ACT TWO

WHO'S DRIVING AND WHO'S IN THE BACK SEAT?

"Your name shall no longer be Jacob, but Israel; for you have striven with God and with men and have prevailed."[1]

Wrestling with the gods appears to be quite a common phenomenon. Like Jacob, many of our most famous philosophers have wrestled with the gods and have much to show for it. How they defined the gods defined them, and therefore inexorably defined their philosophy. Perhaps this is inevitable, since the search for meaning and truth often means a confrontation with, and rejection or acceptance of some sort of god. Wrestling with the gods for me has been synonymous with my process of self-actualization, just as through the eons, I believe, the awakening of humanity has resulted from a similar process. This 'purposeful' path is inexorably tied to the evolution of our religion and spirituality.

Before I continue, I should explain that when I refer to the 'gods', it is a relative term. In some cases it refers to organized religion, in other cases to a spirituality or theism, and in other cases to a separate 'God', or 'gods'. Because the roots of the Western world's philosophy and theism lay in Christianity, this section will also in part describe the history and evolution of this religion.

Our philosophy of life affects everything about us. I recognize that my belief in 'god' and purpose flavours everything about me, just as for our great philosophers, the definition of their gods, or their belief or non-belief in them, inexorably affected almost everything about them, and every thought they had. Nietzsche (1886/2003) states rather emphatically that in "…the

---

[1] Scofield, Genesis, Chapter 32, verse 28, p. 59.

philosopher […] there is nothing whatever impersonal; and, above all, his morality bears decided and decisive testimony to *who he is*…" (p. 38). Hergenhahn (2001) states that William James once said "…the single most informative thing you could know about a person is his or her **Weltanschauung**, or worldview" (p. 575). From Pythagoras to Plato, to Kant, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, James and Jung, the gods have played a pivotal role in the development of their philosophy. They have either independently and/or by influencing each other, placed the gods front and centre in humanity's eons long endeavour to find purpose and meaning in its existence. Each has wrestled with their gods, albeit in different ways with different gods and with different results, and it is the tension from this wrestling I believe, that has resulted in the greatest philosophical achievements of humankind. It is also these self-determined philosophers who laid the foundation for the 20th Century's self-actualization philosophy, its postmodern individualism and relativity, the relativity of the gods, religions and spirituality, and the eventual metamorphosis into new-age psychologies, philosophies, spiritualities, the 'super-hero', and the amazing creativity and infinite potential that has resulted.

As a result of wrestling with our gods through the last 2500 years, give or take, I believe we have stepped ever closer to a conscious awakening of the 'god' within. It has been the beginning, I believe, of humanity's eternal path toward the actualization of its limitless potential. From Judaism, Zoroastrianism, and Egyptian, Greek and Roman polytheism, to European orthodox Christian monotheism, to the Protestant Reformation and to the 20th century's new age postmodern philosophy and spirituality, we have stepped ever closer to what may well be an infinite possibility – the uniquely creative expression of a purposeful, creative force within each and every human being.

As I have stated previously, humanity has been wrestling with its gods for quite some time. There is much debate over who or which came first, but I have little doubt that it is the relationship with our gods that has defined who we are. It has been both a creative and a destructive relationship. We have destroyed many and much in the name of our gods, and yet,

through the eons, it is the creative opposition with our gods that has resulted in our greatest achievements. Carl Rapp (2003) addresses Jeffrey Hart's contention that the "Western tradition is essentially dialectical" (p. 114) and in particular that it is a "…volatile mixture of classical Greek elements (from which we get our science and philosophy) and Judeo-Christian elements (from which we get our moral outlook and religion)" (p. 115). There is much evidence that Judeo-Christian ethics were significantly influenced by the ethics of Aristotle and Plato. However, according to Rapp, Hart explains that "…it is the ongoing tension between Athens and Jerusalem "that is distinctive in Western Civilization, and has created its restlessness as well as energized its greatest achievements, both material and spiritual" (xi)." (p. 115).

We see the results of this tension in the achievements of all of our great philosophers. Although I will touch on the relationship between many of our philosophers and their gods, I will first focus my attention on Frederick Nietzsche, who in my mind was the greatest of those who 'wrestles with God'. Nietzsche and his work is the epitomized example of the tension between Athens and Jerusalem. It is through his work that we more clearly see the origin of Christianity in the sixth century BC. It is also primarily his work, I believe, that has enabled us to take a major leap toward the actualization of humanity.

"Behold, the man has become like one of Us,

knowing good and evil…"[2]

In Nietzsche, there existed a phenomenal opposition and restlessness that through him eventually resulted in the beginnings of a potentially extraordinary transformation of humanity.

---

[2] Scofield, Genesis, Chapter 3, verse 22, p. 9.

With Kant, we transcended nature, paternalistic governments, the authority of old books, and the priest craft of religious authorities who usurp the role of individual conscience (Wood, 2001, p. xvii), but with Nietzsche, however, we transcend God himself, by becoming gods in our own right.

As I mentioned previously, Nietzsche desperately implored us to free ourselves from Christianity, for holding onto it would kill us, just as certainly as we had killed the Christian God. Therefore, in the voice of Zarathustra, a character most carefully, cleverly and perhaps diabolically chosen, Nietzsche takes us back across the eons to a time beyond good and evil, beyond the road to Damascus, before Christianity and Plato, where he skillfully illegitimates the foundations of Christianity and the Platonic moral order.

If you asked any good Christian about the beginnings of the battle between of good and evil, they would likely point you to their holy book's Genesis and its Garden of Eden. It was in this garden, just over 6,000 years ago where humankind chose the tree of the knowledge of good and evil as its path, and ate of its famous apple. However, Nietzsche pulls the rug out from under this foundational biblical scene by pointing to Zarathustra (aka Zoroaster), and the time before the binding of the Olympian God Dionysus, as the source of the knowledge of good and evil. In Nietzsche, the roots of Christianity become Zoroastrian and Persian, and the Judaic source of the biblical text, the Old Testament, and its literal interpretation become suspect.

With Zarathustra, Nietzsche points us directly toward the sixth century BCE. Although it could be argued that the Israelites came up with a pretty solid definition of good and evil when Moses proclaimed the Ten Commandments, the rest of Western humanity didn't really start buying into this until the sixth century BCE. In this century, the Achaemenid, Persian, or Medo-Persian Empire was born. It is in and around this empire that we find an interesting conglomeration of Orphism, Judaism, and Zoroastrianism.

Mahoney (1991) says that this period was "…a time of "turnings," so to speak; an era of unprecedented reflective and spiritual activity…" (p. 29). Mahoney says that in a period of less

than two centuries, around the sixth century B.C., "…humans in Europe and Asia independently founded the first world religions, Buddhism and Zoroastrianism, and thus laid the groundwork for Islam, Christianity, and other religions that would follow" (p. 29). Pivato (2004) reiterates that Zoroastrianism is believed to have originated in the 6th century BCE and it is thought to have "…influenced many of the major world religions…" (p. 24). As a former Christian, I struggled with these claims for quite some time (hence the resulting weight of this section of my book). Mahoney's statement literally screamed at me, not for what it says, but for what it doesn't say. Where are Abraham and Judaism in the founding of Christianity? Who is Zoroaster and why have so few people ever heard of him?

Lampert (1986) explains in his introduction why Nietzsche chose Zarathustra "…as his mouthpiece" (p. 2). Lampert tells us that Zarathustra was an ancient Persian prophet and that Nietzsche explains in *Ecce Homo* that:

> …Zarathustra/Zoroaster's uniqueness lies in his being the first thinker to see morality, the battle of good and evil, as the very wheel in the machinery of things (*EH,* "Destiny," 3). He is the first prophet to proclaim that a happy immortality is to be gained by moral behavior, by enlisting on the side of the good cosmic forces, which are pitted against evil cosmic forces in the great drama that is the meaning of history. He is the author of the grave view of personal responsibility, according to which one will be held accountable for all one's deeds on a coming Day of Judgment, when those deeds will be weighed, and eternal bliss or eternal woe meted out to their doer. (pp. 2-3)

Lampert says, and I would most certainly agree, that this is in contrast to the customary view that these 'Christian like' beliefs "…originated with the prophets of the Old Testament" (p. 3). According to Lampert, Nietzsche holds that the foundational beliefs of Christianity "…originated with Zarathustra/Zoroaster; they are "his work," work that was taken over as their

own by the Hebrew prophets, servants of a jealous God, during their Babylonian captivity, just as it was taken over by Greek philosophers" (p. 3).

The Israelites were taken into captivity by the Assyrians in the eighth century BCE, never to return to their homeland. Just as there was a cross fertilization of religious beliefs between the Egyptians and their Israeli slaves in the four hundred years before Moses, there must have been some cross fertilization of religious beliefs between the Assyrians and the Israelites. Then, two hundred or so years later Judea was conquered and the Jews (a people separate from Israel) were taken into captivity by the Babylonians, just before its conquest by the Persian Empire in 588 BCE (Henrikson, 1983, p. 590-581 BC). The Jews were later released by the Persian King Cyrus in 539 BCE (Henrikson, p. 540-531 BC), in the midst of significant Zoroastrian influence. According to the Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia, Zoroastrian priests, in fact "…had great influence on the government in the first period of Zoroastrianism, that under the Achaemenids, when it was for a time the state religion". Therefore, I would agree that Zorastrianism and Judaism likely influenced each other quite significantly. Around 520 BCE, for instance, according to the Bible, the prophet Belteshazzar (formerly named Daniel), and in my mind a possible Magi of a Zoroastrian sort, after surviving a night in the lion's den, supposedly won Darius, the reigning King of the Persian Empire, over to the God of Israel (Scofield, Daniel, Chapter 25, verses 25-28, pp. 1199-1200). Although this is perhaps a slight exaggeration, Darius was known for his tolerance to other religions, and by his order, the rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem was accomplished.

Lampert says about Nietzsche that regardless of the "…historic primacy of the ancient Zarathustra […], *Zarathustra* focuses on the Platonic Socrates and on Christianity as the sources of the teaching through which the moral interpretation of temporal phenomena gained sway in the West…" (p. 3). Nietzsche, believing that a grave error had occurred when the knowledge of good and evil was foist upon us, has Zarathustra/Zoroaster, being also a practitioner of

"…honesty, or will to truth…" return to correct his error, and "…bring a different teaching, one that is true to earthly life…" (p. 3).

Although Nietzsche most cleverly reincarnates Zarathustra to correct what he considered to be a rather large error forming the foundation of Christianity and Platonic philosophy, I still needed to understand how Zoroaster's influence on Christianity and Platonic philosophy became as significant as Nietzsche implied. I found this influence through Pythagoras.

"Largely through his influence on Plato", says Hergenhahn, "**Pythagoras** (ca. 580-500 B.C.) has had a significant influence on Western thought" (p. 28). Pivato states that Pythagoras was "…believed to be instructed by Zoroaster" (p. 24), and Pythagoras was the father of Pythagoreanism, an interesting combination of rationalism and Zoroastrian like Orphism. Pythagoras believed that sensory experience could not provide knowledge, and that "…such experience interferes with the attainment of knowledge and should be avoided. This viewpoint grew into outright contempt for sensory experiences and for bodily pleasures, and the Pythagoreans launched a crusade against vice, lawlessness, and bodily excess of any type" (Hergenhahn, p. 29). Here we have something akin to Christianity's sin before the birth of Christ, in a non-Jewish philosopher who was significantly influenced by a Persian prophet. Hergenhahn says the "…belief that experiences of the flesh are inferior to those of the mind—a belief that plays such an important role in Plato's theory and is even more important in early Christian theology—can be traced directly to the Pythagoreans" and that Plato eventually became a member of the Pythagorean organization and based his Academy on its concepts (p. 29).

It is in the Pythagoreans where we see the binding of the Olympian God Dionysus, an issue of fundamental importance to Nietzsche. In the early Greece of Pythagoras, according to Hergenhahn, we see two conflicting religions. The primary religion was the Olympian, which depicted many gods who "…. typically showed little concern with the anxieties of ordinary humans. Instead, they tended to be irascible, amoral, and little concerned with the immortality of

humans. […] The Olympian gods also personified orderliness and rationality and valued intelligence" (p. 25). A major alternative to this Olympian religion, says Hergenhahn, was the Dionysiac-Orphic religion, which was:

> …based on the legend of Dionysus […] and his disciple Orpheus. Central to Dionysiac-Orphic religion was the belief in **transmigration of the soul**. […] The rites that were practiced in hopes of freeing the soul from its "prison" (the body) included fasting, special diets, dramatic ceremonies, and various taboos. (p. 25)

According to Hergenhahn, a "…few highly influential philosophers […] embraced the mysticism of Dionysiac-Orphic religion; Pythagoras and Plato are two prominent examples" (p. 25). Through them, this Orphic ideal, says Hergenhahn, later "…gained enormous popularity and indeed was an integral part of our Judeo-Christian heritage" (p. 25), and also that "…through Platonic philosophy elements of the Dionysiac-Orphic religion became part of the heritage of Western civilization" (p. 30).

So, in the 6th Century BCE, the Greek philosopher Pythagoras wandered in and about this mixture of Zoroastrianism, Orphism and perhaps a bit of Judaism, and he "…formed an aristocratic brotherhood with a doctrine of mystical salvation…" (Henrikson, p. 520-511 BC). This brotherhood was called Pythagoreanism. With the knowledge of good and evil, and the transmigration of souls firmly grasped, the mathematical, irrational rationalist paved the way for the Christian future, and he became a founder of Greek philosophy.

In Nietzsche's mind, I believe, this Dionysus/Pythagorean/Orphic/Zoroastrian combination resulted in the symbolic caging of Dionysus, and humanity has been suffocating under its moral precepts ever since. In Pythagorean Orphism we find a direct connection between Nietzsche's Dionysian man and Zarathustra. It was the Zoroastrian influence on Orphism and the Pythagoreans that symbolically bound Dionysus. Before the Zoroastrian and Orphic

influence, Dionysus was a much happier God. He was the life of the party – a drunkard and a dancer – a musician and a lover. He represented the unbound wildness and creativity of human nature. However, Zoroastrianism had bound his hands with Pythagorean rationalism and Orphic-Platonic virtue, and later, Zoroastrian influenced Judaism, through Christianity, had bound his feet with guilt and institutionalized morality.

The myth of the Orphic religion is really quite fascinating, and in it we see the playing out of what would become Nietzsche's Apollonian and Dionysian opposition, and the eventual dominance of Apollonian influence. Orpheus, in some myths the son of Apollo, was a devoted disciple of Dionysus. Like Dionysus, Orpheus was once a happy man. He loved, and laughed and played wonderful music. In fact, he was the most famous poet and musician who ever lived (Graves, 2003, p. 112). According to the myth, he became a very unhappy man when his wife Eurydice died. After an attempted and failed 'transmigration', in his anguish, according to Graves, Orpheus not only neglected to honour Dionysus, but every morning Orpheus "…would rise to greet the dawn on the summit of Mount Pangaeum, preaching that Helius, whom he named Apollo, was the greatest of all gods" (p. 112). After the death of his wife, Orpheus turned from his god Dionysus and denied women. Most understandably, since we know that all gods are jealous gods, "…Dionysus set the Maenads upon him […]. Waiting until their husbands had entered Apollo's temple, where Orpheus served as priest, they seized the weapons stacked outside, burst in, murdered their husbands, and tore Orpheus limb from limb" (Graves, p. 112).

It was not only important to Nietzsche that we question the foundations of our western rationalism and religion, but it was also critical that he point us toward our salvation. Nietzsche saw this salvation in Dionysus. To revive a future humanity, and to save it from the abyss created by the explosive crash between 19th Century materialistic philosophy and its Christian religion, Nietzsche introduces us to Dionysus, from whom he derived his 'higher man'.

With his 'beyond good and evil' Nietzsche not only intended to take us to the future, to a time beyond Christianity, but he also intended to take us to the past, to a time beyond the birth of our concept of good and evil, to this fascinating sixth century BC.

Nietzsche was born into a Lutheran family, like most Germans at that time, and both his grandfathers were ministers. However, he turned away from Christianity as a young adult and he most certainly came to despise the faith of his forefathers. He blames Christianity for making the human being a 'sickly beast', "…the tamed human being whom the priest has 'improved'" (Nietzsche, in Hollingdale, 1977, pp. 119-120). The Church, in Nietzsche's mind, "…*corrupted* the human being, it weakened him…", while claiming to improve him (p. 120). Nietzsche concluded that the "…Christian resolution to find the world ugly and bad, has made the world ugly and bad" (1882/1973, p. 172).

The definitions of this Christianity's right and wrong, or good and evil, were carved in stone, and membership required a commitment to this monotheistic template of behaviour. For Nietzsche, self-actualization would not have been possible in the shadows of a fundamentalist Christian God. Friedrich Nietzsche believed that with monotheism and its one Christian God as the ultimate ideal, man was threatened by a premature state of inertia (1882/1973, p. 179).

Nietzsche, therefore, I believe, likely pointed us to the Greeks for an additional reason. It was in and around the 6th Century BCE when, according to some, the Greeks started to think much too heavily, and launched an unprecedented advance in the culture and knowledge of western civilization. For Nietzsche (1882/1973), it was polytheism that permitted this. "It was in the marvelous art and capacity for creating Gods—in polytheism—…" (p. 179) that the individual was able to express himself as he desired. He could choose his own ideal, for he had countless gods to choose from. "In polytheism man's free-thinking and many-sided thinking had a prototype set up: the power to create for himself new and individual eyes, always newer and more individualized" (p. 180). Polytheism enabled and perhaps fostered the individualism and massive creativity that occurred during its reign. Nietzsche saw polytheism as

complementary to his superman and self-actualization. A god for everyone meant everyone could be whoever and whatever they wanted to be. Nietzsche took this idea one step further by asserting that we could become gods in our own right. Now that we had killed our God, Nietzsche posits, "Shall we not ourselves have to become Gods, merely to seem worthy of it?" (1882/1973, p. 168).

Nietzsche's tacit support for polytheism, and his strong belief in individual truth, laid the seeds I believe, and most paradoxically, for the potential revival of Christianity in the postmodern age. An individual god within self and expressed through self is a god that is as proliferate and diverse as humanity itself.

For Kant, in the century before Nietzsche, the Christian God still existed. He believed, however, that we should develop our own understanding of God instead of relying on that of religious institutions. Without the directives of religious authorities, his categorical imperative was a necessary guiding principle that rational human beings could use on their own to decide between right and wrong action. It was also a necessary guiding principle for one who still believed in his God. "Morality demands the existence of God. So Kant's God had a purely moral role, functioning as the provider of the *summum bonum,* the highest good, which is the final goal of morality" (Appelbaum & Thompson, 2002, p. 168).

In contrast to Kant, without God, Nietzsche found it necessary to empower his 'higher man' with the imperative to create his own values. Although within the context of any culture, one's values will always need to be somewhat congruent with those of the culture in which they choose to live, Nietzsche endowed humanity with more freedom than Kant. The definition of the highest good was open for debate for Nietzsche, and it was not a given as it was for Kant.

Much like William James, in Kant we also see the need to reconcile between his acquired knowledge and that of his belief in God – "I have therefore found it necessary to deny knowledge, in order to make room for faith" (Appelbaum & Thompson, p. 168). More specifically, for Kant "…religion does not depend on external evidence or metaphysics, but is

the expression of a moral seriousness and the goal of human life" (p. 168). Religion (of the non-authoritarian sort I would think), in effect, is given a free pass by Kant because of its critical role in expressing the highest good, which in Kant's mind is the goal of human life.

Unlike Nietzsche, Kierkegaard believed in God, but like Nietzsche he "…rejected what was conventionally accepted, such as the organized church and science" (Hergenhahn, p. 197), and both "…preached reliance on direct, personal experience" (p. 197). Kierkegaard was "…an outspoken critic of the established church for its worldliness and its insistence on the acceptance of prescribed dogma" (Hergenhahn, p. 191), and he believed that "…the most meaningful relationship with God is a purely personal one that is arrived at through an individual's free choice, not one whose nature and content are dictated by the church" (p. 191). Entering a personal relationship with God is Kierkegaard's third and final step toward personal freedom, and self-awareness was a necessary pre-condition for developing and determining the nature, or depth of such a relationship (p. 192). In Kierkegaard we therefore see the beginnings of an internal link between self-development and one's God and the radical idea that God may not be the same for everyone. This father of existentialism and its atheistic tendencies was a progenitor for what I believe will be the spiritual renewal of western civilization after flirting with the death of its Christian God. Building one's belief system based on direct, personal experience, and the sense of wonder and awe and connection this creates, and forming a personal relationship with 'god' inevitably turns the search for meaning inward. The discovery of the innate power within, igniting this power, and the discovery and acknowledgement of the 'higher self', does not deny god, it turns faith to awe and unshakable belief.

William James was one of the first major transcendental philosophers. According to R. Wozniak (1995) James embraced a transcendentalist, intuitive psychology, which focused on the "...realization of higher consciousness within the individual personality" (p. 1). Roger Walsh, in Corsini and Wedding (2008) says James "…suggested that "there is a continuum of cosmic consciousness against which our individuality builds but accidental forces and into which our

several minds plunge as into a mother sea."" (p. 450). DeCicco & Stroink (2007) say William James "...described a spiritual self in which the boundary between the self and the environment vanishes" (p. 85).

Paul Cunningham (2007) refers to William James as a transpersonal scholar (p. 46). James felt that "…we have no philosophic excuse for calling the unseen or mystical world unreal. . . . God is real since he produces effects" (p. 46). According to James, "Certain metaphysical questions lay beyond the reach of science" (Hergenhahn, p. 299). Bankart (1997) says that James believed we were "…at best only tangentially aware of and part of the wider realities of life" (p. 219). James believed that "Other realms of human experience at different levels of the person also existed simultaneously alongside waking consciousness" (Wozniak, p. 3). For James the significance of religion lies with the individual, and the subconscious "...was the doorway through which the ultimately transforming experiences that we call mystical appear to come – transient, passive, states from which the intellect itself may be derived" (Wozniak, p. 4). At the end of his life he "…enjoined psychologists to keep an open mind and to study the fall of the threshold of consciousness. In the subliminal extension of the horizons of awareness, we find alterations that point to the very core of life and identity" (Wozniak, p. 5).

William James's pragmatism embraced both a subjective and an objective psychology. William James was quite impressed with materialistic philosophy and also with Darwin's theory of evolution and the science of his day, and it likely his concurrence with materialistic philosophy that initiated a crisis of faith and major depression for him. It was the resolution of this crisis of faith, I believe, that led to the development of pragmatism. In his introduction to James' *Pragmatism and the Meaning of Truth* (1978), Ayer claims that pragmatism alone "...can enable men to satisfy their religious and moral yearnings, without offending the canons of their reason, and this may well have been James's[his] principle motive for subscribing to it" (p. viii).

At the heart of pragmatism is William James's belief that "...both a scientific *and* a philosophical approach must be used in the study of human behaviour and thought"

(Hergenhahn, 2001, p. 299). Bankart (1997) says that "James work was full of recognition of the essentially creative, spiritual nature of humankind. William James found it difficult to be happy in a world without meaning, and he overcame the rather depressing materialistic philosophies of his age by deciding to believe in free will and therefore believe in his "...individual reality and creative power" (Hergenhahn, 2001, p. 299). It was a pragmatic, purposeful, empowering and humanistic decision. Bankart (1997) states "...that, for James, the exercise of will is a powerful moral force. For him there was no "debate" about free will; its existence was not just a "fact" but a human imperative" (p. 217). Free will, and the acts to which it leads, is the bridge that connects our internal, subjective inner space to the external, material universe. Consciousness and/or our cognitive capacity enables us to overcome our 'nature', our 'construction', our 'ego' and/or our destiny.

Like James, Carl Jung was also a transpersonal scholar, however, Jung did not need to believe in God; he was absolutely certain of God's existence (Nagy, 1991, p. 2). Jung (1958) believed that by fulfilling "…the demands of rigorous self-examination and self-knowledge..." one gains a psychological advantage by taking "... the first step towards the foundations of consciousness – that is, towards the unconscious, the only accessible source of religious experience" (pp. 89-90). Although Jung does not consider the unconscious identical with God, or that it is set up in his place, he considers it "…the medium from which the religious experience seems to flow" (pp. 89-90). The source or cause of such religious experiences, for Jung, however, "…lies beyond the range of human knowledge. Knowledge of God is a transcendental problem" (pp. 89-90).

The religious person, according to Jung, "…has a clear idea of the way his subjective existence is grounded in his relation to "God"." (1958, p. 90). Jung then clarifies that with "God" in this context "…we are dealing with anthropomorphic ideas whose dynamism and symbolism are filtered through the medium of the unconscious psyche" (p. 90) Jung has the pragmatic belief that since this experience has an anthropomorphic basis, anyone "…can at least

draw near the source of such experiences, no matter whether he believes in God or not" (90). However, he is emphatic that anyone who has had such an experience "…is *seized* by it and therefore not in a position to indulge in fruitless metaphysical or epistemological speculations. Absolute certainty brings its own evidence and has no need of anthropomorphic proofs" (Jung, 1958, pp. 90-91). This is most certainly where Jung acquired his own certainty about god's existence.

There are striking parallels between Jung and Nietzsche. In both we have something akin to a drive or life force; 'will to power' for Nietzsche, and the 'energy of the processes of life' for Jung. In both we see the idea that we need to ignite all aspects of our personalities, enabling us to 'fire on all cylinders' to attain our highest potential; our highest self for Jung, the higher man for Nietzsche. We also see the possible seeds of Jung's archetypes and introvert-extravert, anima-animus theory of personality in Nietzsche's Apollonian and Dionysian duality.

Another intriguing parallel to Nietzsche and his Zarathustra, is Jung's relationship with Philemon, a "…fantasy image of an old man […] with whom he had long conversations" (Jung, 1979, pp. 67-68). The story of Philemon, according to the Greek myths, is quite similar to the story of Noah. According to the myth (Oxford English Reference Dictionary) Philemon and his wife were considered worthy by Zeus and Hermes, and were therefore protected by these gods from a great flood. I can't help but assume that Jung intended this allusion to Philemon, as did Nietzsche with his allusion to Zarathustra, as a challenge to the literal interpretation of the Bible and to discredit the Hebrew source of this foundational biblical story.

It is all the more intriguing to realize that Jung and Nietzsche each developed their philosophies from completely opposite ideological foundations. God is front in centre in Jung's philosophy and God is dead in Nietzsche's. Nietzsche was considered an atheist and a father of existentialism, while Jung remained a firm believer in god to his death. Each of their beliefs significantly impacted their philosophies, and yet these philosophies are strikingly similar. In

fact, if we simply tweaked Nietzsche's 'self as god' to 'god in self', Jungian and Nietzschean philosophies become relatively compatible.

While James and Jung contemplated the transcendent, Protestant religions continued to fracture exponentially. Christian religions became as numerous as the interpretations of the verses of its holy book. With this fracturing, in addition to scientific rationalism, there arose a constant challenge to the orthodox Christian faith and the authority of its God. Although, like Nietzsche, many point to the emergence of scientific rationalism in the 19th century as the end of orthodox Christianity, I believe the beginning of the end occurred with Martin Luther's Protestant Reformation. Luther and others of his day wrested religious authority from the Catholic Church—and survived— and the authority of the Church was mortally compromised. Eventually, as Nietzsche forewarned, many in the Western world began to question the validity of Christianity itself.

With their psychology, philosophy and spirituality, William James and Carl Jung laid the groundwork for a new-age psychology and spirituality. For many in the mid-20th Century, orthodox Christianity was quickly becoming an untenable faith. As Nietzsche had predicted, we had murdered our god with scientific materialism and rationalism. This left many searching for a meaning orthodox Christianity could no longer provide. Many found meaning in humanistic existentialism and began turning inward in search of authority. In this inward search, many found strength and vitality in 'self' without God, as in Nietzsche's 'higher man'. Many others however, discovered something more profound than 'self' within, and the new-age subjective, relative spirituality was born, and we begin to see the seeds of a Western spirituality that exists outside of Christianity sprout from the philosophy of Frederick Nietzsche, William James, and Carl Jung. In the meantime, or perhaps as a result, the postmodern age had arrived.