

Shrink Rap Radio #448, March 26, 2015, Understanding Our Archetypal Nature
David Van Nuys, Ph.D., aka “Dr. Dave” interviews Gary S. Bobroff, M.A.
(Transcribed from www.ShrinkRapRadio.com by Ashton Herrell)

Dr. Dave: Gary Bobroff, welcome back to Shrink Rap Radio.

Gary Bobroff: Great to be here with you, David. Thank you for having me.

Dr. Dave: Well, it's good to have you back and once again, you've got a great topic. Last time we talked about crop circles, which is mysterious. Very mysterious and wonderful, and certainly put on a lot of questions in our minds. Now you're here to talk about archetypes, and the archetypes in our personalities that govern our lives in certain ways. Before we get into all of that, what's your background in terms of archetypal work?

Bobroff: Well, it's really a beautiful story because my background in this work began just over 20 years ago. This is the first material that I was ever exposed to with Jung or depth psychology in any way. I was fortunate in my early 20s to go to a workshop that was called *Living Your Great Story*. It was very much based on the same things I am doing now in the Archetypal Nature Workshop, that's directly from Toni Wolff. I had not read Jung. I had not even taken a psychology class. I was in the university studying philosophy.

I went to this workshop and so the woman running it just said she could see electricity shooting out of my head. I was so lit up. I so loved it. This notion that there's these unconscious forms underneath who we are and our behavior, it was just so fascinating to me. I actually knew at the end of that workshop, that this was what I wanted to do for the rest of my life. That's coming from no exposure to Jung, no psychology background at all. It just lit me up so deeply and really changed my life when I knew I had my life direction there.

Dr. Dave: Wow, that's a real gift because so many of us struggle and flounder around, trying to figure out where our path is and so on. So what a gift that is. It feels synchronistic that we're going to be talking about Toni Wolff, and that she played such an important part in your thinking and the system that you developed.

It's synchronistic for me because I just recently interviewed a French Jungian analyst by the name of Imelda Gaudissart who's written a book on the life of Emma Jung. Of course, in Emma Jung's life, has to me, been a mystery. All the attention has been on Jung. Yet we know that he had at least two relationships that we know about, being a Speilrein and then a very long affair with Toni Wolff. It feels like, at least for me, the Toni Wolff card is coming up now.

Bobroff: Yeah, it really does. Even more deeply synchronistic for me is that you mentioned our previous interview on the Jung and Crop Circles book that I have out. After I had finished that book as a thesis at Pacifica, I was studying CIIS for doing Ph. D. course work. I was searching—

Dr. Dave: We should mention CIIS stands for California School of Integral Studies. Right?

Bobroff: —it does. Yep.

Dr. Dave: Did I get that right?

Bobroff: You did.

Dr. Dave: Okay.

Bobroff: So I was writing a paper for Rick Tarnes's class and I was doing a paper on Toni Wolff. I went into the library at Pacifica and I found this little, old pamphlet that had not been touched by anyone in years. I shake the dust off it. I opened it up and here was that whole conversation that I get into in the final chapter of the book, where Toni is talking with an English analyst, who has all these dreams of swirled grain and all that. This was a year after completing a master's thesis at Pacifica on Crop Circles.

Here was this wonderful synchronicity that tied Toni Wolff into that piece and now here I am again with Toni Wolff. I feel like as much as I am a Jungian at this point, I'm also a Wolffian, you know?

Dr. Dave: Interesting, because I had never read anything by Toni Wolff. Amazingly, you have on your website, and I guess it's actually legal and legit, a link to—is it the very pamphlet, that you were talking about?

Bobroff: Yeah, that's on the Crop Circles website. Yeah, the San Francisco Jung Society owns the rights to that pamphlet. They had agreed to let it be downloaded for free—

Dr. Dave: No, I was talking about the link to the Toni Wolff—

Bobroff: The lectures?

Dr. Dave: Yeah, well it was an article that's on your current website, your Archetypal Nature worksite. I didn't get to read the whole thing but I got far enough to get the gist of it, of her writing and thinking and I never read anything by her before. It felt amazingly contemporary.

Bobroff: (laughs) Yeah, she's ahead of her time. Yeah—

Dr. Dave: Yeah, which often happens when we go back and we read original people, original writings, even people who wrote a long time ago and we think, "wow, didn't know they were that smart back then." (laughs)

Bobroff: Yeah, yeah.

Dr. Dave: The arrogance!

Bobroff: Yeah, that's a transcript of her lecture to the Zurich Jung Institute on the archetypes, which is really the literary basis that we have for this work. It was a 1956 transcription of an

earlier lecture that she gave. You were mentioning Emma and Toni, did you know that—my understanding was that in the foyer of the Zurich Psychological Club, when you walked in over—above the doorways in the other rooms, in the foyer of the first room, there was a portrait of Jung on one wall and a big portrait of Emma Jung on the other wall, and a big portrait of Toni on the other one.

Dr. Dave: Oh my goodness.

Bobroff: Yeah, so everyone was pretty up to speed on what the status was of those three. To me when I think of Jung's psychology, I really think of it as the psychology of Jung and a whole bunch of women—

Dr. Dave: (laughs) Yeah, right.

Bobroff: —that's the reality. I mean when I talk to people that are in the know in Zurich, they talk about Toni behind the scenes, definitely helping with psychological types and getting that material very much, as she did with archetype, getting it from the dynamic of Emma and Carl, and herself. You know?

Dr. Dave: Mmhm. Somewhere I picked up the notion, and I don't know if this is true or not, but that a lot of Jung's patients were women from America. Now I don't know if that's true or not.

Bobroff: Well, there's certainly—when I think of—I think that's definitely true. I think there's so many powerful women surrounding Jung. Jung's psychology so emphasizes the feminine as he, himself did. He said the biggest problem in our world is that we emphasize archetypally masculine approaches over archetypally feminine ones. There was so many women around, Von Franz and Jaffé, and so many people that were doing work and contributing and dialoging with him that—

Dr. Dave: Yes.

Bobroff: —that he's certainly responsible for it but there was an army of women that were, I'm sure making contributions that we'll never know the depth of them all. Certainly, I suspect that a lot of significant contributions to Jungian psychology came directly from Toni Wolff.

Dr. Dave: Yes. Oh, fascinating. So clearly, that's been one of the major influences in the system that you have developed and probably are still in the process of developing. I'm glad to hear there's a book in the works. Where else does this system come from? We've leapt ahead or leapt back, I guess. I gather there were other influences on you as you moved along in your thinking.

Bobroff: Yeah, well the tradition continued, of course, as it does in Jungian psychology and many branches. I think in the, probably the 50s, and 60s, and 70s, the language that Toni Wolff put forward of the mother type and the Hetaira and the Amazon, and the media tricks, which is the same archetypes that I use in this system. There's some name changes but basically it's the

same observation. That continued in many different streams. So you find Whitmonts, and many, many women writing about it.

The branch that I follow most directly was continued by Tad and Norene Guzy, who are an American and Canadian couple, who did workshops on personality type and then felt like there was something missing and then found this archetypal piece. They wrote a book called *About Men and Women*, a long time ago. It's a very good book and that's the most direct continuation to the work I do but you'll also of course have Robert Elmore and many other people writing similar things. Robert Moore has the King, Warrior, Magician, Lover Series, which there's one or two key philosophical differences with what I do but he is expanding on the same principles and nature.

The really interesting thing for me is, I really do think that what Toni saw is in nature. I don't really think of it as a theoretical observation and, in fact, I've presented this work to people before that had some knowledge of Tibetan Buddha families. They talk about a very profound similarity between what Toni Wolff saw and what were presenting in Archetypal Nature and the Tibetan Buddha family. So I feel as with much of Jungian psychology, that it's an observation of nature, rather than a theoretical system. That's my take on it. I feel like it's something that's in nature, that's natural. If you look through the animal world, or even the biological world, you're going to see creatures and behavior that reflects these principles.

Dr. Dave: Well, I think we probably want to get into the specifics of the archetypes. So that you can then talk about that and persuade us of that. Before we go right there though, what else did I want to ask you, were you able to ever be in a workshop with Tad and Noreen Guzy, that you mentioned?

Bobroff: No, I wasn't but I went and met with Tad in Calgary, in the 90s and did some initial work with him, and did some research. I had a quite nice day with him and that was really all I got but the folks that ran the workshop, that I went to, had studied with him. They do have a really good book that's now out of print but there's a few used copies around out there that I was able to really read and absorb and got exposure to their work that way and through the people that passed it on to me.

Dr. Dave: Okay. Well, probably before we go further, I should ask you to define what you mean by archetype?

Bobroff: Well, the archetype is, Toni Wolff called them *Structural Forms*. It's a deeply embedded piece of our personality that is unconscious. It's the ways in which we find our deepest sense of identity and fulfillment, and satisfaction. It's the ways that our libido flows down a certain path and unconsciously we find our thoughts flowing to this person or that person, and this or that context. The way that we want to achieve in a certain direction, we want to achieve in the world as a warrior through accomplishment, or we want to achieve through the world through a sense of comprehension and knowing.

There's just these unconscious pathways that our energy flows through them and archetype speaks to that, to our deepest drives and orientational patterns. The way that we really understand

the world but we really see it through how our libido flows, whether we want it to flow that way or not. This is much deeper than the ego consciousness. It's the thing in us, that when we're doing it, we become transcendent or the ways from the shadow side of it that we can fall down the rabbit hole and get lost.

The things that really compel us, and move us, and define us and who we are at the deepest level, what moves us, what fascinates us, where our energy flows, what events we're most excited to be a part of. All of that, when you look underneath it, you see these patterns that Toni Wolff saw, that we call archetype.

Dr. Dave: So to mix metaphors a bit, in a way, it's almost like it's something we come into the world preprogrammed with—

Bobroff: Right.

Dr. Dave: —or to mix the metaphor, something about the gods—

Bobroff: Yes.

Dr. Dave: —and the gods have messed with us in a certain way such that we resonate to a certain pattern.

Bobroff: Yes. Yes, to continue the metaphor of the gods. There are certain temples that we pray at and certain temples that we avoid—

Dr. Dave: Mmhmm.

Bobroff: —in our behavior, in the way that we participate in reality. Does Aphrodite get so much of our attention? Are we constantly thinking about romantic possibilities? Or are we more interested in Hera, the wife and the connection to society? Which temples are we most comfortable in and which do we stay away from? All of that is going to come out through looking at archetypal nature.

Dr. Dave: I have to share with you that when I was being exposed to Jung, the part that resonated least for me, and that in a language you just used the temple that I have sort of avoided most, would be Typology. So I'm of the type—whatever the type is that avoids Typology. That's my type. (laughs) I'm still open to open to what you got to say here. (laughs)

Bobroff: Well, thank you so much for being willing to come and visit the temple of personality type.

Dr. Dave: Yes. Yes.

Bobroff: Actually, my understanding of the origination of this work was that after they completed psychological types and that book came out, that Toni imparticular, felt like there's something still missing. That's when she would develop this archetype piece, which fits in with

personality type. A lot of people—I'm a certified administer of the MBTI, and a lot of people tend to—

Dr. Dave: Would you say that's the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory?

Bobroff: Yeah. Yeah, which is based on Jung's personality types or psychological types.

Dr. Dave: Right.

Bobroff: A lot of people tend to over conflate those types with archetype. They assign an understanding of behavior that is too wide to those archetypes, to those personality types, and with an understanding of archetype you can understand that. You get a clearer picture of type and archetype together. It gives you a much clearer and more accurate view of personality than either one alone.

Dr. Dave: Okay. Well, let's get down to the specifics of the archetypes that you see things in four, which is interesting, the Jungian magical four—

Bobroff: Indeed.

Dr. Dave: —to be a very important number.

Bobroff: Indeed.

Dr. Dave: So take us through the four, that I guess you and Toni, and others have identified.

Bobroff: Yeah, I'll mention just briefly that Robert Elmore who talks a lot about these archetypes, he loves the quaternio, the alchemical fourness of all this. The alchemical aidness, when you take the two gender types of each archetype. That's another reflection of the naturalness of this system. He does beautiful lectures and work on this stuff. Our system's slightly different but I still really appreciate what he offers.

So let me tell you about the system that Toni brought forth and that we continue. The vertical axis is what we call, the personal axis. This has to do with how your energy flows towards your fellow human beings. At the top of that axis, at the top of the circle, we have King/Queen, or sometimes called Mother/Father.

Those folks find their energy flows towards people but it's people in the collective sense. It's how does this person fit into the family? How does this person fit into the workgroup? How will this affect the team? How will this affect our tribe, our nation, our particular ethnic group? How will it affect more concern with society, and other parents, and societal values?

So it's more of the energy of people in the sense of the group. So you'll find a lot of teachers will be archetypal Mother/Father or King/Queen. They're genuinely motivated by doing for, they want to take care of and nurture. At the absolute top maturation of this archetype, you find them with the ability to bless, to see your gold shining and not hate you for it, to be able to say you're

such a valuable member of our community. There's always a place for you here. We're really lucky to have you and really knight you. That knighting ceremony is the capstone of the King/Queen, Mother/Father archetype.

Dr. Dave: Wow.

Bobroff: Yeah, it's quite beautiful. I've had that happen from people, spontaneously in my life. It's quite wonderful. I knew what it was. I knew, "oh my god, I'm getting the King's archetypal blessing experience." (laughs)

Dr. Dave: Yeah. I said, "wow." It was because I felt a surge of something with the idea of receiving that. I'm not sure if I have—I guess there are ways that I have received it. I wonder, if for that one and for the others that you're going to be talking about, if there are either contemporary people who are well known that come to mind or historical figures that would exemplify what you're talking about?

Bobroff: Oh, absolutely. I think everybody in the world is going to be identifiable through one or two archetypes. So in the work we do, we present film and modern examples. There's really no shortage at all of Father and King/Queen types. For example, the shadow of the King and the Queen is there's a desire in the positive sense to do for but the shadow is wanting control over, or power over others.

One of the most classic and frightening examples of what happens when you're identified with archetype, is in the Frost/Nixon interviews. David Frost in the 1970s, when he resigned President Nixon. They have a very long conversation but at one point he asks him, "well, is it sometimes okay if a president approves a plan that is illegal but he sees a point for it? Is that okay?" Nixon actually says, "if the president doesn't, that means it's not illegal."

Dr. Dave: Mmhmm. Yep.

Bobroff: So he's actually completely identified with the King, with the power role. He is the power. So I think if you blend that back down into a lot of people's experiences of maybe having a father or other male relative that is a Father or King type, that they may have some sense of that. You know we have this expression, "my way or the highway?"

Dr. Dave: Yeah.

Bobroff: That's very classic Father stuff. In a cartoony way, you saw it in the 70s with Archie Bunker—

Dr. Dave: Yes.

Bobroff: —very associated with this is the way things were done. I'm going to do them this way. Those are cartoony examples of people that want to stay with the old value system, and they prefer that, but there is the energy in the King/Queen both positively and negatively of conserving what's been built up. (cross talk)

Dr. Dave: On the positive side who comes to mind? You've given a couple examples of the shadow side but what comes to mind?

Bobroff: Yeah, positive examples. When I think of the positive examples, I go more generally with people—to give folks a sense of it, again would be the teachers and firefighters. Firefighter would be a Father type with a Warrior wing. Those who are really interested and want to be of service genuinely.

If you go to a volunteer place, say you work for Habitat For Humanity, you volunteer there. There's going to be a lot of Mother and Fathers, King/Queens there, that are there consistently over time, again and again. I think when you want to give examples in today's modern culture, you have to break off and talk about the wings which are Warrior on one side and Magician on the other. Then you get two very different kinds of examples of both of those.

On the Father/Warrior type, or the Queen/Amazon, both male and female are included here. There's a lot of very classic examples when you specify both archetypes together, which we get into in the workshop. So for example, Vince Lombardi, classic football coach. Of course, Vince Lombardi trophy is named after him. All of his sayings and when you see a meme about him, they're so focused on and really define the Father/Warrior point of view on the world. He says, for example, individual commitment to a group effort, that's what makes a teamwork, a company work, a society work, a civilization work.

They really want everybody pulling on the rope together. It's when we all work together on something that we're going to really get something accomplished. That's wonderful but it's only one point of view on the world. So that coaching point of view in the world, in the boardroom—I would say John Wayne, President Reagan, a lot of figures like that really embody that archetype in the most classical sense.

We also—

Dr. Dave: What about, no pun intended, Martin Luther King?

Bobroff: Well, I think based on—it's tough to say because personality wise, he would be an ENFJ but archetype wise, I don't know that he's Father. That 'J' implies a connection to the Father but personality wise, and in his own personal life, I don't know necessarily that he was Father or Mother archetype but just knowing more about his biography, he certainly was a leader. Whether that was actually his archetype, would be tough to say.

On the female side of the Queen/Amazon, where it's both the Mother/Queen type and the Warrior type, you can have someone like Martha Stewart, or Queen Elizabeth, or Margaret Thatcher. The iron lady, that strong leader, Queen type that really understands power. I think that a lot of republican figures or right-wing figures, certainly Sarah Palin and I guess you'd say not quite shadow version but certainly not super mature version. Then you have the thing—do you know about the Tiger Mom?

Dr. Dave: Yes.

Bobroff: —thing that went on recently? So that kind of energy really speaks to it. Then there's this whole other side that would be the Father/Sage, or the Queen/Sage, or the Mother/Sage, King/Sage, with people like Warren Buffett, whose advice is always very practical and concerned for society and wants to do the right thing, or Bill Gates. Those kind of figures who are fathering. They're interested in what's right for the whole society and a lot of their energies flowing into philanthropy and that kind of thing. So it's concern for the group, Father, but it's coming up with ideas to help the group and that's when you get the Father/Sage combination.

Dr. Dave: Okay. Well, let's move on to the next archetype in your four-way system.

Bobroff: Mmhmm. So at the top you have the King/Queen and then down at the bottom on the personal axis, you have what we call Lover/Seeker. There the energy is flowing into people but it's flowing into people in a one on one sense. So it's romantic fantasies or realities, friendship, one on one, that deep conversation at the end of the night. Also, the flowing into the new, the nontraditional approaches, and the unique and the novel.

The other thing I would encourage folks to really understand about archetype, is it's not cartoony. We give you the cartoony examples to get you to understand it but there are so many nontraditional mixes here, like you can have a Father or King type who is living in a sort of a hippie subculture, or a punk subculture but if you look at them you'll see that they're the social glue and that they're a leader in that group. This happens in nontraditional forms but we give you the cartoony examples to make it clear but, in reality, it's more subtly blended.

Dr. Dave: Mmhmm.

Bobroff: You'll see certain people that really are serving the community, in an alternative community. You'll see if you scratch underneath them, they really are motivated by doing for the other people in that community, even if it's an alternative or new community. The Lover/Seeker is about one on one, your energy. That's my archetype. I'm a Seeker/Sage. My energy definitely flows into thinking about one on one relationship and friendship. What's going on in my friend's lives in a one on one sense. That's a very different thing from the King/Queen, Mother/Father, that their energy is flowing out into the group and how people fit into the group. The Lover/Seeker—

Dr. Dave: Was it hard for you to figure out what type you were? Because I identify with all of them. That's one of the problems I guess I have with these typologies, is that I can see myself in each one. It's hard to know which is really dominant.

Bobroff: Yeah, for me it wasn't hard. For me, I really saw who I was right away. All of us, use all these things.

Dr. Dave: Yeah.

Bobroff: We all like to do a good job. The other axis that goes the horizontal way, that I mentioned briefly, was on one side the Amazon/Warrior and on the other side the Sage and

Mediatrix, that I'll define in a minute. Being where I was, as a Sage, someone who's really interested in ideas and comprehension, and the understanding through the inner process. I really got who I was and I also saw my shadow. One of the key pieces of this, is that, if you can see yourself on the system and get where you are, you get clues as to where your shadow was.

Dr. Dave: Okay.

Bobroff: I really see my shadow across the chart. Across the chart from Seeker/Sage, is the Father/Warrior. The Father/Warrior—he accomplishes what he does through showing up every day, through serving the community, through concern with the group, through the consistency of his determination. To me, that's where a lot of archetypal shadow lessons were for me. I didn't have a problem identifying right away but a lot of people do.

I really think, that for some people, the more difficult it is to identify yourself at first, the likely the more value in that process. We're all coming from cultural positions on these archetypes. Some of us grow up thinking, this is good and that's bad. We all have values that are somewhat unconscious, or maybe they are conscious, about I should be this, I should be that. A lot of people are carrying parental baggage about what archetype they should be, or societal baggage. To chip away at it and find out who you are, is very powerful.

For example, someone who identifies with the Sage archetype. I could spend years, and years, and years, polishing what I do, polishing my ideas and presentations and work before I bring it out into the world. I spent many, many years writing the Crop Circle book, that we discussed earlier. I could've gone on, and on, and on, working on it. I think the Magician can get lost up in his tower. He can be so obsessed with perfection and all that. The Warrior teaches you that eventually you just got to come out into the world. You've got to put it out there and suffer the slings and arrows that come with that.

Dr. Dave: Is part of the idea here of primary and secondary, and maybe tertiary, and quadruciary?

Bobroff: Yes.

Dr. Dave: —that we all have these components but one might be most dominant. The Jungian idea of developing the under developed parts and learning to call upon those parts that are not as developed?

Bobroff: Yes. Exactly. Absolutely. For me, I think my fourth archetypal function would be the Warrior. I think I have a bit more fluency with the Father. I think about, for example, some people really feel like, “oh well, I'm a lot a Warrior and I'm a lot the Sage. I'm both of these figures.” The Warrior is really defined by autonomy and thrives on competition, is actually energized by competition. If you go into a commercial kitchen and you see the cooking stuff there, there's going to be a whole lot of Warriors in that group. If you tell them it can't be done, look out, because they are going to try to prove you wrong.

Dr. Dave: Yeah. We've seen some of these reality shows on TV about food, and cooking, and chefs. That's why I'm chuckling as you describe this.

Bobroff: Yeah. Those are our Warriors, generally. They really thrive on accomplishment, on doing, on getting it done, on overcoming the challenge in the physical world, in the real world. Also, some folks are really living from almost one archetype. We worked before with world class athletes, who have just been coming from purely Warrior. I'll tell you, their personal lives, tend to be not so great because all their energy is in that one archetypal place.

To get back to what I was saying, there are some folks that really feel, "well, I'm very much into the Sage and the world of ideas under Sage but I'm also a Warrior." It is as you say, to think about, well, what's the first, what's the second, and what's the third function? I think of, for example, the classic book and movie, *Cyrano de Bergerac*, which is also called *Roxanne*, in the Steve Martin version.

Dr. Dave: Yes, I remember that one, fondly. (laughs)

Bobroff: Yeah. In *Cyrano de Bergerac*, you have someone who's very fluid with the Sage and coming up with these beautiful poems and all that, a very quick wordsmith, and someone who's also good with the sword. The whole point of the drama is about his connection to himself as Lover, as being worthy of an object of love. So if all of our energy is going into these two impersonal archetypes of Sage and Warrior, points the question of, is our energy flowing into love? Is there a question there about love?

Of course, the fourth archetype of the King, is not barely present. If it's present in the movie, it's present in the roles of the villains, so are the books. I think for most of us we are coming from one or two, usually one personal and one impersonal. It's just a question of, I think for some folks anyway, really opening up and really understanding what these archetypes really are. Then most people, not everyone, but most people are going to settle and go, "okay, this is where I am." It's funny because I have one slide in our workshop, where I talk about the Seeker. Of course, the Seeker, is very much defined by being outside of society. There's a whole question in this work, that appoints to an inherent tension, in America and Western values, between belonging and freedom from belonging. That's been very much up in our culture since the 50s and 60s. In fact, that's almost the essence of the ranker, of the 60s, is belonging, the King/Queen's connection to society versus the Seeker/Lover's wanting to break free from those expectations.

Dr. Dave: Mmhmm.

Bobroff: The Seeker is almost pathologically antiauthoritarian at the extreme. Those folks really don't want to be put in a box. They don't want to ever have someone say, "oh well, you're this type." So I actually include that in the Seeker's definition because you do have people that come to the work and they go, "oh well, I can't be boxed in." Well, (laughs) that's one of the key defining features of the Seeker archetype because he doesn't think he can be boxed in.

Dr. Dave: Okay, so that might be mine then. (laughs) That's one tick in that part. (laughs)

Bobroff: Yeah. I really see—there's another film we look at, in the workshop, which is *The Big Chill*. I think that movie really is all about this question of belonging or freedom from belonging. It starts with the suicide of someone, who's clearly a Seeker archetype, who walks away from a Ph.D. and walks away from these different opportunities, and never really gets connected into society, into the world of Mother and Father, King/Queen that are defined and see themselves as defined by their group identity.

Throughout the movie, you have William Hurt's character, who is absolutely defining Seeker type, who talks about, "why did you quit"—he does this little video of himself, where he's interviewing himself. He says, "why did you quit these jobs and all that?" He says, "I'm evolving. I'm still evolving." That's the Seeker. He's seeking to evolve.

Dr. Dave: Yeah.

Bobroff: That's absolutely the Seeker mode. What the other character in the—Kevin Kline's character, who's established, is trying to do is, bring him off the road. The Seeker can wander too far from shore and be lost as the character whose commit suicide, who opens the movie, has wandered too far from the shore. So Kevin Kline is seeking to offer William Hurt's character opportunities to come back into the fold. The archetypal dynamic there is very explicit, that the person who has the most Father quality in that movie, is saying, "I'm dug in here. This is my world and here's an opportunity to come along and join us" because you can only be off writing the outskirts for so long.

Eventually we all want to find a place and be a part of the community. The Seeker is the most likely to avoid that, to ride away from it, to not see its importance, to not be group identified. Of course, all of us, need all of this.

Dr. Dave: Yeah.

Bobroff: We need all of these archetypes really to blossom but we're always going to live in one or two. They all have their own dangers and potential tragedies. That's a big part of the archetypal nature work, is once you go, "okay, this is where I'm sitting archetypally," there's a thousand myths that are going to tell you, well, that's a possible danger for you in your life.

Dr. Dave: Uh huh.

Bobroff: Saturn and the Greek mythological system, Saturn is the ultimate negative father. He actually eats his children. Well, the Father in the immature form of that archetype, the King, and the immature form of that archetype, can really resent the personal growth and development of his children. If he hasn't matured enough himself, that's going to be felt as a threat. A lot of all the strands can be tied together here and really brought home, in a way, that can help us to figure it out, what it is we need and better identify the dangers that are around us, so that we might be repeating over and over again.

Dr. Dave: And you say that this kind of thinking, this kind of work, can actually help people in their relationships. How is that?

Bobroff: Well, I think there's so much depth to that. Primarily, what I understand is that most folks that are in a long term, happy relationship, have at least one archetype in common. Now, you might find examples that are not like that but if you have two people that are opposite archetypally, and have no archetypal nature in common, one of the dangers there, is that it becomes a way you just split the world in half and you both avoid growing into each other's territory. So you remain in an immature, cartoony version of who you are.

Think of a Father, who's a provider, with a Lover/Seeker woman. She might consider an immature version of this, she might consider her job to be shopping and looking pretty and all that, and he's the one taking care of the worldly responsibilities. That can continue on for decades. It becomes a block to growth, where there's no impetus for either side to grow and develop more archetypal fluidity themselves, or the reverse gender one, where you got a Mother and Queen type, with a Seeker, Eternal Boy, Puer husband—and he might even call her mom like, “Oh yeah, I better get back, mom's going to be angry.” He's off adventuring with his friends. He might even refer to her as mom. She's the one being the responsible one and he continues in a child-like stage.

There's all these ways that dating the opposite can be very attractive. We are certainly attracted to our opposite but the danger is that we divide the world in half and then we have no impetus for growth. One of the really interesting things about Jungian psychology, that has been found, is that our inner Anima/Animus, our opposite type figure, our inner contrasexual half, that's really another half of us, is very often, especially when we're young, opposite personality type and opposite archetype.

So for me, I really realized the truth of that, when I spoke with my first high school girlfriend, a long time after we were together. We had done the MBTI and she was literally opposite personality type and opposite archetype to me. As you get older, we integrate that a little bit and the edges come off and you might find your Anima or Animus projected onto someone who's closer to your own type but in the beginning, boy, we really are attracted to the opposite type.

That's the anima projection stuff, it's very powerful. Of course, it's a projection of our own inner soul and our own inner figure. There's all that work and potential growth there. We see these, both personality and archetype, very much in who we're attracted to. Once you own type in a relationship, even if it's just one partner doing it, you can really help a lot because, boy, do we ever—all of us suffer from this thing. Particularly, I would say Seeker/Lover types, where we imagine that the world and everyone in it wants the exact same things we do.

Dr. Dave: Yeah. (laughs) Right. As I'm listening to you here, I'm imagining the possibility of a specialty within couple's therapy that would draw heavily upon this kind of thinking. I don't know if that already exists out there or not.

Bobroff: Right.

Dr. Dave: Do you envision something like that down the road?

Bobroff: Well, yeah. I do do that work. I do archetypal coaching with folks and that's one aspect of it for sure, is archetypal coaching for couples. I think it is this thing of peeling back our projections. We all do think that everyone wants the same thing we do. If we're a Seeker/Lover type, that's focused on one on one, we might imagine, "oh gee, wouldn't it be great to sit down late night on Christmas and have a real deep, meaningful talk with our father, really finally say everything we've wanted to say?" Well, what the father—if he's King archetype or Father archetype—what he really wants is not that. He wants you there with your spouse and kids and all of his other children and their spouses and children, together at the Christmas dinner table. So he can see that his whole tribe is healthy and happy, and well, and take pride in that accomplishment.

Dr. Dave: Yeah.

Bobroff: So these are very different things that we are looking for from each other. To start to understand those differences, you can really drop a lot of judgment because so many of us are prejudiced against the other archetypes without even knowing it. We might hate the Father/Warrior types, who are in the board room and what not, because we're a different type.

We certainly may feel negated in their presence. If you're not particularly developed in the Warrior, and that's an area of awkwardness for you, and you're not the most athletic person in the world, go out and being in an athletic environment with people that live and breathe in that, they can't wait to get out of work and out off hunting, or playing basketball or running. As soon as five o'clock comes, they're off and gone and spending their weekends outdoors. You're going to feel a little bit negated because they're really good at that stuff and they get off on it, and they love it. If they come in and sit and go in and take a Jungian lecture with us, speaking as a Sage, they might not feel super—they might feel pretty negated in that room, as well.

So you really can be more compassionate and really allow some awkwardness that's real. People are really feeling those awkwardnesses, those moments of awkwardness. We can get ahead of the curve on that and think, "well oh, he might feel a little uncomfortable here so how can I make that easier for them." Really allowing for these different ways of being, allows us to drop judgment, and to be more compassionate and more understanding.

Dr. Dave: Yes. That's what, in fact, one of the things that I do value about these typological kind and characterological kinds of schemes—

Bobroff: Mmhmm.

Dr. Dave: —is the non-pathologizing. Whether it's astrology or the kind of thing that we're talking about where, yeah, you can talk about the shadow but somehow it's different than hanging a real pathological label on somebody. (laughs)

Bobroff: Right. Right. Yes.

Dr. Dave: Yeah, there's a kind of compassion, and a positive, and a negative potential for everyone in these schemes.

Bobroff: That's right. That's right. One of things that I like about this work is that in Jungian psychology there is a tradition of, that's accurate, of course, and has real reasons of doing it, where they really pathologizing the Puer and there's—

Dr. Dave: I resent that. (laughs) I should say I resemble that.

Bobroff: Yeah, exactly. We resemble that remark. There is great things about that and useful and helpful things. I definitely try and offer that to people. I'm going to do a Level Two Workshop on this stuff, that will really get more into that deeper stuff. What you don't see and why I think you and I resent that, is that you don't see the pathologizing of the sinax, of the King and Queen, and Mother/Father. Really there's an archetypal equivalency here with all of these archetypes and none are better or worse. They just point to stories, mythical patterns of strength and weakness, tragedy and success. They point to where our gold is, they point to where our shadow is, and none of them are better or worse. They all have pathological potential and they all have potential for the greatest maturity. For me it's clear, that Jung was as one of the people in the matter of hearts, Jung was a Brother type. He was not a Father type. He was a Seeker. He was a Seeker/Sage his whole life. He didn't magically transform into the King. There was no change in his orientation. He went deeper and deeper into who he was. Yet he bloomed, as much as anyone in my opinion, can bloom.

Dr. Dave: Yes.

Bobroff: So all of these stories have an equivalency of potential health and immaturity. That's one thing I like about—as you're saying pathologizing of our stories can drop. Especially I think for the Seeker and Lover to—because there's no words in our culture that are positive for the Seeker story. If you say someone's patriarch type or the Father type, folks know what you're saying pretty quickly. A lot of people, anyway. You can define it more, as we do in the workshop, that people get it because those stories, that energy, is honored in our society. The Seeker—there's no—most of our words for it are negative. There used to be the term “gadabout” and there's “slacker.” All these kind of things, that—

Dr. Dave: Or the one I identify with and sometimes hurled at myself but I try to be gentle with myself, is dilatant. (laughs) A more acceptable word is generalist. (laughs)

Bobroff: Right. Right.

Dr. Dave: That describes me in certain kind of way. What does that fit with? Does that fit with the Seeker?

Bobroff: Oh, yeah—

Dr. David: The Seeker/Lover?

Bobroff: Well, yeah. I think it does. I think it has to do with—I think it's bringing up more than just that but also has to do with being broadly interested in a variety of types of knowledge—

Dr. Dave: Right.

Bobroff: —rather than being someone who is really focused as our academic world values really deep knowledge of specific area but unfortunately that also brings about tremendous fragmentation and no ability to have a conversation that is central.

Dr. Dave: Yeah.

Bobroff: Yeah.

Dr. Dave: Both orientations have their value and I'm willing to own the value of my broad interests.

Bobroff: Right. That's what allows you to have the kind of conversations you do for your listeners on this show—

Dr. Dave: Right.

Bobroff: —because you have enough knowledge to be able to speak very intelligently about a variety of psychological areas, that folks that are specialists wouldn't. In fact, they probably resent it because they're identified with their own specific—the value of their own specific knowledge.

Dr. Dave: Yeah. It's taken awhile for me to learn to value that in myself rather than to be blaming, coming out of the academic environment, where that very deep dive is highly valued and is part of the ladder to academic success.

Bobroff: Yes. That is the Seeker's struggle. I had a really good friend of mine join me for one of the workshops that I did in person recently on archetypal nature. He really questioned, "What's the value of the Seeker? What's my value?" I really tried to get home to him, that so many of our people that have—if you're going to constitute the Seeker and the Lover archetype, the constitutional pieces would be the archetypal Child and the archetypal Lover. The archetypal Child is what brings the new. It's what brings the new, needed quality.

So many of our biblical and mythological stories about the child who will bring the new order and the struggle of the sinax, the King type, to kill off that child before they come around. So the Seeker is—they are the, Puella and Puer, the eternal child. Often actually, the Seeker is—if you're looking at a man or woman who's older, but looks younger, so very often they are Seeker/Lover. They are archetypal Child people. They are embodying the new, the youthfulness, the child.

Dr. Dave: That's interesting to me because I've always, maybe not so much now, but for a long time looked a lot younger than I was. (laughs)

Bobroff: Yep. Yeah, I know that one too. Yeah, that's right. So these folks struggle to understand what their value is but their value is bringing the new. If you look at so many of our artists and writers, and cultural leaders, the people that really took our cultural dialogue forward, we really revere so many of those folks. Not all of them but of the big, big, big majority of the cultural pioneers, that we really value and whose contributions we recognize in the arts and even in business, who are really truly pioneers, like Steve Jobs. Clearly, not a Father type.

Endless number of writers Bob Dylan, Tom Robbins, Terence McKenna, so many. I could list hundreds and hundreds, Mark Twain, Carl Jung, obviously so many comedians. Almost all of our mystic poet types, Rimbaud, I'm sure Rumi, and all that. The mystic type is—the Seeker gets the one on one and he gets the noose, the whole. The Father/King really represents that middle, the society and the nation, and the whole. The Seeker gets to one on one and then the big, big mystic picture.

In women too—one of the things I do in the workshop, is we compare memes. You know this thing with memes, where you have a picture of somebody and one of their sayings. Where in the Father/Sage space you have Warren Buffet and Bill Gates, giving all this very practical, fatherly advice. On the Sage or Lover/Sage quadrant, the one below that one, you have someone like Anaïs Nin, who's giving all that, “throw your dreams into space like a kite and you do not know what it will bring back, a new life, a new friend, a new country, a new love.” You could have all those memes of hers that speak to this different energy. She says, “and the day came when the risks remain tight and the bud was more painful, than the risk it took to blossom.” That's pure Lover focused on the inner growth stuff. You get the archetypal difference here that these folks are speaking to different archetypal energies.

Dr. Dave: You've got so much energy for this work, that it's infectious. It actually gets me excited. (laughs) What is it that you love most about this work?

Bobroff: Well, I think it's liberating. I think it's empowering. I think you really do, David—this energy that you're feeling from me, I think it partly comes from my own fascination with the endless depth of it. I could study this the rest of my life and not be done but also people really get emotional with this work. They get freed.

One of my deepest, most satisfying examples, is that you very often get a woman who has really felt the pressure her whole life to pretend she finds her deepest satisfaction through mothering, usually a single mom. To have her be given this eternal story of Lover, that is finding satisfaction through one on one, through her friends and lovers, and not through mothering. That's an eternal story that's always been with us. It's a natural way the human energy flows.

Dr. Dave: Yeah.

Bobroff: For her to be given that story, it's like you can drop that whole burden that you've imagined is being placed on you and just be okay to be who you are.

Dr. Dave: So that's exciting for you to be the person who can facilitate that?

Bobroff: Yeah.

Dr. Dave: Yeah. Well, where can listeners find out more about you and archetypal nature? I know you mentioned you're working on a book, when do you think that will come out?

Bobroff: I don't know when that's going to come out just yet but it's definitely percolating and on my mind, and has been for 20 years.

Dr. Dave: I see that you are offering workshops.

Bobroff: I am. Yeah, we've got a webinar coming up, starting March 14th. Then there's in-person workshops. There will be more webinars after that. The website is archetypal nature, archetypalnature.com. We also have a Facebook page, facebook.com/archetypalnature. Again, their first inaugural webinar starts March 14th. They'll be more webinars and in-person workshops coming up down the road.

Dr. Dave: That's great. That's probably a good place for us to wrap it up for today, Gary. I'm going to keep my eye on your career and see how this stuff unfolds or maybe even explodes. (laughs).

Bobroff: Well, thank you.

Dr. Dave: I want to thank you for being my guest again, on Shrink Rap Radio.

Bobroff: Thank you, David. It's my pleasure to be talking to you. Thank you.