

Desire and One-Sidedness: Extroversion's Enemies within, Introversion's Enemies without

Matthew Gildersleeve*

Abstract: This article will provide a thorough Lacanian and Heideggerian analysis of Jung's 1923 book *Psychological Types*. In particular, this article will demonstrate how one-sidedness of introversion or extroversion leads an analysand to experience the obstructiveness of a complex. I will use my past writing, which integrated Žižek's interpretation of Lacan with my Heideggerian interpretation of Jung to show why this one-sidedness leads to the obstructiveness of a complex. In contrast, an analysand adheres to 'the ethics of psychoanalysis' when there is not an one-sidedness of introversion or extroversion. This can be simplified by noting that introverts neglect the desire of the Other compared to the extrovert who neglects acting "in conformity with the desire that is in you". I aim to show that a balance is required between introversion and extroversion for the analysand to be at 'home in the world' and this can be restored with a unification of opposites through Jung's transcendent function.

Keywords: Jung, Lacan, Heidegger, Žižek, desire, introversion, extroversion

INTRODUCTION

This article focuses on elucidating psychological types first introduced to the world by Jung, which he "termed introverted and extraverted" (Jung 1923, 412). Jung explains these types can be "distinguished by the direction of general interest or libido movement" or "by their particular attitude to the object" (Ibid.). My thesis that introversion can be described as a withdrawal from the desire of the Other is supported by Jung when he says "The introvert's attitude to the object is an abstracting one; at bottom, he is always facing the problem of how libido can be withdrawn from the object" (Ibid.). My thesis that extroversion maintains a positive relationship to the desire of the Other but not to the own desire is also supported by Jung when he says "The

* Matthew Gildersleeve (✉)

University of Queensland, St Lucia, Queensland, Australia
e-mail: m.gildersleeve@uq.edu.au

extravert, on the contrary, maintains a positive relation to the object. To such an extent does he affirm its importance that his subjective attitude is continually being orientated by, and related to the object” (Ibid.). Jung adds, “The two types are so essentially different, presenting so striking a contrast, which their existence, even to the uninitiated in psychological matters becomes an obvious fact, when once attention has been drawn to it” (Ibid., 413). This paper brings further attention to these psychological types, which is important for a psychoanalyst who aims assist an analysand to remove an introverted or extroverted complex from being in the world.

Jung provides a preliminary contrast of an introvert who does not engage with the desire of the Other in contrast to an extrovert who is constantly submerged in it:

Who does not know those taciturn, impenetrable, often shy natures, who form such a vivid contrast to these other open, sociable, serene maybe, or at least friendly and accessible characters, who are on good terms with all the world, or, even when disagreeing with it, still hold a relation to it by which they and it are mutually affected (Jung 1923, 413).

Finally, when Jung ponders the physiological basis for introversion of extroversion he states, “it may well be that physiological causes, inaccessible to our knowledge, play a part in this. That this may be the case seems to me not improbable, in view of one's experience that a reversal of type often proves exceedingly harmful to the physiological well-being of the organism, often provoking an acute state of exhaustion” (Ibid., 416).

Half of this article is dedicated to an analysis of extroversion and the other half is dedicated to an analysis of introversion. In his book, *Psychological Types*, Jung begins with a description of extroversion and that is where I will commence in the next section. The rest of my article will also follow the structure and headings that Jung uses in that publication for ‘the extroverted type’ and the introverted type’ which include ‘the attitude of the unconscious’ and ‘the peculiarities of the basic psychological functions’.

THE EXTROVERTED TYPE

Jung explains extroversion by stating, “when the orientation to the object and to objective facts is so predominant that the most frequent and essential decisions and actions are determined, not by subjective values but by objective relations, one speaks of an extraverted attitude”

(Ibid., 417). Throughout this article, I will demonstrate that an analysand one-sided focus on the desire of the Other meets Jung's description of extroversion: "If a man so thinks, feels, and acts, in a word so lives, as to correspond directly with objective conditions and their claims, whether in a good sense or ill, he is extraverted" (Ibid.).

An analysand can be identified as having a one-sided extrovert complex when they neglect their (subjective) desire because the (objective) desire of the Other has greater importance: "His life makes it perfectly clear that it is the objective rather than the subjective value which plays the greater role as the determining factor of his consciousness" (Ibid.). Alternatively, the analysand presents with a one-sided introvert complex when they neglect the (objective) desire of the Other because their (subjective) desire has greater importance.

Both one-sidedness of introversion or extroversion lead to the experience of an obstructive complex but this complex can be removed by unifying both introversion and extroversion through Jung's transcendent function. Jung highlights this and the pathology of either one-sided introversion or extroversion by stating "both orientations are one-sided, with a definitely restricted validity; hence they both require this mutual correction" (Ibid., 433). I will begin my analysis by focusing on one-sided extroversion.

Jung states that the extrovert "naturally has subjective values, but their determining power has less importance than the external objective conditions. Never, therefore, does he expect to find any absolute factors in his own inner life, since the only ones he knows are outside himself" (Ibid., 417). This leads to the experience of an obstructive complex because the one-sided extrovert does not follow the ethics of Lacanian psychoanalysis to "act in conformity with your desire" (Žižek 2009, 90). The overly extroverted analysand ignores their desire because "His entire consciousness looks outwards to the world, because the important and decisive determination always comes to him from without" (Jung, 417).

The extrovert is captivated by the Other as described by Jung "Not only persons, but things, seize and rivet his interest" (Ibid., 418). Jung highlights the limitations of this one-sidedness by stating, "Extraverted action is recognizably related to objective conditions" and "It has no serious tendency to transcend these bounds". Since the extrovert neglects their desire "The moral laws which govern his action coincide with the corresponding claims of society, with the generally valid moral view-point" (Ibid.).

Jung furthers his criticisms of one-sided extroversion by saying “He is adjusted, but not adapted, since adaptation demands more than a mere frictionless participation in the momentary conditions of the immediate environment” (Ibid.). Jung suggests that one-sided extroversion ignores “an observance of laws far more universal in their application than purely local and temporary conditions” (Ibid., 419).

Jung begins to describe why one-sidedness of extroversion leads to the experience of an obstructive complex when he says:

Mere adjustment is the limitation of the normal extraverted type. On the one hand, the extravert owes his normality to his ability to fit into existing conditions with relative ease. He naturally pretends to nothing more than the satisfaction of existing objective possibilities, applying himself, for instance, to the calling which offers sound prospective possibilities in the actual situation in time and place. He tries to do or to make just what his milieu momentarily needs and expects from him, and abstains from every innovation that is not entirely obvious, or that in any way exceeds the expectation of those around him. (Ibid.)

The one-sided extrovert’s complex arises because he does not take “into account the actuality of his subjective needs and requirements; and this is just his weak point, for the tendency of his type has such a strong outward direction” (Ibid.). Jung explains that this neglect comes back to haunt the one-sided extrovert when “His loss of equilibrium is perceived by himself only when abnormal bodily sensations make themselves felt” (Ibid., 420). Furthermore,

A too extraverted attitude may actually become so regardless of the subject that the latter is entirely sacrificed to so-called objective claims; to the demands, for instance, of a continually extending business, because orders lay claiming one's attention or because profitable possibilities are constantly being opened up which must instantly be seized. This is the extravert's danger; he becomes caught up in objects, wholly losing himself in their toils. (Jung, 420)

In response to this one-sidedness, the extrovert’s obstructive complex shows itself as “functional (nervous) or actual physical disorders which result from this state have a compensatory significance, forcing the subject to an involuntary self-restriction” (Ibid.). To explain why this occurs it is necessary to integrate it with ideas combined from Heidegger, Lacan and Žižek. Essentially, the one-sided extrovert is alienated from the Self (Jung), subject (Lacan/ Žižek) or Dasein

(Heidegger). Since the one-sided extrovert neglects acting “in conformity with the desire that is in you” (Lacan 1997, 314) they remain at an imaginary relationship to their Self instead of a symbolic and Real relationship to the Self, subject or Dasein. The one-sided extrovert’s imaginary relationship to the Self is a fantasy ($\$ \diamond a$) that covers the lacking/barred subject ($\$$) (Gildersleeve 2016, 85).

As a result, the analysand misrecognises his or her place within the symbolic order because the place barred subject ($\$$) has not been unconcealed by discovering the possibility of the impossibility of a desire (Gildersleeve 2017b, 16). In my opinion, this is what Lacan means when he says there is a “function of misrecognition that characterizes the ego in all the defensive structures so forcefully articulated by Anna Freud” (Lacan cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 8). In other words, the one-sided extrovert stays at an imaginary relationship to their desire to defend the ego from discovering the possibility of the impossibility of a desire. Being duped in one’s desire allows the analysand to go beyond an imaginary relationship to their desire to discover the lack/desire of the Other or in Lacan’s words, beyond this imaginary relationship of the ego “language restores to it, in the universal, its function as subject” (Ibid.). This is achieved when the analysand has discovered the possibility of the impossibility of their desire. If the one-sided extrovert does not go beyond an imaginary relationship to their desire, they will experience the obstructiveness of a complex/*objet petit a* because their fantasy conceals the Real of the barred subject ($\$$). This provides another perspective to support Lacan when Žižek says “we should remain faithful to the Western ‘Oedipal’ tradition: of course every object of desire is an illusory lure; of course the full *jouissance* of incest is not only prohibited, but in itself impossible; nevertheless, Lacan’s *les non-dupes errent* must still be asserted” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 3). This journey of introversion to be duped by desire through Jung’s transcendent function is necessary to uncover the barred subject $\$$ to counteract one-sided extroversion.

Jung provides an instance to illustrate that one-sidedness of extroversion leads to the obstructiveness of a complex disrupting being in the world. Jung describes this by saying “A man who through his own energy and enterprise has built up a vast business, entailing an intolerable burden of work, is afflicted by nervous attacks of thirst, as a result of which he speedily falls a victim to hysterical alcoholism”

(Jung, 421). This is an example to clarify how an imaginary relationship to desire leads to the obstructiveness of a complex. This supports the tenets of Lacan's ethics of psychoanalysis where "the paradoxical reversal by means of which desire itself (i.e., acting upon one's desire, not conceding it) can no longer be grounded in any 'pathological' interests or motivations and thus meets the criteria of the Kantian ethical act, so that 'following one's desire' overlaps with 'doing one's duty'" (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 4). This highlights the ethical dimension of introversion (which one-sided extroversion neglects) whereby "following one's desire" overlaps with "doing one's duty" as a categorical imperative and "thus meets the criteria of the Kantian ethical act".

In order to understand the effects of one-sided introversion or extroversion, it is necessary to note that Jung says, "As I have already sufficiently indicated, I regard the relation of the unconscious to the conscious as compensatory" (Jung, 422). When the one-sided extroverts neglect 'acting in conformity with their desire' their world "is then complicated by compensatory reactions from the side of the unconscious, which manifests its opposition to the extravagant extraversion in the form of physical disorders, whereupon an introversion of psychic energy becomes unavoidable" (Ibid.). The one-sided extrovert is obstructed by this complex and "Through this reaction of the unconscious, another category of symptoms arises which have a more introverted character. A morbid intensification of phantasy activity belongs primarily to this category" (Ibid.).

THE ATTITUDE OF THE UNCONSCIOUS

Jung implicitly supports my proposal when he highlights the one-sidedness of the extrovert toward the desire of the Other by stating "In the foregoing section I emphasized the tendency to a certain one-sidedness in the extraverted attitude, due to the controlling power of the objective factor in the course of psychic events. The extraverted type is constantly tempted to give himself away (apparently) in favour of the object, and to assimilate his subject to the object" (Ibid., 422). Jung also indirectly suggests that this leads to the "injury" of the obstructiveness of a complex when he says, "I have referred in detail to the ultimate consequences of this exaggeration of the extraverted attitude, viz. to the injurious suppression of the subjective factor" (Ibid.).

Outlining all of this is important because “Lacan insists that the most dangerous form of betrayal is not a direct yielding to our ‘pathological’ impulses but, rather, a reference to some kind of Good, as when I shirk my duty with the excuse that I might thereby impair the Good (my own or the common) the moment I invoke ‘circumstances’ or ‘unfavourable consequences’ as an excuse, I am on my way to perdition” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 4). What this means is that a Lacanian definition of psychopathology involves not acting “in conformity with the desire that is in you” (Lacan, 314) and remaining within the boundaries of the ego/pleasure principle of one-sided extroversion. When the analysand shirks from the duty of being duped in their desire, an imaginary fantasy cannot be traversed. This will result in the one-sided extrovert experiencing the obstinacy of an obstructive complex until they are resolute to balance their one-sidedness with the introversion of acting “in conformity with the desire that is in you”. This allows the one-sided extrovert to confront and traverse the imaginary fantasies of their desire by experiencing displeasure (*jouissance*) from the discovery of the possibility of the impossibility of their desire.

The analysand experiences the obstructiveness of a complex because the one-sided extrovert has not “acted in conformity with the desire that is in you” (Ibid.). Therefore, “It is only to be expected, therefore, that a psychic compensation of the conscious extraverted attitude will lay especial weight upon the subjective factor, i.e. we shall have to prove a strong egocentric tendency in the unconscious. Practical experience actually furnishes this proof” (Jung, 422). In other words, if the one-sided extrovert does not follow this ethics of psychoanalysis by compromising their desire, the “Superego is the revenge that capitalizes upon our guilt—that is to say, the price we pay for the guilt we contract by betraying our desire in the name of the Good” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 5). This is Žižek’s way of saying what I have also said where “Dasein can possess a guilty mood because Dasein may have fallen prey to a complex and obstructed its openness and freedom to listen to the call of conscience” (Gildersleeve 2017b, 5). When my work is combined with Jung’s in this way, it shows the relationship between Jung’s work on the transcendent function, extroversion and introversion. In other words, “we pay for the guilt we contract by betraying our desire in the name of the Good” because the one-sided extrovert

“denies the transcendent function and hinders the essence of life by not retrieving the meaning of a guilty mood or possibilities missing from the readiness to hand to remove the obstructiveness of a complex from being in the world” (Ibid.).

Jung elucidates the mechanisms of psychopathology in one-sided extroversion further by stating,

The attitude of the unconscious as an effective complement to the conscious extraverted attitude has a definitely introverting character. It focusses libido upon the subjective factor, i.e. all those needs and claims which are stifled or repressed by a too extraverted conscious attitude. It may be readily gathered from what has been said in the previous section that a purely objective orientation does violence to a multitude of subjective emotions, intentions, needs, and desires, since it robs them of the energy which is their natural right. (Jung, 423)

In contrast to this, the balanced analysand acts ethically by following the duty/imperative of their desire so they can discover the possibility of the impossibility of their desire. Alternatively, by doing violence to “subjective emotions, intentions, needs, and desires”, the one-sided extrovert does not achieve the ethics of psychoanalysis which results in the Real being “forever doomed to return, to continue to haunt us” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 7) as the obstructiveness of a complex. The one-sided extrovert experiences this because they have failed to discover the barred subject \$ (or Self) through Jung’s transcendent function. When the one-sided extrovert does not follow the ethics of psychoanalysis by acting in conformity with their desire, they misrecognise the Truth of the meaning of their Being which will be experienced as an obstructive complex “forever doomed to return, to continue to haunt us” if the non-substantial barred subject \$ of the Real is left undiscovered.

Since the one-sided extrovert neglects ‘acting in conformity with their desire’ they are

‘only able to wish’, this observation contains a large measure of truth for the unconscious of the extraverted type. Adjustment and assimilation to objective data prevent inadequate subjective impulses from reaching consciousness. These tendencies (thoughts, wishes, affects, needs, feelings, etc.) take on a regressive character corresponding with the degree of their repression, i.e. the less they are recognized, the more infantile and archaic they become. (Jung, 423)

This is a good way to transition to Žižek’s analysis of the meaning of immortality in Kierkegaard’s philosophy. Following the categorical imperative/duty to act “in conformity with the desire that is in you” determines the ethics of psychoanalysis. This is because “as Kierkegaard put it, the true trauma is not our mortality, but our immortality: it is easy to accept that we are just a speck of dust in the infinite universe; what is much more difficult to accept is that we really *are* immortal free beings who, as such, cannot escape the terrible responsibility of their freedom” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 8). What this highlights is that thinking “that we are just a speck of dust in the infinite universe” is a way for the one-sided extrovert to not go ‘beyond the pleasure principle’ which leaves the barred subject \$ undiscovered “forever doomed to return, to continue to haunt us” as the obstructiveness of a complex. Being unethical means to not accept “that we really *are* immortal free beings who, as such, cannot escape the terrible responsibility of their freedom” and that is why psychoanalysis attempts to guide the analysand through introversion to resolutely take “responsibility of their freedom” by acting in conformity with the ethics of their desire.

When the one-sided extrovert ignores introversion to act in conformity with their desire, “The conscious attitude robs them of their relatively disposable energy charge, only leaving them the energy of which it cannot deprive them. This remainder, which still possesses a potency not to be under-estimated, can be described only as primeval instinct” (Jung, 423). In other words, this energy from desire has been foreclosed from being in the world which results in it being “forever doomed to return, to continue to haunt us” until the one-sided extrovert is able to ‘act in conformity with their desire’. Jung adds “Thus with every repressed tendency a considerable sum of energy ultimately remains. This sum corresponds with the potency of the instinct”(Ibid.) and the one-sided extrovert must resolutely take “responsibility of their freedom” by acting in conformity with the ethics of their desire to prevent the Real from “forever doomed to return, to continue to haunt” as the obstructiveness of a complex.

The one-sided extrovert misrecognises the Truth of the meaning of their Being (the barred subject \$) and are not able to remove the obstructiveness of a complex if they “desperately want to believe that there is nothing beyond death, to be relieved of the unbearable pressure of the divine injunction” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b,

8) to act in conformity with their desire. This is another way of saying that a complex arises “when Dasein’s understanding of existence is inauthentically narrow and dogmatically averse to the authentic meaning of the call of conscience which discloses the truth of Being” (Gildersleeve 2017b, 8). Ultimately, this inauthentic understanding of the one-sided extrovert that tries to be “relieved of the unbearable pressure” to act “in conformity with the desire that is in you” “culminates in complexes alienating Dasein from the truth and meaning of Being which results in Dasein falling prey once again as Dasein’s world becomes conspicuously and obstinately obstructive” (Ibid.).

Finally, “By inauthentically understanding the experience of a complex Dasein does so by turning away from it in falling; in this turning-away, the ‘not-at-home’ gets ‘dimmed down’” (Ibid.). This is the one-sided extrovert’s “sickness unto death” (Kierkegaard) where “the individual who desperately wants to die, to disappear forever” to avoid “the terrible responsibility of their freedom” to traverse the fantasy of their desire to discover the Real Truth and displeasure of the barred subject \$.

Jung explains the obstructiveness of a complex resulting from this one-sidedness by saying:

an exaggeration of the conscious standpoint takes place, the unconscious also comes to light in a symptomatic form, & the unconscious egoism, infantilism, and archaism lose their original compensatory characters, and appear in more or less open opposition to the conscious attitude. This process begins in the form of an absurd exaggeration of the conscious standpoint, which is aimed at a further repression of the unconscious, but usually ends in a *reductio ad absurdum* of the conscious attitude, i.e. a collapse. (Jung, 424)

This statement highlights that the one-sided extrovert’s desire needs to be replaced by a “*tombstone* which just marks the site of the dead” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 10) with Jung’s transcendent function so their desire is not “forever doomed to return, to continue to haunt us” as the obstructiveness of a complex (angst, conscience, guilt). This is achieved when the analysand has discovered the possibility of the impossibility of their desire through the desire of the Other, thus demonstrating that both introversion (acting in conformity with desire) and discovering the desire of the Other through extroversion is required to remove the obstructiveness of a

complex (the “opposition to the conscious attitude”). The quoted passage from Jung (1923, 424) demonstrates that this has not been introduced into the one-sided extrovert’s symbolic reality. If the one-sided extrovert does not go beyond an imaginary relationship to their desire, they will experience the conflict and obstructiveness of a complex/*objet petit a* because their fantasy conceals the Real, lack and the barred subject.

The one-sided extrovert’s imaginary relationship to their desire leads to “the return of the living dead” (Žižek cited in M. Gildersleeve 2017a, 11) which is when their desire “does not want to stay dead but returns again and again to pose a threat to the living” (Žižek 1992, 22). When the one-sided extrovert does not ‘act in conformity with their desire’ their desire returns as an obstructive complex because it was “not properly buried, i.e., because something went wrong with their obsequies” (Ibid., 23). Jung describes this return of an obstructive complex for the one-sided extrovert by saying it shows itself:

in the form of a nervous collapse. Such a solution always comes about as a result of the unconscious counterinfluence, which can ultimately paralyse conscious action. In which case the claims of the unconscious force themselves categorically upon consciousness, thus creating a calamitous cleavage which generally reveals itself in two ways: either the subject no longer knows what he really wants and nothing any longer interests him, or he wants too much at once and has too keen an interest but in impossible things. (Jung, 425)

This nervous collapse “which can ultimately paralyse conscious action” is “The ‘return of the living dead’” and is “the reverse of the proper funeral rite. While the latter implies a certain reconciliation, an acceptance of loss, the return of the dead signifies that they cannot find their proper place in the text of tradition” (Žižek 1992, 23). In other words, an obstructive complex will return as the living dead “creating a calamitous cleavage” until the one-sided extrovert ‘acts in conformity with their desire’. This is how the desire of the one-sided extrovert “finds their proper place in the text of tradition” because it has not been foreclosed from the symbolic because “whatever is foreclosed in the Symbolic, we well know that it returns in the Real” (Žižek 2007, 89).

One reason acting in conformity with your desire is the ethics of psychoanalysis is because “The suppression of infantile and primitive claims, which is often necessary on ‘civilized’ grounds, easily leads to

neurosis, or to the misuse of narcotics such as alcohol, morphine, cocaine, etc. In more extreme cases the cleavage ends in suicide” (Jung, 425). If the one-sided extrovert does not discover the barred subject by traversing the fantasy of their desire “The return of the living dead, then, materializes a certain symbolic debt persisting beyond physical expiration” (Žižek 1992, 23). This symptom will only be resolved if the one-sided extrovert adheres to the ethics of psychoanalysis to take the journey to discover the possibilities and impossibilities of their desire. By counteracting one-sided extroversion by acting in conformity with their desire through introversion, the analysand can discover the authentic meaning of their Being which highlights why “following one's desire' overlaps with 'doing one's duty” (Žižek 2011, 239). This demonstrates how Lacan's psychoanalysis elucidates Jungian psychoanalysis by outlining the mechanisms “of unconscious tendencies that, just in so far as they are deprived of their energy by a lack of conscious recognition, they assume a correspondingly destructive character” (Jung, 426). When the unconscious is deprived of energy by lack of conscious recognition, there is a disturbance from the “return of the living dead” because the unrealistic fantasies of desire have not been traversed.

The ethics of psychoanalysis allows the one-sided extrovert to traverse their (imaginary) fantasies to discover a more authentic and Real understanding of the possibilities and impossibilities of their desire. This is how the analysand is relieved from the superego which “is the revenge that capitalizes upon our guilt - that is to say, the price we pay for the guilt we contract by betraying our desire in the name of the Good” Žižek (2005, 69) says, “The Lacanian name for this gesture of breaking the vicious cycle of the superego is act” (Žižek 2012, xl). The ‘psychoanalytic act’ (Lacan, seminar XV) occurs when the one-sided extrovert authentically accepts and love their fate after breaking the vicious cycle of the fantasies of the superego. This occurs when the analysand is “duped in one's desire, though it is ultimately impossible, in order that something real comes about” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 2). Acting in conformity with desire is necessary to open up the space of the lack/desire of the Other through the drive (transcendent function) to discover the Truth and authenticity of the barred subject “submitted to the governance of a rule” (Freeland cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 13). This also explains how discovering the barred subject $\$$ involves going beyond an imaginary relationship to the Other by attempting to symbolise the

lack/desire of the Other until the impossibility of symbolising the lack/desire of the Other is discovered through the Real.

This process requires Jung's transcendent function where "The patient would like to know what it is all for and how to gain relief. In the intensity of the emotional disturbance itself lays the value, the energy which he should have at his disposal in order to remedy the state of reduced adaptation" (Jung cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 14). In this situation, the analyst should guide the one-sided extrovert to act "in conformity with the desire that is in you" to "discover regions of being in the world which are conspicuously experienced as obstructive, unready to hand and 'not-being-at-home'" (Gildersleeve 2017b, 18). Jung describes these regions as forming "a block, which is opposed to the conscious attitude in every respect; such a block inevitably leads to open conflict" (Jung, 426). Jung adds to this description by saying:

Through their agency the unconscious is continually coming to light. On no account should we imagine that the unconscious lies permanently buried under so many overlying strata that it can only be uncovered, so to speak, by a laborious process of excavation. On the contrary, there is a constant influx of the unconscious into the conscious psychological process. (Ibid., 427)

When the one-sided extrovert experiences this obstructiveness of their desire, their complex/fantasy can be removed/traversed by "being submitted to the governance of a rule" of the lack/desire of the Other. At the outset of psychoanalysis is transference where the analysand has not discovered/retrieved the possibility of the impossibility of their desire and so their desire is experienced as the influx of the conflict and obstructiveness of a complex. This is because the one-sided extrovert has not gone beyond an imaginary relationship to their desire, which means, "The end of the psychoanalysis, the dissolution of transference, occurs when this 'epistemological' incapacity shifts into 'ontological' impossibility" (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 14). In other words, "the end of the psychoanalysis" takes place through Jung's transcendent function where the analysand discovers that what they thought was an "epistemological 'incapacity'" of discovering the possibility to satisfy their desire is actually an "ontological impossibility" of the Truth of the meaning of their Being as a barred subject $\$$. This highlights "the reversal that defines the end of psychoanalytic cure"

(Ibid.) where the transcendent function occurs through “the dissolution of transference” when the analysand discovers the possibility of the impossibility of their desire. This is the “instant” or “moment when the arrow of the question that the analysand pointed at the analyst turns back towards the analysand himself” (Ibid.). This grants the analysand “insight of their ‘ownmost self thrown into its individuation’” through the unification of opposites (conscious/unconscious, desire of the analysand/desire of the Other, introversion/extroversion).

THE PECULIARITIES OF THE BASIC PSYCHOLOGICAL FUNCTIONS IN THE EXTRAVERTED ATTITUDE

The one-side extrovert neglects ‘acting in conformity with their desire’ because

the general attitude of extraversion, thinking is orientated by the object and objective data. This orientation of thinking produces a noticeable peculiarity. Thinking in general is fed from two sources, firstly from subjective and in the last resort unconscious roots, and secondly from objective data transmitted through sense perceptions. Extraverted thinking is conditioned in a larger measure by these latter factors than by the former. (Jung, 428)

Since the one-sided extrovert is absorbed in the object rather than subject they are unable to achieve the drive which “consists in ‘*making oneself seen [se faire voir]*’” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 15). Making oneself seen is also the ultimate aim of Jung’s transcendent function and this is what Jung is referring to when he says “growth of personality is synonymous with an increase of self-consciousness” (Jung cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 15). Making oneself seen requires

the subjective process that other kind of thinking arises which stands opposed to| extraverted thinking, namely, that purely subjective orientation of thought which I have termed introverted. A thinking arises from this other orientation that is neither determined by objective facts nor directed towards objective data a thinking, therefore, that proceeds from subjective data and is directed towards subjective ideas or facts of a subjective character. (Jung, 431)

Se faire voir is a growth of personality and increase of self-consciousness because the analysand has gone beyond an imaginary

relationship to their desire to reveal the Truth/authenticity of the barred subject \$ by discovering/retrieving the possibility of the impossibility of their desire. This explains that the one-sided extrovert experiences the obstructiveness of a complex when they have not “made oneself seen” because their fantasy covers the void/cut of the barred subject \$ when they remain at an imaginary relationship to their desire.

Since “there is a subject only in so far as there is a lack in the Other” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, p.14), the one-sided extrovert “makes oneself seen” as a barred subject \$ to increase self-consciousness by discovering the impossibility of a desire through the desire/lack in the Other. What this means is that both introversion and extroversion are required to ‘make oneself seen’. When the one-sided extrovert discovers the impossibility of their (subjective - introverted) desire through the (objective - extroverted) desire/lack in the Other a shift takes place from “desire to see” to “making oneself visible to the Other’s gaze” (Ibid.,15) which unconceals the barred subject “submitted to the governance of a rule”.

When the one-sided extrovert neglects introversion, they remain at an imaginary understanding of their desire instead of a Real understanding. Removing the obstructiveness of a complex equates to traversing the fantasy (of the imaginary I or ego) as the analysand discovers “the hole at the heart of the Other” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 6) where the word fails. A complex is “formed in the specular relation, and of being fundamentally in the service of the pleasure principle—that led Freud to the theoretical necessity of envisioning a *beyond the pleasure principle*” (Ibid.). Going beyond the pleasure principle of an imaginary relationship to desire is necessary to remove the obstructiveness of a complex/*objet petit a* and “it is precisely in this that the subject function can be distinguished as not simply reducible to narcissism” (Penot cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 6). This adds to Jung when he comments “Judgment made upon appearance only cannot be fair to the essence of the thing hence the result is depreciatory” (Jung, 432). The one-sided extrovert’s fantasy covers the barred subject \$ by the imaginary *objet petit a*/complex. This imaginary relationship of a complex/*objet petit a* through fantasy also involves “aggressiveness linked to the narcissistic relationship and to the structures of systematic

misrecognition and objectification that characterize ego formation” (Lacan cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 8).

The one-sided extrovert experiences the obstructiveness of a complex because “The process of thought is reduced to mere 'reflection', not in the sense of 'meditation', but in the sense of a mere imitation that makes no essential affirmation beyond what was already visibly and immediately present in the objective data” (Jung, 433). To remove the obstructiveness of a complex/*objet petit a*, the one-sided extrovert needs to go beyond an imaginary relationship to their desire to discover the lack/desire of the Other or in Lacan’s words, beyond this imaginary relationship of the ego “language restores to it, in the universal, its function as subject” (Lacan cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 8). This is achieved clinically with “speech to bring about change in the structure of the subject” (Golan cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 8). If the one-sided extrovert does not go beyond an imaginary relationship to their desire, they will experience the obstructiveness of a complex/*objet petit a* because fantasy conceals the Real of the lack/desire of the Other. Through Jung’s transcendent function as Will to Power and eternal recurrence of the same, the analysand can traverse the fantasy through a shift in perspective in relation to the complex/*objet petit a*.

When considered in this way, the one-sided extrovert has only an imaginary relationship to their desire and does not penetrate to the meaning of the barred subject (symbolic and Real). The one-sided extrovert is alienated from the barred subject or Self “as the result of a reinforced objective determination, extraverted thinking is subordinated to objective data, it entirely loses itself” (Jung, 434). When the one-sided extrovert’s desire is neglected a “psychological compensation” (Ibid.) takes place which is experienced as the obstructiveness of a complex. This occurs because the one-sided extrovert has not gone beyond an imaginary relationship to their desire or unchained themselves from the complex/*objet petit a* by discovering the missing possibilities from the readiness to hand.

Jung provocatively adds, “The vertiginous abundance of the so called scientific literature of to-day owes a deplorably high percentage of its existence to this misorientation” (Ibid., 433) because of the need to eliminate the subjective from ‘objective’. By eliminating, subjectively ‘acting in conformity with desire’, the one-sided extrovert identifies with an inauthentic familiar (imaginary) everyday being in the world of the ego to flee from an authentic/Real understanding of

the experience of a complex/*objet petit a*. Identifying with an imaginary relationship to desire through the ego can be phenomenologically described as fleeing into the average everyday familiarity with the world to tranquillize the angst, guilt and conscience of a complex/*objet petit a* (Gildersleeve 2016, 11).

As Heidegger says, Dasein's essence as being-in-the-world is care, but if an inauthentic/imaginary understanding of its Being is present, Dasein can be said to be "fleeing from it and of forgetting" (Heidegger cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 13) its authentic/Real Being which is disclosed in the experience of the obstructive *Anstoss/complex/objet petit a*. This is what occurs due to the one-sidedness of extroversion and "Sooner or later in accordance with outer circumstances and inner gifts the forms of life repressed by the intellectual attitude become indirectly perceptible, through a gradual disturbance of the conscious conduct of life. Whenever disturbances of this kind reach a definite intensity, one speaks of a neurosis". (Jung, 434)

When the one-sided extrovert inauthentically understands the experience of the complex/*objet petit a*, the analysand "does so by turning away from it in falling; in this turning-away, the 'not-at-home' gets 'dimmed down'" (Heidegger cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 11). By identifying with the imaginary ego and the "at home" of familiar enjoyment, the one-sided extrovert flees to the "relief which comes with the supposed freedom of everydayness" (Ibid.). However, when the one-sided extrovert neglects 'acting in conformity with their desire'

The relative or total unconsciousness of such tendencies or functions as are excluded from any participation in the conscious attitude keeps them in a relatively undeveloped state. As compared with the conscious function they are inferior. To the extent that they are unconscious, they become merged with the remaining contents of the unconscious, from which they acquire a bizarre character. (Jung, 437)

The one-sided extrovert experiences the obstructiveness of a complex/*objet petit a* as an experience of the Real where "imaginary and symbolic balances are disturbed" (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 13) because they have not valued introversion to act in conformity with their desire. This experience is important for the one-sided extrovert because the aim of psychoanalytic treatment is to become authentic through an encounter with the Real to awaken "the

subject out of its pre-subjective status” (Ibid.). The analysand experiences the obstructiveness of a complex/*objet petit a* when they do not exist as “Being-towards-death” (Heidegger cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 14) of an impossible desire. The analysand experiences this obstructiveness because they have not freed “one from one’s lostness in chance possibilities urging themselves upon us” or discovered “the nullity of what can be taken care of, that is, the impossibility of projecting oneself upon a potentiality-of-being primarily based upon what is taken care of” (Ibid.). Successful psychoanalytic treatment requires the analysand to stop “fleeing in the face of one’s own most Being-towards-death” which is “a constant tranquillisation about death” (Heidegger cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 15). This allows the analysand to discover the impossibility of the possibility of a desire and to find “a sort of perverse pleasure *in this displeasure itself*, to renounce the exclusive rule of the ‘pleasure principle’” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 15). Although the death of the analysand’s impossible desire “introduces an irreducible displeasure”, “The revealing of this impossibility, however, signifies that one is letting the possibility of an authentic potentiality-for Being be lit up” ((Heidegger cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 15).

If the one-sided extrovert neglects ‘acting in conformity with their desire’ “it disappears from consciousness and proceeds to unfold a subconscious activity, which runs counter to conscious aims, even producing effects whose causation is a complete enigma to the individual” (Jung, 438). This effect is the experience of the obstructiveness of a complex/*objet petit a* and indicates the impossibility of a desire has not been discovered because the one-sided extrovert covers the truth of the void of the barred subject \$ through fantasy and “this paradoxical conjunction is designated by Lacan’s matheme of fantasy: $\$ \diamond a$ ” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 16).

Another way to understand how the one-sided extrovert neglects their desire is to note that

Feeling in the extraverted attitude is orientated by objective data, i.e. the object is the indispensable determinant of the kind of feeling. It agrees with objective values. If one has always known feeling as a subjective fact, the nature of extraverted feeling will not immediately be understood, since it has freed itself as fully as possible from the

subjective factor, and has, instead, become wholly subordinated to the influence of the object. (Jung, 438)

Because the one-sided extrovert does this they experience their desire as the obstructiveness of a complex/*objet petit a*, which “at its most radical the object is *that which objects*, that which disturbs the smooth running of things” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 16). A complex is experienced as chaos or a “meaningless blotch” from the perspective of desire. When the analysand shifts to the perspective of drive “the object-cause of desire is something that, viewed from in front, is nothing at all, just a void”. (Ibid.) As a result, the object of desire is only desired through the complex when *objet petit a* “acquires the contours of something only when viewed at a slant” (Ibid.). The *objet petit a* has this effect when the one-sided extrovert has not gone beyond an imaginary relationship to their desire.

The experience of the chaos and obstructiveness of a complex indicates that the analysand has yet to reveal the barred subject \$ hidden by the *objet petit a* since “Objet a is the strange object that is nothing but the inscription of the subject itself in the field of objects, in the guise of a blotch that takes shape only when part of this field is anamorphically distorted by the subject’s desire” (Ibid., 17). This occurs because “In the extraverted attitude this subjective share of sensation, in so far as its conscious application is concerned, is either inhibited or repressed” (Jung, 456).

When the one-sided extrovert does not act “in conformity with the desire that is in you”, the superego is “forever doomed to return, to continue to haunt us” with “an impossible imperative that makes the subject guilty” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 19). Žižek explains “The superego’s injunction has no use for excuses—no invocation of our limited capacities can release us; ‘you can because you must!’ (Kant)” (Ibid.) and the only way to be released from this injunction is to compensate through introversion to act “in conformity with the desire that is in you” until the possibility of impossibility of the desire is discovered through the lack/desire of the Other (extroversion). Consequently, this again highlights the connection between Kantian and psychoanalytic ethics where “The greatness of Kantian ethics is thus to have formulated for the first time the ‘beyond of the pleasure principle’” (Ibid.). Žižek explains, “Kant’s categorical imperative is a superegotistical law which goes against the subject’s well-being. Or, more precisely, it is totally

indifferent to his well-being” (Ibid.) and this is necessary for the analysand to traverse their fantasy/remove their complex which exists when the analysand remains within the pleasure principle of an imaginary relationship to their desire.

The one-sided extrovert has trouble doing this since “It is, however, only concrete, sensuously perceived objects or processes which excite sensations in the extraverted attitude; exclusively those, in fact, which everyone in all times and places would sense as concrete. Hence, the orientation of such an individual corresponds with purely concrete reality” (Jung, 456). The one-sided extrovert stays at an imaginary relationship to their desire because “When he 'senses', everything essential has been said and done. Nothing can be more than concrete and actual; conjectures that transcend or go beyond the concrete are only permitted on condition that they enhance sensation” (Ibid.). Jung reinforces my contention that the one-sided extrovert neglects their desire when he states “he merely desires the strongest sensation, and this, by his very nature, he can receive only from without. What comes from within seems to him morbid and objectionable” (Ibid.).

When the analysand does this, they do not go beyond an imaginary relationship to their desire to a symbolic and Real relationship to their desire. When the one-sided extrovert stays at this imaginary relationship to their desire

the more sensation predominates, so that the sensing subject disappears behind the sensation, the more unsatisfactory does this type become. Either he develops into a crude pleasure-seeker or he becomes an unscrupulous, designing sybarite. Psychic relationship, in the extraverted attitude, is always regulated by objective factors and outer determinants. What a man is within has never any decisive significance. For our present-day culture the extraverted attitude is the governing principle in the problem of human relationship. (Jung, 459)

Because the one-sided extrovert does not value “What a man is within” the apriori barred subject \$ is left undiscovered and is experienced as the obstructiveness of a complex/the Real. Žižek argues “We have reality in front of our eyes well before language, and what language does, in its most fundamental gesture, is the very opposite of designating reality: as Lacan put it, it *digs a hole in reality*, opening up the visible/present reality to the dimension of the immaterial/unseen. When I see you, I just see you—but by naming you I indicate the abyss in you beyond what I see” (Žižek cited in

Gildersleeve 2017b, 22). This is what it means to go beyond an imaginary relationship to desire. The one-sided extrovert experiences the conflict and obstructiveness of a complex when they have not engaged in a symbolic relationship with their desire with language (discovering possibilities) which “*digs a hole in reality*, opening up the visible/present reality to the dimension of the immaterial/unseen”. The one-sided extrovert will experience the obstructiveness of a complex/the Real if they do not open the “visible/present reality to the dimension of the immaterial/unseen” because they remain at an imaginary relationship to their desire and the barred subject/Self remains undiscovered.

The apriori barred subject \$ of the analysand needs to be uncovered so the one-sided extrovert can traverse their fantasy and remove the obstructiveness of their desire/complex through the drive/transcendent function/*Gelassenheit* (Gildersleeve 2017b, 20). This is “the display of *amor fati*, the act of freely assuming what is necessary anyway” which is also “the final moment of the analytical process, the pass, as the experience of the positive character of the loss” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 23) because the analysand is no longer duped by their desire or obstructed by their complex. The analysand traverses their fantasy and removes the obstructiveness of their complex with Jung’s transcendent function by experiencing a “moment” or “instant” of the empty, traumatic space of *jouissance* which is “the end of a prior project” (Sartre cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 23) and the beginning of a new project/desire. This is when the one-sided extrovert establishes a Real relationship to their desire (beyond imaginary and symbolic experiences) by authentically and fatefully “making oneself seen” as an apriori barred subject \$ by discovering the ‘eternal’ possibility of the impossibility of their desire.

THE INTROVERTED TYPE

Moving on from one-sided extroversion, this next section transitions to a discussion of the one-sided introvert. Jung states:

the introverted is distinguished from the extraverted type by the fact that, unlike the latter, who is prevalingly orientated by the object and objective data, he is governed by subjective factors. In the section alluded to I mentioned, inter alia, that the introvert interposes a subjective view between the perception of the object and his own

action, which prevents the action from assuming a character that corresponds with the objective. (Jung, 471)

This is a good way to introduce one-sided introversion. Unlike the one-sided extrovert who neglects their desire, the one-sided introvert focuses solely on their desire and neglects the desire of the Other. This is a problem because fantasy covers the lack/desire of the Other since the one-sided introvert remains at an imaginary relationship to the Other. As a result, the one-sided introvert misrecognises his or her place within the symbolic order (like the one-sided extrovert) because the place barred subject (\$) has not been unconcealed by discovering the possibility of the impossibility of their desire through the desire of the Other.

This is another way to read Lacan when he says there is a “function of misrecognition that characterizes the ego in all the defensive structures so forcefully articulated by Anna Freud”. In other words, the one-sided introvert stays at an imaginary relationship to the Other to defend the ego from discovering the possibility of the impossibility of a desire. In Lacan’s words, beyond this imaginary relationship of the ego “language restores to it, in the universal, its function as subject”. This is achieved when the one-sided introvert has discovered the possibility of the impossibility of their desire. If the analysand does not go beyond an imaginary relationship to the Other, they will experience the obstructiveness of a complex/*objet petit a* because their fantasy conceals the Real of the lack/desire of the Other.

The ethics of Jungian and Lacanian psychoanalysis with the one-sided introvert involves a shift from an imaginary relationship to the Other to a symbolic and Real relationship to the Other which involves a shift from the pleasure principle to ‘beyond the pleasure principle’. This shift is necessary for the one-sided introvert to traverse the fantasy of the imaginary pleasure of the possibility of a desire and to remove the obstructiveness of a complex through an experience of Real pleasure procured by displeasure (*jouissance*). This pleasure procured by displeasure comes from the pleasure of removing the obstructiveness of a complex/fantasy even though this means the displeasure of the loss of the possibility of a desire due to discovering the barred subject \$.

The extrovert has no problem with the desire of the Other and the introvert has no problem with acting “in conformity with the desire

that is in you”. Jung restates this when he says, “Whereas the extraverted type refers pre-eminently to that which reaches him from the object, the introvert principally relies upon that which the outer impression constellates in the subject” (Ibid., 472). Both of these positions need to be integrated to go beyond an imaginary relationship to desire or the Other to encounter the void of the barred subject \$ as the Truth of the analysand. This is when the analysand discovers “the possibilities missing from the readiness to hand and the authentic meaning of the complex, so the complex can be assimilated into Dasein’s understanding of being in the world” (Gildersleeve 2017b, 7).

Alternatively if this unification of opposites (introversion/extroversion - the transcendent function) does not occur the analysand will misrecognise the Truth of the meaning of their Being, which will be experienced as an obstructive complex “forever doomed to return, to continue to haunt us”. Jung describes the outcome that results from the failure of the unification of opposites through the transcendent function by stating, “Through an overvaluation of the objective powers of cognition, we repress the importance of the subjective factor, which simply means the denial of the subject. But what is the subject? The subject is man we are the subject”. (Jung, 473)

Surprisingly, Jung uses the word subject here where he would usually use Self. This is important for the purpose of my paper since I have been working to establish the equivalence of the Jungian Self and Lacanian subject. Addressing the undiscovered subject/Self is the goal of both Jungian and Lacanian psychoanalysis. This is the goal because when the one-sided extrovert inauthentically tries to be “relieved of the unbearable pressure” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 8) to act “in conformity with the desire that is in you” this “culminates in complexes alienating Dasein from the truth and meaning of Being which results in Dasein falling prey once again as Dasein’s world becomes conspicuously and obstinately obstructive” (Ibid.).

Drive allows the analysand to discover the possibility of the impossibility of a desire and this removes the conflict of a complex. Drive removes the conflict and obstructiveness of a complex/fantasy by going beyond an imaginary relationship to desire or the Other to discover the lack of the analysand or the Other. Drive is ethical because it unconceals the Real of the barred subject \$ or Jungian

Self which opens the space/freedom of the lack of the analysand or the Other. In other words, drive encircles “again and again the site of the lost Thing, to *mark* it in its very impossibility—as exemplified by the embodiment of the drive in its zero degree, in its most elementary, the *tombstone* which just marks the site of the dead” (Ibid., 10). For both the one-sided introvert and extrovert, desire needs to be replaced by a “*tombstone* which just marks the site of the dead” with Jung’s transcendent function so this desire is not “forever doomed to return, to continue to haunt us” as the obstructiveness of a complex (angst, conscience, guilt). This is achieved when the analysand ‘acts in conformity with their desire’ to discover the possibility of the impossibility of their desire (introversion) through the desire of the Other (extroversion).

This highlights the necessity of both introversion and extroversion and why one-sidedness leads to the obstructiveness of a complex. The analysand experiences the obstructiveness of the barred subject when it is left undiscovered because “the psychological structure of the subject precedes any development of the ego” (Jung, 473). The ego is responsible for the one-sidedness of the extrovert or introvert and the experience of a complex. Jung’s transcendent function (introversion and extroversion) is required to go beyond the ego by discovering the impossibility of a desire and this unconceals the barred subject \$ (Self) of the analysand. When this happens, the analysand no longer experiences the obstructiveness of a complex because the fantasy of the possibility of an impossible desire has been traversed by discovering its impossibility through introversion and extroversion.

Jung demonstrates that he is referring to the Self when he says subject when he states, “The really fundamental subject, the Self, is far more comprehensive than the ego, because the former also embraces the unconscious, while the latter is essentially the focal point of consciousness. Were the ego identical with the Self, it would be unthinkable that we should be able to appear in dreams in entirely different forms and with entirely different meanings” (Ibid.). This passage is important because it highlights that the Self or subject is beyond the imaginary ego. When the analysand does not go beyond the imaginary ego, fantasy covers the lack in the analysand or the Other. As a result, one-sided introversion leads to the analysand misrecognising his or her place within the symbolic order because the place of the barred subject (\$) (Self) has not been unconcealed

by discovering the possibility of the impossibility of their desire through the desire of the Other.

Jung explains, “The individual Self is a portion, or excerpt, or representative, of something universally present in all living creatures, and, therefore, a correspondingly graduated kind of psychological process, which is born anew in every creature” (Ibid.). The analysand's desire is ‘born anew in every creature’ and is determined by the collective unconscious because “The contents of the collective unconscious are represented in consciousness in the form of pronounced tendencies, or definite ways of looking at things” (Ibid., 476).

Jung explains what effect desire has on the analysand's world by saying “They are generally regarded by the individual as being determined by the object incorrectly, at bottom since they have their source in the unconscious structure of the psyche, and are only released by the operation of the object. These subjective tendencies and ideas are stronger than the objective influence; because their psychic value is higher, they are superimposed upon all impressions” (Ibid.). Desire is intimately linked to the Self as a path to the barred subject \$ as an answer of the Real when the analysand recognises the value of introversion to question desire (*objet petit a*) as a question of the Other (extroversion). Removing the obstructiveness of a complex/*objet petit a* relies on not reaching absolute knowledge (\$A) from this path where the analysand is barred from the imaginary *objet petit a* and ‘makes myself seen’ as the Thing as a void in the symbolic (barred subject \$ as an answer of the Real). This negativity or non-knowledge of the barred subject goes all the way back to Socrates who proclaims:

I am wiser than this man; for neither of us really knows anything fine and good, but this man thinks he knows something when he does not, whereas I, as I do not know anything, do not think I do either. I seem, then, in just this little thing to be wiser than this man at any rate, that what I do not know I do not think I know either (Plato 2005, 83).

Jung highlights that extroversion and introversion are opposites by saying “Thus, just as it seems incomprehensible to the introvert that the object should always be decisive, it remains just as enigmatic to the extravert how a subjective standpoint can be superior to the objective situation. He reaches the unavoidable conclusion that the introvert is

either a conceited egoist or a fantastic doctrinaire” (Jung, 476). This shows that introversion neglects the object (desire of the Other) whereas extroversion neglects the subject (acting in conformity with your desire). Both of these types’ leads to the experience of the obstructiveness of a complex and therefore both require Jung’s transcendent function to unify these opposites. The transcendent function takes places through “the pass’ [la passe], the final moment of the analytical process, the experience of the Lack in the Other” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 16) and this is only possible by first valuing introversion to follow the ethics of psychoanalysis to act “in conformity with the desire that is in you”. The transcendent function takes place by then valuing extroversion to discover the lack in the Other and this is what is required for Jung’s transcendent function to remove the obstructiveness of a complex.

The one-sided extrovert does not understand the value of introversion and therefore “he seems to have reached the conclusion that the introvert is constantly influenced by an unconscious power-complex” (Jung, 477). The transcendent function can remove the one-sided complex through the retrieval of the fascinating presence of the object of desire (*objet petit a*). By shifting the analysand’s perspective from desire to drive, their perspective shifts to see that the fantasy *objet petit a*, conceals a hole, an empty space which is the barred subject (\$) (Gildersleeve 2017b, 11). The empty space comes from an experience of the lack in the Other and equates the lack in the Other with the place of the barred subject of the analysand.

The one-sided introvert does not go beyond the pleasure principle of the ego because “the very decisiveness and inflexibility of the subjective judgment, which is superordinated to all objective data, is alone sufficient to create the impression of a strong ego-centricity” (Jung, 477). This can be described as inauthentically absorbing an entire human existence in only one of its human possibilities, which is perpetuated through an inauthentic turning away from angst, guilt and conscience through a being perfect projection” (Gildersleeve 2016, 3) when the desire of the Other is encountered.

The subject or Self is only discovered through the transcendent function’s unification of both introversion and extroversion. Therefore, when the one-sided introvert experiences the obstructiveness of a complex

it is the sign of a more or less complete unconscious identity of the ego with the Self, whereupon the importance of the Self is reduced to nil, while the ego becomes inflated beyond reason. The undeniable, world-determining power of the subjective factor then becomes concentrated in the ego, developing an immoderate power claim and a downright foolish egocentricity. (Jung, 477)

The one-sided introvert experiences the obstructiveness of a complex because the fantasy of the ego involves an imaginary understanding of the Other instead of a Real understanding. Removing the obstructiveness of a complex equates to Lacan's 'traversing the fantasy' (of the imaginary I or ego) as the analysand discovers "the hole at the heart of the Other" (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 6) where the word fails. When the one-sided introvert remains at a distance from the desire of the Other, a complex is "formed in the specular relation, and of being fundamentally in the service of the pleasure principle—that led Freud to the theoretical necessity of envisioning a *beyond the pleasure principle*". Going beyond the pleasure principle of an imaginary relationship to the desire of the Other is necessary to remove the obstructiveness of a complex/*objet petit a* and "it is precisely in this that the subject function can be distinguished as not simply reducible to narcissism" (Ibid.).

THE UNCONSCIOUS ATTITUDE

Jung reiterates that for one-sided introversion, "The superior position of the subjective factor in consciousness involves an inferiority of the objective factor" (Jung, 477) or desire of the Other. Therefore, one-sidedness of introversion neglects the desire of the Other or in Jung's words "The object is not given that importance which should really belong to it" (Ibid.). As a result of this neglect, the analysand's understanding of the desire of the Other is mere fantasy where "Fantasy is a way for the subject to answer the question of what object he is in the eyes of the Other" (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 8).

Lacan writes the formula for fantasy as $(\$ \diamond a)$ and when the one-sided introvert neglects the desire of the Other, the barred subject $\$$ is covered by the imaginary *objet petit a*/complex. The one-sided introvert's fantasy covers the lack/desire of the Other through the imaginary 'fullness' of *objet petit a*. When fantasy covers the lack/desire of the Other with the *objet petit a*/complex in this way, the one-sided introvert misrecognises his or her place within the

symbolic order because the *objet petit a*/complex covers the place barred subject (\$). To remove the obstructiveness of a complex/*objet petit a*, the one-sided introvert needs to go beyond an imaginary relationship to the Other to discover the lack/desire of the Other. This is achieved clinically with “speech to bring about change in the structure of the subject”. If the analysand does not go beyond an imaginary relationship to the Other, they will experience the obstructiveness of a complex/*objet petit a* because fantasy conceals the Real of the lack/desire of the Other. This highlights the one-sided introvert’s inauthenticity because “if the ego has usurped the claims of the subject, a compensation naturally develops under the guise of an unconscious reinforcement of the influence of the object” (Jung, 478) experienced as the obstructiveness of a complex.

Jung describes the obstructiveness of a complex in his own words by adding that it “eventually commands attention, for often, in spite of a positively convulsive attempt to ensure the superiority of the ego, the object and objective data develop an overwhelming influence, which is all the more invincible because it seizes upon the individual unawares, thus effecting an irresistible invasion of consciousness” (Ibid.). This occurs to the one-sided introvert because they are misguided in the process of individuation since “the self comprises infinitely more than a mere ego” and “Individuation does not shut one out from the world, but gathers the world to oneself” (Jung cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 12). In other words, ego-centeredness is what Žižek would equate with Munch’s “silent scream” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 10) from “the subject’s clinging to enjoyment”. On the other hand, individuation can be equated with “spitting out the bone” because enjoyment has been exchanged “for the Other, for the Law, for the paternal metaphor” which “does not shut one out from the world, but gathers the world to oneself” which allows the subject to find “himself/herself within the community” (Ibid.).

The one-sided introvert experiences the obstructiveness of a complex “As a result of the ego's defective relation to the object for a will to command is not adaptation a compensatory relation to the object develops in the unconscious, which makes itself felt in consciousness as an unconditional and irrepressible tie to the object” (Jung, 478). The one-sided introvert is an example of a complex where the imaginary fantasy of the *objet petit a* conceals the desire of the Other and this leads to the experience of “not being at home” (Gildersleeve 2016, 10) because of the experienced of the

obstructiveness of a complex. The one-sided introvert will experience the obstructiveness of their complex/fantasy by not discovering the missing possibilities of the desire of the Other.

The one-sided introvert desires the possibility “What I think I am, that is, what I am in my own eyes, for myself, I also am for the Other, in the discourse of the Other, in my social-symbolic, intersubjective identity” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 8). However, this will lead to the one-sided introvert’s obstructive being in the world because they have not discovered the missing possibilities (Gildersleeve 2017b, 13) of the desire of the Other. Because these possibilities are undiscovered, the one-sided introvert will experience the desire of the Other as an obstruction to their imaginary fantasy when the desire of the Other is encountered. When considered in this way, the one-sided introvert has only an imaginary relationship to the Other which does not engage with any of the meaning of the others subjectivity (symbolic and Real) through extroversion. The aim of psychoanalytic treatment in this case is for the analysand to develop extroversion to engage with the Other beyond the imaginary, so the one-sided introvert’s fantasy can be broken and the obstructiveness of a complex removed from being in the world.

Jung explains, “The more the ego seeks to secure every possible liberty, independence, superiority, and freedom from obligations, the deeper does it fall into the slavery of objective facts” and “The chief concern of the unconscious in such a case is the relation to the object, and it affects this in a way that is calculated to bring both the power illusion and the superiority phantasy to utter ruin” (Jung, 478). The one-sided introvert is very similar to Žižek’s description of obsessional neurosis: “The key ingredient of obsessional neurosis is the conviction that the knot of reality is held together only through the subject’s compulsive activity: if the obsessive ritual is not properly performed, reality will disintegrate” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 8). This highlights that the one-sided introvert must perform a compulsive ritual to ensure that the possibilities of the desire of the Other do not enter their “knot” of reality because if it does, their reality will “disintegrate”. “Disintegrate” (Žižek) is another way of saying “obstructiveness” (Heidegger) or “utter ruin” (Jung). The one-sided introvert’s reality/fantasy disintegrates when the obstructiveness of their complex is encountered through the desire of the Other.

The pathology of one-sided introversion or extroversion can be further understood by comparing it to a phenomenological interpretation of complexes. My earlier work shows that a complex is phenomenologically disclosed when an analysand's "world is conspicuously experienced as unready to hand and 'not-being-at-home'" (Gildersleeve 2016, 1). In the event of a complex, angst, conscience and guilt are experienced in a moment of conspicuous obstructiveness and obstinacy, which results in the ready-to-hand losing its readiness-to-hand in a certain way. In other words, a complex disrupts the "pleasure principle" because of "a traumatic intruder" (the desire of the Other). When this "foreign body" is encountered, Dasein's world is conspicuously experienced as unready to hand and "not-being-at-home". This phenomenon is repeated in Jung's description of one-sided introversion when he says (the desire of the Other) or

The object assumes terrifying dimensions, in spite of conscious depreciation. Detachment from, and command of, the object are, in consequence, pursued by the ego still more violently. Finally, the ego surrounds itself by a regular system of safeguards (Adler has ably depicted these) which shall at least preserve the illusion of superiority. But, therewith, the introvert severs himself completely from the object and either squanders his energy in defensive measures or makes fruitless attempts to impose his power upon the object and successfully assert himself. (Jung, 479)

When this aspect of Jung's writing is analysed with Lacan and Žižek, it can be appreciated that detachment from the object (desire of the Other) involves identifying with the ego and is a symptom of the analysand's "unreadiness to exchange enjoyment (i.e., the object which gives body to it) for the Other, for the Law, for the paternal metaphor" (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 10). Detachment from the desire of the Other through one-sided introversion involves identifying with the ego which means the analysand has fled from an authentic/Real understanding of the experience of a complex/*objet petit a*, to identify with an inauthentic familiar (imaginary) everyday being in the world. This inauthentic familiar everydayness is described by Jung as the ego surrounding "itself by a regular system of safeguards" to "preserve the illusion of superiority" (fantasy). By inauthentically understanding the experience of the complex/*objet petit a* (the desire of the Other), the one-sided introvert "does so by

turning away from it in falling; in this turning-away, the ‘not-at-home’ gets ‘dimmed down’” (Heidegger cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 11). By identifying with the imaginary ego and the “at home” of familiar enjoyment, the one-sided introvert flees from extroversion and the desire of the Other to the “relief which comes with the supposed freedom of everydayness”.

The desire of the Other derails the balanced movement of the one-sided introvert’s pleasure principle, and depicts a “conspicuous obstructiveness and obstinacy, which results in the ready to-hand losing its readiness-to-hand in a certain way” (Ibid., 1). Jung highlights this by saying the one-sided introverts:

efforts are constantly being frustrated by the overwhelming impressions he receives from the object. It continually imposes itself upon him against his will; it provokes in him the most disagreeable and obstinate affects, persecuting him at every step. An immense, inner struggle is constantly required of him, in order to 'keep going.' Hence psychoasthenia is his typical form of neurosis, a malady which is characterized on the one hand by an extreme sensitiveness, and on the other by a great liability to exhaustion and chronic fatigue. (Jung, 479)

When Lacan and Jung are read alongside Žižek and Heidegger, we can see that this derailment of the pleasure principle by the desire of the Other (Lacan/Žižek) or a complex (Jung) also results in the experience of angst, conscience and guilt (Heidegger). Jung articulates this experience in the preceding quote as he highlights the “overwhelming impressions” the one-sided introvert receives from the object (the desire of the Other). Furthermore, Jung highlights the experience of angst, guilt and conscience (Heidegger) when he notes that the object (desire of the Other) provokes in the one-sided introvert “the most disagreeable and obstinate affects, persecuting him at every step”. Complexes arise when the one-sided introvert’s understanding of existence is inauthentically narrow and dogmatically averse to the authentic meaning of the desire of the Other. In other words, the analysand’s inauthentic understanding of the experience of a desire of the Other leads to “extreme sensitiveness” and a rift which “derails” “the analysand and this forces the analysand to” “cast a look on the world” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 2). The one-sided introvert’s experience of the desire of the Other consists of anxiety, conscience and guilt which are understood as a call of care from Dasein to itself. This indicates that the one-sided introvert

needs to “cast a look on the world” to remove the conspicuous obstructiveness and obstinacy of complex/*objet petit a* and “exhaustion and chronic fatigue” to care for their being in the world.

Jung notes the one-sided introvert’s fear of the desire of the Other when he states “An analysis of the personal unconscious yields an abundance of power phantasies coupled with fear of the dangerously animated objects, to which, as a matter of fact, the introvert easily falls a victim. For a peculiar cowardliness develops from this fear of the object; he shrinks from making either himself or his opinion effective, always dreading an intensified influence on the part of the object” (Jung, 479). The one-sided introvert needs to overcome this “cowardliness” and resolve to authentically listen to the call of conscience to exist in the truth of Being. By being resolute, the analysand can authentically confront extroversion (the desire of the Other) to develop an interpreted understanding of new possibilities to expand the meaning of their being in the world. This is sorely needed “Since his conscious relation to the object is relatively repressed, its exit is by way of the unconscious, where it becomes loaded with the qualities of the unconscious. These qualities are primarily infantile and archaic. His relation to the object, therefore, becomes correspondingly primitive, taking on all those peculiarities which characterize the primitive object relationship” (Ibid.).

The “unconscious”, the truth of Being or “reality” is “an ‘excess’ of a surplus which disturbs and blocks from within the autarky of the self-contained balance of the psychic apparatus” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 2). Žižek argues this excess of “reality” is “the external necessity which forces the psychic apparatus to renounce the exclusive rule of the ‘pleasure principle’ is correlative to this inner stumbling block” (Ibid.). The one-sided introvert experiences this disturbance since “He is terrified of impressive affects in others, and is hardly ever free from the dread of falling under hostile influence. For objects possess terrifying and powerful qualities for him qualities which he cannot consciously discern in them, but which, through his unconscious perception, he cannot choose but believe in” (Jung, 479).

Through this experience of the desire of the Other as the analysand’s complex, the one-sided introvert is forced to renounce the exclusive rule of the “pleasure principle” so that the transcendent function/individuation can take place by removing the “inner stumbling block” from being in the world. Renouncing the “pleasure

principle” means to go “through the wearisome” (Jung cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 3) by resolving to go beyond an imaginary relation to the desire of the Other and confront angst, guilt and conscience. By being authentically resolute, “the inner stumbling block” of the desire of the Other can be removed when the one-sided introvert does not become absorbed in only one of its possibilities and has instead interpreted new possibilities for being in the world. What this also reveals is that not renouncing the “pleasure principle” “can be described as inauthentically absorbing an entire human existence in only one of its human possibilities, which is perpetuated through an inauthentic turning away from angst, guilt and conscience through a being perfect projection” (Gildersleeve 2016, 3).

This explains the relationship between the obstructiveness of a complex and the desire of the Other which tickles the subject or in Jung’s words “it seems as though objects possessed magical powers. Strange, new objects excite fear and distrust, as though concealing unknown dangers” (Jung, 479). The desire of the Other tickles the one-sided introvert with its aura and obstructiveness through its parallax or error in perspective. When the one-sided introvert traverses the fantasy and removes the obstructiveness of a complex with Jung’s transcendent function, the desire of the Other no longer tickles the subject through its aura or obstructiveness. This occurs because the analysand has shifted its “observational position that provides a new line of sight” (Ibid.) and this allows the one-sided introvert to overcome being haunted that “every change has a disturbing, if not actually dangerous aspect, since its apparent implication is a magical animation of the object. A lonely island where only what is permitted to move moves, becomes an ideal. *Auch Einer*, the novel, by F. Th. Vischer, gives a rich insight into this side of the introvert’s psychology” (Jung, 479).

The transcendent function allows this transition to take place from being ‘tickled’ by the desire of the Other to removing the obstructiveness of the desire of the Other. This is a shift in perspective that occurs by discovering the void in the symbolic order, which is the place of the one-sided introvert’s barred subjectivity (\$). This is an experience of the Real which “is purely parallaxic and, as such, nonsubstantial: it has no substantial density in itself, it is just a gap between two points of perspective, perceptible only in the shift from the one to the other” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 6). In other words the one-sided introvert needs

to discover how the tickling “object embodies, gives material existence to the lack in the Other, to the constitutive inconsistency of the symbolic order” (Ibid.).

This highlights that the final moment of psychoanalytic treatment with the one-sided introvert occurs when the analysand experiences the lack in the Other. This takes place by reaching Žižek’s interpretation of absolute knowledge which involves shifting the analysand’s perspective to see that the imaginary fantasy of *objet petit a*, conceals a hole, an empty space which is the barred subject (\$) and desire of the Other. The empty space comes from an experience of the lack in the Other and equates the lack in the Other with the place of the barred subject of the analysand. Penot, too implicitly highlights the need to balance/integrate both introversion (desire) and extroversion (desire of the Other) when he says the “subjectivating function implies the participation of at least two subjects. I would say that it is fundamentally and from the beginning an intersubjective experience” (Penot cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 22).

PECULIARITIES OF THE BASIC PSYCHOLOGICAL FUNCTIONS IN THE INTROVERTED ATTITUDE

Since “Introverted thinking is primarily orientated by the subjective factor. At the least, this subjective factor is represented by a subjective feeling of direction, which, in the last resort, determines judgment” (Jung, 480), extroversion can bring the analysand face to face with concealed authentic/Real possibilities. This allows the one-sided introvert to appropriate the unready to hand and obstructive world, which lets the subject find “himself/herself within the community”. In other words, discovering possibilities involves using language through a symbolic relationship to the Other and “Using language, on the one hand it attempts to lead people to perception of the general structure that conditions all their reactions and decisions in life; on the other hand, it tries to lead them to perceive what makes them unique, their own particularity” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 11). However

Under ordinary circumstances, not even the transition to the 'other side' succeeds still less the redeeming journey through the unconscious. The passage across is chiefly prevented by conscious resistance to any subjection of the ego to the unconscious reality and to the determining reality of the unconscious object. The condition is a dissociation in

other words, a neurosis having the character of an inner wastage with increasing brain exhaustion a psychoasthenia, in fact. (Jung, 484)

The one-sided introvert must not be discouraged by this transition because possibilities are undiscovered and missing from the analysand's world and thus the world falls into unreadiness to hand which is experienced as the 'bone in the throat' of a complex. When the analysand has an authentic/Real understanding of the meaning of a complex, they have the possibility of discovering the unconscious involvements required to unconceal the truth of Being (the Other, Law, paternal metaphor) (Gildersleeve 2016, 12) to find their authentic/Real home in the world. For the analysand to exchange enjoyment for the Other, the Law, or the paternal metaphor, the analysand must go beyond an imaginary relationship to the Other to free other beings for their own authentic possibilities. This occurs by letting these possibilities be involved by making room for them to be part of the analysand's world in the region of the experience of the obstructive desire of the Other.

The one-sided introvert fails to do this because for "every introverted type, he is almost completely lacking in that which distinguishes his counter type, namely, the intensive relatedness to the object" (Jung, 485). Jung explains how this affects those around the one-sided introvert by stating, "In the case of a human object, the man has a distinct feeling that he matters only, in a negative way, i.e., in milder instances he is merely conscious of being superfluous, but with a more extreme type he feels himself warded off as something definitely disturbing. This negative relation to the object indifference, and even aversion characterizes every introvert" (Ibid.).

A counterbalance of extroversion can correct this when the analysand begins the process of 'spitting out the bone in the throat' (Gildersleeve 2016, 11) by projecting its being-in-the-world upon possibilities. Through an interpretation of possibilities, the analysand can authentically free other beings for their own authentic possibilities by letting them be involved by making room for them. By projecting possibilities with interpretation, "innerworldly beings are discovered, that is, have come to be understood, we say that they have meaning" (Heidegger cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 11). This is how the one-sided introvert removes this object indifference and aversion by discovering the meaning of the desire of the Other, the

Law or the paternal metaphor through this interpretation of possibilities.

The analysand “finds himself/herself within the community” or ‘at home in the world’ from this because discovering the meaning of the desire of the Other, the Law or the paternal metaphor modifies the experience of a complex in “both the way in which the ‘world’ is discovered and the way in which the Dasein-with of Others is disclosed” (Ibid.). As a result, “The ‘world’ which is ready-to-hand does not become another one ‘in its content’, nor does the circle of Others get exchanged for a new one; but both one’s Being towards the ready-to-hand understandingly and concernfully, and one’s solicitous Being with Others, are now given a definite character in terms of their ownmost potentiality-for-Being-their-Selves” (Ibid., 12). By understanding the authentic/Real meaning of the desire of the Other, the one-sided introvert “makes it possible to let the Others who are with it ‘be’ through solicitude which leaps forth and liberates” (Ibid.). The analysands find themselves within the community because they have “let others be” by discovering and vocalizing the meaning of the Other, the Law or the paternal metaphor through an interpretation of possibilities. This is also consistent with Jungian individuation. Jung says “I note that the individuation process is confused with the coming of the ego into consciousness and that the ego is in consequence identified with the self, Individuation is then nothing but ego-centredness, the self comprises infinitely more than a mere ego. It is as much one’s self, and all other selves, as the ego. Individuation does not shut one out from the world, but gathers the world to oneself” (Jung cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 12).

The aim of analysis and Jung’s transcendent function with the one-sided introvert is to “traverse the fantasy” of a desire which excludes the desire of the Other. Traversing the fantasy removes the obstructiveness of a complex by discovering the missing possibilities of the desire of the Other from the readiness to hand to reveal the barred subject \$ through a loss (castration) of the one-sided introverts desire. The experience of the obstructiveness of the desire of the Other leads the analysand to the barred subject \$ through the fantasy (\$∅a) when the analysand changes perspective to see the lack in the Other which was concealed by the *objet petit a*/complex.

Since the one-sided introvert remains at a distance and imaginary relationship to the Other, fantasies colour his world. Jung outlines this by saying

When the time comes for him to transplant his ideas into the world, his is by no means the air of an anxious mother solicitous for her children's welfare; he merely exposes them, and is often extremely annoyed when they fail to thrive on their own account. The decided lack he usually displays in practical ability, and his aversion from any sort of reclamation assist in this attitude. If to his eyes his product appears subjectively correct and true, it must also be so in practice, and others have simply got to bow to its truth. Hardly ever will he go out of his way to win anyone's appreciation of it. (Jung, 486)

Žižek can clarify this when he states “What we encounter in the very core of fantasy is the relationship to the desire of the Other, to the latter’s opacity: the desire staged in fantasy is not mine but the desire of the Other. Fantasy is a way for the subject to answer the question of what object he is in the eyes of the Other, in the Other’s desire—that is, what does the Other see in him, what role does he play in the Other’s desire?” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 8). Since the one-sided introvert remains at an imaginary relationship to the Other his understanding of the desire of the Other is inauthentic thus showing itself when his ideas “fail to thrive” when exposed to the Other.

To remove the obstructiveness of being out of touch with the Other, the one-sided introvert needs to go beyond an imaginary relationship to the Other to discover the lack/desire of the Other. If the analysand does not go beyond an imaginary relationship to the Other, they will experience the obstructiveness of a complex because their one-sided introverted fantasy conceals the Real of the lack/desire of the Other. Through Jung’s transcendent function as Will to Power and eternal recurrence of the same, the analysand can traverse the fantasy through a shift in perspective in relation to the desire of the Other. This can allow the one-sided introvert to reclaim some extroversion to overcome “usually awkward experiences with his colleagues, since he never knows how to win their favour; as a rule he only succeeds in showing them how entirely superfluous they are to him” (Jung, 486).

The analysand experiences the obstructiveness of their fantasy “because his relation to the object is such a secondary matter that he is left without a guide in the purely objective valuation of his product”

(Ibid.). Fantasy covers the lack/desire of the Other because the one-sided introvert remains at an imaginary relationship to the Other. Fantasy conceals the Real of the lack/desire of the Other and this is why the one-sided introvert “has little influence as a personal teacher, since the mentality of his pupils is strange to him” (Ibid., 488).

If the analysand does not go beyond this imaginary relationship to the Other, “Superego is the revenge that capitalizes upon our guilt” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 5). This is Žižek’s way of saying what I have also said where “Dasein can possess a guilty mood because Dasein may have fallen prey to a complex and obstructed its openness and freedom to listen to the call of conscience” (Gildersleeve 2017b, 5). If the one-sided introvert does not go beyond their fantasy/imaginary relationship to the Other, the superego is “forever doomed to return, to continue to haunt us” with “an impossible imperative that makes the subject guilty”. Žižek explains “The superego’s injunction has no use for excuses—no invocation of our limited capacities can release us; ‘you can because you must!’ (Kant)” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 19) and the only way to be released from this injunction is to go beyond and imaginary relationship to the Other until the possibility of impossibility of the desire is discovered through the lack/desire of the Other. The one-sided introvert is unable to achieve this since “Foreign influences are eliminated; he becomes more unsympathetic to his peripheral world, and therefore more dependent upon his intimates. His expression becomes more personal and inconsiderate and his ideas more profound, but they can no longer be adequately expressed in the material at hand” (Jung, 488). As a result, “However clear to himself the inner structure of his thoughts may be, he is not in the least clear where and how they link up with the world of reality” (Ibid., 486) and therefore the one-sided introvert must go ‘beyond of the pleasure principle’ of the imaginary. Žižek explains, “Kant’s categorical imperative is a superegotistical law which goes against the subject’s well-being. Or, more precisely, it is totally indifferent to his well-being” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 19) and this is necessary for the one-sided introvert to traverse their fantasy/remove their complex which exists when they remain within the pleasure principle of an imaginary relationship to the Other.

The one-sided introvert attempts to avoid going beyond the pleasure principle but “The foreign influence, brusquely declined from without, reaches him from within, from the side of the unconscious” (Jung, 488)

through the experience of the obstructiveness of a complex. Jung notes the desperate attempts of the one-sided introvert to avoid going beyond the pleasure principle of the ego when he says, “he will break out with venomous and personal retorts against every criticism, however just. Thus in every respect his isolation gradually increases” (Ibid.). Jung highlights the destructive nature that an imaginary relationship to the Other can have on the one-sided introvert when he says

His originally fertilizing ideas become destructive, because poisoned by a kind of sediment of bitterness. His struggle against the influences emanating from the unconscious increases with his external isolation, until gradually this begins to cripple him. A still greater isolation must surely protect him from the unconscious influences, but as a rule this only takes him deeper into the conflict which is destroying him within. (Ibid., 489)

The analysand clings to the pleasure principle by fleeing into the familiarity of the “at-home” and avoids the truth of facing the “not-at-home” which is disclosed by the experience of a complex. By inauthentically understanding the experience of the complex/*objet petit a*, the analysand “does so by turning away from it in falling; in this turning-away, the ‘not-at-home’ gets ‘dimmed down’” by putting “forward negative feeling-judgments or assumes an air of profound indifference, as a measure of self-defence” (Ibid., 490) toward the desire of the Other.

The death of the dwarf inauthentic imaginary ego is necessary for the obstructiveness of a complex to be removed and for the analysand to authentically encounter the barred subject “inscribed in the picture” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 19). In other words, being Real or authentic involves discovering the analysand’s finitude so their frame/horizon of the world is not obstructed by the imaginary fantasy of a complex. This allows the analysand to discover and experience being in the world from “their own particularity” “within the community”. Jung notes that “the unfamiliar object is shown no touch of amiability, no gleam of responding warmth, but is met by a manner of apparent indifference or repelling coldness” (Jung, 492). Therefore, transitioning to authenticity involves removing this narcissistic transference to ‘let’ the Other “act in conformity with their desire” because “transference is essentially resistant, *Übertragungswiderstand*. The transference is the means by which the communication of the unconscious is interrupted, by which

the unconscious closes up again. Far from being the handing over of powers to the unconscious, the transference is, on the contrary, its closing up” (Lacan cited in Gildersleeve 2017a, 11).

The transcendent function, which unifies extroversion with introversion, allows the analysand to stop preserving the fantasies and pleasure seeking of the narcissistic ego to ‘let’ the Other “act in conformity with their desire” and this “constitutes a traumatic experience of pleasure/pain or *jouissance*” (Gildersleeve 2017a, 12). This merging of the one-sided introvert’s desire with the desire of the Other (unification of opposites) through the transcendent function leads the analysand to traverse their imaginary fantasy of the Other by discovering the possibility of the impossibility of their desire (Gildersleeve 2017b, 3). This is how the transcendent function can remove the obstructiveness of a complex and this is when the truth of the barred subject (\$) is revealed through the unification of introversion and extroversion.

These changes allow the one-sided introvert to avoid being “silent, inaccessible, and hard to understand; often they hide behind a childish or banal mask, and not infrequently their temperament is melancholic” (Jung, 492). It will also eliminate the “trace of superiority and criticism that soon takes the wind out of the sails of a sensitive object” (Ibid., 493) between the one-sided introvert and the Other. As a result, the transcendent function allows the one-sided introvert to be open to the desire of the Other through extroversion instead of “The relation to the object is, as far as possible, kept in a secure and tranquil middle state of feeling, where passion and its intemperateness are resolutely proscribed. Expression of feeling, therefore remains niggardly and, when once aware of it at all, the object has a permanent sense of his undervaluation” (Ibid.).

Both introversion and extroversion are required to remove the obstructiveness of a complex but achieving this balance is challenged because “the introverted type subject to misunderstanding: not so much because the extravert is a more merciless or critical adversary, than he himself can easily be, but because the style of the epoch in which he himself participates is against him” (Ibid., 497). This is a challenge to achieving a balance of introversion and extroversion because the one-sided introvert “finds himself in the minority” which can lead to him being a “convinced participator in the general style, he undermines his own foundations, since the present style, with its almost exclusive acknowledgment of the visible and the tangible, is opposed to his

principle. Because of its invisibility, he is obliged to depreciate the subjective factor, and to force himself to join in the extraverted overvaluation of the object” (Ibid.). It is important for the introvert to recognise the value of both introversion and extroversion rather than seesawing from one-sided introversion to one-sided extroversion under the pressure of the majority.

If this balance does not take place, an imaginary relationship to the Other leads to “the return of the living dead” which is when the desire of the Other “does not want to stay dead but returns again and again to pose a threat to the living” (Žižek 1992, 22). When the one-sided introvert neglects balancing introversion with extroversion, the undiscovered/unacknowledged desire of the Other returns because it was “not properly buried, i.e., because something went wrong with their obsequies” (Ibid., 23). By not going beyond the pleasure principle or an imaginary relationship to the desire of the Other, “The more egotistical he becomes, the stronger his impression grows that these others, who are apparently able, without qualms, to conform with the present style, are the oppressors against whom he must guard and protect himself” (Jung, 498). In contrast, the transcendent function that unifies introversion and extroversion is ethical. It is ethical because if the desire of the Other is left undiscovered, this desire is hysterically “forever doomed to return, to continue to haunt” (Gildersleeve 2017a, 7) the one-sided introvert because it has been foreclosed from the symbolic and “whatever is foreclosed in the Symbolic, we well know that it returns in the Real” (Žižek 2007, 89). The one-sided introvert’s imaginary relationship to the Other leads to “the return of the living dead”. This is when the desire of the Other “does not want to stay dead but returns again and again to pose a threat to the living” (Žižek 1992, 22), thus underlining that “his penchant towards egoism becomes unavoidable, which, of course, richly deserves the prejudice of the extravert” (Jung, 498).

The obstructive one-sided introvert complex will return as the living dead until the analysand has accepted the loss of their desire (for one-sided introversion) so they can discover the desire of the Other through extroversion. This is how the desire of the Other “find their proper place in the text of tradition” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017a, 13). The transcendent function of introversion/extroversion establishes an authentic relationship between the analysand and the Other which is not disturbed by the “return of the living dead” because the unrealistic fantasies of desire have (had proper funeral rites) been traversed. This

is because the unification of introversion and extroversion allows the analysand and the Other to give each other the freedom to ‘act in conformity with their desire’ and therefore adhere to “Lacan’s maxim of the ethics of psychoanalysis: ‘the only thing of which one can be guilty is of having given ground relative to one’s desire [d’avoir cédé sur son désir]” (Žižek 2012, 121). The transcendent function of introversion and extroversion is ethical because it allows the analysand and Other to traverse their (imaginary) fantasies to discover a more authentic and Real understanding of the possibilities and impossibilities of their desire. This is how removing one-sidedness allows both the analysand and the Other to be relieved from the superego which “is the revenge that capitalizes upon our guilt - that is to say, the price we pay for the guilt we contract by betraying our desire in the name of the Good” (Žižek 2005, 69) (the ‘Good’ is one-sided introversion or extroversion). Žižek says, “The Lacanian name for this gesture of breaking the vicious cycle of the superego is act” (Žižek 2002, xl) and the unification of introversion and extroversion enables this to happen whereas one-sidedness does not. The ‘psychoanalytic act’ (Lacan, seminar XV) occurs when the analysand and the Other authentically accept and love their fate of the Self/barred subject (\$) after breaking the vicious cycle of the fantasies of the superego.

Lacan explains in “*Seminar XI*, that the essential feature of the scopical drive consists in ‘*making oneself seen [se faire voir]*” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 15). It is my thesis that making oneself seen is also the ultimate aim of Jung’s transcendent function and this is what Jung is referring to when he says “growth of personality is synonymous with an increase of self-consciousness” (Jung cited in Gildersleeve 2017b, 15). *Se faire voir* is a growth of personality and increase of self-consciousness because the analysand has gone beyond an imaginary relationship to the Other to reveal the Truth/authenticity of the barred subject \$ by discovering/retrieving the desire of the Other. However, for the one-sided introvert “sensation is related primarily to the subject, and only secondarily to the object” and “The ascendancy of the subjective factor occasionally achieves a complete suppression of the mere influence of the object” (Jung, 499). This explains that the one-sided introvert experiences the obstructiveness of a complex when they have not “made oneself seen” because their fantasy covers the void/cut of the barred subject \$ when they remain at an imaginary relationship to the Other. This

also highlights that because “there is a subject only in so far as there is a lack in the Other”, the one-sided introvert “makes oneself seen” as a barred subject \$ to increase self-consciousness by discovering the desire/lack in the Other through extroversion.

The introvert’s energy focuses on ‘acting in conformity with desire’; alternatively, the extrovert’s energy goes toward the desire of the Other. In other words, “the extraverted sensation-type is determined by the intensity of the objective influence, the introverted type is orientated by the intensity of the subjective sensation-constituent released by the objective stimulus” (Ibid., 501). Both of these types require each other for Jung’s transcendent function to take place where the analysand discovers the possibility of the impossibility of their desire (introversion) by encountering the lack/desire of the Other (extroversion).

The obstructiveness of a complex arises from the *objet petit a*, that “through its presence, fills the emptiness, the impossible signifying representation of the subject. It is—to put it in Lacanian terms—the realization of lack. It is the thing that fills the place where the signifier is lacking, the phantasmic object that fills the lack in the Other” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 20). In Jung’s words, “its stimulus is removed from it, because it is immediately replaced by a subjective reaction, which is no longer related to the reality of the object” and “Such a type can easily make one question why one should exist at all; or why objects in general should have any right to existence, since everything essential happens without the object” (Jung, 501). My paper aims to counteract this attitude of the one-sided introvert to show why the object (desire of the Other) is essential. The one-sided introvert does not relate “to the reality of the object” because they have not gone beyond an imaginary relationship to the lack in the Other.

A complex is a fantasy because the emptiness of the Real/barred subject is covered by the analysand’s imaginary relationship to the lack in the Other through the *objet petit a*. The one-sided introvert needs to go beyond this imaginary relationship by trying to symbolize the lack in the Other until discovering “the emptiness, the impossible signifying representation of the subject” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 20). When the one-sided introvert reaches this, beyond the obstructiveness of a complex, they have “dissolved the illusion” where “there is nothing beyond the phenomenon except this emptiness, and this emptiness is the subject” (Ibid., 21). This

highlights that going beyond the imaginary (phenomenon) is necessary to discover the lack in the Other/emptiness that is the barred subject $\$$. The transcendent function ‘unmasks the illusion’ or traverses the fantasy by going beyond an imaginary relationship to the obstructiveness of a complex/*objet petit a* to reveal “precisely this nothing as such—beyond the phenomena, there is nothing but this nothing itself, ‘nothing’ which is the subject” (Ibid., 24).

Žižek explains that the experience of this void of the barred subject $\$$ through the impenetrability of the desire of the Other is “a monstrosity” and has “all the connotations of horror fiction” (Ibid., 25). Žižek highlights that fantasy involves avoiding “the traumatic impact of being too directly exposed to this terrifying abyss of the Other” (Ibid.). This is shown when he says, “How are we to cope with that hazardous encounter with the Other’s desire? For Lacan, fantasy provides an answer to the enigma of the Other’s desire” (Ibid.). Jung adds to this by explaining how the one-sided introvert attempts to avoid the traumatic impact of the desire of the Other by saying “the subjective constituent of sensation becomes so alive that it almost completely obscures the objective influence. The results of this are, on the one hand, a feeling of complete depreciation on the part of the object, and, on the other, an illusory conception of reality on the part of the subject, which in morbid cases may even reach the point of a complete inability to discriminate between the real object and the subjective perception” (Jung, 502). Jung’s transcendent function can take the one-sided introvert beyond this “illusory conception of reality”/imaginary relationship to the Other to traverse the fantasy/complex to encounter the ‘traumatic horror’ of the desire of the Other. This also highlights that the one-sided introvert constructs a complex through “the desire staged in fantasy” which “is not the subject’s own, but the others desire, the desire of those around me with whom I interact” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 25).

Jung comments “The extraverted standpoint would say of him: ‘Reality has no existence for him; he gives himself up to fruitless phantasies’” (Jung, 502). The one-sided introvert’s ‘fruitless’ fantasy involves an imaginary relationship to the desire of the Other through the *objet petit a* ($\$a$) and will be experienced as the obstructiveness of a complex until the analysand confronts the “monstrosity” and “horror” of the “traumatic abyss of the Other”. Instead of staying at a distance from the desire of the Other through an imaginary fantasy, the analysand needs to engage in a symbolic relationship by

attempting to symbolise the desire of the Other until the point of failure which results in the experience of the void/Real of the barred subject \$.

If this is not achieved by the one-sided introvert, “Fate itself prepares for them, perhaps even more than for other men, overwhelming external difficulties, which have a very sobering effect upon the intoxication of the inner vision” (Ibid., 512). These “overwhelming external difficulties” show up through the experience of the obstructiveness of a complex/*objet petit a*. Jung’s transcendent function allows this to be removed when the one-sided introvert reveals “the kernel of the subject’s being beyond imaginary identifications” (Žižek cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 23). Jung’s transcendent function involves the process of “decentring” the analysand “with regard to the symbolic texture which defines the subject’s identity” and by doing this, the analysand confronts “this ex-timate kernel only at the price of his temporary aphanisis” (Ibid.). In other words, this “decentring” results in the death of the one-sided introvert’s imaginary and symbolic identifications, and a rebirth or “new birth” through an encounter with the Real/barred subject \$. This is the same process depicted in the *Rosarium Philosophorum*, particularly woodcut 6 (death) and 10 (the new birth) (see Gildersleeve 2015). Golan says “The subject is alienated from the I” and what I have just described explains how “Psychoanalysis attempts to go beyond the alienation by facilitating the appearance of the subject” (Golan cited in Gildersleeve 2016, 23).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, “From an extraverted and rationalistic standpoint, such types are indeed the most fruitless of men. But, viewed from a higher standpoint, such men are living evidence of the fact that this rich and varied world with its overflowing and intoxicating life is not purely external, but also exists within” (Jung, 512). This reiterates the fundamental theses of my article where I argue that Jung’s transcendent function requires both introversion and extroversion to be unified otherwise one-sidedness of either will lead to the obstructiveness of a complex. An analysand can be identified as having a one-sided extrovert complex when they neglect their (subjective) desire because the (objective) desire of the Other has greater importance. Alternatively, the analysand presents with a one-sided introvert complex when they neglect the (objective) desire of the Other

because their (subjective) desire has greater importance. Both one-sidedness of introversion or extroversion lead to the experience of an obstructive complex but this complex can be removed by unifying both introversion and extroversion through Jung's transcendent function. Jung highlights this and the pathology of either one-sided introversion or extroversion by stating "both orientations are one-sided, with a definitely restricted validity; hence they both require this mutual correction" (Ibid., 433). Finally, in this article, I have analysed 100 pages (pp.413-513) of Jung's writing on introversion and extroversion from his book *Psychological Types*. I will conclude this article by highlighting that on the last page that I selected for my analysis, Jung leaves the reader with his diagnosis of civilization including an important message for everyone to contemplate "introverted types are certainly no instructors of a more complete humanity. They lack reason and the ethics of reason, but their lives teach the other possibility, in which our civilization is so deplorably wanting" (Ibid., 513).

REFERENCES:

- Gildersleeve, M. 2015. *The Gay Science and the Rosarium Philosophorum*. *Agathos* 6(2): 37-56.
- Gildersleeve, M. 2016. Complexes Tickling the Subject. *Humanities* 5(4), 85.
- Gildersleeve, M. 2016. Jung's transcendent function as Nietzsche's will to power and eternal recurrence of the same. *Agathos* 7(1): 48-71.
- Gildersleeve, M. 2017a. *Psychoanalysis and Polyamory: or, (Have you acted in conformity with your desire?)*. Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Gildersleeve, M. 2017b. *Se Faire Voir with Jung and the Ethics of Psychoanalysis*. *Social Sciences* 6(1), 16.
- Jung, C. G. 1923. *Psychological Types: Or, The Psychology of Individuation*. New York: Harcourt.
- Lacan, J. 1997. *Seminar of Jacques Lacan* (Vol. 7). WW Norton & Company.
- Plato 2005. *Euthyphro; Apology; Crito; Phaedo; Phaedrus*. Harvard University Press.
- Žižek, S. 1992. *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Jacques Lacan through Popular Culture*. Cambridge MA and London: MIT Press.
- Žižek, S. 1991 / 2002. *For They Know Not What They Do: Enjoyment as a Political Factor*. London and New York City: Verso.
- Žižek, S. 2005. *The Metastases of Enjoyment: Six Essays on Women and Causality* (Vol. 12). London and New York City: Verso.
- Žižek, S. 2007. *The Universal Exception* (Vol. 2). London: A&C Black.
- Žižek, S. 2009. *In Defense of Lost Causes*. London and New York City: Verso.
- Žižek, S. 2011. *Living in the End Times*. London and New York City: Verso.
- Žižek, S. 2012. *Less than Nothing: Hegel and the Shadow of Dialectical Materialism*. London and New York City: Verso Books.