D0109

. More

This talk of the conscious new of the individual leads us, then, to a discussion of religion. We spoke of one major function of the general usage of the word, culture; namely, that it serves to help us small reported changes in human history. We are entering upon such an epochal change in our time. I may said it would take 600 years to accomplish and that it would take the formor the birth of a new religion. It is essentially, primordially, a change, and volution, in human conscious and its tarrier is the individual, for, strictly a peaking, only the individual is conscious, and he or she is always more or less conscious, more or less differentiated and integrated, more or less capable of a control of meaning by interiority.

What the individual does with his of her own individuality, then, is the key to his or her farticipation in the emergence of a new cultural epoch. And I fropose as an initial definition of religion precisely this: what the individual does with his or her own individuality. I am in good company on this definition. Alfred North Whichhead, for one, has defined religion on "what the individual does with his own solitariness," as "the art and the theory of the internal life of man, so far as it depends on the man beinceff and on what is permanent in the nature of things." We shall return in due time to these definitions. It is sufficient to shall return in due time to these definitions.

now simply to note them.

My preliminary definition of religious is also in agreement with that of Soren Kierhebaard, for whom religious new in relating to cheself by willing to be oneself, and in such a manner as to exhibit the fower that creaks one. This definition, too, we shall study in great detail later.

My point for the moment is that there no kioned religion do not tend religion mto something other than the process of becoming oneself. They do not make religion srimarily a collective shenomenon. Nor do they make relating to God or the divine or

the absolute something one does over and above the frozen of becoming the self one is. If the divine is, and if it is to be found in that from for and wot independently of it. he ligion is the self-conscious becoming of the individual as this farticular individual man or about on. It is nothing other than this, mothing more than this. And this self-conscious becoming is Migion, the relating of the hidividual to the divine.

If I am correct, or at least on the right track, in these proposals, then an interesting correlation opens up be twentous discussion of enteres and this treatment of religion. If the sole beautiful the new culture is the individual, if the sole arena of its birth panas is our own inner space, and if religion is what the individual does with his or her sinder space, then the form of the emergence of the new culture is religion. In ligion and the entergence of participation in the emergence of a new cultural epoch is the individual's religion, and the marridual's religion is his or her farticipation in cultural evolution: for their two terms are synonymous with a third: what the individual does with his or her own maintained to.

This, then, is the essential correlation of religion and culture. Religion, as the art and theory of the mernal life of man, is the principal bearer of culture. This is particulable frue today in the emergence of a mew cultural epochs which will be a fluction of the expansion and differentiation of consciousness—an expansion and differentiation which can only be understood as what the individual and individual does with his own soll toriness, what the individual does in regard to the task of becoming the one he or she is, the clifterentiated totality of everything human that we allow made and female; body, soul, and spirit; good and evil; human and divine.

This process of what the ordividual does in the become of the one he or she is we shall mame, with Jung, individuation. Individuation is both religion and the beaute of culture, according to my definition of religion and culture. Later on in our course, we

Ahall Atudy in detail what Jung meant by individuation. For the moment I wish only to indicate my the of the term in Melation to religion and culture.

Now there are several problems that are liable to arise with regard to this discussions. Am I not overly privatizing the meaning of religious and the tack of creating culture? Is it not surrical to describe religious with Whitehead as what the individual does with his or her own solitarium? Is it not strong a to emphasize that the principal beares of culture is the suddividual?

I call after tion, them, to the she nome now noted by Whitehead, that those religious in which solitariness is introduced an essential are precisely those imbued with a universal. Consciousness. There are other forms of religion, them, than that form defined by solitariness. There are tribal and social forms of religion.

Theo 143, Lecture 2: Religion

This talk of the consciousness of the individual leads us, then, to a discussion of religion. We spoke of one major function of the more general usage of the word 'culture'; namely, that it serves to help us understand epochal changes in human history. We are entering upon such an epochal change in our time. Jung said it would take 600 years to accomplish and that it would take the form of the birth of a new religion. It is erssentially, primordially, a change, an evolution, in human consciousness, and its carrier is the individual, for, strictly speaking, only the individual is conscious, and he or she is always more or less conscious, more or less differentiated and integrated, more or less ready to assume the invitation to wholeness, more or less capable of a control of meaning by interiority.

What the individual does with his or her own individuality, then, is the key to his or her participation in the emergence of a new cultural epoch. And I propose as an initial definition of religion precisely this: what the individual does with his or her own individuality. I am in good company on this definition. Alfred North Whitehead, for one, has defined religion as 'what the individual does with his own solitariness,' as 'the art and theory of the internal life of man, so far as it depends on the man himself and on what is permanent in the nature of things.' We shall return in due time to these definitions. It is sufficient now simply to note them.

My preliminary definition of religion is also in agreement with that of Sören Kierkegaard, for whom religiousness is relating to oneself by *willing* to be oneself, and in such a manner as to discover and exhibit the power that creates one.' This definition too we shall study in great detail later.

My point for the moment is that these notions of religion do not turn religion into something other than the process of becoming oneself. They do not make religion primarily a collective phenomenon. Nor do they make relating to God or the divine or the Absolute something one does over and above the process of becoming the self one is. If the divine is, and if it is to be found in human life, it is to be found in that process, and not independently of it. Religion *is* the self-conscious becoming of the individual as this particular individual man or woman. It is nothing other than this, nothing more than this. And this self-conscious becoming is religion, the relating of the individual to the divine.

If I am correct, or at least on the right track, in these proposals, then an interesting correlation opens up between our discussion of culture and this treatment of religion. If the sole bearer of the new culture is the individual, if the sole arena of

its birth pangs is our own inner space, and if religion is what the individual does with his or her inner space, then the form of the emergence of the new culture is religion. Religion and the culture-bearing capacity of men and women are one. The individual's participation in the emergence of a new cultural epoch is the individual's religion, and the individual's religion is his or her participation in cultural evolution: for these two terms are synonymous with a third: what the individual does with his or her own individuality.

This, then, is the essential correlation of religion and culture. Religion, as the art and theory of the internal life of man, is the principal bearer of culture. This is particularly true today in the emergence of a new cultural epoch which will be a function of the expansion and differentiation of consciousness – an expansion and differentiation which can only be understood as what the individual does with bhis own own solitariness, what the individual does in regard to the task of becoming the one he or she is, the differentiated totality of everyhting human that we all are: male and female; body, soul, and spirit; good and evil; human and divine.

This process of what the individual does in the becoming of the one he or she is we shall name, with Jung, individuation. Individuation is both religion and the bearer of culture, according to my definitions of religion and culture. Later on in our course, we shall study in detail what Jung meant by individuation. For the moment I wish only to indicate my use of the term in relation to religion and culture.

Now there are several problems that are liable to arise with regard to this discussion. Am I not overly privatizing the meaning of religion and the task of creating culture? Is it not unusual to describe religion with Whitehead as what the individual does with his or her own solitariness? Is it not strange to emphasize that the principal bearer of culture is the individual?

I call attention, then, to the phenomenon noted by Whitehead, that those religions in which solitariness is introduced as essential are precisely those imbued with a universal consciousness There are other forms of religion, then, than that form defined by solitariness. There are tribal and social forms of religion.