

William Parker lecture at Visual Studies Workshop, April 1971 reel 4

Parker comments made during the reading of texts are set in ().

Additional information set in { }.

Transcribed by Bob Martin

An archetype is not an image, it is simply a structural possibility in the *psychoid* realm of the unconscious...if we put a finer distinction of that term, it is not just individuated but can also be expressed in the fabric of humankind. "The archetype is quiescent: a structural factor in the psychoid realm of the collective unconscious." And remember...I said the collective unconscious is often referred to in Jungian psychology as that substrata of the mind that Freud called the unconscious. Jung uses the term personal unconscious for Freud's unconscious. Then he says there is a deeper substratum called the collective unconscious. He calls it this, interesting enough, he says this is really the objective psyche. It is objective: our ego consciousness is highly subjective. We have these old saws about, are you being subjective? Or have you considered this under objective controls? So the words get very confusing: objective normally means externalized, doesn't it? Don't we normally think of it that way? For Jung the psychoid realm is external in the sense that it is not ever to be assimilated to the ego. And it also manifests itself in the external world, so it is external.

Student: Synchronicity goes as far as to call it absolute reality.

Absolutely. {Laughs} Absolute reality, absolutely...In other words, absolute reality we are left a little bit hanging in mid-air: absolute reality, whoopee: because what is that? The idea is that it would imply a unitary reality in which there are no differentiations, something that is total. We can say but I don't know that we'll ever get it. People think they've reached it, it's real, I'm in it, something of that nature. {Back to Jacobi's definition of archetypes} "It is an invisible nuclear element and it is a potential carrier of meaning." See that? A carrier, not an image yet. It is a potential carrier of meaning, it is also a nuclear element, meaning that it is like an atom with its own energy system. Waiting for emergence. It is there, but it has no structure, it has no form, it has no particular, I mean when I say structure it is a structural factor, or a potential for structure. But it does not in itself have any kind of figurative identity. She says that is where it is: it is somewhere in this level where energy is. Explore that but I still think you'll still end up finding it an unanswerable question on every frontier of human awareness and knowledge. This is where we can start really dealing with the reality of the archetype, she says, "Through a suitable constellation." Now that is interesting, we wonder what that suitable constellation is that means through a suitable series of events, or suitable affect, "Which may be conditioned by individual or collective factors, it receives additional energy." Now this is difficult because she is saying that here is an archetype: let's fragment it in our diagram, it is only a potential for becoming, say, the letter A. So at this point it is just a nuclear element that has the capacity for becoming subject to receiving content and also to become structural as a formal unit. Now this obviously takes place somewhere in the marriage between conscious and unconscious activity. What could be a suitable

constellation? And why does she say on individual or collective levels? Jung's concept of the objective psyche or the objective mind, is first posited in the fabric of the individual. That is everyone has their own collective unconscious. That is where you have a range or field of psychic energy that is not subject to your individuality of ego-centered consciousness. It is a part of the whole fabric of your instinct system and part of a fundamental, Jung once used the parallel to a tree, as in the rhizome tissue of the tree's roots...that something in the psyche interrelates you to energy that is not only expressing something in another form externally, in other species, genus, or type, but it is also expressing itself in terms of motivating your particular conscious development. But on the other hand he also says what is unique about this concept of the collective unconscious is as though it spreads, and so the human being, type, species: basically humans have a shared collective unconscious as well as a shared collective consciousness. It would be hard to imagine institutional development without at least postulating the theory that we do share certain ideas. There may be controls, commandments, morays, laws, who knows, but the point is there are shared affinities. And the concept of correspondences can be simplified down to the level of the idea of units that consist of further units. There are sympathies between particular emotions or behavioral forms and so on. So Jung says...in a culture there are certain shared ego identities. There are also shared... social determinism was mentioned yesterday...there are certain archetypal levels that express themselves in a culture, all people experience them... One cannot explain the advent of a system such as the National Socialist Party in Germany, the emergence of an individual who speaks to a collective group with a high level of ego-conscious control and manages to articulate forces that literally swept a nation to disaster as well as some very unusual...orientations. The concept of the Buchenwald is not a minor concept in terms of just the ill-behavior of mankind: this is psychotic or even *psychoid* behavior...This level has the capacity of emanating energy that is extremely constructive or destructive.

Student: In the case of Germany then, if you could give an example of an archetype that was expressing itself there.

Okay. This one might be exhausted obviously, but I'll give you a few links that might be helpful and you might enjoy reading...Martin Luther actually used the term, the master race. Hitler was clever in the sense of being able to select fragments from the literature of the German nation as well as fragments that were expressed in what we might call the slag-heap of religious experience that was still alive. Extraneous knowledge in the collective consciousness of Germany was *Votonism*, a very bloodthirsty, sacrificial, aggressive...Look at the background; migrational peoples, step into the territory, people in their castles and you just have no sympathy, very aggressive, peripatetic highly linear energy expressed. Luther was having a terrible problem with the idea of the Reformation. He was a very wise man but also had a few problems himself as we know. He chose Germany as the nation that might be able to become the vanguard for the establishment of Protestantism...And as a result he wrote a series of documents and testimonies to the fact that constantly cultivates the German ego that, 'You are the master race, you are the pure strain.' All of the terms that we associate with genetic identity and purity are directly establish-able from Luther, not Hitler's unique

imagination. He really didn't know what he was reading, he read a great deal of Luther, but can you imagine that you are reading something and you have your own little impulse, yeah that is neat, I'll use that. It may be taken totally out of context. A parallel illustration... in Germany...there is a well documented study of Nietzsche... in his final dissolution...being led down the steps at gatherings when his sister wished to present him...this is my great brother. But of course Nietzsche by that time was so internalized there was no consciousness of people around... highly introspective... and maybe like Melville said, man's insanity is heaven's sense, well Nietzsche was simply gone, consciously, insane. And his sister used to take great pride, there are innumerable documentations of the pride in which she took in presenting this shell to people. Many of you may also know that Nietzsche's sister was extremely in concert with certain developments in the National Socialist Party idea, and was also interested in certain impulses that were developing in Germany that would apply to the selection of a dictator, to the cultivation of a leader... Taking this back... Luther's writings had been posited on a fabric of a very sensation-oriented religious structure, Votonism. The concept of war was not considered to be a special, in a time of necessity, it was innate. Rather than peace, war was the central theme of Votonism. And bloodletting. Hitler was basically a kind of fabric, having little conscious control. It is like a psychic fabric in which he could assimilate threads of information into the warp and woof of his particular mind without necessarily subjecting to an ego center. He was an extremely disoriented human being.

Student: Was he one of those people you could consider on your compass chart as being feeling-oriented?

No, I would say he was sensation-oriented. And as a result, what we find is horrifying about the, and we are finding it even in our own culture because we are really going through a crisis on the same level. I guess this gets political and personal, but boy we are. And things that have happened before will look like tea parties compared to what we will do. That is a terrible prophecy. It could be I should say...watch out...But at any rate, let me give you one other illustration and I mentioned this yesterday...but the swastika is not unique, as many of you know, to Germany. It appears even in Paleolithic rock carvings: Paleolithic, not Neolithic, so we are talking, my friends, about a motif that goes back 30 to 80 thousand BC, we don't have evidence from 80 thousand, but we say the passage of the motif had origins earlier. And the mandala, for example...same thing, very ancient motifs...we can say comparatively they appear in other cultures, there are neolithic tribes today we can make comparative appraisals. This is a perfect example of an ambivalent semiotic motif or sign system. It has the capacity to become plus or minus. It appears among Navajo Indian tribes as an image of solar energy. It also appeared in certain Egyptian iconographic structures. It was more compositional, not actually the motif itself, as a symbol of interpenetration of various sectors: celestial, terrestrial, and the two banks of the Nile in almost this cubic structure. You have the two banks of the Nile with the heavens above as a canopy and the Nile below is the fluid aspect of the world. It was at one time called a {phonetic: ganadian} It is an example not only of solar energy, the rays of the sun, but also wind energy, the pneuma energy, the {G} was associated with the fertility motif that supposedly out of these various

extensions spilled energy, whether that was sunlight or mana or food...The preponderance of identification with this motif has been highly positive. An image associated with Christian deities, benevolence, refreshment, the *refrigerium* concept, like refrigerator, in early Christian Art, open the ice box, grab a can of beer and an apple, or whatever it is, the idea of the ...brotherhood is all a clear association of that. It is also a motif that has expressed light as opposed to darkness. However why does this then become selected? If you read Shirer's book, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, there is a passage on how Hitler actually selected this motif as the standard for flags, arm bands, uniforms and so on. This existed in Votonism as a motif of negative proportions but Hitler was not conscious of this. He was shown innumerable badge motifs, patches, logos...and that is interesting in itself, what does logo mean, it means word or letter. And basically the idea is this thing is supposed to carry some particular meaning that people are to identify with this motif. They were passed in front of him and he said, that's it, that is not quite how... but essentially...read it and you will see. It was a totally automatic and natural selection. Not necessarily analyzed or considered... And this became a carrier of certain latent *extranated* emotional factors left over from these various fragments that were not positive as images within the collective German psyche, but at least positive as potentials for behavior that would be reflective of earlier levels of behavior. And were also suggestive in the literary traditions, political traditions, and so on. So as a result, when Hitler takes, marry those two ideas: you are the master race, and if we think of a content like that being poured upon a motif that has had an expression as a very powerful identity associated with the holy, the numinous, the deity, you have got the marriage of two very powerful ideas...And when you start calling another person a 'master,' you may be saying they are a good craftsman, right, and they can say thank you. Or you can say you are a master and you say you are the best in your field. But we know the insidious danger when a person assumes that to be their total identity, and thus ego inflation occurs and we have the person behaving as if they were a god emanating some kind of energy that will be beneficial to this collective group, and as a result it becomes negative as such rather than positive. That would be a specific example of how a series of latent or expressed images based upon archetypal energy systems marry to certain motifs. Does that do it?

Student: Yes, that does. Could you explain more, the potential of the archetype is positive or negative. We as human beings, how can we in some way stack the deck so that it is more positive?

Well this would be an example of, and again it applies on a number of levels: I guess photon, neutron, positive negative...

Student: We as human beings, how can we in some way stack the deck so that it is more positive?

We can only do it by knowing what the negative is. Jung— I'll quote— I am keeping it very much within the system— I have personal views that are totally anti-Jungian views but I'm not dealing with that here.

Student: So when you feel strong, don't stomp all over France or something like that?

Well no. Jung says the greatest thing we must have, and notice this metaphor he uses, it is pretty bad and people say ugh: he says man's greatest quest in the twentieth century is to have an imagination in evil. To *have* an imagination in evil. He says as long as we assume that evil is in the other, now this sounds like a sermon, watch out for the evil, as long as the evil is in the other then we have no access to understanding it. That we are in potentia capable of expressing plus/minus affects. And you could only enter into a proper dialogue with other human beings if you have a knowledge of your capacities, for whatever the polarity is. And in essence he says we have this marvelous way, and he wrote this address in a little book called *The Undiscovered Self*, and he wrote it to the Christian community as a slap in the face. He said look you people you have been creating problems for us for so long, get off of it...He has a little phrase, if you think you can trace evil back to some euphemistic slip up, Eve giving Adam the apple, and curing all your ills, or if you think you can define schizophrenia as a singular phenomenon within an individual when you have the Berlin Wall that is the living material manifestation of schizophrenia, or if you can assign the idea of destructive energy to the level of the Devil, or to the scapegoat, or to there but the grace of god go I, etc., etc., then you are just making a profound error. Evil is not in the other, it is not a separate system, it is within the honesty and integrity of a psychological identity. And Jung would say why do we cast off our negative capacities? They are often the point where the positive capacities come from. Remember that concept from yesterday, the shadow side? The shadow aspect as well as the unrealized dimension of our mind is the point from which the greatest energies emanate.

Student: Have you read what Brown says about Luther?

Yes, I have. Absolutely.

Student: Did Freud use the sense of archetype in both the limited sense as within one culture and in the unlimited sense of a transcultural idea?

He did indeed. But he doesn't necessarily use the word archetype. Freud is the originator. In volume ten of his collected works, he is the originator of the whole concept of the possibility of a collective unconscious and the possibility of an aspect or realm of the psyche that is prior to unconscious, super-ego, id, etc...The great defection occurred when Jung read this commentary by Freud. Freud never explored it and absolutely later denied it, but it was written there. You can almost say that the whole foundation for Jung did originate with Freud's intuition, but he did not follow it. He centered upon the one nuclear complex energy form called libido associated with sexual energy...And when Jung and Freud came together to lecture at Clark University, they began to analyze one another's dreams, and as a result, what happened was Freud became extremely paranoid about Jung being the Prometheus who would steal fire from the gods and destroy... through the father complex...When they went back, Jung decided that there must be some problem either with himself or with Freud, and he went through a period, if you've read *Psychological Reflections*, you can see he went through

a terrible period, almost a psychosis as the result of his need to find out his own identity and his own direction. So it was Freud who first did articulate the idea of not only the trans-human, cultural expression of psychic activity as shared as well as individual.

Student: Is *Moses and Monotheism* an attempt to do that?

Yes, but it is not respectable. That is silly, it really is. Honestly. How many of you have read that supposedly great essay on Leonardo da Vinci by Freud?

Student: Where he builds the whole thing up on the wrong bird?

On the wrong bird... I read this thing the other day... For some reason I find in this a parallel... a student handed in a paper to a professor and it was so good that the professor accused him of plagiarism and wrote it on the paper. The student went to the head of the department and protested. And of course the professor said indeed it was a plagiarism, we need not discuss this. So the head of the department said, fine, find the plagiarism, and he couldn't. And then he had to change the grade from an F to an A because it was a splendid paper and later published in a scholarly journal. And as a result, can you imagine that professor having to remain there in the classroom with this person for the rest of the semester and have him say, look you fathead. Well, imagine Freud, because he never had the benefit of realizing— he was still living when he discovered his gross error— in calling a kite a vulture. And the word in Italian for this particular bird, a very tiny little sparrow-like creature... And there is Saint Anne and her whole skirt becomes this sweeping, devouring predatory bird. And he makes this big thing about Leonardo's homoeroticism, and the early dream: I was lying in my crib and the bird came out and fluttered its tail into my mouth. If you want to read the counterpoint, the first major article that appeared was Erich Neumann's study... *Leonardo da Vinci and the Mother Archetype*, and he shatters Freud. Absolutely, just mercilessly pins him to the table like a butterfly and says, now this is what you did to us, with a vengeance, no question about it... And there have been innumerable studies. Norman O. Brown also commented on this, made a very thorough study of this mistake... At any rate, I was back here somewhere talking about how an archetype begins to emerge and Jacobi talked about a suitable constellation. Well a suitable constellation could be either something that happens within a culture. I suppose you could say a suitable constellation would be what happened in Los Angeles: if an earthquake hits, that is a suitable provocation for the establishment, some kind of rumble creates an activation. So on that kind of crude level as well as to the idea of some kind of suitable affect may occur when a person has an emotional experience that causes the triggering of an archetypal foundation or a pre-forming faculty to begin to emerge, and we see content from the conscious mind. Often we talk about response in the time of crisis: it is not just instinctual response, there can be intellectual responses to things. When one says thank god I got out of that, and then they say, how did I do it? I used some information, data, or had an approach to things that I was totally unaware of, or at least did not have my little readiness kit attached to my belt. So at least Jacobi is trying to imply that the suitable constellation can occur on a cultural level, on a highly individual/personal level, can occur in groups... This is an illustration— it is a metaphor

in a way— of something that happens on a collective level. Take the idea of three people and person one becomes exercised over something and they talk to person two and person three. And in a certain period of time the affect of their concern... is no longer identified with individuals, it is as though it transcends the individuals and like a floating balloon, these people share a collective concern. And often we say it is the first sign of a terribly inflated concern. Often it is out of the dimension of the individual, and as a result it leads to the party raid, (laughter) or it leads to a mob action or mob violence, or whatever it may be. It is also a funny thing that once this inflation occurs in this introjected... person number one or two or three may need to go to a “head shrinker.” That is they need to have their head brought down to normal size... it comes from the outer bands on the head to keep the spirits in so they don’t fly out through the ears. A head shrinker is one who deflates the inflation. And the inflation is generally the dangerous aspect. This is an example of what has happened is what we call a shared archetype. And generally the archetype is far more powerful than the individual identity and as a result it begins to float around up here with sparks flying off of it, (laughs) and it cannot be identified with the action, a high level of energy is constellated, and people suddenly come back to themselves and say what have we done, or what have I done.

Student: Do you have to separate very distinctly the archetype idea from the particular galvanizing thing that makes a person or a group of people ... upon which can be very different from the potential of what the archetype might be.

I think so. Carry that a little further because I am not sure exactly what you are asking. I think I know but I am not positive.

Student: You referred to the thing that these three people... {inaudible}

That is right. I stand corrected, I don’t mean that *this* is the archetype, this is the affect of the archetype that was constellated. They are sharing an image, and their collective consciousness gave this fundamental archetype that rose up in person number one, a collective identity, and as a result the image itself became powerful, not so much the archetype. Is that what you mean? Because I think you are right. I didn’t mean to imply that this is the archetype, floating around up here. It is the image that it is associated with.

Student: The potential can go in so many different ways, and they would not have the objectivity or universality or even truth that we might infer that the archetype has.

Yes, well that is true, but it can have a universal truth in certain negative expressions, or positive expressions; like we call the *esprit de corp*, is often an affect system that emerges from a central archetype, in an earlier stage, whether it constellates in an individual, given to a group, and a certain collective identity, sympathy between... So we can say in that case it can definitely be an image that is shared and becomes based upon a collective archetypal foundation, or prompted by an individual archetypal foundation... Maybe I am not really getting what you are asking me. Say it again.

Student: Would the archetype then be no more than utterly undefined energy? Without any form whatsoever.

Absolutely. This is a fact. If you tried to say that it is something specific, then we get caught up in the idea of a really insidious philosophy, because it would say there are then hierarchical levels for individuation, there are hierarchical levels for perfect type... or otherwise it would transform the whole system of everything, from education to personal behavior...The archetype in itself is empty, formless, not identifiable.

Student: Is it a predisposition to a form?

Absolutely. It a predisposition to a form either constellated in an individual or constellated in a group, through individuals obviously.

Student: So it is the individual that allows the positive or negative aspects to manifest.

No, it is the fabric of consciousness that causes the manifestation to either become positive or negative. It is almost like a control system. Pull the wrong button and the negative turns on. I guess the simplest expression, I don't know what level this is on... but anger, after a severe bout of anger, if that is the proper expression, there can often be a period of great calm and tranquility. Kick the wall if you are angry. And one says it hurt but now I feel better. {laughs}

Student: Would it depend on the interaction between the energy itself and whatever the particular vessel is at that time? It could within the same person, let's say, manifest itself in positive or negative ways.

It could indeed.

Student: So it would depend on a lot of interactive factors.

Jung speaks of the idea of the crisis of archetypal constellations...It is a crisis in the sense that things can turn either way. And granted we are dealing with some very simple polarities, but nonetheless, we have enough presences in our own cultural life and personal life to show that kind of action.

Student: When you use the word constellation are you referring to undefined archetypes?

No, constellation in this sense is a verb, to form, to come together, to make present. It is a good distinction though because the word does serve that function as well. To constellate an archetype means not necessarily to provoke it but to make that archetype now have a function, to clothe it in some way, to pour content into the vessel.

Student: So would you use archetypal constellation as a verb?

Well, we say an archetypal constellation would be present in an image, or a sign system of some sort. An arrow says go... There is a kind of directive signal. That is a signal, but we can carry a signal into the realm of a sign that we may share, that may have a meaning, a tone: be my Valentine, does that mean anything, or a peace symbol? And then we can say symbols are where some image appears in our presence and we as individuals or collectively begin to feel potentials for meaning that are not necessarily to be explained but simply to be experienced. Not to be reduced to a single experience but to open up beyond itself.

Student: My confusion now is I am beginning to understand archetype as a kind of protoplasmic potential for something, but I don't understand how we can talk about *an* archetype rather than *the* archetype.

This goes back— a good distinction— we have the energy and then we have truly archetypes, plural.

Student: You mean there are different wells?

Yes, there are different pre-forming units. There is not just one structural archetype. Unless you want to consider the energy itself an archetype.

Student: Is there a good archetype and a bad archetype?

No no, every archetype has its capacity for being good or bad, it is ambivalent. The archetype has no moral dimension, it is ambivalent.

Student: Is there an example of what one archetype is and another archetype is? You mentioned the earth archetype.

Yes, I mentioned the earth archetype... Let me take one we can all identify with... the archetype of the great mother.

Student: In your example, one particular foment would draw, depending on that thing in its head, would draw on one of a number of archetypes.

Well, no, take Leonardo da Vinci. I was trying to seek an illustration that we know: take the Mona Lisa. Now all of the associations with that particular figure seem to sponsor, from Walter Pater, even earlier writers, Vasari, the most extraordinary ambivalent levels of interpretation. She is often called a vampire, she is often called the world's most beautiful lady, the smile is cute or frightening... We start tracing the factor of ambiguity in the facial expression of the Mona Lisa, a historical person, and there are other extant portraits of the woman that do not seem to share, it is almost like Picasso's portrait of Gertrude Stein. You know that famous phrase, well it doesn't look like her, and Picasso said, it will. And it did, (laughter) in time. So his painting had a great deal of futurity associated with it. Leonardo, we might say he starts with the great mother as the central constellation. He did indeed have a mother problem but not in our twentieth century way

of thinking about it. He was very much associated with the advent of a high degree of ego development but he was also very much associated with the early maternalistic attitude towards the earth. The earth was created, prime brute force, energy. It is a mother but not personal. In its original source, the Great Mother is based, remember the term ouroboric, the archetype is ouroboric, it is undifferentiated. So the Great Mother can, in cultural manifestations, become the negative mother. I mentioned Kali is one of the supreme examples, *Rangda* in Balinese mythology. Our culture doesn't seem to have anything really. They get involved with something like anti-Puritanism, but I would say... think of Florence Nightingale and Marilyn Monroe: as images projected upon children in the fourth grade. Look at this good lady, she cared for the sick. Now look at this naughty lady, etc. See how she died? {laughter} Those kinds of things. They are supreme archetypal constellations of the positive and negative aspects of the feminine. Most cultures have very elevated, rich imagery to associate with, particularly within pantheons, that there is a plus god and a minus god, and there are manifestations of that. And thus they have less incidents of crime and destruction and so on. Absolute and without question because they have a way of ritualizing both negative and positive impulses through symbolic figures. But the way Mother in da Vinci's *Mona Lisa* is a source is either plus or minus: it just so happens in that particular constellation, she goes through various identities that are based upon mythologins... They talk about the Sophia image, that means the goddess of wisdom. Now that was an early Greek motif, there were certain aspects of Minerva and Aphrodite where she would not appear as the youthful temptress type but would appear as the woman of wisdom. You know the Botticelli painting, the *Primavera*? The rite of spring? Venus stands in the garden, you have Mercury holding his wand up to the clouds, and winter turning into spring, Flora emerging out of the breath of, I can't think of her name. There are three linked figures: it is an image of metamorphosis. And then in the background you have standing this very classical figure with a rather bulbous torso expressing her maternal aspect. It is Venus in her aged, wise mother identity: it is one aspect of the Great Mother. She can appear to be the devourer, she can be a woman of wisdom, she can appear to be an ethereal beauty, she can appear to be a vampire consort. She has any number of potentials. We find this in Latin American art, a considerable polarization of deities... We find in the ritualistic art of Africa, a strong definition of the polarity factor being expressed in various deity forms, thus creating a balance. People have an opportunity to assuage the gods that are creating problems for them as well as to bless those that are not. So Sophia means wisdom: Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, the Temple of the Holy Wisdom: it is a feminine image. Wisdom being associated with the earth's wisdom... We say that man really has his feet on the ground. He doesn't need to go to school because he already knows it, it is in his bones. We are talking about a Sophia aspect. It is a mythological metaphor. But then the Sophia factor is still too grand an image to project upon the *Mona Lisa*, so we then have the anima function of Leonardo. And the anima would generally be some figuration that would be quite youthful... an inspiring feminine force, perhaps that is more apparent in the *Ginevra de' Benci* portrait in the National Gallery in Washington: the more youthful, delightful image of the feminine. Somewhere Leonardo was very much caught up on this fundamental level. And as he tried to project in a portrait of *Madame La Gioconda*, he had the inability to be able to manifest her either as the youthful inspiring goddess, or even as the goddess of wisdom, so he takes these

two components as almost like fragments of potential expression and come up with something that has a strong ambiguity. The Mona Lisa is indeed—I think all that business of the smile and so on comes from the level that she has the potential of becoming really the world's worst bitch, (laughs) or the most extraordinary tempting creature imaginable. And it does not have to be necessarily related to a particular ideal. She is highly ambiguous as far as her facial expression. Even the landscape behind her does not belong to the earth, it belongs to something extra-planetary, moon-like. And the motif extends all the way back to those early things that Leonardo did when he was working for Verrochio. Look at that strange landscape that goes behind the angel that he painted. He kept putting the feminine figure in an extra-terrestrial, extra-planetary setting, as though she did not belong to this world. And what happens in the *Mona Lisa*, we have the final culmination of neither the constellation of the feminine ideal in the anima—and these are just two of the types—there are different levels of this: nor is there an appearance of the goddess of wisdom, but basically in a tempering of the original archetypal source, positive or negative. So she becomes highly ambivalent. I don't know whether that is an illustration, but it is as though the original archetype itself—called the archetype of the great mother but there is no little great mother image residing somewhere in the psyche with top...it is a pre-forming structure, so as one responds to the feminine, more on psychic levels than physical levels, there is a potential for either it becoming a highly destructive image or one that is very appealing, constructive. Does that do it?

Student: It opens the door.

Student: If there are many energies, two questions would be: one, can the energies themselves in any way interact without the mediation of something else?

Like can two archetypes conjoin?

Student: Right, but in their undifferentiated state, though.

I would honestly say I don't know. There is nothing in Carl Jung's theory that would state that there is any kind of interpenetration between pre-forming faculties. There is nothing to suggest that you have the Great Mother marrying the Great Father archetype potential, and then emerging as whatever it might come out as, a circus freak or something.

Student: The other question would be can any undifferentiated energy manifest itself in any archetype image? Can that type of a mix go on or are there certain limitations in the undifferentiated state that will prevent it from later forming an archetypal image, from surfacing in particular forms?

I am not sure I understand what you are asking. Are you saying, is it possible that they can be curtailed?

Student: Is it possible that certain combinations don't work I guess. In other words, can any energy manifest itself in any archetypal form or are there certain types of archetypal forms which could only interact with specific... of the energies available.

It is almost like saying both yes and no. In other words there are definitely theoretical concerns that express that any energy provocation can constellate an archetype but that is based upon the primal need of the conscious mind, or the conscious psyche as to what, it is almost like saying give energy to something and it will just feed whatever is in need of becoming evident. However, there are definitely, and it enters into the life of the culture, Neumann deals with this, that there are distinct goal orientations of a culture that obviously whatever energy occurs does attach itself to a particular archetypal structure... This particular image does require this particular type of energy...

Student: I have been doing a lot of reading in Eastern thought...the theory of one being from which all creative energy is sourced.

Yes, well actually that would be basically the idea that, as I said earlier, maybe the primal energy is projected upon either a deity or some kind of soul-complex, or in nature.

Student: ...one state of being and all energy sources come from that, and there are forces that bring them out into material form, concrete, like us...

It is like from some original source or some kind of...activity and then we are constellated. Well, I say that is more of a systemic expression of the same idea but it is given identifiable...I notice the troops are getting restless. It either means people are hungry, bored, or what have you. Do you want to have a break and have a bite to eat? Do you want to skip this phase out or do you want me to finish this one little thing from Jacobi... There is that step of synchronicity that several people have initiated, and there are a couple of levels that I don't think we can discuss without at least looking at some of these ideas.

Lunchbreak

We will just finish this up and then I can give you a hint as to what we will be doing this evening, and evidently Nathan will be helping me out on that. I don't know exactly what it is going to be but it will at least deal with the subject of the archetypal level that supplied the form...I will discipline myself to make sure we are through at 4:30 today... Going back to this Jacobi commentary, to at least sum it up, she talks about a "suitable constellation which may be conditioned by individual or collective factors, the archetypal pre-formative vessel receives additional energy, its charge is increased and its dynamic operation begins. The individual constellation depends upon, you asked the question... what kind of constellation affects the activation of the archetype, she simply sums it up by saying, "It depends upon the individual's state of consciousness, and the collective constellation of the corresponding state of consciousness of human groups." So it obviously implies that the activation can come through a broad socio-cultural spectrum

in human beings at large, or through an individual. Then she says, "The charge of the archetype is manifested in a kind of magnetic pull on the conscious mind," and this is at least the indicator that obviously consciousness must round out this pre-formative structure. "It exercises a kind of magnetic pull on the conscious mind which however is not at all at first recognized. It takes the form of a vague emotional activity which may swell into violent psychic agitation." One thing that is immediately accessible to read is a description of these levels, in Minor White's *Mirrors, Messages, and Manifestations*. There is a section concerning the Point Lobos experience where he talks about walking on the beach, not being necessarily aware of anything, he simply has the camera virtually pointed at the ground. He begins to see a reflection in the water. He talks about, and we are not evaluating the way it is expressed, I am just talking about the context behind it, he starts beginning to see the water's reflections becoming pure light, and light turns into fire, and fire turns into various imagistic motifs such as foliate images, flower images. He talks about the idea that virtually the world turns into a highly—fluid is the wrong word—transformative structure. He begins to feel as though the image is given to him, he doesn't really take it or find it or what have you. It is almost like he is marrying with what is happening in relation to the water and the rocks and so on. In that same book...he talks about various levels of becoming aware of the photograph, and he starts off on some very peculiar sensation levels. He talks about the photograph as being subject to a form of cannibalism: he talks about 'you eat my images.' Now regardless of the other parallelisms we're going to adjust the use of words that are highly provocative of a kind of food: he talks about the photograph as mana. It has innumerable parallels, personal and theological, etc., but he starts on this very fundamental level almost as though you assimilate the image in a sensory or a digestive manner, maybe. And these areas elevate, he talks about...with only a camera between us, it sounds like a popular musical song, but it is a very important thing...there is no real separation, (sings) if only a camera took me, (laughter) and there is no real separation between yourself and myself...it's less...I the photographer and you the subject, but the camera between us is simply a plane that causes us to come into conjunction. There are many images where he has commented on the very levels that are not discursive, like point one point two point three...but that the image being revealed to him rather than his deciding upon, it seems to come to him, knowing not whence or where. Read the final denouement, he does associate this very strongly with a kind of deistic function. Stieglitz, though we have been taught now to distrust the normal reports and the varieties of conversations with Stieglitz, yet on the other hand there are certain things that are certainly confirmed in correspondence, and this one aspect of Stieglitz talking about relevance and also equivalence. Not necessarily existing relative to the cloud photographs, but actually, he says, to the farthest reaches of the universe. There is a certain type of relativity, a certain type of correspondence, and he uses a simple fragment, and I read it actually in a letter from Stieglitz when I was working on the Dorothy Norman book that makes it very clear that he thinks of things as constantly interpenetrating in the photographic experience. Emmet Gowin: Do most of you know Emmet's work? A remarkable constellation, a rare dimension in photography and that is the cultivation of sentiment. It is a very feeling-oriented form of photography. He may be, from my view, the only photographer I've seen in the last 10 or 12 years that has a high function of feeling as a type, as we mentioned. And that is not to deny that

they don't have certain analytical functions or there are not structures within the identity, and of course the technical control is so profound to constellate this quality of feeling, the tonal range gets you involved with a kind of emotional dimension that relates to feeling. But what strikes me is, one night we were talking...and I asked him how does he arrive at a particular image: what happens, because some of them look, forgive the words, set up, as though, the wife holding the, what do you call those onions, leeks. Or the two chickens...a marvelous image of the posing of the two chickens against the young children. And yet he insists that most of these are, some of them do include what we will call "fabrications"—but nothing ever happens in the fabrication stage itself. It is almost like setting up the potentials for a number of units to come into relationship. Do you know that remarkable photograph of the man that did the ice sculpture? Remember that one at the Eastman House show? That thing just drives me out of my mind, I can't get it rid of it...he was talking about a girl who was a journalist and was to do a story—this may be a little distorted but it is at least not untrue—for her school newspaper and she was going to interview this local gentleman who worked in an icehouse and he had three great works that he did in ice sculpture: he did this little boat that you saw in the photograph in the show, and then his next thing was at Christmas time he took food coloring and colored ice blocks and did Santa Clauses, and they are very simple little structures. And the last thing—this will drive you out of your mind—he did the capital letter "B," and he does that over and over again, so it's three things: Santa Claus, the capital letter B, and these little boats. And there is that man standing there...with these little ice sculptures before him, and the light, and the whole constellation, the mood, the feeling, is that you either feel a tremendous pang of sympathy for the individual, a certain degree of poignancy, etc., and he {Gowin} did take a whole series of photographs, and was almost as though he didn't know that one was in it. It wasn't a question of one or two or setting it up or what have you. But a series of scanning possibilities and then of course this one appeared. He said a lot of times they are just selected, following the act. Which may be an indicator that somewhere the energy is constellated and there is not necessarily a strongly conscious knowledge of what you are taking, it emerges out of a field of energies, and I think that is common enough for most photographers to identify with. At any rate, she talks about the pull of the archetypal constellation upon the conscious mind, and this implies that there is a filling process, the vessel is filled with content. Let me just leap beyond this for a moment and show you an illustration where the same principle of the completion of a unit occurs: Jung talks about eons in terms of psychological dimensions that are manifested in a broad worldview sense, the Weltanschauung sense, and he uses in his commentaries on astrology, as many of you know he was deeply involved with this dimension...He speaks of great ages. Now, he is not giving one the potential for reading one's horoscope...he accepted astrology as a dimension of one measure, one type of factor that might be important in terms of measuring events and so on. But did not take it as scientific evidence: this is where it starts tying into synchronicity. He talks about the age of Alexander being associated primarily with the image of the ram, and the image is pretty concrete there: battle, aggression, taking over, etc. He points out that he did not invent all of those fish images in the age of Pisces. Every age has a constellation of great individual, and if we took the, and it has nothing to do with one's background, if we took representative examples of the fish, or the *Ichthus* deity...We do not find that Christ

is the only identifiable person: Wayne Meeks, who teaches in the graduate program at Yale in the department of theology, has written a new book...that points out that actually among the various deities associated with the Ichthus image, there are at least 25 of major import. It just so happened that the historical call happened to graft onto other cultures the image of the Ichthus Christ more predominantly than others. Which is another example of varied constellations of deities and some simply fall by the wayside, and one becomes important as the gatherer and holder of the energy. But the Piscean image is basically of the fish, or the multi-fish, and you have following this the age of Aquarius. Now the Aquarian image is basically the water-pourer, and even your National Geographic astrology map will show you this {laughs}. You have the vessel pouring forth out into constellations... it pours out the water...this would imply the idea of some content being delivered. And the interesting thing that we forget is that the passage into the next eon is known as the *fomalhaut*. And these are represented by two little fishes again that have open mouths. And in the constellation they reside. That is an open mouth (laughter) There are two of them and that is the second one {laughter} and the content pours into the mouth of the little fish. Now what happens is the little fish, in time as the mythological story goes, they will in turn begin to ascend from their primal fluid matrix, and they will gradually become, they will remarry with an earlier archetypal level, that is the idea of the ram or the mountain goat, and then what will emerge is the goat-fish, or the Capricornian image. What this means is that there is a synthesis between... the highest reaches represent consciousness, the fish represent the primordial levels, unconsciousness... Even in images of this nature you have the idea that there has been a cyclical development and then we have finally, the fish-god is basically—almost like our turtle image—in a very fluid and formative matrix. Almost in a state where there is no identifiable structure. The Aquarian image is very much celestial, and the content that is poured is... the *fomalhaut*, again, we have the fish now reappearing as a secondary motif rather than the dominant one. Instead of the Piscean age... the twin fish appear as a small unit content. It is as though you have innovation, and innovation reflects upon something past, and then out of this emerges something new. And then of course we have the remarrying of the content that is poured into these two with the ram or the goat and thus the Capricornian eon will be born. We won't see the emanations of that yet, so we've got to go through the *fomalhaut* period, and that seems to strike some very important possibilities. If that escapes you, I think it shows a parallelism between how often the activity on the archetypal level is projected in terms of dimensions such as this. What happens is something is triggered, an age begins to identify with certain semiotic systems, certain symbols, they flower, they become literally fixed in human beings, or in works of art. Then a new energy begins to rise and we have the old becoming less and less important... What was at one time dominant becomes secondary, it then marries to a new level of content and so on in a kind of archetypal continuum influencing one dimension to the other. And Jacobi says, "Attracted by the ... the light of consciousness falls on the archetype, the archetype enters into the actual psychic area, it is perceived." Now many of you say can you perceive an archetype, and I say it is not to be known and so on. What she means is there is a point when we speak of the archetype as such, that is not known, but when consciousness falls upon...like the content pouring into a vessel...then it is perceivable, and it is perceivable as a symbol first. It is perceivable as an emotional effect... it is experienced physically...

something feels good, something is boiling, something is bubbling up, there is a quality of sensory amplification. One hears better, one feels the tingling of the skin, whatever it may be. If not on that level, there is a kind of activation of your mind being flooded with ideas, possibilities. You have probably had that happen in the sense that you are trying to approach something and you feel terribly inspired and your mind becomes a field of multiple images. And you are trying to make something concrete. It is as though the activated energy consciousness is more or less, the only way I can imagine it is here is the archetypal unit and things are being magnetized to it. And the very initial activation stage is that extraned units of awareness as well as ego conscious or ego-oriented units are beginning to be pulled to the archetype itself. And it is though you have a connection between them...Extraned units are fragments, the ego center has the clusters... not chained psychically, but the archetype itself as it emerges through this field some of these are attached to it. And there is a plastic stage in which the archetype is not yet known by the ego but there is a feeling state, a physical state, an intuitional state, a state of heightened emotion. I suppose this happens to people when they get excited over something, and particularly if their psychic image is associated with it, they are coming close to a high degree of what we call nuclear energy or unit energy within the structure of the psyche itself. Then as the fifth level, she says "From the archetype as such is touched by consciousness, it can manifest itself either on the lower biological plane"—that's what we mean by sensory experience—"and take form as an expression of instinct or instinctual dynamism," and that would be a sensation response that draws one toward an event, or makes you feel disposed toward some atmosphere of people in a room or what have you. And then she says, "Or on the higher"—and she uses the word spiritual but not in a religious sense—"spiritual plane as an image or an idea. In the latter case the raw material of imagery and meaning are added to it and a symbol is born." Once it has become imagistic by having had clusters of extraned or ego-centered awareness pulled to it, and the symbol is born. The symbolic guise in which it becomes visible varies and changes according to the outward and inward circumstances of the individual, and the times. The encounter with the consciousness of a collectivity"—that means a collective group—"and its problems give rise to collective symbols." That is mythologins, and thus the reason for often having cultural parallels from certain types of literature, imagery, that constellate during certain periods of time. "Contact with individual consciousness is the other level and its problems give rise to individual symbols, as for example the image of a witch with the features of one's own mother." You can see how that turns to a personal level. But for a moment to at least think of the possibility of how this works, remember I said that the symbol is basically affective, and not necessarily the image itself. There is an imagistic foundation. All the various units that cluster to the archetype and then finally the entire unit structure clusters to the ego. This is not necessarily the point in which the image is made manifest. It will be manifest in several ways, in some kind of behavioral form—movement, body movement, dance as someone mentioned earlier. It can become manifest in terms of being projected into matter; a clay image, or taking the photograph. It is at that point though that one has a strange, there is an ambivalent structure to your own consciousness. That is, certain aspects of the experience you know, you know what you are doing. There are other things that seem to be basically given to you. Maybe you have parallels that you can identify with this as being at least a reasonable,

or maybe even a way of expressing something that is very simple, But nonetheless it defines a kind of, this is what I mentioned the other day about the *hieros gamos* and the sacred marriage, the *conjunctio*, We have, instead of conscious/unconscious, these become combined... You have two overlapping areas. If we enlarge this you have the archetypal constellation and the ego center, in this area where they marry, there is a high degree of not only physical affect but emotional triggering, flooding of ideas and so on. And then of course these two never, if the archetype basically absorbed the ego that would mean you are out of it. Or if the ego absorbed the archetype it means it was not an archetype, it is a traditional strain. It is basically your discovery of an image that has been well developed or well present within your culture and that you only think of it as a new discovery.

Student: How do you distinguish between the traditional strain and an archetype?

You generally discover it. Because if the archetypal manifestation is truly unique... it will find pattern similarities, it will find unique expression. This is where the person arrives at the idea and says, guess what, I know I have an idea and it is called know thyself, and have you seen people being put down by saying, well that has already been said by Heraclitus or something like that, dismissing ideas that are born in human beings. A traditional strain generally will have a strong set of structural patterns. It means that your set of either extraneous units of awareness may have been provoked by some kind of archetypal constellation, but what you have really done is arrive at an idea that has a set series of pattern structures that you can trace back to sources. The archetype is generally something that is in this marriage between the two, produces something that is unique to you, or to the collective culture, and does not have any previous expression except as the underlying earth archetype, but with the underlying source, but the manifestation of that archetype varies.

Student: Are traditional sources old archetypes?

Absolutely. In fact Neumann talks about, here is a directing archetype, and here is a cultural canon, almost like an accepted law, he says that we have constellated in the history of culture... as one archetype becomes established, and we have a type of credible imagery... it can be on the level of a motif or a sign. This is credible collectively, believable as a specific meaning unit, it has a specific meaning. It is basically just a signal, but if this no longer has any meaning, that is a terrible way of putting it, it is as though there will be other potentials for this being transformed. It is as though the energy here, this becomes an established signal or sign system. This will eventually become fixed to the point that it becomes so communicable that it loses its force as a signal that will cause sympathy or what have you. Then new directors are causing the development of new semiotic images, this will fall back and become tradition. It is like the whole stockpile, the whole study of iconography. All of the basic motifs and images that we associate with varied periods.

Student: So an archetype doesn't become passe.

The archetype doesn't, the image does. And the archetype sponsors motifs, images, levels of, I am trying to think of the best word to use: when I say content, that is too general. Levels of content that become very active, they are believable, the strain of content becomes believable to people. And then after a while they become known. In other words the factor that was at one time filled with a kind of attractive mystery. Then it is revealed, the veil is rent and suddenly one knows it. Then there is a moving of that motif into tradition, and then of course a new archetypal constellation begins to emerge. Neumann deals with this in four essays...It is the second essay in the book.

Student: Can you give us a more concrete example of how a traditional strain, as you say, would differentiate itself through time.

All right. This will come up later, let's use the idea of the concentration upon the eye region of a human face. We have innumerable examples, within the history of art, of a certain degree of associative imagery that constellates the eye as a window. That you are not seeing into the head of the person, you are seeing literally into the soul. The eye can often become...to look at someone directly in the eye is often a very disturbing experience. Animals, for example, let's take it down to a fundamental plane. One of the forms of challenge to an animal is to fix your eyes on them, often with aggressive animals, particularly with dogs, they are showing their kindness to you and if you stare at them, you don't have to show any grimace, but just a direct stare, they will often divert their eyes, mainly because you are challenging them. And I don't care how long Fido has been around, if you keep doing it and Fido decides to accept the challenge you might get a hunk out of your cheek or something. (laughs) Audrey and others...some lack respect in the quarters, but at least Conrad Lorenz has dealt with the same subject and that is respectable so as a result the concept of eye contact has had an almost magical association with meaning. It also has associations with instinctual levels, challenging, establishing territory and so on. Why does this become a major motif in Near Eastern art, particularly, the female heads where the eyes are removable and we have these large socket openings where we know at one time the eyes were quite constant. The standing votive figures with the huge eyes with the big central pupil area. Staring into space, generating an attitude of...not worship, but expectancy. And all of it seems to be totally centered around the eye region. I mentioned the later period in Rome where this still carries through that you have an association in time, the eye is treated as just simply descriptive. We describe the eye unless there is a point in which we are trying to discover some new nuance of the mysteries, or what is out there, or what is next in time, suddenly the eye becomes a very predominant motif. There is considerable evidence that Walter Keane {laughs} played a pretty good game of economic cleverness: all those people bought those little children and have cried over them, or whatever they did with them, put them in their houses...and it was mainly the eyes that got them.

Student: Is his wife still doing that, are they separated?

Yes, they separated and she got the legal right to the eyes {laughter}. That is true. That is a joke that went around but I don't know whether to take it seriously or not but I did read they have a legal separation since they were both doing those paintings...

Student: She said she invented the style.

But didn't she get the rights...I don't know what he does...

Student: He paints ears. {laughter}

Student: Didn't they have a paint out in Union Square or something like that and he didn't show up, she was going to show that she was the one who painted them.

That is incredible...The reason I mention that is because now...if you accept the fact that there is a background, where today in our culture is there a strong expression, other than Walter Keane and his wife, upon the eye motif.

Student: Little Orphan Annie.

Little Orphan Annie, no pupil...That is a good one but I can't accept that one. She is not the eye motif, she is the hair motif.

Student: There is an interesting thing that happened with some children too, doing a portrait of each child and asking, I'll do a picture of some part of your head or body that you want a picture of, and practically all of them wanted their eyes photographed.

That is amazing, absolutely. Well we know the persistence of images such as the concept of stealing one's soul, or stealing one's identity through direct eye confrontation, or particularly through the photograph—the eye of the camera.

Student: Did anyone happen to see David Douglas Duncan last night on David Frost? He said...this is what I am interested in saying about war, zoom in on this and it was that cover shot of the guy with the white eyes, always look at the eyes, and that is what I am trying to get across about war.

Very good. I was thinking of the fact that we would not necessarily have, at least that I know of, there may be parallelisms, of any particular motifs that appears in our culture associated with this grand tradition of the eye being the window to the soul, the eye being an expression of a state of pneuma...meaning of holiness or revealed energy. What were you thinking of?

Student: CBS.

What has happened in our time is that most of the eye motifs have been reduced to basic signals or semiotic signs. You are quite right, CBS is one...Center of the Eye workshop... it was the aperture image, all of these are basically signals that we are

quite familiar with. I know that is not an apt illustration but it may give you a certain sense that at one time there was a high level of attractive, it is a provocative motif and one need not necessarily know what it means; it attracts one. At a later point it becomes simply a motif that is used as a logo or a signal or something of that nature.

Student: There is a counter to that image in *Un Chien Andalou*.

Exactly, isn't that marvelous with the slicing of the eye.

Student: So are you saying that the eye is an example of a traditional strain?

Oh yes indeed it is.

Student: And not an archetype.

No, none of these are the archetype themselves, they are just simply the images associated with...

Student: Or it is not the image of an archetype.

It could be constellated originally by an archetypal constellation, or it could be structured around an archetypal constellation, then the image is born out of associationism. I would assume that possibly the eye, I never delved into this, but it might be interesting to see that the eye in Egypt was a highly valued organ. Because seeing was not just to see, to identify, seeing was also one of the passage ways for the KA, the spirit.

Student: An eye for an eye.

Yes, but that is not Egyptian.

Student: What archetype would you associate with the eye motif?

There is no name particularly but I would say it has to do with the concept of *conjunctio*: there is an archetype called the conjunctio archetype, that is a linkage between yourself and the outside world. The eye is the organ...

Student: What is the word?

Conjunctio, it means connection...that is the word, or conjunction, or coming together. But linkage motifs, remember the one I mentioned about the illustration of the Virgin Mary and the sky orb? Well there is this tube linking the two. There are innumerable examples of the linkage: the archetype that prompts the idea of some bridge between two different levels. And the eye is basically the bridge between the intra-physical, intra-psychic, and the external. And was often used as a way of pointing, as if the eye in itself, was enlarged, increased in size, to show the capacity of the individual to absorb what was happening generally well beyond the earth, in some extra-terrestrial way.

Student: I just wanted to relay an experience dealing with the eye. I once knew a man who was diagnosed as a schizophrenic, he asked if he could do a drawing of me. He was in an institution, he used a ball point pen and drew on napkins, and began to make this drawing of me that was really well done in the rendering of the details was really perfect. And when he got to doing the eyes, which he left until last, he stopped and said, "I'm tired, I think I'll do it after lunch." But he never did do it after lunch, and later on in the afternoon I asked to see his other pictures, and he had about 150 napkin drawings of everyone in the institution and no one had eyes on them.

That is extraordinary. Absolutely. By intuition we measure that as a profound example of the eye certainly as a powerful motif...I was trying to think of some form, I don't know you give me one and let's see if there is a tracery in it, that I know of, that is traditional, it can be behavioral, it can be an attitude, it can be an image that we have around us constantly that at one time may have had greater power than we would associate with today. Can you think of any? My mind is totally blank.

Student: There is a good example in the Abel's book about the gargoyle and the demon image. The way that it evolves from being a monster deity on the Neolithic level, a horror image of forces that control the world, and as civilization progresses it gains mastery over those forces it finally ends up being around the cathedral but being used as a semi-humorous way.

I was thinking one, shield heraldry, national motifs that have animals on them...often extend from those medieval images of animals being associated with various deities and saints.

Student: What about something in transition? I might get into trouble, with something like nationalism. Like a sense of an artificial group that you form, a family thing.

Well absolutely. It is quite possible that the archetype that would bind them together, groups, are also expressed because of the need of consciousness to establish certain laws, etc., and protective structures. That in a period of time, suddenly that, at one time necessary clustering of identity...

Student: Formalizing.

Yes, formalizing as it becomes more dogmatic, suddenly the rule is the connecting principle, and then of course that wanes in terms of its affect. Well I hope the illustration is clear. There are other examples but I just can't seem to rise to the occasion to present any. (laughs) I can't get my catalog to work. And I take bizarre ones like gotcha and so on because I call them waning archetypal traditions. And that they reemerge with a little bit of affect because of a new need. So topless waitresses represent the re-emergence of the last fragment of an archetype that basically, the idea of, I don't know what to call it: that breast exposure...is not necessarily indicative of the meaning it once had. If you look at Minoan Art and so on it is an extremely powerful motif: cosmic in

nature, as far as an image of fertility... Well, {back to Jacobi} she says, "The symbol implies a certain amount of autonomy in its confrontation with the conscious mind." Now the symbol represents this throwing together of conscious content with archetypal energy, and obviously this marriage is taking place, this synthesizing experience. "The symbol... may be brought close to the conscious mind by understanding and be felt and recognized as some degree as belonging to the ego without being wholly fathomed so that it continues to be alive and affective." The example of something, what moves us today? Does anything prompt us to feel a high degree of either collectively held energy or individuated energy? What is your thing? Or what word, or what...

Student: I don't exactly understand what you mean by that, but what about certain behavior, well how about something like group singing?

Sure. That kind of thing.

Student: Swaying and singing we shall overcome.

Is there a kind of thing that happens, and if we believe Plato... {laughs}
Are there any words that still have a high degree of emotional overtones that we don't think of analytically. If you say, war, there are a lot of emotional associations, but often we analyze them. We put them into specific...

Student: We were just talking about this coming over here, there are a lot of people where the word communism is still extremely, it shuts off everything.

That in regional areas particularly. It is still being identified with certain words that would move men to all sorts of action, disastrous and otherwise. Again this is maybe a matter of not necessarily setting it up and saying this is a particular word or this is a form of activity... What about in, I mentioned this yesterday, what about the fragmentation in photography? I am glancing at that John Wood back there. Let's all look to the back of the room to this visual aid that was conveniently put on the shelf. {laughs} What about the idea of our viewing the motorcyclists in different ranges in space, and as fragmented or as unit-structured? Is that typical of our time? Does that have any connection? Do we all sense that? Or, is that real to you? Why? I am just wondering, why is that real? Why could that be a unique identification of a type of structure that was not necessarily typical of other periods. We know that it has appeared in the other periods, the idea of unit-structured images, predellas in medieval art, a complete cyclical sequence. The cartoon sequence in the popular periodical or Sunday paper is a very ancient serial kind of motif. But what about something like this?

Student: I see very good reasons for it: specialization, alienation, a general schizophrenic tendency of the whole culture.

Well, all right, that to me though implies the idea that then the image is born out of something that is like a difficult stage, rather than integration. Is it conceivable that as

opposed to the idea of fragmentation, alienation, separation of parts...What about the possibility of this being a new form of integration? Rather than disintegration.

Student: I don't see that as being a fragment. It is unified.

From my view, the idea of a unit-structured series, serial imagery, the whole concept of units as I was talking about in Jerry's case of plenitude, the idea of images spilling over, represents a new kind of attitude, a new dimension of interest on the part of consciousness that may be provoked by virtue of a certain archetypal constellation. All we can do is ponder why man seems to be turning away from totalities, from structures that are pre-formed, spatial identifications that are established within the edges of the frame, you know the Renaissance window on the world. Why do we now find ourselves scanning, we put together units by virtue of playing across a field and not necessarily seeing them in a logical continuum. In your film last night: why is it that you would do something that deals with various serial, kinetic, images that we begin to find that we are required to put these pieces into a kind of order? They may be as variable as the many people in the room or it may be a kind of consistent way of perceiving. It might have to do with perhaps... I used the word enantiodromia, a reversal of consciousness. It seemed very important for ego development that we be able to achieve, over a period, as we call it, of at least three thousand years of civilized behavior, and then if we add to that the four to five hundred years following, the separation of AD and BC, at the beginnings of the 5th and 6th century, a gradual evolution of ego attention to need to have the totality of the observed world expressed in an art form. You can start really with those early Byzantine mosaics. They are not only de-corporealizing— making less physical images of figures— but they are always putting them into groups. They are setting them up according to logical, ordered systems. They are showing certain monumentality factors that were not present in work before, particularly toward groups of people. And then of course later when the Renaissance emerges we have figures disposed in a natural space. We have a believable identification of the world. In time we have, not in the old chestnuts of modern art, but we have a gradual elimination of this structure, this integrity factor that allows us to witness the world in logical order; things in their proper station and position. Now it is as though perhaps the consciousness has its interest in formal structures that are highly ordered is waning. It is almost like the eye does scan, we now begin to put units of information together from disparate levels of position in space and time. The observation of the color here, the linear construct there, the particular literary motif here, etc. These become generally a field in which we draw these things together, they are pulled together. I would suggest that maybe the photograph by John might be reflective of—not just his but dozens of others—of a whole new attitude toward seeing and responding to what he is seeing. That you don't really see that as a total image, you see it as units that you then have to reconstruct. So in a way the image stands to make you introject the visual experience, you bring it into your mind to put it together, it is not brought together in that particular structure. We will deal with this later. Is that an adequate definition relative to what you were asking?

Student: Yes I think so, it is, you take it a lot further but it is a good place to start.

Finally, we are on the last piece {Jacobi} she says, "When the symbol is brought closer to the ego it can be conceivably fathomed and explored. Then it seems wholly integrated with the ego and assimilated by the conscious mind, but strangely enough, it loses its efficacy and becomes a mere allegory, a sign, or a conceptually unambiguous content of consciousness." Now what does that mean, conceptually unambiguous? There is a certain point in which you know the symbolic structure and the image cultivated from it so well that it begins to lose its attraction, and basically is subject to become discarded into tradition. Obviously we would have no evolution of visual consciousness if there were not factors that indicated that we arrived at certain sets of imagery, certain formal constructs that are highly appealing. They last for a period of time, have profound effect, and then of course they disappear. But then we also have the return of certain motifs that at one time were quite powerful, they go back, they become extraneous knowledge or fragments, or they become part of the personal unconscious factor. They may be reconstellated or cluster again to an archetypal energy system and reemerge in totally different clothing. One of the fascinating things when we talk about Jerry's work, this summer when I was out at the Gernsheim collection... It struck me as very peculiar, I got more interested in looking back at those earlier Rejlanders and Robinsons particularly since they have a rather extensive collection, not at the photographs. That is pretty obvious, but at these drawings that this man did. It was the most extraordinary thing, he had a certain degree of visual consciousness that could master the most extraordinary dimensions of space relative to the landscape, and in fact some rather innovative, tilting planes and bringing things forward to the surface as well as uses of aerial and linear perspective. And in every one of these, the figure is virtually a stick-figure. It is unbelievable, you have a man with a fishing pole, here is this gorgeous landscape, (laughs) a mixture of Constable and Ruskin and botany: you can see all the educational principles involved and then there is this dumb sketch of a man drawn literally on a stick-figure basis. Now not quite that bad but close to it, with the fishing pole and so on. And consistently: he did a number of drawings for the theater, costumes, almost like Larry Rivers, here are all these Robinsons, and you have the figures in them, and you can tell that he copied the figures from something. And then he will have colors, little touches of colors, and they are labeled out to the side, so you have these figures with all these things sticking out to the side, saying, "head-pink" hand-green, feather-red and so on. He did a lot of these chromotypes, the tinting of photographs, where the color is almost arbitrary, not necessarily related to the image. But there is one thing that is evidential, and that you cannot argue with, this man could not constellate an image of the human figure in his drawing. It seems to me that with all of that literature, combination photography and all of those statements that give us rules and regulations and based obviously on other sources, but you suddenly discover that no wonder the figure looks so artificial in those Robinsons. No wonder we can see the outline effect where he worked out the printing technique. It is as though the figure became so vitally important to him and the landscape he had already achieved. The landscape is usually what is least convincing in a Robinson, at least from my perceptual view. *Fading Away*, as an example, shows the whole obviousness of the juxtaposition of the figures in their relationships, it is almost like a hyper-concentration upon making an image of the human figure appear... *Bringing Home the May*, and *The Shepherd Girls*, and *The Girl By The Seaside*: all that cornball garbage. What is fascinating about it is

the fact that when a person could not constellate a figurative image, it was not accessible to him, either through his craft ability...or even his psychic ability.

Student: Have you seen the picture of the figure in the landscape, not the shepherd girls, not the morning lark... it's the one of a woodsy scene, and there are ten figures...

Ten figures, exactly.

Student: It is so weird.

Absolutely astounding. And you notice that is the one where you definitely see the outline effect and the change of size factor.

Student: The scale is all off, it is insane.

But I would seriously doubt, say any interpretation that would imply that Robinson was simply interested in pictorial photography, regardless of what he wrote in the title of his books. He was interested in constellating the human figure: of developing something that he had no capacity to do. It was almost as though you could say it was his inferior function, sensation...and as a result he turns to photography as a way of confirming the identity of the human figure. This is a man who was anything but sensation-oriented: all one has to do is read his books and read the kind of concerns that he had. But photography was a way of introducing, let's say the archetype was activated in some way, he turns to the medium of photography to present those human figures and he literally finds a technique which he did not try to disguise, and we have enough evidence that he could have blended edges and so on: he wants to say I know the landscape, there is the figure in front of it. Which I think is an illustration where, to a degree, at that point it had profound meaning for Robinson to have those figures *set on top* of things, if you will, they may have not been developed that way. So that they are basically the dominant structure. And that is why there is always, I think, this peculiar dis-association between landscape and figure, not because of a cruder technique or approach. In time, though, his approach to that had no affect as a device or what have you, it certainly did on collective levels, but it had no effect upon what we would call the mainstream of photographic development. It is no wonder that Emerson found it so completely offensive. But what happens to Emerson? What is his grand denial? What was it that he could not accept about the pictorial image? Basically it was that {the camera} was a scientific instrument that did not allow for personal, creative dimensions. That is how you can sum it up. And so as a result he decided that it was a scientific instrument and as a result he decided those gorgeous naturalistic images were later denied by Emerson as being basically not subject to human control. There you can find that at a certain point the image itself waned an affect on an individual because Robinson's form of combination printing, or Rejlander's, waned as far as having an effect upon the collective, mainstream, group-identity of photography, and in time lost its efficacy, lost its life, lost its import: people didn't do it. And then of course it re-emerges in a whole series of montage interests. And then of course it reemerges with a whole

new constellation of energy or affect or intention to say perhaps we view our world much more in terms of fragments that we then conjoin and bring together.

Student: So it seems the idea of sequencing photographs, like Duane Michaels, there is a recent issue of *Camera Magazine* with sequences in them and yet the original, who was it, Disderi? He did sequences way back, and then they were stopped for a while, the original carte-de-visits, then there was a dry period, and then they started again.

Absolutely. But then that tradition is much earlier than the history of photography...how many of you saw the Duane Michaels' show at the Museum?...There is a whole book, that's right: the shoe, the furtive figure, comes closer and closer, following the shoe. I love that one of the spirit-figure rising out of the body (laughs). We might want to look at this later but it just happens to be sitting here and it strikes me as interesting, *The Ox Herding Pictures*...that follows a definite sequence. And of course Duane's are not necessarily linked just by virtue of technique or style, they are linked also by a definite anecdotal linkage. That is a kind of an event factor applies...These ten ox herding pictures of losing the ox, trying to trap the ox, and so on, is a phenomenal motif where suddenly one of the frames in this series of cartoons is completely empty, as though it is some cosmic revelation, the all, etc., and then we merge back to the image of nature. And can you imagine a better polarization of logos—the spiritual, non-material, and then the next image that follows is enantiodromiacally, the world of the earth. Then we have the old wise man... this little peasant who had been chasing that ox—which means chasing 'instinct.'

Student: But what I think is really kind of funny in there is that the blank one is called *The Man and the Ox Both Gone*, in other words it isn't translated...

Well it means they are both gone because there is no need to be concerned with the identity of their crisis, that there is something larger than they are.

Student: Yes I was just saying that it is a very nice clean way into it.

It really is, but what I am saying is that there is an almost leaping beyond the event and then coming back...and as she {Jacobi} is saying is that certain things wear out as far as affect and then of course they become part of tradition. Then she says, finally, this is the last statement: "All archetypal imaging functions constellating a symbolic function fostering a series of images cannot be understood at all. They may confront the ego consciousness as an expression of a complex hidden, so to speak, behind it are hostile foreign bodies split off from it in disassociation from the psyche. It then becomes an autonomous splinter-psyche which can make itself felt in the form of spirits, hallucinations, etc., that is in all kinds of neurotic and psychotic symptoms."...So insanity might be best measured not just upon chemical factors or what have you, this may be part of the triggering mechanism, but a splinter-psyche is basically an archetype which has reached the level of consciousness and assimilated the ego. And thus the ego no longer has its identity, it is not subject to controls or being caught between unconscious and conscious life, it is displaced, as it were, it becomes a unit structure of

the archetype. There is that marvelous series, what is his name, it appears in everything from Time/Life studies of the mind, you know the man who did the drawings of cats? They gradually disintegrated into zig-zag patterns and concentrations upon the eyes and so on. Where the sheer formal level becomes so delightful that there is a kind of assimilation, an inability to differentiate. You can imagine sitting around painting London in public, these nice little kitty cats, and suddenly this cat becomes transformed, the eyes fix you and gradually its body substance disappears, and one is left hardly with more than a psychedelic color patterning. It is conceivable that there are images that affect us this way, that we even encounter. I don't know what you have encountered lately might seem to you to show a high degree of dissociation. Ironically these images are not always expressed in terms of— we are very used to the idea of fragmentation— dissociation of order. We have cultivated in our particular time a strong degree of emphasis upon the idea of things out of sequence. Often the images that are most disturbing to us are those that are extremely frontal, ordered, or what have you. Sometimes mugshots, things like this carry with them a kind of content level that is disturbing. Whatever images that you might have encountered that you feel strongly about, I guess it could appear on any level...Going through all of this, I hope it hasn't lead to more confusion, but one of the reasons for prompting this whole sequence is to suggest that not only are there content levels: there are subject matter, as it were, associated with the constellation of archetypes rising to consciousness, and then being expressed in form, but there are also formal levels. And what we will do this evening is try to—and I will not go over this thoroughly, I will just introduce this Arnheim study of—it is a rebuttal to Jung's whole concept of the archetype, and it is an argument with the whole concept of, (laughs) it should present some alternative...and he calls this *A Perceptual Analysis of a Cosmological Symbol*. This first appeared, it is now in his study, *Psychology and Perception*, in the revised edition, but it is also from a German magazine called, *Sim*, remember the root word for symbolism. This is a group of painters who set up a pragmatic program for their own works. Most of them are still active, but they all seem to center around these mandaloid structures. Claus Jergen Fisher, he is now in New York. Many of you may know his work: the introduction of actual fabrics in the center of the canvas and so on. But this analysis first appeared and I think it is rather important as a way of at least taking a motif and analyzing its structure and then arriving at "why does this seem to express itself in cultures as having a high degree of meaning?" And he says it is not at all because of the association factors. And he gives you all of the symbolologies and so on. He says it really relates back to a very simple definition of the way forms work: how they appear in our field of vision, and that they can become definite receptacles for the content we pour upon them. I think that it really isn't a rebuttal to Jung, but he constantly takes Jung to task and says that he makes things more complex than need be, which may be the kind of accusation that might be appropriate. And then look at the examples, let's talk about this idea of frontally and explore on a formal level where an archetypal constellation appears in a period of time, then reemerges, particularly in the medium of photography, as profound content levels as well as physical presences. And may indeed be based upon some underlying structure that is not necessarily known to consciousness. Let's stop there, any comments, questions? Ideas? {laughs}

Break.

Louie was asking me about, some of us were looking at Les Krims' pictures today, photographs, and this particular one came up as a subject of conversation, it is the one with the sockets forming a cross, the electrical wires into the woman's mouth, the ellipse being seen on the television set... the shag rug on the floor, the window, and Louie asked me, what did you ask me again?

Student: I asked you what you thought about it, first.

That's true, I said, well here is summing up what we were discussing: how do I feel about these works, what do I think about them, and I said, well, there are several in this that I am automatically disposed to find important, and then of course you say why, why do you think that it is inevitable that you would find them important, and I said it is because it is my set of responses and what I am looking for. I begin to look for certain things and he feeds that to me. But I said there is an example where traditional motifs are used: the cross, the television set, the woman on the bed, etc. But then the discussion suggested is there any other level that could be defined as archetypal, or are these simply semiotic or as Morse Peckham has put it, what is that called, signs and symbols?

Student: That was the distinction I was making.

Are they basically just a group of motifs that communicate a specific meaning, like the traditional cross and so on, and I said no. And this of course would depend upon how people respond to that image. I find it very traditional in the usage of interconnections and there are a number of motifs that you could observe in medieval art that are absolutely paralleling that structure. It always sounds like an apology, but I asked Les again today about a couple of these images afterward, "Have you seen this? No I have not." As far as the image of the mother figure, as a *mama* figure, now here we have this nude inactive, she is reclining, not flat, but she is sitting in a state almost as though she is patient-like, and there is no active, yes I animate the photograph, she is not actively performing a gesture. And there is an image of the great mother in which she serves as a figure who nourishes, not through normal functions. That is she does not nourish through the breast region, suckling the child... Many of these, in the Abbey of Montecassino, there is a remarkable image—this a fourteenth century manuscript illumination—where the image of earth, it is entitled *Earth*, there are actually pagan motifs brought to bear upon Christian themes. And in the format of this illumination you have a strange mountain top thing, and out of this rises a figure of a female, she has her hands held up. (laughs) So actually her body is the earth itself. And we were speaking earlier of the dragon-like figure that is suckling at this breast, that is a dragon, and there is another mythical kind of animal, but they are composites, suckling at this breast. And then there are two little trees, these two little lolly pop trees on either side, so there is a high degree of symmetry. There is the image of the mother, who arises out of, the earth is indeed her body, and there are rocks and little blades of grass, etc. Now this is the typical image of her nourishing according to her normal function, although part of her

structure, is the representation of the actual earth structure itself. There are other images and they are particularly centered around two images: one is the image of Sophia, you remember I mentioned the goddess of wisdom? It is Mary in her image as the wise mother. She feeds, these are generally thirteenth and fourteenth century as well. They're stacked figures, now imagine these to be figures standing or kneeling, and they are stacked on either side, almost as you remember in those Duccio or Giotto figures, the stacking effect. And it persists, even in these images. There is a large image of a crowned Mary with glowing tresses, and she sits on this rather embellished throne...{laughs} I wanted to get my chance to sketch this out. And what happens is there is a displacement. We do not have the feeding or the suckling at the breast and there is not an association with natural phenomenon with part of her structure. She actually appears as a fully identifiable figure, but there are things like, in the breast region, there is an opening like this. The breasts are absolutely apparent inside but of course clothed, I mean there is clothing falling across the breasts, like this. These are two breasts and these are the clothes... {laughter} There are tubes that go from the central heart region and they connect, these tubes go down and they connect to the mouths of each one of these figures. And they send out these little tentacles, and I mentioned that often these figures are holding instruments that identify them with all the varieties of human behavior: architect, engineer and so on. Many of you may know the Aphrodite Venus figures that float in mandorlas, these almond-shaped motifs, and they send out rays. And then we have the nude figure of the Venus standing in here, and there is a landscape below, and there are again figures enjoying the hunt, or building a house, or engaged in human activities, and again these rays come down and often do enter into the region of the eye, or the ear, or the mouth itself. I am simply pointing out that there are indeed parallels to this concept of the connection between the woman figure and its connecting to some object or even some symbolic motif. There are a number of examples, one called *philosophia*, with the world disc, and she appears to hold something that looks like a zodiacal, circular disc. And yet all of these are varied symbolic motifs representing types of professions and types of identity, evidently showing the totality of mankind. And obviously in a period where there was a beginning of differentiation of specialization types. One of the best ways to show all men was to show the hoe for the farmer and the square for the architect, or whatever it may be. Les is comparatively...The only thing I can say is returning to yesterday that there are innumerable images that you could use to parallel Les's and you can say that it is a pretty nifty connection, the idea that coming from the woman's mouth, these wires, and they plug in to the cross, many of you may see the cross as feeding the woman, I see just the opposite: the woman is feeding the cross, you follow me? You asked me that question yourself. That is funny because you are not the only person who has mentioned that. If we thought of this as an action or an event, and to me those are dramatic charades. They are developed as event-structured motifs. He sets it up, so to speak. So even though there are parallels that does not explain, though, the archetypal function. I am more interested in, why does that particular image get realized, through Les Krims in this day and time?

Student: My question is partly whether or not it is really dealing with archetypal images. If it is dealing with symbols that in some way go beyond themselves in such a way. The

only distinction I can make is between a symbol and a signal, in which if you take the various aspects and if they are put in there as signals to trigger almost in terms of a Pavlovian response, then like the female nude I think is often used this way, the cross is used this way, and what I want to know is, in Les's work, how do you distinguish? Can you?

Let me put it this way: I distinguish it in so far as I find a symbolic construct that I cannot ultimately define, specifically. Look at the component parts just for a moment: you have the cross, you have the bed structure, you have the woman like this, and then you have the electrodes going up and connecting to this, and then you have the little television set with the eclipse indicated.

Student: It is an eclipse?

Yes it is.

Student: Is that clear from the print?

Student: How would you know it?

I saw it for the first time and I thought it was the eclipse and I can do is trust. I asked Les, how many of you were here when I asked Les, is that the eclipse, and he said yes. I said was it pasted on the surface?... Someone told me that he took a photograph in Life of the eclipse and he put it up and I didn't believe it, because look at the way that appears. But he said very definitely it was the eclipse. And he set it up right at the moment when it was shown on the television, the full eclipse, and he took the photograph. He had it all set up and waiting for it.

Student: And you saw it in the picture before hearing from Les.

Absolutely. Honestly, and I am not just saying that, I did indeed. I don't know what that means.

Student: The print reads a little clearer than the reproduction.

It certainly does, you are quite right. In fact that is why I noticed today, a number of those things I had not seen except in that magazine and other sources published, but I had not seen in the actual prints. There is an extraordinary difference, even to the point in that reproduction you cannot really tell the sockets too distinctly. In the print they are very visible. You can see the plugs and the sockets and everything else. Well the point is, is that I would start with the idea that sure, using your term for a moment, Pavlovian response, a cross that will constellate different types of responses in people. The nude figure will also constellate certain expected results. And then if we thought of electrical wires going into a plug, you would automatically think of some kind of energy, right? That is inevitable, isn't it? Or not, I mean it is to me. We all agree, that is inevitable, Louie didn't seem to think so.

Student: No, the reason it is not inevitable is because it was obvious to me that these sockets were set up to a blank wall. Now I may be being too literal in my reading of the print, and that did work against my idea, for me, of any actual energy flow.

Student: But the sockets are in the wall.

Students: {inaudible}

There is no proof, but I look at that plug in that wall and that thing up there and I just automatically think of the fact that there is energy. There is something going through those wires. Granted it can be interpreted a dozen ways, that might be an obvious connection. Then certainly if we see the eclipse we have the moon and sun in conjunction, at least not there in conjunction but there is a passage of one into the other. And we can make all sorts of parallels between moon-sun, paternal-maternal, in the traditional associations of these motifs. Solar-lunar: the great alchemical images of franking, sol and luna and then often the conjunction of these two, and in fact set over one another. The great Carolingian...they go back even to early Near Eastern art... there are a number of Carolingian book covers that show very idealized figures of Christ on the cross, and then you have the sun and moon motif, next to one another, often shedding tears, weeping at the tragedy of the loss of the god, etc., etc. So there are a number of parallels and there is an example of where the sun and moon are at least in conjunction, and as a result there is a kind of paternal-maternal implication according to this traditional mythology. The very fact that energy, the connection between the female principle and the cross as representative of the paternal principle. Again we go back to this idea of the logos: word dimension, and then we have the Eros image. What to me is happening is that all these motifs have a certain tradition. And the minute I look at that, I do, my mind turns around and doesn't look at photograph and start saying, what is this, what tradition is it in and so on. It just happens that if in my experience there are a group of images that are that I am quite familiar with, that I may well see them reflected or at least being re-constellated or reconfigured in some manner. That again to me though is not the archetypal level: those are sign-systems. They are semiotic motifs that begin to set up inter-relationships that may definitely follow traditional, iconographic motif presences. And also we may carry it a step further and say that I begin to contemplate just such things as where is the energy connecting. This is where I become positivistic: the wires depart from the woman's mouth, they plug into the wall. So I take it in a very simple-minded way, that the energy comes from the woman to the cross, right? And if we follow traditional theological constructs, one of the great crises in the early establishment, certainly look at the writings of Saint Paul. I am interested in theology. The very nature of the constant crisis of trying to present or graft onto varieties of cultures the paternalistic deity as opposed to the Great Mother worship, the fertility worship, etc. And there is a tremendous crisis after the *Pantocrater*, the ruling father images develop...and the cult of the Virgin Mary as a way of trying to excuse or re-adopt the archetypal feminine into a highly paternalistic system. And Les shows this exhausted figure. Now I take it as an actual event. I do not necessarily look at it as just a form to be observed. If he deliberately sets it up for me then I have to think in terms of

what he is trying to impart, almost as if I look at this as a set-up. And as a result, the figure in its exhausted phase, the woman looks depleted, she has been feeding the cross, and as a result he is making some kind of comment to me about the nature of the relationship between the masculine and the feminine, the paternal and the maternal, etc.

Student: The very reasons that you are citing, one of the things we discussed was the energy flow to go one way, is the reason that I had them going the other way. That when you plug into the wall, you are getting power from the wall, not from the tape recorder or the television. But the power, if those are electric outlets...

That is true, but I still see...

Student: Also because the woman is exhausted...instead of draining that the power is coming in, or that what is coming in is the cause of the exhaustion.

Right. Or either way. If the power, logically so. I see it literally in reverse, as if it emanates from her. Now I grant you, I called it a simple-minded way. I see it almost in the reverse, but in either case it is a passage of energy between the two and they are definitely connected. Now when I extend that into the idea of some particular system that relates to an earlier patriarchal motif, or one that relates to the paternal, again, that does not justify calling this an archetypal image. What begins to interest me is why does this particular motif... appear in this particular period of time through this particular photographer, Les Krims? And Nathan pointed this out, and I think it is an extremely important factor, that maybe it is extraordinarily inappropriate to take a single work and project upon it some dimension that would not...

End of reel #4

