trained in medicine in a climate of rational empirical science (Mack & Semrad, pp. 269f.) and was influenced by the view that the determining factors of psychology were to be found in physiology. Mack and Semrad describe how Freud was forced to give up the aim of explaining psychological phenomena by physiochemical data after 1897 because of the lack of such data (p. 270). Freud saw psychology as a natural science and sought biological explanations for his psychological theories (p. 271): ‘his consistent, overriding goal was to apply Brucke’s [physiological] principles to the study of the nervous system and then to the mind’ (p. 270).

Freud constructed a tripartite framework of the psyche:

- the id, which is the ‘locus of the instinctual drives’ and is a primary process seeking pleasure without regard to the situational context;

- the ego, which ‘represents a more coherent organisation, the task of which is to avoid unpleasure and pain by opposing or regulating the discharge of instinctual drives to conform with the demands of the external world’ (p. 292);

- the superego, ‘which contains the internalised moral values and influence of the parental images’ (p. 292).

The concepts of the unconscious part and the conscious part of the psyche do not, however, fit neatly into the above scheme. The instincts of the id and most of the censoring contents of the superego are unconscious, and part of the conscious operation of the ego can also be attributed to unconscious motivation (pp. 292f.). Freud saw a person’s unconscious as comprising a combination of biological instincts, such as the sexual and self-preservation drives, and psychic contents which had at some time been conscious but had later been pushed below the threshold of consciousness by processes such as forgetfulness and repression (pp. 289f.; cf. Jung 1971, CW6, paras 88ff):
The unconscious is associated with the particular form of mental activity which Freud called the 'primary process' or 'primary process thinking'. The primary process has as its principal aim the facilitation of wish fulfilment and instinctual discharge; thus it is intimately associated with the pleasure principle.

The content of the unconscious is limited to wishes seeking fulfilment (Mack & Semrad, p.289).

Freud’s psychology is based on the view that, apart from the instincts, the contents of the unconscious originate from conscious experience, that is the unconscious was secondary to the conscious mind. Freud, following the methods of rational empirical science, viewed the world reductively and sought to classify phenomena. This was aided by his dualistic outlook in which phenomena were viewed in dichotomous conflict, for example the *libido* (which he equated to sexual instinct), opposed the *ego* (or nonsexual instinct), life instinct (Eros) opposed the death instinct (Thanatos), and the pleasure principle (instant gratification) opposed the reality principle (delayed or postponed pleasure with perhaps greater pleasure in the long run) (Mack & Semrad, pp. 284f.). ‘Freud always thought in dualistic terms’ writes Fromm (1980, p. 111). But this contributed to what Fromm describes as his great discovery—‘that of the conflict between thinking and being’ (p. 25). The importance of Freud to the psychological understanding of the human condition lies in what Fromm describes as the ‘radical’ theory of:

...his insistence on the central role of repression and the fundamental significance of the unconscious sector of our mental life...This theory was radical because it attacked the last fortress of man’s belief in his omnipotence and omniscience, the belief in his conscious thought as an ultimate datum of human experience...Freud deprived man of his pride in his rationality (Fromm 1980, p. 133).

Fromm identifies a seeming paradox in that Freud the rationalist opened the way to a future understanding of the importance of the irrational to the human psyche. Freud, however, could not let go of the Cartesian view that the centre of the human being was the conscious mind. He merely allowed the light of pre-Cartesian thinkers who saw authority in the spiritual and mystical to remain alight in the rationalist world. Fromm comments on the contradiction: although Freud
investigated the irrational and symbolic, yet he ‘was so little capable of understanding symbols’ (p. 73):

Freud was a rationalist with a lack of artistic or poetic inclination, and hence he had almost no feeling for symbolic language whether expressed in dreams or in poetry (p. 73).

Fromm states that Freud was not a radical thinker: his conventional views reflected his ‘bourgeois and authoritarian-patriarchal attitude’ characteristic of his society (Fromm, p. 6). Freud saw human destiny as being achieved through the initiative and dominance of the ego, and he saw love as being possessive and dominating.

Adler, another prominent psychologist writing in the first half of the twentieth century, also saw the conscious ego as the centre of the psyche. Adler regarded the unconscious as a secondary and minor component of the psyche, relegated to the unknown aspect of the individual’s urge toward completion of conscious development. Hence Adlerian psychology is termed individual or ego psychology. Adler, however, took a position counter to that of Freud. Whereas Freud emphasised the biological instinctual motivation to behaviour with the associated repression of inappropriate and unacceptable wish-tendencies, Adler...

---

4 Fromm cites the following examples to illustrate how Freud’s psychological concepts followed his ‘social reality’: (i) Freud’s therapeutic aim was control of instinctual drives through the strengthening of the ego; they have to be subdued by ego and superego...The key word is control...The whole scheme “superego, ego, id” is a hierarchical structure, which excludes the possibility that the association of free, i.e. nonexploited, human beings can live harmoniously and without the necessity of controlling sinister forces; (ii) Freud’s grotesque picture of women...as essentially narcissistic, unable to love and sexually cool is male propaganda...Since they were property, they were expected to be ‘inanimate’ in marriage...No wonder that men experienced lust in the process of conquest...essentially the pleasure [was] in the chase and the eventual conquest’ (Fromm 1980, pp. 7ff.).

5 Fromm writes, ‘What does he mean by love? From his theoretic premises Freud is forced to speak of love “objects”, since “libido remains libido whether it is directed to objects or to one’s own ego”...Love is sexual energy attached to an object; it is nothing but a physiologically rooted instinct directed toward an object. It is a waste product. as it were, of the biological necessity for the survival of the race. “Love”, in men, is mostly of the “attachment” type, i.e. attachment to the persons who have become precious through satisfying their vital needs...Freud postulates: “Loving in itself, insofar as it is longing and deprivation, lowers self-regard, whereas being loved, having one’s love returned and possessing the loved object raises it once more”...This statement is a key to the understanding of Freud’s concept of love. Freud said:...Loving makes you weak: what makes you happy is being loved. And what is being loved? Possessing the loved object! This is a classic definition of bourgeois love: Owning and controlling makes for happiness, be it material property or be it a woman who, being owned, owes the owner love’ (Fromm 1980, pp. 8–10).
emphasised the ego’s innate drive toward superiority over its environment (cf. Jung 1971, CW6, paras 88ff.).

Adler had learned from organic medicine that a body with an inferior organ overcame the weakness by the overdevelopment of supporting organs, in a process of overcompensation (Adler 1956, pp. 24ff.). He subsequently applied this knowledge to formulate the hypothesis that a person with a bodily inferiority develops a psychological overcompensation directed at rising above the inferiority (Adler 1921, e.g., ch. 1). Linking this with French psychologist Janet’s hypothesis of the general human feeling of incompleteness (cf. Adler 1921, p. vii), Adler postulated that a feeling of psychic inferiority manifests itself by overcompensation in the form of a superiority complex (1959, pp. 1f.; 1921, p. ix). This means that people perceiving inferiority, albeit unconsciously, strive to achieve control over their environment, a concept similar to Nietzsche’s ‘will to power’ (1921, p.ix).

Adler believed that the one basic dynamic force behind all human activity was the urge to move from a feeling of inferiority towards a position of superiority, perfection and totality (1956, chs 1-3; 1965, pp. 30ff.). People accordingly manufacture situations in which potential failure or rejection is avoided, in what Adler termed a ‘fictional’ style of life which establishes unique, ideal forms of reality. To the extent that this context deviates from what is considered a normal perception of reality, the person is neurotic, that is, having an exaggerated perspective on certain behavioural patterns. From this it can be assumed that each person is neurotic to the extent that his/her view of and adaptation to reality differs from absolute or objective reality.

Adler’s psychotherapy was based on the premise that once patients acquired a rational understanding of the nature of their fictive life attitude, they could extend beyond this situation into a more normal context of reality (1956, ch. 13). Adler viewed genetic inheritance and early social environment as only providing ‘the frame and the influences which are answered by the individual in regard to his styled creative power’ (1956, frontispiece). The neurotic establishment of the style of life is the person’s unique response to the striving for superiority over the environment. The unconscious is ‘that part of the subject’s striving which he does not understand’ (1956, p. 3). Adler therefore seems to give the unconscious a value
below that given by Freud. The various Freudian instincts and complexes are subsumed in Adler’s ego-drive to superiority. Adler’s psychotherapy assumed that rational understanding of the neurosis gave the ego the power to achieve superiority. He saw the unconscious as well as the conscious as determined by subjective values and interests, that is ‘a creation of the individual’ (1956, pp. 8f.).

Adler writes:

I began to see clearly in every psychological phenomenon the striving for superiority. It runs parallel to physical growth and is an intrinsic necessity of life itself. It lies at the root of all solutions of life’s problems and is manifested in the way in which we meet these problems. All our functions follow its direction. They strive for conquest, security, increase either in the right or in the wrong direction. The impetus from minus to plus never ends. The urge from below to above never ceases. Whatever premises all our philosophers and psychologists dream of—self-preservation, pleasure principle, equalization—all these are but vague representations, attempts to express the great upward drive...Achieve! Arise! Conquer! (1956, p. 103).

Thus, both Freud and Adler adopt a self-centred psychology. However, Jung (1971, CW6, paras 90f.) points out that Freud’s view is extraverted and Adler’s view is introverted.6

Adler later modified his emphasis on ego-superiority by placing it within a social context. The individual should aim at personality completeness and superiority, not for selfish reasons only, but to be able to contribute to society, that

---

6 Jung (1971. CW6) summarises the psychologies of Freud and Adler as follows: ‘Freudian psychology is characterised by one central idea, the repression of incompatible wish-tendencies. Man appears as a bundle of wishes which are only partially adaptable to the object. His neurotic difficulties are due to the fact that environmental influences, education, and objective conditions put a considerable check on the free expression of instinct. Other influences, productive of moral conflicts or infantile fixations that compromise later life, emanate from the father and mother. The original instinctive disposition is a fundamental datum which undergoes disturbing modifications mainly through objective influences; hence the most untrammeled expression of instinct in respect of suitably chosen objects would appear to be the needful remedy [to achieve a normal life]. Adler’s psychology, on the other hand, is characterised by the central concept of ego-superiority. Man appears primarily as an ego-point which must not under any circumstances be subordinated to the object (para. 90)...The basic formula with Freud is...sexuality, which expresses the strongest relation between subject and object; with Adler it is the power of the subject, which secures him most effectively against the object and guarantees him an impregnable isolation that abolishes all relationships. Freud would like to ensure the undisturbed flow of instinct towards its object; Adler would like to break the baleful spell of the object in order to save the ego from suffocating in its own defensive [neurotic] armor. Freud’s view is essentially extraverted, Adler’s introverted’ (para. 91).
is to have a 'social interest' (Adler 1965, pp. 368ff.; 1959, pp. 1, 113). Adler's view (1965, pp. 363f.), was fundamentally different to Freud's view, which saw civilisation as a negative complex of inhibitions to the absolute egoism of the individual, 'Accept the unavoidable inhibitions, then within their frame there will be the green light for your drives'. Freud tended to the view of 'aristocratic individualism' (Adler 1965, p. 369), whereas Adler preferred the conscious choice of the individual to be that of the 'common man' with a developed social interest (1965, p. 369).

Adler's psychotherapy, therefore, had two objectives: (i) to allow patients to understand consciously the neurotic fictional lifestyle which they had largely unconsciously established in defence of their perceived inferiority, and to allow them to live in superiority over their pseudo-reality; and (ii) to redirect their psychic energies in their newly acquired state of personality completeness towards their fellows in society. The concept of the 'social interest' appears to emerge as a balance or compensation for the blatantly self-oriented master-drive towards perfection.

Both Freud and Adler saw the unconscious as a psychic phenomenon secondary to the primary ego. The ego was the centre of psychic life. Human destiny was to be achieved by perfection of the ego through the development of rational thinking.

### 3.3 Jung's View of the Psyche

Jung changed the scientific conception of the human psyche by demonstrating the primacy of the unconscious part of the psyche in the functioning of the human personality. This broad theory will be used in subsequent chapters as a fundamental idea for theorising on the human–land relationship. Key elements of Jung's theory which will be discussed in this section are the collective unconscious and its function as the source of fundamental motivation for human psychic life; the structure of the unconscious in the form of archetypes; the psychological maturation process from egocentricity to individuation which brings about a change in a person's psychological orientation to the world and hence a different perception of relationship to the land; and psychological types which explain
individual variations in modes of thinking and acting towards the world.

**Primacy of the Unconscious and the Collective Unconscious**

According to Jung, the unconscious antecedes the conscious in the psychic evolution of both the human race as a whole and of an individual. Consciousness develops by differentiation from the unconscious, and receives its essential life-drives or motivation from the unconscious. This view was revolutionary when first posited by Jung in the early twentieth century and continues to be in conflict with the rational view of the primacy of the conscious mind. Jung comments that the unconscious is one of those ideas which initially people 'find strange':

> After the philosophical idea of the unconscious, in the form presented chiefly by Carus and Von Hartmann, had gone down under the overwhelming wave of materialism and empiricism, leaving hardly a ripple behind it, it gradually reappeared in the scientific domain of medical psychology (1968b, CW9(i), para. 1).

> Medical psychology, growing as it did out of professional practice, insists on the personal nature of the psyche. By this I mean the views of Freud and Adler. It is a psychology of the person, and its aetiological or causal factors are regarded almost wholly as personal in nature (1968b, CW9(i), para. 91).

Freud and Adler had annexed the unconscious to the conscious mind, the ego, so that it was conceived as a personal unconscious. Jung had a radically different view—that the unconscious extended beyond the ego and the personal unconscious:

> The psyche reaches so far beyond the boundary line of consciousness that the latter could be easily compared to an island in the ocean. While the island is small and narrow, the ocean is immensely wide and deep (Jung 1966b, p. 102).

Jung developed his views from empirical research on hospitalised patients, his private patients in psychotherapy and on his own psychic experience and self-analysis. Whereas Freud used the reductive analytical method (which Jung comments is generally pessimistic when it breaks down something complicated into the more simple, such as instincts), Jung chose, according to the particular case, either the reductive or the constructive method, which synthesised the products of the unconscious, such as ideas, images and emotions, with
consciousness in an attempt to lead the patient's view positively forward (1954, CW17, para. 195). This synthesising approach led Jung into extensive research into the motifs and symbols of myths, religions and alchemy of cultures from around the world and from different historical times. He concluded that there was a universality to these motifs and symbols (e.g. 1954, CW17, paras 196–198), and formulated one of his main hypotheses, the collective unconscious:

My thesis...is as follows: In addition to our immediate consciousness, which we believe to be the only empirical psyche (even if we tack on the personal unconscious as an appendix), there exists a second psychic system of collective, universal, and impersonal nature which is identical in all individuals. This collective unconscious does not develop individually but is inherited (1968b, CW9(i), para. 90).

and again:

A more or less superficial layer of the unconscious is undoubtedly personal. I call it the personal unconscious. But this personal unconscious rests upon a deeper layer, which does not derive from personal experience and is not a personal acquisition but is inborn. This deeper layer I call the collective unconscious. I have chosen the term 'collective' because this part of the unconscious is not individual but universal; in contrast to the personal psyche, it has contents and modes of behaviour that are more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals. It is, in other words, identical in all men and thus constitutes a common psychic substrate of a suprapersonal nature which is present in every one of us (1968b, CW9(i), para. 3).

Archetypes

How does Jung support his view that the unconscious is the antecedent of the conscious? He demonstrates a commonality between the images and motifs that occur in dreams of people to the present day and those of the myths from all cultures and times. He postulates from this that there are primitive or primordial contents which can still be generated from the unconscious into conscious perception (e.g. 1964, pp. 83–90). This leads him to regard the psyche as having a similar evolutionary pattern of development to that of the physical body, which
itself passes through the growth patterns of antecedent biological life forms in its
growth towards the pattern of human maturation.\footnote{Jung writes: ‘In reality we are concerned with [in relation to the unconscious bases of dreams and fantasies] primitive or archaic thought-forms based on instinct... The instinctive, archaic basis of the mind is a matter of plain objective fact [to the empirical psychologist], and is no more dependent upon individual experience [according to Freud] or personal choice [according to Adler] than is the inherited structure and functioning of the brain or any other organ. Just as the body has its evolutionary history and shows clear traces of the various evolutionary stages, so too does the psyche’ (1967. CW5, para. 38). He writes further, ‘The existence of these archaic strata [of the collective unconscious] is presumably the source of man’s belief in reincarnations and in memories of ‘previous existences’. Just as the human body is a museum, so to speak, of its phylogenetic history, so too is the psyche. We have no reason to suppose that the specific structure of the psyche is the only thing in the world that has no history outside its individual manifestations. Even the conscious mind cannot be denied a history reaching back at least five thousand years. It is only our ego-consciousness that has forever a new beginning and an early end. The unconscious psyche is not only immensely old, it is also capable of growing into an equally remote future. It moulds the human species and is just as much a part of it as the human body, which though ephemeral in the individual, is collectively of immense age’ (1968b, CW9(i), para. 518).}

Why is the unconscious so important, in Jung’s view, to the human psyche? Freud had identified the sexual instinct as a major determinant to behaviour, and Adler saw the master instinct as the power drive to ego-superiority. Jung broadened and deepened these views to see life’s motivations emanating from the unconscious in the form of structured patterns of psychic phenomena which he termed archetypes. These patterns had long been recognised, such as Freud’s ‘archaic remnants’ (Jung 1964, p. 57), Bastian’s ‘elementary ideas’ (1969b, CW8, para. 353), Burckhart’s ‘primordial image’ (1967, CW5, para 45n), Levy-Bruhl’s ‘representations collective’, Plato’s ‘idea’, Irenaeus’s ‘archetypes’ and Philo Judaeus’s ‘God-image’ (1968b, CW9(i), para. 5).

Prior to 1919, Jung used the term ‘primordial image’ to describe these patterns, but after that time used the term archetype (1969b, CW8, para. 270n). Jung qualifies the term archetype by explaining that the concept refers to something so fundamental that it cannot be represented \textit{directly} in the psyche, and consequently should be considered as ‘psychoid’ (1969b, CW8, paras 417, 840). This means that the archetype, the common structural pattern to all, is represented by a secondary image in the unconscious which is potentially capable of conscious experience, and this image can be manifested in infinite forms, all of which, however, have the same motif or psychical meaning (cf. 1969b, CW8, paras 270,
398). Jung compares the archetype and its generated image with the axes used to describe the form of mineral crystals and the actual crystal form. Crystallographers use the 'a', 'b' and 'c' axes (or up-down, front-back, left-right) to describe the form of minerals. Each mineral has a characteristic and unique axial configuration, and within each mineral type the individual crystals also have unique forms, although these grow in conformity to the mineral type arrangement.

Jung sees instincts and archetypes as comprising a complexio oppositorum (1969b, CW8, paras 397-420) which fulfils a fundamental role in cosmic life. Instincts and archetypes are 'the most polar opposites imaginable' (para. 406) but operate in union where the tension between their polarity gives energy to the psychic process (para. 414):

Psychic processes therefore behave like a scale along which consciousness 'slides'. At one moment it finds itself in the vicinity of instinct, and falls under its influence; at another, it slides along to the other end where spirit [i.e. the archetype] predominates and even assimilates the instinctual processes most opposed to it. These counter-positions, so fruitful of illusion, are by no means symptoms of the abnormal; on the contrary, they form the twin poles of that psychic one-sidedness which is typical of the normal man of today (para. 408).

The instincts are unconscious, and are the biological or animal, compulsive, and typical modes of action (1969b, CW8, paras 232–251, 272f., 398, 420). The archetypes are also unconscious, but are typical modes of apprehension (para. 280) through which the psyche experiences things (paras 243, 261). The archetypes are manifested in the psyche as images and ideas (para. 417), and they convey the

---

8 Jung writes: '...archetypes are not determined as regards their content, but only as regards their form and then only to a very limited degree. A primordial image [i.e. as generated by the archetype] is determined as to its content only when it has become conscious and is therefore filled out with the material of conscious experience. Its form, however,... might perhaps be compared to the axial system of a crystal. which as it were, preforms the crystalline structure in the mother liquid, although it has no material existence of its own. The archetype in itself is empty and purely formal, nothing but a facultas praeformandi [a potential of a pre-existent form], a possibility of representation which is given a priori. The representations themselves are not inherited, only the forms, and in that respect they correspond in every way to the instincts, which are also determined in form only...our comparison with the crystal is illuminating in as much as the axial system determines only the stereometric structure but not the concrete form of the individual crystal... The same is true of the archetype. In principle, it can be named and has an invariable nucleus of meaning—but always only in principle, never as regards its concrete manifestation' (1968b, CW9(i), para. 155).
meanings of the instincts to the psyche (para. 398). The archetype has the special 
quality of not only being the image of meaning of the instinct but also of 
incorporating the instinct's energy and thereby having 'numinosity' and 
fascinating power' (para. 414) so that it generates emotional and religious effects 
(paras 405, 414). The archetype communicates with the human psyche through the 
use of 'passive conscious material' (para. 403) which is constellated into symbolic 
'visualizations or concretizations' (para. 417) of its images or ideas. The conscious 
mind, however, is mostly unconscious of the operation of the archetypal influence 
on psychic life (para. 412). Nevertheless human behaviour is pre-determined to 
follow instinctual forms of archetypal patterns (para. 401).

As an aid to the understanding of the human position in the cosmos, Jung 
proposed the following model of cosmic existence (1969b, CW8, paras 397–420). 
At the most fundamental level of existence is a state of cosmic unity. Within this 
fundamental unity there is what the human rational mind would conceptualise as a 
dichotomy, a complexio oppositorum, of opposites in tension, namely matter and 
spirit. From these derive instincts and archetypes, but in their most fundamental 
forms before their manifestations as patterns of actions, images or ideas in the 
collective unconscious. Jung termed the fundamental instincts and archetypes 
psychoid because they are beyond the psychic. The psychoid instincts generate the 
biological instincts, specific to species and situations. The biological instincts form 
part of the collective unconscious, that is they are psychic. They are 'rooted in the 
stuff of the organism' and form 'the bridge to matter in general' (para. 420). The 
psychoid archetypes produce the archetypal images and ideas of the collective 
unconscious. It is these psychic images and ideas which form the bridge back to the 
spirit (para. 420). Thus the psychic opposites of instincts and archetypes 'confront 
one another' within the psyche (para. 420), and provide the psychological basis for 
the linkage between spirit and matter, or between the human archetypal 
apprehension of the world and the psychic instinctual foundation to the material 
world.

The instincts and archetypes provide the psychic energy to the unconscious 
and conscious psyche, but it is the archetypes which provide 'the spiritual goal' for 
humanity to transcend 'the primitivity and unconsciousness of sheer instinctuality'
Jung writes:

[the archetype] represents the authentic element of spirit, but a spirit which is not to be identified with the human intellect, since it is the latter’s *spiritus rector* [spiritual director/guide]. The essential content of all mythologies and all religions and all isms is archetypal (para. 406).

**Psychological Individuation**

Jung suggests that consciousness has brought humankind the fundamental problem of psychic detachment from nature: consciousness ‘is just man’s turning away from instinct’ (1933, p. 110; cf. 1969b, CW8, para. 750). Jung writes:

Perhaps it would not be too much to say that the most crucial problems of the individual and of society turn upon the way the psyche functions in regard to spirit and matter (1969b, CW8, para. 251).

Unconscious organisms, including primitive humans, live in unconscious identification with the natural environment, in a non-reflective, instinctual way. Jung argues that consciousness has arisen by the differentiation of the ego from the unconscious, and the ego’s ability to perceive images from both the unconscious and the external environment and to know or reflect on them (1969b, CW8, paras 610f.; cf. para. 584; cf. 1968c, CW12, para. 149). Consciousness then brings humankind the additional problem of ‘[external] environmental adaptation’ (1969b, CW8, para. 339).

The ego operates rationally, analytically, and through discrimination (cf. Jung 1968c, CW12, para. 30). This contrasts with the irrationality and synthesising of the unconscious. The ego perceives the world in dichotomies, in either/or situations, and consequently adopts a one-sided view. The historical evolution of consciousness has been achieved by the progressive withdrawal of psychological projections,⁹ as the archetypal image/idea becomes understood as an entity separate from the hitherto object of the projection. The scientific revolution of the Enlightenment has produced a proliferation of one-sided knowledge about the world. Of these new ‘“scientifically” attested views’ Jung writes:

---

⁹ Psychological projection refers to the unconscious process of an archetypal content of the unconscious such as an image or idea being projected from the unconscious and perceived as being attached to an external object. Comment on the process is made in section 3.4.
These each and all relate to knowledge of the external object and in a chronically one-sided way, so that nowadays the backwardness of psychic development in general and of self-knowledge in particular has become one of the most pressing contemporary problems...The current 'isms' are the most serious threat...because they are nothing but dangerous identifications of the subjective with the collective consciousness. Such an identity infallibly produces a mass psyche with its irresistible urge to catastrophe.... 'isms' ...are only a sophisticated substitute for the lost link with psychic reality. The mass psyche that infallibly results destroys the meaning of the individual and of culture generally (1969b, CW8, paras 426f.).

Modern rational thinking has so exalted the ego that it has forced archetypal influence into unconsciousness, and perceives only a material, despiritualised natural world. The ego thinks of itself as autonomous within the cosmos, detached from the spiritual and material worlds. It maintains its pseudo-autonomy by rejection of the numinosity of the archetypal symbols, and it dominates its external environment as a reflection of its attempted domination of its psychic environment. The egocentric person, however, is still subject to archetypal influence but, being unconscious of it, becomes a prisoner to it (or in serious cases, as Jung states, is possessed by it (1968b, CW9(i), paras 393, 621)), instead of allowing the archetype to create new consciousness in the person. Jung writes:

Modern man does not understand how much his 'rationalism' (which has destroyed his capacity to respond to numinous symbols and ideas) has put him at the mercy of the psychic 'underworld'...His moral and spiritual tradition has disintegrated, and he is now paying the price for this break-up in world-wide disorientation and dissociation...

Today...we talk of 'matter'...But the word 'matter' remains a dry, inhuman, and purely intellectual concept, without any psychic significance for us. How different was the former image of matter—the Great Mother...what was the spirit is now identified with intellect and thus ceases to be the Father of All. It has degenerated to the limited ego-thoughts of man; the immense emotional energy expressed in the image of 'our Father' vanishes into the sand of an intellectual desert (1964, pp. 84f.).

The purpose of Jung's work was psychotherapy. He found that the person whose psyche was centred in the rational mind, the ego, was consciously isolated from both the instinctual roots of the unconscious and from the world. The person
was incapable of formulating a meaningful myth of life. The egocentric view could not provide a religious feeling of communion with the world (Latin, *religio*, linking back; *religere*, to go through again, to consider carefully [of the archetypes]; 1967, CW5, para. 669; 1969b, CW8, para. 427). The ego-centred psyche is dissociated from its psychic source and views the world unrealistically in a distorted and fragmented way (1968b, CW9(i), para. 173; 1969a, CW11, para. 751; 1968c, CW12, para. 516; 1965, pp. 3, 109, 132, 324f., 348). Jung found that the religious instinct came not from the ego, but from the unconscious (1965, pp. 346, 348ff.). The archetypes, as the motivating forces of the psyche, are the true subjects of human life, whether the person is conscious or unconscious of the process (1969b, CW8, paras 405f.; 1969a, CW11, para. 757; 1965, pp. 348f., 352f.). In Jung’s view, the reality of the unconscious is so fundamental to the psyche that it is ‘the generator of the empirical personality’, and the consciously perceived world is ‘a kind of illusion, an apparent reality constructed for a specific purpose, like a dream which seems a reality as long as we are in it’ (1965, p. 324).

The human purpose is to realise psychic wholeness:

Unconscious wholeness...seems to me the true *spiritus rector* of all biological and psychic events. Here is a principle which strives for total realization—which in man’s case signifies the attainment of total consciousness. Attainment of consciousness is culture in the broadest sense, and self-knowledge is therefore the heart and essence of this process (Jung 1965, p. 325).

According to Jung, psychic wholeness is approached through the conscious assimilation of archetypal contents generated by the unconscious. The unconscious initiates the process, but the ego can also participate by transferring some of its psychic energy to the archetypes to assist them over the threshold of consciousness (1969b, CW8, para. 425n.). Jung identifies four stages of human life (1969b, CW8, para. 795). The first and last, childhood and extreme old age, are ‘utterly different, and yet they have one thing in common: submersion in unconscious psychic happenings’ (para. 795). The second stage, youth, extends from puberty to middle age and is characterised by the problems of adapting to the external situations of life and the developing inner world of the ego as an independent entity relative to its maternal or parental psychic matrix. In youth, Jung writes, there is ‘a more or
less patent clinging to the childhood level of consciousness, a resistance to the fateful forces in and around us which would involve us in the world', that is a wish to remain 'unconscious or, at most, conscious only of the ego; to reject everything strange, or else subject it to our will; to do nothing, or else indulge our own craving for pleasure or power' (para. 764). The third stage, adulthood, is characterised by a struggle to transform one's nature because of the inner upwelling of unconscious contents. The person is faced with two choices: (i) rejection of assimilation of the unconscious instincts, with the result of 'rigidity' of personality with a hardening of one's convictions and principles, or (ii) a change in the manifestations of one's character (para. 773).

Jung uses the term 'individuation' for the process of attaining psychic integration, because the psyche is then in-divisible. The individuated person experiences a new centre of being, no longer in the ego but beyond it and within the now-acknowledged, enlarged psyche incorporating the personal unconscious and part, at least, of the collective unconscious. Jung calls this new psychic centre the self.¹⁰ Jung describes the self as follows:

a centre of personality, a kind of central point within the psyche, to which everything is related, by which everything is arranged, and which is itself a source of energy. The energy of the central point is manifested in the almost irresistible compulsion and urge to become what one is, just as every organism is driven to assume the form that is characteristic of its nature, no matter what the circumstances. This centre is not felt or thought of as the ego but, if one may so express it, as the self. Although the centre is represented by an innermost point, it is surrounded by a periphery containing everything that belongs to the self—the paired opposites that make up the total personality. This totality comprises consciousness first of all, then the personal unconscious, and finally an indefinitely large segment of the collective unconscious whose archetypes are common to all mankind (1968b, CW9(i), para. 634).

Jung writes:

---

¹⁰ Jung's use of the term self is therefore different to the normal meaning of the word self. Some other writers (discussed in chapter 6) have a still different meaning and capitalise the word as Self. Whenever the term is used in the Jungian sense in this thesis, it is written as self, that is in lower case italics.
This 'something' is strange to us and yet so near, wholly ourselves and yet unknowable, a virtual centre of so mysterious a constitution...I have called this centre the self. Intellectually the self is no more than a psychological concept, a construct that serves to express an unknowable essence which we cannot grasp as such, since by definition it transcends our powers of comprehension. It might equally well be called the 'God within us'. The beginnings of our whole psychic life seem to be inextricably rooted in this point, and all our highest and ultimate purposes seem to be striving towards it (1966c, CW7, paras 398f.).

and:

the self...should be understood as the totality of the psyche. The self is not only the centre, but also the whole circumference which embraces both conscious and unconscious; it is the centre of this totality, just as the ego is the centre of consciousness (1968c, CW12, para. 44).

Individuation brings a fundamental change of attitude, that is the person adopts a radically different psychic orientation both to the unconscious and to the world (e.g. 1966c, CW7, p. 4, paras 132, 159, 359–365; 1969b, CW8, paras 430–432, 697ff.; 1965, pp. 287, 325). The centre is now experienced within the personality and beyond the ego. Jung notes that the unconscious reflects the attitude which the ego shows to it (1968c, CW12, para. 29). Hence the egocentric person views the unconscious with hostility and seeks to avoid or dominate it, whereas the individuated person experiences the interiority of the self and befriends it. The person now knows the self as the source of psychic life and, hence, is no longer driven to conquest and possession but instead is free to follow the guide of the self.

Psychological Types
Jung provides further insight into what constitutes a person’s psychological attitude to the world within the fundamental categories (or motifs) of egocentricity and individuation. His research on psychological types identifies sub-categories of psychological operation by which he explains the variations in how people think and act towards the world. Each person has a preferred broad attitude or orientation to the world, of either extraversion or introversion (1971, CW6, paras 1–7). Extraversion is when a person’s psychic energy flows outwards to an object, and
the object is perceived as containing the fundamental value for meaning in life. The reverse occurs with introversion—the energy flows back from the perceived object to the person’s psyche, and the highest value attaches to the person’s psyche: the object sometimes ‘represents no more than an outward token of a subjective content, the embodiment of an idea, the idea being the essential thing’ (1971, CW6, para. 5). In addition, Jung identifies four psychological functions by which a person relates to the world. The functions operate within, and in association with, the orientations of extraversion and introversion. The functions are arranged in two pairs, thinking as the opposite to feeling, and intuition as the opposite to sensation. Thinking ‘brings the contents of ideation into conceptual connection with one another’ (para. 830) and feeling imparts a value judgment of acceptance or rejection of something (paras 724f.). Thinking and feeling are rational functions. Intuition is the unconscious perception (para. 770), and sensation is the conscious perception of things via the senses (paras 792–796). These are irrational functions. Thinking and feeling are the judging functions by which people make decisions or bring things to a conclusion, whereas intuition and sensation are the perceiving functions by which people engage more or less continually in perceiving things (e.g. paras 668, 776, 792). As a person’s ego develops by differentiation from the unconscious, one of the four functions assumes dominance, and the person’s consciousness operates mainly through this function. The dominant function is usually associated with an auxiliary function, always from the other pairing. The two least differentiated functions, one from each pairing, are largely unconscious and not used rationally. The effect of partial differentiation of the fourfold system of the functions is that people perceive reality only partially, and adopt a one-sided and distorted view of the world.

Jung used the variety of combinations of psychological orientations and functions to categorise personality types. While these types operate within the overall attitudes of egocentricity and individuation, they explain the different modes of interaction with the world. Jung’s work has been seminal to later categorisations of personality and temperament types. For example, Keirsey and Bates (1984) describe sixteen types within four main categories of temperament:

- **Dionysian** temperaments, based on the sensation and perceiving
functions, live through instinctive action:

- **Epimethean** temperaments, based on the sensation and judging functions, live through duty, conscience, regulation and conservation;

- **Promethean** temperaments, based on the intuition and thinking functions, live through power over nature, and science;

- **Apollonian** temperaments, based on the intuition and feeling functions, are the idealists and visionaries.

The different temperaments developed because of the differential emergence among people of the functions from the unconscious into consciousness. Some people, for example, relate to the world by contemplation, others by changing nature through action. Jung was able to assist his patients towards individuation by making them aware of the existence of their inferior functions of which they were unconscious. Expanding their consciousness in this way evoked a fundamental change in their attitude to the world from egocentricity to individuation (1971, CW6, para. 911). Jung has thus provided a model for understanding the psychological bases to the human attitudes to the world.

### 3.4 The Symbol

Jung hypothesises that the archetypes are structured forms of the *unconscious*. Consequently they can not be perceived directly by the conscious mind. He argues, therefore, that the meaning of an archetype can be perceived only via a symbol, which is created by the conjunction of an unconscious meaning and an image or idea recognisable to the conscious mind. For example, the archetypal meaning of union between the cosmic creator and the creation is symbolised by the mythical idea of the centre-of-the-world, and by the image of the *axis mundi*, which might be variously represented by the cosmic mountain, the temple, an obelisk, the hearth, the altar etc. Symbols can, therefore, take on a variety of particular forms associated with each universal archetypal meaning. Indeed, according to Jung, people perceive the external world always through the unconscious meaning of
archetypes, that is people perceive the world symbolically. Thus, symbolic perception is a fundamental form of human relationship to the land. Accordingly, this section looks firstly at Jung’s conception of the symbol, and then at the process of psychological projection by which contents of the unconscious are brought via the symbol into the visible world. This provides a basis for then applying Jung’s ideas on symbolism to establish the system of symbolic perception of land associated with the attitude of egocentrism and that associated with the attitude of individuation.

The Concept of the Symbol
Jung sees the symbol as having a meaning associated with an individual’s psychic energy or libido,¹¹ and as being formed by the conjunction of archetypal meaning and images or ideas recognisable to the person’s contemporary conscious mind. Ideas, as well as objects of nature, images of people, animals, plants, and landscapes, forms which might be experienced in dreams and expressed in myth, can all function as symbols. Jung writes of the living nature and the psychic purpose of symbols:

> the vision of the symbol is a pointer to the onward course of life, beckoning
> the libido towards a still distant goal—but a goal that henceforth will burn unquenchably within him, so that his life, kindled as by a flame, moves steadily towards the far-off beacon. This is the specific life-promoting significance of the symbol...I am speaking...of living symbols that rise up from the creative unconscious of the living man (1971, CW6, para. 202).

Jung writes that, if the value of the symbol is acknowledged as an ‘exponent of the unconscious’, that is as exhibiting archetypal meaning, then:

> the symbol acquires a conscious motive force—that is, it is perceived, and its unconscious libido-charge is thereby given an opportunity to make itself felt in the conscious conduct of life. Thus ...a practical advantage...is gained, namely, the collaboration of the unconscious, its participation in the conscious psychic performance... (1971, CW6, para. 204)

The following quotes show how Jung conceptualises the symbol:

---

¹¹ Jung uses the word libido to mean a person’s total psychic energy, that is including all instincts and archetypes. This is in contradistinction to Freud’s use of libido to mean the sexual instinctual drive (see, for example, Jung 1967, CW5, paras 185–189; paras 190–203).
The essence of the symbol consists in the fact that it represents in itself something that is not wholly understandable, and that it hints only intuitively at its possible meaning. The creation of a symbol is not a rational process, for a rational process could never produce an image that represents a content which is at bottom incomprehensible (1971, CW6, para. 171).

The symbol is neither abstract nor concrete, neither rational nor irrational, neither real nor unreal. It is always both (1968c, CW12, para. 400).

Jung (1969b, CW8) sees the symbol as the essential medium through which the contents of the unconscious can be brought into consciousness and thence into the conscious life of the world:

The psychological mechanism that transforms [psychic] energy is the symbol (para. 88).

The transformation of libido through the symbol is a process that has been going on ever since the beginnings of humanity and continues still. Symbols were never devised consciously, but were always produced out of the unconscious by way of revelation or intuition (para. 92).

In abstract form, symbols are religious ideas; in the form of action, they are rites or ceremonies. They are the manifestation and expression of excess libido. At the same time they are stepping-stones to new activities, which must be called cultural in order to distinguish them from the instinctual functions that run their regular course according to natural law (para. 91).

Jung’s cosmic myth that humankind’s function is to bring the unconscious God into consciousness (1965, p. 338) is, therefore, dependent on the symbol and humankind’s bringing of symbolic meaning into consciousness.

**Psychological Projection**

Psychological projection is the process whereby archetypal images and ideas generated from within the unconscious part of a person’s psyche are perceived unconsciously as being inherent in objects or situations in the external world. Thus, projection effects the linkage between the unconscious and the psyche’s perception of the visible world. The effect of projection is that the situations and objects then fulfil the psychological function of symbols, that is they are infused with unconscious psychological meaning. Projection and the resultant symbols thus
provide the human psyche with a framework or lens through which it perceives the outer world—'The archetype does not proceed from physical facts, but describes how the psyche experiences the physical fact' (1968b, CW9(i), para. 260).

The following quotes from Jung illustrate the importance he places on projection as the means of relationship between people and their perceived world:

Everything unknown and empty is filled with psychological projection; it is as if the [alchemist's] own psychic background were mirrored in the darkness. What he sees in matter, or thinks he can see, is chiefly the data of his own unconscious which he is projecting into it. In other words, he encounters in matter, as apparently belonging to it, certain qualities and potential meanings of whose psychic nature he is entirely unconscious (1968c, CW12, para. 332).

It is well known that the unconscious, when not realized, is ever at work casting a false glamour over everything, a false appearance: it appears to us always on objects, because everything unconscious is projected (1971, CW6, para. 212).

It is the natural and given thing for unconscious contents to be projected. In a comparatively primitive person this creates that characteristic relationship to the object which Lévy-Bruhl has fittingly called 'mystic identity' or 'participation mystique'. Thus every normal person of our time, who is not reflective beyond the average, is bound to his environment by a whole system of projections (1969b, CW8, para. 507).

The archetypes project into a person's mind ideas and images which are relevant to the person's stage of psychological development and particular life situation and are potentially recognisable as having meaning for the person's conscious life (cf. Jung 1968b, CW9(i), paras 645, 693). Accordingly, an archetype can be perceived in an infinite variety of symbolic forms among different individuals, but its meaning remains constant and universally valid because it relates to the collective unconscious. Any object can act as a symbol, but there are certain things, such as sun, fire, earth, water, father, mother and child, which are pre-eminent in their attraction of particular archetypal projections because, in nature, they represent so well the archetypal meanings associated with the energy of the libido, the development of consciousness and the growth of the psychic personality through the continual sequence of emergence, death and rebirth of
consciousness through its inter-relationship with the unconscious. Consequently, these symbols comprise the main elements of myth and religion.

**Symbolism of the Egocentric Attitude**

This section looks at three forms of symbolism characteristic of the egocentric attitude to the world, namely the hero and his association to the mother, the paradise image and the mandala.

**The Symbols of the Hero and the Mother**

Jung draws the link between the religious—mythical significance of the symbolism of the sun and that of the hero (see 1967, CW5, pt 1 ch. 5, pt 2 ch. 4), for example:

> The visible father of the world is the sun, the heavenly fire, for which reason father, God, sun, and fire are mythologically synonymous. The well-known fact that in worshipping the sun's strength we pay homage to the great generative force of Nature is the plainest possible evidence...that in God we honour the energy of the archetype (para. 135).

> The finest of all symbols of the libido is the human figure, conceived as a demon or hero. Here the symbolism leaves the objective, material realm of astral and meteorological images and takes on human form...The symbolic transition from sun to man is easily made... (para. 251)

According to Jung, creation myths symbolise the emergence of consciousness from the unconscious (1968c, CW12, para. 30). Creation myths illustrate how the conscious mind projects onto the world the symbolic image of the composition of its own psyche, namely the emergence, by differentiation, of consciousness from unconsciousness (1968b, CW9(i), para. 187; 1968c, CW12, para. 30). Hence, the ego perceives through discrimination, and consequently sees the unconscious and the conscious as opposites. Thus consciousness might be symbolised by light, sky, sun, or hero, while unconsciousness might be symbolised by dark, water, earth, or dragon. The fertility of the earth attracts the symbol of the mother; hence its opposite, the sky, is seen as the father. The perceived transformation from the unknown (dark) to the known (light) is symbolised by the transforming or mobile agents such as fire, or wind (and by the concepts of spirit and love), or the generative agents such as those associated with the mother and birth including earth, water, or any container or enclosure suggestive of the womb.
The images of the child and the hero symbolise the archetype of the self with its meaning that the psyche’s libido is directing the psyche towards wholeness by rebirth through the child or re-assimilation through the hero’s confrontation with the unconscious. However, in the egocentric stage of psychological development, this symbolism is unconscious, and the symbols are perceived in the context of the ego’s desire to consolidate its autonomy. The development of personality comprises a life-struggle to attain integrity through a separation and independence from the psyche of the mother. This struggle is the motif of the masculine conquest by the hero of the world’s threats, as exemplified by Heracles. The hero symbolises the ego struggling for dominance over the maternal unconscious. It is here that the conservativeness of the unconscious poses the problem, reflected in the overloving and possessive mother, of holding the ego back from its destiny to which the archetype of the self is driving it. The mother is then seen as dangerous and evil, the ‘terrible mother’ (Jung 1967, CW5, para. 254), with the result that the earth and water are symbolised by primordial images associated with the darkness of the ocean depths and the underground, such as the reptilian forms of monsters, dragons, serpents etc. The life of the ego, symbolised in the hero myth, becomes a continual act of consolidation of its differentiation from the unconscious. The differentiation of consciousness from the unconscious is slow and difficult, and can be threatened by reabsorption into the unconscious; hence creation myth symbolises the growth of consciousness as a battle between hero and mother, such as Marduk’s slaying of Tiamat. The mother-archetype is seen in Tiamat as evil and something which has to be sacrificed to win the freedom of conscious existence. Marduk, the sun god, relates to the world through conquest and domination and by using the resources derived from the slain mother for his purposes. The hero can only reawaken the productive capabilities of the slain mother by male-initiated fertilisation, which requires the hero to assume the characteristics of the father. To do this, the hero must commit incest. This is represented mythically, for example, by the fertilisation of the earth by the rain issued by the sky-father or the general power of resurrection and eternal life of the sun god such as Osiris.

Jung interprets Heracles’ labours as struggles against the jealous ‘mother’ (Hera) who wanted to destroy him: his labours were symbolised by confrontation
with archetypal images of monsters, giants and overwhelming situations (1967, CW5, para. 450n). Heracles represents the person struggling for ego-identity, whereas the giant Antaeus, whose only source of strength derived from contact with the earth, represents the person who is imprisoned in the maternal psyche and is unconscious of self-identity. But Heracles continued (until near the end of his life) to see the mother-archetype as an adversary, so that his life became a series of conquests in the hope of achieving a position of domination over his environment. Heracles, like Adam, represents people who are in the stage of psychic development in which the ego is still tied unconsciously to the mother-archetype in its negative form of possession, which prevents the ego from realising its uniqueness and its ability to act as an independent psychic entity. These people have an attitude to life of either submission to permanent entrapment within the maternal psyche (which they perceive as a paradise of childhood (1969b, CW8, para. 751)), or of continual aspiration to a position of dominance, which is assumed to be possible only by the ego conquering everything from the unconscious and making the ego the centre of the psyche. The whole world is seen by these people as a symbol of the ‘terrible mother’ (1967, CW5, paras 264f., 315, ch. 7), the negative aspect of the unconscious. The egocentric person’s hostility towards the unconscious is reflected in a perceived hostility from the world (1968c, CW12, para. 29).

Paradise
The egocentric goal is to conquer evil and to establish dominance over life. This discriminatory view of the world perceives the goal as good, as against evil, in the form of an existence of bliss and abundance where humankind, animals and the natural environment co-exist in mutual support and without conflict. This is the image of paradise, as exemplified in the Old Testament by the Garden of Eden. Jung sees the paradise image as an example of the mother-archetype, that is a
symbolic womb or maternal container in which spiritual re-birth might occur by re-integration of the ego with the unconscious.\textsuperscript{12}

Paradise represents a protected \textit{temenos} or sacred space—a mother-symbol where the ‘good mother’ makes possible the communion with the gods. The paradise is thus differentiated from the surrounding wilderness in which annihilation is threatened by the ‘terrible mother’. But, Jung suggests, paradise is the image of harmony with nature, which existed only in the unconscious state when instinct was guided by nature: consciousness has introduced a tension between itself and the unconscious (1969b, CW8, para. 750). Paradise represents a wish to return to the childhood unconscious and its absorption in the maternal psyche (1969b, CW8, para. 751). Egocentric people believe that paradise can be achieved through the ego acting as its own centre, without any opposition from the unconscious. Through continual propitiation, evil can be expunged from the centred sacred land and restricted to the wild non-sacred land. Thus cosmicisation of the landscape aims to separate the transformed land from the far-off wild land where nature remains uncreated (i.e. not under the control of consciousness). The egocentric person perceives the world through the projected images of the mother-archetype, but Jung makes the point that the mother should be understood as the ‘dual mother’ of evil and good (1967, CW5, pt 2 ch. 7). The one-sided ego identifies with the sun god and assumes it can subjugate the terrible mother symbolised by the earth. However, the ego, which is separated from its unconscious and from the earth, is motivated unconsciously by its most powerful archetype, the \textit{self}, the image of which is projected in the form of a uniting symbol such as the garden or paradise in the centre of which is the human figure, whether Adam, the noble savage, the heroic ancient Greek after death, or the modern

\textsuperscript{12} Jung writes, ‘Like any other archetype, the mother archetype appears under an almost infinite variety of aspects...mothers...the goddess...other symbols of the mother in the figurative sense appear in things representing the goal of our longing for redemption, such as Paradise, the Kingdom of God, the Heavenly Jerusalem. Many things arousing devotion or feelings of awe, as for instance the church, university, city or country, heaven, earth, the woods, the sea or any still waters, matter even, the underworld and the moon, can be mother-symbols. The archetype is often associated with things and places standing for fertility and fruitfulness: the cornucopia, a ploughed field, a garden...Because of the protection it implies, the magic circle or mandala can be a form of mother archetype’ (Jung 1968b, CW9(i), para. 156).
romantic in the natural wilderness, who is imagined as the cosmic personality in union with the gods.

The Mandala

Jung identifies the mandala as the pre- eminent archetypal symbol because of its functional significance in unconsciously motivating people towards wholeness of personality (1968b, CW9(i), para. 715). Mandala is a Sanskrit word for circle (1968b, CW9(i), para. 629). The basic form of the mandala symbol is a central element in association with a periphery which itself may be delimited by a boundary. In discussing mandalas ‘spontaneously produced by [his] patients’ and not influenced by traditions or models as are the Asian meditational mandalas, Jung writes that they seem to be:

...free creations of fantasy, but determined by certain archetypal ideas unknown to their creators. For this reason the fundamental motifs are repeated so often that marked similarities occur in drawings done by the most diverse patients...The pictures differ widely, according to the stage of the therapeutic process; but certain important stages correspond to definite motifs...a rearranging of the personality is involved, a kind of new centring. That is why mandalas mostly appear in connection with chaotic psychic states of disorientation or panic. They then have the purpose of reducing the confusion to order, though this is never the conscious intention of the patient. At all events they express order, balance, and wholeness. Patients themselves often emphasize the beneficial or soothing effect of such pictures. Usually the mandalas express religious, i.e. numinous, thoughts and ideas, or, in their stead, philosophical ones. Most mandalas have an intuitive, irrational character and, through their symbolic content, exert a retroactive influence on the unconscious. They therefore possess a ‘magical’ significance, like icons, whose possible efficacy was never consciously felt by the patient...Confronted with these pictures, many patients suddenly realize for the first time the reality of the collective unconscious as an autonomous entity (1968b, CW9(i), para. 645).

Jung notes the characteristic forms of his patients’ mandalas as: circular, spherical or egg-shaped; a circle elaborated into a flower or wheel; sun, star or cross usually with rays from the centre; a snake coiled as a ring or a spiral around the centre; a circle in a square or vice versa; a square or circular city, castle and courtyard
...we are driven to the conclusion that there must be a transconscious disposition in every individual which is able to produce the same or very similar symbols at all times and in all places (1968b, CW9(i), para. 711).

The mandala, which Jung calls the ‘archetype of wholeness’ (para. 715), is generated spontaneously by the unconscious of people who are in some state of psychic disunion:

[The mandala] is evidently an attempt at self-healing on the part of Nature, which does not spring from conscious reflection but from an instinctive impulse... (para. 714; cf. paras 693, 710)

Jung distinguishes between the centre of a mandala and the area contained within the enclosing boundary (see Jung 1966b, ch. 3, esp. pp. 96f.), and attributes the centre with the symbolism of the deity or the self, and the enclosed space with the meaning of the temenos or mother-image where ‘transformation of man into divine being takes place’ (p. 112). Jung writes:

[The mandala] portrays an autonomous psychic fact, characterized by a phenomenology which is always repeating itself and is everywhere the same. It seems to be a sort of atomic nucleus about whose innermost structure and ultimate meaning we know nothing. We can also regard it as the actual—i.e., effective—reflection of a conscious attitude that can state neither its aim nor its purpose and, because of this failure, projects its activity [unconsciously] entirely upon the virtual centre of the mandala. The compelling force necessary for this projection always lies in some situation where the individual no longer knows how to help himself in any other way (1968c, CW12, para. 249).

The mandala, as with all symbols, is an image relevant to a particular psychic condition, in this case to egocentricity. The mandala discriminates between inner and outer, which may be considered to symbolise the two aspects of the unconscious, the terrible mother (outer) and the good mother (inner). The mandala symbol unites opposites. The boundary enclosing the hinterland indicates firstly the distinction between the good and bad mothers: it separates the individual psyche from the boundless collective unconscious which, if unchecked, would overwhelm the individual psyche (as symbolised by the mythical cosmic flood (1967, CW5, para. 571; cf. para. 170)) and dissolve the ego into the unconscious. Secondly,
the boundary indicates containment and centring, whereby those elements of the collective unconscious relevant to, and capable of, assimilation by the ego are directed towards the psychic centre, the self.

The inference from Jung’s work is that egocentric people perceive the meaning of the mandala only unconsciously, and then through discrimination of its elements. Without therapeutic guidance or an ability for self-analysis it seems that they do not consciously perceive the mandala’s psychic meaning of integration and wholeness. Rather, they perceive the image through the psychological desire to consolidate the ego against a threatening unknown. Consequently they perceive the landscape as divided between the immediate hinterland related to a centre, and the far-off land. They attempt to establish a sanctuary in their living space by continuing the mythical sacrifice of the terrible mother, the process which Eliade named cosmicisation (1971, p. 10).

An egocentric person continually and unconsciously projects the meaning of the self onto objects in the outer environment (1969b, CW8, para. 507; 1968c, CW12, paras 332. 247–249). Consequently, the person seeks to re-connect to and to acquire divine power from the object which has become a symbol of the unrecognised self and a centre or axis mundi. The self-image may be projected to an object of any scale, for example, the sun, a mountain as the axis mundi, or any object or person, but unconsciously the object will be perceived through the image of the self. Irrespective of the scale of the object, the person is driven unconsciously to unite with it, a process that the autonomous ego perceives as a desire to possess and control the power inherent in the object. Mythically, egocentric people perceive the symbolic outer centre as the locus where they can ritualistically renew their power over nature in imitation of the hero sun god. The sacralised land surrounding the centre fulfils the role of the mother-symbol in providing the vessel for the rebirth of the person by re-connection to the gods at the centre. However, the egocentric attitude knows only the autonomy of the sun god and seeks the continuation of his power over the earth monster through ritualistically sacrificing nature such as through clearing and cultivation of the land, and the establishment of symbolic axis mundi, such as through circular or square patterns of land subdivision focused on a centre, where the sun god’s power can be renewed
through labour as propitiatory ritual.

**Symbolism of the Individuated Attitude**

Individuation brings about a fundamental change in a person’s attitude towards the world, involving the acknowledgement of the existence and primacy of the unconscious and the symbolic nature of human perception of the outer world. Psychological development involves the becoming aware of the meaning of particular symbols and the consequent withdrawal of projections of those symbols. Therefore, as the common psyche grows through the development of consciousness by the progressive withdrawal of projections, symbols can lose their unconscious effects both on individuals and within societies (see, for example, Jung 1966, pp. 100–103). Jung writes:

So long as a symbol is a living thing, it is an expression for something that cannot be characterized in any other or better way. The symbol is alive only so long as it is pregnant with meaning. But once its meaning has been born out of it, once that expression is found which formulates the thing sought, expected, or divined even better than the hitherto accepted symbol, then the symbol is *dead*, i.e., it possesses only an historical significance (1971, CW6, para. 816).

Thus symbols evolve historically. For example, Jung gives the example of the symbol of the deity being at one time the gods living on the cosmic mountains or in wild nature, which gave way to the idea of a single god, and then to the idea of god becoming man (1966, p. 102). The symbol changes but the archetypal idea remains constant (cf. Jung 1971, CW6, para. 817).

The individuated person has undergone the hero’s *conscious* confrontation with the unconscious and *experiences* re-connection to the unconscious. The individuated person can withdraw the projected images of the autonomous hero, the paradise mother-symbol, and the mandala. Individuation realises the *complexio oppositorum*. Jung writes: ‘The sad truth is that man’s real life consists of a complex of inexorable opposites...Life is a battleground’ (1964, p. 75). Jung writes that the path to individuation is no easy matter of choice to embrace the harmony of peace with God, but is a life-wrenching struggle to displace the ego from its previously-assumed position of supremacy and open it to assimilation of archetypal
...the uncertainty of all moral valuation, the bewildering interplay between good and evil, and the remorseless concatenation of guilt, suffering, and redemption. This path to the primordial religious experience is the right one (1968b, CW9(i), para. 399).

Jung’s description of the struggle towards individuation would appear to have similarities to the process of religious conversion described, for example, by Bonhoeffer in terms of the need to overcome the ego’s feeling of autonomy, with its inherent shame and conscience, and to become reconciled by obedience to the ‘command of God’ (1985, pp. 244ff.). Jung argues that the ego’s real or fundamental life is known only symbolically. Thus ideas, actions and visual images are only symbols of the fundamental archetypes:

Our task is not, therefore, to deny the archetype, but to dissolve the projections, in order to restore their contents to the individual who has involuntarily lost them by projecting them outside himself (1968b, CW9(i), para. 160).

After ‘rebirth’ from the hero’s journey, the person can dissolve the images of the hero, paradise and mandala through the experience of the ego’s communion with the unconscious in which the threats and dangers are met by the ego’s response of obedience to the direction from the unconscious. In his autobiography, Jung records that he began drawing mandalas in 1916 aged forty one and only stopped their drawing in 1927 aged fifty two after a dream had allowed him to interpret the psychological meaning of the concepts of the self and individuation (1965, pp. 195–199). He could then withdraw the projection of the mandala but also understand its meaning for a particular stage of psychological development. Jung notes that, in individuation, the mother is now seen as a consort to the ego, as both are in communion (1967, CW5, para. 330n.). As the fundamental motivation comes from the unconscious, it may be inferred that whether the relationship is as a consort or as a mother nurturing the child, the problem of incest, which arises in the egocentric view of the hero fertilising the maternal earth, disappears. This is supported in the New Testament where the reborn person is seen as the child of God and as being aware of the revelation of God through the spirit (e.g. Jn 1: 12; 1 Jn 5: 1; Rom. 8: 15f.). However, just as faith is necessary to realise God’s
revelation, so Jung notes that the ego needs to direct psychic energy to the unconscious to assist archetypal meaning to come into consciousness (1969b, CW8, para. 425n.). That is, the ego needs to recognise its direct relationship to the other. Likewise the symbol arises through collaboration between the conscious and unconscious (1971, CW6, para. 821), that is from a communion between opposites. In all cases the linking energy is initiated from the unconscious or from God.

Through conscious experience of the self, the psyche no longer projects the image of the mandala and its centre. The projected centre dissipates—as Campbell states, ‘The World Navel, then, is ubiquitous’ (1949, p. 44). Discussing the final stage of the individuation process, Campbell writes:

Finally, the mind breaks the bounding sphere of the cosmos to a realization transcending all experiences of form—all symbolizations, all divinities: a realization of the ineluctable void...This is the highest and ultimate crucifixion, not only of the hero, but of his god as well. Here the Son and the Father alike are annihilated—as personality-masks over the unnamed (1949, pp. 190f.).

Campbell appears to suggest here that a person can grow beyond symbolism. Interpretation of Jung’s writing suggests, however, that symbolism cannot be avoided, as it provides the medium through which the unconscious communicates with the ego. Rather, it seems, that individuation leads a person along the path of progressive withdrawal of projections, as the meaning of symbols becomes conscious. Individuation thus allows a person to become free of the symbols of egocentricity, exemplified by the hero, the mandala and the centre, and to assimilate their archetypal meanings into conscious experience. Jung writes (1970a, CW10, para. 34n.), ‘If we take Nature for our guide, we shall never go astray’, said the ancients.’ He states that, ‘The products of the unconscious are pure nature’, and argues that it is the role of the conscious mind to assimilate these products and use them rationally (para. 34).

Jung suggests that the instincts and archetypes are the bridge between spirit and matter, and that the symbol is the vehicle by which human perception links the unconscious to the material world. From this, it may be inferred that the individuated person can withdraw the projected mandala images hitherto perceived as inherent to a differentiated landscape, and can perceive the integrated landscape
as a material manifestation of the inner psychic processes in which nature's fertility symbolises the inner psychic energy—that is the unknown mystery of the divine.

3.5 CONCLUSIONS

Human life comprises an integration of physical and psychical reality. Each human psyche inherits characteristics from the cosmic or collective unconscious. The conscious ego grows by differentiation from the unconscious part of the psyche but retains its link with, and receives its fundamental motivation from, the unconscious. Communication between the unconscious and conscious parts of the psyche is through archetypal forms which are perceived by the ego as symbols. Human life, guided unconsciously by archetypal meaning, is symbolic of the inner cosmic process, both in the totality of an individual's life course and in its elements such as ideas, imagination, visual imagery and actions.

People perceive their relationship to the world through archetypal symbolism. The form of this perception changes as a person develops psychologically. After the unconsciousness of early childhood, the human psyche develops through two psychological stages: in youth, the psyche develops consciousness and is centred on the ego; in adulthood, the psyche can progress by integration of the ego and the psyche's unconscious to the stage of individuation.

People with an egocentric psychological orientation perceive a dichotomous relationship to the world in which they identify with the mythical hero whose goal is reconciliation with the sacred, which he attempts through the conquest of the earth. The unconscious, working always towards assimilation with the ego, creates reconciling symbols in the egocentric psyche. The ego, which is blocked to this reintegration, fails to consciously assimilate the symbolic meaning and perceives the landscape through the projected images of the unacknowledged self in the form of mandalas or centres within mother-symbols.

Individuation introduces a conscious experience of the self as an inner, living centre. This involves the withdrawal of the projected centre, thereby making redundant the psychic purpose of the mandala. The individuated person sees beyond the symbolism of egocentricity and perceives the landscape as an integrated psychic–physical union. The person can then see the landscape as the physical
manifestation of the inner psychic cosmic life, and the natural fertility as a symbol of psychic energy, or the mystery of God. The individuated person might then perceive a direct archetypal link with the earth, and see life in terms of creativity through the bringing of archetypal contents of the unconscious into the conscious life of the world, both in the human psyche and in the agricultural development of the land.
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CHAPTER 4
THEOLOGY OF RELATIONSHIP

4.1 INTRODUCTION

It was argued in chapter 2 that myth is a fundamental form of theorising on the position of people within the cosmos. Religion might be seen as a formalisation of myth into a system of beliefs on the relationships between humans, the creator god(s) and the created world, and the rituals of worship deemed necessary to effect a link between people and the deity (see, for example, Eliade 1963, ch. 9). Jung (1967, CW5, para. 669) notes that the word religion derives from the Latin religio, to link back, meaning to reconnect with a cosmic creative power. The purpose of religion, then, seems to be to make possible this communion between human and cosmic life.

Fundamental to religion is the understanding of the nature of the deity. Theology is the study of the nature of god, including the nature of the relationships between god and people and god and the world. A people’s theology influences fundamentally how they perceive their relationship to god and, by inference, to the created world. People who adopt a non-religious world view and deny the existence of a god attempt to see their relationship to the earth as a bipartite system. Nevertheless, as noted in chapter 2, those adopting such a rationalist viewpoint follow, unconsciously, mythical rituals which are essentially religious (see Eliade 1959, pp. 201–213). People who adopt a religious viewpoint see their cosmic relationship as a tripartite system comprising god, people and the world. The perceived nature of god, whether recognised rationally or not, is basic to an understanding of relationship to the natural world. The role of theology in determining how people perceive their relationship to the land has received little attention until recently, when modern societies have come to recognise the limits to which nature can be exploited and degraded. The examples of myth presented in
chapter 2 suggest that there are two modes of theorising on the human relationship to the earth. Psychology, as discussed in chapter 3, also suggests that people perceive their relationship to the world in either of two fundamentally different ways. Theology focuses on the nature of the relationship between people and God, but also embraces the relationship between God as creator and the natural world as creation. However, in the Christian scriptures, land is mentioned more in the Old Testament where (apart from the concept of the Promised Land) the emphasis is on legalistic and ethical utilisation. The New Testament does not deal with land explicitly, and relationships to the land, either of God or people, need to be inferred from theological understanding. Theologians consider the relationships of God to people, people to God, God to the world, and even the world to God. But there seems to be little available theological theory on the nature of the human relationship to the land, that is on how the human creature should relate to the creature land (theories on relationship to the natural world are discussed in chapter 6). One of the thrusts of this thesis is an attempt to incorporate theology into the theory on relationship to land.

The aim of the chapter is, therefore, to investigate how theology sees the nature of relationship, with the hope that this knowledge might be relevant to consideration of the human–land relationship in later chapters.¹

The investigation begins, in section 4.2, by looking at how the main cultures relevant to the use of land in Australia, namely the Australian Aborigines as the continent’s original occupiers and the ancient Greeks and Hebrews from whom the subsequent European settlers derived their theology, understood the nature of god or gods. The feeling of relationship and attraction between beings is expressed by the concept of love. Love, therefore, brings into focus the mythical beliefs of the nature of God and of human relationship to God and the world. Consequently, section 4.3 analyses the meaning of love in the context of the human–God relationship. The section, which draws largely on Nygren’s book *Agape and Eros*, first published in English in 1953, identifies two fundamental implications of theological viewpoints for understanding the human relationship to the land are discussed in chapter 5 and form the basis for the research method used in part II. Recent attempts to provide a theology of land-use are evaluated in chapter 6.

¹ The implications of theological viewpoints for understanding the human relationship to the land are discussed in chapter 5 and form the basis for the research method used in part II. Recent attempts to provide a theology of land-use are evaluated in chapter 6.
motifs of love, *Eros* love and *Agape* love. Section 4.4 discusses the range of perceptions of the nature of the human–God relationship against the background of Nygren’s analysis. Section 4.5 contains the conclusions on the types of relationships as seen by theology, and points towards their implications for use later in the thesis in developing a human–land theory.

### 4.2. THE NATURE OF GOD

All cultures and peoples have developed viewpoints on the gods or god, the power beyond themselves who made them and the world around them. Reviewed in this section are examples of cultural views on the nature of God. The review is limited to viewpoints relevant to the use of the land in Australia and to the examples of theory and practice of agricultural land use analysed in part II. It begins with the Australian Aboriginal culture, then looks at the ancient Greek and the Judeo-Christian traditions as the major theological influences of the European-Australians.

**The Australian Aboriginals**

The Aboriginals perceived the world in duality (Maddock 1984, pp. 85f.). Their deities, the Dreamtime ancestors, did not create *ex nihilo*, but transformed the pre-existent natural elements of the earth so that the land was suitable for human habitation. The ancestors lived a different type of existence to humans. Maddock

---

2 Berndt and Berndt (1989, p. 15) write, ‘In the beginning there were only the land, the waters and the elements: nature itself, untamed, empty of human beings. There were, however, some forms of natural species. There were spirits too, varying in shape and size, and some monstrous creatures... All this was really before “The beginning”, before what has been called “the Dreaming”. It was a world latent in its potentialities, waiting to be awakened. That awakening was to come with the appearance of mythic beings, the deities and characters of the Dreaming, who were the forerunners of human beings... Their role was essentially that of humanising the whole of the natural environment, harnessing everything within it, for the progenitors of traditionally oriented Aborigines.’
(1984, p. 85) states that '[Aboriginal] theory is of definition of space and time, not of creation out of nothing'. He continues:

The relations between men and other creatures and the relations between men and powers are...abstracted, albeit distortedly, from relations between men; the world order is modelled after the human social order...

Their plan of life is held to have been laid down during the Dreaming by the powers, and occasionally to have been modified since by the intervention of these powers, as when one appears to a man in a dream and communicates a new song or rite. Aborigines claim credit only for fidelity to tradition or, as they put it, for 'following up the Dreaming'. It is powers alone who are conceived of as creative, men being passive recipients of unmotivated gifts (p. 101).

Elkin (1979, p. 166) states that Aboriginal religion is based on totemism, in which each individual or group is seen in relationship to a particular natural species, and only later was the concept of an overall sky-god added to the totemic system. The Aboriginals have, therefore, a fragmentary view of the world, with a differentiation between the gods and humans and a differentiation between the different phenomena of nature. Elkin writes '...there is a segmentary aspect to this relationship and bond which exists between man and nature, and it is this very feature which distinguishes totemism from a generalized nature-religion' (p. 166).

Elkin (1979) states that '...the Aborigine does not try to explain the origin of everything in the heavens above and the earth beneath, but only those things, natural, manufactured, personal and social, with which his life is concerned' (p. 251). They 'personalize' nature (pp. 166, 251) and seek, through ritual, to influence Maddock adds. The cosmology posits a metaphysical discontinuity, a duality, between men and powers [ancestor gods]: the latter shaped the landscape in which the former dwell; formed the species with which they share the earth and off which they live; and laid down the plan of life to which they should conform. Powers are thought of especially as actors and as related to men. Little interest is shown in their motives or personalities, or in the general scheme of their relations to one another (a systematic pantheon remains to be constructed). It is in keeping with this doctrine of two kinds of existence, the extraordinary existence of powers and the ordinary existence of men and other creatures—that men are unable ordinarily to experience the powers...ordinary experiences can be good only for communication between ordinary beings; communication between the two "sides" of the metaphysically discontinuous world requires that extraordinary experiences be possible... The most momentous communication is the plan of life itself, the all-encompassing scope of which is shown in the shapes of the landscape, the events narrated in myths, the acts performed in rites, the codes observed in conduct, and the habits and characteristics of other forms of life' (Maddock 1984, pp. 86f.).
the powers (ancestor spirits) to maintain the patterns of nature on which they depend and to which they must adjust (p. 251). The link to the spiritual world is the totem—the Aboriginal ‘regards the totem as his assistant, guardian, mate, or the symbol of his social or cult group, and he frequently regulates his thoughts and his behaviour in accordance with his convictions in this regard’ (p. 168). The totem is therefore the centre of the Aboriginal cosmic system. Elkin states that the concepts of the sky-gods and of totemism overlap and coalesce in different regions of Australia (p. 259), but concludes that ‘totemic philosophy and ritual were fundamental and primary in Aboriginal thought and religion’ (p. 260). Elkin states that even the sky-gods were assimilated into the totemic system and were probably later additions to the totemic system associated with the Dreamtime (pp. 259f.).

The Aborigines attribute particular qualities of sacredness to specific locations and natural features by virtue of the activities of the ancestors at these locations in the Dreaming. Land space is thereby given a characteristic of differentiation or heterogeneity by the imposition of mythical centres or axis mundi. The main function of humans in cosmic life is to reactivate the creative powers of the mythical ancestors. This is done by ritual focused on these centres. In effect, the ritual transcends temporal time and links back to the eternal nature of the Dreamtime powers. The powers are invoked by human action into renewal of their creativity. Elkin emphasises that Aboriginal ritual is not a means of achieving the magical or extraordinary but, on the contrary, of maintaining the pattern of nature as manifested in the sequence of seasons and patterns of species fertility involving birth, maturity, death, rebirth (pp. 227f.). Elkin describes the Aboriginal human–god relationship as ‘an interdependent dualism...Man’s part in ritual is essential, for it is the occasion and indeed the means through which the unseen, the “Dreaming” becomes effective in the sphere of space and time, i.e. here and now’ (p. 234).

Religious ritual is at the core of Aboriginal life—of reality and survival. Nature was not seen as totally beneficial (cf. Elkin, pp. 69f.). Berndt and Berndt (1989, pp. 172f.) note that ‘potential or actual conflict—between spirit characters and human beings, and among the spirit characters themselves’ is a feature of many Aboriginal myths. They continue:

People, in this case Aborigines, are often frightened, anxious and suspicious
in particular contexts—frightened of other people, disturbed at unfamiliar actions, fearful of the manifestations of natural phenomena and of the destructive forces of the elements in the world around them...as in all societies, it [fear] was present in one way or another, and is easily activated (Berndt & Berndt 1989, p. 173).

The above discussion suggests that traditional Aboriginal life is a continual propitiation to those ancestor spirits of the Dreamtime which acted in the mythical past, and can be invoked to continue to act in a benevolent way towards the human race. This is seen as necessary both to prevent the cessation of natural seasons and fertility and to overcome the evil spirits which might have pre-existed the Dreaming or have grown by differentiation of a dead person’s soul into a good spirit and a bad spirit (Berndt & Berndt 1989, pp. 173f.). Danger, death and evil are part of the Aboriginal world, and life attains its religious characteristic to subsume these within the benevolent creative activities of the Dreamtime ancestors (Berndt & Berndt 1989, pp. 387f.). Life might be seen as a propitiation to these ancestors as a defence against evil. The Aborigines communicated with the ancestor spirits at the sacred-site centres and, through ritual, assumed the initiative in the restoration of the mythical spirits into the land and thereby in the maintenance of the cycles of nature.

The Ancient Greeks

In common with the Australian Aboriginals, the ancient Greeks thought of their gods not as creators of the cosmos but as products of some primordial state which they knew as chaos (Fuller 1923⁴, pp. 34f.; Morford & Lenardon 1991, pp. 43f.). Morford and Lenardon state that, ‘The concept of God creating something out of nothing [i.e. *ex nihilo*] is not found in the Greek and Roman tradition’ (p. 44n.; cf. Nygren 1982, p. 565n.). They note that Hesiod, writing in the *Theogony* in the eighth century BC, might have interpreted chaos as a ‘yawning void,’ or, like the pre-Socratic philosophers, as ‘a primal world substance or substances’: they consider it is unlikely that Hesiod anticipated Thales’ sixth century BC interpretation of chaos as water (p. 43). It seems that Morford and Lenardon mean

---

⁴ Despite the datedness of this reference, its clear and concise description of the topic makes it useful for the purpose of this chapter.
‘yawning void’ as an absence of form and not as nothingness. They note also that the Roman Ovid, writing in the first century AD, describes chaos as ‘a crude and unformed mass of elements in strife’ (p. 44; cf. Guerber 1916, p. 2).

The Greek gods had human characteristics but in a superior form (Dickinson 1922, p. 9);5 the gods mediated between humans and wild nature.6 Fuller states that the Greeks considered themselves as the social equals of their gods (p. 31), and together humans and gods comprised a society analogous to an enlarged city-state (p. 30). Unlike the Australian Aboriginal ancestors, the Greek gods formed an interrelated society in which individual gods personified particular elements of the human character and condition. The chaos of human life and the terror of wild nature were thereby brought into patterns of order which could be understood by the human mind. Dickinson (1922, p. 15) notes that the Greek ‘was made at home in the world’ through his knowledge of the gods.7

Both gods and humans had allotted places and roles within the world constitution, and both were subject to the ‘all-compelling Fate’ or the world ‘Destiny’ (Fuller 1923, p. 34). Life was seen in terms of a legalistic contract (Dickinson 1922, p. 22). Torment, punishment and death delivered by the ministers of justice, the vengeful Furies, were the consequences of crime. Gods and humans lived in the shadow and fear of the Furies (Dickinson, p. 24). World fate had the ultimate jurisdiction over crime; however in daily affairs humans acknowledged

---

5 See note 4 above.

6 Dickinson describes the relationship of people to the gods thus: ‘...the gods of Greece were beings essentially like man, superior to him not in spiritual nor even in moral attributes, but in outward gifts, such as strength, beauty, and immortality. And as a consequence of this his relations to them were not inward and spiritual, but external and mechanical. In the midst of a crowd of deities, capricious and conflicting in their wills, he had to find his way as best he could...it was a difficult thing to ascertain or to move the will of the gods, and one must help oneself as best one could. The Greek, accordingly, helped himself by an elaborate system of sacrifice and prayer and divination, a system which had little connection with an internal spiritual life, but the object of which was simply to discover and if possible to affect the divine purposes (Dickinson 1922, pp. 17f.).

7 ‘In place of the unintelligible powers of nature, he was surrounded by a company of beings like himself; and these beings who controlled the physical world were also the creators of human society. From them were descended the Heroes who founded families and states; and under their guidance and protection cities prospered and thrived. Their histories were recounted in myths, and embodied in ritual. The whole life of man, in its relations both to nature and to society, was conceived as derived from and dependent upon his gods...(Dickinson 1922, p. 15).’
their divine contract by propitiatory sacrifice to ensure the favour of the gods. Dickinson differentiates between the Christian idea of sin as an inner turning from God and the Greek idea of sin as an external act or omission against the gods, which might be overcome by an external act of propitiation (1922, p. 23; cf. Fuller 1923, p. 38).

Fuller describes how in the Greek religion based on the gods of Mount Olympus there was little emphasis on life after death. He writes that, according to Homer, after death 'the good and the wicked fared alike in the spectral twilight of Hades' and the 'souls were shadowy and witless images without substance or intelligence, drained of the red blood of real existence, and deprived of all that makes life worth living' (Fuller 1923, p. 41). The aim of life, therefore, was the full development of the physical body and intellect in this life.

There were three forms of Greek religion (Fuller, pp. 44ff.). The first of these was the Olympian cult which, Fuller writes, accords with Aristotle's view that God is the abstraction of Perfection manifested in goodness, peace and happiness. The gods were worshipped as ideals of perfection in freedom from sorrow and suffering. The Aristotelian God was the 'Goal towards which all things aspired, the one example of achieved perfection, whose completely fulfilled happy existence incited all other nature to strive, each after the realization of its own capacities and excellence' (Fuller 1923, pp. 43f.). This view, however, did not satisfy the need to explain the existence of evil, suffering and injustice. To achieve this, the ideas of immortality and reincarnations were used.

The second religion described by Fuller is the Eleusinian Mysteries, centred on the myth of Demeter and Persephone, which adopt the goal of after-life immortality. People were admitted to the Mysteries via sacred ritual, including initiation. Salvation, in the form of immortality, was attained merely by initiation, not by any conversion of spirit or way of life (Fuller 1923, p. 51). The Eleusinian Mysteries were based on the idea of life's patterns of death and rebirth personified by the earth-goddess Demeter who mourns in the winter when her daughter Persephone is confined to the world of the dead and vegetation on earth loses its life, and rejoices in Spring and Summer when Persephone is allowed to return to her and vegetation comes to life. Demeter controls immortality, whereas nature is
dependent on her for the renewal from death to life. Fuller writes that the Eleusinian cult did not involve the initiates achieving an inner mystical meaning or a moral guide for life: rather the promise was ‘material benefits on earth as well as felicity in heaven’ (Fuller, p. 51). The after-life was thought of in terms of the bliss of the (paradisal) ‘Islands of the Blest set far in the golden west beyond the storm and tumult of the world’ (Fuller, p. 51f.).

The third religion, the Orphic Mysteries, attempted to reach the mystical levels. It too was based on a myth of death and rebirth. Dionysus was a god ‘of fertility of the earth, of the harvest, of the trees, and especially of the vine and the vintage and wine’ (Fuller 1923, pp. 56f.). According to the Greek myth, Dionysus, son of Zeus, was devoured by the Titans except for his heart, which was returned to Zeus. Zeus ate the heart and fathered a second Dionysus, Dionysus Zagreus. Zeus killed the evil Titans with a thunderbolt which burned them to ashes, from which he made humans. Humans obtained a double nature: a sinful and imperfect nature inherited from the Titans, and ‘the spark and possibility of the divine’ inherited from Dionysus (Fuller, p. 60). The Orphic Mysteries were based on two main ideas: (i) The Dionysian trait of being capable of rebirth after death; and (ii) the possibility of overcoming sin to attain divinity (pp. 56–69). Human double nature reflected the good and evil within the society of the Olympian Gods. Fuller explains that the Orphics saw the evil side of human nature as represented by ‘the desires and experiences of the body’ (p. 60). The physical, the flesh, the sensual, represented evil; the invisible soul represented good. Hence a clear duality was perceived in which, Fuller suggests, the trials and suffering of life achieved a mythical romanticism. In reflection of Dionysus’ rebirth from death, the attainment of control over the physical body enabled the soul’s ascent to the dignity of ‘the essential divinity of man’ (p. 61). ‘...the soul was sharply distinguished from the body by a moral as well as a physical cleavage’ (pp. 61f.). Sin was, then, from the gods, and integral to human nature. Redemption became possible for the Orphics by reincarnation, each successive life bearing ‘the fruits, bitter or sweet, of the degree of...adherence to Orphic precept and practice in former existences’ (p. 63). The goal was escape from the sensual physical life to divine immortality (p. 64).

The Orphic cult spread readily, suggests Fuller, because ‘Its ritual was one
of exaltation and self-abandonment' in which drunkenness or other orgiastic means allowed the person to escape from temporal concerns into a trance-like state in which communion with the divine was assured (1923, p. 57). Once adopted by the Greeks, the cult became more refined and, because of its body–soul dichotomy, led to the practice of asceticism (p. 65) which became associated with 'serious abuses' such as 'magic and divination, the purchase of indulgences, and the hawking of absolution and salvation' (p. 68).

The ancient Greeks believed that they held the means of salvation in their hands. The Greek Gods were not creators of the cosmos but fellow actors within it (Fuller 1923, p. 34). The relationship to the Gods could be determined by human initiative and, whether this was by means of intellectual enlightenment, asceticism, or ritual life, it was essentially a religious propitiation to the gods of myth.

**The Hebrews**

This section draws heavily on Kellett's *A Short History of Religions* first published in 1933. Kellett writes that the Greeks developed rational thought and ways of advancing the human mind towards divine wisdom, whereas the Hebrews held more to the questions of a right relationship to God and to the revelation of God to humans (pp. 93f.). Thus, he writes, Judaism, not Greek philosophy, held the possibility of the development of the revelatory religion of Christianity (Kellett 1962, pp. 37, 63, 79, 96f.). Following is an outline of the development of the ancient Hebrew's understanding of the nature of God.

The Old Testament comprises books of writings of different authors from different times. and often the books show evidence of reworking to bring old mythological stories into accord with contemporary intellectual and ethical views, particularly in relation to a developing view of the nature of God (e.g. Kellett 1962, pp. 62, 80f.). The ancient Hebrew God, Yahweh, of the early Old Testament times (e.g. before the tenth century BC) was a tribal God relevant only to a local geographical area. Yahweh was a God of the living, and irrelevant to the ghostly existence in Sheol, the subterranean region of the dead. The vicissitudes of life were equated to a God who was capricious, amoral, wrathful and capable of savagery and destruction (e.g. Ex. 12: 23) and who demanded blood sacrifices (Kellett, p. 58). Yahweh was similar to the Greek God Zeus who lived on a
sacred mountain and was a super-man both 'affable' and 'dangerous' (Kellett, p. 47). But Yahweh’s mind could be turned by human action, hence the relationship between humans and their God was one of propitiation. Kellett notes that the big question of ‘all philosophies’ is ‘by what process God reveals himself to man’ (p. 93). Hence in pagan religions, as in ancient Judaism, there was much emphasis on divinisation of the will of God by such means as foretelling the future by interpretation of invisible signs of ghosts, demons and angels, especially by people such as augurs, diviners, sorcerers and prophets and priests (Kellett, pp. 53ff.). The human task, therefore, comprised: (i) interpreting the intentions of a far-off God or gods; and (ii) influencing the gods’ actions through propitiatory sacrifices.

Kellett describes the ancient Judaic worship of Yahweh as ‘monolatry’ (1962, p. 60). Yahweh was in control of the destiny of the Hebrew people and their land. Yahweh was a jealous God, the sole God within the people’s land. Other gods existed in other lands for other peoples. The nature of Yahweh, however, changed over the centuries. From approximately 700 BC, the jealous and awesome God assumed a new characteristic of mercy, and the blood-sacrifice religion mellowed into one based on a new moral code as espoused by Isaiah, who advocated replacement of propitiatory sacrifice by the admonition ‘cease to do evil, learn to do well’ (Kellett, p. 63). Possibly from a Persian influence, according to Kellett, after approximately 500 BC the Hebrew understanding of God became dichotomised into Yahweh representing the good and Satan representing evil.

This ran counter to the ‘rigid monotheism’ of the Mosaic theology contained in the Old Testament book of Deuteronomy, in which the legalistic contract between people and Yahweh had the consequences of punishment for sin, and favour and reward for worshipful propitiation. Worldly suffering was made compatible with the concept of a merciful and good Yahweh by the idea of the promise of reward in the after-life (equivalent to Greek Orphism). Kellett (1962) notes that the Book of Daniel, written in the second century BC, counteracted the Deuteronomic theory, and was ‘the chief and triumphant expression’ of the emergence of a belief in resurrection (p. 76). This had the important corollary that the old idea of Sheol became transformed by the first century BC into the idea of a post-life heaven of harmony and love—but only for the righteous before God.
Thus a dualistic view of the world was reinforced by the differentiation between good and evil, earthly life and heavenly existence, and the righteous and unrighteous.

The Christians
The ancient religions were based on the view of a far-off God whose providence had to be earned through a propitiatory and ritualistic life. The Christian tradition introduced a new paradigm based on a God who continually and without motivation reaches to the world in forgiving love. Christianity infused a new meaning to the idea of love.

Leaders in the Jewish religion asked Jesus what is the greatest commandment in the law (Matt. 22: 36), to which he replied that the first is to love God with your total being and the second is to love your neighbour as yourself (Matt. 22: 37–39). Jesus was quoting two commands from the Old Testament (Deut. 6: 5, and Lev. 19: 18). However, Nygren (1982, pp. 61–66) claims that Jesus was investing the commands with a totally new meaning within the context of loving your enemies:

The Christian is commanded to love his enemies, not because the other side teach hatred of them, but because there is a basis and motive for such love in the concrete, positive fact of God's own love for evil men. "He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good." That is why we are told: 'Love your enemies...that ye may be children of your Father which is in heaven' (Matt. 5: 44f.) (Nygren p. 66).

Nygren states that this new command to love, which subsumes the former Judaic emphasis on righteousness according to the law and teaching of the prophets (cf. Matt. 22: 40), introduces a new religious ethos based on a different perception of the nature of fellowship with God (pp. 66f.).

The Apostle Paul formulated a theology of the new ethos: love does not insist on its own way, bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things (1 Cor. 13: 5–7, in part). Paul sees God's love as the essence of human faith and hope in eternal life: 'And now faith, hope, and love abide, these three; and the greatest of these is love.' (1 Cor. 13: 13). Life in this Christ-like love comprises absorption into God's will and service to the 'neighbour' (1 Cor. 10: 24; Rom. 15:
1-3). For Paul, life is no longer justified through law-righteousness but through faith in God’s love through Christ: ‘it is no longer I who live, but it is Christ who lives in me’ (Gal. 2: 20). Obedience and service are so profound that Paul states that he would even forego his salvation if necessary to bring salvation to his people (Rom. 9: 3).

Despite the new Christ-based religious ethos having developed within the revelatory Judaic religious tradition, it was not widely accepted within the Jewish community. Tarnas (1993, p. 98) offers the following explanation:

The Jews had long awaited a messiah, but had expected either a political monarch... or a manifestly spiritual prince—the ‘Son of man’—who would arrive from the heavens in angelic glory at the dramatic end of time. They did not expect the apolitical, unmilitant, manifestly human, suffering and dying Jesus.

Tarnas (pp. 98f.) describes how only a relatively small number of disciples and followers of Christ converted from Judaism to Christianity, and they retained the ‘intensely nationalistic and separatist’ Jewish characteristic which would have impeded the expansion of Christianity. It was, however, ‘Paul of Tarsus, who was Jewish by birth, Roman by citizenship, and Greek by culture’ (Tarnas, p. 89) who saw a universal relevance for Christianity, in contrast to the Jewish exclusivist view (p. 99), and who became the new religion’s ‘preeminent missionary and foundational theologian’ (p. 89). Tarnas explains that the change of Christianity from a Palestinian to a Hellenistic phenomenon occurred because of two factors: the apparent compatibility between the idea of Christ and the Greek philosophical concept of the Logos as the divine cosmic Reason accessible to each individual, and the Pax Romana which facilitated communication of ideas throughout the Roman Empire (pp. 99ff.).

4.3 LOVE

The above section draws two pictures of God. One is of a God who requires that people offer a pious love for God; the other is of a God who offers unearned love to the whole of humanity. Love is the concept of relationship and is at the core of Christian theology. However, even within Christian theology there are different
understandings of the meaning of love. To examine the meanings of Christian love, we look at the analytical work of Nygren.

Nygren, a philosopher of religion and formerly Bishop of Lund, Sweden, pioneered the method of motif research and identified two fundamental motifs in the idea of Christian love which he named *Eros* and *Agape*. While not all philosophers of religion agree totally with Nygren’s conclusions, his major work, *Agape & Eros* (originally compiled in the 1930s), is widely acknowledged as a classic and seminal analysis (see, for example, the various contributors to Kegley 1970). The motifs of *Eros* and *Agape* will now be outlined.

**The *Eros* Motif**

In all religions in which propitiation is the means for connection with the divine, love is seen as a desire. Desire is the longing for something of value which, since the time of the ancient Greeks, has generally been associated with beauty. Aphrodite was the Greek goddess of beauty and desiring love, and her male counterpart was Eros (Morford & Lenardon 1991, ch. 7). It is the term *Eros* which Plato uses when examining the nature of love. Morford and Lenardon (ch. 7) use Plato’s *Symposium* to describe the nature of *Eros* love. Plato describes how Eros, born from the father Poros (Resourcefulness) and the mother Penia (Poverty) (Morford & Lenardon, pp. 162f.), is neither mortal nor immortal but ‘something between’. *Eros* is the link between humans and the gods, and hence has the two natures of incompleteness or need, and of the cleverness, initiative and resourcefulness required to be able to contrive how to attain completeness. Plato

---

8 The method of motif research or motif analysis is discussed in chapter 5.

9 Nygren (1982, p. 35) describes a fundamental motif as ‘the basic idea or the driving power’ of a religion. This will be discussed further in chapter 5.

10 It should be noted that although Nygren uses the term *eros* as one of two motifs in religious thinking, others have used it in somewhat different ways. Ancient Greek mythology saw Eros as the god of love who brought life into the primordial world and instituted the love for relationship, particularly in humans. Freud used eros, initially, to portray the human psychic libido or energy which he considered to be based on sexual desire. Later he considered eros to represent the total life, or binding together, instinct as distinct from the death or destructive instinct (cf. Jung 1966c, CW7, pp. 28f.). Jung’s use of the term *eros* may be summarised as the psychic principle of the feminine, matter or Physis, feeling, imagination, uncertainty, connectedness (even possessiveness and selfishness (CW9(i), p. 88)), and darkness; the opposite psychic principle is logos, characterised as the male, the spirit or Nous, thinking, reasoning, certainty, differentiation (CW9(i), p. 96), and light.
uses the analogy of the original humans being in the form of a circle and comprising double the number of hands, feet, genitalia, and faces but, because of their opposition to the gods, Zeus cut the humans in half. Thenceforward humans were motivated by desire to refine the wholeness of their original nature by unifying with another in love and thereby attaining happiness: ‘And so love is merely the name for the desire and pursuit of the whole’ (Plato in Morford & Lenardon, p. 160). Morford and Lenardon write, ‘Love [Eros] and the lover desire what they do not possess, namely, the beautiful and the good, and the ultimate goal of their pursuit is happiness’ (p. 164). Plato’s thought is based on dualism—between mortal and immortal, need and possession, body and soul. At the core of dualism is the religious attitude that the divine is separate from the human.

Nygren (1982) writes of the importance of dualism in Plato’s thinking:

The two worlds [of Plato], the world of Ideas and the world of the senses...stand admittedly side by side unrelated to one another, but not—be it noted—on a par with one another. To man, who is placed between them and has connections with both of them, it falls as his lot to effect the transition from the one to the other...it is his business to cut himself loose from the lower world and ascend to the higher; and when he does so, when he turns away from the things of sense to the world of Ideas, then the latter achieves a conquest, as it were, over the former. This, however, is possible only in virtue of the Eros that indwells the human soul. The Ideas as such are quite incapable of making any conquests; they are not forces, they exercise no influence in the sense-world. The relation between the two worlds is entirely one-sided; the movement is all in one direction, from below upwards... Eros is man’s conversion from the sensible to the supersensible; it is the upward tendency of the human soul: it is a real force, which drives the soul in the direction of the Ideal world. If there were no such thing as Eros, intercourse between the two worlds would be at a standstill, and they would lie unmoved side by side. It is Eros that sets in motion the ascending process... (Nygren, pp. 170f.)

Nygren notes that in the ancient world there was no distinction between philosophy and religion, and that Plato’s doctrine of Ideas is equally a doctrine of salvation, giving direction to a person’s conversion from focus on the transitory physical world to a focus on the soul’s eternal nature (Nygren 1982, pp. 167–172). Nygren describes the content of the Eros religious motif as follows (pp. 175–181):
(i) *Eros* as acquisitive love. *Eros* involves ‘a desire, a longing, a striving’. It is based on a perceived lack or need of something accredited with value. Happiness will ensue upon possession of this thing of value. Nygren notes Simmel’s observation that love will logically ‘die away when the possession of its object is secured’ (p. 176). Acquisitive love is ‘motivated by the value of its object’. Plato’s heavenly love, in contradistinction to vulgar love (sensual love of temporal things), is directed upwards to the heavenly world of Ideas;

(ii) *Eros* as the person’s way to the Divine. ‘Eros is the mediator between Divine and human life. It is Eros that raises the imperfect to perfection, the mortal to immortality’ (Nygren, p. 177). The gods who live in perfection do not feel love and do not need to love. The gods are objects only in the process of love: ‘“A God holds no intercourse with a man,” Plato says, “but by means of this intermediary [Eros] all intercourse and discourse between gods and men is carried on.” ’ (p. 177). Love in the form of *Eros* is activated by the human’s desire to reach up to the state of divinity. Nygren notes that Plato seeks to overcome the sharp duality between the sense-world and the Ideal world through the development of progressively more abstract understanding of phenomena. For example, the idea of beauty is advanced ‘from one beautiful body to all beautiful bodies, from these to the beauty of the soul, from this to the beauty in human laws and institutions, then to the beauty of the sciences, and finally to that which is absolutely beautiful, the Idea of beauty itself’ (p. 179). This is the image of the heavenly ladder for the soul’s ascent to eternal wisdom (p. 174). Nygren states that *Eros* does not overcome the dualism between the physical and the spiritual worlds, as it comprises a ‘flight’ or ‘escape from the sense-world’ (pp. 178f.).

(iii)*Eros* as egocentric love. Everything in the *Eros* concept focuses on the individual and his/her destiny. The aim of *Eros* love is the individual’s achievement, through possession of something of value, of happiness. And this happiness is to be permanent, which means that *Eros* seeks individual
happiness in immortality.

The Agape Motif

Nygren contrasts Christian Agape love with Eros love, and argues that the two are mutually exclusive. Agape and Eros are fundamentally different motifs of religious thinking, and consequently produce different perceptions of the human relationship to both God and the world. Nygren writes, 'The Christian idea of love involves a revolution in ethical outlook without parallel in the history of ethics, a revolution rightly described by Nietzsche as a complete “transvaluation of all ancient values”' (p. 28) and, as a consequence, 'Christianity takes a unique place as a creative force in the history of human thought' (p. 46). This uniqueness of the idea of Agape love indicates the coming into consciousness of a new idea, which Nygren describes as manifested by the reframing of a fundamental question which generates answers that provide 'a new total attitude to life in general' (p. 47). Eros is egocentric, based on the pursuit of individual happiness, and sees personal destiny as the development of human worth and dignity towards the goal of divine perfection. From this attitude grows the need for law and ethics to provide boundaries to self-interest to allow cohesion in society. Agape by contrast is theocentric and is based on the relationship of fellowship between humans and God and humans in community (cf. Nygren, pp. 44f.). The relationship in Eros is governed by law and 'retributive righteousness'; in Agape the relationship is governed by God's freely given and forgiving love (p. 70). Nygren summarises the characteristics of Agape love as follows (pp. 75–81):

(i) Agape is spontaneous and 'unmotivated'. God's Agape love is given automatically to all, irrespective of character or righteousness. Nygren stresses that personal quality is not a motivation for God's love. God's love is given to all. Therefore, righteousness under the Old Testament legalistic religion did not attract Agape love any more than did unrighteousness. That is why Jesus sought the lost and the sinners, to show that Agape subsumed the law. Nygren notes that Luther saw the following additional characteristics of spontaneous love (pp. 726–733):

- 'Christian love...is free from all selfish calculation or ulterior
motive. It does the good not in order to gain or increase its own blessedness, but "out of free love and for nothing, to please God, not seeking nor regarding anything else, but that it thus pleases God." (Nygren, pp. 726f.);

- Spontaneous love is in contrast to the law. The law demands compliance, and has two motives: the fear of punishment and the desire for rewards. This precludes free and spontaneous giving. Freedom comes only from faith and direction from the Holy Spirit;

- *Agape* love overflows in abundance. It flows from its own source (God or the Holy Spirit in the individual) irrespective of the nature of the object;

- *Agape* love "is round and whole, the same to one as to another without respect of persons" (p. 730);

- *Agape* love is lost love. Given love is often met with rejection and failure but love is given nevertheless. "For it is the nature of love to suffer betrayal"... It is "a divine, free, unceasing, yea indeed a lost love", which is prepared freely to find its kindness thrown away and lost, as also Christ has found. For how should Christian love fare better in this world than the love of God and of Christ?" (pp. 732f.).

(ii) *Agape* is "indifferent to value" (Nygren, p. 77). Nygren writes: "...*any thought of valuation whatsoever* is out of place in connection with fellowship with God"; "God's love allows no limits to be set for it by the character or conduct of man"; "He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust" (Matt. 5: 45) (Nygren, pp. 77f.).

(iii) *Agape* is creative. "What is ultimately decisive for the meaning of Agape can only be seen when we observe that it is Divine love and therefore shares in the creativeness that is characteristic of all the life of God". "Agape does
not recognise value, but creates it... *Agape is a value-creating principle*’ (p. 78). It may be inferred from Nygren’s writing on this point that *Agape* love is the grace of God which gives the Holy Spirit to each individual soul as the means of communication between God and the person, whether this is recognised by the person consciously or remains an unconscious connection. This capability of communication seems to be the basis of the idea of the *Imago Dei* (image of god).

(iv) *Agape* is the initiator of fellowship with God. In religions that follow the *Eros* motif, communication with God depends on human initiative. In the *Agape* religious motif fellowship with God is possible only because of God’s initiative. *Agape* love is a gift through God’s grace. Nygren stresses that the divine initiative inherent in *Agape* love is revolutionary in religious thought (p. 80). He writes ‘...there is from man’s side no way at all that leads to God...*Agape* is God’s way to man’ (p. 80f.).

From the perspective of *Agape*, sin is seen as the rejection of the freely given spiritual love, and the concept of forgiveness can be seen as God’s continual infusion of *Agape* love through the Holy Spirit into the personal soul whether or not the person seeks to receive the ‘forgiveness’. All acts such as repentance, states Nygren, are ‘futile’ attempts to communicate with God (p. 80). *Agape* originates from God. Only faith, which is the response to God’s *Agape* initiative, makes a person open to the conscious acknowledgement of divine forgiveness and its creation of a re-created spiritual personality, reborn in *Agape* love and having a fundamentally altered perception of life.

### 4.4 Religious Viewpoints between Eros and Agape

Nygren’s motif analysis of Christian love identifies two opposed and incompatible paradigms for the human relationship with God. Nygren notes further, however, that Christian theologians have often undervalued the nature of *Agape* and consequently have either reverted to the *Eros* motif or, while acknowledging that
the motifs have different characteristics, do not recognise that the motifs describe incompatible forms of love. Augustine is the main example of a church father who sought to synthesise the motifs into Caritas love, the concept of love still accepted within the Catholic tradition today. Consequently, Nygren’s theory has been both seminal and controversial. This section will consider Nygren’s theory in the light of the alternative viewpoints of: (i) Augustine’s use of the two motifs; (ii) some critiques of Nygren’s analysis; and (iii) non-Christian religion as exemplified by Buddhism, a philosophical religious system which, like Christianity, is based on the teaching of one individual.

Augustine’s Use of the Motifs

The following account is taken from Nygren’s (1982, pp. 449–562) analysis of Augustine’s use of the motifs of Eros and Agape. Augustine was a strong adherent to Neoplatonism when he became aware of the Christian concept of Agape. For the rest of his life he sought to synthesise them into one system of love which he called Caritas. Nygren sees this as a ‘new contribution’ to the doctrine of love which has changed ever since the Christian idea of love (p. 450). Caritas, a ‘new and unique’ idea, ‘both and neither’ Eros and Agape. Nygren (pp. 464ff.) claims that Augustine retained his Neoplatonic Eros piety even after his conversion within the Christian faith: ‘[the] primary significance [of Augustine’s conversion] is that the inconstant Eros mood is elevated to a stable and permanent Eros disposition.’ Augustine sees love as the ‘most elementary of all manifestations of human life’ and all love as being directed towards the acquisition of happiness (pp. 476ff.). God is the highest good, the essence of goodness, eternal and immutable (p. 492), whereas the creature is imperfect and is continually wandering in search of the perfect rest which is God (p. 487).

Why, then, is Agape necessary? Nygren writes:

In the light of Christianity, Augustine finds Neoplatonic Eros subject to a peculiar contradiction: Eros is man’s longing to get beyond all that is transient and even beyond himself, up to the Divine; but the ascent provokes superbia and self-sufficiency, with the result that man remains after all within himself and never reaches the Divine (p. 472).

God’s love is given through grace and is infused as though into the psyche of each
person, thereby making it possible for each person to ascend towards divine perfection. *Agape*’s task is to vanquish the person’s superbia (pride) which binds the soul to itself and prevents ascent to the divine (p. 474). Augustine saw God’s descent to earth in the human form of a servant who suffered and was crucified as a necessary *exemplum humilitatis* to show how far people in their pride had distanced themselves from God. God’s Incarnation was the exemplar, for Augustine, to show how people should overcome their pride through adopting a humility which will allow them to find the divine through love for God (pp. 473ff.).

Augustine further synthesised the Christian and Hellenistic love motifs to overcome the *Eros* implication that the world of the senses should be overcome to aspire to the world of ideas. He formulated two kinds of love: *Frui* which enjoys or loves something for its own sake, and *Uti* which uses or loves something for the sake of something else. Hence, the world, created as good by God, should be used as a help to loving God, ‘*Caritas* enjoys God and uses the world, *Cupiditas* [vulgar, not spiritual love] enjoys the world and uses God’ (pp. 503ff.). Nygren points out that the Christian ethic to love your neighbour as yourself fits uncomfortably in Augustine’s system. Love for the neighbour becomes a merit to overcome sin and then is a form of *Uti* where the neighbour is seen as a means for raising oneself towards God (pp. 549ff.).

Nygren describes how Luther opposed all ‘egocentric’ forms of religion in which people appropriate the process of justification or salvation to themselves by virtue of their own dignity, worth, or works:

> Salvation, God’s own work, which He has reserved to Himself and accomplished through Christ, is transformed more or less into a work of man; righteousness is transformed from something God gives into something man achieves. At the same time, everything also centres upon man’s own interest. Through the idea of merit, the good which he does is put into intentional connection with eternal blessedness, so that it comes to be regarded less as obedience to God, than from the point of view of the profit which it yields for man...piety is always this, that it *pus man’s own self in God’s place* (pp. 681ff.).

Luther shatters Augustine’s synthesis between *Eros* and *Agape* by showing, through a return to Pauline theology, that ‘Ultimately, there are only two different
religions, that which builds on faith in Christ, and that which builds on reason and one's own [pious] works (p. 688). Nygren writes:

The deepest difference between [medieval] Catholicism and Luther can be expressed by the following formulæ; in Catholicism: fellowship with God on God's own level, on the basis of holiness; in Luther: fellowship with God on our level, on the basis of sin. In Catholicism, it is a question of a fellowship with God motivated by some worth—produced, it is true, by the infusion of Caritas—to be found in man; in Luther, fellowship with God rests exclusively on God's unmotivated love, justification is the justification of the sinner, the Christian is 'simul iustus et peccator.' It is above all this last—Luther's assertion of the sinfulness remaining even in the justified man—which has caused offence in Catholic circles. 'According to Luther, God accepts the sinner as righteous in such a way that the sinner remains a sinner' (Denifle). This is in absolute conflict with Catholic Christianity, which, in accord with its upward tendency, seeks to bring man into fellowship with God on the level of God's holiness (pp. 690f.).

Again, Nygren writes: 'Augustine thus teaches a theologia humilitatis, but merely as a means for rising to a theologia gloriae...but his theologia gratiae finds its significance in his theologia caritatis' (p. 532). Luther, by contrast, adopted the Pauline theology of the cross.

A Critique of Nygren's Analysis of Motifs

During the 1960s, Nygren's theory on motifs was subjected to a formal critique by leading world philosophers and theologians. The critique extended over a decade and comprised each critic submitting a paper: Nygren was then invited to make an overall response. The papers together with Nygren's response were published in book form in 1970 under the title The Philosophy and Theology of Anders Nygren (editor, Charles W. Kegley). Comment is now made on the main critiques on Nygren's distinction between the motifs.

Warnach (1970) presents the Roman Catholic argument against Nygren's analysis. Warnach states that the Catholic view is that the created human being retains a personal dignity and has a freedom to choose to love God, notwithstanding that all human life is a response to God's creative and sustaining Agape love (pp. 154f.). In his book, Agape & Eros (translated into English...
originally in the 1930s), Nygren (1982) had claimed that this view of the dual nature of humanity, both divine and human, derives from ancient Greek myth and not from the Hebrew scriptures. It leads to the belief that the divine part of human nature is only tainted by sin, and that the sinful part can be overcome by human choice and achievement (presupposing the infusion of God's love). The Lutheran view, adopted by Nygren, is that the human is totally in sin against God's Law and wholly dependent on God's Grace for justification. Warnach, however, sees the justified person as acting under a free and responsible will to overcome sin to become the 'true being' in which 'eros with its teleological dynamics and natural richness of living' is synthesised with God's love to create a 'pure' or personal love, that is to say of agape' (1970, pp. 154f.). However, Nygren (1982, pp. 123ff.), in accord with the Lutheran view, had emphasised that Paul describes human relationship to God not as agape but as responsive faith which is manifested in neighbourly love:

There cannot be any doubt that the Pauline ethic is religious from start to finish...it is the connection between God's love and neighbourly love that Paul emphasises; and the result of this is only to make neighbourly love still more profoundly religious. Hence the virtual exclusion of man's love for God from the Pauline idea of Agape cannot be regarded as a retrograde step. It means rather that Paul has once again risen to a height in the history of the idea of Agape, to which scarcely anyone has since been able to follow him (1982, p. 125).

Burnaby (1970) also takes the Catholic view and disagrees with Nygren's motif analysis:

For Augustine and the Catholic tradition, fellowship with God is a communion in which man has been brought through Christ into realization of sonship to the father, by conformity of his will to the divine will (p. 186).

Thus can Burnaby (p. 186) disagree with Luther's statement 'simul justus simul peccator', as he sees communion as being on God's level not, as Luther saw, as being on the human level only through the Grace of God.

Of the contributors to the Nygren critique (Kegley 1970) those philosophers and theologians from a Lutheran background (e.g., Bring, Lindstrom, Erling, Heikkenen, Johannesson, Kinder, and Watson) supported Nygren's analysis of the
motifs of *Eros* and *Agape* and, apart from acknowledging the fruitfulness of his thoughts, supported the use of motif research as a scientific analytical method (e.g. Watson), and advocated extension of motif research into other areas such as historical research (Erling).

The above critique suggests that *Agape* is seen by the Catholic tradition as an aspect of love which, in the context of the Augustinian *Caritas*, can be synthesised with *Eros*. The Lutheran tradition, however, sees the two motifs as opposite and incompatible because it sees *Agape* as a unique concept in world thought (Nygren 1982, pp. 46, 726ff; cf. 1970, p. 356).

**Buddhism**

Nygren’s study on the motifs of religious love was conducted in reference to the Christian tradition. Nygren claims, however, that *Agape* is a unique motif within religion. Nevertheless, the question arises as to where other world religions fit into Nygren’s system. Brief comment is now made on the relationship of Buddhism to the two motifs. (A fuller analysis on which these comments are based is contained in Appendix 1.) Buddhism is an apposite example for comparison with the Christian motifs of love because it derives from the teachings of one individual, it teaches respect for nature, and one of its schools sees grace as fundamental to the achievement of individual salvation. Buddhism predates Christianity by some five hundred years and there is a question of whether Buddha recognised the role of a divine god or whether he was as atheistic as later teaching suggests (see Bouquet 1958, pp. 282ff.). Nevertheless, classical Buddhism of the Theravada school has been described as ‘the prime example of mysticism without God’ (Smart 1989, p. 77).

Theravada Buddhism is based on an ascetic and ethical life regime. Its goal is to raise the mind to the state of nirvana, which is perceived as freeing the mind from earthly desire, the root cause of suffering, and as liberating the person in afterlife from the normally unending cycle of rebirth in another human life or in some other form of organic life. Mahayana Buddhism arose partly because not everyone was capable of leading the life of a monk or nun in ascetic contemplation, and partly because the contemplative was seen as uninvolved in the world which needed so much caring (Smart, p. 80). Another reason seems to be the human
need to worship a personalised religious figure. This led to the use of Buddha statues and the worship of the Buddha as a personal divine figure: and to ‘mythological innovations’ of ‘great Bodhisattvas [Buddhas-to-be] such as Avalokitesvara, the Lord Who Looks Down (with compassion), and Amitabha, the Buddha of Infinite Light’ (Smart, p. 80). In Mahayana, pious devotion replaced the strict meditation and learning of the Theravada school. The earning of individual merit is fundamental to both schools.

Dissatisfaction in the failure to acquire, through intensive meditation, a sense of unity with the Buddha of Infinite Light, led the Japanese monk Honen to think that just by repetitive calling on the name of the Buddha, the grace of liberation would be given to the person. Liberation was envisaged as rebirth in the Pure Land, a paradise created by the Buddha for the purpose of facilitating the person in after-life being able to acquire the state of nirvana. The monk Shinran extended this view to mean that earning merit by pious works was unnecessary. An individual needed only to call once in faith to the Buddha, as the Buddha desired salvation for all (Smart, pp. 139ff.).

It appears from this that the Pure Land concept of grace could be equated to Christian Agape. There are, however, fundamental differences between them. The Amitabha is a human-derived god figure. The Buddha achieved his enlightenment entirely through his own efforts, totally uninfluenced by any divine action. The goal in Buddhism is to attain Buddhahood. In Agape Christianity there is no question of equality with God: there is a fundamental difference between the creator and the creature. However, the basic difference between Pure Land grace and Agape is in the role of suffering. Buddhism seeks to rise above suffering: Christianity embraces suffering. As Luther describes, grace, which is continually given, is only received by the individual who has recognised creatureliness in the face of God so that repentance becomes “passive, the suffering and the sensation of death” (Elert 1962, p. 146). Liberation achieved through human effort without ‘repentance’ is what Bonhoeffer describes as ‘cheap grace’ (1959, ch. 1).

This look at Buddhism indicates that the two motifs of religious thought are, indeed, fundamental. However, Buddhism even including its concept of grace conforms to the Eros motif. Even if the monk Shinran, for example, experienced
grace in the *Agape* sense, his thinking was constrained within the *Eros* Buddha myth. That is why, in the *Agape* Christian myth, God's Incarnation in the world cannot be separated from the suffering and death of Christ (see, for example, Neill 1970, pp. 123f.). Only then, in the Christian story, was the resurrection possible. *Agape* teaches that spiritual rebirth of the individual depends upon the undergoing of a 'death' of the ego-will, and living in the world of nature with Christ-like suffering. Then one can give of God's infused grace to the world.

4.5 CONCLUSIONS

Theology provides the insight that people have different notions of the nature of God and consequently of their relationship with God. There is, however, a strange lack of theological theory on how the human creature should perform God's deputed role of dominion towards the created world. This confirms the need for research, such as this thesis seeks to do, on the significance of theology for a theory of human relationship to nature.

The theology of divine relationship posits two fundamental motifs, *Eros* and *Agape*. The *Eros* motif presupposes that humans can, by their own initiative and achievement, acquire a state of divinity on the level of God. The *Agape* motif perceives the communion between God and people as being totally dependent upon the unmotivated initiative of God. *Agape* sees that human pride and piety based on self-love is inimical to communion with God. Rather, the human response in *Agape* is acknowledgement of creaturiness, repentence of ego-will, and responsive faith in the obedience and trust in God's creative life. The two motifs are fundamentally opposed, and hence offer two different perceptions of the God relationship. Various attempts have been made to either merge the motifs into a general concept of love, or to recognise their differences but, nevertheless, to attempt to join them as being complementary. No attempt at synthesis of the motifs is successful because they are, in essence, incompatible.

It is the distinctiveness between the two motifs which has implications for the development of a theory on human relationship to the land.
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PART II

ANALYSIS

The discussion of myth, psychology and theology in part I has enabled the identification of key ideas and motifs relevant to theorising on the human relationship to land. In part II, these ideas and motifs will be used as a basis for the analysis of theory and practice of the human use of agricultural land, with a view towards the formulation in part III of a theory on the development of non-degradative agriculture.
CHAPTER 5
RESEARCH METHOD

5.1 INTRODUCTION
This chapter provides the link between part I, the investigation of background theory, and part II, the analysis. The chapter explains how the research questions were generated, and describes the selection and application of the research method.

Section 5.2 explains how the research questions were derived from the background theory and directed towards the thesis aim of formulating a theory of the human relationship to land that will provide a basis for the development of non-degradative agriculture. With a view to the selection of a research method, the section looks first at the major theories formulated in the examples investigated from psychology and theology, and considers the linkage between the analytical methodologies used and the resultant theories. As a basis for identifying the research questions, the section then discusses how a correlation might be made between the themes of myth, the fundamental motifs of theology and the fundamental attitudes (orientations to the world) of psychology. This suggested correlation enables the generation of the research questions. Section 5.3 describes the selection of the research method and section 5.4 discusses the chosen research instrument of motif analysis and how it will be applied in the thesis.

5.2 GENERATION OF THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS
Before research questions can be formulated on the relationships between humans and the world, it is necessary to draw a correlation between the various kinds of relationships between humans, God and the world that were discussed in part I. However, as a basis for selecting an appropriate method for investigating the research questions, the correspondence between the main theories identified in part I and the analytical methods utilised in deriving them are now discussed.
The Methodology—Theory Link

The purpose of this sub-section is to link the main theories of theology and of psychology described in part I with their associated analytical methodologies. Although this sub-section will concentrate mainly on the analytical work of Nygren and of Jung, we may first note some of the findings of chapter 2 where examples of myth were investigated on the basis of a structural analysis of how each myth represented the relationship between people and the cosmos, including both the gods and the land. Two themes were evident: propitiatory sacrifice to the gods performed at an *axis mundi* or sacred centre-of-the-world with the objective of maintaining the cycles of nature through the inducement of the continued beneficence of the gods; and the suggestion of a different relationship in which the god(s) give freely of their own initiative to the world.

Nygren's utilisation of the term 'fundamental motif' was introduced in chapter 4. The philosophical basis of Nygren's analytical method will now be considered to assist in the understanding of the meaning and significance of his use of this term. Bring (1970) describes how Nygren developed his ideas on the philosophy of religion by extending the theories of both Schleiermacher and Kant. Schleiermacher had rejected the Enlightenment view of 'natural theology' which considered revelation and reason to be conjoined. He sought to differentiate between the viewpoints of individual religions, but Nygren considered that Schleiermacher, ultimately, resorted only to a differently defined natural religion in which the various religions were bound by a common content (Bring 1970, pp. 34f.). Nygren then turned to Kant's epistemology based on the 'transcendental presuppositions of knowledge: space, time, and the categories' (Bring, p. 36). Bring writes:

There is...a tendency in Kant to let philosophical analysis apply primarily to knowledge and judgments, rather than to reality. Nygren develops this idea further and makes the point that the concept of reality can never be made central for philosophy. If one does this, one lands in metaphysics...This applies equally when one rejects a transcendent reality, conceiving spatiotemporal reality as reality in itself, as when one assumes another reality in addition to spatiotemporal reality...

Instead of the concept of reality, Nygren makes the concept of validity
This means that the decisive question has to do with the meaningfulness of judgments (Bring 1970, p. 37)...

Nygren sees all judgments within the life of the human spirit as falling under certain transcendental propositions, which can be rewritten as universal questions concerning what is true in a theoretical sense [i.e. science], good in a moral sense [i.e. ethics], beautiful in an aesthetic sense, and eternally valid in a religious sense. Human experience can therefore be divided, according to Nygren, into different domains, and each domain has its special presuppositions (Bring 1970, p. 39).

Each domain’s presuppositions provide the meaning for the questions which are valid to it. Hence, Nygren later substituted ‘contexts of meaning’ for domains of experience.

The context of meaning for religion is the question of relationship to God, to which each religion will give its own answer: ‘A religion has a definite center, something which colors all individual ideas in this religion. Together with “ideas” one could also say decisions or patterns of behaviour’ (Bring, p. 39). It is this centre which Nygren calls the basic or fundamental motif (Bring, p. 40). Bring (p. 63) notes that Nygren sees that the task of all philosophy is ‘to get behind the judgments which we make to their transcendental presuppositions’.

Nygren’s search for validity within the religious context of meaning led him to discover different answers to the religious question. These answers he called fundamental motifs. In his analysis of Christian love, he identified the motifs of Judaic Nomos, Hellenistic Eros and Christian Agape. However, in practice he sees Nomos and Eros as two types of egocentric love (for which the term Eros is used in this thesis) as distinct from theocentric love (Agape). It was suggested in chapter 4 that Buddhism also follows for the most part the egocentric Eros motif. Brief review of the other main world religions suggests that they also follow the Eros motif. The exception, as described by Nygren, is the Christian theocentric Agape motif, but even within the Christian tradition the two motifs continually struggle for primacy.

Bring emphasises that clarity of philosophical analysis depends on asking questions which are valid to the particular contexts of meanings, otherwise confusion is inevitable (pp. 40f.). However, answers to questions within one
context can (because of their contextual validity) complement answers from another context: Bring comments that Luther’s historical and philological investigations into the Bible complemented his religious study, and states that religious answers and answers in psychology and psychiatry can be of ‘the greatest importance’ to each other (pp. 40f.).

The objective of Nygren’s philosophical analysis is the fundamental motif:

that factor in virtue of which a particular outlook or system possesses its own peculiar character as distinct from all others. It is the fundamental meaning behind the outward forms and expressions, which gives them their significance...(Watson’s preface to Nygren 1982, p.xviii)

Nygren (1982) writes:

A fundamental motif is that which forms the answer given by some particular outlook to a question of such a fundamental nature that it can be described in a categorical sense as a fundamental question...It happens, however, from time to time in the historical process that the meaning of one or other of these questions is completely altered...It is not that a traditional question is set aside and a new question substituted for it, but rather that a new meaning is unexpectedly discovered in the old question. The form of the question remains unchanged, but its content is different; it does not mean the same; the frame is old but the picture is new (pp. 42f.).

Jung’s method of investigation also can be linked to the particular type of theory which he formulated. Jung treated the psyche as a real part of nature, and he thus described his type of psychology, analytical psychology, as a natural science (Jung 1965, p. 200). His scientific investigations grew from his primary occupation as a consultant psychotherapist, which enabled him to study the psychology of his patients through, for example, the themes and imagery of dreams, visions and intuitions. He sought correlations between these images and those contained in historical and literary records of mythology, religion and alchemy.

Jung’s theory attributed primacy to the unconscious in the motivation of the human psyche. From this he was able to bridge the gulf between science and religion (cf. Jaffé 1984, p. 133). The motivation for Jung’s work may be summarised in his words:

My life is what I have done, my scientific work; the one is inseparable from the other. The work is the expression of my inner development;
for commitment to the contents of the unconscious forms the man and produces his transformations. My works can be regarded as stations along my life’s way.

All my writings may be considered tasks imposed from within; their source was a fateful compulsion. What I wrote were things that assailed me from within myself. I permitted the spirit that moved me to speak out (Jung 1965, p. 222).

This overview of his method correlates with his theory:

Unconscious wholeness therefore seems to me the true *spiritus rector* of all biological and psychic events. Here is a principle which strives for total realization—which in man’s case signifies the attainment of total consciousness...

The decisive question for man is: Is he related to something infinite or not? That is the telling question of his life...If we understand and feel that here in this life we already have a link with the infinite, desires and attitudes change (1965, pp. 324ff.).

Referring to a change of attitude engendered by one of his dreams, Jung comments:

This reversal suggests that in the opinion of the ‘other side’, our unconscious existence is the real one and our conscious world a kind of illusion, an apparent reality constructed for a specific purpose, like a dream which seems a reality as long as we are in it (1965, p. 324).

Jung’s ‘decisive question’ is what Nygren calls the religious question. Thus Jung’s science is predicated on the religious presupposition. The primacy of the unconscious (and the archetype of the ‘God-image’ contained therein) seems to be psychological language for the religious concept of the *Agape* Grace of God. Jung recognises that the human desiring love is different from Christian love (e.g., 1965, pp. 353ff.; 1967, CW5, para. 101). Further, he notes that a person can manifest Christian love: this appears religiously to be a gift of grace but psychologically must be seen as an archetypal influence on the person’s psyche (CW5, para. 101). It seems that Jung’s psychological theory of the primacy of the unconscious in generating the psychic transformation towards wholeness in what he called the individuation process is the same theory described by theologians who talk of the conversion of a person who experiences the transforming wholeness caused totally by God’s *Agape* love. But Jung concentrates on the opening of people’s
attitudes to the existence of the God-image and does not seem to acknowledge *Agape* as a motif of fundamental significance to human attitude. He thereby leaves the question open as to whether individuation occurs through God's (*Agape*) action or is dependent on the individual's psychological work to bring it about. Does Jung, therefore, as the scientist give equal emphasis to God's Grace and to human initiative, and thereby adopt a position of *Caritas*? And does a *Caritas* position leave itself open to its disintegration, as occurred in the Middle Ages, into its components of *Eros* and *Agape*? This possibility will now be looked at briefly through the work of Heisig and Hillman.

Heisig (1979, chs 4, 5) criticises Jung's methodology as being unscientific on the grounds that Jung's observations and interpretations were overly biased by his own viewpoint, were not based on systematically framed experimentation (pp. 118ff., 124ff.), and that Jung was unclear on what constituted proof, evidence, and verification; nor did Jung provide, for example, specific criteria for psychic health or 'individuation' (p. 141). Heisig describes Jung's methodology as hermeneutic (interpretation of meaning) based on the kerygmat (proclaiming of the Christian Gospel) principle:

> Interpreting Jung's psychology in the terms [of kerygmat hermeneutics] would involve a significant shift from his own methodological premises. Such an interpretation suggests that archetypal psychology is best situated among the human rather than among the natural sciences. More specifically with reference to the *imago Dei*, it suggests that the theory of projection may then be seen as a body of rules for interpreting God-talk symbolically as expressive of psychological needs. The theory of mind would then be viewed as a metaphorical model, subject to the canons of a hermeneutical critique but not to the verification procedures required of a theory in the natural sciences (Heisig 1979, p. 144).

Clarke (1994) studied Jung's dialogue with Eastern religions and compared Jung's methodology with the system of hermeneutics as formulated by Gadamer. Clarke observed that Jung's early use of the term hermeneutics was later replaced by the term amplification, which Jung felt better described his therapeutic method. However, Clarke concludes that as a hermeneut Jung's interpretations (of Eastern religions) were of questionable validity because of Jung's unfamiliarity with
Eastern ways and the inaccuracy of the texts then available to him (pp. 169ff.).

Jung was no stranger to criticism during his lifetime, but continually emphasised the living reality of the psyche and the importance of the underlying psychological meaning of experiential phenomena. He also saw that psychological meaning coalesced with religious meaning. The existence of the psyche was important, and this was not open to formal scientific verifications:

The epistemological boundaries set by the scientific standpoint make it inevitable that the religious figure appears essentially as a psychic factor which can only be separated theoretically from the individual psyche. And the more it is so separated, the more it loses its plasticity and concreteness, since it owes its explicit form and vitality precisely to its intimate connection with the individual psyche (Jung 1967, CW5, p. 62).

The difference in viewpoint between Jung and his critics such as Heisig and Clarke does not seem to be only on scientific method. It seems that Heisig and Clarke differ from Jung on the fundamental ground of religious motif. Jung’s work, like Augustine’s, implies, if not recognises, the Agape motif in the initiating function of the spirit or unconscious. In terms of Nygren’s philosophy, Jung investigates validity in the scientific context of meaning and finds that the unconscious, and its primacy, is ‘true’, but he is careful to maintain the individualities of the scientific and religious contexts of meaning. His scientific answer, however, complements the theocentric Agape motif within the religious meaning (but he does not make the link to this motif’s validity within its philosophical context of meaning). Heisig and Clarke, on the other hand, appear to coalesce the meanings of science and religion, thereby adopting what Nygren describes as a metaphysical position. They seek to ascertain what is ‘true’ in a combined scientific quasi-religious context, and consequently confuse the two types of meaning. They attribute primacy to the ego, thus conforming to the Eros motif. Clarke notes that the hermeneutic method is open to dispute because of its relativistic view that no one interpretation is correct ‘in itself’ (1994, p. 53). Perhaps this method is attractive to the Eros perspective because it gives the ego’s ‘free-will’ an open field in which to theorise. This impression is supported by looking at the motif of the proponent of ‘post-Jungian archetypal psychology’, Hillman.
Hillman gives a hint of the *Eros* motif when he introduces his book, *Re-Visioning Psychology*, with the claim that ‘This book is about soul-making’ (1975, p. xv). The egocentric perspective is further indicated:

*By soul I mean, first of all, a perspective rather than a substance, a viewpoint toward things rather than a thing itself. The perspective is reflective...*(p. xvi)

We need an imaginal ego that is at home in the imaginal realm, an ego that can undertake the major task now confronting psychology: the differentiation of the imaginal, discovering its laws, its configurations and moods of discourse, its psychological necessities (p. 37).

...making soul means putting events through an imaginal process...this process requires *imaginative work* (p. 189).

Hillman’s conformity to the *Eros* motif, as it was described by Nygren, is confirmed by his looking back to the Renaissance because of its refinding of Neoplatonism (pp. 197ff.) and of the scholarship of Marsilio Ficino whom Hillman adopts as the ‘Renaissance patron of archetypal psychology’ (p. 200). Nygren shows that the Reformation refound the *Agape* motif, whereas the Renaissance rediscovered *Eros* (1982, p. 669), and that Ficino not only refound eros-piety but gave it a new character. Platonic *Eros* is egocentric but has its ‘centre’ in the divine idea: Ficino’s *Eros* is anthropocentric, as he puts the human ‘at the centre of the world’ (Nygren, pp. 672ff.):

*Man is the God of the elements, the God of material things, the God of the earth; he is not merely God’s representative on earth, but he is himself ‘God upon earth’. In thought he can penetrate the fabric of the universe and reconstruct God’s whole creation and ordinances...Man is not satisfied, however, merely to be like God: he can in his ‘animi magnitudo’ be content with nothing less than becoming *God* himself (Nygren 1982, pp. 675f.).*

Thus it might be said that the link between analytical methodology and its resultant theory is fundamentally influenced by the analyst’s religious motif. The test of philosophical validity should then be whether the answers to the key questions in each context of meaning are complementary, that is capable of coherence between the areas of meaning.
The Two Motifs

According to Christian theology, people need to be 'reborn' into Agape life through the process of repenting from the position of the 'old Adam' and being recreated to the 'new Adam' through Christ. This conversion transforms the personality and gives it a new attitude and orientation to life. This transformation seems to have its parallel in psychology in the process of individuation as formulated by Jung. The old Adam correlates to the egocentric personality: the new Adam correlates to the individuated personality. In each of the types of transformed persons, guidance is experienced as coming from the inner or spiritual being. However, the psychologically individuated personality can be said to be living according to the Agape motif only if that person accepted as a living experience that the guidance from the unconscious or the Self came from the unmotivated initiative of the Self (or God-image) and not from the initiative of the individual's own work. While it cannot be said that a spiritually reborn person in the Agape motif is identical to the psychologically individuated person, there are strong parallels and, following Nygren, it may be said that the answers given to the religious question by Agape and to the scientific question by individuation are strongly complementary. That is, each can strengthen the other in creating a 'valid' orientation to the world. With these qualifications, in this thesis the two sets of dichotomies will be considered essentially the same, so that the egocentric personality will be correlated to the old Adam, and the individuated person to the spiritually reborn person in Agape. Transformation of personality creates a new attitude towards the world with a new perception of what constitutes valid knowledge. This is manifested in the two fundamental motifs, Eros and Agape, having different perceptions of the world. These differences will now be outlined under the headings of love, sacrifice, and symbolism, three of the most important themes identified in the previous three chapters.

Love

Nygren (1982), representing the Lutheran view, sees human love and God's love as two different and mutually exclusive kinds of love. Warnach (1970, pp. 154f.), representing the Catholic view, sees human and divine love as two interacting
aspects of the one love. Hillman writes of love as intellection (1975, p. 198); and

...love is not enough; or rather, love is just one more form of imaginative
labor. Love then can be seen as neither the goal nor the way, but as one of
the many means of putting our humanity through a complicated imaginal
process (p. 189).

Jung sees love as a symbol of libido (1967, CW5, paras 96ff.), that is the
psychic energy or 'creative power of our own soul' (CW5, para. 176), and (together
with hunger) as 'the immemorial psychic driving force of humanity' (CW5, para. 97). Jung distinguishes between human desiring love and divine spiritual love, but
maintains that humans are capable of manifesting spiritual love, an effect he
attributes to the person's ego being influenced by an unconscious archetype: the
person has been 'gripped by something akin to a donum gratiae, for he could
hardly be expected to be capable of usurping, on his own resources, a divine action
such as that love is' (CW5, para. 101).

It might be inferred from Jung's work that human love is characterised by
desire and possessiveness, because the ego thinking in the Eros (ego-centred) motif
projects its real psychic centre, the Self, onto objects in the external world and,
being driven unconsciously toward psychic wholeness, seeks to achieve this
through the attraction and acquisition of the external things. The person is,
however, unconscious of the attraction being symbolic of the urge towards the
attainment of psychic wholeness.

Nygren and Jung thus identify two kinds or motifs of love. Human love
seeks to possess its object; divine love seeks to give to the object. The person
living according to the egocentric motif has an acquisitive orientation to life
because of assuming a position of autonomy in relation to both God and the world:
the God–people–world system is seen only in its disparate parts, and people use the
world as a means of aspiring to God—on God's level. By contrast, the person
living according to the theocentric motif experiences a belonging to a unified
system comprised of God and people and world. This belonging is manifested in a
feeling of inner guidance which annuls the desire to possess and, instead,
egenders a feeling of giving of the self to the world. That is, through Agape love,
God who acts in all nature guides people in works of love towards the natural
world.

Sacrifice

This sub-section looks at how the theme of sacrifice in myth is perceived by each of the two motifs. Jung suggests that the symbolism of myth reflects psychological situations. According to this view, creation myth symbolises the emergence of consciousness from the unconscious by the images of the sun god (e.g. Marduk) slaying the earth monster (Tiamat). The motif is sacrifice of chaos to produce order, and henceforth creation is seen as the ordering of the earth through the initiative of the sun god. The motif of sacrifice and initiative is continued in the myth of the conquering hero in which the hero symbolises the ego's struggle to become independent from its maternal unconscious, and to consolidate its integrity against the still powerful and threatening unconscious. Heracles' labours exemplify the ego's symbolic struggle against the devouring 'terrible mother'. In its search for autonomy, the ego is hostile to the unconscious, a hostility which it projects symbolically to the world. Hence, Marduk usurps the creative power by sacrificial conquest, and Heracles is continually sacrificing people and creatures in ritualistic repetition of the sun god's action so as to renew the mythical connection to the sun god and his power over nature. Heracles, however, had to sacrifice himself before he was made divine. Societies which sacrifice their sun-king or substitutes for him are following this theme of sacrifice being the means of transcending the earthly life and acquiring divinity.

A universal religious and psychological motivation for the ritual of sacrifice may be inferred by conjoining a key concept from each of the fields of myth, psychology and religion. Myth indicates that sacrifice frees the soul of the slain for the beneficial use of the sacrificer (cf. Campbell 1990, pp. 9f.; Eliade 1971, p. 20). This might be seen in Marduk's taking control of Tiamat's soul and its primal creativity, and in the priest's slaying of the sun-king so that the divine power can be renewed in his younger successor for the continuing beneficence of the people (cf. Campbell 1969, pp. 151-169). Jungian psychology argues that each psyche is unconsciously motivated towards reconnection to the (eternal) collective unconscious. The Eros religious motif expresses this urge, but from the egocentric viewpoint, as it assumes that the connection to God depends on human
initiative. From these concepts, it may be inferred that sacrifice is the symbolic means of activating the world soul, perceived as external to human life and accessible only through sacrificial propitiation, either in repetition of the sun god’s original sacrifice or in ritualistic renewal of the sun god’s divinity. Sacrifice thus effects a merging of temporal and eternal time, and human and divine life, and might, therefore, be seen as the core of the Eros motif.

The religious motif of Eros also adopts the world view of duality and of autonomy of the individual in relation to God, as exemplified by Eve and Adam. The Eros motif follows the conquering-hero myth in its assumption that individual initiative is the pre-requisite to achieving divine status. The Eros motif continues the mythical emphasis on sacrifice; firstly in the sacrifice of the world of darkness and evil by the (sun) God, and secondly in the individual’s imitation through propitiation of the self-sacrifice of the God, exemplified in the crucifixion of Christ. This propitiation assumes the form of a self-sacrifice manifested in behaviour such as piety and asceticism, the purpose of which is to renew the link with the God of light’s power over the darkness of nature.

The myths of creation and of the conquering hero, and the Eros motif symbolise the egocentric psychological condition through the themes of sacrifice for the usurping of creative power, and sacrifice for the renewal of this power. In each sacrificial situation, the cosmos is seen in dichotomy, namely the sun god against the earth monster, and the hero’s physical life against his spiritual, divine existence. The sacrifice diminishes or degrades a part of the cosmos and thereby degrades the cosmic unity and total potential creativity.

The Agape motif makes redundant the need for propitiatory sacrifice. This is because the cosmos is now seen as a unity in which the essence of creation is continually giving of itself to the world. This suggests an alternative interpretation of Christ’s crucifixion. If sacrifice is seen as the human way to make something sacred and to establish a link with the divine, then sacrifice should be seen as an Eros institution. In Eros, the crucifixion will be seen as a sacrifice by God of himself in the form of the Son. This is in accord with the mythical sacrifice of the sun god or sun-king. However, in Agape the crucifixion might be seen as humankind’s killing, but as God’s giving to the world in unconditional Agape love.
Symbolism

Creation myth, hero myth, and the *Eros* religious motif appear to be symbolic expressions of the egocentric psychological attitude. Jung maintains that the egocentric psyche perceives itself as being fragmented from its psychic (and physical) world, but is being continually motivated by the unconscious towards psychic re-integration. This seems to be the basis for the egocentric person desiring to become ‘like God’, and experiencing this motivation through projected images of union such as the mandala images of harmony, paradise, and the union of opposites. These images are unconscious compensations for the egocentric’s psychic disunity. Hence, the Garden of Eden presents a paradise image, and the central tree is an *axis mundi*. As the tree of life, the *axis mundi* might represent the original centre where the sun god seized power over nature and created the world; as the tree of knowledge of good and evil, it seems to represent the centre where humankind sacrifices the sun god (through disobedience) and aspires to become divine. The Garden and the tree epitomise the mythical image of the sanctuary or paradise and its centre, the *axis mundi*. The mandala image of enclosure and its centre is symptomatic of egocentricity. The unconscious produces the image to direct the psyche towards individuation. However, the egocentric person projects the image unconsciously, and consequently perceives the world through paradise and centre images. Thus people perceive the land heterogeneously—the untamed wilderness represents the fearful chaos, the area of slain nature represents the temenos of protection and in its centre is the *axis mundi* where propitiatory sacrifice can renew the people’s link to the sun god and thus maintain their control over nature.

The symbolism of individuation and *Agape* is quite different from that of egocentricity. The individuated person no longer sees creation through images of the hero slaying the terrible mother, and of a far-off God being separate from the creation. Jung hypothesises that psyche and matter are two perceptions of the one reality. He also suggests that a psychoid essence is the foundation and source of the psychic archetypes which are structured forms within the unconscious, and that the archetypes can be perceived by the human mind only through the *self*, and then via symbols. He sees a total integration of matter and psyche, both at the essential or
foundational level, and in the human perceptual level where the symbol unites the visible world and the unconscious archetypes. There is a parallel between this psychological model and the theological model posited, for example, by Luther. Luther also sees the creator and the creation as being totally integrated. He sees God as the Trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, in unity and being of the same divine essence. The Father might be seen to equate with the psychoid, the essence of creation and revealed only in the creation itself; the Son might equate with the archetypes which give form to the creation and open the human personality to divine revelation. Thus Jung and Luther, each using the language of his own discipline, seem to be seeing the cosmos in the same symbolism based on unity and the inner source of life which is continually revealing itself symbolically to the world, but is acknowledged consciously only by the psyche which has let go of its pseudo-autonomy and submitted in obedience to the inner guide. The individuated person befriends the unconscious and its symbol the world of nature. Such people experience connectedness to the cosmos and, in accordance with the Agape motif, can give from the self or Spirit, towards building up the creativity of the world.

People living according to the Agape motif have let go of the symbols of the centre-of-the-world, comprising the images of paradise on earth, the sacred temenos and the axis mundi.

The Research Questions

It may be concluded from the above that myth, psychology and theology each recognise the two fundamental ways of relating to the world based on the ego’s perceived relationship to the unconscious. This raises two key questions for theorising on the human relationship to the land:

1. Are the theory of human–land relationship and the practice of agriculture both manifestations of the symbolic perceptions of the land that characterise the egocentric and individuated attitudes to the world and their derivative mythical and religious motifs of Eros and Agape?

2. Is the egocentric attitude as expressed by the Eros motif
correlated with degradation of agricultural land, and is the individuated attitude as expressed by the Agape motif correlated with the increase of agricultural land’s natural fertility?

Researching these questions should provide a basis for formulating a theory on the development of non-degradative agriculture.

5.3 SELECTION OF METHOD

The human relationship to agricultural land is perceived in idea, image and action. It might, therefore, be expressed in forms such as myth, ritual, religion, art, poetry, music and fiction writing, as well as in the more formalised theory and practice of agriculture, as shown in the historical record. The present author's experience is in the theory and practice of agriculture, and consequently the research in this thesis is restricted to these areas. Nevertheless, the theory and practice of agriculture present an almost limitless field for research. They can be made manageable, however, by focusing the research on the symbolism associated with the two fundamental religious motifs, or psychological attitudes. Hence a comprehensive study of agricultural thinking and methods is not required but, rather, the study of examples suitable for the identification of fundamental motifs.

There are several methods for conducting such research. The scale of study could range from the intensive study of a single farm at the present time, to a broad review of the world's agriculture throughout history. The following main types of study would be possible:

1. Case study of one farm
The task of correlating a fundamental motif with a particular theory and practice could be conducted by the intensive study of one farm or one agriculturalist's operation. This would require ascertaining both the farmer's religious myth or perceived nature of relationship to 'god', and a psychological assessment of the farmer's personality type and the level of psychic development. The farmer's agricultural practices would have to be studied, particularly in relation to how fertility was treated and the nature of the interaction between human work and the processes of nature. The state of the land would have to be assessed in terms
of degradation and sustainability. The farmer's theoretical knowledge of the agricultural operation would have to be obtained. The study would depend on research instruments such as field measurements, analysis of farm records, interviews and questionnaires, and possibly computer modelling. Several possible outcomes might result. The theory from part 1 suggests that a person will have only one religious motif. Somehow the other motif would have to be explored, such as by leading the farmer into a 'what if' consideration of alternative theory and practice. Or, if the farmer had actually converted from the egocentric to the individuated situation, and had accordingly altered the farm practices, there might be evidence on the farm of the former practices as well as the new practices.

2. Case study of two or more farms
This option would allow more flexibility in the choice of properties regarding type of farming, state of degradation or fertility, type of person etc., and would enable comparisons to be drawn. The same types of data and methods of collection as used in approach number 1 would be required (except that the 'what if' speculation might be unnecessary). This option could be extended to a large number of farms by either a more extensive program of farm-site studies, possibly in conjunction with a questionnaire survey, or by questionnaire survey alone.

3. Case study of schools of thought
It would be possible to study theories and practices of particular groups or organisations, whether government or private. This could involve field study of farms, interviews of farmers, officials, technical staff etc., with or without the use of questionnaires, either completed during interview or completed by the recipient subsequently. Where appropriate literature existed the study could be conducted by an analysis of literature.

4. Case study of cultural group(s)
The study could focus on particular cultural groups of agriculturalists. A group having a common religious background would be particularly interesting because it should permit correlation between religious motif and agricultural theory and practice. Site study of farms, and discussion and interview with the farming people would be necessary. Literature analysis could be used in conjunction or.
alternatively, as a separate study. Similar study could be made of groups having internal homogeneity in terms of culture or historical roots of settlement, which might mean that they illustrate a particular religious view or have developed a common psychological attitude.

5. Analysis of literature

The literature could be analysed as a separate study or in conjunction with any of the above case studies. For example, a single farm (or farmer) might have documentation of matters pertinent to personal or family religious views or personality type and level of psychological development, and to agricultural theory and the practice of agriculture. Such a farm, although perhaps rare, would provide a valuable source for research. However, literature would generally be more readily available at the broader scales of schools of thought, cultural groups, or generalised theory.

Field study and personal interview were attractive research instruments because they would have allowed study of the elements at the most intimate level of interaction between agriculturalist and land. However, the instruments would have required a high level of expertise in their design and in the collection of data in relation to, for example, measurement of farm fertility, sustainability of practices, land degradation, personality type and level of psychological development. This would require skills from agricultural science, agricultural or civil engineering, biological science, computer modelling, and psychology. Obtaining information on personal religious motifs might be a sensitive issue and could, even if it were possible to design suitable interviews or questionnaires, alienate the respondent and thus limit or distort the data. Dependence on the field study and the personal interview would make the research idiosyncratic in the sense that it would be based on one or a few personality types, and farm and environmental types.

By contrast, the analysis of literature provided the flexibility to research at any level from the heights of generalisation to the depths of individual situations and experiences, from the modern to the ancient historical times, and at any geographical location, so that any farming type and land environment could be considered. Analysis of literature also had the flexibility of allowing the return
to any topic at any time, as opposed to the generally more scheduled approach of farm visits and farmer interviews. Literature analysis gave more control over the research to the researcher. Literature analysis was, therefore, selected as the method of research. The tool or instrument of research was religious motif or psychological attitude analysis, the two parallel tools which emerged from the investigation of psychology and theology, described in chapters 3 and 4.

It was necessary to decide on the scale of the study. This could range from the world to the whole or part of a single farm, or to a particular agricultural practice. To address both of the research questions it was decided to include motif analysis at three different scales: the world; the continent; and the specific agricultural technique. This permitted an assessment of consistency of findings between the scales. It also allowed research question 1, which needs to include the world view, to be addressed by motif analysis of both the theory of the human–land relationship and of the practice of agricultural development. The analysis could then cover an extended period of history and a large regional area such as the south-eastern part of the Australian continent.

Theories on the human–land relationship, especially when they adopt a religious view, will generally not focus on land, but rather on nature or, in some cases, on the cosmos. The choice of examples of theory for analysis was restricted to those from Western culture, and those related to religion were restricted to the Christian religion. These restrictions were made because the Western-Christian tradition comprises the predominant religious and psychological basis to modern Australian agriculture.

In a study of human relationship to land, the Australian continent provides an interesting case study, because for approximately fifty thousand years it was inhabited by the Aboriginals who practised subsistence hunting and gathering before the British brought Western culture to the continent with their settlement commencing in 1788. Thus within the span of little over two hundred years the land-use culture of the continent has undergone a transition from hunting and gathering to the Western patterns of pastoralism, cultivation, and selectively intensified hunting and timber extraction. The main facts, at least, of this transition of land-use culture and the consequential transformation of the landscape are
contained in the historic record, and provide a source for research into the human—
land relationship. Hence a case study of the development of agriculture in Australia
has been included at the continental or national scale.

Western-style agriculture has produced much wealth for the nation but has
also been associated with degradation of the land. A disjunction between
agricultural practice and the ecology of the land has been revealed by symptoms
such as soil erosion and the ravages of drought on cultivated and grazing areas.
Improvements were introduced in chemical fertilisers, including the use of trace
elements, and in the techniques of cultivation and irrigation, and yet soils continued
to lose natural fertility and generally degrade. Clearing of woodland and forest and
replacement of native grasses by introduced species continued.

In an attempt to reverse this degradation, governments introduced soil
conservation programs. The community hope was that, with more empirical
knowledge, Australian agriculturalists would understand their land environment
better and improve it. But the problem of salinisation of the land and rivers became
worse and added to the continuing problem of soil degradation. Keyline farming, a
non-government system, was also introduced as a response to land degradation. It
had the same apparent goal of agricultural sustainability but used different
techniques to those of the soil conservation programs and focussed specifically on
improvement of soil fertility. Public controversy arose regarding the merits of the
two schemes but, despite the apparent similarity of their goals, there has never been
a reconciliation between either their theories, or their practices. There seemed to be
a fundamental difference in the perception of the issue by the proponents of each.
This situation has never been explained. Accordingly it was chosen as a second
case study, specifically to address research question 2 which seeks to know whether
either of the two motifs of Eros and Agape is associated with degradation or
increased fertility of the land.

Thus, three topics have been selected for analysis: at the world scale, theory
on human–land relationship; at the continental scale, the history of agricultural
development of Australia; and at the scale of schools-of-thought of agricultural
techniques, a study on the comparison between government soil conservation and
keyline farming. Part II is arranged from the general theory (chapter 6) to the
general case study of Australian agriculture (chapter 7), which serves also as background to the particular case study of soil conservation and keyline farming (chapter 8).

5.4 MOTIF ANALYSIS

Section 5.2 suggested the potential usefulness to the present study of Nygren’s concept of ‘fundamental motif’. Nygren’s analytical method, ‘motif-research’, focused on identifying the underlying motif of a writer’s thinking. He applied motif-research in the theological area of the Christian concept of love. Motif analysis is adopted in the present study as the most suitable method for investigating writers’ thinking on the relationship between humans and the land. This section describes how the method will be used in part II of the thesis. Firstly, however, general comment is made on how Nygren used motif analysis in his study of Christian love.

Nygren (1982) writes:

...we must try to see what is the basic idea or the driving power of the religion concerned, or what it is that gives it its character as a whole and communicates to all its parts their special content and colour. It is the attempt to carry out such a structural analysis, whether in the sphere of religion or elsewhere, that we describe as motif-research...(p. 35)

The purpose of the [motif-research] scientific study of religion is not merely to record the actual conceptions, attitudes, and so forth, that are found in a particular religious milieu, but more especially to find out what is characteristic and typical of them all (p. 37).

The fundamental motif gives the religious system its ‘coherence and meaning’ and provides the basis for the connection between the various components of the system (Nygren 1982, pp. 36f.). Watson (see Nygren 1982, p. xviii) makes the point that ‘Similar or identical forms and expressions may sometimes conceal totally different motifs. while widely differing forms and expressions may sometimes represent the same motif’. Nygren emphasises, however, that the motif—that factor which provides the connectedness between a system’s components—‘is no less empirically given’ than are the components
themselves (p. 36). Watson explains motif research in the following way:

Motif research is the name given to a method of investigation that is directed to discover the fundamental motif of any given outlook or system of thought. And the fundamental motif is that factor in virtue of which a particular outlook or system possesses its own particular character as distinct from all others (Watson's preface to Nygren 1982, p. xviii).

Bring (1970) points out that answers to the key questions in the different contexts of meaning can be complementary: 'insights within the different domains of experience can be made to work together' (p. 40f.). Heikkinen (1970) recognises the function of symbols in linking religion and psychology: he suggests that motif research could be extended to the 'theory of psychoanalytic thought' and states, 'Motif research may well focus its critical acumen upon the study of the symbolic language of the biblical faith' (p. 139). Erling (1970) sees Nygren's analytical methodology of motif research as a means of applying critical philosophy to the understanding of historical reality, and thus recommends the method for general historical research (pp. 109ff.). He notes that motif research is fundamental to the understanding of historical events because it uncovers not only the conscious but especially the unconscious 'structures' of people's thoughts and actions: the structures operate as 'self-evident presuppositions' (p. 110). Thus, Erling states that Nygren used motif research to find 'more significance in what thinkers of a given time took for granted than in what they argued about' (p. 110).

In the present study, motif analysis is applied to the area of people's relationship to the land through theory and action. The analysis is used to uncover the 'self-evident presuppositions' in people's theorising on and treatment of land. In this study, the mythological themes (chapter 2), the psychological orientations (chapter 3), and the theological motifs (chapter 4) are conjoined under the concepts of the Eros motif and the Agape motif to represent the two fundamental presuppositions on human relationship to the land. The motif of Eros is based on human aspiration to ascend to God: the motif of Agape is based on the view that communion with God is possible only through God's initiative in coming into the world. Each motif is associated with a distinct mode of theorising on the linkage between humans and God, a particular attitude towards the world and a particular system of symbolic perception. The investigation in part II analyses theory
and recorded actions in relation to the land on the basis of attitudes and symbolic perceptions. The distinctive characteristics of the attitudes and symbolisms of Eros and Agape will now be outlined.

**Attitudes and Symbolism in Eros**

People living within the Eros motif experience a fear of the unknown (Elkin 1979, pp. 69ff.; Eliade 1959, pp. 47ff.) and consequently seek to propitiate, consciously or unconsciously, the powers of the world with the objective of inducing a favourable living situation (Elkin 1979, ch. 9; Eliade 1959, pp. 87ff.). Land space is a wild and threatening chaos until it has been cosmicised, that is brought into order by the transformation of wild nature through the processes of land settlement (Eliade 1959, ch. 1). The land is sanctified by the establishment of a centre-of-the-world which differentiates cosmos from chaos. The centre comprises the mythical *axis mundi* and its encompassing temenos. The *axis mundi* links heaven and earth and enables communication between people and God: it gives life a reality because it links to the 'other', the unknown. The temenos is the sacred living space in which propitiation to the sun god can maintain protection against the 'earth dragon' or the powers of evil which rule the uncosmicised space and can annihilate life (Eliade 1959, ch. 1).

In Eros, life is a repetition of the mythical actions of the gods when they created the world: each cosmicisation of land is an imitation of the creation where the sun god slew the earth monster and reconstituted her parts to create an ordered world which could be controlled in its form and fertility by the initiative of the sun god (Eliade 1959, ch. 1). Life becomes a propitatory ritual to maintain the link between people and the earth-controlling sun god (Frazer 1933, ch. 59). Caution and sacrifice protect against annihilation by evil (Frazer 1933, chs 56–60). Life focuses on care (Bonhoeffer 1959, pp. 154ff.) and survival, that is self-love (Nygren 1982, p. 210), through ritual and contemplation of the divine powers to which people aspire (Nygren, pp. 223 et al.).

Jung provides an explanation of the symbolism of Eros. Egocentred people experience unconscious projection of mandala images which they perceive as centre-of-the-world complexes of the *axis mundi* within the temenos (Jung 1968b, CW9(i), paras 713ff.; 1968c, CW12. ch. 3). The unconsciously motivated urge
towards psychological wholeness is perceived as the goal of paradise (Jung 1964, pp. 74ff.), that is the state of perfection and harmony (Eliade 1959, p. 92). Harmony is the goal, because in Eros humans, the world and God are each viewed as autonomous (Preus 1977, pp. 70ff.).

The result of the Eros aspiration to divinity and the process of land cosmicisation is that wild nature is ‘slain’ and tamed. Nature may therefore be considered to be degraded by cosmicisation; that is, in the Augustinian view, nature is to be used so that people can better enjoy God (Nygren 1982, pp. 503ff.).

**Attitudes and Symbolism in Agape**

In Agape, people feel a sense of belonging (Bonhoeffer 1959, pp. 223ff.) because of the experience of communication from God within their own psyche (Preus 1977, pp. 122ff.). Here God reveals himself at the human level so there is no question of people having a free-will (Preus, pp. 30ff.; 82ff.) to choose to become like God and to imitate the actions of the mythical gods. In Agape, the ‘sacrifice’ of life is the submission of the self-will through the painful process of ‘repentance’ against the ego’s natural opposition to the spirit of God (Elert 1962, pp. 145ff.). Life then becomes free from compulsive piety in obedience to the inner motivation (Preus 1977pp. 78ff.; 120f.). This, however, is no paradise of harmony but rather an inner tension between the ego-will (‘flesh’) and the spirit (Jung 1968b, CW9(i), para. 399; Preus 1977, pp. 49ff., 102, 119). In recognition of the total dependence of human life on God’s continuous creativity, both physically and psychically, the idea of human dignity is, in the face of God, subsumed in the idea of human humility comprising weakness, foolishness and utter creatureliness (von Loewenich 1976, pp. 129ff.). After repentance, however, joy can be the basis for ethical behaviour (Elert 1962, pp. 69f.) in the knowledge that divine communication has been effected by God who continues to give abundantly of his unmotivated love for the confirming of the world (Nygren 1982, pp. 91, 140). Human life then becomes a channel of God’s love to the neighbour (Nygren, p. 210) and, through the deputyship of dominion, to the world (Preus, pp. 61ff.).

Agape life constitutes relationship in integration. Human life is meaningful only because it is, like all nature, a manifestation of God’s creative essence. In trustful obedience, human life can then be focused towards serving the world
through building up its fertility, that is by confirming the life-creating essence of nature. No longer is the mandala image of the centre-of-the-world unconsciously projected because the centre is known as the centre (or Self) within (Campbell 1949, pp. 177, 190, 236f.; Bonhoeffer 1959, pp. 137f.). No longer is the earth perceived in differentiation between cosmos and chaos but the whole landscape is seen in integrated relationship with people comprising God's ongoing creation (Preus 1977, pp. 61ff.). The key ideas of the Agape motif are compared with those of the Eros motif in Table I below.

The motifs of Eros and Agape thus have two different modes of perception of relationship to the world. They therefore provide a basis for analysis of theory and practice of agriculture. Part II describes the motif analysis of the literature relating to the three chosen topics: the theory of human–land relationship; the history of the development of agriculture in Australia; and the comparison of soil conservation with keyline farming.

The motif research will proceed by the analysis of the selected theorist's writings and of the literature describing examples of practices of relationship to the land, whether at the global, Australian or local scale. Each theory and practice will be analysed for the attitude expressed or portrayed, consciously or unconsciously. They will be categorised according to the fundamental motifs, based primarily on the attitudes portrayed towards the three main criteria of love, sacrifice and symbolic perception of landscape, as discussed in section 5.2. These criteria will be supported by reference to the more extensive list of key ideas of the motifs shown in Table 1. The method might appear to be imprecise but it should become evident in the analysis chapters that the motifs are of such a fundamental nature that they influence a person's total outlook and relationship to the land. The research attempts to show that a motif influences both theory and practice of relationship to the land.
Table 1  Key ideas of the two motifs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key ideas of EROS</th>
<th>Key ideas of AGAPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-love</td>
<td>Love given to the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to possess</td>
<td>Feeling of communion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Experience of knowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfection and harmony</td>
<td>Tension of opposites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human dignity</td>
<td>Weakness and foolishness (of ego)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exaltation</td>
<td>(Agape) humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-will</td>
<td>Freedom in obedience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propitiation</td>
<td>Trustful acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Carefree in faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection and caution</td>
<td>Life in abundance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductionism</td>
<td>Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>Nurture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandala symbolism</td>
<td>Whole of nature as symbol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axes mundi and centres</td>
<td>Dissolution of centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise</td>
<td>Tension of opposites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneous land</td>
<td>Integrated landscape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The author
6.1 INTRODUCTION

It was argued in part I that fundamental thoughts originate in the archetypes in the unconscious part of the psyche, and are perceived by people symbolically according to their religious myth. Religion systematises mythical theory on the human relationship to the cosmos, in particular to the cosmic creator(s) but also to the created world. The concept of a creator derives from the idea of creation from chaos or from nothing, and is symbolised by the idea or image of a god or gods. People's perception of the nature of God determines how they view their relationship both to God and to the created world. Theology identifies two fundamental motifs of perceiving the human–God relationship, Eros in which communion depends on human initiative, and Agape which sees God as the initiator of communion. Jung's psychological theories provide a scientific explanation of the two religious motifs through the two stages of psychological development termed egocentricity and individuation. Each of these psychological states has a distinct attitude to the world which generates its own system of symbolic perception, manifested in religious myth, theory and action. The consistency between the theological motifs and the psychological attitudes provides the research instrument of motif analysis by which the essential meaning of theory and action can be identified. The Eros motif (derived from the egocentric attitude) is based on a perceived duality between humans and both God and the world: the Agape motif (derived from the individuated attitude) is based on relationship through integration. It was argued in chapter 5 that Eros comprises a degradative relationship whereas Agape comprises a creative relationship. Hence, the
identification of the fundamental motif of the theory of human relationship to land seems essential to the aim of formulating a theory on non-degradative agriculture.

The aim of this chapter is to ascertain whether theory on the human–land relationship is consistent with the symbolism of either the *Eros* or the *Agape* religious motif.

Most philosophical and theological theorists refer to the human relationship to the cosmos or to nature in general. In general, they do not refer explicitly to the relationship of humans to agricultural land. An exception is Steiner, who used cosmological theory to deduce agricultural theory. Some have formulated theory from their practical experience, such as in forestry (Leopold), agriculture (Fukuoka, Mollison), and laboratory science (Lovelock). Theory derived from practice might remain at the human–land scale (Leopold) or, in some cases, might be extended, in varying degrees, towards the scale of cosmological theory (Fukuoka, Mollison).

To achieve the aim of this chapter, selected theories will be analysed to see whether they manifest either of the two patterns of archetypal symbolism associated with the egocentric and individuated psychological attitudes to the world. The theories to be reviewed have been selected from a range of viewpoints within the Western tradition. The selection was limited to Western theories because of their cultural consistency with both the Western religious motifs discussed in part I and the Western agricultural case studies to be presented in chapters 7 and 8. They represent both secular and Christian viewpoints. The reviews of the theories are contained in sections 6.3 to 6.6. Analysis of the symbolism of the theories according to fundamental religious motif is contained in section 6.7. The reasoning underlying the selection and arrangement of the theories to be reviewed is described in the following section.

**6.2 SELECTION AND ARRANGEMENT OF THEORIES TO BE REVIEWED**

The word *theory* derives from the ancient Greek *theoros*, a spectator or envoy sent by the state to consult an oracle or to perform a religious rite, that is one who brings a message from the gods (Greek *theo*, god) *(The New Shorter Oxford
Jung, in accord with Plato, Kant and others, writes that ideas are \textit{a priori} archetypes in the unconscious which pre-exist and anticipate the emergence of thoughts into consciousness (1971, CW6, paras 732–737). This being so, theories should be valid to the extent that they reflect archetypal ideas. Accordingly, the validity of each theory depends on whether the theory's underlying motif is an accurate representation of the relevant archetypal idea.

As mentioned in chapter 4, people formulate theory on the human relationship to land within the framework of the tripartite relationship of God, people and land. The rationalist attempts to reduce this framework to a bipartite system comprising only people and land. However, psychologically all people are religious in the sense that their unconscious is continually working towards assimilation with the ego. This is experienced as a desire to link back to something. Hence, even the egocentric rationalist who denies God adopts the \textit{Eros} religious motif by perceiving the ego to be in control of reality. Those who consciously adopt a religious viewpoint see their relationship to land in the context of their perception of the nature of God. \textit{Eros} religion attributes people as having the initiative of communion with God and with the created land. \textit{Agape} religion attributes this initiative to God. Thus theory is formulated either within the contexts of rationalism, \textit{Eros} religion or \textit{Agape} religion.

The importance of religious viewpoint in adopting a position in relation to the land has been well recognised. In a seminal paper \textit{The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis} (1967), Lynn White, Jr reviewed the history of Western land utilisation and concluded that religious attitude is at the root of how people think and act towards their ecological home (White 1967). In his view, the Christian religion, at least as commonly interpreted, has led to the current ecological crisis, and it can be solved only by rethinking this religion or finding a new religion. White was criticising the \textit{Eros} interpretation of Christianity identified in chapter 4 as one of two religious motifs. White (1967) wrote:

\begin{quote}
Since the roots of our trouble are so largely religious, the remedy must also be essentially religious, whether we call it that or not.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
What we do about ecology depends on our ideas of the man–nature relationship. More science and more technology are not going to get us out
of the present ecologic crisis until we find a new religion, or rethink our old
one.

In a later paper, quoted by Warwick Fox, White writes:

[The problem with] our structure of values [is that] a man–nature dualism is
depth-rooted in us ... Until it is eradicated not only from our minds but also
from our emotions, we shall doubtless be unable to make fundamental
changes in our attitudes and actions affecting ecology (White, see W. Fox
1990, p. 7).

Jung has written at length about this dualism, and explains it in psychological
terms:

How else could it have occurred to man to divide the cosmos, on the analogy
of day and night, summer and winter, into a bright day-world and a dark
night-world peopled with fabulous monters, unless he had the prototype of
such a division in himself, in the polarity between the conscious and the
invisible and unknowable unconscious? (1968b, CW9(i), para. 187)

White mentions neither psychological individuation nor the religious motif of
Agape, both of which would appear to generate the fundamental attitudinal change
which he advocates. Instead he advocates the adoption of Saint Francis of Assisi as
a ‘patron saint for ecologists’ (White 1967).

Whilst White attributes the current ecological crisis to faulty religious
beliefs, there are many theorists who deny the relevance of religion per se.
Theorists selected as representative of this group are Leopold, Passmore, Lovelock,
Naess and Warwick Fox, Mollison, and Campbell. Leopold, writing in 1949, was
one of the first to draw attention to the links between attitudes and land
degradation. He saw the solution in the development of the intellect to embrace an
ecological conscience and to formulate a land ethic based on intellectual values.
Passmore, philosopher, and Lovelock, scientist, believe that human reason is
capable of subsuming and rising above religion and thus is capable of controlling
nature. Arne Naess and the ‘Deep Ecologists’ and Warwick Fox and the
‘Transpersonal Ecologists’ also advocated the development of a rational ecological
conscience based on the assumption that the ego is capable of incorporating
rational understanding with spiritual understanding. Mollison has developed a
rational theory called permaculture. He differs from the other theorists in that he
practises and consults in agriculture as well as formulating theories of agricultural use of land. Campbell is included in this group because of his presentation of the theory underlying the *Potter Farmland Plan* which represents conventional secular agricultural thinking. These theorists ignore or deny the unconscious, spiritual and religious, although in some cases they contend that their rationalism *is* religious. The thinking of these rational or non-religious theorists is discussed in section 6.3.

White rejects the common (Eros) religious beliefs but alludes to another way of thinking religiously. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 identified *Eros* and *Agape* as the two fundamental motifs, and accordingly the theorists who acknowledge the relevance of religion in seeking a right relationship with the ecological environment are grouped into the *Eros* thinkers and the *Agape* thinkers. In fact there seem to be no representatives of the *Agape* motif in agricultural land theory but there is a group who have attempted to move towards *Agape* or, more accurately, towards an Augustinian *Caritas* amalgamation.

Religious theories based on the *Eros* motif are analysed in section 6.4. Thinkers selected for review are: Saint Francis, because of the prominence given to him by Lynn White; Teilhard de Chardin because of the comprehensive nature of his scheme of cosmogenesis which attempts to explain the cosmic role of humankind; Steiner because of his scheme of theosophy which attempted to explain humanity's place in the cosmos and gave rise to the biodynamic system of agriculture; and theologians Matthew Fox and Collins who have attempted to explain the land degradation crisis in theological terms.

Section 6.5 reviews theory which attempts to move away from the egocentric *Eros* position. Included here are Augustine's *Caritas* views in relation to human relationship to land, and the agricultural theory of Masanobu Fukuoka, agricultural practitioner and consultant. Although an *Agape* agricultural theory does not exist there are *Agape* writers who express views on relationships to nature which are sufficient to imply what an *Agape* agricultural theory might be. Section 6.6 analyses the *Agape* elements of Augustine's theology, as well as the theory of Paul, Luther and Bonhoeffer.

It should be noted that the *Eros* motif allows the adoption of either a 'non-religious' or a religious attitude, whereas the *Caritas* and *Agape* motifs inherently
allow only the religious attitude. The structure of the chapter can therefore be illustrated in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>Religious Motif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: the author.

6.3 RATIONALIST THEORIES

The rationalist human–land theories of Aldo Leopold, John Passmore, James Lovelock (Gaia hypothesis), Arne Naess (Deep Ecology), Warwick Fox (Transpersonal Ecology), Bill Mollison (Permaculture) and Andrew Campbell (Potter Farmland Plan) are reviewed in this section.

Leopold

In the introduction to the 1989 edition of Leopold's book *A Sand County Almanac*, Finch writes:

No other single book of American nature writing—with the exception of Walden—has achieved such lasting stature as *A Sand County Almanac*. Since it was first published...in 1949—one year after the author's death—it has become an established classic in the field, admired by an ever-growing number of readers, imitated by hundreds of writers, and providing the core for modern conservation ethics (p. xv).

Leopold (1989), a government forester and wildlife manager, wrote about the beauty and wonder of nature, the human despoliation of the natural landscape, and the need for society to develop a land ethic. Leopold recognised that humans had used agricultural land violently, thereby weakening the land's capacity for 'self-renewal' and making the land 'sick' (pp. 194, 218). He recognised that in their relationship to nature people manifest a search for something: people are hunters, but the hunted objects, 'the wild things', remain elusive. Consequently,
people and society attempt to control and possess the elusive wild things through 'laws, appropriations, regional plans, reorganization of departments, or other form of mass-wishing to make them stay put' (pp. 167). Society puts its faith in government to use conservation to heal the rift between land use and nature (p. 213), yet too often landowners and governments address the symptoms and not the causes of land degradation (pp. 194ff.). Leopold notes the dualistic viewpoint of the egocentric attitude to the world:

Conservationists are notorious for their dissensions. Superficially these seem to add up to mere confusion, but a more careful scrutiny reveals a single plane of cleavage common to many specialized fields. In each field one group (A) regards the land as soil, and its function as commodity-production; another group (B) regards the land as a biota, and its function as something broader (p. 221).

Leopold is discriminating between the responses to nature of different personality types. For example, an extrovert person whose dominant function is sensation might represent group A ('man the conqueror'), and an introvert–intuitive person might represent group B ('man the biotic citizen') (p. 223). Leopold advocates education in ecology for the development of an 'ecological conscience' (p. 221) generally within the community (p. 224). Ecological education will lead to wisdom (p. 187) which will enable people to appreciate the 'biotic right' of each species (p. 211) and the land's 'value in the philosophical sense' (p. 223). He writes that 'the motive force' for people to seek contact with nature is pleasure, and that life's behaviour patterns 'are, in the last analysis, esthetic exercises' (pp. 167ff.). Pleasure, Leopold writes, should be directed away from the primitive forms of conquering and taking 'trophies' from nature towards the experience of nature and thence to the perception and understanding of nature, thereby enabling the 'building of receptivity into the still unlovely human mind' (pp. 167–177).

For Leopold, ecological knowledge is to be used to make ethical judgments in the use of land:

A land ethic, then, reflects the existence of an ecological conscience, and this in turn reflects a conviction of individual responsibility for the health of the land. Health is the capacity of the land for self-renewal. Conservation is our effort to understand and preserve this capacity (p. 221).
Examine each question in terms of what is ethically and esthetically right, as well as what is economically expedient. A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise (pp. 224f.).

Leopold believes that the intellect is capable of acquiring sufficient wisdom to control the ecological processes, at least in the context of preserving nature. He holds to the mandala image of a paradise symbol when he writes: ‘Conservation is a state of harmony between men and land’ (p. 207). Leopold’s emphasis on rationality makes him unaware of his symbolic perception of the world. He sees significance in the whole of nature—the energy of the sun released by the burning oak (p. 7), nature’s pattern of life and death (p. 4), the fundamental existence of life (p. 17), the concepts of ecological unity (p. 22) and the ‘grace’ of nature (p. 34), and the death of the fierce green fire in the eyes of the shot wolf (p. 130)—but its unconscious symbolism dies in rationalism. Yet he searches for the numinosity underlying nature when, for example, he suggests that a change of values and attitude ‘can be achieved by reappraising things unnatural, tame, and confined in terms of things natural, wild, and free’ (p. ix).

Leopold symbolises unity as ‘ecological community’, providence as ‘the land’s cultural harvest’, and sees ethical judgment as their means of linkage (p.viii). He elevates the rational mind to a position of autonomy, thereby maintaining a dichotomy between humans and the world. He makes pertinent criticism of greed-driven and reductionist approaches to land use, but denies the religious dimension of a creator God when he states: ‘There is as yet no ethic dealing with man’s relation to land and to the animals and plants which grow upon it’, and denies the unconscious when he subsumes instinct as a part of ethics (pp. 202f.). The implications of Leopold’s land-ethic philosophy are that land will continue to be differentiated according to use, such as wilderness, reserve, agriculture etc., based on human judgment of ‘value’, and that the ecological characteristics of agricultural land will be considered only in terms of the agriculturalist’s judgment of value, which will be measured by the amount of gain which can be achieved through domination of the ecological process. Ecological potential will be reduced to the constraints of the rational mind.
Passmore
Philosopher John Passmore, in his book *Man's Responsibility for Nature* (1980), attempts to identify the ‘Western traditions which tend to encourage and those which might serve to curb man’s ecological destructiveness’, and to recommend an attitude which might allow a more cooperative human relationship to the land (p. ix). Passmore identified two traditions, ‘man as despot’ and ‘stewardship and co-operation with nature’ (see his chs. 1, 2). The despot tradition is based on the mental attitude that ‘man is free to deal with nature as he pleases, since it exists only for his sake’ (p. 27). Passmore rejects White’s view (White 1967) that this attitude derives from the Judeo–Christian Genesis myth, and states that ‘It is only as a result of Greek influence that Christian theology was led to think of nature as nothing but a system of resources, man’s relationships with which are in no respect subject to moral censure’ (p. 27, cf. p. 17). According to Passmore, the Old Testament tradition tells ‘man that he is...master of the earth’, ‘but at the same time...the world was good before man was created, and...exists to glorify God rather than to serve man’ (p. 27). This tradition allowed both a conservative and a radical interpretation:

This attitude to nature sometimes gave rise to conservative conclusions: nature had been made by God for man’s use and it would be presumptuous of man to think he can improve on God’s handiwork. But it could also be interpreted in a radical way: nature was there for man to modify and transform as he pleases. Bacon and Descartes interpret it in the second way, and their interpretation—although there were objectors—was absorbed into the ideology of modern Western societies...It found expression in a metaphysics, for which man is the sole finite agent and nature a vast system of machines for man to use and modify as he pleases. That is the metaphysics the ecologists are...rejecting (p. 27).

Passmore sees two other minority traditions which deny human despotic rule over nature:

...the tradition that sees him as a ‘steward’, a farm-manager, actively responsible as God’s deputy for the care of the world, and the tradition that sees him as co-operating with nature in an attempt to perfect it (p. 28).

Passmore sees no evidence in the Christian tradition in support of the view that humans should act as stewards over nature (pp. 29ff.). He concludes that:
It is certainly a mistake, indeed, to describe as 'typically Christian' the view that man's duty is to preserve the face of the earth in 'beauty, usefulness and fruitfulness'. One should not be in the least surprised that ecological concern is sometimes condemned as heresy—'a kind of subtle undermining, in its theoretical origins, of the destiny and dignity of man himself' (p. 31).

He sees more potential in the tradition of co-operation with nature, because it offers the potential for the enhancement of nature:

The great virtue of the doctrine that it is man's task to perfect nature by designing *with* it is that it is a half-way house between the despotic view...and the primitivist view that he should do nothing to modify nature, since it is perfect as it is...this way...can...reduce the potentialities of nature to so low a point that they constitute nothing more than the rawest of raw material...[For] other exponents, it can so emphasise preservation as to be scarcely distinguishable from primitivism (pp.38f.).

He claims that the co-operation tradition allows for the possibility of a correct relationship to nature: humanity should study nature to learn better how to design landscapes and use the land to build on the already-achieved forms of human civilization (pp. 39f.).

Passmore dismisses any usefulness of mysticism or religion:

Men do not need religion...In short, the faithful cannot hope by recourse to Revelation, Christian or Muslim, to solve the problems which now confront them. Nor will mysticism help them. There is no substitute for hard thinking...(p. 100)

The way forward is by 'thoughtful action' (p. 184) directed towards the use of the natural world so that 'we should do nothing which will reduce [future] freedom of thought and action, whether by destroying the natural world which makes that freedom possible or the social traditions which permit and encourage it' (p. 195).

Passmore epitomises the rationalist viewpoint: he sees the free and rational mind as the symbol of the essence of cosmic life and the force behind cosmic destiny. His co-operation with nature is nothing more than a relegation of nature, as a symbol of the unrecognised unconscious, to a position of passivity and domination and possession by the ego. 'Only if men can first learn to look sensuously at the world will they learn to care for it' (p. 189), he writes in repudiation of the view that the spirit should rise above nature, but also in denial of
the existence of archetypal instinct and psychological intuition. He sees human
development, according to Aristotelian philosophy, as dependent on the
development of the liberal intellect, and this can occur best in the Western
intellectual, political and moral traditions. Science is to unlock the knowledge
necessary to bring nature to perfection. Passmore sees no need for a new ethical
system—‘conventional morality, without any supplementation whatsoever,
suffices to justify our ecological concern’ (p. 187). Society already holds the view
that injury should not be done to our neighbour and, he states, pollution and
ecological degradation ‘constitute injury to our fellow-men, present and future’ (p.
186ff.).

Passmore’s ecological theory would lead to a continuation of current theory
and practice of land utilisation. He did, however, raise the questions of design in
accordance with nature (his ch. 2) and of the confusion inherent in the concept of
conservation which seeks to combine the incompatible concepts of exploitative use
and preservation (pp. 98ff.). These questions will be discussed further in relation to
Agape theory in section 6.6.

Lovelock

Lovelock’s Gaia theory (Lovelock 1988) is included for analysis because it helps to
illustrate the effects of psychic symbolism on the conscious perception of reality.
The Gaia theory is that the earth is a single living organism which evolves through
the self-regulating interaction between the living organisms and their environments
(including land, water and air) on the surface of the planet. Lovelock sees humans
as ‘just another species, neither the owners nor the stewards of this planet’ (p. 14).
In the context of Jungian psychology, the Gaia theory can be seen as a partial and
distorted view of reality. Lovelock perceives the planetary sphere as a mandala
symbol in the image of the mother-archetype, and hence gives it the name of the
ancient Greek earth goddess. He infuses the earth with the unconsciously projected
archetypal image of the self, so that Gaia, the living earth, symbolises his unknown
psyche. But Lovelock, the rationalist scientist, consciously thinks that the ego is the
totality of the psyche and, consequently, attributes the concept of Gaia only to the
life forms and their physical homes on the crust or surface of the planet, and
ignores the earth’s interior foundation, which prompted a theologian to inquire
of him which he thought came first, life or Gaia (p. 203f.). Lovelock is symbolising
the (recognised) biophysical crust as the ego and the (unrecognised) chthonic world
as the unconscious. Whilst purporting to take 'a planetary perspective' (p. xvii),
Lovelock fragments his view by ignoring the chthonic and the unconscious. He
symbolises the cosmic psychic life force by the image of the sun’s energy and the
psychic process of transformation of archetypal contents into ego-consciousness by
the image of the transformation of solar energy into planetary organic life.
Lovelock appears to hold the Freudian view that the ego is the source of psychic
life in the following symbolisation of the life of the tree and the earth:

...let the image of a giant redwood tree enter your mind. The tree is
undoubtedly alive, yet 99 percent is dead. The great tree is an ancient spire
of dead wood, made of lignin and cellulose by the ancestors of the thin layer
of living cells that go to constitute its bark. How like the Earth, and more so
when we realize that many of the atoms of the rocks far down into the
magma were once part of the ancestral life from which we all have come (p.
27).

This is the reverse of the image of a tree as the extension of the living soil which
provides the foundation to the living parts of the tree (Steiner 1974, pp. 67f.).

Lovelock perceives the world in dichotomy. He divides the world between
the 'autopoietic' (meaning the living systems capable of their own organization,
regeneration, regulation and renewal, which includes the organisms and the
ecosystems), and the non-autopoietic world which includes inanimate matter and
the primitive forms of life. Autopoiesis is the concept of an organism, whether the
cell or the planetary Gaia, interacting with its outer environment and organizing its
inner environment (Lovelock, p. 27) with the objective of sustaining itself (W. Fox
1990, pp. 169f.). Lovelock applies the term Gaia only to the autopoietic world:

I suspect that the origin of Gaia was separate from the origin of life. Gaia did
not awaken until bacteria had already colonized most of the planet. Once
awake, planetary life would assiduously and incessantly resist changes that
might be adverse and act so to keep the planet fit for life (p. 76).

Lovelock perceives Gaia, as Leopold uses ecology, as a symbol of relationship and
unity. He sees consciousness not as a child born from a mother, but as order
conquering chaos:
The tightly coupled evolution of the physical environment and the autopoietic entities of pre-life led to a new order of stability; the state associated with Gaia and with all forms of healthy life. Life and Gaia are to all intents immortal... (p. 219f.)

Lovelock equates Gaia to the life of the surface of the earth and its atmosphere. This is contrary to the mythical meaning of Gaia. The Greeks imagined Gaia as the first-born from chaos, and as the earth deity who created Uranus, the heavenly deity. Morford and Lenardon (1991) quote Homer’s description of Gaia as ‘allmother, deep-rooted and eldest, who nourishes all that that there is in the world’ (p. 46). The underworld was part of Gaia’s domain (cf. Morford & Lenardon, pp. 47, 187; Jung 1967, CW5, paras 265, 315). Lovelock, by contrast, sees Gaia as the ‘new order of stability’ (p. 219f.) which has evolved beyond its dark unknown roots. He likens the underworld of the human imagination to the demons and dragons of ‘older religious belief’ (p. 220). He despiritualises the earth and transfers the idea of the earth goddess from the chthonic realm (the unconscious) to the heavenly realm of light (consciousness). Lovelock sees the projected self as the mandala mother-archetype image—not, however, as the vehicle of confrontation with the unconscious and possible spiritual rebirth, but instead as an absolute in itself, which like the mother, represents the bliss of paradise. Paradise is the ego’s illusion of a reality in autonomy from the unconscious. Lovelock avoids the struggle and tension involved in the confrontation with his inner psyche by holding to Gaia as the image of the good and of harmonious relationships. Humans can participate in this harmony, he says, by enlightened knowledge which will enable the right choices of use of the land. These will be propitiatory towards Gaia and thereby avoid her wrath and continue to invite her beneficence (cf. p. 212).

He appropriates religion as part of the Gaia scientific theory because, then, both religion and science are ‘manageable’ (p. 206), illustrating his exaltation of the ego. But here is the paradox of the egocentric view: Lovelock attributes no pre-eminence to humans among the species (p. 14) yet seeks to make the earth into a home fit for each individual to live, albeit temporarily, a happy life (p. 236f.). ‘How should we live in harmony with Gaia?’ he asks (p. 225). We must obey, not transgress, her rules (p. 212), ‘It all depends on you and me’ (p. 236). So Lovelock suggests a ‘gentle’ (p. 232) relationship to a paradisal land which he sees as the
landscape differentiated between specific uses:

...small, densely populated cities...At least one-third of the land should revert to natural woodland and heath...Some land would be open to people for recreation; but one-sixth, at least, should be 'derelict', private to wildlife only. Farming would be a mixture of intensive production ...and small unsubsidized farms for those with the vocation of living in harmony with the land (p. 231).

Deep Ecology and Transpersonal Ecology

In 1972 Norwegian philosopher, Arne Naess, formulated the concept of deep ecology to describe the human relationship to nature (W. Fox 1990, p. 37). In their book Deep Ecology Devall and Sessions (1985) introduce the concept of deep ecology, as a response to 'the continuing environmental crisis', with the following statements:

Many philosophers and theologians are calling for a new ecological philosophy...

We believe, however, that we may not need something new, but need to reawaken something very old, to reawaken our understanding of Earth wisdom. In the broadest sense, we need to accept the invitation to the dance—the dance of unity of humans, plants, animals, the Earth. We need to cultivate an ecological consciousness.

...we encourage introspection, purification and harmony, and a dancing celebration or affirmation of all being...We...present an ecological, philosophical, spiritual approach for dealing with the crisis.

Deep Ecology is an invitation to thinking...(pp. ixf.)

Deep ecology is emerging as a way of developing a new balance and harmony between individuals, communities and all of Nature (p. 7).

Warwick Fox, in his book Toward a Transpersonal Ecology: Developing New Foundations for Environmentalism (1990), identifies three criteria of deep ecology. First is deeper questioning. This comprises the asking of progressively deeper questions about the human–nature relationship. Asking 'why and/or how questions...eventually takes one beyond the realm of the everyday, the technical, and the scientific and into the realm of the philosophical' (Fox, p. 92). Fox writes that Naess used the deep questioning process to reveal 'bedrock or end-of-
the-line assumptions' which Naess termed 'fundamentals' because they uncovered 'man's attitude towards nature, industrial man's attitude towards non-industrial cultures, and the ecological aspect of widely different economic systems' (Fox, pp. 92ff.). Fox emphasises that deep ecology means the process of deep questioning (irrespective of the outcome of the logical inquiry). Naess, however, restricted the meaning to (or assumed the outcome would automatically be) the gaining of ecological wisdom (Fox, pp. 94f.).

Fox identifies the second criterion of deep ecology as philosophy. He notes that Naess was influenced by the philosophy of Gandhi, for whom 'the liberation of the individual human being was his supreme aim' (Fox, p. 108). Fox quotes Gandhi:

What I want to achieve...is self-realisation, to see God face to face...I live and move and have my being in pursuit of that goal...Life is an aspiration. Its mission is to strive after perfection, which is self-realisation...Man is not at peace with himself till he has become like unto God. The endeavour to reach this state is the supreme, the only ambition worth having. (p. 109)

Fox notes that Naess rejects the idea of a transcendent God and views the visible world as total reality (p. 106). Naess sees the goal for each person to be 'the this-worldly realization of as expansive a sense of self as possible' (p. 106). For Naess, the 'self' refers to the 'narrow, atomistic, particle-like, or egoic' person who seeks 'self-aggrandisement' whereas, by contrast, the 'Self' (capital S, but not Jung's self) refers to the 'wide, expansive, field-like, or non-egoic' person who has sought to 'understand the world and our place in it' which leads to identification 'with the world of which we are a part' (p. 106).

The third criterion is the ecological perspective. In contrast to the anthropocentric view, Naess (and other ecophilosophers) adopts a viewpoint of 'ecocentric egalitarianism' (p. 117), with the objective of 'The well-being and flourishing of human and non-human life on Earth...' (p. 114). With the development of an ecological conscience Naess saw moral codes and systems of ethics as redundant, as people would act spontaneously in a harmonious way towards nature because they would be aware of the intrinsic value of nature and would value it 'for its own sake' (p. 223ff.).

As the Naess concept of self-realisation 'is one that involves the
realisation of a sense of self that extends beyond one's egoic, biographical, or personal sense of self, Fox suggests the term 'transpersonal ecology' instead of deep ecology (p. 197). His term conveys the meaning that the personality, aware of its relationship to its ecological environment, is changed fundamentally in character and in attitude to itself and nature (pp. 198f.). Transpersonal ecology emphasises the attitudinal change from the egocentric to that of the 'Self', and the spontaneity of behaviour towards nature, as illustrated in the following statements of Naess cited by Fox:

Care flows naturally if the 'self' is widened and deepened so that protection of free Nature is felt and conceived as protection of ourselves...Just as we need not morals to make us breathe...[so] if your 'self' in the wide sense embraces another being, you need no moral exhortation to show care...You care for yourself without feeling any moral pressure to do it—provided you have not succumbed to a neurosis of some kind, developing self-destructive tendencies, or hating yourself (p. 217).

If reality is like it is experienced by the ecological self, our behaviour naturally and beautifully follows norms of strict environmental ethics...Through identification [which, Fox adds, 'is the key term in transpersonal ecology'] they may come to see their own interest served by conservation, through genuine self-love, love of a deepened and widened self (p. 218f.).

The deep (and transpersonal) ecologists state that they hold utopian visions of how humans should live in nature (see Devall & Sessions 1985, ch. 5). They advocate more emphasis on wilderness landscapes and, while not rejecting urban life and modern science, often advocate the incorporation of ancient primitive forms of relating to the land into the present world. Shepard (quoted by Devall & Sessions, pp. 172ff.) extends the idea of ecological egalitarianism to the advocacy of the termination of all agriculture except for hunting and gathering. He further suggests a strict differentiation of land according to use so that large areas might be retained as wilderness. Devall and Sessions note the following components of Shepard's utopian view: 'almost all forms of farming together with genetically-altered plants and animals must go'; 'it is necessary for our physical and emotional health that we incorporate into our lives the central features of a hunting/gathering way of life (rituals, exercise, etc.).'; on the assumption (or plan?) that the
world’s population will stabilise at eight billion by the year 2020, the population should be dispersed in cities of 50,000 inhabitants ‘in narrow ribbons along the edges of the continents and islands while the center of the continents would be allowed to return to the wild’; most of the food would be derived from ‘biochemistry and microbial biology’ and people would make expeditions on foot into the wilderness for education, hunting and gathering. Shepard rejects the psychological views that primitive people identified with nature by psychological projection, and that modern people, by withdrawal of some of these projections, have despiritualised the landscape and have thus become divorced from it (cf. Jung 1964, pp. 6f., 39f.). Shepard rejects also mystical experience; ‘...mystical experience is hardly a way of advancing to a mature life on this earth’ (quoted in Devall & Sessions, p. 174).

Deep ecology has therefore taken us further from the goal of a sustainable agriculture and instead has formulated a paradise image of relationship to the land, either by ‘a non-land-based subsistence’ (Shepard quoted in Devall, p.174) or by spontaneous, natural and beautiful actions in harmony with the land. The deep ecologists see nature as a symbol of their repressed unconscious in an extreme example of egocentricity. They assume the ego can possess the ‘other’, whether the unconscious or its symbol as nature. The ego projects the unassimilated psychic centre (Jung’s self) onto the environment, which the deep ecologists take to be nature in general; that is nature symbolises the mother–archetype in which paradise is thought to reside.

The eco-philosophers reject the spiritual, and attempt to establish the ego as the centre of cosmic life and to possess nature as part of the rational intellect. Divorced from the inner psychic centre, their only contact with nature is via unconsciously projected symbols characteristic of the egocentric psyche.

Theories derived from agricultural practice

Two examples of theory derived from agricultural practice are reviewed in this section. Mollison’s theory of permaculture is included because it was formulated as a sustainable alternative to the conventional large-scale mechanised practices which are considered generally to degrade the land. The Potter Farmland Plan, as described by Campbell (1991), is included because it synthesises
conventional theory into a scheme also directed towards sustainability.

**Permaculture**

Mollison, in part collaboration with Holmgren, developed the permaculture theory, commencing in the early 1970s. The primary aim of permaculture (permanent agriculture and permanent culture) (Mollison 1994, p. 1) is 'to stabilise and care for land' (Mollison 1988, p. ix). Mollison (1988) defines permaculture as:

> ...the conscious design and maintenance of agriculturally productive ecosystems which have the diversity, stability, and resilience of natural ecosystems. It is the harmonious integration of landscape and people providing their food, energy, shelter, and other material and non-material needs in a sustainable way (p. ix).

He sees cities as ecologically sterile, inefficient in energy use, and polluting through their waste outputs; and the large mechanised farms also as inefficient in use of energy and resources and degrading of land and ecological systems.

Permaculture is based on the small-scale and intensive food-producing (family) living unit which would use low to medium technology and would require low levels of energy inputs both within the units and, communally, between the units. Individual farms would aim for self-reliance in food and energy. Populations would be organised into an almost tribal pattern of villages (Mollison 1994, p. 177) aggregated into bioregional associations where the regions might be defined according to 'watershed', 'remnant or existing tribal or language boundaries', 'town boundaries' etc. Mollison suggests regional populations of between 7000 and 40,000 which would progressively develop the permaculture principles towards a state of self-sufficiency: any surpluses could be traded between the regions (Mollison 1988, pp. 510ff.). Mollison is not averse to environmental change and is not a preservationist, rather he sees ecological health in the increase of the biological resource:

> As much as 'the will to do' indicates health in the individual, so an increasing biological resource indicates health in the community...If no increase, or a decrease, is evident, something is wrong...

> It is only the increase in the variety, quantity, and health of natural systems that indicates the health of any area...Modifications to habitat can result in a constantly increasing biological resource, both qualitatively...
Permaculture comprises a mythical cosmicisation of the landscape—in the ancient pattern of the centre-of-the-world where the landscape is transformed unconsciously into mandala patterns. Each household, village, and bioregion forms a sacred space centred on an *axis mundi*. In the habited sanctuaries, the land and ecological systems are transformed into forms suitable for human purposes. As in any egocentric attitude, there is a fear of the unknown (the dragon or devouring mother unconscious) and Mollison, therefore, advocates cautious use of resources and regulation of population numbers and human ‘appetites’ (Mollison 1994, p. 20). He extends the propitiatory attitude even further: he states that almost all the presently settled (urban) and agricultural lands require ‘drastic rehabilitation and re-thinking’:

One certain result of using our skills to integrate food supply and settlement...will be to free most of the area of the globe for the rehabilitation of natural systems. These need never to be looked upon as ‘of use to people’, except in the very broad sense of global health.

...Household design relates principally to the needs of people; it is thus human-centred (anthropocentric).

This is a valid aim for *settlement design*, but we also need a nature-centred ethic for wilderness conservation...we can withdraw from much of the agricultural landscape, and allow natural systems to flourish (Mollison 1988, pp. 6f).

He thus dichotomises the landscape into the humanised landscape and the natural landscape, as the ancients saw their land as sacred against wilderness in the reflection of ego and unconscious. Permaculture uses the mandala pattern of centralisation in the design of the settled landscapes, whether at the house, farm, or village scale. Land use is arranged in concentric zones, ranging from the most intensively human-managed areas in the centre, through progressively less managed and controlled areas, to the outer zone of wilderness where human involvement is as a visitor, not manager (Mollison 1988, p. 57; 1994, p. 11). Mollison recognises that the ideal needs to be modified in the actual landscape (1994, p. 9); nevertheless the mandala represents a superimposition of an unconscious image onto the natural landscape.
Permaculture is a system of applied ecology which contains many innovative techniques for efficient use of energy and natural resources and combines the thinking of a wide range of agricultural practitioners into a coherent scheme. Mollison symbolises the concept of creativity by the idea of increase in ecological fertility, but he leaves no doubt that humankind controls the process of fertility. Mythically, he identifies with the sun-god who usurped the control of nature through conquest. He sees rational knowledge alone as the propitiatory means of renewal of the sun-god’s efficacy. Mollison’s emphasis on rationalism elevates information and quality of thought to the status of an alchemical tool for the bringing of a site’s resources to higher creativity (1994, pp. 31f.). He adopts ‘a life ethic, which recognises the intrinsic worth of every living thing’ (1994, p. 3), from which he formulates three ethics of permaculture: care for the earth and provision for all life systems to continue and multiply; care of people and provision of their access to necessary resources; and the setting of limits to population and consumption (1988, p. 3). He writes, ‘...enlightened self-interest leads us to evolve ethics of sustainable and sensible behaviour’: through self-interest the area of concern is widened to include the conservation of the natural systems (1988, p. 3).

**Potter Farmland Plan**

In his book *Planning for Sustainable Development: The Potter Farmland Plan Story* (1991), Andrew Campbell describes the theory behind the development in Victoria during the 1980s of demonstration farms for sustainable agricultural practice. The Potter Farmland Plan was a significant contribution to the decision by the Federal Government in 1989 to support the Landcare project aimed at the rehabilitation of Australia's rural land (p. 191). Campbell outlines the extent of the degradation of Australia's agricultural land as a basis for the need for the Potter Plan (pp. 2f.). When discussing the pioneers’ extensive clearing of the native forests, Campbell adds:

> We can smile at or wistfully regret the mistakes of the old-timers, but they were operating according to the conventional wisdom and prevailing community attitudes of the day—not just among farmers, but throughout the community. Clearing was not only good, it was an essential pastime for good farmers. The communal image of the ‘good farm’ was one laid out on the
square like a chequerboard, cleared from fence to fence, with perhaps some
conifer hedgerows to accentuate the regularity, and...a formal avenue along
the driveway...These attitudes die hard, and are still prevalent today,
encouraged and exemplified by legislation. It was only during the 1980s that
the tax concessions for clearing were removed! (p. 14)

Demonstration farms were selected from existing farms in areas showing a
range of ‘farm types and land degradation problems’ (p. 12). The farms, therefore,
had existing patterns of layout and production. The Potter Plan sought to review
these patterns with the objective of achieving sustainability. Campbell makes the
following comments on sustainable farming:

Broadly, sustainable farming systems must meet the needs of current
generations without compromising the ability of future generations to meet
their needs.

Farming systems must also be economically viable, which means that the
concept of sustainability embraces the balance between conservation and
productivity—they are inextricable in the long term.

A sustainable farming system is one which is profitable and maintains the
productive capacity of the land while minimising energy and resource use
and optimising recycling of matter and nutrients.

Sustainability...is a moving target for which we must continually adjust
our aim with better knowledge and changing economic and physical
circumstances. But it is possible to judge the relative degrees of
sustainability of certain practices and systems, and to strive for improvement
(p. 4).

Campbell’s theory follows the discriminatory pattern of the egocentric attitude
where the world is seen in dichotomies. For example, he sees the needs of current
generations against those of future generations, and the objectives of conservation
against those of agricultural production, so that these dichotomies need to be
brought, through compromise, into balance. Campbell’s thinking appears to
exemplify the process of psychological projection where an archetypal idea which
is not assimilated by the ego is projected onto a symbolic idea. In this case, the
archetypal idea of psychic energy being continually given by the unconscious to
enliven the ego appears to be not understood and, consequently, is projected onto
the concept of sustainability—which the egocentric attitude perceives mythically
as attainable only through propitiatory renewal. Campbell sees sustainability as embracing the ideas of harmony between humans and nature, and of permanency or immortality. Sustainable agriculture is, therefore, a mandala or paradise image (initiated unconsciously by the archetype of reconciliation or wholeness). Sustainability represents the goal of human perfection and Campbell, like Mollison, assumes that the way to the goal is through rational knowledge and 'enlightened self-interest' (p. 171). Campbell states that 'we already have the necessary knowledge and examples [i.e. the demonstration farms] from which to learn' to achieve sustainable agriculture (p. 3). By this he means that we have the skills and techniques, but to apply these we continually need to acquire more knowledge of nature (e.g. on land types (pp. 62. 175) ) as our propitiation to our Promethean-theft of control of nature.

The Potter scheme sought to overcome the limitations of the reductionist approach in which only the symptoms of degradative agricultural practice are addressed, by adopting the holistic method of 'whole farm plans' (p. 6; pp. 33ff.). Campbell writes:

Whole farm plans provide a framework for blending ecological principles into agricultural systems (p. 34).

Farm management should aim to incorporate the elements of existing natural systems which convey the stability, resilience and ability to recover from disturbance which characterise a sustainable system. (p. 36)

The plans attempt to blend 'agriculture with applied ecology' (p. 8). They give priority to the agricultural systems and selectively incorporate ecological principles judged to be beneficial to the sustainability of these systems. The planners appear to be identifying themselves mythically with the sun-god who creates by bringing order to the chaos of nature. Agriculture is the weapon of sacrifice, and ecology is the propitiatory ritual designed to renew their control over the conquered nature. Their relationship to the land reflects their assumed egocentric domination of the unconscious.

The Potter planners' propitiatory use of applied ecology is exemplified by their use of land units as a basis for agricultural planning. Land units have commonality of soil type, aspect, slope, drainage and vegetation. The planners
assume that agriculture will degrade the land. Accordingly, they attempt to match
types of use to particular land units as a precautionary measure to minimise the
potential degradation, and advocate the supplementary use of soil conservation
practices to protect the land from damage by the natural elements. It appears that
the planners fragment their view of the total landscape into projected mandala
images of the self. Each land unit, then, represents a mother-symbol or temenos.
However, when the planners do not recognise the land-unit image’s symbolic
purpose, they perceive it (unconsciously) according to the myth of the sun-god
cosmicising the land by conquering nature at this centre; thereafter, they have to
ritually continue to protect the land from being overcome by the natural elements,
through precautionary use and protective works. Some land units, however, are
considered so vulnerable to degradation that they are fenced-off and revegetated
and virtually taken out of the normal farm practice. These areas can provide
incidental benefits of remnant habitats and of limited control of erosion and
salinisation etc. However, the plans are manifestations of the view that agriculture
and nature comprise a dichotomy, and differentiate between land brought under
control, and land which threatens permanent human settlement.

6.4 RELIGIOUS THEORIES IN EROS MOTIF

This section contains analyses of theories on the human–land relationship which
acknowledge the religious factor. In dealing with each theory, it will be shown
why each has been categorised within the Eros religious motif (and the egocentric
attitude with its associated psychological symbolism). Discussed first is St. Francis
of Assisi. He was not a theorist per se but rather a poet and a friar whose life
example is the subject of many commentaries from which Francis’ thinking,
together with its religious motif and symbolism, can be analysed. Francis is
included because of the pre-eminence attributed to him regarding a correct
relationship to nature (e.g. White 1967). This is followed by analysis of the theory
of Teilhard de Chardin who attempted, from the combination of a scientific and a
theological perspective, to formulate a cosmological theory from which the
human–land relationship could be deduced. It is the coherence and
comprehensiveness of Teilhard’s theory on the human place within the cosmos
which makes it pertinent to this study. Next considered is the cosmological theory of Rudolf Steiner, not only because it also seeks to define the human place in the cosmos, but also because Steiner deduced from his cosmology an agricultural theory known as biodynamic agriculture. To conclude the section, the writings of Matthew Fox and Paul Collins are considered as representatives of modern theologians who have attempted to address the question of the environmental crisis.

**St. Francis of Assisi**

White (1967) proposed Francis as ‘a patron saint for ecologists’, and Cousins stated ‘[Francis is] considered the prime example of a nature mystic in the history of Christianity’ (quoted in Sorrell 1988, p. 89). Chesterton (1949) writes that Francis ‘came forth one of the strongest and strangest and most original personalities that human history has known’ (p. 94).

Francis lived in the late-twelfth and early-thirteenth centuries. He chose to avoid the temptations of life, and even of the life in a monastery, by adopting a wandering ascetic life in which he tried to imitate Christ through his vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. Chesterton notes that Francis saw God’s grace as ‘an infinite debt’ and chose asceticism as the means to repay the debt:

> [Debt] is the key of all problems of Franciscan morality which puzzle the merely modern mind; but above all it is the key to asceticism. It is the highest and holiest of the paradoxes that the man who really knows he cannot pay his debt will be forever paying it. He will be for ever giving back what he cannot give back...(Chesterton 1949, p. 90)

Francis’ pious and propitiatory outlook is shown by Chesterton’s statement:

> ...St. Francis was not thinking of martyrdom as a means to an end, but almost as an end in itself; in the sense that to him the supreme end was to come closer to the example of Christ...I have not suffered enough; I have not sacrificed enough...He wandered about the valleys of the world looking for the hill that has the outline of a skull (Chesterton 1949, pp. 142f.).

Francis belonged to the medieval tradition which saw the role of the saint as conquering evil and restoring the pre-Fall paradise. Paradise, however, could only be attained by propitiatory sacrifice. Francis offered his body as a sacrifice to God; he also constantly praised God as creator in propitiatory ritual. Sorrell (1988) raises the question whether Francis’ *Canticle of Brother Sun* was an exhortation to
humanity to give praise to God for the created world (Sorrell's preferred interpretation), or an invocation to the creation to give thanks to God (Sorrell, ch. 6). Either way the *Canticle* focuses on the idea of praise which, etymologically, is linked to the word *prize*. Praise, therefore, can be seen as a propitiatory action designed to win the goal of salvation, with the implication that God is separate from both humans and nature. Sacrifice of the evil spirits in humans and in nature was seen as necessary to appease God and win the prize. Sacrifice of the evil side of nature was essential to survival on the land:

An ascetic ideal was the original stimulus in evolving a philosophy of man as a creator of new environments. The early saints purposefully retired from the world, and they fancied that by their clearings they were re-creating the earthly paradise, re-asserting the complete dominion over all life that existed before the Fall...taming the wild was a part of the religious experience (Glacken quoted by Sorrell 1988, p. 4).

The ascetics also sought to tame the evil within themselves. This is illustrated when Chesterton interprets Bonaventura as suggesting that Francis saw his vision of the seraph to mean the crucifixion of Francis' own soul:

St. Francis beheld the heavens above him occupied by a vast winged being like a seraph spread out like a cross. There seems some mystery about whether the winged figure was itself crucified or in the posture of crucifixion, or whether it merely enclosed in its frame of wings some colossal crucifix...This seraphic suffering, it is said, pierced his soul with a sword of grief and pity; it may be inferred that some sort of mounting agony accompanied the ecstasy. Finally after...the agony within subsided...he saw the marks of nails in his own hands (Chesterton 1949, pp. 151f.).

Francis related to the land and the creatures in a different manner to some other ascetics. For example the Cistercian Order, according to Sorrell, looked on raw nature with horror as they considered that nature, like humanity, had fallen into sin after the sins of Adam and Eve. The Cistercians saw their task as restoring nature to its pre-Fall paradisal perfection where all creation existed in harmony. The Cistercians emphasised 'the practical and technical domination of creation, in a systematic manner, for its use by mankind' (Sorrell 1988, pp. 32–36). By contrast, Francis refused to impose on the environment in any large-scale or systematic way. The eremetic life of the Franciscan Order allowed this, whereas the
settled monastic life of other orders did not (Sorrell, p. 37). Francis, writes Sorrell, used creation on three levels: the symbolic, aesthetic and utilitarian (p. 123). Francis saw the creatures and elements of creation as manifestations of God in their behaviour and their beauty; they were imitating Christ (p.48). Nature, however, was created for the benefit of humans. Because of his propitiatory outlook, Francis did not use nature fully but rather identified with it to the extent that others considered him to have the power of miraculous control over nature. Thus, whereas others sought a physical control over nature, Francis sought a spiritual, almost God-like, control over creation.

Teilhard de Chardin
Teilhard, a theologian and a palaeontologist, saw the earth as an integrated physico-psychic organism in a state of genesis. He thought all matter was impregnated by a ‘within’, a psychic quality which, in organisms, provided the essence of life. Teilhard considered the highest achievement of cosmogenesis to be, currently, the human faculty of conscious or reflective thought. Teilhard made two basic assumptions for his theory of cosmogenesis: (i) that the ‘psychic’ and ‘thought’ had the position of primacy in ‘the stuff of the universe’; and (ii) that the social ‘phenomenon of man’ was an integral part of the biological stage of the evolution of the cosmos (Teilhard 1965. p. 30).

Teilhard extrapolated from his understanding of evolution and of theology to the idea of a cosmos moving from its present physico-psychic stage to a future psychic phase comprising a higher consciousness which he termed the noosphere. Thus he saw the physical world, including humankind, as a vehicle for the growth of the world spirit to a condition of knowing itself. Through evolution, organisms underwent ‘complexification’, for example from a unicellular to a polycellular state in which the cells have differentiated functions. The highest currently existing form of cellular differentiation is in the human brain, which is capable of reflective thought. Teilhard distinguished between two types of evolution, divergence and convergence. Divergence occurs in all non-human species and is illustrated, like the branches growing from a tree trunk, by the emergence of new species from a basic stock through the development of differentiating characteristics. The human species, however, exhibits convergence, because the uniquely conscious human
mind allows interaction of thought between different time periods and different contemporary cultures. This allows the development of a world consciousness, a 'harmonised collectivity of consciousness equivalent to a sort of super-consciousness' in which 'each element sees, feels, desires and suffers for itself the same things as all the others at the same time' (1965, p. 251). The sphericity of the earth and the increasing world population make this convergence of thought inevitable (1965, e.g. pp. 251ff., 259).

Teilhard sees the cosmogenic goal as the aggregation of individual souls or 'grains of consciousness' with the centre of the world spirit, the 'Omega Point', within the noosphere. The egos do not, however, lose their identity by coalescing into an undifferentiated mass but, rather, 'accentuate their depth and incommunicability' (p. 262). The noosphere becomes 'a system whose unity coincides with a paroxysm of harmonised complexity':

By its structure Omega, in its ultimate principle, can only be a distinct centre radiating at the core of a system of centres: a grouping in which personalisation of the All and personalisations of the elements reach their maximum, simultaneously and without merging, under the influence of a supremely autonomous focus of union [the Omega Point] (1965, pp. 262f.).

Teilhard thus sees personalisation as an advanced stage of evolution beyond individuality. It develops through the ego coming to know the universal beyond itself and, through convergence, centring all its knowing back onto itself. Accordingly, he names cosmogenesis by the alternative term centrogenesis to emphasise that the process involves a centring of thought on the cosmic Omega, and a reflecting of this new cosmic awareness back on the ego (1971, pp. 104ff.). The personalised ego has then become its own cosmic centre and is capable of interacting through love with other personalised ego-centres for the purpose of advancing cosmic evolution towards a higher consciousness.

Teilhard's theory of cosmogenesis is based on the views that humankind is 'the leading shoot of evolution' (1965, p. 36) and reflective thought provides the way for evolution. Accordingly, he states 'I have chosen man as the centre, and around him I have tried to establish a coherent order between antecedents and consequences' (1965, p. 29).

Teilhard's theory is egocentric. He ignores the unconscious and the
irrational as psychic phenomena and considers only the conscious ego and rationality as means for advancing cosmogenesis. He denies the guidance of the spirit and, in his book *Activation of Energy*, does not acknowledge Jungian psychology, but refers only to the Freudian psycho-analytical aim of ridding the mind of ‘suppressions and complexes’ (1971, pp. 176f). More important, says Teilhard, is the ‘constructive’ task:

By this I mean helping the subject to decipher, in the as yet ill-explored and imperfectly cleared-up areas of himself, the great aspirations...(the sense of the irreversible, the sense of the cosmos, the sense of the earth, the sense of man). It is the converse operation to [psycho-analysis]. I mean psycho-analysing not in order to bring something out but to put something in...(1971, p. 177)

For Teilhard, psychic development comprises the bringing of external sensory knowledge into the rational mind. Development to cosmic awareness depends on making the right ethical choice.

Teilhard’s theory is constrained within egocentric psychological symbolism. In seeking to consolidate his rationalism, he is symbolically slaying the unconscious by seeing the world of matter as the ‘terrible mother’ from whom the spirit must strive to extricate itself and ascend to the perfection of the distant God. His Omega Point represents a psychological projection of his unacknowledged psychic centre and is a symbolic *axis mundi*, which he actually describes as an ‘axis’ (1971, p. 100) and a ‘pole’ (1965, pp. 271, 291). He sees the whole cosmos through the projected mandala images of the self archetype: the centres range from the smallest particles of matter and the organic cells to the human ego-centres, and to the cosmic centre or Omega Point. He sees the cosmos as comprising a series of concentric spherical layers culminating in the outermost noosphere, with all the layers being bound by a radial interaction, thus representing a cosmic-scale mandala tied to a centre (1971, pp. 99–127).

Teilhard perceives the projected mandala image also as a symbol of paradise in the future heaven (1971, p. 113) or the noosphere at the end of the material world (1965, p. 273). Perfection, for Teilhard, is a state of harmony (e.g. 1965, p. 221) with the Omega. Having ascended to the peak of higher consciousness, the individual can look ‘downwards’, take in the pattern of the
whole...the harmony is perfect' (p. 221).

The implications of Teilhard’s theory of cosmology for a theory on the human—land relationship have to be inferred because he struggled to state this relationship explicitly. As a result of his rationalist attitude he projected images of the archetype of wholeness as symbols of harmony. As a child, Teilhard saw objects of nature as symbols of the self: he states that he derived religious feelings when contemplating his ‘idols’ such as iron, shells, flames and translucent crystals, all of which suggested something of the eternal (1964, pp. 17f.). He states that he adopted an ascetic and mystical attitude because, rather than seeing nature and matter only as evil, he saw matter as something from which one had to both ascend spiritually and to receive physical nourishment and the inspiration for the spiritual ascent (1964, p. 106). While acknowledging the spiritual ‘within’ of matter, Teilhard, like the alchemists, sought to extract the spiritual substance from the material (1964, pp. 97, 109). Christian asceticism, he says, begins with acknowledgement of the goal of achieving human perfection in imitation of the beauty of creation as a reflection of the divine good (1964, pp. 96f.). Teilhard seeks to deny the dark, evil side of life, and interprets Christ’s crucifixion as a symbol of the world’s task to reject the material and be transformed spiritually (1964, pp. 14, 101–104). People, also, have to rise above nature to become spiritual (by which he means rational) beings:

Anyone whose aim, in conquering the earth, has really been to subject a little more matter to spirit has, surely, begun to take leave of himself at the same time as taking possession of himself (1964, p. 97).

Teilhard’s rationalism leads him to humanise the Cross and to spiritualise matter (1964, p. 105). Teilhard sees joy and rejoicing in the awareness of the beauty of creation (1965, p. 203) which, however, must be balanced by the use of nature in a minimum way through the ethical choice of prudence (1964, p. 100n.).

Matter, for Teilhard, is the symbol of the unconscious which the ego has to conquer to achieve its own perfection. But once conquered it must be touched and handled ‘with a proper sense of reverence’ (1964, p. 107), which means that it should serve as a symbolic centre for the ego’s divine ascent:

...the task assigned to us is to climb towards the light, passing through, so as
to attain God, a given series of created things which are not exactly obstacles but rather foot-holds, intermediaries to be made use of, nourishment to be taken, sap to be purified and elements to be associated with us and borne along with us (1964, p. 108).

Teilhard thought in the dualistic mode of the egocentric attitude. Consequently, he divorced the ego from the irrational part of the psyche, sought to spiritualise the rational mind, and symbolised matter as the unknown unconscious.

Bio-Dynamic Agriculture

Rudolf Steiner formulated a scientific—religious cosmology to explain the human relationship to the world and nature (cf. Shepherd 1954, pp. 19, 203). From this, he derived his theory of bio-dynamic agriculture aimed at sustainability (Steiner 1974, pp. 29, 141).

Steiner called his cosmology Spiritual Science or Anthroposophy because it is based on the perfecting of people as the way forward in cosmic evolution. Steiner, as quoted by Shepherd, defines his philosophy thus: ‘Anthroposophy is a path of knowledge, to guide the spiritual in the human being to the spiritual in the universe’ (Shepherd, p. 171). Shepherd comments that Anthroposophy has the view that ‘whereas formerly the divine wisdom was imparted by the divine world itself to man, now man himself, by divine grace, must transmute his earth-born thinking to the higher level of divine wisdom, by the true understanding of himself’ (Shepherd, p. 73). Shepherd states that Steiner saw Christ as ‘the pivotal fact’ in the evolution of world history (pp. 54, 56, 63). However, Steiner adopts the rationalist view that Christ was merely an example whose spiritual ascent people have to learn to imitate through concentrated meditation and the development of higher rational thinking.

Steiner’s cosmic view is reflected in the psychological symbolism of bio-dynamic agriculture. Steiner was psychically alive to the primacy of the spiritual over the material existence. However, he assumed that the ego was the centre of the psyche and, consequently, projected the mother-archetype onto land and agriculture. He saw agriculture symbolically as a means of slaying the mythical mother and achieving autonomy (cf. Steiner 1923, p. 209). The aim of agriculture, he says, is to channel the astral forces (‘ego-potentiality’ or soul) into the substance
of the earth comprising matter and ‘etheric-body’ (spirit) (cf. Steiner 1974, pp. 29–33). Humans who have attained higher consciousness are able to control the process of bringing the astral forces to the earth by the wisdom of bio-dynamic agriculture. In humans, much of the life-force of food goes, according to Steiner, into ego development, whereas in animals with their less developed brain, most of the ego-potential of the food is excreted as dung (pp. 139ff.). Hence, in bio-dynamic agriculture, animal manure is fundamentally important as it allows the earthly etheric life now transformed by the astral forces in the process of growth of the fodder plants to be redistributed to the earth. The etheric life symbolises the basic instincts of the unconscious, and the astral life symbolises the archetypes which give structure and form to the instincts. Important to bio-dynamic agriculture is the making of compost as a medium of astral-enlivened etheric life. Different preparations such as sprays are also made in which the liquid is mixed in prescribed spiral patterns (mandala patterns having symbolic cosmic significance), and sprays containing crushed mineral such as quartz which is said to concentrate light into the soil (Podolinsksy 1985, pp. 128–136, 152–156; Steiner 1974, e.g. pp. 26, 75).

Steiner sees the cosmos in dichotomies and sees the unconscious urge towards integration, symbolically, through the concept of ‘mutual interactions’ (1974, e.g. p. 125). For example, he divides the heavens into the ‘Cosmos’, comprising the distant planets, and the near or earthly planets. The distant planets (symbolising the unconscious) supply light and the living warmth (etheric life) to the underground soil and rock; the near planets (approximately symbolising the conscious) supply a dead form of light and warmth to the air and water of the earth’s surface. Steiner appears to see the quartz crystal as a symbol of the self and thus sees the earth’s siliceous material as the collecting container for cosmic forces coming to the earth. But these can only become expressed in life forms by combination with the astral forces. The aim of bio-dynamic agriculture is to achieve human control of the astralisation of the cosmic life-force, symbolising the ego’s desire to control the unconscious.

Bio-dynamic agriculture is similar to medieval alchemy in that it seeks to ‘redeem’ the cosmic life-force from matter for the benefit of the world. Alchemists
and the bio-dynamic advocates project the self onto the world; their goal is to bring the cosmic spirit to life within the material object, a symbol of their own psyche. Both groups see the earth mythically as a symbol of the slain earth monster, and are trying to consolidate their consciousness by taking control of the life-force which can then be used to redeem the life of the earth in symbolic simulation of Christ’s redemption of the world’s sin (cf. Jung, 1968c, CW12, paras 451f.). Their egocentred attitude sees the maternal unconscious only as the object to be dominated, not as the nurturing good mother. Steiner’s philosophy of good overpowering evil (i.e. the ego conquering the unconscious) is indicated by his seeing the earthworms as regulators or protectors against the evil chthonic mother represented by the rampant and over-strong ethereal life of the soil (1974, p. 129). In alchemy and bio-dynamic agriculture, physical work is a manifestation of the unconsciously motivated action towards symbolic reintegration (i.e. the redemption) of the ego with the unconscious. But the action is not conscious of the psychic meaning and is, consequently, egocentric. In bio-dynamic imagery, the quartz crystal symbolises the ordering of the cosmic chaos as the self; the composts, especially those stored in cow horns and the ritually prepared sprays, symbolise the fertility of the mother-symbol. The composts resemble ‘the black, magically fecund earth [unconscious] that Adam took with him from Paradise’ (Jung 1968c, CW12, para. 433). The bio-dynamic theorists polarise the psyche into the slain mother and the fertilising sky-god. They aspire, through the ‘knowledge of the higher worlds’ (Steiner 1923), to become, like the sky-gods, the fertilisers of the earth, and thereby to achieve the perfection and harmony of paradise (cf. Shepherd 1954, ch. 9).

For Steiner, the purpose of agriculture is to provide nutrition for the human will (1974, pp. 7, 67). He sought to understand all the domains of nature so that he could take in hand, and control, nature’s ‘working forces’ (1974, pp. 118f.): ‘... we must till the soil and manure it properly. Heaven does not give these things of her own accord’ (p. 89). Steiner sees rationality as the heavenly ladder: ‘... we must endeavour to shape things in such a way as to bring forth a new fertility’ (p. 120) and, through the addition of bio-dynamic composts, we should endow the soil with ‘reason and intelligence’ (p. 96). The bio-dynamic farm should be ‘a self-contained
individuality' (p. 29). Thus, for Steiner, the farm seems to assume the mandala image of the *temenos*, the place for rebirth—but through human initiative.

Bio-dynamic agriculture is based on organic as opposed to artificial chemical fertilisation, and emphasises the inter-relationships within nature. It aims to increase farm fertility in a way which produces healthy soil, plants and animals. However, it is based on a philosophy which fragments the rational mind from the psychic *self* and assumes the ego’s control over the psychic process. It sees agriculture as a symbolic reflection of this attitude, with the consequences that it sees the rational mind in control of fertility, and it sees farms as self-contained centres in dissociation from the motherly matrix of the broad ecological landscape. The resultant farmscape will thus follow the ancient patterns of cosmicisation in which the humanised centres are sacred, in contrast to the threatening surrounding wilderness. The landscape is perceived in dichotomy, symbolising the immature ego fragmented from its mother unconscious.

**Creation-centred Spirituality**

In his book *Original Blessing* (1983), Dominican scholar Matthew Fox proposed creation-centred spirituality as a transformation of religious thinking directed at achieving a right relationship between humans and the world. Fox’s ideas are included in this section as they presage, and perhaps provide the inspiration for, a group of modern theologians who have attempted to provide religious insight into the ‘current environmental crisis’. These theologians include, for example, Sean McDonagh and Paul Collins, whose work will be also mentioned briefly.

Fox is a rationalist who assumes the ego is the centre and the *de facto* totality of the human psyche. As a result, when he refers to writers such as St. Augustine and Jung, both of whom acknowledge the Holy Spirit or unconscious, he misinterprets them by using their ideas in a rationalistic context. Fox, in accordance with Westermann, correctly criticises the tendency of Christian religion to restrict itself to the Fall and redemption, with its emphasis on guilt, propitiatory good works and asceticism. He attempts to replace this outlook by re-introducing the idea of the wonder of God’s created world and takes this as the basis for seeing God as a God who is in love with beauty (p. 205). Fox sees the essence of God as beauty, to the extent that he says ‘beauty *is*’ (p. 219). Consequently, Fox
denies evil in God, and in humans who are made in the Imago Dei. Fox's view of the 'royal personhood' and divine dignity of humanity causes him to reject Augustine's concept of original sin and to relegate it to a 'very minor role in theology' (p. 50). Fox assumes the rational mind can aspire to a 'quest for wisdom and survival' (p. 9).

Fox proposes four paths for achievement of salvation, the via positiva, the via negativa, the via creativa, and the via transformativa.

The via positiva involves the befriending of creation as a blessing through the recognition of human dignity and the pleasure that can be obtained from the earth's beauty, order and harmony. He rejects the idea of a nature which, with the sin of Adam, itself became fallen in sin away from God—an idea he attributes (wrongly, cf. Augustine 1972, p. 1073) to Augustine. Fox thus adopts the paradise image of dignified humans and a beautiful nature all in harmony with a loving and benevolent God.

The via negativa involves, according to Fox, a relaxation and letting go of attitudes, such as in meditation, so that a state of nothingness can be achieved. Fox writes in terms of sacrifice and befriending the darkness, not in the Jungian sense of submission of the ego to the direction of the unconscious, but in the rational sense of adoption of a new conscious outlook from the experience of the stillness of meditation. He sees Christ's death and resurrection as an indication that each person, in royal personhood, can also be liberated from the fear of death and thus can experience a transformation of consciousness (pp. 166ff.). This, however, Fox sees as a rational process, not the spiritual rebirth posited by Jung.

The via creativa is the recognition that humans are in the Imago Dei and therefore have the 'awesome responsibility' of being co-creators with God and are the primary agents in cosmogenesis, fertility and in the human imagination. Fox ascribes these aspects of creativity to the rational mind, but he recognises that something must come from inside ourselves, and this, he proposes, can be brought into life through art when conducted as meditation (pp. 190f.). People then become the mothers of God and the birthers of creativity.

The via transformativa involves a transformation of conscious attitude to the world based on compassion and justice. This attitude is born of a self-love
which is extended to the world. Fox’s theology is based on the ethical choice of the right and the good in the assumed knowledge of divine wisdom.

Fox’s rationalism sees the world in dualism—science versus religion, left and right brain, fall/redemption versus creation-centred spirituality, and good and evil. His unconscious self is projected in images of union so that he can say that the goal is to overcome dualism and to achieve harmony (pp. 210ff.). Fox exemplifies the ego which is still living out the creation myth of the sun-god slaying the earth dragon, seeking to consolidate itself against regression into the unconscious. His ritualistic cosmicisation is manifested in the intellectual slaying of the Father (Augustine) and the mother (church).

People who have acquired wisdom will be able to have a right relationship with the world and be able to recreate both religion and the world (p. 305). Fox elevates the rational mind to divine status and searches for the paradisal goal. The ego is as separated from the earth as it is from the unconscious and can only continue in its pseudo-domination of the unconscious and its symbol, the earth.

Sean McDonagh, a Columban missionary, also sought a reconciliation between the Christian religion and the ecological crisis in his book *To Care for the Earth: A Call to a New Theology* (1986). McDonagh adopts the ideas of both Teilhard and Matthew Fox. He accepts that the rational human mind provides the means for continued cosmogenesis, that the natural world’s ‘beauty and abundance’ comprise ‘the primary revelation of God’ (p. 10), that we should learn to celebrate the beauty of nature (p. 96), and should seek a harmonious relationship with nature (p. 178). McDonagh proposes new ritual liturgies focused on the elements of earth, fire and water designed to encourage examination of our conscience in relation to our treatment of nature (pp. 159ff.). The liturgies are propitiatory, and continue the myth that humans can develop their dignity and excellence from their divine spark to the level that allows them to influence God to continue to provide a beneficent natural world. He suggests that people can develop a love and gratitude for all of creation (p. 178) and a moral code of action to maintain and conserve natural resources (pp. 193ff.). McDonagh’s vision of beauty and harmony is the paradise mother-symbol of the dissociated egocentric personality and can advocate only constraints on the use of resources and
propitiatory ritual as guides for relationship to the land.

Paul Collins, Melbourne historian and theologian, also addresses the ecological crisis in his book *God's Earth: Religion as if Matter Really Mattered* (1995). Collins asserts that 'all of our usual religious, social, philosophical and cultural sources have failed us' (p. 8). Consequently, he turns to ecology and the natural world to review our interpretation of the Christian religious tradition. Collins is seeing ecology as a symbol of the archetypal idea of integration, and the natural world as a symbol of the unconscious. He retains the rationalist viewpoint and thinks in terms of propitiation (e.g. p. 14), caring for the world, and the search to find the transcendent God in, above all, the natural world (pp. 246f.). Collins is searching for union but is projecting his unknown self onto the natural world:

...theology in our time needs almost to reinvent itself. It must discover a new starting point...It is in the environment of the world and its cosmic context that the ultimate meaning of existence is to be discovered. It is the natural world which is the primal revelation of God and the place where the transcendent is most sacramentally present (p. 244).

Collins, McDonagh, and Matthew Fox all echo Lynn White's claim that the common interpretation of religion provides an inappropriate basis for a theory of sustainable use of land.

### 6.5 RELIGIOUS THEORIES EXTENDING FROM EROS TO AGAPE

Discussed in this section are the theories of a Christian church Father, St. Augustine, and an agriculturalist, Masanobu Fukuoka. Augustine's theological views were so profound that they have been a significant influence in Christian thinking to the present day, although they have been subjected to varying and sometimes incompatible interpretations. Augustine is often criticised as having denigrated nature at the expense of exalting the spirit. Augustine's theology, however, has much to contribute to a theory on the human–land relationship. Fukuoka adopts a particular religious viewpoint which he puts into agricultural practice, and also has much to contribute towards the theory of relationship to land.
St. Augustine and Caritas

Augustine's spiritual conversion, described in his book *Confessions*, was an example of the Jungian individuation process where a person comes to experience the reality of the unconscious part of the psyche beyond the ego. Prior to conversion, Augustine followed the (Neoplatonic) way of *Eros* love of God but was unsatisfied by the impermanence of the feelings this aroused. Love for God was just one of the multitude of passionate desires ruling his life. Augustine saw the liberation from the passion of longing-desire as a consequence of union with God. Conquest of desire was the conquest of the terrible mother, in the senses of overcoming the longing for continuation of the paradise of childhood, and of overcoming the self-centred and instinctual animal aspect of the psyche.

After conversion, Augustine could differentiate between two attitudes to the world which he described as the city of God and the earthly city (Augustine 1972, bk 14, ch. 28). The city of God referred to the individuated or *self* attitude in which life is guided by the spirit, whereas the earthly city referred to the egocentric attitude in which life is directed by the instinctive passions and self-interest, which Augustine described as life of the flesh or of the world. Augustine thought that a paradise of bliss existed prior to the 'Fall' of Adam by the 'original sin'. Theory based on the *Eros* motif, however, has difficulty with both original sin and Augustine's two worlds. *Eros* clings to the idea that the human is a divine creation and that the divine inner spark or the *imago Dei* is immune from original sin, and it is the human task, through rational initiative, to choose the right behaviour to perfect the personality so that the divine spark is realised. *Eros* interprets the two worlds as meaning that the spiritual world is separate from the physical world and, hence, love of the spiritual entails a denial of the physical world. For Augustine, however, following Paul, the spiritual and the physical are two aspects of the one reality and, within human nature, there are two attitudes to the world. The attitude of the flesh seeks its own, and therefore is in broken relationship with God and the world: the attitude derived from the spirit is in union with God and the world.

Augustine, having realised that the dragon of the underworld was within his own psyche, could accept that the ego freed from the bondage of passionate desire could acknowledge the unconscious as the nurturing mother. Augustine had
experienced the second or spiritual birth in which the dual aspects of the unconscious as terrible or devouring mother and as the nurturing mother were seen as opposites in tension within the one psyche. Augustine saw the world as God’s creation and as a symbol of His loving providence. It was not creation but people living in the ‘flesh’, in the bondage of the sin of self-love (Augustine 1972, bk 14, secs 1–3, 28), who live in evil and defile the beauty of the created world (Augustine 1961, bk 5, sec. 2). It was not the world which had to be slain but the desiring self-centredness of people. Augustine saw the things of the world to be enjoyed and loved—not in themselves but as manifestations of God’s creative and eternal love (Augustine 1961, e.g. bks 1–4). Nature was to be used:

For our souls lean for support upon the things which you have created, so that we may be lifted up to you from our weakness and use them to help us on our way to you who made them all so wonderfully. And in you we are remade and find true strength (Augustine 1961, bk 5, sec. 1).

Augustine emphasised that enjoyment and love of the world must not become ends in themselves but should always occur within the context of a fundamental love of God as creator (e.g. Augustine 1961, bk 2, sec. 5; Nygren 1982, pp. 504–510).

Contrary to the criticisms of Augustinian theology by people such as Matthew Fox (1983), Augustine exemplifies the psychologically mature or individuated person who had an attitude of union with the world. Nygren points out, however, that Augustine never let go of his Neoplatonic Eros motif and therefore saw God’s Agape love, as manifested in the Incarnation, only in the context of an exemplum humilitatis to overcome human pride and autonomy, and to illustrate humility as the right way to love God (Nygren, ch. 2). Augustine thus synthesised the motifs of Eros and Agape into the concept of Caritas, which meant that God’s infused love made it possible for people, in Eros, to return this love to God. Thus, while Augustine achieved the psychological union with the world and provided the basis for the utilisation of the resources of the earth as blessings, his retention of Eros theory meant that he failed to recognise that humans, too, could think and act in Agape. His theology remained within the Eros parameters of motivated self-love. People and land could, then, be loved only because they represented vehicles of God’s nature, the true object of Eros love. In retaining the
Eros component of the human way to reuniting with God, Augustine was forced in his theorising on the relationship to nature to differentiate between two types of love, a love to enjoy something for its own sake, and a love of something which can be used to acquire something else (Nygren 1982, pp. 503ff.). Nygren explains that, for Augustine, the love of nature should be of the second kind and used to lead to the love of God. Taken to the extreme, love of God should be absolute so that it should not be necessary to love anything in the world (Nygren, p. 510). This is like the Platonic ideal, but it is wrong to interpret Augustine as not seeing enjoyment or love in the world. Augustine, by stressing the unity of the created world and its creator, has opened the possibility of a theory on the human relationship to land. The result is that in Augustinian theology land, although loved, remains something which is to be used for a self-centred personal end. People would then use land according to the traditional practices of cosmicisation for the purpose of facilitating the human ascent to the status of divinity.

**Masanobu Fukuoka and Natural Farming**

Fukuoka belongs to the Buddhist tradition and, like Augustine, came to experience the oneness of nature. This allowed him to overcome selfish desire for worldly things and to acknowledge the futility of human knowledge in the face of nature’s wisdom. He sees God as symbolised by nature and life (Fukuoka 1987, pp. 250, 258), and pictures God as sitting in heaven and having the earth as His garden (p. 258). Fukuoka envisions people worshipping through their respectful use of the ‘garden of God’ and having their gaze directed to the ‘skies’ whence will come their blessings (p. 258). Fukuoka sees nature, when not degraded by the arrogance and selfishness of humans, as capable of providing for human life. He, therefore, sees nature as a symbol of the Agape God but holds to the Eros view that humans have to initiate union with this God. There are similarities between Augustine and Fukuoka in their views of an Agape God, the Eros human way, and the need to overcome earthly desire. Fukuoka, however, put his views into agricultural practice.

At the age of twenty five Fukuoka experienced a change of outlook on life through a sudden realisation of the unity of nature (Fukuoka 1978, p.8f.). Over the next four decades, he developed a farm based on natural fertility. He focused on
using plants in interactive combination to maintain a living ground cover and a sequential maturing of different crops planted in the same field. The plant roots, together with the life in the soil, maintained aeration, warmth, moisture and a natural fertility in the soil. Stubble was left to decompose into organic matter in the soil. No fertilisers, either as compost or chemicals, were added and the soil was not ploughed. Fukuoka flooded his rice fields for less than a week, mainly to inhibit weed growth, but thereafter used no flooding so as not to kill the soil life. Fukuoka succeeded in rehabilitating skeletal soils on the hillsides by planting nitrogen-fixing companion trees together with herb and vegetable ground covers, in the orchards. On both the hillsides and the flats, the soils generally became deeper and more fertile within a few years.

Fukuoka saw that human arrogance led to the view that rational knowledge gave humankind control of nature. He saw that, instead, human domination of nature had caused its degradation. His concept of natural farming, comprising no cultivation, fertilisation, weeding or use of pesticides, was based on the Buddhist concept of ‘Mu’ or nothingness, in which the person lets go of all desires and sees only harmonious relationships within nature and between humans and nature. Ideally, he sees humans and nature in a perfect relationship where neither has to ask for, give or receive anything from each other (Fukuoka 1987, p. 93) (in the sense of purposeful toil as distinct from obtaining natural nourishment). Intellectually, Mu is fundamentally different from caritas which sees God as actively giving and humans as actively seeking. Fukuoka uses nature as the medium for union with the source of life. The ‘do-nothing’ method of farming, however, makes the land more an idol than a symbol which might generate spiritual experience. Fukuoka, like Augustine, follows the Eros way of slaying the dragon of the psyche by propitiation. Augustine lived the ascetic life. Fukuoka submitted to the rules of physical nature (p. 29). Fukuoka creates a fertile husbanded agricultural landscape which is preferable to the degraded landscapes of conventional methods. However, he retains the view that humankind can achieve, through the rational mind, a state of earthly paradise (e.g. pp. 23, 93) where humans can live harmoniously with nature. He thus retains the dichotomy between humans and nature, failing to assimilate into consciousness the symbolic meaning of nature, and thereby denies
the creativity of the human mind and the physical landscape.

Fukuoka writes: 'The return of all people to the country to farm and create villages of true men is the road to the creation of ideal towns, ideal societies, and ideal states' (p. 258). He advocates small farms (quarter-acre) which are mainly self-sufficient so that trading need only be small in amount and mainly at the local or regional scale. He succeeded in showing how degradation of agricultural land could be reversed and how sustainable farming can be practised. Fukuoka thus comes to a conclusion broadly similar to that of Mollison: both advocate small-scale agriculture in a village or tribal environment. Mollison, however, emphasises the rational mind and its control over the design of ecological systems. Fukuoka seeks to curb the rational mind and give nature the conditions in which its own fertility can flourish.

However, Fukuoka sees the land as a symbol of an unconscious which, although it is alive, exists in separation from the rational human psyche so that sustainability, not creativity, is the goal. and nature, freed from degradation, is still under the constraint of the rational mind.

6.6 RELIGIOUS THEORIES IN AGAPE

There seem to be no formal theories on the human–land relationship based on the Agape motif. However, inferences on what this relationship would be can be made from the theorists writing in the Agape motif. This section will discuss the Agape theories from theology and, briefly, Jungian psychological theory, in so far as they shed light on the human relationship to land. The Agape religious myth sees God as the initiator of cosmic life. Humans can only act responsively to God. Humans, therefore, learn of God through God's revelation. The Agape myth provides a basis for the interpretation of every aspect of life, as will now be illustrated by consideration of the ideas of cosmic unity, how God relates to humans, how humans relate to the world, and how humans might treat the world.

Cosmic Unity

The book of Genesis, as a whole, portrays the cosmic creation in the stages of generation, degeneration, and regeneration (Harper Study Bible 1971. p. 2). The
Eros myth sees humans as the agents of regeneration whereas the Agape myth sees regeneration as coming from God. Agape sees the cosmos in union. Paul writes of Christ:

> He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; for in him all things in heaven and on earth were created, things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or powers—all things have been created through him and for him. He himself is before all things, and in him all things hold together (Col. 1: 15–17).

Paul writes that God is ‘all in all’ (1 Cor. 15: 28). John’s Gospel commences with a statement of cosmic unity in which God, Spirit, Christ are one, and jointly are one with the world. ‘He’, meaning Christ, symbolises the self, and ‘light’ symbolises the coming of consciousness in the sense of spiritual reintegration:

> In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things came into being through him, and without him not one thing came into being. What has come into being in him was life, and the life was the light of all people. The light shines in the darkness and the darkness did not overcome it (John 1: 1–5).

The God–Human Link

Augustine’s recognition of the Agape aspect of Christianity is illustrated by his allegorical interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis (Augustine 1961, bk 13) in which he uses the creation of the earth and creatures to describe symbolically the coming of the archetypal images from the unconscious to dispel the darkness from the egocentric psyche and create the light of the reintegrated psyche. (While the archetypal idea of Agape love had awakened in his mind, Augustine’s intellectual retention of neo-Platonism prevented him attaining appreciation of the fullness of Agape (Nygren 1982, p. 470).) Augustine recognises that revelation comes from God.

Paul describes the Agape view of the relationship of God to humans, as for example in his letter to the Romans:

> ...God’s love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit that has been given to us (5: 5).

> To set the mind on the flesh is death, but to set the mind on the Spirit is life and peace...the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God; it
does not submit to God's law—indeed it cannot, and those who are in the flesh cannot please God.

But...you are in the Spirit, since the Spirit of God dwells in you...if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body, you will live...you have received a spirit of adoption...it is that very Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God (8: 6-16 pt.).

Augustine (1972, bk 14, chs 1-3) explains that 'flesh' stands for the corrupted soul which affects a person's total life; hence it may be interpreted as the egocentric attitude. Paul, then, has described, through the symbol of the Holy Spirit, the psychologically individuated person. He describes the Spirit as a 'free gift' from God (Rom. 5: 15-16) which, when accepted in faith, effects the forgiveness of egocentric sin and the reconciliation of the person with God (Rom. 5: 10-11).

The Human–World Link

Reintegration with the Holy Spirit provides a person with a new life attitude: 'there is a new creation: everything old has passed away; see everything has become new! All this is from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and has given us the ministry of reconciliation; that is, God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself' (2 Cor. 5: 17-18). It is this ministry of reconciliation which gives humans, as the imago Dei, the responsibility of dominion over the earth and the task to subdue it to the Spirit (cf. Augustine 1961, bk 13, secs 23f.). Paul writes that the Spirit infuses a person with new power (1 Cor. 2: 4), and Elert (1957) writes, 'the new ethos becomes tangible and the creative power of the Holy Spirit becomes perceptible' (p. 212), but 'Only the enlightened and enlightening faith can discern the power of the Holy Spirit by whom this faith itself has been kindled...the eye of faith can distinguish the new life from the old' (p. 213; cf. 1 Cor. 2:6-15).

The newly-created person can experience the reconciliation with the Spirit as a direct linkage, and can similarly experience a direct relationship with the world. As Bonhoeffer says (1959, p. 86), a person has no direct link to anything in the world other than through the Spirit. The link with the world is understood from the belief in God as creator of heaven and earth, the reality of which becomes known when the reality of the Spirit is experienced. Luther emphasised the reality of the link with nature:
Creation looms large with Luther, and he can wax eloquent when he contemplates the glory of it. 'For this is undoubtedly the highest article of faith in which we say: I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.' This is faith in God indeed. For when I believe this, then I know that I, together with all creation, am a creature of God, created for God, subject to the will of God, and embraced in his loving providence... when I look around at the world and at everything that God has created, then I recognise myself as part of that creation (Preus 1977, p. 61).

Elert writes of Luther:

I believe that God has created and still preserves me as well as all creatures. Here the emphasis is both on the 'me' and on the 'as well as.' God has not created me as one who is isolated; He has created me as a creature in the sum total of all. Here faith in my creator has to become a hymn of praise to the preservation of my environment and of the world in general. Luther cannot separate either God or himself from the natural environment (Elert 1962, p. 449).

Bornkamm (1958) writes 'in faith [Luther] bridged the great distance between this God, personalised in Christ, and his hidden vibrant activity and life in all, and through all, forms in nature' (p. 193). Luther saw beyond the fear-generated hostility characteristic of the ego-centred person who can see the world only in duality (cf. Rom. 8: 7; Col. 1: 21; Elert 1962, pp. 450f.). Following Augustine (1972, bk 22, ch. 24), Luther saw nature as good and, unlike humans, not corrupted by the Fall: 'Creation itself is not contaminated by sin; no, it is good. "The nature of animals has remained as it was created." But it is subject to man's abuse.' (Bornkamm 1958, p. 192). Elert (1962) writes that Luther rejected 'every form of pluralism' (p. 437); his belief in God 'presupposes the unity of life and the interlacement of life in the world as a whole' (p. 437):

...according to Luther, autonomy [of the human] is thwarted by the realisation that life and the world are a whole. This wholeness embraces nature and ethos, because it is precisely when we relate the two to each other that we encounter God, and because it is only the hereafter that enables us to recognise God's world, life, and ethos as a unity and a whole (Elert 1962, p. 437).

God is in the things... He is in every creature... He is 'completely' present... this is not a matter of passive existence... It is God who creates.
does, and preserves all things (Elert 1962, p. 440)

Jung regarded his psychological theories as religious because they linked consciousness back to its origins. In her book *The Myth of Meaning* (1984) about Jungian theory, Jaffe comments that, almost simultaneously with psychology focusing on the unconscious basis of consciousness, the natural sciences were searching for the 'hidden reality underlying the phenomenal world' (p. 29). Jaffe notes that in crystallography, biology, and physics, for example, scientists identified underlying structural forms which gave order to the phenomenal forms (pp. 29–32). She writes that:

Physics also,... has postulated a transcendental and autonomous 'order' which acts formatively not only on matter but on the mind of man (p. 32).

According to [the physicist] Pauli the intimate connection between the human mind and the external world... is due to the fact that our ideas are arranged in an orderly manner by these [psychoid] archetypes... they are the vehicles of that autonomous and transcendental order, 'thought to be objective', which unites mind and world. They function... 'as the sought-for bridge between sense perceptions and ideas and are, accordingly, a necessary presupposition even for evolving a scientific theory of nature...' (p. 33)

The Christian theological concept of God as a trinity comprised of the Father, the Son (Christ), and the Holy Spirit seems to be paralleled by the Jungian psychological concepts of the psychoid archetypes (the fundamental essence of psychic existence), the archetypes (the structured psychic forms which give structure to human psychic experience), and the self (the image of the spiritually-integrated personality). When the cosmos is perceived through the concept of common structural forms in the whole of nature, parallels can be seen between the evolutionary stages of humans, physically and psychically, natural species and the cosmos as a whole. As with the Genesis creation mythology, all pass through generation, degeneration, and regeneration. Humans and natural species are born and grow through youth, maturity and old age. The human psyche is generated from the collective unconscious, develops into egocentricity (temporary but necessary degeneration), and then becomes progressively more individuated (regenerated). The Spirit is the agent for human regeneration. Luther and Augustine see nature as good. Nygren (1982, p. 740) suggests that Luther sees nature as
operating in *Agape* love. Jung points out that individuation involves a recognition of the individual’s limitation in the face of the infinite (1965, p. 325; cf. Westermann 1974, pp. 19ff.), and from this recognition grows a new attitude to the relationship to the world: ‘Individuation does not shut one out from the world, but gathers the world to oneself’ (1969b, CW8, para. 432).

**The Human Responsibility to the Earth**

Luther sees ‘no basic boundary line’ between human life and nature (Elert 1962, p. 452). He is clear that in human life, anything against ‘the Gospel’ is from Satan and is ‘of the world’, with the result that there is a constant struggle between the ‘flesh’ and the ‘spirit’ (cf. Augustine 1972, bk 14, ch. 28). In nature, Luther talks of the creatures as ‘armies’ warring in the ‘cosmic struggle’ for fertility and growth against Satan who works against these things (Elert 1962, pp. 452f.). Paul describes this struggle:

> For the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the children of God; for the creation was subjected to futility, not of its own will but by the will of the one who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay and will obtain the freedom of the glory of the children of God. We know that the whole creation has been groaning in labor pains until now; and not only the creation, but we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly while we wait for adoption... (Rom. 8: 19–23)

Luther, following Paul, could therefore reject the idea of the ‘spiritualisation’ of humans at the expense of the material aspects of human and natural life:

> As long as early Lutheranism remained true to Luther’s belief, it was consciously engaged in a struggle against every neo-Platonic disregard for the material world as well as against every confusion of the ethos with a deadening of emotional life. ‘For God wants nature preserved, not destroyed’ said Luther. The Holy Spirit does not corrupt and destroy nature; He heals the destruction and the corruption of nature in man (Elert 1962, p. 453).

But preservation of nature is not sufficient. Preus (1977, p. 61) quotes Loefgren: ‘Luther’s theology begins with the doctrine of creation, because for him redemption means not liberation from creation but its restoration and completion’. This completion is what Augustine called the submission of the darkness by the
spirit to produce the 'living soul' of the world, that is to produce 'fertility and increase' (1972, p. 583; 1986, bk 13, secs 23f.). Human actions in the natural world, therefore, says Bonhoeffer, should be to 'prepare the way' for the growth of the spirit in the world (1985, pp. 110ff., cf. p. 324), and that means to increase fertility in the world.

6.7 ANALYSIS OF MOTIF-SYMBOLISM

This section analyses the motif-symbolism of the theories on the human–land relationship which have been outlined in this chapter. All theories, whether they refer explicitly or not to a religious viewpoint, are based on a particular psychological attitude to the world. The egocentric and individuated psychological attitudes are expressed respectively by the *Eros* religious myth and the *Agape* religious myth, and by particular projections and interpretations of archetypal symbolism. The theories on the human–land relationship outlined in earlier sections will now be analysed for their motif-symbolism under the headings of: the human perception of land; the goal of the human–land relationship; the treatment of land; and the resultant landscape.

**The Human Perception of Land**

The theories categorised as rational non-religious (section 6.3) and religious in the *Eros* motif (section 6.4) share the common characteristic of a perceived duality between humans and land. This duality becomes indistinct in those theories based on a religious view that extends from the *Eros* motif towards the *Agape* motif, where elements of both motifs are joined (section 6.5).

The concept of duality grows from the egocentric psychological attitude to the world, and reflects the ego's perception of its autonomy as a psychological entity. When the ego sees itself as its own centre, it assumes autonomy from the unconscious. The unconscious, however, is the source from which the ego grew, and continues to provide the life to the ego through the flow of psychic energy in the form of instincts and archetypal images. The ego cannot escape an awareness of the ever-present psychic super-power, no matter how much it tries to repress it and relegate it to the position of 'the other'. Through psychological projection, this
'other' becomes symbolised by external objects such as the land. Psychic autonomy comes to the ego only at the price of waging a continuous war against this super-power which, if not defeated, will overwhelm and annihilate it. The land becomes the object of this symbolic conflict so that, for anyone with an egocentric attitude, the relationship to the land has to be one of conquest where the forces of nature are reduced to submission to human control.

Passmore (1980) illustrates the viewpoint of the autonomy of the ego:

Only if men see themselves...for what they are, quite alone, with no one to help them except their fellow-men, products of natural processes which are wholly indifferent to their survival, will they face their ecological problems in their full implications (p. 184).

These implications, Lovelock (1988) points out, could be the extinction of the human species and its 'replacement with a more environmentally seemly species' (p. 236). Lovelock emphasises the human–earth duality when he writes 'we are just another species, neither the owners nor the stewards of this planet' and our survival depends on 'a right relationship' with the earth (Lovelock 1988, p. 14).

The egocentric theorists symbolise the unconscious in the mythical imagery of the earth dragon or terrible mother. Hence, Lovelock sees Gaia as 'no doting mother...She is stern and tough...ruthless in her destruction of those who transgress...If humans stand in the way...we shall be eliminated...' (Lovelock 1988, p. 212). The power and complexities of the earth mother have to be overcome in symbolic representation of the ego seeking ascendancy over the unconscious. Teilhard, therefore, seeks to rise spiritually above the material world, and Mollison, Steiner, and Campbell seek to control nature in a humanised landscape—a landscape in which the battle against the wildness of nature has been won and the manifestations of natural life, as form and process, have been simplified and controlled to manageable states.

Fukuoka (1987) sought to overcome the duality of the egocentric view of the human–land relationship by taking a Buddhist view of the wholeness of nature and how humans, with the right attitude of nothingness in the mind, could become part of the harmony of nature. Fukuoka has moved beyond the stage of seeing nature as the threatening mother, the 'arrogant' views of 'concern and desire' (p. 188).
and the need to ‘“know”, “use”, or “conquer” nature’ (p. 17). Nevertheless, Fukuoka’s relationship to nature is based only on an adopted rational attitude and does not confront the fundamental dichotomy between the ego and the unconscious, and between the human and nature:

> A true dialogue between man and nature is impossible. Man can stand before nature and talk to it, but nature will not call out to man. Man thinks he can know God and nature, but God and nature neither know man nor tell him anything. Instead, they look the other way (Fukuoka 1987, p. 267).

Despite Fukuoka’s criticism of the rational, self-seeking viewpoint, he clings to the Eros myth of the human–God dichotomy which can be united only through a human initiative. Land, then, is not to be conquered but respected.

The human–land duality disappears only in the Agape mode of thinking. Only when a person’s psyche becomes individuated, can one accept that the initiative of life comes from the unconscious and that all life is in union. Augustine writes:

> For it is through God’s creative activity which continues to this day that the seeds display themselves and evolve as it were from secret and invisible folds into the visible forms of this beauty which appear to our eyes. It is God who effects that miraculous combination of an immaterial with a material substance, with the former in command, the latter in subjection; God unites them to make a living creature (Augustine 1972, pp. 1071f.).

Land is seen here, not as an adversary, but in the image of the good mother from which nourishment comes. The source of life experienced within the psyche is known as the same essence of life within all nature and thus a direct link between humans and land is experienced.

**The Goal of the Human–Land Relationship**

All activities of life are symbolic of the basic psychic reality (Jung, e.g., 1968c, CW12, para. 74), or the sacred meaning of life (Eliade, e.g., 1971, passim). Plants symbolise the power of growth and of rebirth (Eliade 1974, ch. 8), and nutrition represents a (holy) communion (Eliade 1971, p. 4). The sacred symbolism of eating has been formalised in the ritualistic feast or rite, including the Christian Eucharist (cf. Jung 1967. CW5, para. 522). Agriculture, also, because it deals with the
fertility of the earth, is a symbolic ritual (cf. Eliade 1974, p. 331; Jung 1969b, CW8, paras 85f.).

The unconscious psychological goal, whether of activities dealing with the land or other activities, is refinding the individuated self. The egocentric person experiences this drive towards individuation through projected archetypal images and ideas symbolising the self and perceived as mandala mother-symbols.

The following inferences may be made. Lovelock saw Gaia as a mandala image. His egocentric outlook, however, prevented him from seeing the cosmos in union; he saw that only the surface of the earth is alive, and thus the various forms of organic life, including the human species, as being only accidental evolutionary products. He appears not to have understood the psychological meaning of the mandala. For Leopold, the image and idea of ecology was a mandala image symbolising the archetypal idea of psychic reconciliation, integration and union. In the same way, the deep ecologists and transpersonal ecologists focused symbolically on the concept of ecological conscience; Mollison and Campbell focused on sustainability; Teilhard focused on the Omega point; Steiner focused on reincarnation and higher knowledge; and Fukuoka focused on nature and life as a mandala symbol of reconciliation.

The goal of the psychically fragmented person is best described by the image of paradise because it represents union. The egocentric person, however, discriminates and consequently sees union as harmony and bliss, and does not see that psychic reintegration involves a dynamic union between the conscious and the unconscious which Jung (1964, p.75) describes as a battleground, and Luther (following Paul) describes as the daily anfechtung or struggle between spirit (unconscious) and flesh (ego) (Preus 1977, pp. 35, 40). St. Francis' motif exemplifies the egocentric goal of paradise. He 'envisioned a harmonious and interdependent community of creation' (Sorrell 1988, p. 134). Francis was following the medieval orthodox (Eros) Christian view that before the sins of Adam and Eve the world existed as a paradise, and it was the Christian's task to overcome sin and restore the bliss of paradise. Sorrell (1988) quotes Bonaventura: 'It seemed as if [Francis] had returned to the state of primeval innocence, he was so good, so holy' (p. 52). Sorrell equates Francis' power of miraculous control over
nature to this return to the paradise state (pp. 51f.). Jung cites Francis as an example of a person who longs to become like a god, and writes that it was common in ancient cultures for people to identify with the sun, the stars and fire etc.; Francis experienced the stigmata on his hands in ecstatic identification with Christ, and ‘carried the relationship even further by speaking of his brother sun and his sister the moon’ (Jung 1967, CW5, para. 131). Following the Eros motif, Francis sought to establish a paradise in which he could be like God in his relation to the created world. In seeking the external God, Francis denied the internal God. He thus denied his body in symbolic denial of his self. His passion for the love of the external Christ resulted in his being worn out by ‘his fighting and fasting life’, and broken he lay on the earth in the form of the cross and died before he was fifty years old (Chesterton 1949, pp.102–106). Chesterton (1949, p. 153) raises the question whether Francis’ seraphic vision should have been interpreted instead to indicate that God, not Francis, is the essence of (Agape) giving, as though in continual crucifixion, for the life of the world. In Eros, the goal is always in reference to the individual. Even asceticism represents ‘a change from the discipleship of Christ to the “imitation of Christ” ’ and in this there is ‘a very subtle type of selfishness’ (Elert 1957, p. 230).

The goal in the Agape motif is, by contrast, the giving of the self for the nurture of the ‘other’, that is for the neighbour, the created world, and the psychic other, the unconscious. The person acting in Agape is both integrated with the world and fulfils the divine role of furthering creation by the channelling of archetypal existence into the work of the world.

The Treatment of Land

Augustine likens the imitation of God by a self-centred person to a theft, because the person is usurping the initiative and judgment of God (Augustine 1961, bk 2, sec. 6). Bonhoeffer (1985) explains that the egocentric person experiences the separation from the ‘origin’ as a nakedness and shame (pp. 6ff.). Shame extends into conscience because the autonomous person seeks reunion, not with God as origin, but with his or her own centre, which is assumed to be in the rational ego. Conscience, writes Bonhoeffer, ‘is the voice of apostate life which desires at least to remain one with itself’ (p. 9); conscience is ‘always a prohibition.
"Thou shalt not." "You ought not to have." Conscience is satisfied when the prohibition is not disobeyed (p. 9). Conscience takes the place of 'the voice of God' because the person's ego has assumed the power of knowledge of 'good and evil' (p. 10). The total perception of life is now discriminatory and seen through disunion (p. 11). Egocentric life consequently is propitiatory, as every action is perceived through the perspective of prohibition and theft. Life is bound by constraint and fear.

Leopold (1989) writes that, 'An ethic, ecologically, is a limitation on freedom of action in the struggle for existence'; it is 'a differentiation of social from anti-social conduct' (p. 202). Leopold, and the later egocentric theorists, relate to the land through an 'ecological conscience'. This leads to the view that people should care for, protect, and preserve the land. Mollison, for example, states that the land resources should be used cautiously, and Lovelock (1988) implies that this caution means that nature should be outwitted to ensure our survival (p. 236). Passmore's 'co-operation' with nature is propitiatory, and the concepts of conservation and sustainability imply that land use is inherently a theft and degradational and, therefore, requires protective and remedial measures. Fukuoka tries to minimise the theft aspect of agriculture by submitting 'to the will of nature by reaffirming one's obeisance to divine providence' (p. 254) and by adopting 'The path of a "do-nothing" nature where all one does is to plunge into the bosom of nature, shedding body and mind' (p. 257). Francis took the minimal use of nature to a further extreme. He depended on food provided by others and used nature only for the purpose of contemplation to reach the heights of mystical ecstasy (Sorrell 1988, p. 145).

The person relating to the world through the Agape motif sees the land and each plant and animal as manifestations of the Agape cosmic life force which is giving itself to the world. Action in nature is directed towards bringing this spirit towards a more fertile form of realisation. The advocates of species egalitarianism do not recognise the self-giving aspect of Agape: they see the world only through the self-interest of individuals and associated concepts such as intrinsic worth and autonomous rights. The Agape motif sees no individual rights but only the will, purpose or evolution of God. The Agape theologians see land use as one
manifestation of preparing the way for the increase of the cosmic spirit. This means that land should be brought into higher fertility to support more life and to provide a symbol of the evolution of archetypal Agape into the consciousness of the world.

6.8 CONCLUSIONS

Most theories on the human–land relationship are based on the Eros motif and perpetuate the idea of dichotomy between humans and the land. These theories are inherently degradational.

Some theories seek to overcome the domination-of-nature characteristic of Eros theory and adopt what may be called the Caritas position. These appear capable of producing sustainable forms of agriculture but are, like the Eros theories, propitiatory towards nature. Consequently, they do not provide an adequate theory on human relationship to nature, as they retain the belief in dichotomy between humans and nature, and prevent the realisation of nature's inherent fertility and the potential fulness of the human–nature relationship in terms of cosmic creation.

The Agape motif, while not yet formulated into human–land theory, appears capable of transformation into such a theory which would be directed towards a creative relationship between people and land.
CHAPTER 7

MYTHICAL SYMBOLISM IN THE
DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURE IN
AUSTRALIA

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter analysed theories on the human–land relationship according to the symbolism of the religious motifs of Eros and Agape. This chapter moves the motif analysis onto the consideration of the development of agriculture in Australia as the first of two case studies in the practice of agriculture. The history of the introduction of European-type agriculture to the Australian continent reveals how people from the Western culture perceived and treated a land foreign to them. Despite the land having been inhabited by the Aboriginals for approximately 50,000 years, the Europeans perceived it as a wilderness. Unlike the human relationship to land in Europe which extends for thousands of years, most of which is beyond recorded history, European settlement of Australia is little over 200 years old and totally within the span of historical records. The manner in which the Europeans have transformed the Australian landscape for agricultural settlement should, therefore, provide evidence which can be used to address the research question 1, which asks whether the practice of agriculture illustrates a mythical symbolism characteristic of one or other of the fundamental psychological attitudes and their associated religious motifs of Eros or Agape.

Accordingly, the aim of this chapter is to ascertain whether the perception and use of agricultural land in Australia can be correlated with the mythical symbolism of one or other of the two fundamental religious motifs.

To achieve this aim, the motif-symbolism in the perception and use of land
is considered from the three different but related perspectives of the individual agriculturalist, the agricultural community, and the government. Section 7.2 adopts the personal perspective by outlining one man's relationship to the Australian land. The life of pastoralist Edward Ogilvie is analysed in the context of a religious quest, or mythical hero-journey, to see what symbolic role the land played in his life. Section 7.3 analyses how the agriculturalists as a community related to the land. This section begins with comment on the motif-symbolism of the Aboriginal relationship to the land, because the Aboriginal subsistence use of the land provides a useful comparison with the Europeans' commercial use of the land, and because the Aboriginal landscape provides the starting point for the European transformation of the land. Section 7.4 looks at how governments in Australia have perceived the land symbolically, particularly relating to land use planning.

7.2 AGRICULTURE AS A HERO'S JOURNEY

In his book *Squatter's Castle: The Story of a Pastoral Dynasty* George Farwell (1973) describes the development of a sheep and cattle grazing property in the Clarence River district of north eastern New South Wales during the squatting era in the early part of the nineteenth century. Then, pioneer graziers settled land by being the first to claim and use it. Some pastoral squatters went beyond the boundaries of the military-controlled convict penal colony of New South Wales, the forerunner of the Australian nation.

Farwell's book focuses on the life of Edward Ogilvie (1814-96). The story illustrates how an individual life fits into the pattern of the mythical hero as outlined in chapter 2, and how the life events can be interpreted as symbolic of unconscious psychic motivation as outlined chapter 4.

Edward Ogilvie arrived on his father's new land grant in the Hunter River district in 1825, where he was educated by his mother and learned about life on the land (Farwell 1973, p. 63). His need to be free from the constraints of his father's property and the parental psyche saw him embark on an arduous trek in 1840 to explore the newly discovered Clarence River region to which he returned as a squatter settler in 1841 to establish the sheep property Yulgilbar. At the age of 26 Ogilvie had heard the mythical Hero's 'call to adventure' and had faced the
trials and tasks of his Hero journey (chapter 2). The unknown land, the floods, the
droughts and the often hostile aboriginals symbolised for him the unconscious part
of his psyche. To consolidate his ego-consciousness, he sought to conquer both his
unconscious and its various symbolic projections onto the landscape. The property
Yulgilbar symbolised his centre-of-the-world, a *temenos* or sanctuary against the
threatening world.

Ogilvie persevered to overcome the natural hazards and to establish a
working relationship with the aboriginals (Farwell 1973, ch. 11). This relationship
was, however, one between stronger and weaker, and involved the Europeans
settling permanently along the fertile river flats, forcing the Aboriginals back into
the rugged hills. While Ogilvie’s discussion with the tribal aboriginals put an end
to the previous antagonism and killing between the two cultural groups, Farwell
writes, ‘This did not in the least obscure the fact that, ultimately, there could be
only one victor’ (Farwell, 1973, p. 150). Ogilvie sought to conquer the indigenous
people and the landscape. His immature, egocentric psyche perceived the world
through the archetypal image of the terrible, or devouring mother. The egocentric
person makes life tolerable against the constant fear of a perceived threatening
world by psychologically establishing symbolic centres, or sanctuaries, where
propitiation can be made to the gods. The person perceives each object, through
psychological projection of the inner self, as a centre. Ego-centredness prevents the
person from knowing the inner centre, with the consequence that the unconscious
urge towards psychical integration is perceived as the desire to possess and control
the external symbolic centre. The constant egocentric urge to conquer the
unconscious was manifested by Ogilvie and his squatter colleagues continually
looking for new land. They sought to conquer the landscape in general but the goal
was the paradisal Utopia, the mandala image of the Garden of Eden, where life
exists in abundance and harmony, and the conquest is won.

Ogilvie projected his inner centre onto forest, grassland, rivers, aboriginals,
livestock, climate, bushrangers, employees and markets, all of which he sought to
control. Ogilvie was driven unconsciously towards individuation but could see only
the external value of these objects, and not their psychological meaning as symbols
of his unknown centre. The egocentric person perceives the whole world through
the projection of the *self* in the form of the archetypal image of the centre or mandala. This archetype influences perception from the minute scale of, for example, a tree, to the global scale, which for Ogilvie was the world economic market (London) for his wool. All the labour and danger of the squatter's life achieved meaning because of its relationship to the market 'centre', the unconscious *axis mundi* of his world mandala.

The Utopian goal perceived by the *Eros* egocentric mind can be achieved only by treading the steps of the Hero journey, which involves adventure and risk. The prize must be won by conquest and victory. The *Eros* God is a god of power and glory who can be reached only through the offering of one's life as a propitiatory sacrifice to hardship and even death. Righteous, pious and sacrificial behaviour are seen as necessary to win acceptance and favour from this god. In the egocentric psyche's search for autonomy of the ego against the awesome power of the unconscious, fear is the emotional response, and propitiation is the rational response. The uncontrolled world remains the constant adversary.

In 1854, when he was 40 years of age, Ogilvie sought a different kind of centre: he went on the 'grand tour' of Europe. He travelled widely, but the place which made the deepest emotional impact on him was the age-old mandala form of the city, in the particular form of Florence. Here he indulged in visits to galleries and the opera, and a very social life. After fourteen years as the hardworking bachelor-squatter, Ogilvie's psyche was craving for a depth which was best provided by the symbolic centre of Florence. In 1858 he married Theodosia de Burgh in Dublin.

While abroad, Farwell recounts. Ogilvie developed plans for the building of a 'great new mansion', and after his return in 1859 much of the effort on the pastoral property was expended on the construction of the Yulgilbar mansion which was opened in 1866 (Farwell 1973, chs. 17, 19). In the style of a medieval Italianate castle (p. 246) with flagpole, circular drive, and stone gates adorned with lifesize stone lions (p. 264), the building was a concrete mandala. Ogilvie's lifelong attempt at achieving superiority over his environment continued in the form of establishing new businesses on the river port of Lawrence, south of Grafton, and the initiation of several litigation events (p. 249).
On the death of his wife in 1886, Ogilvie returned to England on his 'second lonely odyssey' but he became 'rudderless' and without direction (p. 304). Ogilvie pursued his long-held interest in tracing his ancestry, as his family believed it was linked to the old Scottish clan of Findlater (p. 313). This was not proven, but Ogilvie succeeded in having approved a family coat of arms with the motto *Tout Jour*, which meant *Forever* (p. 328). Ogilvie's purpose in life became manifest in his desire to establish a dynasty in which his name would be permanently carried by his pastoral property and his successors (pp. 220, 328). The goal was immortality, and the means were wealth, land, and descendants.

In terms of Jung's psychology, Ogilvie's life can be seen as a symbolic hero's journey in search of the holy grail. In each stage of his life, following mandala symbolism, he searches for his psychic centring, but sees it only in the external landscape.

Farwell gives little evidence of how Edward Ogilvie treated the Yulgilbar property environmentally except to mention that, 'Here and there flats had been thinned of trees' (p. 179). It seems that Ogilvie, however, saw the land only as a resource to be exploited for his gain. Profits were taken from the opportunities presented by the land: there is no suggestion that the fertility of the land was to be built up and nurtured.

In the context of psychological types, as identified by Jung and later described by Keirsey and Bates (see chapter 3), Ogilvie would seem to fit with the Dionysian temperament, which is characterised by the need to be free, to live though action, and to expend resources. Life for this temperament type consists of ongoing action (Keirsey & Bates 1984, pp. 30ff). Such a personality is one-sided and dissociated from nature. Ogilvie exemplifies the Dionysian type of Eros egocentric attitude in which the landscape has only external value and is seen as an object to be acquired and dominated, and where the ego sees itself as its own centre. Yulgilbar, the focus of his youthful Utopian dream, was transformed for reasons which were unconscious to him. Most of the Australian agricultural landscape has been transformed for similar unconscious motives, as will be discussed in the next section.
7.3 **MOTIF-SYMBOLISM OF AGRICULTURE IN AUSTRALIA**

This section analyses the symbolism, according to religious motif, of the social development of agriculture in Australia. The term agriculture (Latin; ager, field) means, in its broadest sense, a culture based on the field or the open landscape. People in sedentary societies such as our modern urban-industrial society commonly think of agriculture in the form of enclosed fields or paddocks, generally of rectangular shape. The nomadic Aboriginals of Australia were not limited by rectangular landscape forms but were, nevertheless, pre-eminently a field society, and hence agri-culturalists. Accordingly, this section commences with a brief analysis of the motif-symbolism of Aboriginal agriculture.

**The Symbolism of Aboriginal Agriculture in Australia**

The Aboriginals were hunters and gatherers and, although they often had regular camp locations, they were essentially nomadic. Western interpreters of the Aboriginal relationship to the land often see it as a paradisal existence in which humans and nature coexist in a harmonious *status quo*. Bolton (1981) notes that writers from the early nineteenth century to the present have viewed the Aboriginal land as ‘timeless’, ‘a static environment impervious to any change’, or, quoting Major Mitchell, an ‘“Eden...a sort of paradise” ’ (pp. 1–3; cf. Blainey 1982, p. 58). Mollison (1988) continues this viewpoint by implying that the Aboriginals lived in a state of perfection and harmony with the land (pp. 2, 10). Berndt and Berndt (1988) seem to put a similar view when they cite an Aboriginal view (within a European-contact situation) that ‘nature is their garden, and one which they need not cultivate or “improve” ’ (p. 109).

However, the Western interpretation of the Aboriginal relationship to land is ambivalent. Bolton (1981) tends towards paradisal imagery, or at least the imagery of an equilibrium of coexistence with nature, when he seems to attribute
the Aboriginals with a conservation ethic (pp. 8f.). He comments, also, on the consequences of Aboriginal agriculture such as the extinction of a number of the large animals, the alteration to vegetational communities, and increased ‘erosion, salt creep, and the eventual spread of the central Australian desert’ (Bolton 1981, pp. 6ff.). Berndt and Berndt (1988) express a similar ambivalence: on one hand they see the Aboriginals, in accordance with their mythical beliefs of having spiritual links with the land, as maintaining a status quo in nature, and on the other hand they write, there was ‘in no sense a direct or conscious attempt at conservation for conservation’s sake...there are plenty of examples of profligacy’ (pp. 146f.).

Blainey (1982) provides several examples of the Aboriginal profligacy in their use of resources, including the wasteful catching of fish (p. 140), hunting of ducks (p. 152), and the mining of red ochre (p. 183). He writes that the pieces of evidence supporting the view that the Aboriginals contributed to the extinction of the giant marsupials, ‘defy the simple idea that aboriginals were living in harmony with a static environment’ (p. 65). But it is the use of fire which Blainey (1982, ch. 5) sees as central to the Aboriginal relationship to the land. They carried firesticks with them and not only burned the vegetation systematically for hunting purposes and for ease of walking, but set fire to the vegetation ‘casually’ (p. 68). Blainey quotes Curr, a Victorian squatter, as saying that the Aboriginal, through his ‘fire-stick’ farming, ‘tilled his land and cultivated his pastures with fire’ (pp. 78f.). Blainey writes, ‘Fire dominated the life of the aboriginals to an even greater degree than the motor-engine dominates western nations today’ (p. 75), and it ‘often confers a stronger sense of omnipotence than its modern counterpart’ (p. 76). Latz (1995, ch. 3) hypothesises that the early Aboriginals in northern Australia would have initially encountered mostly fire-sensitive rainforest environments, but

---

1 Bolton writes, ‘The whole of Australia was their farm, and it was a farm which they exploited with care for the needs of later generations. It may be that the increasing aridity of the land taught them forcibly that resources could not be regarded as infinite, but that they must practise disciplined nomadic habits, restriction of numbers, and conservation of sources of water and food. In addition their pattern of life was imbued with a deeply felt sense of religious tradition which identified the people with the land and its natural features. The individual was subordinated to the good of the community, and the community was subordinated to the environment’ (1981, pp. 8f.).
learned that burning of the forest extended the fire-dependent flora of the coastal grasslands and woodlands which produced roots and seeds and attracted the fauna better suited to their hunting and gathering life style. Once the former ecological balance had been overcome, Latz suggests, the transformation would have acquired its own momentum so that with climate change, lightning fires, and continual Aboriginal burning, the grasslands would have extended as a new ecological system. Soils would have become eroded, watercourses silted, runoff increased, dunes formed, rainfall decreased, and the giant marsupials would have lost their habitats so that ‘predation or dramatic climate changes could have caused their extinction’ (pp. 35ff.). The change to the ecological systems would have resulted ‘in a considerable lowering of productivity’ (p. 38).

Two particular insights of Jung, on fire and instinct, seem relevant to an interpretation of the symbolism of the Aboriginal relationship to the land. Jung describes fire as a religious symbol of fundamental importance: fire is a symbol of the soul (Jung 1969b, CW8, para. 665) or of libido or psychic energy, and a symbol of psychic transformation and rebirth (Jung 1967, CW5, paras 227–250; Jung 1968c, CW12, paras 446, 449). Fire touches almost every level of Aboriginal life from the carefree play of setting fire to plants while walking, to the regulated burning procedures for hunting and regeneration of rank grasslands to fresh growth, and the highly spiritual use of fire such as in initiation ceremonies (see Elkin 1979, pp. 206f.). Elkin writes that, for the Aboriginals, fire ‘has an “other-world” source’ (pp. 247f.) and has fundamental practical and symbolic significance (p. 248). Fire, says Elkin, is the culminating and most emotionally charged of the sequence of experiences in the male initiation ceremony (p. 207). The ceremony seems to symbolise a psychological rebirth in which the young male is torn away from his mother (the devouring maternal psyche), put through physical initiations (symbolising self-sacrifice and death), and finally made to endure the fire ceremony (symbolising purification and spiritual rebirth) (see Elkin 1979, pp. 201–207). It seems that the Aboriginals used fire as a symbol for the libido and for the archetypal idea of spiritual rebirth.

The Aboriginals seem to have also used fire as their main means of relating to the land. Jung suggests that the early humans (largely unconscious) would have
acted instinctively towards the environment, and only later tried to put into thought, through myth, what and why they were acting as they did (Jung 1964, pp. 65–68). The Aboriginal use of fire, then, may be seen as instinctive. Psychological projection of the unconscious onto the landscape makes the land a symbol of the psyche. Fire symbolised their own psychic energy, connection with the eternal, and the psychologically transformative power of the spirit. The ritualistic burning of the landscape represented a symbolic transformation of their own psyche from dark (unconscious) to light (conscious) and seems to have been a ritualistic consolidation of consciousness against the ‘loss of soul’ (cf. Jung 1968b, CW9(i), para. 213). In practice, burning gave them a domination over the landscape; psychically, it gave them domination of consciousness over the darkness. Fire was the tool by which the Aboriginals symbolically acted out the Eros myth of seeking freedom from the unconscious. In the process, however, of the largely unconscious psyche developing towards ego consciousness, the unconscious suffers through being suppressed, and the landscape, as its symbol, also becomes degraded.

The Symbolism of European Agriculture in Australia

Whereas the Aboriginals have inhabited the Australian continent for tens of thousands of years, European settlement commenced in 1788 and hence spans a little over two hundred years. This section analyses, through historical examples, the motif-symbolism of European agriculture in Australia.

The initial European settlement in Australia was at Sydney Cove in Port Jackson, which had the locational attributes of a fine deep-water berth for ships, and the water supply of the Tank Stream described by Governor Phillip as a ‘fine stream’ (Lloyd 1988, p. 25). Lloyd records that Captain Collins described the stream as a run of fresh water, ‘which stole silently through the head of a very thick wood... Heavy timber fringed the stream’s banks, sprinkled with wild celery, spinach and parsley’ (p. 25). Lloyd continues, ‘To protect the supply as much as possible from the sun, Phillip forbade the cutting down of any tree within 50 feet of the stream, and fences and intercepting ditches were constructed on both banks. (p. 25).

It was not the sun, however, which was the main threat to the quality
of the water. The small volume of flow in the Tank Stream and the failure to find, in the initial years, a large and regular supply of fresh water (Lloyd 1988, pp. 25ff.) meant that from the beginning of European settlement in Australia the stream became a ‘centre’ which was literally and symbolically the source of life. People sought to possess it and quickly degraded it. Lloyd notes that pollution of the waters of the Tank Stream continued at least until 1810 when Macquarie decreed against effluent pollution from the several industries of the new colony (p. 28). Taking water directly from the rivers, transformation of the rivers by clearing and use of banks, and the construction of structures like the tanks excavated in the rocky bed of the Tank Stream and the later dams and weirs of the inland rivers, was a continuous pattern in Australian land development. Degradation of the water courses has been a characteristic of land settlement.

Because of the poor quality of the soils in the coastal region around Sydney, agriculture was soon concentrated on the fertile alluvial flats, especially those of the Hawkesbury River north-west of Sydney. Stamp (1969, pp. 12, 30, 37f.) notes a similar pattern in England, recording that successive waves of settlers from at least Bronze Age times, and including the Celts, Anglo-Saxons, Vikings, and Normans, selected discriminatively the land that was easiest to work and most productive. In Australia, agricultural settlement normally followed the fertile river flood plains and exhibited an exploitative, take-from attitude. Atkinson (1975), writing in 1826, notes that most of the alluvial lands of the colony’s main rivers were forested with large trees, principally blue and flooded gum and the native ‘apple’ tree (p. 8), and comments that the whole of the alluvial flats would make ‘most excellent permanent pastures, if laid down with proper grasses’ (p. 9), presumably after clearing. The fertility of the soils was like a magnet to the settlers, who sought to extract this fertility in the form of cultivated cereal grains with, it seems, no regard for the land itself.

2 Although the contamination of the Tank Stream began early in the settlement’s life, the first attempt at containment, if not prevention, was not made until October 1795 when Governor John Hunter issued a decree noting the causes and elements of significant pollution: huts had been built on both sides of the stream, with paths to the water from each dwelling; pigsties had been built on the banks, disgorging filth into the stream during rainy weather’ (Lloyd 1988, p. 27).
Atkinson notes that the greater part of the Hawkesbury and Nepean River flood plains had been cleared for cultivation (p. 8) but these rich lands were squandered. The ‘ignorant, indolent, and improvident’ settlers allowed the crop lands to become so choked with weeds that, after a few years, they abandoned the fields and cleared new forest and repeated the process (pp. 8, 31f.). Atkinson’s description indicates that the settlers’ profligacy led to degradation of the land and exacerbation of the effects of flooding. The concentration of settlement on the river plain invited devastation from flood. Bolton (1981, p. 37) notes that the clearing of trees and cultivation of the banks of the Hawkesbury River and creeks caused much loss of land and property from erosion and floods. As a response, Governor King issued a proclamation in 1803 forbidding the felling of timber along the banks of rivers and watercourses (p. 37).

C. J. King (1950) records the frequency with which the Hawkesbury River flooded and the serious impact the losses had on the food supply for the colony (King 1950, Essay 3, p. 451; Essay 7, pp. 627ff.). Governor Lachlan Macquarie seems to have had a sympathy to both people and the land, characterised by an attitude of nurturing rather than dominating. His journals indicated that he had a keen eye for the beauty of the landscape (Macquarie 1956, pp. 20f.), and his policies of treating emancipated convicts as free men within the colony showed a human understanding for others which was in contrast to the oppressive cruelty of the colony and self-seeking greed of some of the free settlers who opposed government support of the emancipists (King 1950, Essay 5, pp. 530ff.). Macquarie also showed an appreciation of the need to integrate land utilisation patterns with the natural characteristics of the land. He sought to minimise the risk of flood damage to the agricultural settlements on the river flats by encouraging a system of

---

3 ‘These floods are much augmented, and the rapid rise of the waters accelerated, by large quantities of timber and still living trees, that have either fallen in accidentally, by the banks whereon they stood being gradually undermined by the water, or have been thrown in designedly by the indolent Settlers in clearing the land (Atkinson 1975, p. 7).’

4 Atkinson quotes a contemporary writer: ‘The inundation which happened in March 1806, carried away grain and live stock to the amount of £35,000. The waters of the Nepean rose ninety-two feet above the common level of the river, threatening to carry everything away before it. At the Hawkesbury, houses, barns, stacks of corn, together with some thousands of hogs and other livestock, were swept away, leaving nothing but desolation and ruin behind (Atkinson 1975, p. 10).’
mixed crop and livestock farming integrated with the towns planned to be
developed on the ridge-land above the flood levels. Five towns (Richmond,
Windsor, Pitttown, Castlereagh and Wilberforce) were built and the farmers were
couraged to move their houses and farm storage buildings to the townships.
Macquarie thus saw land settlement as an integration between the type of use and
the natural characteristics of the land, as well as between the different types of use.

King (1950, Essay 7, pp. 625f.) writes of the fear which the new land with
its often unproductive soils and unpredictable climate raised in the minds of the
settlers. William Howitt, writing in 1855, also alludes to the fear of raw nature in
the uncleared forest (Bolton 1981, p. 41). Even the rationalist Western psyche
experienced the unconscious emotion of fear of the unknown. The unknown forest
and land symbolised the unconscious which, as Jung stated (1968c, CW12, para.
6), is the thing most feared by the conscious mind.

The pioneers soon found that particular species of trees had export value.
The pioneers’ inner centres, to which they were unconsciously united, were
projected onto the trees which they consequently ruthlessly exploited, in some
cases almost to extinction as happened within several decades to the cedar, for
example, in the coastal pockets of rainforest along the eastern coast (Bolton 1981,
pp. 38, 40). The Big Scrub rainforest in north eastern New South Wales was not
only made extinct of cedar but, by the early 1900s, was almost totally cleared of
trees for its timber resource and to allow the expansion of pasture for the grazing of

It was the forest in general, not just the valuable timber trees, which showed
how the Eros mind could exist only through domination of nature, whether psychic
or physical. The forest symbolised the unconscious, and bore the brunt of the
pioneers’ need to impose a rational order upon the unformed wilderness. The

---

5 King (1950) writes, ‘Overhanging like a pall every enterprise of an agricultural or stock-
raising character in the early colony was a dread of the elements—the periodic droughts,
storms and floods, which overnight or after days or weeks of fore-shadowing, destroyed stock,
homes and crops. The droughts were ‘blights’, the floods ‘inundations’. The very
words... conjure up a picture of presentiment of overwhelming disaster, of death, disease and
misery’ (p. 625)... ‘The quietly sleeping continent, brooding in its immensity, was sometimes
feared like some strange pagan deity. It was felt to be an enemy to the petty outpost of
settlement, precariously poised on its edge’ (p. 626).
agriculturalists seeking space for the cultivation of crops, and for pastures for dairy cattle and sheep grazing, embarked upon massive programs of clearing of trees. The effort and cost was immense (Wadham 1967, pp. 26f.) and is described as ‘heroic’ (Rural Reconstruction Commission 1944, p. 68), a term which hints at the mythical nature of the enterprise. The cutting by axe and saw, the ringbarking, grubbing and burning of the felled timber of Australia’s forests epitomises, among the agricultural activities, the Eros attitude that life comprises a fight against nature and the fashioning of human destiny through the rise of the rational mind above physical nature. The quest to reunite with the inner centre is symbolised in the conquest of the physical landscape.


The basaltic grasslands of Western Victoria were taken up as sheep and cattle runs by squatters in the late eighteen thirties and forties [see Kiddle 1961], and the native flora was virtually exterminated over hundreds of square miles (Turner 1968, p. 165).

Marshall (1968, p. 27) describes Western Victoria ‘of which the inhabitants are all so proud... Here you see mile after mile of drab flatness, broken by unsightly windbreaks of cypress and tatty sugar gum’. Marshall comments that the region’s wildlife was almost entirely exterminated by the sheep farmers, who were ‘hungry’ men and who ‘had no feeling for the countryside; they were ‘brave and resourceful men, but their sole ambition was to ‘make a do’ on the land, which meant clearing the timber and overgrazing the pastures (p. 27). Turner explains that more serious than the loss of individual plant species is the loss of plant communities which form the basis of a region’s flora and fauna ecological system (Marshall 1968, p. 163). Destruction and transformation were the aims:

The early pastoralists spread out over the landscape with their sheep devouring all before them, and the farmers followed with the axe and the firebrand, intent upon destroying their enemy the forest (Turner 1968, p. 159).

Nearly all squatters [in the Western District of Victoria] persisted in their early tendency to eradicate native trees wherever possible, and even when they had not intended to do so the feeding habits of their stock as well as
other causes only guessed at brought about the death of many trees (Kiddie 1961, p. 317).

In its report to the Federal Government in 1944, The Rural Reconstruction Commission bemoans the loss of so much valuable forest throughout Eastern Australia, much of which was cleared on land too steep for agriculture and is now abandoned, often still containing the felled timber, to bracken, scrub, or inferior forest (Rural Reconstruction Commission 1944, p. 68). The Report notes the tendency for the pioneers to abandon a property once productivity (and fertility) began to decline, and to move to new land (pp. 36, 68). The Report (p. 68) writes of the ‘prevailing trend of thought’ that the trees of the forests were ‘the enemy of development’, and elsewhere (p. 45) states that for improved agricultural methods the farmers would have to have an attitude open to new ideas. What the Commission was criticising was the selfish exploitative and dominating attitude of Eros which, more than being a contemporary cultural outcome, is inherent in the egocentric psyche.

It was not only nature but the whole cultural environment of the colony that was often seen as the object to be exploited. In every action, the rational mind is unconsciously seeking connection to the world, through a feeling of wholeness, belonging, reconciliation and atonement. Through projection, each object of the mind’s focus is perceived as a symbol of the unknown psychic centre or self.

Kiddle (1961, pp. 26, 47) notes that many of the free settlers in western Victoria, who were backed by capital, saw the whole colonial adventure as an opportunity to exploit the land and the cultural system for making profits as quickly as possible before returning to Britain. Perceiving the world through the Eros motif, these pioneers projected their psychic centres onto the colony, and thence sought to dominate it. This domination was, however, dependent on a symbolic centre at a larger, global scale, namely Britain, the export market for the colony.

---

6 The Report continues: ‘However, before judgement is passed, it is necessary to remember the prevailing trend of thought of those times. The parts of Australia with better rainfall were almost entirely tree clad. There were trees in all directions; they had to be cleared before the land could be developed and farmed; they were the enemy of development; it was absurd to think of a shortage of trees; the wood was only of limited value for practical purposes and not the same as the woods to which our forefathers were accustomed and would be never as valuable; if there were forests other species would have to be grown...’(p. 68)
Thus the colonial adventure grew as a manifestation of the community's unconscious drive to tame the unknown, symbolised by the colonial wilderness—the periphery beyond the walls of their homeland temenos. Their axis mundi was the economic market through which they sought to win their economic and social prize—a symbolic salvation. Their life acquired meaning through relationship to the unconsciously projected centre.

Kiddle (1961, pp. 22, 102, 130) comments that the Victorian Western District pioneers were generally of Calvinistic background and saw material wealth as a reflection of righteousness in their religious beliefs: prosperity was a manifestation of being God's chosen people. This indicates an Eros religious myth of a God of Glory, a God who could be found in human success: hard work and a pious attitude was the propitiation necessary to achieve material and spiritual reward. Righteousness was the prize earned by human effort. This is the reverse of the Agape God of the Cross who is hidden from humanity until revealed in the suffering and giving for the good of the other.

The pastoralists in general did not nurture the land. Mythically, they sought to slay the earth dragon. They had to conquer to win the prize. The pioneers saw the land in Utopian terms; once the wilderness was tamed, the harmony of paradise would be attained. In their conquest, they extracted fertility from the land and degraded it. Vegetation, soils, and water courses suffered. The Rural Reconstruction Commission (1944, p. 35) notes the degradational effect of this exploitative agriculture. Clearing and overgrazing transformed and degraded the ecological systems. Organic matter, living and dead, decreased; soil structure was destroyed so that the formerly aerated, spongy soils collapsed to massive hardpans; and water infiltration and water-holding capability of soils decreased. Hydrological regimes were disturbed—runoff increased, vegetative evapotranspiration

7 ‘...when the land was first cleared from the virgin state and put under pasture or crop, a great deal of stored plant food was liberated in the destruction of the original vegetation; the soils also often had a fair accumulation of humus in their upper layers and this often represented a further storehouse of plant food; finally the roots of the natural vegetation had in many cases left a soil of fairly good structure and penetrability. The first pastures or crops, therefore, had every advantage, a friable soil with abundant plant food, and, as a result, their growth was usually remarkably good...more often than not the fertility was only transitory...sooner or later, the farmer learnt that good soil structure can be lost and that the storehouse of fertility...was not inexhaustible’ (Rural Reconstruction Commission 1944, p. 35).
decreased, groundwater tables rose and salinisation appeared where soil-salts accumulated at the surface through altered groundwater–surface relationships and subsequent evaporation.

In a report to the Victorian Government, Carr (1940) described the changes brought about by grazing to the upper catchments of the Mitta Mitta and Murray Rivers in north-eastern Victoria. She records that, prior to its use for European livestock grazing, the region was well vegetated and had soils which absorbed most of the rainfall and released the water slowly to springs and streams which were clear and rarely failed in summer. After the introduction of cattle grazing, the streams rose quickly after rainfall, were turbid, and receded quickly to a trickle. The early explorers, from 1835, were looking for 'open country which could be put to immediate use by the application of techniques and practices which approximated to those then current in Europe. The Europeans of that day saw timbered country as a desolate wilderness' (Carr 1940). The original vegetation was park-like, with open Eucalyptus forest and abundant kangaroo grass on the flats. By the 1880s, the slopes had become badly eroded to a bare, red surface. By 1940, overgrazing had caused loss of vegetation cover and erosion of topsoil, and the land had become drier. Many springs and boggy areas on the slopes had dried completely, and in the lower country they had dried or disappeared because of scouring of the creek beds. Many water holes and swamps had disappeared and some creek beds were scoured and rocky, and had only intermittent flow (Carr 1940). Similar accounts of degradation of the agricultural landscape are given by Lloyd (1988, p. 48) and Powell (1989, pp. 45ff.).

Cultivation for crops also led to land degradation. King (1950, e.g. Essay 1, p. 11) notes the primitiveness of early crop farming in the colony and the problem of soils which quickly lost their organic matter and fertility under cultivation. He notes also the effects of an exploitative attitude when he cites Collins who writes that the wheat grounds had, in 1795, become infested with weed and were exhausted of fertility because of '... a greediness to make it produce golden harvests every season, without allowing it time to recoup itself from crop to crop, or being unable to afford manure' (King 1950, Essay 3, p. 445). Soil exhaustion of the cultivated lands was common in the colony because of the inherently poor soils,
the continuous cropping without use of rotations to pasture, and the general lack of availability of animal manure (King 1950, Essay 1, pp. 3, 11; Essay 3, pp. 572, 575, 581). British farming had developed for centuries the pattern of mixed crop and livestock agriculture because of the needs of a diet based on cereals and animal products, the need for animals to draw the ploughs, and the necessity to add animal manure to the arable soils to maintain productive capability. In early Australian agriculture, however, the separation of livestock grazing from cropping lands led to impoverishment of organic matter in the cultivated soils.

The wheat industry manifests the take-from attitude to land. Farmers attempted to grow wheat year after year on the same ground. Williams (1974, pp. 270ff.) records that a Royal Commission in 1860 found that in South Australia, farmers grew wheat continuously on the same land for at least 3 years and sometimes as long as 26 years; they compensated for the reduced yields by growing on increased acreages and reducing their production costs by the use of machinery. Williams (pp. 292ff.) notes that techniques used to retain sufficient moisture in the semi-arid climate included ‘dry farming’ which involved shallow cultivation after rain to produce a fine tilth in the surface soil to prevent capillary rise and evaporation, and fallowing whereby a paddock is left unplanted for one season so that the soil could absorb rainfall over the season for use by the planted crop in the subsequent season. As a result of these practices, soil fertility and structure became degraded because of the destruction of the original vegetation, the non-replacement of organic matter, and the physical breakdown of structure by continuous cultivation (Williams 1974, pp. 297ff.). Williams notes further that the loss of fertility was masked by the use of superphosphate fertiliser in the first half of the twentieth Century. It was not until improved pastures were developed after 1945 that a rotation including pastures allowed the crop lands to retain structure and fertility (p. 316).

Unlike the Aboriginals who perceived a spiritualised land, the British settlers lived in a largely despiritualised world. Their thinking about the land was rational, although they perceived the land unconsciously through archetypal imagery. The psychic need for reconnection to a sacred origin, which the Aboriginals expressed through myth and ritual, was manifested by the British
settler only unconsciously in the desire to tame the land and establish their own centres of sacred space. Clearing the land by felling and burning trees, delimitation of space by marking boundaries, stocking the land with sheep and cattle, and cultivating the soil are, psychologically, mythical creations, symbolising the birthing of conscious thought from the unconscious. The difference between the mythical existence of the Aboriginals and the rational outlook of the British settlers was that the British, with their higher level of consciousness, had suppressed their myth in the unconscious. The cleared forest and the ploughed field fulfilled the same need psychologically as the aboriginal corroboree ground and the spirit centre:

...the non religious man of modern societies is still nourished and aided by the activity of his unconscious, yet without thereby attaining to a properly religious experience and vision of the world...(Eliade 1959, pp. 212f.)

Because it [agriculture] deals with life..., it is therefore first and foremost a ritual. It was so from the beginning and has always remained so in farming communities, even in the most highly civilised areas of Europe. (Eliade 1974, p. 331; cf. Jung 1967, CW5, para. 226)

The degradation of the Australian rural landscape in little over 200 years of European settlement is evidence of the broken relationship between the egocentric psyche and the land. The ego-dominated psyche operating within the Eros religious myth seeks to establish its autonomy and superiority over its environment. The Australian agriculturalists have sought to achieve this psychological goal through their symbolic domination of the landscape, with the inevitable result of degradation of the land.

7.4 MOTIF-SYMBOLISM OF GOVERNMENTAL PLANNING OF AGRICULTURE

The previous two sections analysed the motif-symbolism of an Australian pioneer and of the Australian agricultural community. This section analyses the motif-symbolism of the government perspective of the human–land relationship as expressed in planned agricultural land settlement. The governmental outlook is
discussed under the topics of land survey, landscape authorship (a term used by Powell (1988, p. 312) in the planned development of closer-settlement agricultural areas, and the government–people relationship in agricultural lands.

**Survey as Symbol**

Elkin (1979) records that when a group of Australian Aboriginals entered a new area of land,

...they stamp their feet into or 'scrape' them along the soil, and beat their rhythm-sticks on the ground, and so raising the 'new' earth to enfold them as in its emanations symbolised by the dust (p. 43).

Elkin (1979) states that 'the sacramental relationship with that timeless, unseen reality' (p. 44) of the Dreamtime-created landscape had to be initiated by the people so that the land would know, that is recognise, them (p. 43). This is the *Eros* myth, in which contact with the divine is made by the initiative of the people (and not of God).

Elkin (1979) describes how the Aborigines had a fear of the unknown land (pp. 69f), that is of land which had not been brought into sacredness by ritualistic repetition of their mythical ancestors' creation activities (Eliade 1971, pp. 6–11). Fear of the landscape symbolises the human's greatest fear, namely confrontation with the soul (Jung 1968c, CW 12, paras 6, 126). Westermann (1974, p. 11) states that creation mythology and its associated propitiatory rites have the 'function of preserving the world and of giving security to life' to 'threatened man in a threatened world'. Each person and each society lives according to a religious myth which gives assurance of a sacred existence in a sacred place of the world.

In *Eros* mythology sacredness can be effected only by establishing protected areas in which contact with the divine power of the earth can be made for the purpose of invoking from the spirits 'permanence and perpetuation' (Elkin 1979, p. 44) for human and natural life. The holy area or *temenos* protects a person from the 'perils of the soul' and is 'a taboo area where he will be able to meet the unconscious' (Jung 1968c, CW 12, para. 63). The sacred site gives protection against the threatening spirits of the unknown landscape.

The Aboriginals extended sacrality over their landscape by songlines, paths or tracks along which they sang mythical stories as they travelled them (Elkin
By the use of feet and song the aboriginals created from the wilderness a sacred surveyed land. For thousands of years the Australian continent lay under a survey system based on sacred sites linked by the songlines. Human life had religious meaning and security because of the surveyed creation of sacred space beyond which lay the profane wilderness of fear. The surveyed landscape was an integral part of the myth of life, and symbolised the psychic need for confirmation of a tenuous consciousness against the threat of unconsciousness.

Each aboriginal tribe saw its land as the centre-of-the-world. Beyond was the feared unknown (Elkin 1979, pp. 69f.). The landscape was seen in terms of mandala symbolism in a hierarchical system. Their global system centred on the spiritual home of their chief ancestor and contained, concentrically, their sacred tribal area and beyond that the unknown territory. At a smaller scale were the various sacred sites for particular purposes such as for rites of increase of fertility, initiation, and the locations of individuals’ spirit doubles (Elkin 1979, pp. 221ff.).

The British settlers brought their own survey systems to Australia. These systems had evolved over thousands of years and had become far more formalised than the Australian Aboriginal system which was locked into Dreamtime mythology by repetitive ritual. The governors of the British colony in Australia were faced with establishing a settlement pattern in the new landscape. Powell (1970) notes that intensive farming was the ideal of European nineteenth century land use, and in both the USA and Australia ‘a system of land survey was developed to provide a visible and measurable framework for the expansion of closer settlement’ (p. 50). In the Australian colony the government sought to survey the land prior to any alienation from Crown ownership by sale as freehold land. Powell (p. 50) distinguishes between the system introduced in the United States in 1785 of a national rectangular grid— ‘a striking example of geometry triumphant over physical geography’, and the British system of more or less rectangular areas based on local features such as rivers and roads and hence incapable of having consistent orientation nationally. Both systems, however, imposed the straight line on the landscape.

Jeans (1972, p. 106) notes that the geometrical ‘township’ survey based on
a grid six miles square ‘containing thirty-six square-mile lots centres on a reserve for a village which would provide the farmers with services, school and church’, which had been used in East Florida since 1763 was instructed to be used by each of the early Governors of the colony of New South Wales. These instructions had been ignored, however, in favour of more ad hoc boundaries until Governor Brisbane adopted them in 1821. Governor Darling, whose governorship began in 1825, was instructed to survey the colony according to the traditional British system of parishes (approximately 25 square miles), hundreds (100 square miles), and counties (40 miles by 40 miles and bounded by streams and ranges) (Jeans 1972, p. 106). Survey in early New South Wales was a compromise between the urgent practical need to delineate land for valuation and sale, and the need for accuracy. Natural boundaries formed the basis for the counties, but the smaller subdivisions of parishes, portions, and town sections were geometrically determined according to the cardinal directions so that the boundaries ‘in most cases ignored the landform and potential land uses’ (National Capital Development Commission 1977).

The Australian surveys were generally orientated to the cardinal directions but there was inconsistency between areas, and the system lacked the regularity of the American system (Powell 1970, pp. 65ff.). In 1858 the Geodetic Survey was introduced to Victoria, and was based on astronomical and theodolite measurements using the meridians of Longitude and the parallels of Latitude to give an accurate rectangular grid over the State (Powell 1970, pp. 66ff.).

Williams (1974) notes that in the colony of South Australia, which commenced in 1836, the ideal of the Wakefieldian colonial settlement pattern was given its skeletal structure by the survey system, and ‘on the face of the land there was imposed a deliberately created design’ (p. 65). The initial instruction to the Governor of South Australia was to survey ‘townships and counties according to the rectangular system used in East Florida since 1763, but ‘using natural-features for boundaries wherever possible’ (p. 72). The survey system comprised counties, hundreds, and rural sections. Williams notes that the boundaries of the earliest counties followed natural features such as the coastline, major rivers and ridgelines, whereas in later surveys, especially where the topography was less dramatic,
straight geometric boundaries were used (p. 72).

Williams (1974) writes that over the whole of South Australia, if the boundaries along coastlines are excluded, 'straight lines accounted for 88 per cent of all hundred boundaries. Geometry was triumphant over geography' (p. 94). The geometrical basis of survey had many detrimental impacts on land use (pp. 100ff.), and there was public disenchantment with the survey program. He notes that in South Australia, apart from Adelaide and the larger townships, there are 510 planned townships incorporated in the broad survey of the state, many of which have never been surveyed on the ground or developed (p. 333). The 'parkland towns' had a square configuration comprising a business centre surrounded in turn by parkland and suburbs. Major roads radiated from the town centre. It seems reasonable to conclude that the pattern which is so symmetrical and geometrical and is demonstrated so often to have no compatibility with either the topography or the potential design of the most efficient use of the land, is symbolic, reflecting the most fundamental psychological archetype, the mandala.

Thus the modern survey seems to be far from just a utilitarian means for the allocation of occupation or ownership of land. Rather it continues the religious practice of the Aboriginals who, through sacred sites and songlines, transformed chaos land into sacred inhabitable land. The survey delimits a temenos by differentiating the enclosed space from all space beyond its boundary. The temenos focuses on its own centre. But the survey also establishes relationships. All parcels of land in a local area relate to a local centre such as an adjacent road or river. If the survey follows the cardinal directions the parcels of land relate jointly to the global

---

8 Williams illustrates the disenchantment with the survey program by the following quote from the Border Watch newspaper of 18th April 1864: 'And it came to pass that as they measured the land in straight lines, turning neither to the right nor to the left, lest their calculations should become disordered and themselves be lost; so did they mark out beautiful roads thirty cubits in width that went nowhere, others ran over perpendicular mountains or through impassable swamps, many went into deep watercourses or hideous caverns, and some did terminate in the depth of the ocean... and the people were exceedingly glad, but the working bullocks lifted up their voices and wept. Now these men of learning became after much toil and hard practice very skilful in the mysteries of land measuring after their fashion—that is to say in straight lines; for to measure a piece of land in any shape, or no shape at all, they held to be a departure from sound judgement and a sinful thing to contemplate. And a chronicle of these days hath related that one rash man not having the fear of the Theodolite before his eyes did leave the paths of rectitude and right-angle to make a better road across a gully, and was seen no more' (Williams 1974, pp. 108ff.).
centre, the North Pole. The resulting hierarchy of relationships is a geometrical representation of the psychic relationships of individuals, firstly with themselves, secondly with others, and thirdly with the archetypal god, the *anima mundi*.

From the examples of the Australian Aboriginals and the British methods of survey in Australia, it might be concluded that the survey of land is a universal religious activity based on the psychological projection of an archetypal symbol the purpose of which is to direct the person to psychic integration. The methods of survey become more formally geometrical as the culture advances technologically or organisationally. The survey itself is based on the symbolic perception of a centre. Survey, even in the modern rationalist world, continues the psychological meaning of ancient geomancy, although to the modern mind the practice seems quite divorced from religion or psychology.

Pennick and Devereux (1989, pp. 245ff.) confronted the problem of the straight line in the landscape. They concluded that straight lines which have been superimposed, either as constructed features or abstract lines, and are now viewed as mundane and secular, were, in the past, magical and sacred (p. 246). They state that the lines were originally linked to the gods, and this association devolved to the kings, themselves originally divine and later representatives of the deity (p. 246). They note that the words for kingship in many languages, such as the Latin *rex* and the English royal, derive from the Latin *reg* meaning to guide or direct in a straight line (pp. 246ff.): the ultimate derivation, they suggest, is from the straightness of the rays of the sun, the symbol of god (and the *self*) (p. 262). The sanctity of the straight line comes from the mythical idea that the landscape is wild and threatening, and security is made possible only by the gods. In *Eros*, the people have to invoke the intervention of the gods. The Aboriginals thereby created a secure landscape by sacred sites and songlines. Other cultures, from ancient to modern times, have sacralised their lands with the divine straight-line by which they have made their lands *reg*-ular and *rect*-angular. The idea of the divine kingship was intimately linked to the land and its fertility. The king acted as an *axis mundi* through which the earth spirit could be directed to the benefit of the people. The royal processional way radiated from the palace/citadel to signify the transformation of wilderness to sacred space in which fertility could be directed
towards the welfare of humankind:

The universal nature of landscape lines shows that while regional, physical variations existed, and various cultural applications were made of the lines, the common characteristic of sanctity they all share is archetypal. It was not a learned concept, but one that emerged from within. The first landscape was that of the soul, the psyche: the sanctity of the straight came from the human mind, not from any specific time or place (Pennick & Devereux 1989, p. 261).

Survey can be seen, therefore, as a form of art in which the canvas is the landscape and the motifs derive from the archetypal forms of the mandala. As discussed in chapter 4, the mandala indicates an immature psyche centred on the ego. The dissociation between the straight line survey and the natural landscape indicates the brokenness between the Eros thinking of government and the land.

**Landscape Authorship**

Powell (1988, p. xv) uses the term landscape authorship to describe governmental transformation of regional and national landscapes in the establishment of new patterns of land settlement and land-use. The word author derives from the Latin *augere* meaning to increase, augment, enlarge etc., and subsequently from *auctor* which can mean creator, maker, producer, performer etc. This section analyses the motif-symbolism of governmental authorship of landscape in the development of agriculture in Australia through the example of the closer settlement policy. This focus is chosen because these patterns of settlement derive from clearly-stated government policy amenable to motif-analysis.

Powell (1988) notes that the Australian colonial governments held to ‘the yeoman imagery’ (p. 14), the ideal of the family-operated small farm (p. 13). Governments held this idealist view of rural settlement under the guiding principles of ‘more and smaller is better’ and of creating a ‘little England in Australia’ (Powell 1988, p. 15; 1989, p. 40). This pattern was manifested in the colony’s earliest rural land subdivisions, in governmental irrigation schemes and in the soldier-settler closer settlement schemes (which included irrigation and dryland farming areas) following both world wars (Wadham, Wilson & Wood 1957, pp. 133f., 231, 305f., 312; Powell 1988, especially ch. 4).
The 'industrious yeomanry' ideal (Powell 1988, p. 114) had its roots in Britain. Lord Ernle (Rowland Prothero) in his book English Farming: Past and Present (1961) records the transition of English agriculture from prehistoric Celtic times to the early twentieth century in which the basis of British agriculture had always been the small farm. 'England is still mainly a country of medium and small farms,' writes Fussell in the first introduction to Ernle's book (p. lxxiii), notwithstanding the aggregation of properties associated with the displacement of hundreds or thousands of yeomen farmers in events such as the growth of the medieval feudal estates in Anglo-Saxon and Norman times, the dissolution of the monasteries and the parliamentary enclosures.

Ernle was a writer, land agent and parliamentarian. His writing on agriculture was a part-time activity, and it seems that for him, who lived very much in the rational world, land represented a symbol of the unknown instinctual side of his psyche. Despite his rationalistic acceptance of the evolution of British agriculture towards the aristocratic large holdings, he clung to the ideal of the yeoman farmer. It seems clear that not only does the picture of yeoman agriculture represent the nation's past but it is also a powerful psychological image of the mother-archetype, continuing the imagery of the Garden of Eden.

The yeoman ideal came to Australia with the first British settlers. King (1950, Essay 2, p. 44) writes that Phillip, Governor of the First Settlement, had instructions from the British Government 'to afford every encouragement to non-commissioned officers and men of the marines to settle on farms, and to settle, also, under similar conditions, convicts having served their terms'. Initially, farming in the settlement was conducted on government farms using convict labour. In 1789, the second year of settlement, Phillip conducted an experiment to see whether a farmer could be self-sufficient on a small farm. King records that James Ruse, a former convict, was given in late 1789 one acre of land to clear and cultivate. The results were encouraging, and in 1790 Ruse was given a grant of 30 acres in Australia's first private land grant (King 1950, Essay 2, pp. 41-44). Land grants were subsequently given to military personnel, emancipated convicts and free immigrants. Another category of land holding arose with the subsequent arrival of free immigrants with sufficient financial resources to take up large
pastoral holdings.

King writes that by the mid-1790s there were two distinct interest groups engaged in the colony's agriculture, the private free settlers (either military personnel or free immigrants) and the public farmers (on government farms and the emancipated convicts on land grants). The private land holders soon held the majority of land and held market monopolies. King writes, 'The free immigrant and the large farmer constituted no more than a sprinkling of the total number of agriculturalists, although overshadowing them in influence' (King 1950, Essay 5, p. 530). In response, the governments sought to break the monopolies by fostering public farming (King 1950, Essay 3, pp. 444ff.). The Governors used the yeoman-ideal as the tool in their objective of control over people and land. The small-farmers were pawns in this (Eros) power game, and instead of being nurtured into independent freedom were put mostly into financially and practically impossible situations, with the result that most lived in poverty or were forced to abandon their farms (King 1950, Essay 1, p.10).

In contrast to the yeoman-ideal was the large pastoralist, epitomised in the early decades of the colony by John McArthur, who saw the commercial potential in grazing sheep for export of wool to the European markets. He was the forerunner of the later squatters who extended into inland New South Wales with their sheep flocks and cattle herds. These settlers followed the natural configurations of the land, seeking river frontage to a permanent river and extending away from the river to the back country. Pastoral runs therefore followed topographical boundaries like ridgelines and watercourses, avoiding the geometrical artificiality of the government survey. The contrast between this style of settlement and the government-planned yeoman settlement indicates a different level of relationship to the land. The squatters were involved with the land and followed the natural configurations; the governments were regulating the land and thought in abstract (archetypal) imagery. The pastoralists worked with sizes and types of land from which they could make a living (although many overgrazed and degraded their lands). Government officials, however, were administering others onto the land. Their plans followed archetypal images of the Garden of Eden and the geometrical survey. In her book A Spread of Green, about the development of the
Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area (MIA) in New South Wales, Sue Chessbrough (1982, p. 33) writes that the managing authority, the Water Conservation and Irrigation Commission embarked on an advertising campaign in Australia and overseas to attract settlers to 'this new "Garden of Eden"'.

The yeoman-ideal has remained a constant thread in Australian governmental agricultural land settlement. It has been the basis for the various soldier-settlement schemes. Closer settlement schemes for the resettlement of ex-servicemen into civilian life were fostered by the British and Commonwealth governments, particularly after the main wars. In Australia all mainland states adopted closer settlement schemes after World War I (Wadham, Wilson & Wood 1957, pp. 133f.). These authors comment that in the schemes after World War II little suitable crown land was available and, consequently, 'The acquisition and subdivision of large estates was therefore the chief source of new farms, and much more care was taken in assessing such properties than was the case after the first World War.' (p. 305). Governments used land settlement for the political goal of re-employment of the former servicemen. Closer settlement manifested two Eros characteristics, pattern and power. The power implications are discussed in the following section. The pattern followed the mandala-image of the yeoman farm, and often became associated with irrigation as a powerful means of imprinting government control over the land through the development of infrastructure and change of land-use. Chessbrough (1982) quotes from the poem *Australian Engineers* by Henry Lawson who lived in the MIA for a time during its pioneering days:

It is they who would set fair cities on the western plains far out.
They who would garden the deserts—it is they who would conquer the
Drought!
They see the dykes to the sky line, where a dust waste blazes today.
And they hear the lap of the waters on the miles of sand and clay (p. 91).

Chessbrough (1982) adds, 'The farmers experienced many problems in the experimental stages of the new-style intensive farming under irrigation. Much of the trouble lay in the size of the farms. After a Royal Commission in 1915 and several subsequent committees of inquiry into the settlers' complaints, the farm sizes were increased and the irrigation areas extended' (p. 122).
In another article, Lawson likens the Irrigation Area to ‘a new life in an old dead land that is being made to live again’ (Chessbrough 1982, p. 92). Chessbrough quotes Lawson again:

[The Area]...is a spread of green, all chequered off, with little homes and trees and clear fringed canals and channels—just like English brooks (Chessbrough 1982, p. 139).

In *Eros*, Lawson saw the land as dead. Transformation to life could be wrought only by human conquest, and that was in the chequered mandala pattern. Government asserted its power by superimposing upon the pastoral landscape a yeomanry dependent on government services and often poverty-stricken. Lloyd (1988) notes that the urge of the politicians and bureaucrats to impose closer settlement on the land gave impetus to the development of irrigation.\(^\text{10}\) Closer settlement irrigation-schemes manifest the *Eros* goal of conquest of nature in an unconscious cosmicisation of space through transformation of wilderness into the garden image. The schemes, in their totality and in each farm unit, represent the establishment of centres-of-the-world. The egocentric rational mind, however, is unconscious of each centre being a projected self-image in the form of a sacred *temenos* differentiated from the surrounding unordered (and unsacred) wilderness.\(^\text{11}\)

---

\(^{10}\) ‘A crucial factor in the development of irrigation was the political drive for closer settlement, which was a major issue at successive election campaigns early in the twentieth century. The period from 1902-3 to the outbreak of war in 1914 was very much the era of closer settlement in New South Wales. In the succinct formula of the *Australasian Pastoralists’ Review*, closer settlement was designed to “burst up the big estates and put people on the land” (14 September 1904)...This fitted in admirably with the irrigation ethic developed by authorities such as the American engineer, Elwood Mead, who argued that successful irrigation areas depended on intensive settlement and relatively small holdings...in 1909, Mead became Chairman of the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission of Victoria...In conjunction with a new *Water Act*, Mead’s appointment brought dramatic changes to Victorian irrigation and his ideas were just as pervasive across the Murray...Under Mead’s vigorous direction the Victorian commission (sic) was authorised to purchase, survey and subdivide land, to build houses, finance new settlers and plan townships.’ (Lloyd 1988, pp. 184f.)

\(^{11}\) Powell (1989) alludes to politician Alfred Deakin’s paradise-garden vision: ‘He conjured a prosperous future for all, safe from Nature’s blows. By increased production, consequent rises in railway freight revenues, and additional taxation from the settlement of areas which “are now little better than barren wilderness”; enormous benefits were guaranteed and Victoria would claim its rightful high position in the coming federation, when “this small Victoria will be in many senses a greater garden than it is now” ’ (p. 117).
The politicians, it seems, were unconsciously projecting mandala images (symbols of the unknown self) as visions of the garden paradise. Following Deakin’s lead, the Victorian government embarked upon government-sponsored irrigation schemes which imposed new centres in the form of large water storages and new centres of settlement which followed the mandala image. Similarly, in New South Wales, the closer-settlement areas followed a pattern of centralisation. The Government water authorities followed unconsciously an image of centralisation in their landscape authorship. This is evident at all scales of land use and in their system of administration, as illustrated in the following three examples:

Example 1: local scale
On the scale of the communal settlement the elements were arranged concentrically. Rutherford notes that in the MIA:

The scheme in 1906 was to develop several towns and outlying villages as compact nuclei. And around them to set up concentric belts of farming: very small suburban 2-acre blocks for urban workers: small fruit-vegetable blocks of 5 to 20 acres abutting the towns on the better soils favoured by proximity to water supplies; and in the outer ring, larger farms (20 to 100 acres) (Rutherford 1968, p. 176).

Rutherford (1968) comments that engineering considerations for ease of supply of water might have influenced the design. He notes that the design for the Mildura section of the Mildura—Red Cliffs irrigation district was based on a main straight-line road upon which was superimposed a rectangular grid (p. 181):

The settlement was to contain a modified concentric zonation of blocks, ranging from ‘town blocks’ of 1/8 acre in the centre, through adjacent ‘villa’ lots of 2 ½ acres, to ‘agricultural’ blocks of 10 acres (Rutherford, p. 182).

Rutherford comments further that this subdivision pre-empted the planning of the irrigation channels which, as a consequence, were often disjunctive with the former (p. 182). The later-developed Red Cliffs section shows a more conformable pattern of roads and channels where each follows the contours.

Example 2: regional scale
The landscape authorship over the regional landscape involved differentiation between the newly established centre and the pre-existent peripheral areas. The
large dam was the cosmic centre, the *axis mundi*, from which the whole scheme derived its life. The dam harnessed earth fertility in the form of water as the ancient geomancers fixed the earth spirit by driving a stake into the earth and fixing the head of the serpent at that place. The river as serpent is now centred so that its upstream section is reduced to a mere conduit to supply the centre. The downstream section almost withers away. The main centre gives birth to secondary centres in the form of irrigation areas supplied by channel from the dam or its associated weirs. The irrigation areas are gardens transformed from the wilderness. They appear and act as a sacred *temenos* in which human life is supported by earth fertility and protected from death in the surrounding wilderness. Unfavourable market prices, pests, and soil salinity shook the *Eros* ideal by showing that the garden was neither sacred nor protective.

**Example 3: state scale**

A third social and political aspect of the centralisation is that the authority creates a population of dependent yeomen farmers whose physical livelihood is totally tied to the State irrigation project. The people are subjugated to the bureaucratic system just as the medieval serfs were to the land and the ancient labourers were to the royal court in the construction of the large civil world of irrigation canals and sacred monuments.

The mandala is not a pattern of the natural landscape, and if it is used as a basis for landscape design it subjugates and degrades the natural physical forms. The rigid geometrical layout of the small farms makes it hard for the farmers to readjust agricultural strategies when agricultural technology and market situations change. The initial irrigation areas of the MIA and northern Victoria were often in areas incompatible with the local soil types (Langford Smith & Rutherford 1966, pp. 30f., 172, 230) and in many irrigated areas the water tables have been raised, often with salinisation effects (Powell 1989, pp. 255–262). Construction of the dams and weirs possibly causes rises in the local water tables because of the altered hydrological base levels (Pigram 1986, p. 266). Perhaps, above all, the problem in focusing on the centres in the form of irrigation areas is the neglect of nurturing the fertility of the whole regional landscape. Writers such as Lloyd (1988), Powell (1989) and King (1950) comment on criticisms of the agricultural and
economic wisdom of closer-settlement irrigation areas.  

Powell records that colonial Surveyor-General Mitchell protested in the mid-1800s against the 'impertinent Lilliputian attempts' of the British administrators to impose a rectangular grid survey 'to tie down the Australian giant' (Powell 1989, p. 39). The survey grid may be likened to the Lilliputian ropes, but the closer settlements may be likened to disease-induced cancers on the continental body which, by the centralisation of their impacts on investment and the land environment, have induced a wasting rash on the surrounding body areas. Governments do have a role of regulation and supervision. The question is whether the mandala-based survey and settlement pattern is a fruitful and creative design. This question will be addressed further in chapters 8 and 9.

The Government–People Relationship

Writing on the historical development of water resources in Victoria, Powell notes:

> After the inception of European settlement in Victoria the expectation that government agencies would deliver the goods became ingrained. Even before the early years of federation, some Victorian communities behaved as if they thought that every senior government official was the leprechaun who would produce the pot of gold, and to some extent their naïve optimism was shared in political circles and in the bureaucracy. (Powell, 1989, p. xii)

Powell's use of symbolic mythical terms indicates an underlying psychic meaning.  

Lloyd states that in the late nineteenth century, 'It was widely accepted that irrigation schemes, because of their scale and magnitude, were national works

\[\text{\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{12}}}\] For example, King quotes Wadham thus: 'Of all the foolish policies of land settlement which have been advocated for general application in many parts of Australia, the endeavour to create systems of small-scale or peasant farming is probably the most stupid. Millions of money have been wasted on it; countless years of human toil and vast amounts of materials have been spent in fruitless endeavours to build rural societies on that basis—and there is every reason to suppose that similar endeavours will be made in the future in some districts with results which will be similar' (King 1950, Essay II, pp. 141–143).

\[\text{\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{13}}}\] The leprechaun represents what Joseph Campbell describes as the guide or herald, a mythical figure from the other world who initiates the rational psyche into the world of the unconscious. The pot of gold is a mandala symbol comprising both the mother-symbol of the vessel in which spiritual rebirth can occur, and the gold contents symbolising the centre of the mandala, the self or reborn personality (see Campbell 1949, ch. 1).
which should be left to government' (Lloyd 1988, p. 166).

He comments that this attitude was due, in part at least, to the pastoralists' lack of security of land ownership which inhibited private expenditure on water conservation, and notes that, 'Thousands of pounds were lost by government in providing [the squatters and small farmers] with temporary [drought] relief...' (p. 166). The land holders apparently saw government as a projection of the father-archetype, and accordingly looked to it for protection against natural disasters like drought. Lloyd writes that severe droughts such as in 1902 and 1906 'concentrated the minds of farmers, pastoralists and officials on water conservation' (p. 192). The availability of stock water in the variable rainfall regime of inland New South Wales had become a major issue.

In the early 1900s the New South Wales Government decided to build large dams on the main rivers for water supply to downstream irrigation areas based on small farms (Lloyd 1988, p. 187). The Water Conservation and Irrigation Commission (WC & IC) was established in 1913 to oversee these developments, starting with the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area (MIA) supplied with water from Burrinjuck Dam and Berembed Weir. Lloyd comments on the autonomous power shown by the WC & IC in its reshaping of rural settlement patterns. Lloyd adds

---

14 Lloyd quotes Brett, writing in 1885–86 on the desirability of irrigation schemes, 'Then would nature be properly fulfilling the Divine command to increase and multiply, and replenish the earth... [the people] would not have known want after settlement because the wisdom of their legislators had made preparations for their comfort... the State would be benefitted by a large and increasing yeomanry living in absolute freedom, and exchanging the fruits of their labour for the necessities their less fortunate brethren in centres of population would supply in articles of manufacture' (Brett quoted by Lloyd 1988, p. 165). Lloyd also quotes Wright, a prominent engineer in the 1880s: 'Reliance on Government has unfortunately obtained a widespread hold upon the minds of all classes in the colonies, discouraging any individual or collective enterprise to supply permanent water' (Wright quoted by Lloyd, p. 166).

15 Lloyd writes, 'despite expanded public and private activity, successive governments were tentative about developing a coherent conservation strategy, and matching it with effective administrative arrangements. In 1896 the Australasian Pastoralists' Review observed...Only systematised state control can assure this adequate utilisation [of rainfall] and therefore much argument lies on the side of efficient state control' (1988, p. 192).

16 'If the engineering dimensions of the MIA were relatively plausible, the justification for its existence remained obscure. How to obtain the best results from the water and secure an adequate monetary return from the huge capital investment were problems addressed only in the broadest terms...the areas to be irrigated consisted largely of pastoral holdings which had to be subdivided and occupied by "new men" as there would be no settlements of "dry farmers" whose life long prejudices would have to be uprooted.' (Lloyd 1988, p. 198)
that the Commissioner was like a ‘proconsul’ of the irrigation settlements (p. 202): the WC & IC was paternalistic towards the settlers and evangelical in its mission to foster closer settlement (pp. 206f.).

In Victoria, the water management authority for the State’s rural areas, the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission (SRWSC), was also powerful in landscape authorship through the development of water storage and irrigation schemes and associated townships (Powell 1989, chs. 5, 6). Powell writes, ‘By the early 1960s the SRWSC had consolidated its reputation as Australia’s leading agency for rural settlement and regional development (Powell 1989, p. 232). Powell records that in a 1963 Symposium the justification for irrigation-based rural development was questioned: Tisdall, supporting the SRWSC policy, stated:

Irrigation development is not simply an isolated business undertaking, and in advanced countries is not so regarded. It is nation-building in the real sense.... Irrigation has... not been treated entirely as a normal business proposition. Land settlement has always been an important objective, as a matter of government policy (Powell 1989, pp. 248f.).

Powell records that Professor K. O. Campbell’s paper, presented at this Symposium, raised the ire of Ronald East, Chairman of SRWSC. Campbell stated:

Irrigation policy in any objective analysis must properly be viewed as but one facet of national agricultural policy. Rather than endow water with romantic [or alchemical] qualities as the sine qua non of crop and livestock production, we should regard it as one among many resources employed in rural production... (Powell 1989, p. 249)

Campbell stated that objective appraisals were needed on the role of irrigation in rural and national development, but were inhibited by ‘social and institutional

‘The viability of the MIA rested on a range of... untested, even naive, assumptions. It was essentially an act of faith which discounted conventional tenets of scientific method, economic logic, and agricultural experience... The relative costs and returns of the scheme were discarded as irrelevant by E. W. O’Sullivan, a parliamentarian and former Works Minister, who eloquently epitomised the prevailing mood: “I consider it is a terrible mistake to attempt to reduce land settlement to a commercial basis. You have something far more important than the obtaining of profit out of the people to consider when promoting land settlement. You are making homes for them, and adding to the resources of this country, and incidentally to the revenue of the country, and above all you are giving the people something which they can cherish as their own, whether it is theirs by leasehold or freehold... what we have to do is put people on the land...” ’ (Lloyd 1988, p. 199)
obstacles' (quoted by Powell 1989, p. 249). These obstacles were fundamentally the unconscious imagery perceived by the egocentric mind. The administrators were using farmers and the mandala image of the garden to symbolically transform the landscape into centres, as the alchemists had sought to transform base metal into gold (the symbol of the self). Campbell was criticising the Eros aspect of government land settlement development based on the associated ideas of control of water and control of the agriculturalists through the irrigated garden-farm ideal. The policy fragmented the landscape into centres of investment scattered throughout hinterlands relatively neglected by government investment. The politicians and bureaucrats were responding unconsciously to projected images of their inner psychic self. In their rationalistic attitude they sought domination of the land by the use of water, and of the people by subjecting them to yeomanry, in unrecognised symbolism of their egocentric desire to dominate their own psyches. The causes of governmental domination of society in this way and of society's acceptance of it are archetypal, and are a manifestation of an immature stage of psychic development in which the psyche is still egocentric and believes in the Eros myth.

7.5 CONCLUSIONS

Research question 1, posed in chapter 5, asked whether the theory and practice of agriculture followed the symbolism of one or other of the religious motifs of Eros or Agape. The analyses of the practice of agriculture at the three levels of the

17 'This short paper [Campbell’s] succeeded in pricking the balloon of reified assumption. Irrigation had provided one national endeavour in which the need to “respond” to a pressing environmental “challenge” had found practical and lasting expression: that had been the original premise, and it was still being drummed home in the 1960s...

'So the “Closer Settlement imperative” and that treasured mandate, “Man versus Nature”, were both condemned as anachronistic. But the intrepid Campbell went further. The Australian Character was partly a product of generations of strife in arid and semi-arid conditions; the inheritance was seen in the “discriminatory benefits” attached to public investments in irrigation, and the idea fixe was not easily removed, despite the speed of technological change and economic restructuring. Irrigation communities had a vested interest in perpetuating and extending the government assistance they had long enjoyed, but an equivalent resistance could be expected from entrenched irrigation commissions “whose sole purpose is the development and management of irrigation facilities for agriculture”. ' (Powell 1989, p. 250)
individual pastoralist, the agricultural community and the governmental planners show that people in general perceive and use land through the symbolism of the *Eros* motif. People are unconscious of the direct relationship between themselves and the land, and relate to the land indirectly through projected mandala-images of the archetypal *self*. They cosmicise the land by unconsciously designing agricultural areas according to mandala patterns. The agriculturalists transform the natural ecology of the agricultural areas in unconscious imitation of the mythical sun god's conquest of the earth spirit. They establish centres in the agricultural landscapes as symbolic *axis mundi*, the locations where, according to the *Eros* myth, people can acquire the sun god's power over nature and thus take control of the earth's fertility.

The consequence of agriculture following the symbolism of the *Eros* motif is the production of a landscape differentiated between the humanised, centralised agricultural areas and the natural wilderness areas. In the agricultural areas, the ecological characteristics are reduced to forms which are controllable by human technology: in the wilderness, nature is largely divorced from human work. Thus, the rural landscape is made into a symbolic representation of the divided egocentric psyche, where the ego seeks autonomy from the unconscious.
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8.1 INTRODUCTION

Analysis of the religious motifs which underlie the theories on the human–land relationship (chapter 6) and the practice of agriculture in Australia (chapter 7) has shown that the \textit{Eros} motif is the main mode both of human ideation about the land, and of the conscious mind's symbolic perception of the land. It was concluded in chapter 7 that the development of agriculture in Australia followed the \textit{Eros} motif. This chapter will examine soil conservation and keyline farming which developed in Australia as two different responses to the degradation of agricultural lands. These two movements represent attempts to theorise about the human–land relationship, and to develop practical measures to overcome land degradation and to achieve sustainable forms of agriculture. Soil conservation and keyline farming appeared to have the same goal of sustainability, but approached this goal by methods which were not only different, but fundamentally opposed. Soil conservation sought to protect land against erosion, whereas keyline farming aimed at increasing the fertility in the soil. The differences between the two approaches led to vigorous public debate on the relative merits of the schemes, a debate which commenced in the mid–1950s and remains unresolved. This raises the question of whether the two schemes have resulted from different attitudes to the world and, hence, from different religious motifs.

The aim of this chapter is to assess whether there is a correlation between each of the agricultural methods of soil conservation and keyline farming and either of the two religious motifs, and whether either scheme is associated with degradation of the land or with increase in the soil’s natural fertility. This will
Section 8.2 contains an outline of the history and the main components of soil conservation practice. Keyline farming is similarly treated in section 8.3. These outlines provide the basis for understanding the historical relationship between the two systems, and also for a comparison of their theories and practices. Section 8.4 comprises a comparative analysis of the religious motifs underlying the two systems. This analysis should allow conclusions to be drawn in relation to the above aim. As neither movement refers to a religious viewpoint, its motif will have to be interpreted through the insights from myth, theology and psychology discussed in part 1. Each system’s theories and practices are taken as manifestations of their proponents’ underlying fundamental attitude(s) to the relationship of humans to the world. The case study of soil conservation in Australia focuses mainly on New South Wales, as the soil conservation movement provided the main context in which keyline farming was developed in that state. The New South Wales soil conservation movement followed so closely the theory and practice of the movement in the United States of America that these two movements are discussed jointly in section 8.2 and in the analysis in section 8.4.

### 8.2 Soil Conservation

Australia and the United States of America had generally parallel histories of their development of European-style agriculture in landscapes which hitherto had supported only nomadic cultures. The introduction of Western agriculture to both continents resulted in degradation of the lands of the humid regions as forests were cleared for pastures and crops, and the soils that lost structure and fertility became eroded by rainfall runoff. In the drier regions, overgrazing of the native grasslands put the soils at risk of erosion by wind and water. The conversion of grasslands to cultivation for the production of cereal grains gained momentum after the British market was opened by the repeal of the British Corn Laws in 1846, and increased progressively as the railways in Australia and the United States were extended inland from the ports (Wadham, Wilson & Wood 1957, p. 17; cf. Jacks & Whyte 1939, ch. 3).
Soil erosion became devastating, however, when cultivation was extended onto marginal lands of unreliable rainfall. The cropping industry had expanded during the first decades of the twentieth century and was further boosted by the boom prices after the first world war and the need for new land for the establishment of soldier-settler schemes to accommodate the repatriated servicemen. The situation was exacerbated by sequences of droughts leading into the 1930s which, together with the financial collapse of prices in the 1929–30 depression, caused many farmers to abandon their farms (Kellogg 1941, pp. 117ff.). The dust storms from the inland grain areas in both America and Australia had visible and political impact on the populations of the eastern metropolises (Bennett 1939, pp. viii, 55; Soil Conservation Authority Victoria 1979, p. 5; cf. Macdonald Holmes 1946, pp. 18f.). The United States Government responded by establishing its Soil Conservation Service in 1936 under the directorship of H. H. Bennett. In Australia, also, the governments of New South Wales (1938), South Australia (1939) and Victoria (1940) introduced soil conservation legislation. E. S. Clayton, the inaugural director of the New South Wales Soil Conservation Service, had previously visited the United States to study its soil conservation program, and immediately led the New South Wales Service in following the United States practices (Longworth 1988, p. 4).

The preamble to the United States Soil Conservation Act, 1935, recognises soil erosion as ‘a menace to the national welfare’ (Bennett 1939, p. ix). Bennett writes that the land must be ‘defended forever’ and identifies the control of runoff as the main means of solving the erosion problem. Soil conservation was based on land use systems designed to impede the flow of runoff, such as strip-cropping where cultivated strips were protected by adjacent pasture strips and constructed linear earth-banks, all of which were aligned along the contour. In New South Wales, the Conservation Service acquired second-world-war surplus heavy machinery such as bulldozers and graders for hire to the landowners. The earthworks ranged from small pasture furrows to more substantial absorption banks. The banks prevented the runoff gathering speed over long slopes, but waterlogging on their upslope side was a problem, and the works did nothing to improve the absorption and the productivity in the inter-bank areas (Bennett 1939,
Subsequently, the banks were aligned on a gentle slope to drain the runoff 'safely' from the property, down prepared grassed waterways. Erosion gullies were treated by the construction of both diversion banks upslope from the gully, and gully-head walls, often of concrete or stone. Drainage lines through a paddock, particularly eroded creek banks, were planted with trees.

The soil conservationists delineate land types, within particular climatic regimes, on the basis of their homogeneity of physico-ecological characteristics such as soil type, slope, aspect, drainage and flora. Each land type is evaluated against its risk of erosion under normal agricultural use, from which the conservationists categorise land capability classes, usually ranging from class 1 for land having no erosion risk or limitation to use, to class 8 which, because of its risk, is assessed to be suitable only for uses retaining a permanent vegetation cover, such as recreation, wildlife habitat or water supply (Robertson et al. 1968, p. 92). Attempts to codify the erosion hazard led to the formulation of concepts such as 'erosivity' and the 'soil loss tolerance' which assumes that agricultural use will necessarily cause erosion, and that the conservationists' task is to quantify an acceptable relationship between land class, permitted use and soil loss (in one case recommended as a use which would be sustainable for two thousand years before the soil was eroded totally) (Soil Conservation Authority Victoria 1978, pp. 124–127). This thinking follows the United States theory that soil is irreplaceable and, once lost, is gone forever, as only nature can make soil, and then only at the rate of between three hundred and one thousand years to produce one inch of topsoil (Bennett 1939, p. 8).

Land capability theory retains the view that water runoff is the major cause of erosion and, therefore, the degree of slope of the land is fundamental to the categorisation of hazard. Consequently, the recommended ideal pattern is for the steep land to be retained in forest, the middle slopes to be used for pasture and grazing, and the flatter lands, normally on the lower slopes and floodplains, to be used for cultivation.

8.3 Keyline Farming

In 1943, P. A. Yeomans and his wife purchased a four hundred hectare
pastoral property located at North Richmond, seventy kilometres north-west of Sydney and one kilometre west of the Hawkesbury River, in the foothills to the Blue Mountains, New South Wales. The property was an investment to be managed by Mrs Yeomans' brother, as Yeomans was involved in mining, earthmoving and business. The property 'had been allowed to run wild with undergrowth and trees'. In December 1944 the property was devastated by a bushfire in which Yeomans' brother-in-law died (Macdonald Holmes & Devery 1950, p. 15). Yeomans and his wife then decided to manage the property.

The property contains two sections divided by a watercourse. Each section comprises gentle slopes with associated small valleys extending from a ridgeline to the water course at its lower boundary. The soils, derived from sandstone and, in places, an overlying shale, were shallow and stony, and often eroded to subsoil or bare rock (Macdonald Holmes 1960, p. 50).

Following the fire, the paddocks were bare and hard, more like macadamised road surfaces, with deep gullies and holes in the valleys. When high wind and heavy rain followed some weeks later, two of the dams were completely filled with ash and debris (Macdonald Holmes 1960, pp. 35f.).

Some of the hilly parts, untouched by the bushfire, were covered in thick forest-regrowth following previous timber cutting.

Initially, Yeomans experimented with soil conservation methods to restore the property to productivity. In 1945, Professor James Macdonald Holmes, University of Sydney Geography Department, became associated with the work. He provided advice on soil conservation and supervised his students in the construction of a detailed contour map of the property. Macdonald Holmes describes how Yeomans, after years of experimentation and considerable expenditure on the 'orthodox American soil conservation methods of the day', found that these works not only failed to raise productivity, but were 'opposed to the ultimate full development of the farm' (Macdonald Holmes 1960, p. 44). Yeomans had invited the chief soil conservationists to the property but:

Their comments and advice about the property were considered by Yeomans to be negative and pessimistic, and so he decided to proceed alone with a general policy of soil conservation which had, for those days, a new twist. Whereas the approach of soil conservation is generally applied to getting rid
of water safely, he decided that it would be a better proposition to hold, store
and use for irrigation as much of the run-off as possible (Macdonald Holmes
1960, p. 35).

Water was an important element in Yeomans' plan. It was, however, his
reading of the topographical configurations of the landscape and the consequent
runoff patterns which gave him the means to develop his keyline plan. Contributing
to his thinking were his mining expertise, and years of experimentation,
observation and analysis of developments on his property:

...all those years of preoccupation with contours must surely have been the
basis of the inspiration which caused Yeomans suddenly to 'see' and to
understand the hitherto unappreciated patterns of land, which in turn led to
the rather amazing use of this new scientific discovery in the control of rain
water, and to the answer to the simplest of all questions; namely, which way
should water flow (Macdonald Holmes 1960, p. 41)?

Yeomans' objective for the land, however, was the improvement of the natural
fertility of the soil. (The concept of the land's natural fertility is elaborated in
Appendix 2.)

Yeomans (1954; 1958; 1978) identified primary ridges and valleys as the
smallest topographic units in the landscape. The primary valleys, which carry water
only after rainfall, are tributary to the smallest of the permanent watercourses,
which he called the secondary valleys. A primary valley extends from its lowest
level at the secondary valley, thence upslope to its commencement location on the
secondary ridgeline. In the upper section of the primary valley, Yeomans identified,
both on the ground and in the detailed contour patterns, a point of break-of-slope
between a steeper section above and a gentler section below the point. He found
that the land shape allowed for a pattern of ploughing parallel to the contour
through this point of break-of-slope, both upslope and downslope from this
contour, to direct the chisel-plough tyne marks gently downslope (slightly off the
contour) and extending from the line of drainage in the centre of the primary valley
outwards across the ridges on both sides of the valley. The normal flow pattern of
runoff is transverse to the contours, causing concentration in the valleys from
which it drains from the land. Theoretically, Yeomans' ploughing pattern could
direct runoff and soil moisture, derived from rainfall or irrigation, away from the
valleys and across the adjacent ridges. Yeomans called the point of upper valley slope change the *keypoint*; the contour through this point, the *keyline*; and the ploughing parallel to the keyline, *keyline pattern ploughing*. He found that runoff and soil moisture did follow the pattern of keyline ploughing. Pattern ploughing offered a means of both increasing the supply of water to the ridges and the infiltration of water into the soil.

Yeomans noticed also that the keypoint of the primary valley, if the topographic configuration was suitable in particular cases, offered the highest potential dam site in the landscape. Water could be taken by a pipe through the base of the dam wall to flow by gravity via shallow channels for irrigation of the ridge slopes. Having discovered a means of improving the water supply, Yeomans then concentrated on techniques of soil improvement. He used a combination of water management, ploughing and grazing management. Keyline pattern ploughing was done with a chisel plough which did not turn the soil over or bring subsoil to the surface but, instead, aerated the soil by opening it along the tyne lines and left the surface in a rough, cloddy condition to aid infiltration. Cattle were used to shock graze the pastures just prior to the flowering of the grasses (Yeomans 1971, pp. 62f.). This caused the death of the maximum growth of grass roots and the growth of a new set of roots. The old roots provided new food for the soil biota and added to the humus content of the soil, thus aiding in moisture retention. Progressively deeper chisel ploughing increased the depth of aerated soil into which the new crop of roots could penetrate. Biota, including earthworms, thrived in the aerated, moist and warm soil, which increased year by year in depth and fertility. Over three to four years, Yeomans developed progressively a dark, deep and fertile soil from what had been shallow, stony soil, and, in places, only subsoil and weathered shale.

Trees were important in Yeomans’ planning. They held the soil, brought nutrients from the subsoil to the surface, provided timber for fenceposts, provided relatively dry ground for cattle and minimised the compaction of pasture land by the cattle in wet times. Trees also provided, both within the forest areas, and in pasture areas protected by trees, shade and protection from hot and cold winds, thereby benefitting animals, plants and soil by minimising desiccation and the
ranges of temperatures. In the forested areas which Yeomans wanted to incorporate into the farm’s grazing lands, he cleared strips of twenty to thirty metres width along the contour while retaining intervening strips of forest of similar or larger widths. The cleared strips, in anticipation of the later keyline pattern ploughing, were ripped along the contour to encourage infiltration. Macdonald Holmes (1950, p. 18) comments that, to his knowledge, these practices had not been used elsewhere in the world, and that the cleared strips were successful in increasing productivity, reducing runoff and erosion, and providing sheltered grazing and lines of firebreaks (1950, pp. 18–21).

From the control of water for its better use over the landscape, Yeomans developed a scheme for planning the whole farm. Climate and land shape were relatively fixed, but keyline planning could maximise the land’s fertility by the planned layout and use of water, roads, trees, buildings and fences, and the overall improvement of the soil. The roads, tree belts and fences were aligned with the diversion channels feeding runoff from the higher land into the keyline dams, and with the irrigation channels leading from the dams across the ridges. The house, work areas and main farm access road were located on the crest of the secondary ridge. The irrigation channels divided the higher-elevation non-irrigated pastures and crop areas from the lower-elevation slopes used for irrigated pastures and crops. On the lower boundary of the irrigation areas was a channel for collection of irrigation water seepage which could feed into a low-elevation dam from which water could be pumped back to high elevation storages for reuse. Between the irrigation paddocks and the main watercourse was a buffer strip-forest which provided a filter for any farm effluent water before it entered the watercourse.

The layout of the keyline farmscape differs radically from the layouts of conventional farms and farms developed to soil conservation guidelines. In these, the naturally fertile flood plains often attract the most intensive use for pasture or crop production with the use of irrigation water pumped from the river, the medium slopes are used for non-irrigated pasture and crops, and the steeper slopes and uplands are left in forest, because it is the poorest country and because conservation theory considers it to be of the highest erosion hazard due to its steepness and poor soils.
8.4 MOTIF ANALYSIS

The purpose of this section is to analyse the religious motifs of key aspects of the agricultural systems of soil conservation and keyline farming. In considering each aspect, the motifs of the two systems will be compared. The first aspect to be analysed will be how the land is perceived within each system, that is how the land is perceived as a symbolic representation of the human psyche. This perception is fundamental to each of the other aspects subsequently discussed because it flows from a particular psychological attitude to the world and establishes the symbolic context for the religious myths by which people experience their relationship to the world. The analysis then proceeds under the headings: goals and objectives; machinery and methods; reduction or integration?; the resultant landscapes; and degradation or fertility?

Symbolic Perception of the Land

Traditionally, conservationists have a dualistic, that is a discriminatory, view of the world, and see human survival in terms of a conquest of nature (Bennett 1939, p. 12; Jacks & Whyte 1939, p. 285). For example, Bennett (1939, p. 12) writes that, 'History is largely a record of man's efforts to wrest the land from nature'. He is thus symbolising his ego as the land and his unconscious as nature. He sees nature as the adversary (cf. Jacks & Whyte 1939, p. 289) which needs to be conquered to ensure human survival, in a symbolic representation of his egocentric perception of the need to protect his ego against the unknown and feared unconscious. He projects the archetypal image of the 'terrible mother' onto 'nature', while identifying his ego with the more concrete object of the land. He therefore assumes a posture of protection towards land and of hostility towards nature. This is a consistant view among conservationists, and is a manifestation of the Eros myth of the egocentric psychological attitude.

A different picture of attitude towards the land is given by Rita Yeomans in the preface of The Keyline Plan (1954, p. 8) when she writes in response to questions about her husband's interest in the land:

For a number of years my husband has made an intensive study of land problems. It seems to give a feeling of satisfaction in his life that no other
type of work has been able to do. Always an original thinker, with an
inventive mind, he has spent hundreds of hours walking over the land and
watching the soil, oblivious to heat, cold and rain. Often he was up in the
middle of the night during heavy rain observing its effects on some new
cultivation or drain.

...Sometimes he would go on long moonlight walks over the property trying
to visualise the ultimate appearance of the land when a particular scheme
was completed.

Yeomans is here portrayed as one who has befriended the land and who seems to
have integrated his being with that of the land. The land is the object for his
projection of the ‘good mother’ archetypal image with which his rational mind is
seeking assimilation. This is the attitude of an individuated person, one who sees
the world in integration according to the Agape myth.

Goals and Objectives
The goal of conservationists is the survival of humankind against the threat of
nature itself. Their objective, therefore, is the protection of forms of settlement,
such as the agricultural systems, against wild nature. The conservationists attempt
to achieve this protection through the mastery of nature whereby they can control
the fertility process and contain the degradational processes associated with the use
of resources to manageable levels.

The goal of keyline farming is the increase of the earth’s fertility, which
may be restated as seeking, through an integration of human life and nature, to
bring the life of the earth into more creative forms. The objectives are ‘the
development of better soil structure, increased soil fertility and greater actual depth
of fertile soil’ (Yeomans 1954, p. 13).

Machinery and Methods
Bennett admired the achievement of the Americans who had ‘transformed a
wilderness into a mighty nation’ in only fifteen decades, but decried their
‘astonishing improvidence’ through the plunder, exploitation and abuse of the soil
(Bennett 1939, p. v). He saw that continuation of these practices could lead to
devastating consequences, just as soil erosion had played a large part in the
collapse of many ancient civilisations. Americans, he wrote, had ‘never learned to
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love the land' (Bennett 1939, p. 13). It is in his interpretation of love, however, both in the relationship between people and nature and in his proposed method of loving the land, that Bennett indicates his *Eros* religious mythology and psychological symbolism. Bennett assumes that coexistence with nature comprises a furtive conquest and taking possession of resources, conducted within the protection of propitiatory action to militate against annihilation by a wild antagonist. *Eros* love inherently seeks to acquire something, but always in the unconscious context of a theft. *Eros* love seeks control over the *self* (God-image) and symbolises the egocentric mythical view of how the ego can achieve autonomy in relation to the *self*. Conservationists project the God-image onto nature and, in America and New South Wales for example, sought mastery over nature through a combination of technological strength to remake the land and rational knowledge to unlock the secrets of nature. Bennett notes that the preamble to the United States Soil Conservation Act, 1935, states that the resultant wastage of soil and moisture from soil erosion 'is a menace to the national welfare' and responds by proposing that the human task is to defend the land against the ravages of erosion so as to allow human culture to be preserved and sustained (Bennett 1939, p. vff.).

Adoption by the Australian states of the United States conservation practices was an example of not just following a more powerful country or a ready-made policy, but of following the same archetypal symbolism of the *Eros* motif. The New South Wales Premier McKell wrote, in the first *Soil Conservation Journal* in 1945, of the need for the rural people, with the guidance and assistance of the Soil Conservation service, to embark on 'a full-scale attack' on the 'menace' of erosion (Cummins 1988, p. 14). The soil conservation program was based on the *Eros* attitude that land could be used only within the limitations of propitiatory sacrifices to a vengeful and threatening nature. The bureaucracy saw its role as the mediator between the individual landowners and a menacing nature. The Soil Conservation Service, like the ancient sun-king, had to placate nature and ensure the continuation of human use of the land, in a symbolisation of the ego's struggle to dominate the unconscious. The sun-kings and sun gods operated through power and guile; the bureaucracy performed through technological power and rational knowledge gained by research.
Modern society sees soil conservation as a rational science. Soil conservationists, however, follow the same psychological symbolism as the ancient religious societies in their practice of geomancy. According to Jung, all perceptions and actions are symbolic and are performed within the structure of archetypal forms; and the egocentred psyche is continually attempting to consolidate its consciousness against the threat of reabsorption in the unconscious. Eliade (1974, ch. 9) also points out that even modern agriculturists follow (unconsciously) the ancient religious rituals of cosmicisation. The twentieth century American and Australian conservationists think and act in unconscious repetition of the mythical portrayal of the sun gods (ego-symbols) who tamed the earth monster (symbol of the unconscious), and thereby seized control of the earth spirit or life-force.

In repetition of the creation myth, as exemplified by Marduk who used his trident and club to slay the earth and tame its waters, the twentieth century agriculturalists used their machines to dig and overturn the soil to the extent that both the physical structure and the life of the soil were destroyed. Conservationists followed this trend with the only modification that their earthworks were designed for protection of an already degraded soil from erosion. Following the American practice, the New South Wales Soil Conservation Service made available heavy machinery for the construction of earthworks such as contour furrows and the larger contour or absorption banks designed to trap the rainfall runoff and prevent its destructive downslope flow.

Psychologically, these banks fulfil the same function as the *sulcus primigenius*, the primal furrow, which the ancients, including the Greeks and the Romans, dug around new city sites for the purpose of keeping the earth's evil spirits outside the newly-created inner sanctuary or *temenos* in which the earth spirit (the unconscious) can be brought under control of the sky-gods (the ego) whom the people can appease through ritual (Pennick 1979, pp. 53ff.; cf. Jung 1968c, CW12, para. 63). The conservation furrows are linear, unlike the ancient circular or square furrows of true mandala form. Nevertheless, they fulfil the mandala function of differentiating chaos from order, thus continuing the process of *Eros* cosmicisation through repetition of the mythical creation of order (ego) from chaos (unconscious). An important part of conservation work is the
stabilisation of eroded gullies which, dragon-like, writhe upslope devouring the soil. Gully control, by means such as rock or concrete walls and spillways at the gully head, often in conjunction with diversion banks, presents a graphic illustration of the unconscious repetition of the ancient geomantic practice of sanctifying a site by driving a stake into the ground to pierce the head of the earth serpent to harness and control its energy for human purposes (Eliade 1971, pp. 18ff.; Pennick 1979, pp. 44ff.). These actions symbolise the ego’s attempt to rise above nature through the conquest of the unconscious.

Within the *Eros* perspective, life is a continual propitiation to the supra-human powers. For the pioneer agriculturalists, the propitiation comprised a mythical identification with the sky-god in the conquest of wild nature through the transformation of land into cosmicised landscapes. The result, however, has been the curse of degradation of the land. As a response, the soil conservationists have attempted to formulate a systematised form of propitiation based on their ‘vision’ and understanding of how to achieve a sustainable land use: soil conservation has been made a ritual for changing the community’s attitudes and actions towards a caring for the land and the development of ‘a land stewardship ethic’ (cf. New South Wales Landcare Working Group 1992; Junor 1988). Soil conservation and its derivative and ethically broader term landcare are meant to provide the community with the means of keeping the menace of nature at bay and of taming nature for human needs.

The propitiatory basis to soil conservation is exemplified by the concept of land capability, based on the cautious use of land resources within the constraints of acceptable levels of degradation inherent in *Eros* forms of agriculture.

The contrasting attitude of keyline farming is shown by the transition which Yeomans made in the type of machinery which he used. Originally he used the normal ploughs which penetrated to a standard depth and turned the soil and, if required, could reduce the soil to a fine tilth. He used bulldozers and graders for the construction of conservation earthworks. As he developed his thinking from conservation to development of fertility, he changed his cultivating machinery to a chisel plough (which at the time was revolutionary in Australia), the tynes of which cut and aerated the soil but did not overturn it. Yeomans sought to create a soil
climate with suitable air, moisture and heat conditions to aid soil life through the progressive decay of dead plant material and its transfer into new soil life. The chisel plough was the instrument he used to bring the elements of nature into integration for the development of new fertility.

Once Yeomans developed new fertility in his soils, he found that erosion no longer occurred. Hence, land use no longer had to be propitiatory, but instead became a creative action of development of the life of the earth. No longer need farming be merely the extraction of the soil’s stored fertility: ‘Crop production is properly a part of an important method in the development of better soil’ (Yeomans 1954, p. 27). Yeomans is thus seeing agricultural work and even the growth of a crop as directed towards the increase of the soil’s fertility. This is symbolic of human life being seen as directed towards bringing spiritual life into consciousness.

Another indication that Yeomans was seeing the land according to a different motif from the normal Eros motif was that he did not see forest land as an adversary which had to be cleared in a wholesale manner, but as a resource which could be integrated with pastureland for the mutual benefit of each. This led to his innovative adoption in 1945–46 of what Macdonald Holmes described as contour strip clearing (Macdonald Holmes 1946, p. 146; Macdonald Holmes & Devery 1950, pp. 18–21).

Reduction or Integration?

Bennett displays an egocentric attitude to the world as manifested in his reductionist view that the discordance in the human–land relationship can be explained by the single cause of erosion. His reductionist view leads him to identify the two natural elements of water and wind as the main erosional agents. It is, however, in his further discrimination between these two elements that Bennett displays most clearly his Eros mythological, or egocentric, attitude. Bennett focuses the majority of his conservation work on water, through the control of runoff:

No permanent solution [to erosion and floods] appears possible without better control of runoff all the way from the crests of ridges down across the watersheds...to the very channelways of streams and rivers. Control of runoff means control of erosion... (Bennett 1939, p. 14)
Bennett symbolises water as the devouring mother, the evil side of the unconscious which seeks to prevent the attainment of ego-independence and subsequent individuation. In myth, water represents the primordial substance from which other things grow (cf. Eliade 1974, ch. 5). This is because, in nature, water both provides a life-force and is amorphous and fluid and, thus, is an appropriate symbol of the unconscious. But things grow, in nature and psychically, by differentiation from the mother (water or unconscious). Bennett symbolises the ego as the land and the unconscious as the runoff water. Hence, in seeking to consolidate his consciousness, he formulates a conservation theory based on the defence of the land from the water.

Ironically in the United States and Australia it was the effects of wind erosion which was the major catalyst to the introduction of soil erosion legislation (cf. Soil Conservation Authority Victoria 1979, pp. 1–23; Soil Conservation Service of New South Wales 1985, ch. 15). Wind is of the atmosphere, which in myth is the heavenly derivative of the earth. The wind, traditionally in myth, symbolises the pneuma or spirit which is the life-force of the psyche or soul (Jung 1969b, CW8, paras 662ff.). Thus the wind is associated with the sky-god, the Father and the Holy Spirit. However, in the Eros motif, it seems that the wind is unconsciously associated with the ego in its struggle against its adversary the earth, which symbolises the unconscious. It appears that people see the wind rationally as a major erosional agent, but perceive it unconsciously as a sky-god symbol of the ego. It might be inferred that Bennett was thinking in Eros and unconsciously discriminated between the wind as spirit and good, and the water as matter and evil, and focused his attention on the symbolic domination of the threatening mother in the form of water runoff.

By contrast, Yeomans' innovative use of contour-strip clearing of forest, and his planting of forest strips in pasture land, which had land benefits regarding wind and water, indicate that he saw the elements such as wind and water as aspects of the unity of the integrated landscape. Shelter from the wind is an integral part of his overall farm plan in which water, air, soil, plants and animals are brought together for the development of natural fertility.

The concept of land capability also shows how the conservationists
perceive a dichotomy between people and land. In an *Eros* relationship, use of land is synonymous with taking-from, that is degrading, the land. Capability implies a prohibition, as does the law in an *Eros* religion, and is relevant only when the relationship is seen in terms of acquisition and possession—it becomes irrelevant where the relationship comprises giving to the other. Land capability illustrates the extreme brokenness of the human–land relationship in *Eros* thinking. Land types are unconscious attempts to impose mandala images on the land in the form of *temenos* sanctuaries in which life will be protected from the curses of nature but only if the use of the land within the *temenos* follows the propitiatory and cautious rituals of conservation, landcare and land capability. In keyline, land is viewed according to its present weakness and its potential for development of fertility.

**The Resultant Landscapes**

The agricultural landscapes developed under conventional and conservation methods display the *Eros* motif characteristic of seeking to acquire for the person the highest advantage from any situation. This manifests itself as the extraction of the most easily accessible resources such as the most intensive use of the most fertile soils and of irrigation water from the river (although this will require pumping). The poorest land is generally left undeveloped.

By contrast, Yeomans recommends that the keyline development of a farm can start on the higher-elevated land (Yeomans 1954, p. 75). This makes sense in a plan that uses water under gravity as a major input to the development of the farm’s soils. Yeomans, however, notes that improvement of what is often the poorest land can bring the most immediate financial benefit to the farm (Yeomans 1954, pp. 75–77). Yeomans includes all parts of the landscape in the keyline plan for the farm. The fertility of all areas is improved, even the originally poorest areas. Conventional farms, on the other hand, take-from the naturally strongest areas and allow the poorer areas to become even poorer.

**Degradation or Fertility?**

A person living within the *Eros* myth causes degradation—degradation of the person’s psyche to ego-centredness, and degradation of any object, whether a person or thing, because in *Eros* the ego is always seeking its own advantage.
through control or possession of the object.

Agriculture and soil conservation conducted in *Eros* are degradational. In the conventional farm layout, the uplands suffer degeneration of the forest and degradation of soils from grazing by livestock and vermin such as rabbits, if managed without practices to enhance either flora or soils. The forested uplands become a wasteland which presents a fire risk with the associated danger of spot fires being generated from the ridgelines. The slopes become degraded through the compaction of the soil by grazing, and through the erosion of cultivated land. Runoff is increased from the uplands and slopes wherever the soils are made less absorptive or where conservation works concentrate and add speed to the runoff. The lowlands receive both the eroded soil-debris and the increased runoff from the uplands and slopes. Consequently, they can become waterlogged and the groundwater tables can be raised, both of which might cause salinisation. Increased runoff from the agricultural landscape exacerbates the frequency and severity of river floods. The clearing and intensive use of the floodplain increases the likelihood of river-bank erosion and pollution of the watercourse from farm effluent. The landscape has become a symbol of the agriculturalist's psyche where the unrecognised unconscious is dominated and degraded.

Although governmental soil conservation programs have been conducted in Australia for approximately fifty years, the problem of land degradation is worsening (cf. Woods 1984). This can be partly explained by the reductionist approach adopted by the conservationists. This led them to focus on single issues, such as the emphasis given in the early years to soil loss by erosion, to the exclusion of other issues such as the loss of the soil's structure, organic matter and fertility. More fundamental, however, is the farmer's psychological and religious attitude to the human–land relationship. The egocentric attitude and the *Eros* myth have perpetuated the view that humans can control and dominate the land.

For decades the conservationists have been focusing on stabilising the land surface by prevention of soil erosion. But their claim to a proud record of achievement is a Pyrrhic victory:

As future agricultural production is intensified, land managers and soil conservationists will be facing a new set of land degradation problems.
These include declining soil structure in the wheatbelt and increasing soil acidity over the intensively grazed lands and soil salinity in non-irrigated areas (Junor 1988, p. 10).

The problem of the continuing reduction of native vegetation, animal habitats and biological diversity in the Australian agricultural areas indicates a broken relationship between the people and the land (Department of the Environment, Sport and Territories 1995). The New South Wales Landcare Working Group (1992, p. 7) states that, 'Despite all the warning signs and our continued efforts to reduce natural resources degradation, the problem has increased'. This suggests that the concept of conservation, as perceived in the Eros religious motif, is an illusion born of conscience which, as Bonhoeffer says, is the response of a person who is split psychologically and is searching for a personal reunification and a feeling of belonging to the world (Bonhoeffer 1985, pp. 9–11). This belonging, however, can never be achieved in the Eros motif.

In keyline, the objective is to increase the natural fertility of the soil (see Appendix 2) over the whole farm. Yeomans manifests an individuated psychological attitude to the land, that is he sees the land in terms of the Agape religious motif. He sees land as the medium through which nature's biological fertility gives of itself for life, just as the psyche is the medium through which nature's spiritual fertility gives of itself to conscious thought. Yeomans sees fertility as a symbol of the psychic energy of the world. He seeks not to conquer and dominate the land into a state of sterility in which productivity can be achieved only through human inputs to the land, but to build up the land to new levels of fertility and life. As an individuated person, he projects onto the land the friendly attitude with which he experiences his unconscious. He sees the land as a symbol of the unconscious and thus as the primary generating force in land use systems. The relationship of human work to the land symbolises the ego's relationship to the unconscious. While the unconscious is the source and continuing primary influence on the ego, the ego nevertheless has to supply psychic energy to the unconscious to allow the archetypal ideas and images to come to consciousness. So in keyline planning human theory and practice are directed towards bringing the potential fertility of the land into physical realisation. Yeomans has shown that the pattern of
land degradation associated with the development of the Australian continent to European-style agriculture can be reversed. Agriculture conducted in the *Eros* attitude leads to land sterility; keyline farming is creativity on the land.

### 8.5 CONCLUSIONS

The theory and practice of soil conservation manifest the mythical symbolism of the *Eros* motif. Soil conservationists portray an egocentric attitude to the world in which they see agriculture as a form of human conquest over nature comprising a Promethean theft of land resources. According to this mythical outlook, agricultural production is always associated with degradation of the land and can be maintained only through constant protection against the degradational forces. However, the protective measures of conservation can exacerbate the degradation problem. The case study indicates that soil conservation of agricultural land follows the *Eros* religious motif and is associated with degradation of the land.

The theory and practice of keyline farming follows the symbolism of the *Agape* motif. P. A. Yeomans, the originator of keyline farming, portrays an individuated attitude. He perceives the land from the viewpoint of its inherent life, and sees the purpose of human relationship to the land as the building up of the natural fertility of the land. He sees agriculture as the integration of human work with nature, directed towards the development of ecological creativity. The case study indicates that keyline farming is consistent with the *Agape* religious motif and is associated with increasing the natural fertility of the land.
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CHAPTER 9
DISCUSSION

9.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis was to formulate a theory on the human relationship to land that would provide a basis for the development of non-degradative agriculture. Part I examined the ideas and themes of myth, psychology and theology relevant to theorising on the human—land relationship. This examination showed that people have one or other of two fundamental attitudes to the world, depending on their level of psychological development. In general, people from childhood to young adulthood have an egocentric attitude. Many retain this attitude throughout life. Others mature psychologically, generally after mid-life, through the reintegration of the ego and the unconscious. These people experience a conversion of their psychological attitude towards the world to what Jung called an individuated attitude. Egocentric people perceive their world through a universal system of symbols and theorise their relationship to the world according to the *Eros* motif; individuated people perceive a different form of symbolism and theorise according to the *Agape* motif.

Part II examined how the two attitudes and their associated symbols and motifs were manifested in the theories of human—land relationship (chapter 6), in the development of agriculture in Australia (chapter 7) and in the case study of soil conservation and keyline farming in Australia (chapter 8). The purpose of this chapter is to synthesise the findings from the analyses in part II, in the light of the examination of background theory in part I, to draw conclusions on how people might theorise on their relationship to land so that ecologically creative forms of agriculture might be consciously developed.

To reach these conclusions, first the meaning of the human relationship to the land is discussed in section 9.2. People with the egocentric attitude theorise
according to the myth of the sun god usurping the creative process through the sacrifice of the earth spirit. This gives rise to the *Eros* religious motif which assumes that the only way for humans to be like the sun god is through ritualistic repetition of the mythical sacrifice directed at the renewal of the sun god's power *in the present*. Mythical sacrifice, then, is at the core of the egocentric relationship to the land, and is manifested in the taming of nature and the bringing of the land under human control. The *Eros* relationship to land is discussed in section 9.3. Psychological individuation produces a fundamentally different attitude and mytho-symbolic perception of the world. Individuation gives rise to theorising in the *Agape* motif in which creativity and God's communion with the world are seen as God's initiative. God's giving to the world makes human-initiated sacrifice redundant, so that human relationship to the land can become directed to increasing the land's divine natural fertility. The resultant landscapes should be fundamentally different to the *Eros* landscapes. The *Agape* relationship to land is discussed in section 9.4.

Society operates in general through the *Eros* motif—in its laws, education, theory, and often in its religions. If the *Agape* motif is to be incorporated in land theory, there is a need to increase knowledge of the fundamental influence of archetypal symbolism and religious motif on theory and action. Accordingly, section 9.5 discusses how education on the psychological attitudes and the religious motifs might assist in the achievement of a creative relationship to the land. The conclusions to the thesis are contained in chapter 10.

### 9.2 The Human Relationship to the World

Humans are an integral part of the world. How people perceive their relationship to the world is, however, determined by the psychic relationship between their ego and their unconscious. When the ego assumes psychic autonomy, it tries to become its own centre. In its apparent detachment from the world, it perceives the unconscious motivation towards psychic individuation as a desire for reconnection to the world, manifested through domination and possession. When the ego blocks the assimilation of psychic energy from the *self*, it degrades its own psyche, degrades the world with which it comes into contact, and moves towards
psychic death. On the other hand, the ego that assimilates the unconscious experiences the *self* as the centre and source of psychic life. The enlivened, individuated psyche experiences a *direct* relationship to the world through the common archetypal link. For the individuated person, desiring love is subsumed within a love which, originating in the inner *self*, is given creatively to the world.

As has been long recognised in myth and religious scripture, egocentrism and individuation are the two fundamental orientations towards the world. This is illustrated, for example, by the two different types of men in the Australian Aboriginal myth of the Southern Cross (see chapter 2), the distinction in the book of Genesis between Adam and Noah (Gen.3; 6–9), Moses’ challenge to the Israelites to choose between life and death (Deut. 30: 15-20), and Paul’s distinction between the person centred on the flesh (or the will of the ego) who is bound to passion, desire, selfish ambition and hostility to God and the world, and who moves towards death, and the person centred on the spirit who experiences love, peace and faithfulness (Rom. 8: 5–12; Gal. 5: 16–24). Transformation from the way of the flesh to the way of the spirit constitutes a new creation (Gal. 6: 15) which allows the person to serve and restore the world to new life (Gal. 5: 13; 6: 1).

Each of the two psychological orientations to the world generates its distinctive type of thinking and acting towards the world, and its own system of archetypal symbolism. Egocentricity is expressed symbolically by the *Eros* motif in theory and action, and individuation is expressed by the *Agape* motif. These motifs represent two different types of relationship to the world. *Eros* perceives the world through the projected images of the *self* in the form of the hero and the mandala, and assumes that the initiative for linking humans to the sacred belongs to humans. The *Eros* motif symbolises the dichotomy between the ego-centred psyche and the *self*, and the ego’s unconscious drive towards reunion with the ‘divine’ *self*. *Agape* experiences a symbolism of integration, and recognises that God initiates the connection to the human and provides the link between humans and the world. Bonhoeffer, for example, recognises this difference when he writes that the only direct relationship between one person and another is through the holy spirit which is common to them both (1959, p. 86). Jung has a similar view when he describes
the commonality of the collective unconscious, and goes further when he explains that the archetypes in the unconscious part of the human psyche provide the (direct) link between humans and nature and the world (1970a, CW10, para. 53). Egocentricity and individuation are two different relationships to the world, each with its own motif-symbolism expressed in theory and action. Accordingly, egocentric people and individuated people perceive the land differently, produce different agricultural landscapes, and have different effects on the land's natural fertility. These different relationships will be discussed in the next two sections.

9.3 THE EROS RELATIONSHIP TO LAND

*Eros* motif-symbolism expresses the egocentric psychological attitude to the world. Egocentricity comprises a duality of the broken psychic relationship between ego and unconscious. In *Eros* myth, this duality is bridged through sacrifice. People in *Eros* follow this mythical theme and relate to the land through ritualistic sacrifice. This is manifested in the conquest of nature which leads to degradation of the land. Propitiatory ritual is then utilised to minimise the degradative effects on the land. This section therefore discusses the *Eros* relationship to land under the headings of *Eros* motif-symbolism, land degradation, and protection and propitiation. There are different personality types within the umbrella of egocentricity and each type relates to the land in a characteristic manner. Hence there are a variety of resultant landscapes within the *Eros* motif. The section concludes by discussing how different personality types are associated with characteristic forms of *Eros* landscapes.

**Eros Motif-Symbolism**

Jung argues that human life is symbolic of unconscious psychic meaning, and that people perceive the world through the symbolism of archetypal ideas and images. Based on this view (see esp. Jung 1967, CW5, pt 2), the following interpretation of the *Eros* relationship to agricultural land may be suggested.

Pioneer agriculturalists see new land as wilderness, a symbol of the ego's maternal unconscious. Those in the immature psychological stage of not yet having achieved independence of the ego from the maternal psyche see the land as a
symbol of the terrible, devouring mother. The ego, unconsciously following the myth of the sun god slaying the devouring dragon, seeks to extricate itself from the devouring mother-unconscious, symbolically, through the conquest of the wilderness. The pioneers open up the land (i.e. transform it from darkness to light) by clearing its vegetation, in unconscious repetition of the creation-myth conquest. Mythically, they use the sacrifice of nature to free the earth-soul (Eliade 1971, p. 20).

The sun god is a symbol of the energy (or libido) of the psyche (Jung 1967, CW5, para. 251). Sacrifice of the dragon represents the ego's achievement of autonomy from its maternal psyche. However, the psyche is driven unconsciously towards reintegration: this gives rise to the hero myth in which the hero's adventures are confrontations with the unconscious and culminate in the hero's self-sacrifice and reunion with the good mother or consort of the unconscious, in a resurrection or rebirth. In Eros, the initiative for the hero's rebirth lies with the hero, and the sun-hero is equated, not with the libido, but with the ego. The link to the external spirit, the source of life, is through ritualistic sacrifice—of the self. Hence the sun god, having slain the terrible mother, re-enters the 'realm of the mothers' to be reborn through reconnection with the source of life (see Jung 1967, CW5, pt 2). The egocentric attitude, however, sees the process of resurrection as the bringing of the cosmic spirit into the control of the ego (cf. Jung 1967, CW5, para. 379).

Sacrifice of the dragon and the hero's self-sacrifice might be different aspects of the same integrated process, and thus contemporaneous (cf. Jung 1967, CW5, paras 239ff.). However, the egocentric viewpoint differentiates the two sacrifices into different events portrayed as creation myth and hero myth. The sun god's sacrifice of the dragon makes order out of chaos but, before the sun god can use this ordered substance for the creation of the world, he must be reunited with the creative mother through self-sacrifice. The site of the self-sacrifice, where the divine powers of the sky and the underworld are united through the fertility of the earth, becomes the symbolic centre-of-the-world, the axis mundi. This centre, as suggested above, might be coterminus with the site where the dragon was sacrificed. The image of centralisation, exemplified by the axis mundi, seems to
grow from the egocentric attitude that the cosmic spirit can be confined to, and controlled at, a centre, symbolising the ego's assumed centring upon itself.

Sacrifice and self-sacrifice split the mother into the devouring part, from whom life must be protected, and the good part whose fertility is essential to the earth's creativity. The pioneers' ritualistic clearing of the wilderness sacralises the land and establishes a temenos, a sanctuary from the evil of the wilderness. Before the pioneers can fulfil the fecundating role of the sun god, they must become reunited, through self-sacrifice, with the good mother. This can be achieved only within the protection of the temenos. The agriculturalists' self-sacrifice is manifested in their unconscious devotion to the continual labour of conquering nature and subsequently renewing its life through human-initiated fertilisation.

The agriculturalist sacralises the land with the weapons of axe, fire, and bulldozer. Periodically these are re-employed or replaced by the plough and the use of herbicides and pesticides to maintain control of the natural spirit. The land is renewed through the application of seeds and fertilisers. Agricultural labour is then propitiatory towards nature to maintain domination over it, and to control cosmic fertility. The agriculturalist thus follows the path of the medieval alchemist by assuming to hold the power of redemption of the now conquered and controlled cosmic fertility from matter.

The temenos and axis mundi, as sacred space, are differentiated from the profane wilderness. The sacred space and its centre jointly portray a mandala image. However, the egocentric attitude is unconscious of the mandala's individuating function, and sees the pattern of differentiation and centralisation of space in terms of sacrifice and the ego-control of the fertility of nature. Eros agriculturalists unconsciously differentiate land into patterns based on the temenos and axis mundi. Land planners separate agricultural land from forest and parkland, order the land through its subdivision into rectangular patterns, and transform the natural ecological systems through the construction of centres such as the large dam and irrigation infrastructure. Modern agriculturalists are unconscious of their egocentric attitude, of the Eros-motif myth which they follow, and the symbolism which their actions and landscape design follows. This unconscious symbolism perpetuates the dissociation between the egocentric agriculturalists and the land.
The Degradation of Eros Landscapes

Sacrifice is central to the Eros motif, and is symbolised by the sacrificial taming of nature and by the self-sacrificial constriction of human psychic activity to propitiatory ritual. The first form of sacrifice degrades the land, the second degrades the psychic efficacy of the agriculturalist. Consequently, the Eros landscape is one of degradation. The killing of the earth monster does not belong only to the rituals of ancient societies and colonialists such as the Australian pioneers. The Department of the Environment, Sport and Territories (1995, pp. 1, 6) points out that native vegetation in Australia was cleared from as much land in the fifty years after 1945 as had been cleared in the one hundred and fifty years of European settlement prior to 1945; and that clearing of native vegetation is a major factor in habitat and biodiversity loss, possible decrease of annual rainfall, and in the rising of ground water tables with the associated salinisation effects of degradation of watercourses, decreased agricultural production and dieback of native vegetation. The taming of the wilderness by the clearing of the forests in south-eastern Australia has brought unexpected results. The original forests are now seen as high users of water and the replacement crops and pastures as low users of water. This has led to increased amounts of water surface run-off and of percolation through the soil, resulting in soil erosion and raised water tables with consequential salinisation of soils and watercourses (e.g. Walker 1986, p. 48; Jenkin 1986, p. 145). The lower water use of agricultural land compared to native forest indicates a decrease in the soil’s natural fertility and in the ecological health of the land, because of the agricultural soil’s reduced capability to absorb and use water in its life processes.

While the arid and semi-arid areas of Australia appear to have experienced erosion from wind and water before their use for European pastoralism, the introduced grazing regimes have exacerbated the erosion and greatly degraded these environments (Noble & Tongway 1986, pp. 222ff.). The use of artesian bore water overcame, to some extent, the effects of drought on stock drinking water but put extra grazing pressure on the vegetation (Noble & Tongway 1986, p. 218). The introduction of bores meant that the pastoral landscape replicated the cosmicised landscape of village and wilderness. The bore created a new centre in the arid
landscape, and differentiated the land centred on the bore from the hinterland wilderness. Stock concentration around the bore depleted the vegetation in a symbolic killing of the earth spirit and its replacement of her life-giving force with the human-introduced bore water. The land became centralised on the bores, reorientating its previous natural pattern based on the springs, waterholes and watercourses. Like the survey and land subdivision patterns, the pattern of bores superimposed a symbolic and artificial pattern, often contrary to the natural topography, on the landscape.

Cultivated lands also were degraded. Clarke (1986) describes how cultivation practices have degraded soil structure, biota, levels of organic matter, nutrient availability, and water absorption and retention. The practice of fallowing cultivated ground illustrates the unconscious adoption of the *Eros* motif. Fallowing is used, after a number of years of cropping from a paddock, to spell the soil for one season to allow that season’s rainfall to accumulate in the soil as a boost to the crops of subsequent years. Fallowing also assists in weed control, as the cultivation of the field without the main crop can maintain a clean paddock. Cultivation is itself an *Eros* activity to tame the land and reduce it to a form controllable with the farmer’s technology. As Clarke (1986) has described, cultivation can largely destroy the life of the soil. Fallowing is the propitiatory response to temporarily curtail production while nature is allowed to regenerate itself before the next onslaught with plough, herbicides and fertilisers. The soils become so lacking in natural fertility that, even with massive conservation earthworks, they are unstable and vulnerable to water erosion (cf. Clarke 1986, p. 279). Decades of *Eros* agriculture and conservation practice have maintained a reductionist focus, while progressively the overall health of the land has been worsening, as evidenced by the increasing problems of soil decline, rising ground water tables and salinisation.

**Protection and Propitiation—The Consequences of Incomplete Dominance of Nature**

Notwithstanding the ego’s attempt to dominate the psyche, the ego is continually aware of the reality of ‘the other’. The *Eros* agriculturalist tries to subjugate nature but is aware that the power of nature can bring devastation at any time such as in flood, drought or fire. The potential for natural devastation is increased by
degradative agricultural practices which decrease the land's natural fertility and ecological strength. Reductive practices destroy the ecological integrity and put one element such as water out of balance with another such as soil. The agriculturalists see the resultant degradation as a curse, and respond with protective measures such as the construction of earth banks to slow and redirect water flow, fencing off hazard areas, and using land within its 'capability' as advocated by the soil conservationists.

The *Eros* agriculturalist seeks to be able to take from the land's resources and at the same time to maintain the life-giving nature of the land so that the resource will be permanently available. This is the meaning of the concept of conservation, to use and save a resource contemporaneously. In *Eros* this is impossible, because egocentric use comprises a domination and a taking-from the other. Propitiation is then necessary. Fallowing paddocks to accumulate moisture over one year for use by the subsequent year's crop is a form of propitiatory non-use. Propitiation is the motivation for precautionary practices such as the regulation of land use to comply with the erosion hazard assessment of land capability units, the 'protective' works of soil conservation and the exclusion of land from agricultural development such as in water, forest and nature reserves. Soil conservationists, for example, think in terms of tolerable soil erosion from agriculture, as all use is considered degradative, and good practice, therefore, can only be precautionary, i.e. propitiatory to the uncontrolled forces of nature.

In *Eros*, the human–land relationship is broken and, consequently, humans can only take from nature and protect from nature, which symbolises the egocentric ego's attempt to consolidate its autonomy stolen from the unconscious. The desire to be in a permanent relationship to the land has given rise to the use by land use planners of the terms preservation, conservation and sustainability. Macdonald Holmes (1960, p. 46) recognised the limitations of the concept of conservation when he wrote, 'Soil conservation is stagnation, and may even be retardation'. This means that a dominating, take-from agriculture, notwithstanding propitiatory measures, can not increase or even maintain natural fertility. Like conservation, sustainability seems to be a projection of the archetypal idea of eternity or of the image of utopia or paradise where humans and nature co-exist in harmony in a
permanent and unchanging condition. Jung has shown that life is a *complexio oppositorum* in which there is a life-or-death struggle between good and evil, conscious and unconscious in the ever-evolving world (Jung 1964, p. 75). Hence, sustainability may be seen as the egocentric interpretation of the archetypal idea of eternity, but without the Jungian insight that even the eternal unconscious exists not through sustainability but through creative evolution.

**The Influence of Personality Type on Relationship to Land**

People relate to the world according to their psychological attitude of either egocentricity or individuation. However, within these broad or fundamental orientations to the world, individuals show variations in how they interact with the world consistent with their personality type. According to Jung (1971, CW6), these are comprised of the individual's preferred use of extraversion or introversion, thinking or feeling, sensation or intuition, and judging or perceiving. From the temperament types described by Keirsey and Bates (1984),¹ based largely on Jung's work, the following four categories of land users in the egocentric attitude can be identified:

1. **Fertility Robbers**

These are the Dionysian temperaments whose key characteristics include impulsiveness, the use of tools to achieve an end, risk taking, action as an end in itself and the urge to be doing, and ignoring hierarchy, authority and regulation.² The Dionysians are exemplified by the adventurers and pioneers who 'opened up' the land by clearing the forests and grazing the new-found native grasslands, for example Edward Ogilvie, whose life was described in chapter 7. They include also those agriculturalists who see the land as something to be exploited in the sense of taking resources from it notwithstanding the consequent degradation. These people

---

¹ Keirsey and Bates (1984) base their temperament types on the following psychological functions: extraversion (E), introversion (I), sensation (S), intuition (N), thinking (T), feeling (F), perceiving (P) and judging (J). They categorise the four main temperament groups as follows: Dionysian—the SPs (ISTP, ESTP, ISFP, ESFP); Epimethean—the SJs (ISFJ, ESFJ, ISTJ, ESTJ); Promethean—the NTs (INTP, ENTP, INTJ, ENTJ); Apollonian—the NFs (INFJ, ENFJ, INFP, ENFP).

² The context of the Dionysian temperament type among the four broad temperament categories is summarised in chapter 3.
abandon land when it becomes derelict and move their activities to new land. They are the egocentric neurotics who are so detached from the world that they are compelled to assert their dominance over it by killing the mother-symbol, in this case the land. They do not know their psychic centre, and spend their lives searching unconsciously for it through the desire to possess an unending variety of objects symbolising the self, exemplified by Ogilvie’s construction of his mandala-styled castle and his subsequent search for a family tree and the establishment of a family coat of arms.

2. Transformers and Transmuters
The Promethean temperaments are the people who see new possibilities in situations. In Eros, they seek to change the land into controllable forms. Named after Prometheus who stole fire from the gods so that it could be used by humans to differentiate themselves from the rest of nature and to become more like the immortal gods, these people alter the form or the basic nature of the land.

The transformers alter the structure of the ecological systems, rivers or landforms, such as when forest is changed to grassland, native grassland to ‘improved pasture’, rivers are dammed, or land is levelled. They simplify the land to forms manageable with their contemporary technology. Examples of transformers are Mollison with his permaculture (see chapter 6) and the governments which implemented policies of closer settlement of the pastoral estates (see chapter 7).

The transmuters alter the nature of the land so that it might conform with, and be controlled by, agricultural practice, such as when cultivation, chemical fertilisation, or irrigation changes the soil’s ecology. For example, the flooding of paddy rice changes the groundwater, climate and biota of the soil, necessitating enormous human effort and the addition of fertiliser to maintain production from a soil whose natural fertility has been destroyed (cf. Fukuoka 1978, pp. xx, 54). Examples of transmuters are Steiner who advocated the alteration of soil by the addition of manufactured compost (see chapter 6), and the water and irrigation

---

3 The context of the Promethean temperament type among the four broad temperament categories is also summarised in chapter 3.
authorities whose policies led to the transmutation of the lands in the irrigation areas (see chapter 7). The Prometheans not only slay the dragon but also try to reorganise its dismembered parts under a humanly-controlled scheme.

3. Protectors
These are the Epimethean temperaments, who are the conservators and upholders of traditions and regulations. They dislike wastage and have a strong sense of duty and of right and wrong. These people seek to maintain the resource base of the land, particularly against agricultural practices which are seen to degrade the land. Examples of this type are the soil conservationists (discussed in chapter 8) and the landcarers, as represented by the Potter Farmland Plan (discussed in chapter 6) whose goal is to protect the land against preventable misuse. They are reductionist, often focusing on single issues, such as erosion or tree decline, with potential detriment to the overall situation of the agricultural enterprise in integration with the ecological system. Also included in this temperament type, although they attempt a broader view, are the ethicists who seek to define right behaviour, exemplified by Leopold, Lovelock, and Matthew Fox (see chapter 6). These temperaments are aware that the slaying of the dragon has not put to death its spirit, and consequently the land must be used cautiously and only within limits and so as to avoid invoking annihilation. They also see that the mother has not only a terrible side but also a good side to be worked with.

4. Preservers
These are also Epimetheans, but carry the protection of the land to the extreme of excluding it from developmental use such as agriculture, and preserving the land largely in an unchanged condition as in National Parks, forest reserves and water catchment reserves. These people are exemplified by the Deep Ecologists (discussed in chapter 6). They are responding to the voice of conscience which they hear as a command of prohibition (Bonhoeffer 1985, pp. 9ff.), which is the unconscious awareness of the danger of the 'original sin' of turning away from the unconscious. They perceive the 'National Park' as a symbol of the unconscious but,
instead of befriending it as the nurturer of the psyche, see it as the Tiamat-symbol of the earth’s life-force which must be kept alive, but only under the control of the rational mind and differentiated in space from the living areas of city and farm. Propitiation requires that nature within the protected areas must not be altered, because on this captive nature depends the link with eternity of the ephemeral ego. The ancients perceived their created living space, the *temenos* with its *axis mundi*, as the sacred space where appeasement could be made to the gods. For them, the outer areas were wilderness where life was unprotected from the evil spirits (or the devouring unconscious). The modern protectors have reversed this pattern of differentiated land. To their rational minds, the living areas are despiritualised and no longer provide the way to the gods. As Jung says, the centre of the mandala is no longer filled with a God-image, but is empty (Jung 1966b, pp. 96ff.). The egocentric preservers project their psychic centres into the appropriate symbol of the life-force, namely wild nature, thereby showing an awareness of the need to assimilate the unconscious. They have progressed beyond the stage of seeking to slay nature as a symbol of the terrible mother, and see nature as a symbol of the good aspect of the earth mother—but still from the egocentric perspective.

The above examples of different treatments of land within the egocentric attitude exhibit a range of resultant landscapes from the exploited and despoiled, through the rehabilitated, to the protected and the preserved. Their common characteristic is that they are differentiated landscapes reflecting the fragmented egocentric psyche. The extremes of despoliation and preservation of landscape illustrate the effect of progressive withdrawal of psychological projection, both by individuals and within society historically. The despoilers see the land only as the dragon to be killed and represent an attitude common among pioneers (cf. Leopold 1989, p. 188). This might be due to the personality types attracted to pioneering and also to the mass psyche of the time (cf. Jung 1969b, CW8, paras 410, 424–426). The protectors and the preservers have withdrawn the projection of the dragon as the terrible mother to the extent that they can see also the need to work with nature as the good mother. Thus personality typology seems linked to the withdrawal of projection, and results in different treatments of land even within the
same broad attitude and motif.

The *Eros* motif does not provide a basis for a nurturing relationship to the land. We now look at what the *Agape* motif might contribute to the search for the establishment of fertile landscapes.

### 9.4 THE AGAPE RELATIONSHIP TO LAND

The *Agape* religious motif overturns the world view of the *Eros* motif and portrays a different relationship to the world. *Agape* focuses on integration, which makes redundant the *Eros* differentiation of space between sacred and profane and the focus on the symbol of the centre-of-the-world. Consequently, this section begins by discussing how the *Agape* relationship to the world breaks down the image of the centre. *Agape* also focuses on the building up of fertility, in contradistinction to the *Eros* focus on the sacrificial reduction of fertility. The section goes on to illustrate how the ideas of integration and fertility might be manifested in the landscape through the examples of Howard's Garden City concept and Yeoman's keyline planning ideas, both of which are consistent with the *Agape* motif. The implications of an *Agape* relationship to land for the formulation of a theory on non-degradative agriculture are then discussed in relation to natural fertility of the land. The section concludes by discussing the new symbolism that *Agape* offers for the perception of land and the human relationship to it.

**The Agape Motif Dissolves the Centre-of-the-World Symbol**

*Agape* sees the initiative for communion between God and the world as belonging to God, and thus is an expression of the individuated psychological attitude to the world. The divine communion with the individual personality is experienced within the psyche and as originating from beyond the ego, that is in the *self*, where the spirit and the ego are in communion. Experience of the *self* obliterates the *Eros* symbolism of sacrifice and of the sacrificial altar, the *axis mundi*. The person in *Agape* experiences connection to all people through the collective unconscious, and to all of creation through the common archetypal foundation to physical existence. Furthermore, in *Agape* the divine communion is experienced through the outer world such as through the Word and the religious sacraments, and also, as Jung
suggests, through synchronous events experienced both psychically and in the events of physical life. These experiences dissipate the symbolism of the centre, because the existence of the divine is perceived everywhere so that the world can be seen in integration and unity. The *self* is experienced as the source and motivation for personal life, and thus can be acknowledged as the source of life for others and for the natural world. Consequently, there is no need to take life through conquest and sacrifice but, instead, life can be channelled from the ever-giving *self* to the world in the creativity of building up the fertility—both spiritual and physical—in the world. *Agape* unity dissolves duality. For example, the *Eros* dichotomy of the sun god and the earth monster dissipates in the view of the unity of God and the creation, in which God might be seen as the God of darkness evolving through creation to the god of light. This seems to be expressed symbolically in the evolution of the images of the animal-formed monsters, through the half-monster and half-human, to the human in devil form, thence to the human conscious of the wholeness of life, exemplified in Christ. The God of fire evolves through *Agape* love to the God of grace. This is manifested in the individual by the evolution from bondage to the passion of the animal instincts, which seek to dommate and take from the world, to an *Agape* love directed towards giving to the world. In *Eros*, sacrifice always seeks an outcome of self-advantage. In *Agape*, the individual submits to the spirit obediently and without selfish motive, and can then give to the world for the uplifting of fertility in the world.

The following example illustrates the contrast between how a landscape is perceived in *Eros* as differentiated, and in *Agape* as integrated. As ancient civilisations developed, the main symbol of centralisation evolved from the natural landscape sacred site to the cultural landscape of the city. The city represented the container, the *temenos*, the protected space in which the gods could be reached and from which the devouring demons of profane space could be excluded. In ancient rituals, the idea of a sacred centre is reflected both in the hierarchical arrangement of people focusing on the high priest as the mediator between the people and the gods, and in the differentiation of space between the degrees of sacredness of sites and between sacred land and wilderness. In the ancient Hebrew ceremony for the Day of Atonement (Leviticus, 16: 1–22), the tabernacle space was differentiated
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into the holy place behind the veil where communication could be made with God’s mercy, and the body of the tabernacle where sacrifice was conducted for the expiation of the sins of the people. The camp was differentiated, as sacred space, from the wilderness beyond the camp. The sacrificial animals were also differentiated between their blood, as a symbol of the life-force, spirit or soul, which was used at the altar as an offering to God; and their skin, flesh and dung, symbolising matter, which was taken outside the camp and burned (Leviticus, 16: 27; cf. Jung 1967, CW5, paras 246, 671). Camp and beyond-the-camp symbolise the egocentric perception of the ego raising itself, according to the Eros motif, by differentiation from the annihilating unconscious. The sacrificial ritual aims to consolidate the ego’s autonomy.

The New Testament mythology overturns this attitude of Eros and its associated concept of centrality and differentiation of space. The Christian Agape myth sees the initiative of grace coming from God, irrespective of any human action. The revelation of God’s incarnation in Christ, and Christ’s subsequent death and resurrection, overturns previous conceptions of a God of strength, power, and majesty, to a view of a God who is revealed in giving, weakness, and humility:

[Christians] have an altar from which those who officiate in the tent have no right to eat. For the bodies of those animals whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest as a sacrifice for sin are burned outside the camp. Therefore Jesus also suffered outside the city gate in order to sanctify the people by his own blood. Let us then go to him outside the camp and bear the abuse he endured. For here we have no lasting city, but we are looking for the city that is to come (Hebrews 13: 10–14).

The Agape God has abolished differentiation—between inner and outer space, the righteous and non-righteous, and between God and the world.

The Christian Agape myth makes the symbolism of the centre redundant, because it acknowledges that spiritual wholeness comes from the initiative of the cosmic power (through the Holy Spirit), which can be experienced by the ego as an inner, but transcendent, phenomenon (cf. Eph. 3: 14–19). As a result, religious consciousness is increased and the previously projected centre is now experienced as the inner self. The sacred centre is dissipated with the realisation that God is the centre of all and is revealed not in the majestic tower or the power of the citadel,
but in the continual self-giving of nature, as symbolised in Christ's giving his life on the Cross. The mandala of the city is stripped of its royal stronghold. The wonderful vision of the New Jerusalem (Revelations 21), despite its symmetry and beauty of symbolism, had ‘...no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it’ (Rev. 21: 22). The vision indicates that, just as the writer sees the God-image as unifying the opposites of might (of the Lord God) and meekness (of the Lamb), the opposites in the New Jerusalem are also brought into union:

And the city has no need of sun or moon to shine on it, for the glory of God is its light, and its lamp is the Lamb...Its gates will never be shut by day—and there will be no night there (Rev.21: 23,25). Then the angel showed me the river of the water of life, bright as crystal, flowing from the throne of God and of the Lamb through the middle of the street of the city. On either side of the river is the tree of life...(Rev. 22: 1-2).

According to Jung, the development of conscious understanding causes psychological projections to be withdrawn, with the effect that the perception of the world becomes despiritualised (Jung 1966b, pp. 97ff.). Progressively the God-image was withdrawn from the family of gods to a single god, but still far off, thence to the human ego (Jung 1966b, p. 102). All these views represent a dichotomy between humans and God. The dichotomy is overcome, through integration, only by the individuated attitude of Agape, and the conscious experience of the divine spirit through the inner self; that is when the God-image has been withdrawn to the self (Jung 1966b, pp. 99, 112ff.). Then the centre is perceived as being everywhere, and the mandala symbolism is redundant.

The Garden City Themes of Decentralisation and Integration

The city represents the most culturally sophisticated landscape form of a mandala. In the search for evidence of manifestations of the different attitudes of Eros and Agape in agricultural land use, it is to city planning that we might first look for a change from the pattern of centralisation to another pattern which might represent symbolically the Agape attitude. Ebenezer Howard’s ideas on urban and regional planning sought a solution to the problems of unfettered centralisation.

Lewis Mumford describes Howard’s strategy for city and regional
development as ‘antipathetic…to the dominant ideology and practice of our time’ (Mumford 1961, p. 522). He argues that Howard’s ‘transformative idea’ is that his strategy for regional planning caters for continual growth without the usual problems associated with unlimited expansion from a centre (p. 518). Howard advocated urban areas of relatively high population density and limited to approximately 30,000 population. The city itself was to be interpenetrated by parks and open space and, above all, was to be established with a hinterland which was to remain permanently rural. Subsequent population growth was to be accommodated by the establishment of additional cities of similar size, always to be separated from each other by rural land. Constellations of, say, ten such cities linked by rapid transportation could all be linked to a larger city of approximately 50,000 people in which the highest urban functions could be supported in an urban federation or ‘social city’ grouping (Howard 1965, ch. 7).

Howard’s goal was to ‘restore people to the land’ in a fruitful relationship (1965, p. 44). He sought to achieve this through the decentralisation of the urban function from the single megalopolis to many urban units of limited size, each having its own urban integrity and integration with its rural hinterland. Urban and rural areas would function interdependently for the provision of commercial, social and natural benefits. It was as though Howard was seeing nature and human settlement as an ecosystem in which each element was working for the benefit of other elements. Urban wastes were to be returned to rural areas to aid in the increase of soil fertility. Agriculture would benefit by the proximity of urban markets. Efficient transport would allow for inter-regional trade.

Howard was reacting against the Eros symbolism of the centre, and his proposals were ‘transformative’ in the same sense that Agape was seen as a ‘transvaluation of all ancient values’, namely Eros values (Nygren 1982, p. 30). Howard’s work grew out of a recognition of the despiritualisation of humankind in the latter part of the nineteenth century in the poverty of the depopulated and degraded agricultural landscape, and in the squalor of the industrial urban landscapes. Howard’s focus at all times was to overcome the self-seeking characteristics of human nature and to raise the well-being (implied as spiritual and physical) of individuals and of society (Howard 1965, pp. 51, 146, 151). Howard’s
intuition (Howard 1965, p. 10; Mumford 1961, p. 521) indicated assimilation of the irrational unconscious part of his psyche into his consciousness. He saw beyond the normal dichotomous perspective of city and country, centre and wilderness, cultural landscapes and natural landscapes, to an integrated cultural landscape: ‘Human society and the beauty of nature are meant to be enjoyed together’ (Howard 1965, p. 48).

Osborn (see Howard 1965, p. 9) and Mumford (1961, p. 518) note how Howard’s work is generally plagiarised or misrepresented. Elements which are seen to have obvious practical benefits are adopted but applied in a wrong context. There is a parallel here to the way Yeoman’s Keyline ideas (discussed in chapter 8) have been treated. The misuse arises when people look at the same problem but view it in the reductionist mode of the Eros attitude, in contrast to the integrated mode of Agape. Howard’s term Garden City is described as ‘unfortunate’ by Mumford (1961, pp. 518f.), because common understanding of the term was used by others to describe an urban development having low density of settlement because of its emphasis on gardens within the city. Osborn notes that Howard was describing a city in a garden, not a city of gardens (see Howard 1965, p. 26).

It is here that Howard’s insight starts to emerge. Howard’s Garden City concept means a reconciliation of city and country, and of human use of the land and the natural landscape. He saw beyond the mandala symbolism of the egocentric view, and recognised that each development should be unique, following local situations and individual initiative (cf. p.56). Howard’s diagrams of the Garden City and the Social City used mandala patterns of circles and radial axes from the centre. He emphasised that these illustrations were schematic only, and in no way implied actual design proposals (p. 51). The danger inherent in these diagrams is that planners, thinking in Eros, utilise the mandala shapes as concrete designs. Mumford stresses this point:

...but Howard’s new formulation gained distinction precisely because he refused to be tied down to a particular physical image of the city or a particular method of planning or a particular type of building. The specific forms of such a city would be a resultant of the landscape and the climate, the industries and the technological facilities available, and above all, the arts of the builders and the inhabitants...(1961, p. 519)
...his proposals have a universal quality (see Howard 1965, p. 33).

The universality of the Garden City concept appears to derive from Howard’s openness to unconscious archetypal ideas such as growth through integration of apparent opposites. This might have allowed him to symbolise the landscape as the unconscious, and human settlement as the assimilation of the unconscious into consciousness.

**Keyline Adds Design to the Garden City Concept**

It would seem that openness to unconscious archetypal ideas in both Howard and Yeomans led them to landscape concepts which had a fundamental consistency, although one was conceived abstractly and the other from land practice. Hence, Howard’s Garden City concept can be merged with Yeoman’s keyline landscape design. Yeomans identified climate and landscape as the most permanent elements to be considered in landscape design. To these he next added water, and it was from the better use of water in combination with particular climate and landscape situations that he developed farm and city design principles:

> While these principles of design are universal in their application, there will be only one way to design each landscape. Every special purpose landscape will be unique; there will be no other like it on the face of the earth (Yeomans 1971, p. 44).

Yeomans decries the ‘monotony and boredom’ of the human-made landscape, contrasting it with the ‘endless variety’ of natural landscape configurations (Yeomans 1971, pp. 26, 43). By assimilating the variety of the natural landscape into landscape design, Yeomans de-centred the design process. Yeomans echoes Howard’s regional planning strategy when he advocates that to overcome the ‘inhumanity of society’ and the ‘destruction of our environment’ there is a need for ‘a reunion of mankind with the natural landscape and the ways of Nature’ (Yeomans 1971, p. 109).

Like Howard, Yeomans had to learn to free his thinking from the image of the centre. They both saw the fertility of life as a symbol of the psychic energy emanating from the unconscious. Initially, Yeomans focused on the fertility of agricultural soil and discovered that an understanding of the topographic shape of the land allowed him to use water under gravity flow for the development of soil
fertility. This led to Yeomans de-centring farm planning from its usual focus on the river, to an integrated approach in which the whole area of the farm was increased in fertility, commencing with the development of the highest elevation land. This Agape approach of building up the natural fertility of the whole farmscape has fundamental implications for land utilisation. In agriculture the focus becomes fertility, rather than human control over land physically and biologically, with the result that the types of degradation caused by conventional agricultural practice, such as erosion, destruction of soil structure and soil life, acidification, and salinisation, are eliminated (cf. Macdonald Holmes 1959, p. 62). As discussed in chapter 8, the keyline farm plan reverses conventional design by locating the house and work areas on the high land, irrigating the slopes and leaving the riverbank land in ecological-buffer forest.

The Agape motif underlying keyline planning has general implications for rural land use. Forest land will now be used as an example. Yeomans developed the system of ‘contour tree-strip clearing’ of forested farm land and of planting tree strips parallel to the water channels and along the contour in his paddocks. The spacing between the strips was determined by the vertical distance between the base of one strip and the tree-crown of the lower strip, so that all of the pasture in between was protected from wind. Thus, Yeomans had developed a plan in which all natural elements were brought into mutual benefit. Unlike the conservationists who saw wind and water as two separate factors in erosion, Yeomans had integrated water and wind in the farm development plan. The combination of water and wind has theological and psychological significance. Jung points out that the New Testament statement that it is necessary to be born of both water and the spirit is describing the psychological reality that a person is first born of the womb (literally from water, or figuratively from matter), and then reborn from ‘the fructifying breath of the wind’ (the spirit) (Jung 1967, CW5, para. 334). Water and wind, therefore, are conjoined in the individuated person and, also, in the keyline farm design.

Forest in ancient times and in the settlement of new land was seen as wilderness—a symbol of the unconscious. People sought to tame the forest and cleared it to transform the land into habitable, cosmicised, space. Modern land-use
planning, however, reverses this process. Agricultural land has become so degraded that people seek to maintain the efficacy of nature’s fertility. Natural landscapes such as forests symbolise this fertility and hence are protected from change in the propitiatory process of land reservation in the forms of National Parks, nature reserves, and natural resource reserves. The current trend to return agricultural land to natural landscapes also belongs to this process. It is ironic that the purpose of these areas is to preserve the integrity of nature and thereby allow people to maintain the link with cosmic fertility, and it is these areas which often experience the most devastating bushfires which damage the areas’ own ecological resources, and the life and property in adjoining land. Through the Eros separation of habitable land from non-habitable land, and the prevention of creative human interaction with the reserved land, societies have established wildernesses in the biblical and mythical sense of areas of threat to humans and to creativity. The wilderness experience, however, is meant to lead a person to the realisation of the primacy of the divine spirit, and the integration of the divine will with the ego. If the forest is seen to symbolise the unconscious, then it should not be locked into a status quo but should be brought into new fertility. The Ebenezer Howard plan of integrating urban settlements into an increasingly fertile hinterland, and the keyline farm plan for increasing land fertility, would increase the fertility, productivity and the bushfire-protection capability of the presently reserved areas. This would be an Agape creative use of the land.5

Yeomans’ keyline planning provides design principles for the total settled landscape, including the individual farm and the regional landscape incorporating new cities integrated with an agricultural hinterland (Yeomans 1971, p. 109):

Instead of the drift away from the land to the city, there is a need for more people on the land. There can be good business in the diversification of the farming enterprise and the successful background to this move is a fertile soil (Yeomans 1971, p. 113).

5 The keyline farming provision of stored water at both high and low elevation in the landscape and of farm roads and cleared work areas especially along the ridgelines is almost identical to one set of recommendations for bushfire control in state forests (Carr 1940).
Yeomans (1971) found that he could apply his farm water control principles to urban design, so that water and effluents could be transported under gravity by conduits or channels of gentle gradients located, as in the farmscape, in relation to the primary valley keylines. Roads and urban-use zones are arranged according to the water-control lines. Administration and commercial uses are located on the ridges, together with some housing. Downslope, the uses progress from housing, to industrial, then to the city forest which contains the effluent treatment works and recreation grounds, thence to the lowest zone of city forest and large scale recreational areas. All effluents pass through city forest; industrial effluents pass through treatment works then the city forest before the cleaned water passes to the watercourse.

The keyline urban areas on the ridge crests might appear superficially to be the same in a locational sense as the ancient and medieval hill-top towns built around fort or citadel. However, the towns built around the fort and citadel were located for either defence or religious prominence, on sites that were often separated, both topographically and by use, from the agricultural areas. By contrast, the keyline ridge locations are based on the need to integrate the urban and agricultural areas, and integrate both with the natural characteristics of the whole regional site, in an ecologically viable manner.

The main ridge, as classified by Yeomans, commences at its lowest point between two watercourses at their junction and rises progressively, forming the water divide between the two watercourses, until the ridge line joins with other main ridges which themselves form water-divide boundaries between progressively larger catchment areas. The steeper crestlines are the land horizons of the skyline; the gentler divides between the smaller watercourses are of the most use in farm and city planning (Yeomans 1978, p. 119).

The keyline main-ridge city locations differ markedly from the urban sites of expedience such as those on the lowlands, including port sites and the urban centres which were developed where historically important transport routes crossed rivers, often in the centre of productive river valley agricultural areas. The river-valley sites are generally flood-prone, and neither ports nor river towns have hydrological advantage for the storage and use of water under gravity.
Agape Landscapes Increase Fertility

The thinking of Yeomans and Howard are along similar lines, with Howard focusing on the method of growth of settlement and Yeomans focusing on the practical design methods. Both see the need for increased fertility of the soil as a symbol of the need for the integration of the chthonic or instinctive spirit of the psyche into consciousness. Each focuses on the need to increase the fertility of the human spirit and of the physical landscape. They recognise a communion between an integrated psyche, human work and the fertility of the land. The attitude of Agape, freed from the Eros search to acquire an external centre, is able to give to the landscape and to seek the confirmation or building up of natural fertility. Both developed their ideas from the chaos of a degraded situation: for Howard the evils of the industrial slums, for Yeomans the destruction of soil fertility and the pollution of watercourses.

Howard showed how the integrity of individual urban units and the integration of urban and rural functions could be maintained as the population increased and human settlement expanded over the landscape. Yeomans showed, first with agricultural land and then with urban land, how use of the land can be directed towards the increasing of the land’s natural fertility. A regional landscape developed according to the ideas of Howard and Yeomans can be called an Agape landscape because the work of planning and development is directed towards the building up of the land’s characteristics of both natural fertility (see Appendix 2) and the creative work of humans living on the land. The Agape landscape symbolises the individuated personality: the landscape receives its fundamental structure from the topography (as does the psyche from the structure of the archetypes), and its nourishment from the interaction of the temperatures, water, topography, soils and biological life (as the psyche is nourished by the ideas, images, intuitions and emotions from the archetypes), and is created into new forms of fertility and productivity through human agricultural and urban development (as the unconscious is newly-created when it is brought into consciousness). The cultural (Agape) landscape brings nature to a new creation—a symbolisation of the world spirit becoming to new consciousness.

In the Agape landscape, the urban areas will be natural or ecological cities.
They will be located on the gentler ridgelands and their plans of overall shape and pattern of roads, water and sewer lines will follow the sinuous land contours and have gentle gradients. Urban effluents will add to the increasing of the natural fertility of forest and farm lands integrated with the urban settlements. The rural farms will prosper because of their continually increasing natural fertility which will make redundant the need for expensive technological inputs to maintain productivity. The integration of human settlement into the process of increase of natural fertility adds an aesthetic quality to the landscape. Macdonald Holmes writes of the keyline farms:

There is great beauty in these landscapes because, as each new work was done on the farm, it was so arranged that it would add something more to create a harmonious, satisfying and, with all, a highly productive enterprise (Macdonald Holmes 1960, pp. 4f.; cf. Hancock 1972, p. 162).

A New Symbolism
The introduction of European agriculture into the harsh climatic and soil conditions of Australia might be likened to an expulsion ‘outside the camp’ (Heb. 13: 13), to the wilderness beyond the sacred space. The European environment is sufficiently amenable to the European agricultural practices that land degradation is manageable, and conventional practice is not questioned. The Australian environment is, however, like a physical wilderness in which agriculture that attempts to dominate nature is cursed by land and water degradation. Eros agriculture kills the land’s natural fertility. The degraded land symbolises the egocentric person in the spiritual wilderness of separation from God, and who dies psychologically.

The injury to the land and the suffering of the agriculturalists are symbolic of the mythical hero’s annihilation in the ‘night sea journey’, which is necessary before the human egocentric psyche can be reborn with the new attitude of Agape. The keyline and Garden City ideas are manifestations of this new attitude. However, like the Agape Christianity of 2,000 years ago, the planning motif of Howard and Yeomans has been misunderstood or rejected because it was received by minds thinking in the opposite attitude of Eros. People thinking this way can at best adopt only some of the elements, but can perceive neither the underlying
purpose and source of the initiative of the new attitude, nor the different relationship between people and land which it implies. By contrast, people who think in the Agape motif can view fertility, coming naturally from the earth, as a symbol of God's grace, or of the psychic energy of the unconscious, given continually to the world.

From the Agape perspective, land can be seen as a symbol of the human psyche. The natural wilderness symbolises the unconscious, and the degraded landscape of Eros agriculture symbolises the egocentric psyche that suppresses its unconscious life from consciousness. Human domination of the land symbolises the Eros psyche's rejection of God's Agape love. The Aboriginals and the European agriculturalists, each in their own cultural way, transformed the Australian landscape so that they could be the dominant species in the biological system and thus control the land's fertility. They reduced the fertility to the constraints of their technologies, and thereby degraded the land's potential productivity. They did not recognise the land's fertility as a symbol of God's Agape love given unconditionally for the creation of new life.

The history of European agricultural settlement of Australia is a two-hundred-year-old, continental-scale symbol of Agape suffering-love where the people sacrifice not the personal body on the cross but the natural fertility of the Australian landscape. Eros agricultural use of the Australian continent symbolises the human rejection of the Agape nature of God. The resilience of nature symbolises God's continual forgiveness.

The Agape myth permits a new understanding of nature. Nygren (1982, p. 740) cites Luther's view that nature operates in Agape love and only humans live through (Eros) self-interest. This view requires qualification. The abundant giving of Agape underlies the totality of nature. However, each individual and species follows the Eros way in asserting its integrity. A seed grows to maturity by asserting its use of living space and life-resources, often at the expense of peers and rivals. At maturity the situation changes towards Agape when the individual produces fruit and seed in abundance for the benefit of others and for future life: the adult instinctively focuses on rearing the young. At death the individual's body is given over totally for the growth of new life.
Plants colonise new land through the succession from pioneer species to the climax or dominant species. The Australian Eucalyptus forests have become climax plant communities in the humid areas of the continent because they can survive both the droughts and bushfires common to these areas. The Eucalyptus forests, however, also promote the environmental conditions in which they can dominate other species by, for example, their high rate of evapotranspiration of moisture and their flammability. Thus the Eucalypts have risen to dominance through their strength in a particular ecological situation. This might be seen as an Eros way of life which blocks potential increase in fertility through the development of additional or new species. Nature can then be seen as an analogue of humankind in which people use strength to dominate others and thereby block potential creativity.

Agape theology provides a perspective for reviewing the Eros characteristics of human self-centredness and of nature’s struggle for dominance. The Old and New Testaments have an underlying theme of Agape in which the guidance of God is revealed not in the strong but in the weak. It is the weak who are ‘chosen’, not those who are physically or intellectually weak, but those who have matured psychologically beyond egocentricity to a recognition that they are weak in the face of a superior presence, the unconscious or the self. This is exemplified in Moses (Ex. 3: 11; 4: 1, 10, 13), Gideon (Judges 6: 15), Saul (1 Sam. 9: 21) and Mary (Luke 2: 1–14). Meyer (1983) writes that Luther describes Mary as ‘a sickly and poverty-stricken child, fourteen years of age’, and whose tribe was ‘truly reckoned amongst the lowest class of people’ (p. 21). Mary was miserable and alone, having been rejected by her people and almost also by Joseph (Meyer, pp. 21f.). Thus Luther could say that Jesus had a ‘beggar’s birth’ (Meyer, p. 32). Jesus died like a criminal (Luke 23: 26–46).

The Agape myth is that God operates through those who recognise their creatureliness. In this resides their faith, and from this condition God raises the last to be first (Matt. 19: 30; 20: 16), a symbolic rebirth of the ego through its assimilation of the spirit. Christian symbolism expresses the union of God (spirit or unconscious) with Mary (matter or the ‘flesh’, meaning the ego) to produce the Child (the individuated self or spiritualised matter). This symbolism is reflected in
agriculture where humans working in *Agape* produce the physical and biological conditions in which the earth’s natural fertility can be creative and increase the fruits of the land. The *Agape* myth suggests that cosmic evolution occurs through the creation of new life in an accepting and assimilating environment—an environment seen in *Eros* as weak, but seen in *Agape* as having the strength of obedient union with cosmic life. Yeomans resurrected the natural fertility on his keyline farms by subduing the dominating elements such as the erosive rainfall, runoff and the compaction of the soil, and worked with the weak and largely unseen life of the soil. He provided the conditions in the soil conducive to the increase of natural fertility which produced abundantly and provided ecological strength in the times of drought:

> Keyline overall planning has a new psychology. Its approach to land is no longer the idea of conservation, especially not soil conservation. The object of keyline is development rather than protection. Keyline is land development at its best, and development is progress. Soil conservation is stagnation, and may even be retardation. Again, keyline means a new philosophical outlook. Land is to be lived on and enjoyed, not to be lived off and destroyed by wrong practices in an effort to gain a precarious livelihood (Macdonald Holmes 1960, pp. 45f.).

Darling expressed the significance of the new motif of keyline as follows:

> My father often said that Australia had everything except a good rainfall, and what the country needed was a high range of mountains down the centre of the continent, so that we could get the rain we needed. I regard Keyline as that range of mountains (Darling 1959).

Darling was recognising the new symbolism of keyline, and the fundamental shift between the *Eros* motif based on humankind aspiring to majestic heights via the *axis mundi* of the cosmic mountain, and the *Agape* motif, in which humans submit their work to the service of the hidden fertility of nature.

If the Australian pioneer agriculturalists had viewed the forests from the *Agape* perspective, they would have seen an ecological system dominated by a few species which needed not to be destroyed but to be subdued and assimilated into the patterns of human settlement. Then, the land’s natural fertility could have been increased and new life created in integration with the original forest. This would
have been quite the opposite of the *Eros* practice of human domination by the wholesale destruction of the forest with the resultant despoliation of the land’s natural fertility. The cultural landscape developed in *Agape* would symbolise the individuated psyche which derives its life from the unconscious and brings the contents of the unconscious into conscious life. The wilderness would be integrated into the agricultural process directed towards the increase of the land’s natural fertility.

### 9.5 Development of Agape in Society

Sections 9.3 and 9.4 discussed the effects of the two psychological attitudes and their religious motifs on how people perceive and use land. The *Eros* motif generated from the egocentric psyche is prevalent in society, as it develops automatically with a person’s development of consciousness. More uncommon is the *Agape* motif, which is adopted by the person who has undergone the difficult psychological confrontation with the unconscious. Whereas egocentricity theorises and acts towards the world according to the symbolism of the *Eros* motif, individuation theorises and acts according to the symbolism of the *Agape* motif. The two psychological attitudes thus have different perspectives on what constitutes knowledge. This presents the possibility of adding to society’s theory on the relationship to land through education on the psychological attitudes and their systems of symbolism. To explore this possibility, this section discusses the nature of knowledge first as viewed in the *Eros* motif and then in the *Agape* motif. This then allows a discussion of the education which might bring *Agape* into society’s consciousness as a prerequisite to achieving a creative relationship to the land.

#### Knowledge in the Eros motif

Writing in the early 1600s, Francis Bacon heralded the adoption by Western culture of the rational scientific method of acquiring knowledge (Broad 1958). In his book *Novum Organum*, Bacon rejected the practice of ancient Greek and medieval scientific philosophy of formulating speculative hypotheses about the metaphysical causes of natural phenomena (Bacon 1952, pp. 107–136). Bacon advocated that experience through experimentation was the means by which thinking and matter
could be brought together as knowledge, and thereby overcome the Greek and medieval dualism between mind and matter. Bacon's method of scientific investigation comprised the steps of focusing on a 'particular', an exhaustive identification of the particular's situation in nature, formulation of the goal of the investigation, conduct of the experiment, derivation of an axiom, and deduction from the axiom of new particular(s) which need to be experimented upon, and which might lead to new axioms. He saw the interplay between particulars and axioms via induction and deduction not proceeding reductively from particular to particular, but from particular(s) to a lesser axiom thence progressively to intermediate axioms and a general axiom (Bacon 1952, p. 128). The general axioms provide the theory and knowledge for the interpretation of nature and the bringing of nature into submission for the use of humanity (Bacon 1952, pp. 107, 134f.). The goal of science is, according to Bacon, the interpretation of nature and the turning of nature to practical use for 'the endowment of human life with new inventions and riches' (p. 120).

Bacon sought to rid the human scientific mind of any irrational influence. He rejected any scientific use of fable or myth as 'fictions of the imagination' and 'idols of the human mind' (p. 130). Rational science empties the mind of prejudice and 'levels men's wits' (pp. 132f.). For Bacon, the investigation process begins with the aim of discovering the 'natural cause of some object' (p. 127). The function of hypothesising is to link the assessment of the results of the experiment with the derivation of axioms (p. 132). He thereby sees the rational mind as the supreme arbiter in both setting the aim of scientific investigation and in the extrapolation from experiment to a general principle of truth. For Bacon, the basis of the scientific experiment is the sensory perception of the external object (p. 108). By rejecting the experiences of the inner world, Bacon dichotomises the human–nature relationship. He sees the 'divine mind' (p. 133) as the means of ascent of the ladder of particulars and axioms to the wisdom of the knowledge of nature (p. 128).

Just as the land use planners cosmicise the land by transforming wilderness into order, so did Bacon attempt to cosmicise the intellectual landscape by categorising the multitude of particular objects into 'proper and well arranged...living tables of discovery...and the mind can then apply itself to the
ready prepared and digested aid which such tables afford' (p. 127). Bacon’s goal was the ‘instauration’, or restoration, of humankind to its pre-Fall paradisal situation. He wrote that human innocence can be regained through ‘religion and faith’, and the ‘power over nature’ and ‘empire over creation’ can be regained through the arts (mechanical) and sciences (the understanding of nature) (Bacon 1952, p. 195).

Jung distinguishes two types of thinking, fantasy-thinking and directed thinking. Fantasy-thinking, which predominates in the mind of the primitive, is largely unconscious. It arises from archetypal ideas and images and is used to adapt the external world aesthetically to the subjective fantasies (Jung 1967, CW5, Para. 24). Directed-thinking is developed through rational logic and divorces thinking from the ‘aesthetic impact’ and the ‘emotional effect of sense-impressions’; it allows thinking to attain a separation from the nature of the psyche and from the world (Jung 1967, CW5, para. 113).

Bacon’s rationalism illustrates an extreme of directed-thinking. Bacon’s fantasy-thinking was, however, still very active but, being repressed from his normal conscious thinking, it manifested in symbolic imagery as unconscious compensation directed at urging his psyche towards wholeness. Bacon’s allegorical story New Atlantis (written just prior to his Novum Organum) contains sequences of vividly described mandala images including:

- the walled ‘fair city’;
- the axis mundi image of the ‘great pillar of light’ in the form of a cylindrical column ‘rising from the sea, a great way towards Heaven’ and topped by a large cross of light ‘more bright and resplendent than the body of the pillar’;
- ‘a small ark, or chest of cedar, dry, and not wet at all with water, though it swam. And in the fore-end of it... grew a small green branch of palm.’ Inside the chest was a letter and book containing all the canonical books of the Old and New Testament and some not yet written. The letter and book were understandable to all languages and promised to the recipients ‘salvation, peace, and goodwill’;
- the Utopian image of the island of Bensalem, discovered within the
'greatest wilderness of waters in the world' (Bacon 1952, pp. 199–214). These images show that Bacon had fragmented his psyche into the rational ego and the unacknowledged unconscious which, nevertheless, remained active through the generation of symbols of fantasy into his mind.

Isaac Newton (1642–1727) followed the Baconian scientific method in his investigations of the mathematical principles underlying 'natural philosophy'. He advocated the discovery of the qualities of bodies by experimentation, thence, by induction, the derivation of universal qualities:

We are certainly not to relinquish the evidence of experiments for the sake of dreams and vain fictions of our own devising; nor are we to recede from the analogy of Nature... We no other way know the extension of bodies than by our senses...

...the argument of induction [must] not be evaded by hypotheses (Newton 1995, bk. 3, rules 1–4).

Newton, like Bacon, demystifies both nature and theology. Newton saw God as a living, intelligent and powerful Being who has dominion over the world, as a Lord has control over servants. He sees God as eternal, infinite, omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent as an innate force in all matter—but 'Deity is the dominion of God not over his own body, as those imagine who fancy God to be the soul of the world, but over servants', and hence, despite God giving motion to matter, neither God nor matter is affected by the other (Newton 1995, pp. 440f.). Newton sees only a rational and mechanical world in which the human intellect can rise through inductive reasoning to divine wisdom:

But hitherto I have not been able to discover the cause of those properties of gravity from phenomena, and I frame no hypotheses; for whatever is not deduced from the phenomena is to be called an hypothesis; and hypotheses, whether metaphysical or physical, whether of occult qualities or mechanical, have no place in experimental philosophy. In this philosophy particular propositions are inferred from the phenomena, and afterwards rendered general by induction (Newton 1995, pp. 442f.).

Experimentation on nature and inductive reasoning will, according to Newton, allow the 'determination and demonstration of the laws' of the supreme Spirit (pp. 442f.).
Newton's mathematical work focused on the motion of matter and on the qualities of attraction and repulsion of material bodies. His calculations abound in patterns of the circle, spiral, vortex, wheel, sphere and square. Key concepts for him are the *vis insita* (innate force of matter), and the centripetal force of moving bodies. All these images are images of the mandala or of the movement towards a centre. It is as though Newton's rational mind was being driven, unconsciously, by mandala imagery of his unacknowledged self. The unconscious was directing him towards individuation but, in his egocentric attitude, he saw only the symbol and not its meaning. Knowledge had been cut off from its archetypal source and remained constrained by the *Eros* religious myth.

***

Based on Jung's view that the psyche receives its motivation from archetypal ideas and images, it seems that the purpose of rational thought is to bring the archetypal meanings to consciousness. Thus the efficacy of rational thought depends on the correlation between knowledge and its archetypal meaning. Jung notes that all thought about things 'unknown or only relatively known', including the scientific hypothesis, is only the 'best possible expression at the moment' of an unconscious archetypal idea, and is therefore symbolic (1971, CW6, para. 817). Knowledge can not, therefore, be separated from its symbolic meaning.

**Knowledge in the Agape motif**

The *Agape* motif recognises the link between the irrational and the rational, and that the rational mind receives its direction from the irrational. Thus *Agape* provides a fundamentally different view of what comprises knowledge.

The *Agape* view is that wisdom derives from the spirit or the unconscious. Plato recognised that ideas are pre-existent in the mind, but thought that *Eros* inductive contemplation was the only way to bring these ideas into intellectual knowledge. Aristotle, by contrast, saw the new-born mind as a blank slate onto which knowledge became imprinted, again by inductive reasoning. Bacon adopted the Aristotelian view, but rejected the Greeks' jumping from initial observation or experiment to the speculative generalised hypothesis. Jung agreed with the Platonic view on pre-existent ideas but found that the ideas had a dynamism of their own, and that it was the instincts and archetypes of the unconscious which
gave direction and life to the human psyche, including the rational mind. Jung makes it clear that ideas are not acquired, like possessions, from the world external to ourselves, but 'if some great idea takes hold of us from outside, we must understand that it takes hold of us only because something in us responds to it and goes out to meet it' (Jung 1968b, CW9(i), para. 215).

A hypothesis might, therefore, be seen as the attempt by the mind to formulate, rationally, some understanding of an archetypal idea which has come to conscious awareness. Denial of the origin of the idea will divorce the conscious understanding from the universal or cosmic reality:

A genuinely scientific attitude must be unprejudiced. The sole criterion for the validity of a hypothesis is whether or not it possesses an heuristic—i.e., explanatory—value (Jung 1966c, CW7, para. 216).

...in all fields of knowledge psychological premises exist which exert a decisive influence upon the choice of material, the method of investigation, the nature of the conclusions, and the formulation of hypotheses and theories (Jung 1968b, CW9(i), para. 150).

Jung writes that a person's destiny and creativity are inborn in the person's psyche, and evolve with psychic development:

This is especially the case with a creative person who does not at first see the wealth of possibilities within him, although they are all lying there ready. So it may easily happen that one of these still unconscious aptitudes is called awake by a 'chance' remark or by some other incident, without the conscious mind knowing exactly what has awakened, or even that anything has awakened at all (Jung 1954, CW17, para. 200).

Jung has shown that human thoughts, feelings and actions are preformed and continually influenced by the living and spontaneous archetypes in the unconscious (Jung 1968b, CW9(i), para. 154).

One manifestation of wholeness of personality is the integration of fantasy-thinking and directed-thinking, with the result that the individuated person experiences the images, ideas and emotions of fantasy as originating outside the ego, that is from the self. This realisation effects a change of attitude towards the world—from a viewpoint of a world in fragmentation to one of an integrated world. The new attitude changes the person's perception of concepts from a merely
rational intellectual awareness to a fundamental psychic experience of a living phenomenon having real meaning. For example, in theology the concept of grace can be experienced by the individuated person as the psychic energy which directs both the inner and the outer events of a person's life; the concept of sin as the egocentric blocking of grace; and forgiveness as the spontaneous, abundant and ever-present generation of grace from the unconscious. Knowledge, in *Agape*, can never be divorced from the spiritual or archetypal meaning. Theory developed in the *Agape* motif, compared to that developed in *Eros*, should represent a higher consciousness of the human–cosmos relationship, because of its incorporation of archetypal meaning into consciousness.

**Education for the Agape Myth**

Based on Jung's assertion of the primacy of the unconscious in cosmic life, theory would be valid only if it is consistent with this psychic reality. Egocentric people are unconscious of the fundamental psychic reality of cosmic life, and develop *Eros* theory which is inevitably fragmentary and distorted. Egocentricity is the predominant psychological attitude, and most education in the world is based on the *Eros* motif. People use education, just as they use land or any other aspect of life, to consolidate the pseudo-autonomy of the ego in its relationship to the unconscious. Rational education can become superficial and divorced from reality if it ignores the irrational intuitive and emotional aspects of life. Jung suggests that the unconscious creates symbols so that the ego can bring their archetypal meaning into consciousness. If theory is to be valid in the psychic–physical world, education would need to incorporate theory of the irrational process of symbolism. It therefore seems essential for the achievement of a non-degradative relationship to land to incorporate in society an education on the psychological attitudes and their symbolic expressions in the motifs of myth and religion. This section outlines the influence of the *Eros* motif on the Aboriginal and Western educational systems as a basis for suggesting how the *Agape* motif might also be incorporated in education.

The Australian Aboriginals appear to provide an example of an ancient culture which formulated educational systems according to the *Eros* myth. It would seem that the Aboriginals sought to consolidate their newly-emerging and tenuous consciousness by bringing their archetypal imagery into consciousness
by repetitive enactment of myths. Through ritual and tribal law, the events of the
mythical ancestors were continually brought into consciousness. Spiritual life and
physical life were integrated unconsciously through the projection of archetypal
images onto the environment. The myths and rituals were developed into coherent
forms from the experiences of archetypal images and events by individuals who
perceived them as revelations. The myths then became the subject of education for
the tribe through initiation ceremonies, religious ritual and tribal law. The teaching
was so rigid and so associated with fear that the beliefs became concretised, with
little amendment, over thousands of years (Berndt & Berndt 1988, pp. 176ff.;
Maddock 1984, p. 87). Original psychic experience had been transformed into
dogma (cf. Jung 1968c, CW12, paras 12–14). The experience and interpretation of
psychic revelation by individuals, except for the ‘men of higher degree’ (Elkin
1984, pp. 281ff.), was thereby discouraged. The culture had entered a period of
status quo in which it was assumed that the well-being of the tribe and the eternal
spiritual life of the individual were assured through propitiatory ritual. Aboriginal
education would appear to have perpetuated an Eros motif of religious salvation.

The ancient Greeks also had an Eros-based educational system. It was
assumed that people could acquire the capability of ethical judgment once they had
ascended, through the inductive reasoning process, to the level of abstract thought
on the ‘Good’. The person could then become an autonomous centre for judgment
of right and wrong, and therefore of care and responsibility for the world. Plato saw
ideas as pre-existent in the mind, whereas Aristotle saw the mind as being like a
blank slate at birth. Both, however, saw enlightenment as being achieved by an
inductive learning from particulars and progressively extending knowledge to
generalisations. The hypothesis was made secondary to inductive reasoning and
sensory perception. The rational intellect was the divine aspect of the human
person and provided the link with the deity and immortality. The personal goal of
education was happiness, and this could be acquired only through sufficient
knowledge and wisdom to allow intellectual contemplation, for it was in knowing
wisdom that the highest happiness was experienced. The communal goal was the
welfare of the state. Hence the state was seen as an institution established by
human initiative for the benefit of the collective population.
Modern Western education was founded on, and is still based on, the Greek educational philosophy. The Greeks sought a liberal education which could free the mind from the constraints of present time and space and allow contemplation and leisure. Rationalism and the inductive scientific method became even more entrenched in Western education following the enlightenment period. Within the *Eros* attitude, education is directed apparently to the benefit of the individual, but in practice it is directed, as acknowledged by the Greeks and as practised by the Australian Aboriginals, towards the consolidation of the organism of the community. The state is the symbol of the projected *self* and, therefore, is perceived as a centre-of-the-world or as a mother-symbol, that is a sacred vessel capable of allowing rebirth into divinity. The state, then, becomes the vehicle for individuals to attain spiritual salvation.

According to Jungian psychology and to the *Agape* religious myth, however, *Eros* education, which focuses on the ego, on rationalism and on reductionism, may be seen, when considered alone, to be counter to wholeness of personality, to life and to creativity. If it is acknowledged that the initiative for human and natural life comes from the unconscious, then education for the understanding of nature and life must be primarily deductive, because the archetypes are the generators of all ideas and hypotheses. Inductive investigation provides examples of the universal situation. By denying the archetypal basis of knowledge, *Eros* education cuts off knowledge from its source and provides a partial and distorted view of reality. In *Agape*, the purpose of education is to ‘prepare the way’ (Bonhoeffer 1985, pp. 110–119, 181, 305, 309) for the coming of the unconscious into consciousness. Each individual should be given the opportunity to become psychologically individuated, that is to develop as an *Imago Dei*. Education has the obligation to encourage each person to develop to his or her potential creative destiny. Only education based on the *Agape* motif can achieve this. Continuation of *Eros* education will block this evolution and constrain individuals by moulding them into amorphous parts of the collective society.

---

6 The great value of rational education seems to be to assist the bringing of the irrationally-sourced archetypal ideas into the conscious intellect, and thereby to develop knowledge which is psychically real as well as materially real.
Experience of psychic integration does not, however, lead automatically to conscious and rational theorising of the new individuated attitude according to the *Agape* motif. This gap between experience and theory may be illustrated by reference to the lives of Aeneas (see chapter 2), Charles Darwin and Jung.

Throughout his life, Aeneas was guided by the spirit world towards his destiny, and might, therefore, be considered to have become psychologically individuated. During his journey through the underworld, Aeneas had been advised by his father of his future role in establishing the Roman Empire and of the need to guide people in peace and to show 'generosity to the conquered' (Virgil 1986, bk VI, l. 853). However, in the final test when he stood over the conquered Turnus, counteracting his father's advice, he succumbed to *Eros* passionate revenge and 'angrily plunged his sword full into Turnus' breast' (Virgil 1986, bk XII, l. 951). Aeneas had not brought his individuation into the theory of *Agape*.

Darwin appears to be a person who was educated in the *Eros* motif but whose life experience made him aware of the dissociation between his psychic life and his system of rational theory. Darwin (1809–1882) is regarded as an empirical scientist, but he questioned throughout his life what comprises knowledge and how it is acquired (Barlow 1958, p. 119; cf. Greene 1961, p. 254, and Moorehead 1969, p. 169). He thus appears to be aware of an irrational and symbolic nature to knowledge which urged him to question the validity of the Baconian view of empirical science. Darwin had a conventional upbringing in education and religion. His aptitude for observation in nature, heightened by the experience of his world trip as a naturalist, raised in his mind the paradox between his religious belief in a beneficent God who designed the created world and the wastage, cruelty and suffering in nature.

Darwin's pre-eminent theory is that of natural selection, which allowed the evolution of the natural world to be seen in a new light. He saw the ever-present urge within nature to express natural fertility through the evolution of new species. But the new forms of life survived only when the receiving environment was suitable to nurture them. This is a symbolic representation of the operation of the psyche where the archetypes are continually tending towards conscious realisation but are assimilated into consciousness only when the ego is open to receive them. It
seems that his whole outlook was motivated by the *Agape* or individuated attitude to the world which allowed him to see nature as a symbol of the *Agape* process. The disjunction between his fundamental attitude and his rational theory caused him distress and illness for most of his adult life (Barlow 1958, pp. 115, 144, 240ff.). He could not correlate his unconscious intuition and his rational theory, nor could he explain his experience of ideas coming to him irrationally and not as a result of the Baconian empirical process. Nevertheless, Darwin's theory broke asunder the myth of thousands of years of the far-off, omnipotent and vengeful God who created the world once and for all, and to whom propitiatory sacrifice must be offered to gain beneficence. Natural selection opened the way for the natural world to be seen according to the *Agape* myth of a God-in-becoming from darkness to light, and this through the humility of unmotivated giving of the self to the world.

Even Jung seems not to have made fully the step from psychological individuation to theorising in the *Agape* motif, despite his life-work being an exposition of the *Agape* motif in psychic life. He admitted that he could not understand the idea of love, presumably because he did not distinguish between the religious motifs of *Eros* and *Agape* and, consequently, could not correlate egocentricity with the motif of *Eros* love, and individuation with *Agape* love. He recognised the inadequacy of the concept of (*Eros*) desiring love to describe God's love, yet he had no other myth with which to describe love (Jung 1965, pp. 353ff.). The implication is that wholeness of personality and its associated attitude of integration is dependent on both the experience of psychic integration between the ego and the *self*, and education to enable the rational mind to theorise in the *Agape* motif.

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to address the challenge of how to incorporate education on the *Agape* motif into a society in which most people have an egocentric attitude and theorise in the *Eros* motif, and where education is supervised by government, itself an *Eros* institution. The following comments, however, can be made. In ancient *Eros* traditions, governments saw no incompatibility between the two functions of implementation of law and justice, and of mediation between the people and their gods. Both were based on power—power to punish according to the law, and power to lead propitiatory worship. The
uniquely Christian *Agape* characteristic of self-giving for the benefit of ‘the other’ differentiates between the functions of secular and religious leadership. In *Agape*, the role of government is seen as a mandate from God for the preservation of life, quite distinct from the religious function for the redemption of life. The *Agape* Christian tradition recognises that the created world includes the following mandates from God for the orderly conduct of life, according to God’s will, in society (see, e.g., Bonhoeffer 1985, pp. 179–184, 252–267, 297–317):

- The Church for the proclamation of the *Agape* myth;
- The State for the protection of life and the implementation of law and justice;
- Marriage for the orderly generation of new life;
- Work for the creation of new value, not *ex nihilo*, but from already created things.

Bonhoeffer (1985, p. 257), following Luther, explains that no mandate exists independently for its own sake, but all are conjoined in mutual relationship. The mandates are also in mutual opposition, and each is limited in its function by the existence of the others. They exist in relationship under the authority of God. The bringing of the *Agape* myth into the consciousness of society depends on all the mandates: the myth is proclaimed by the church within the overall protection of the state; the children from marriage are guided by parents and educated by the church; people can then live and work in witness to the *Agape* myth (Bonhoeffer 1985, p. 257).

The placement of education under the umbrella of *Agape* may be likened to seeing the second half of the Ten Commandments under the umbrella of the first half. It comprises the shift in attitude from egocentricity to the centring on the self or God. Jung points out that the church itself requires re-education so that its traditional symbolism is not concretised in dogma but, instead, progresses with the development of human consciousness, and acknowledges the living nature of the archetypes and their symbolic images (e.g. Jung 1966b, ch. 2). Education can no longer be seen as ‘secular’, but must assimilate both the irrational and the rational.
Whether education is conducted by the church, by the state, or by both, the curriculum should allow for the Agape myth to be understood in contradistinction to the Eros myth. This will require people to learn of the structure and operation of the human psyche, particularly of the development of the egocentric and individuated attitudes and their ramifications for life and work. Mythology should be studied, especially as illustration of archetypal structure and meaning; religion and theology should be studied as developments of myth and as systematisations of the psychological processes.

Bonhoeffer (1985, p. 309) writes that the government mandate is ‘regulative not constitutive’. Throughout the history of European settlement in Australia, governments have played an active role in the design and utilisation of the land. In agriculture, governments have encouraged orientation of production on particular export markets, have established patterns of production by the building of infrastructure such as large dams and their associated irrigation works, and even controlled farming such as on the irrigation areas. Through taxation policies (such as incentives to clear native vegetation up until 1976), and agricultural extension and soil conservation programs, governments have influenced the practice of agriculture in fundamental ways. The influence, however, has not been beneficial overall, because not only do governments see themselves in a regulatory role (which is, correctly, a mandate made necessary by the egocentrism of society), but they have been operating within the Eros myth and thus encouraging the domination of the land with degradation of its natural fertility. When viewed against the responsibilities of the mandates, the role of governments in Australian agriculture is seen to be massively overstepping their ‘regulative’ role.

In Agape, each individual has a direct relationship with God (or the self) and an integral part of this relationship is work. Creativity can only occur when a person acts as a channel for the spiritus rector so that archetypal energy can be directed, through agricultural work, to the land. Governments should protect this capability of human creativity and not intrude beyond their legitimate protective function. Education on the Agape myth would better equip government personnel to understand the creative process and the divine nature of the relationship between a farmer and the land, and hence also of the divine nature of government.
regulation.

This chapter has shown that each of the two fundamental psychological states, egocentricity and individuation, generates its own myth of understanding of the human cosmic situation. The *Eros* myth portrays a perceived duality between humans and the world. This duality is fundamental to how egocentric people treat land and understand knowledge. The *Agape* myth, however, grows out of an experience of integration of the human personality and the cosmic world. This experience gives a feeling of direct relationship to the world and gives a fundamentally different understanding of knowledge. Education alone will not achieve a communal conversion from *Eros* to *Agape* thinking. However, education is pivotal to the development of society's theory of the world from a predominantly *Eros* viewpoint to one inclusive also of the *Agape* viewpoint, and of the psychological processes required to achieve individuation which can allow a conscious experience of *Agape* love.
Chapter 10

Conclusions

People relate to the world in one or other of two fundamentally different ways, depending on the perceived relationship between the ego and the unconscious. People who assume that the ego is autonomous and centred on itself have an egocentric attitude to the world, and theorise according to the symbolism of the *Eros* religious motif. People who experience assimilation of the unconscious and the ego have an individuated attitude to the world, and theorise in general according to the symbolism of the *Agape* religious motif.

For thousands of years, human consciousness has predominantly had the egocentric attitude with its *Eros* religious motif. The *Eros* motif is based on the perceived separation between people, gods, and the world, and on the belief that communion with the divine world depends on human initiative. The *Eros* relationship to land is through the symbolism of sacrifice and centralisation. The ego, centred on itself, symbolises its pseudo-autonomy from the unconscious through images of the sun god’s sacrificial slaying of the earth monster, or the bringing of light and order out of the dark chaos. Consequently, people in *Eros* feel impelled to conquer nature and tame its spirit. They thus establish sacred land, the sanctuary or *temenos*, in differentiation from the profane or wild land. However, they continually need to renew contact with the unknown sacred. They achieve this through ritualistic sacrifice of the sun god, a symbol of their own ego, to the earth spirit. The site of the sacrifice is the *axis mundi*, where the gods of the sky and earth, that is the ego and the unconscious, are reunited. People in *Eros* identify with the sun god in propitiatory, ritualistic labour to first slay nature, and then, in self-sacrifice, to renew their divine power through contact with the now controlled spirit of nature. They then have the power to fertilise the earth and control its life. *Eros* agricultural landscapes are consequently patterned according to the image of the sacred area centred on the sacrificial altar of the *axis mundi*.

Sacrifice involves the taking of life, manifested in the land by, for example,
loss of biodiversity and natural fertility, and in the human psyche by its constriction to propitiatory action. Degradation of the land is seen as a curse which evokes further propitiation in the form of precautionary land use practices such as soil conservation. Different personality types manifest their egocentric relationship to the land in different ways: some despoil the land, some transform it into human-controlled forms, some protect and conserve it, and others preserve it. Each type, however, differentiates between sacred and profane land, reflecting both the fragmentation of the egocentric psyche and the broken relationship between egocentric people living in the Eros motif and the earth which they dominate.

The Agape religious motif is the mythical expression of the attitude of the psychologically integrated person, and provides an alternative symbolic perception of the land. People thinking in Agape see the land in ecological integration as a symbol of the individuated psyche. They experience a direct relationship to the land through the commonality between people and nature in the elements of their material constitution and their psychoid and archetypal foundation. The Agape relationship to the land extends beyond the degradative constraints of conquest, sacralisation and centralisation. In Agape, people see the natural characteristics of the land, its topography and ecological structure, as symbols of the archetypes of the unconscious, and incorporate them into the utilisation of the land, just as the archetypes are incorporated into the consciousness of the wholistic personality. The land's natural fertility, continually generating new life, is seen as a symbol of the creativity of the unconscious.

Although little land has been developed in the Agape attitude, the analysis in this thesis permits us to establish the characteristics of such development. Settlement patterns would be radically different from most existing developments, and would flow compatibly with the land shapes and ecological systems, and comprise an integration between agricultural and urban areas. People would experience a direct archetypal relationship to the land. People and the land would be integrated through their working jointly towards increasing the land's natural fertility. Nature would be seen as a living resource awaiting to be brought to higher levels of fertility and production by the creative work of Agape love.

Although the human psyche and the world of nature operate fundamentally
according to the Agape motif, the development of individuals towards independence and their growth towards maturity necessarily follows the Eros motif. During this growth, egocentric people are unconscious of the Agape nature of life, as modern society operates on the conscious level, in theory and action, according to the Eros motif. Education would therefore be necessary, for the majority of the population, to bring the Agape myth into consciousness. The purpose of this education would be to effect a change of focus from a single external god to the inner self as the source of psychic inspiration and the locus of experience of direct union with the cosmos. Such education would encourage people to develop psychologically towards individuation and to formulate theory based on the Agape motif. People would then experience a direct relationship to the land in which agricultural work directs psychic creativity towards the increase of natural fertility.
Buddhism is an apposite example of a non-Christian belief system to compare with Christianity because its beliefs are based, as in Christianity, on the life and teachings of an individual, and because in one of its schools of thought the concept of grace is fundamental. It is also relevant to this thesis because it teaches respect for nature.

Bouquet (1958, pp. 282ff.) raises the question of how much the various schools of Buddhism might have altered the meanings of the Buddha's original teachings and how much Buddhism might have been influenced by the beliefs of other cultures with which it came into contact (p. 285). Thus, for example, Rahula (1974, p.1) adopts the humanist view:

The Buddha was not only a human being; he claimed no inspiration from any God or external power either. He attributed all his realization, attainments and achievements to human endeavour and human intelligence. A man and only a man can become a Buddha...

Man's position, according to Buddhism, is supreme. Man is his own master, and there is no higher being or power that sits in judgment over his destiny.

However, Bouquet (1958, pp. 282f.) writes:

Most scholars who know the early Buddhist texts now seem to hold that the Buddha himself was an off-shoot of the Upanishadic age, and that in his earliest utterances he speaks of the Great Self in a typically Upanishadic manner.

Bouquet continues by describing how the Buddha focused on human behaviour and how Buddhism became 'more and more' atheistic (p. 282). He suggests that Buddhism's replacement in its country of origin, India, by Hinduism was because of a reaction against this atheism (pp. 282f.).
Theravada follows the classical program of ascetic meditation as practised by the monks and nuns. Smart (1989, p. 77) describes this as ‘the prime example of mysticism without God.’ The goal of Theravada is for the mind to reach nirvana, the state of purity beyond the normal ego experience of suffering in the world—a state which ensures liberation of the person’s after-life being from the continual cycle of rebirth into human or other forms of life. Mahayana arose as a second major school because not everyone was in a position to undertake or was capable of undertaking the strict ascetic life, and also the Theravada follower was seen as possibly egoistic and thereby unable to engage practically in compassion for others (Smart, p. 80). Smart notes that this was resolved by the ideal of the ‘Bodhisattva, or Buddha-to-be, who out of compassion puts off his own final salvation till all are saved’ (p. 80). This led to:

the use of Buddha statues. It was not a long step from this to the idea that Buddhas continue to be present to us and so can be worshiped. This generated a type of Buddhism in which bhakti (warm devotion) came to supplement and even displace the austerer form of self-training and mysticism. Out of this arose mythological innovations: stories about great Bodhisattvas such as Avalokitesvara, the Lord Who Looks Down (with compassion), and Amitabha, the Buddha of Infinite Light (Smart, p. 80).

Within both schools, the earning of merit is fundamental: in Theravada through one’s meditational and learning practices to become liberated from continual rebirth in the cycle of life; in Mahayana through pious devotion to the Buddha-gods.

Buddhism, the philosophy which was meant to perpetuate the Buddha’s teachings on the paths to self-liberation, evolved from the Mahayana school into a further branch, namely the Pure Land movement, in which the cosmic Buddha was believed to have constructed an after-life paradise which was conducive to the attainment of nirvana (Smart, 1989, p. 82). In Japan, this movement was developed through the ideas of two monks, Honen and Shinran. (Smart 1989, p. 139ff.):

Honen...was especially drawn to meditation on the Buddha of Infinite Light, Amida [Amitabha]. He followed the sacramental method of meditation in which by visualizing Amida he would become unified with him...he nevertheless felt dissatisfied: he could not attain a sense of utter liberation.
Honen turned to the idea that those who cannot be freed by strenuous meditation can nevertheless gain Amida's favour and assure themselves of rebirth in the Pure Land simply through the repetition of his name in the formula... 'Homage to the Buddha Amida'...

Shinran... [thought that] it was enough simply to turn once to Amida in faith... Since Amida did not require good works, but longed for the salvation of all beings, there was no point in such 'good works' as becoming a monk or nun. By a similar logic to that of Luther, Shinran pioneered the move away from monasticism...

Though Shinran's view is very similar to Protestant notions of the grace of God, there is a difference arising from the structure of Buddhist myth. In the Christian case there is always maintained a differentiation between God and the human being, however tender the relationship and sense of communion on both sides. But in the case of the True Pure Land, the destiny of those who go on to the Pure Land is to attain Buddhahood and indeed return to the world to help save others.

Smart's comparison of Shinran and Luther is a fundamental point in the assessment of the place of Agape in the world's religions. This will be commented on below, but first comment is made on Jung's view of Buddhism and Eastern religion.  1 Jung had a long interest in Eastern religions largely because he saw its introspective nature as a balance to the extraverted nature of the Western psyche, that is the Easterner sees the meaning of the world within the person, the Westerner sees it in the external world (Jung 1965, p. 317). Jung had a great respect for the Eastern wisdom but he also believed that each culture developed psychologically from its own geographical and intellectual roots so that he felt that the Western mind could not adhere to Eastern practices in a psychologically valid way:

The Indian's goal is not moral perfection, but the condition of nirvandha. He wishes to free himself from nature; in keeping with this aim, he seeks in meditation the condition of imagelessness and emptiness. I, on the other hand, wish to persist in the state of lively contemplation of nature and of the psychic images. I want to be freed neither from human beings, nor from myself, nor from nature; for all these appear to me the greatest of miracles. Nature, the psyche, and life appear to me like divinity unfolded—and what

---

1 Jung's theories of psychology are discussed in chapter 3.
more could I wish for? To me the supreme meaning of Being can consist only in the fact that it is, not that it is not or is no longer (Jung 1965, p. 276).

Jung succinctly portrays the difference between the Western and Eastern religious imagery:

In the Pauline Christ-symbol the deepest religious experience of the West and East meet. On the one hand, Christ the sorrow-laden hero; on the other, the Golden Flower that blooms in the purple hall of the city of jade—what a contrast, what an unfathomable difference, what an abyss of history! (Jung 1931, p. 133)

In his book, *Jung and Eastern Thought*, Clarke discusses several criticisms raised by various philosophers of Jung’s views (Clarke 1994, ch. 9). Clarke writes that Jung’s ‘refusal to experiment with yoga methods inevitably led to a self-imposed limitation’ on his assessment of Eastern practices (p. 172). Watts (1973) is cited as criticising Jung’s ‘idea of the substantiality of the ego’ (Clarke, p. 173). Clarke states:

One of the consequences of Jung’s failure fully to emancipate himself from Western prejudices, [Watts] adds, is that ‘the voice of the Protestant conscience’ still speaks loudly within him, and urges him to reject the temptation to believe that the human spirit is capable of rising above its pains and troubles, and that it can therefore, as in the East, allow the conscious ego a sabbath from perpetual strife (p. 173).

Clarke also cites critics of Jung’s view that Eastern meditation aims at ‘dissolution of the ego’ and achieving a ‘condition of imagelessness and emptiness’ (p. 172). Clarke states that through the Eastern techniques ‘the mind is taught, not to eliminate itself, but rather to refine itself, to achieve a state of clarity and purity in which the world is not so much avoided as confronted without illusion or self-deception’ (p. 172). He cites also the view that the mind can achieve a state of higher consciousness which can perceive the world as unity, thereby rising ‘above the realm of the archetypes’ and beyond Jung’s ‘dualistic outlook’ (pp. 174f.).

The Buddhist tradition is based on ethical formulations for attitudes and behaviour (as the means to overcome desire for earthly things, the consequential suffering, and liberation through enlightenment). The Buddhist virtue of *metta* is often likened to the Christian *agape*. However, Bouquet (1958) draws a distinction:
metta means an attitude of pity, benevolence or goodwill towards others 'living in ignorance and misperception' (and hence in suffering), whereas agape means positive action to help others by the adoption of the suffering of others (pp. 301ff.). Neill (1970) writes:

The Buddhist has made his existential decision on the subject of suffering. Suffering, anguish, is the worst of all things...

Why suffer? That is the ultimate question. It comes to sharp and challenging expression in the contrast between the serene and passionless Buddha and the tortured figure on the Cross. In Jesus we see One who looked at suffering with eyes as clear and calm as those of the Buddha. He saw no reason to reject it, to refuse it, to eliminate it. He took it into himself and felt the fullness of its bitterness and horror; by the grace of God he tasted death for every man. Others suffer; he will suffer with them and for them, and will go on suffering till the end of time. But he does not believe that suffering is wholly evil; by the power of God it can be transformed into a redemptive miracle. Suffering is not an obstacle to deliverance; it can become part of deliverance itself. And what he was he bids his children be—the world's sufferers, in order that through suffering the may be brought back to God.

The Buddhist ideal is that of passionless benevolence. The Christian ideal is that of compassion...We can only ask our Buddhist friend to look long and earnestly on the Cross of Christ, and to ask himself whether, beyond the peace of the Buddha, there may not be another dimension of peace to the attainment of which there is no way other than the Way of the Cross (pp. 123f.).

Suffering is central to Luther's theology of the cross which recognises the essential link between the Law and the Gospel. Luther's sense of personal justification (or sanctification) began with contrition and self-accusation from an understanding of God's Law (Elert 1962, p. 145): 'True repentance is not active; it is not a work of man which brings about forgiveness of sins. No, it is "passive, the suffering and the sensation of death" ' (p. 146). Luther could then say ' "Therefore in Christ crucified there is the true theology and knowledge of God" ' (p. 67), i.e., the Gospel is heard as a revelation (p. 64). Luther heard the Gospel as meaning 'pro me', which allowed him to 'characterize joy as the real motive of ethical
behaviour' (p. 69). Luther saw that faith, engendered by the Gospel, reconciles the opposites of death (sin under the Law) and life (justification through forgiveness) (p. 62). Faith regenerates a person to a new plane (pp. 146ff.), ‘becomes an active ferment’ to unite the psyche by bringing the ‘transcendental I’ together with the ‘empirical I’ (pp. 148ff.):

Luther, who emphasised the ‘purely passively’ of faith and justification as no other person did, at the same time ascribed to faith the highest vitality, which can no longer be interpreted as being anything but empirical. ‘Where faith is of the right kind, there the deed also follows; and the greater the faith, the greater the deeds. Faith of the right kind is indeed something powerful, mighty, and active. To it nothing is impossible; nor does it rest and take a holiday... ‘This same faith is alive and active; it pervades and changes the whole man’... he sees and experiences the world differently (Elert 1962, p. 151).

Comment might now be offered on the question of grace in the Christian sense compared to that of the Buddhist school of True Pure Land. The Buddhist tradition seems to conform with what Nygren describes as the Eros motif where people assume the initiative in the salvation process. This seems to be intensified by the belief in the cosmic Buddha who, despite all mythological qualities, is still seen as a human-created figure of enlightenment. The idea that a person can achieve liberation by asking for grace without enduring the soul-searching involved in what Luther meant by repentence seems to risk falling into what Bonhoeffer (1959, ch. 1) calls ‘cheap grace’, i.e. grace without suffering and spiritual conversion. This is not to suggest that Shinran, who had spent years in religious training, had not become spiritually integrated. However, it might be asked what would Shinran have made of Paul’s theology of the cross, and whether Agape theology might represent a more accurate myth of salvation than that of Buddhist enlightenment. Might Pure Land Buddhism then be seen as having similarities to Caritas?
APPENDIX 2

NATURAL FERTILITY OF LAND

The purpose of this appendix is to outline the concept of natural fertility of land, a central idea in the thesis. Sir John Russell (1966), in his book *A History of Agricultural Science in Great Britain 1620–1954*, describes the development of scientific theory on what constitutes the fertility of the soil. Two main viewpoints can be identified in the book. The first is exemplified by the theories of Justus von Liebig (1803–1873), a chemist who thought that fertility depended not on organic matter as such, but on the chemical nutrients which it contained. This led him to postulate, in the 1840s, that soil fertility could be maintained or increased by calculating the amounts of the chemical nutrients that were taken out of the soil as produce and replacing the appropriate amounts as chemical fertilisers (Russell 1966, p. 99). The second viewpoint is exemplified by Sir Albert Howard, an agricultural scientist, a major work of whom is the book *An Agricultural Testament* published in 1940. Howard’s view was that fertilisers had to derive from living matter to provide the soil with the essential vital energy. Mineral fertilisers, he said, lacked this living essence and could not produce healthy plants and animals. Thus, whereas Liebig advocated the use of chemical fertilisers, Howard advocated the use of organic composts.

Both Liebig and Howard may be compared to the alchemists in their search for the essence of life in matter. They also followed the myth of the fecundator sun-god to the extent that each saw it necessary to add material to the land to bring it to fertility. The polarity of their views is an example of the dualistic attitude of egocentricity. However, each was seeing fertility as a symbol of something fundamental but unknown, the psychic energy of the unconscious.

P. A. Yeomans also sought to increase the fertility of the soil, but had a fundamentally different perspective. He attempted to provide the conditions within the soil for the natural life of the soil to generate its own fertility. As an agriculturalist during the 1940s and 1950s, he assisted the land’s own creativity.
rather than trying to be the creator of fertility. Yeomans was a contemporary of Sir C. Stanton Hicks, Professor of Human Physiology and Pharmacology, University of Adelaide, and appears to have been influenced by him, particularly on the characteristics of soil fertility. The remainder of this appendix is quoted from Hicks' contribution to the book *Life from the Soil* (White & Hicks 1953). In reading the quotation and in the context of this thesis, the following concepts might be equated: matter and its innate life, with God the Father and the psychoid unconscious; life forms such as the soil biota and humus, with God the Son or the archetypes; fertility with the Holy Spirit or the self; and the new life with revelation or a higher consciousness. Hicks' views, as with Yeomans, might be seen to symbolise the individuated or *Agape* attitude to the land.

Hicks writes:

...Only a realisation that fertile soil results from living processes can lead to its maintenance and increase by man.

Soil formation, as distinct from the formation of fine fragments and particles of rock by the processes of weathering, etc., depends upon the interaction with these particles of living things, beginning... with the lowliest fungi and mosses. As each decays it produces a residue of organic matter in various stages of dissolution until it finally returns whence it came: that is, from the atmosphere, in the form of Nitrogen and Carbonic acid gas or Carbon dioxide. This process is contributed by more and more complex forms such as leaves, roots, bacteria, protozoa, worms, grubs, etc., and surface animals and birds. This organic material, living and dying and decaying, is termed humus, and it is this humus which provides the binding element for the rock particles to form granules, which when so formed give rise to 'soil texture' and water holding power.
If this humus is wanting, the particles lose their capacity to hold together in granules, and they no longer imbibe and hold water, which runs off and washes the loose inert mineral matter away. The wind also lifts the finer particles and blows them about. This is what is termed *erosion* as distinct from *denudation*, the basic geological process which sculptures mountains into hills and builds plains in valleys and along the coast by transporting the denuded debris. Erosion is therefore, an end result of death of the living basis of formation of fertile soil. The fertility is due to the capacity of a living soil to hold water without being waterlogged, to fix atmospheric nitrogen and pass it to plants and to provide by a thousand and one processes for the useful transfer of essential mineral elements to the searching roots.

It may well be that the phenomenon which we term 'life', and which we find so difficult to define, is essentially a unique process whereby the known tendency of the universe to 'run down', is re-wound through the trapping and reorganisation of the sun’s light and energy by the plant, however lowly, and, through the plant, all animal and human life. This tendency of energy to 'run down' has been termed entropy and life may be the reverse process [or the unity of the *hieros gamos* of the male sun and female earth?]. This may be an oversimplification, but it will serve to emphasise the fact that without solar energy there would be no life and that the plant cover of the earth forms the receiving end of that energy, so far as terrestrial life goes.

The importance of the plant cover and of the living soil which makes such a cover a practical possibility cannot therefore, be over-estimated...

Every sort of plant community, whether forest, grassland, moor, or swamp, forms a community with its own species of animal life, and when climatic and other conditions are stable, this community is known as a climax. Every climax has its own soil condition served by its own soil population. On these conditions depend the fertility, the through-put of life, the retention and release of water, and manifestly the soil population will be determined by the nature of the humus.
In a forest, in average rainfall conditions, the litter can rise to as much as 12 tons to the acre, and the soil may contain up to 60 tons of organic matter to the same area. The micro-organisms alone may total 200,000,000 of every kind, and weigh up to 7 tons per acre. The additional earthworm population may reach 50,000 in the upper 2 to 7 feet of soil on every acre, and it has been estimated that these may bring to the surface each year as much as 18 tons of material.

...the organic material, living and dead, confers upon the the inert mineral particles the granular texture. It also contributes to soil structure which depends upon arrangement of the granules. Manifestly, the pores between the granules are determined again not only by the size of the original inert mineral material, but upon texture, and structure. Thus is determined how rapidly water will enter, and pass through the soil, as well as the amount that will be retained in the soil 'sponge'. Soils that are granular and crumbly take in water most rapidly, and store it in larger quantities. Closely covered grass land or dense forest is productive of this type of soil.

If there is adequate humus in the soil, the difference between sandy soils, and soils formed from loams or clays is, for all practical purposes, wiped out. This fact emphasises the fundamental basis for flood control through reduction of run-off, by providing humus through forest or dense grass cover, the former obviously on the higher slopes and ridges. It emphasises, too, the necessity for ecological live and let live. If through unbridled greed forests are cut out, and grass is over-stocked, the fertility of the soil falls as the humus content deteriorates, and erosion sets in as a final indication of death of the soil...(White & Hicks 1953, pp. 160-163)

Natural fertility of the soil might thus be seen as a symbolic expression of the psychic energy which drives the creativity of cosmic life. The purpose of agriculture should, then, be to provide the conditions for the increase of the soil's natural fertility.
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