

### **William Parker lecture at Visual Studies Workshop, April 1971 reel 3**

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

Additional information set in { }.

Transcribed by Bob Martin

Were you thinking of a specific image or were you thinking of an idea?

Student: An idea... in a different way...more mystic than Jerry...to me.

I don't know, I think Minor's {White} is a very cultivated form of...but Minor's is much more ritualized. I don't think Jerry has a strain of mysticism in him. Take it for what it is worth. He is not esoteric, and it isn't the comedy...I am going to enjoy someday hearing Jerry hear this recording and hear this part, Jerry Uelsmann is not this, (laughter) he is not that, and so on. Obviously, from my personal experience, the comic routine, and Banale mentions this in the introduction, is not a factor to be dealt with, humor... I find he has an interest in things mystical but also a turning away from, so it is not an innate mystical disposition in Jerry.

Student: {inaudible}

No, I'd say Minor's is a deliberate cultivation of ritual techniques through which to engage levels of consciousness, to have revealed to him. And it is a very deeply, almost spiritual experience, whereas Jerry's is much more, it happens to him...It just happens to him, he has no responsibility for it.

Student: It happens. What happens? ...{inaudible}

That would be more typical of the idea that you have to cultivate the disciplines in which it can happen.

Student: ...I have to be in another form of it, and it happens...if you believe it happened then you can't help it, but that is something else.

Well it is, that is true, but what I am trying to suggest is that I do not believe that Jerry's images are ritualistic in nature. That they are born out of a kind of mechanical discipline and what does emerge as an image is basically last known to him.

Nathan: Bill, do you find in his own use of the word 'celebration' which recurs as a descriptive position about his work. He speaks of it as more of a celebration.

I would, he speaks constantly of being, if we can use the metaphor, most people might not take it seriously, some of Jerry's utterances concerning like the celebrative aspect.

The idea of, I am trying to remember, I can't think of the right word but, he talks about, 'I just enjoy light-sensitive materials and to work with them is enough for me,' it is kind of Dionysian. The idea of analysis, I'll never forget one night at my home someone began to wax on about Jerry's work and he became because he thought that the person was trying to put him down, that he didn't know what was in his own work. (laughs). Again, Jerry, pardon that personal vignette, now I'm telling stories on you out of class. (laughs) But for example, his interest in astrology: Jerry became very interested in astrology, Minor had the Hotchkiss workshop and asked everyone for their birthdate and so on. And that is an interesting phenomenon, that should be a study in itself. (laughs) But Jerry became very interested in astrology, and you know the images that emerged from that series. And can you honestly state that those are born out of some deeply personal experience of astrology or are they more or less, again, they are sort of paradigmatic expressions of what he knew at that time. But many of them start hitting on levels that he does not know about, that he cannot be conscious of, because it is as though he stumbles in his celebration into the core of the ritual, and finds himself instead of paying homage at the altar, he is on it. {laughter} That is probably a better metaphor for it. And jumps off to find another altar because he is highly mercurial in what he celebrates. The paying homage to rather than the idea of being a medium or vehicle through which the images or spiritual dimension is transferred, Jerry's is much more the idea of the unconscious celebrant. Now if we are going to talk about it that way we have to have that possibility of certain ritual forms do not assume that anything is revealed to you in the initial experience of the ritual. You go through it and then supposedly in retrospect you find out what happened to you. Many religious rituals imply that you are an adept and you trained and you know exactly the steps that you are going to follow, and there are certain conclusions that are pre-evident, pre-known, Jerry's would be more like the first.

Student: Could his darkroom work be his ritual?

I think it is. A highly celebrational ritual. It seems to be great fun to him, (laughs) never a negative thing, but not just because of what he has written about it, the way he expresses it, except that he says it becomes arduous sometimes to repeat something. When he has lost the interest in this idea of plenitude spilling over. Let me suggest this to you: that if you accept this, and if you accept this and if you accept that, *then*, and that is dangerous, I realize that, I am conscious of my own frailty when I present this, but I take the position, and let me make it highly personalized, I take the position that Jerry is basically represented in a number of his prints, not all by any sense. And I say in the prints that I evaluate as more provocative and that might be my fabric identity. He is more or less a vehicle for the manifestation of ideas rather than the definer of ideas. He uses absolutely traditional constructs, the symmetry factor, this kind of iconic symmetry. He uses motifs that would have an immediate parallelism or opposition— polar opposites or parallels— that we can find almost immediately the cause of their obviousness certain constructs that relate culture to culture in terms of their meaning. However what often escapes the observer is the idea of the dynamic behind it. Take a unit idea such as the prevalence of the mandala or the quaternity. I mentioned the tetramorph, the idea of the religious symbolism, the deity associated with the center and

so on: if we took the idea of the quaternity and the mandala, and we say that traditionally this particular motif has had prevalent the idea of a godhead at the center with the four attendant figures on the sides, or at the cardinal points of the compass. But we do not have an association of any kind of deeply religious imagery...we often have the nimbus surrounding the head of a figure expressing illumination or revelation...We have the structure of the trinity, etc. But the alchemists constantly, I am using a parallel illustration, the alchemists constantly talked about three elements and the fourth was unknown, just like this morning we were talking about three levels of consciousness that seem to be accessible and one is unknown. And the validity of the idea comes out of the fourth that is discovered through the process of individuation, which we discussed this morning. Jerry has commented on this, so that it is not to infer that these ideas are totally foreign to him. And I know the source for it, and basically it is this: someone was discussing at one time, the idea of the 19th century—I can't remember the exact date when this was established—but any of you interested in theology or the dates in which particular dogmas or canonization of doctrine that occurred within the Catholic Church: the ascension and assumption and placement of the Virgin Mary as the fourth part of the Trinity occurred basically as a prelude in the 19th century and then the canonization has happened in the 20th century. Now you find this far out and I agree it is not very good evidence to present here, but we have to reckon with it, because the idea was: father...son on the right hand, holy ghost here. There was an absence in the quaternity. There was an absent element. Now obviously we have the parallelism between—metaphorical and I'll come back to the point momentarily—we have basically the concept that these are three in one as a kind of dogma. And...two are paternal and one is...diffuse, that is neuter, and identified with inspirational, mighty rushing wind, tongues of flame, something that is not at all corporealized in terms of human identity, agreed? We don't have any images, at least that I know of, of the holy spirit in figurative form. There can be identities attached to the holy spirit but no particular images: air, fire, earth, water...

Student: A bird?

The bird emits the pneuma, the wind. When you see the dove, you are seeing an extension, just to use that as a parallel, if you go to the Victoria and Albert Museum... here is the realm of the heavens, generally a circular motif, and there is a tube that comes down and it joins with the nimbus of the Virgin Mary. That's the Virgin Mary {Parker makes a drawing on a chalkboard, laughs, laughter}...I'm supposed to be a painter and now we have Parker with his chalk talk, he uses little elementary school hieroglyphs. But anyway, there are generally three lines that are represented within this tube, and the earliest representation of the holy spirit was basically a linear motif, not a bird... not a baby figure floating down the tube, but basically you had the three lines, and this was called pneuma. It is like the root for pneumonia, airsickness, whatever it may be: the mighty rushing wind, the breath of god, the archetype as far as the archetypal motif, that goes all the way back to Paleolithic cave paintings at least if we believe some of the recent research, speculative of course, of some of those things we thought were arrows piercing the beast and so on are often abstract representations. Pictographs of hands, the association of breath from the nostrils as being the life-

source. We certainly can deal with it in Egyptian art as being a very evident motif. The Amarna style introduces the idea of pneuma, it is even written by the way, hieroglyphic representations of this motif: air, pneuma, you know that marvelous stele figure of Nefertiti and Akhenaton playing with their children in that out of door realm beneath that sort of canopy, and the wind blows the fillets from the crowns? Now they have discovered in hieroglyphics the description that they were in a holy precinct, and the wind is pneuma, this holy magical wind passing through and they are not only witnessing the delight of their children and family life, but the sun sends down the rays on the ends are little hands carrying ankh motifs: a symbol of life and air was associated with this... There are innumerable ancient paradigms. In Christianity the pneuma was to justify a connection between the heavenly sphere and the earthly plane, and if Mary was to conceive— even if this was to be a magical conception— she certainly could not have conceived through natural fecundation. That indeed it must be magical, {laughter} You all like that? Fecundation? You know what that sounds like. {laughter} Yeah I've got a lot of dirty words. {laughter}

Students: {inaudible}

Student: Gotcha

{Laughter}

You're stealing my punchline!

{laughter}

But anyway, if you want to follow this, it is not the best because Ernest Jones is not an historian, but he has an essay called, *The Madonna's Conception Through the Ear*. I'll get back to my point. (laughter) But this happens to me on occasion I suddenly just go walking off into outer space. Bye! Well anyway, if the Madonna was to magically conceive, therefore she could not conceive through normal channels. (laughter) It is getting worse! There was the construct based upon the ancient idea that life was engendered through breath. And as a result the heavenly spirit emanates the pneuma, and generally three lines, it actually extends into Egyptian Art where the pneuma/air is often extended in a linear motif. The pneuma passes from the heavenly orb or mandala often with the identifiable image of the hand or the bearded figure, portrait bust, and connects with the region of the head. Ernest Jones' essay talks about the two aspects of the audio/aural plus the visual expression. The most obvious one from art history is Simone Martini's *Annunciation*: Gabriel announces, you know those early pop up images with the words ave maria, grazia: you had the words passing across, so there is the visual image of the passage way, there's no way to deny this bridge. There is also the concept of hearing through the ear. If the word is spoken, look in the National Gallery at Van Eyck's *Madonna*, and that one is neat because the words are written upside down, figure that one out. It passes across...it is almost as a negative reversal, hold it up to a mirror and it will appear right, etc. Pardon that little aside. He did some interesting tricks with this idea of confirming the idea that something is heard, and it is

upside down because it implies the celestial world and the visitation of the terrestrial world there has to be an inverse relationship. So you are really expected to sense the idea of the spoken word as very definitely coming from above... The Madonna hears... we see, we read the expression, and always the words do not disseminate into space but they make a direct beeline for the nimbus or the halo or often for the ear. What we find is that there is a transfer of spirit in the three lines of the pneuma coming down through this tube passage. If you want to read further, this is actually based upon a very ancient motif that is now, our astronauts have discovered to be physical fact: there are certain concepts of the idea of a sun-phallus. And there are Egyptian liturgical documents that talk about the sun sending out a tube that swings back and forth and emits wind, and of course this wind supposedly fecundated the earth. And it is thoroughly documented. And the astronauts discovered, when they took photographs and found out that there is a solar extension that causes the wind currents to emerge. Jung had a famous study of a schizophrenic who kept on saying, 'see it up there, see the penis on the sun,' and everyone said, eww, (laughter) watch out for that patient, and finally Jung, it was his first major study in schizophrenia and the unlocking of the clues to it. He began to talk to the patient and found he was obsessed by the sun-phallus, and he finally found in the Egyptian *Book of the Dead* a reference that then carried him to another reference and he found out that it was indeed a constant motif that reappeared in different cultures. I mentioned to you Edwin Witmont's book, *The Living Symbol*, {reference check shows the author is Gerhard Adler, 1961} you might want to read that because it has a thorough discussion on this whole phenomenon of the sun-phallus. I didn't know it at the time it was before the Jung studies, but he has carried it further. But the perception actually extending from Near-Eastern art... to medieval art of the connecting tube joining the celestial sphere to the earthly sphere through which passes a fecundating wind, and the wind enters through the Madonna's ear...almost as how early *Democratean* theories of memory passes down through the spine and literally enters into her womb through a channel in the spine and also back up to her head so that she is aware of this factor. The idea of wearing a hat or veil in church, all of those marvelous late Gothic paintings of the veil covering the ears. The ear was an orifice that could either be subject to visitation from satanic forces, or by the divine forces: you had to watch out. It is like when kids say, 'in your ear!' (laughter) And you too may have a magical conception! (laughter) The same archetype is operative: 'screw you in the ear' is a very contemporary expression but also ancient and at one time a very ritualized... (laughter) But what happens is man no longer believes in the image and as a result there is what we call an apologizing. The apologetic or a justifying image introduced, and where you first find it: you find it in Robert Campin, in Van Eyck, suddenly the halo becomes a fire screen. Suddenly the light falls through window, it is a natural landscape. There were periods before this where you have— Campin actually introduces this— where you have the light rays coming through the window, and then you have the little baby with a little cross on his shoulder floating down. Later it is even Crivelli—he is the most remarkable one— to show you how the persistence of an archetypal motif: Crivelli will have this elaborate Renaissance setting with filigree on every tile and detail of the architecture, and the gowns have 85 pounds of gold leaf and tooling. It was the waning period of the Renaissance when no one believed in the magical process of the association with the pneuma visiting Mary through the ear. So to show or accommodate

the magical event, Crivelli shows God in the heavens as a figure floating up on a cloud, and out of his hand he delivers a dove—the holy spirit—and the dove flies down and the point was, and this is being totally facetious, you realize that if the dove keeps following that same path it will not be able to get through the wall of the building, so Crivelli constructs a little peep hole, where the dove can fly right through the wall, and then of course, say hello to Mary. {laughter} Now the idea is that the dove is not necessarily *the* holy spirit, going back to my original point. The dove is the representative of the wind that wafts the dove: the dove is really speaking of the pneuma that he glides upon. And it was Clement of Alexandria who first defined the dove as being a representative of the holy spirit, and what we often forget is that we read Clement of Alexandria said the dove shall represent the holy spirit and we forget that it is because of this association with wind and air flight and buoyancy.

Student: Were you trying to associate the mandala with that photograph... Will the use of the mandala explain the photograph?

No, it won't, not at all... We have already discussed the fact that there is a mandala construct...

Student: I don't really see how there is. There are three figures and a fourth which is the holy ghost or an unknown figure, but the three figures themselves seem to have opposition among any of the two of them.

No, they are... incredibly the same are they not? They don't have manifest differences.

Student: So we don't have mandala symbolism at all.

No, but you are incorrect. Mandala symbolism, this can be mandala. I don't really have to have a circle to create a mandala: a mandala is any unit of four or any unit of totality. It does not have to be a circular form, it can be a square form. It can be a series of words: a mandala can be a series of words that are interconnected.

Student: You don't need to have opposites?

And not necessarily have opposites.

Student: And no need for a godhead rising?

No, absolutely not. A flower is a natural expression of a mandala and yes we have seen that in the psychedelic rose, in posters and so on. Targets are mandalas. I say the typifying form is the quadripartite structure with the godhead emanating from the center... in the tetramorph showing different dimensions of figures or creatures. But the point I was getting at is it not so much that there is a mandala in this, but let's talk about the dynamic of why this might appear in our time. And as I was saying, there is one viable historical event. There are many but I am saying one is extremely important, is this idea of the canonization, the doctrine of the assumption of the Virgin Mary into, not

now the trinity: for a good Catholic you would no longer believe in the trinity, you would believe in the quaternity. And that if you look at it, what I was trying to get to was the idea that the father, son, and holy ghost are basically paternalized identities: at least two are male and one comes down as a descending force, pneuma. It is a revelatory, but it comes from the celestial sphere, from the sphere of the word or the logos. The feminine that is now assimilated into the quaternity, as I said, in fact, represents the assimilation of the feminine *into* the construct of the paternalized consciousness... I mentioned it this morning and I'll bring it up again: the women's liberation movement is the assimilation of the animus function. Were you here this morning?

Student: No.

If not you must not know what I am talking about. That is the masculine identity that resides in a woman, we can discuss it later, further. The idea that, the function that is being assimilated into the mandala of femininity is the masculine realm. It is like the contra-sexual, the contra—opposite drive. It is as though the emergence, I also mentioned this morning Erich Neumann's concern with the advent of the earthly and the chthonic re-emerging and finding its best expression in science, from the Renaissance forward. In other words science inspects matter, and it inspects all forms of energy associated with matter. It is like an inspection of the feminine principle from paternalistic or masculine perspectives. There is a kind of conjunctio or a marriage or a synthesis between these oppositions: spirit/matter, logos/eros, and so on. In the obviousness of Jerry's introduction of this, to me perhaps the most striking phenomenon is the fact that the image does take place beneath the earth. So it is definitely subterranean, it is definitely implying a measurable psychological attention to the chthonic. It is not confirmed so much that he's got an opposition between the spiritual and the three figures that stand in their neutralization that this is the trinity, and the neutrality of their identity—it is almost like they are three in one. Look at one and you've got the other two: you get the idea? It is not so much the opposition between the Christian image and the turtle image as expressing the chthonic, it is the idea that the entire image takes place in the earth as it were. There is not a construct of the revealed identity in the iconography of this having a manifestation of a polar opposite. In other words the Christ figure is dragged forward by the turtle, almost as if it were seated upon a catapult of some sort. I characterize this as being one of Jerry's typical event images: ask him about this, he does not see this as a fixed symmetrically structured, iconically static image. He sees it as having the potential of evolution, and this motif right here is simply accommodated by the flipping of the central figure, and you get this kind of harness-like effect. The turtle appears to move forward. It is an implied kineticism in opposition to the basic symmetry. And it literally seems to drag, almost forcefully drag, the trinitarian Christ figures forward. This suggests that if we were to find the unit idea somewhere involved in this that we are not really concerned with the archetype, or female sexual anatomy, or spiritual imagery, or what have you. But basically that structuring of an event in which things are material: the whole aspect of working this out in photography. Magritte would obviously paint this. Jerry does it through a series of very materialistic images. He has the entire event take place within the bowels of the earth. It is as though there has been an implied prelude towards the event that is expressed here. That is that

the spiritual dimension has descended, literally, has actually descended into the body of the earth. And the feminine principle begins to cause a dragging forward, a kind of waning canon of consciousness. And if we were to take a spin-off of this we might say that Jerry is making a profound comment upon waning forms of rationalism. The idea that, you will have to see if you can accept these connections, and there is nothing logical about this at all. We seem to be concerned in our time with a denial of consciousness, and that means rational consciousness. I am talking about collectively. We have these things that are almost becoming trite phrases like, 'the drug problem,' a lot of moral dimension in all of this granted. But we say what happens to a nation when its technology cannot keep up with its feeling sensitivities. A constant attacking of reasoning powers, or reasoning potentials. And a need to return to a more chthonic and earthly expression. The rife development of body-touch, Esalen Institutes, motion, the idea of re-engaging the physical, you follow me, the reengagement of sensory experience. It is a pretty tragic commentary when we find out that we have to realize our bodies are *there*, but it is there, it is absolutely a collective phenomenon. And it is a very major factor, I think, to deal with the idea of the structures of meaning: don't tell me what it is about, don't give me a list of rules, I want to know it for myself. The broader, moral, ethical problems of our culture seem to be centered around a denial of rules, regulations, and systems of consciousness that have a high degree of a discrete number of units, or a discrete order sequence. And a resurgence of a very chthonic earth principle. They say the same thing, but a very ancient earth principle. Jerry does not present a polarity, he presents really the earth. And if anything, he is presenting the turtle—the image of basically the earth—is actually guiding or at least dragging forward the kind of the iconically obvious, or even dead image of the spiritual. And there is a possibility that we might find not anything to be discovered necessarily in the photographic image itself, but trying to say does this have within it, unit ideas that link broadly to other expressions, whether they be in literature, can you think of parallel to this whole idea? Of the activity now taking place on the chthonic level, but even the spiritual is now part of a sloughed off skin. Or speaking of turtles, the carapace that has been discarded but still follows along as part of a slag-heap to a new kind of consciousness. Can you think of any literary example? Philosophical example? Oh surely you can, come now.

Student: Bergson for one.

Bergson is a supreme example of this major concern. Tell us what you have been into.

Student: The idea of the force animating nature and the world spirit. And what is most interesting is the connection with, and what even reinforces your conclusion, is the comparison is set up between this photograph and the photograph as it appears in the book: here there is still a possibility of an interpretation which would smack of medievalism. It is the saints standing on top of the dark demons of the unconscious.

That's right.



Student: And even though this demon seems to be the dynamic force, the saints are still on top of the unconscious, on top of the world forces, which correspond to the solarized or dark and gray world on top. Whereas in the photograph as it is printed in the book, the four figures are united by the purple, so it is as if...

They are co-equal.

Student: It is an even higher synthesis.

Who has the catalog? Hold that up so you can see the color of what he is referring to, he is absolutely correct. The color plate inside on that first frontispiece page. It is highly unified by virtue of its coloration. I also find it fascinating that the coloration principle is an adding, now this might sound far-fetched to you, but the idea of polychroming. And not just in photography, it has always been a technique to enhance the life principle of what is being described. For example, Greek sculptures being painted, rouged, wearing wigs, costumed, false mustaches. The Jericho Heads: again...the plaster, a pinkish plaster, with the addition of those Nigerian sculptures with holes for the addition of hair and so on. But coloration has always been a principle not of simply to define so it is closer to reality, but to enhance the life, the animistic inhabitation of spirit within the form. Jerry "colors it" so to speak, he adds, he further enforces the idea of this as a material representation by putting color on it. I guess you could set this up and do it as color photography, I guess that would be possible... Bergson's idea of the life force of informing all things is also realized in his concept, as I mentioned earlier, he doesn't specifically use the word enantiodromia but it is the same principle. The idea of energy being achieved by expression and then going to its counterpoint and the kind of synthesis that emerges between them and the projection forward of new life energy and the king of vital life that emerges out of a conflict of opposites. I was thinking also in literature, we mentioned this morning Eliot's cycle of the *Wasteland*, as a perfect example of this return to the chthonic, a return to the earthly—that is early. I was also thinking of certain parallels in rock music today: the strong emphasis upon the chthonic and the earthly, even the idea of sensory or audio-amplification. The forcing of ideas upon consciousness through physical touch, or through amplification of sound or what have you is a further indication that the chthonic is crying out to be realized. What we really do in this case is we leave Jerry's photograph and we start saying how does it fit into the total fabric of concern with the reemergence, the resurgence of the earth archetype. So what do you do with that?

Student: You mentioned before the renewed interest in figurative painting. Also in films we have the phenomenon of neo-realism as a very vital school.

And we have in Grotowski and Living Theater, the idea of the entrance into the audience, that there is no longer a separation of the observer and the observed—a strong physical interpenetration. I would suppose, there is no grand revelation in this, but I would suppose the only thing we have, maybe there is the possibility that we can speculate on the return of the work of art being not unique as an identity in and of itself. I'd like to test it and see what you think of this at least. That we tend to {laughs} This will

be a very disappointing summation of my personal viewpoint: we tend to so over-concentrate upon individual identity, and over-concentrate upon the idea of an artist irregardless to what medium, style, we tend to over-construct relationships to groups, periods, etc., that maybe we are having a return to the concept of *affect*. Where the work of art becomes basically anonymous. Now I have been challenged on this a number of times and I have spoken on it on different levels. And certainly I don't want this to be a summary of my point of view because I deal with it on other levels completely. But the concept of anonymity suggests then that the work of art is nothing but the best and most unique way in which an image can be transferred and show its interpenetration with other images coming from other sources upon a collective consciousness field. Rather than positing the idea of the astute observer, or one who can necessarily trace parallels, but being based upon the idea of its affect upon culture. Now maybe Jerry is not the right candidate for that, I just think there is a possibility that we might observe in his work something basically universal in nature as we started off with, something literally cosmological in affect. Now the Arnheim commentary that I'll share with you at a later session, it is something you can read for yourself in a later session, argues with the whole concept of mandalas and structures that have any kind of universal significance, or any kind of archetypal levels. He talks about it being summed up under the peculiar structure of our eye, and the way we see mandalas is based upon our visual apparatus...I won't read to you the sheet that shows the varied motifs and introduce it as a prelude to something else, but, when you reach the last line of the article one is left with serious doubts as to whether then we say does the structure of the eye reveal the imagery or does the imagery reveal the structure of the eye? We are left with that kind of strange interpretative paradox.

Student: Mathematics is coming around to that, too...Several people have proposed certain theories called limitative theory positing definite conceptual limits to the human mind, so what one person has said is that this is bringing the Platonic archetypes back into the mind and making them into mind functions and understanding them as...

Rather than externalized, we are nothing but reflections, now the archetypal level of the Platonic level of the ideal is now basically intra-psychic, rather than extra-psychic. So as I said, I am not really analyzing Jerry's work, I am simply suggesting to you that I don't think there is a way you can find the content or the subject matter except by seeing how it relates to a field of ideas. It becomes a unit structure within a whole series of structures that constellate a pervasive weltenshuang, a pervasive world-view, a concern for the re-realization...a re-emergence of a concern with matter. Then of course we have the polar opposite, the destruction of it, it seems to be a very pervasive concern in our age. There are others doing it equally, with profound significance. It all depends upon who is your choice for the unit idea. Is there any other particular photographer you think of that might work with the unit idea of the re-constellation of matter and its concerns? Can you think of someone in particular? I would say for example Weston did anything but that. He denied the presence of matter and matter became a metaphor always for something else...well that summed up Weston, OK, {laughs}...What about someone like Les Krims? This is another favorite subject.

Nathan: He will be here tomorrow.

{Laughs} He won't believe it, if he has to hear me go through that moral bit again. Remember at Eastman, do you really believe in all that...

Nathan: Oh yeah he is bringing new prints, too, so maybe we can do something with him.

That would be terrific. There are some of those images that have to be reckoned with that I don't care what you do with them, they are not going to be discerned on the level of interpreting the imagery within the print: you suddenly have to leave the print and put the ideas from the print into a construct that is field-oriented, you have to see how it impinges upon other ideas.

Student: Heineken is interested in that same concept.

Nathan: The question of priority with what you are saying about the field orientation, what we essentially seem to be doing today is going outside of the work.

That is right.

Nathan: I wonder what attention might be given to using the body of Jerry's work as a field, as a primary stage before one goes outside of the work. I think that there is a possibility that it might do one of two things: it might help to support the argument, it might also question aspects of it.

Excellent. I grant you, Nathan, in fact I would not want to assume that one would start with the idea of externalization to see how something relates to unit ideas until perhaps one dealt with the breadth, the range of the concerns that the individual has had.

Nathan: There is a very strange thing that happens in the act of posterity, the putting together of the book, if you have experienced Jerry's work over a period of years. A kind of flow that comes out, and then faced with this problem—a book on my work—it is very interesting what he selected out of his work.

That is very true.

Nathan: There are certain recurrences, certain seriousnesses that are maybe hard to understand in relation to how much energy he puts into punning or humor, or the commitment to a kind of humor he has. There is none of it. There is none of Jerry's sense of humor appearing. It is all Jerry's sense of seriousness. And it is a sense of seriousness about Jerry... I think in some respects the argument can be strengthened by working through his prints because I think maybe it has to do with the question of choice, which is very important in Jerry's work, the combining represents choice.

Absolutely.

Nathan: Which is a very different process than maybe just purely photographing in terms of containment. His very act is one of fragments which will eventually come together, he is making a catalog of very definite objects or spaces to be brought together. There is one photograph that is missing which I think is essential to that and that is the one that has a great big *me* under it.

Isn't that the case? When you started speaking of Jerry's humor...Can I think of a single photograph that might have Jerry's humor in it because most of them are serious. And the one with me and the one in the bathtub perhaps, Rejlander and Robinson.

Nathan: Right, the *me* is not in the context of this which I think takes you off in a totally different direction, which strangely enough is very consistent because when we are talking about systems of consciousness, prior to that I was trying to think of what options an individual has, say an artist's path, whether it was a question of revealing self, concealing self, or denying self. And I think maybe these three ideas are very central to Jerry's work.

Student: Nathan, is that the only three?

Nathan: That's all I got in that thirty seconds.

Revealing, concealing, and what was the third?

Nathan: Denying.

Denying, absolutely.

Student: What about transformation?

Well, transformation maybe emergent from whatever is operative on those levels.

Nathan: Transformation may be denying, I don't know, but you could think about it on those terms.

Student: Or the question of an anonymous position.

Nathan: But the whole self relationship with that *me* photograph, and the anonymous creature that constantly recurs, and the identity figure that constantly recurs as a factor in the foreground in Jerry's work, it is always there. It is not described, it is just there.

Exactly.

Nathan: I am amazed, even in his titling. So many of the titles have to do with self-identity and question. I might say that out of this I could possibly challenge this photograph on the basis of contradiction of systems.

In what sense?

Nathan: In what the turtle can represent in other cultures as well as the trinity, this may be a personal problem.

Oh indeed.

Nathan: In something he is facing.

Now Nathan, that goes back to your original statement earlier about the personal dimension, the personal almost confessional aspect of any of his photographs is almost like a working out his identity or what he is concerned with, but often having greater promise of touching upon the identity of others. Not necessarily working out the same problem.

Nathan: This seems to point to something which I think is incredibly important. Individuals faced with certain combinations of choice, I stress combinations of choice, how consistent do we become in what the decision actually is. How, faced with the combination of questioning of self, how consistent is that picture with other pictures that may have resulted? Which I think tends to support the possibility of form/idea, form/content relationships as they appear historically, or even pre-historically.

Yes.

Nathan: Rather than just the suggestion, I am disturbed by aspects of the Jungian position, which seem to be as much based on foreknowledge of symbolic meaning while it is an anti-catalog of iconographies of meanings. The general tendency seems to be that it becomes a catalog.

It becomes a catalog. That is quite true, an absolutely justifiable complaint, because Jungians insist that archetypes manifest themselves spontaneously in varieties of cultures. For example, he is not a Jungian, but Fromm in *The Forgotten Language* deals with the Red Riding Hood motif and the Cinderella story, and the raising of Lazarus. There are innumerable cultures that have had these same motifs, although they do not have any interconnection, there is no rite of passage in the delivery of documents or what have you. But Jungians say, so therefore images can spontaneously arise out of a similar archetypal constellation, then they give you catalogs and listings of the images and what they mean as though they would almost deny their variability. I agree with you there. But that I think is more the result of turning to evidences in trying to find, remember when I mentioned in Eddinger... the idea of the archetype of the Great Mother, that is no more than a categorical term for a wide number of variations of the image. And then trying to say, well we sum up the meaning of this image in its verbal expressions as the Great Mother, whether she is positive or negative. Does that make sense, do you understand what I am saying?

Nathan: Yes, I want to go one step further. Suppose that out of the experience of Jerry's photographs we came to the realization or feeling that there was a concealing of self as a dominant theme, especially maybe if you know Jerry. That the photographs, very consistently, commit themselves to an elusiveness, and a position that can't be explained. It is almost like a place where his mind can go and not feel it has to be committed to the decision of self. Certainly this experience also seems to exist in Les's photographs. But not relying purely on...I just have a carved figure iconography that may be why flesh is more important to Les than figurative kinds of meanings to Jerry. They both, this kind of separation seems to exist in terms of choice. What do I utilize to reconstruct the fantasies of my mind, or the fictions: Les's term which he won't use anymore but I still think it is very valid much in the same sense that these may tend to represent the fictions of Jerry's mind. I am still trying to understand what the difference between fantasy and fiction might be here.

Nathan...on a personal experiential level, but I would say, if I've got your order correctly, I would reverse it and say Jerry might existentially in the expression of his personality be denying the levels of awareness that he reveals in his work. Two, that the levels he reveals in his work, when they are intended out of labor analysis are seldom as affective as when they are not conscious to him. It is almost as though, take the concept, the repression of identity often forces the energy toward some kind of identity that is supra-personal rather than personal.

Nathan: What I was suggesting was to support what you had said previously, where he consciously attempts to bring something together, it usually fails. It usually becomes very hokey, and very...or even super hokey.

That is perfect.

Nathan: Well it is very interesting that this is an area where that can happen very easily...the putting together became an anti-thesis because I think of what it inherently suggested very consistently, that you couldn't get past the putting together.

Exactly.

Nathan: And what excited us in the beginning with Jerry was that he could put something together to get past the putting together. This is not the first experience we have had of somebody trying to put something together on photographic terms. But also maybe makes the conditions even more difficult, which makes the problem even more interesting.

And I accept the idea that certainly the personal— if certain of the ideas that are manifested in his photographs were lived there would be an entirely different experience than if they are revealed not necessarily through conscious awareness or existential awareness: that they simply become manifest in a projective form. And it may be conceivable that— I like your expression— the idea that Jerry was one of the first that got past just the manipulation techniques in the sense that the imagery itself became so

convincingly related. There were examples that we thought of as surreal, or pastiches on disproportionate size, or whatever it may be, that we associate with surrealism. But then they seem to become by virtue of the photographic medium itself a kind of credibility factor. I think Jerry did have a profound influence and I think it has to be reckoned with, and it has been discussed enough now that there may be a contribution that would occur later in time that he wiped out the concept of painted surrealism, because there you have a manifest invention. Magritte's never looked quite as convincing after Jerry Uelsmann because of the fact that he utilized the most appropriate transfer medium to constellate the image and then to juxtapose that image with others. And as a result there was a kind of credibility that these *fancies*, these fictions, fantasies, whether there was a separation between the two, they became convincing just by virtue of the medium in which they were cast. Secondly, Jerry has commented on the fact of how often he asked to explain his photographs. Perhaps one of the testimonies to the fact that it is not always accessible to him is the fact that it is a denial of that self-identity beyond the creative act. It is not known to him, not accessible to him.

Nathan: You've heard Jerry talk about them...and I get the sense that he is re-fantasizing his own photographs...In talking about them, he is coming to them as if he were some kind of awed stranger.

Oh absolutely.

Nathan: Which I think may be very consistent with the idea of the possibility of denying self to maybe arrive somewhere else.

I think I understand that, I am not positive. What do you mean denying self so he can arrive somewhere else?

Nathan: Well it is setting up a series of... I'll change the terminology slightly: suppose that Jerry is creating an environment, an environment that locates self in some way. It might be another way of describing what some of the activity is about, the need to make marks, the need to make pictures, to bring into the environment. Suppose Jerry's choice is to create a non-actualized environment. That announces terms of performance and behavior, psychically, which are very different than if he created a very actualized environment.

I get it, in other words, he invents an environment in which he can more or less behave but not necessarily ever be identified with, very good. Yes, I think it is quite true. As a result, he does not necessarily live the experience, as it were. This fosters the possibility that he becomes a vehicle for the potential of the experience for others' observations, without necessarily having a connection to it at all.

Nathan: ...except for his becoming the awed visitor as well.

He does have that, he is the awed visitor. I'll give you an example. I know this for a fact: Jerry has published and written, you know the photograph of the Valentine angel in front of the house... You have seen it a number of times: I believe in angels, and if you have ever heard Jerry's stock lecture it always comes up, "Well I really believe in angels, an angel came to see me last night," He will say this, I have heard it fifteen times and I walked up to Jerry and said, "Jerry, what is this angel bit? Tell me about it, do you really believe in angels?" And he said, "Yes I do I really do." And I said, "What are they?" And he told me angels were...and I swear, every question I could ask him and I do not think he was dissembling or covert or hidden, or anything else, it basically came down to the level he began to speak of the idea that angels are, he remembers from childhood the idea of Christmas...it was like a spirit figure, he even went so far as to give certain images associated with. So I handed him this article. It is a study, I can't think of his name. He is at Princeton and teaches art history...It is a study of angels as messenger figures, and traces the history of the image of the angel, particularly in works of art with a major concentration in the Renaissance period. He talks about underlying constructs. There is another woman who wrote an article in *Spring* publications, a journal of analytical psychology, concerning angel figures, and she talked about them as mediating agents. And Jerry read this, and he was really sort of secretly terrified, at least as he reported later, saying, "You mean that what it is about?" So now there is an example: Jerry had access to, it was sort of disarming, charming childhood memory, I believe in angels, or maybe it was an implied, like there is some level of mysticism within my identity that I can't name further than 'I like angels' or 'I believe in them'. When he was confronted with the fact that what he was expressing definitely had a tradition. That the concept of the angelic visitant was an extra-projected or personification of the idea of inspiring force, mediating agent, messenger, one who brings a new content into being. And this disturbed him because you see he was then given a very direct way to associate his expression with reality, a viable tradition, a use of iconography that extends back in time, then comes forward into his own work, for example. Suddenly angels are not as real, or somewhat rejected as fact, really, he said after reading it he didn't want to ever think about it again. That is what he told me, whether he repeats it again is not the point. I believe to a degree when confronted with the reality of what at one time was a fantasy to Jerry, it is no longer real, either for his work or for his personal experience. And as a result he will then try to constellate the next level, go chasing the hare again into another operational field. Well that looks like it is perplexing to you or either that it didn't quite relate to the point you were making but I think there is a point in which Jerry if indeed...

Nathan: No, no, I was just going elsewhere. I was thinking of the non-discussion of his work that many people prefer to engage in...tends to limit the possibilities. It is another theme you brought up earlier, this may be another way of describing that phenomenon.

Well it is. One thing I wanted to say is that I meant to put this into focus was the idea of Minor's concern with the physical appraisal of a work of art and experiencing it through breathing exercises and sensory amplifications— follow the line, close your eyes. {makes a clicking sound} It works for me, I get great pleasure out of it. I go home and try it and all I do is get myself so mesmerized {laughter} My wife says, 'get up off the



floor!" {laughter} and I say 'let me alone,' {laughter} The dog nipping at my heels and the cat... That is certainly an expression of the idea that evidently we have a great need to return to our sensory experience... I asked Minor, as a matter of fact, I said 'Minor do you feel strongly about the idea of a work being...' well rather he asked me the question, "Do you really think that then there is a point at which art can become anonymous? As though as conscious individuals we might develop a kind of neo-primitivism. That was the word he used, neo-primitivism, that it was suddenly tribal in affect rather than individual: no longer the market for the one-man show and so on, and I said no I don't, I can't really speculate on the subject, and he said, "Well then do you believe the photographer or artist on any level has a responsibility to prepare himself for the manifestation of archetypes, nature, whatever it may be that he confronts, religious experiences or what have you. And I said yes. That I don't think a person even on Jerry's level can have access to even the escape hatch to a degree, from reality, in less he has a certain dispositional, a discipline, in this case it is more or less a celebration of discipline. To enter the darkroom for Jerry is life. What emerges from it is a substitute for having to live it. Now that sounds like a terrible pronouncement upon a human being but I think it is a rather valid way to approach life for some people {laughs} What a profound morbidity. I tell you, can you imagine someone hearing this later? {laughs}... Maybe it is a part of my own set of dispositions, I'll never forget, I don't know why I am just getting silly now at this point. {laughter} I'll never forget when I was a budding sophomore at a little regional university and I was thinking I was having very profound thoughts, and I was struck by the idea that one can have any experience simply by *thinking* it, and someone said what do you mean, this woman said what do you mean? And I said, well look what you can do just through thought, you know, let your fancy fly across continents. You see I sounded like one of the slower students in the university {laughter}... I never had any children's' books when I was little, and it was the constant image of just saying think it, think it, and finally the person put me down and got rid of my whole little fantasy world by simply saying, 'Why cheat yourself?' I don't know if the point is clear, it is not funny, but it took me a long time to figure out what she was saying. And the idea was, yes, intellection, reasoning, cortical experience can become really a type of measure of avoiding sensation or sensate experience. Often fantasy can create a milieu in which one behaves almost as though one constructs a false persona that does not match the reality of the person. For what it is worth, out of all the things Peter Bunnell could have written about Jerry, where is that catalog, can someone pass it to me? {Knocks something over} Well that is some kind of warning. {laughter} I just find that this certainly relates to what we have been talking about and it is kind of interesting... and there were a number of rewrites, I edited the thing so I know exactly what occurred before, but the one thing he insisted upon remaining was this: "Jerry's humor remains for him... and while it is no less discerning than wit, it has much of the uninhibited earthiness of a vaudevillian comedy. It is reflected in his speech, his wildly eccentric clothes, his mania for collecting bric-a-brac, his phantasmagorical letters, some of which include handwriting, photographs, Victorian valentine stickers, Laurel and Hardy vignettes, peace symbols and Florida gator heads. It can never be thought that he conducted anything like an old world salon in Gainesville, Florida, but a typical meal at the Uelsmann's might begin with libations followed by a superb lasagna prepared by his wife Marilyn for a dozen or so people including a visit to the University

of Florida campus for a screening of the complete Flash Gordon serials run end to end followed by dessert at Dipper Dan's and climaxed by a return to the house for a raucous song fest of marveling church hymns and nifty songs from the 20's, conducted, orchestrated, and played with consummate endurance a pianola pedaled by Jerry himself. He has frequently remarked that he prints his photographs best to Beethoven and Bluegrass, and although Earl Scruggs would make a perfect name for his extremely gentle watchdog, he chose instead to name her after a once famous animal photographer. An addict for musicals of the Broadway variety, Jerry entertains his secret desire to be a tap dancer, and he would also admit to a love affair with Shirley Temple, that is before she became an ambassador to the United Nations. So show humor and amusing antics are significantly absent in Uelsmann's photography: and it is in his photographs that the darker facets of his being become apparent, for one cannot escape the belief that his comedy conceals an intensity of concern for life and personal doubt which Jerry harbors about life's meaning, indeed his interest in photography goes back to the time...." It goes on for two and half pages presenting a kind of series of images associated with Jerry's self doubt: the...of his early age, his overweight factor, and so on. I believe all of this is credible, and I believe at least with my experience of Jerry is concerned, there is an adamant, overt denial of life's seriousness, and it is so much fun, (laughs)...not get too serious, there is no one I rather be around than Jerry Uelsmann, he just goes ha-ha-ha, just chuckle, chuckle for hours on end. But the point is that I also find it equally alarming that the moment one tries to broach a subject, I don't care on what level, of depth, now that does not have to be discussing anything relative to mandalas and archetypes, it can be something on the depth level of just starting to analyze the structure in something. There is often a certain level in which the discussion begins and then humor reappears as a guard against that level of reality. Now to me that is the very reason why his work has access to the reality: it is the unconscious function in Jerry's life. As I said, intuition is not his dominant function. Basically it is a construct, really of, as I said the high design aspect is very analytical, thinking. Sensation is distinctly operative in his need to play the pianola etc., etc. and cause that level of response: there are a lot of body sensations happening in his midst, laughter, whatever it may be...I know you think this is too metaphorical, but when Bob came to Jerry and said...

Nathan: I was going to add to it.

In Iowa when Jerry got up to give his presentation and Fichter was to run the slides, and Jerry said, "Now we are just going to go through these rather rapidly and I won't spend a lot of time," and Fichter started showing one after the other and Jerry did the most remarkable, he showed the grounding of sensation, it was unparalleled. He did a perfect verbal commentary, have you ever heard that tape? {quickly raps his knuckles on a table top} He went through sequence by sequence they were going like 90 miles a minute, and it summed up, "there it is folks, ladies and gentlemen," and tap dances off the stage, and then came back to discuss them, but intuition: Jerry does not have access to a highly intuitive level, he does not make connections. That is not a judgment upon the person, I say that is why often his work, through the process, I will now connect this with this. That in and of itself is a paradigmatic expression of the intuitive

principle: to bring two units into combination to find plenitude or a third element or a fourth or fifth or what have you. But the steps in themselves are a very archaic form of the way the intuitive principle operates: units, complexes within the psyche, as Eddinger will point out, not necessarily known to conscious awareness. Two psychic complexes impinge upon one another: out of that comes the hunch or the revelation or what have you. One knows not where the information came from. One knows that something is simply operational within the psyche. And Jerry's ability to consciously discuss interconnections is not as viable as it happens in his work. Therefore his unconscious function is projected in a form, in a media, to be lived would be to deny it. I would say it is almost like, do we have examples in art where a person realizes their unconscious function and quit working: dozens of them. Look at de Chirico, it has been developed as a study, Sovie's study of de Chirico and so on. Can you imagine a man in regards to whatever analytical interpretation that paints a series of works that are at least by, bad measure, but at least by curatorial acceptance and representation in museums is rather remarkable, and yet we find that de Chirico paints even continually until today those... horses, nymphettes leaping across beaches and their hung in practically every pension and surround in Rome and Florence, and you can buy them for \$25 a piece. And there is no market for the de Chirico image except among, let's say, untutored people or individuals who wish to appear to be pretentious. But the works that were famed were basically denied by de Chirico to the point that he even said, "I did not paint these." Like the famous Roulot story being carried to court to authenticate the works that were burned and the court case against Vuillard, there was the court case where, because of signatures and legal rights, de Chirico was forced to admit under legal pressure that he did indeed paint them. But the truth is, he didn't paint them: it painted him, so to speak. Or they were painted through the forces that were constellating in his own psychological makeup. He discovered who he was and suddenly, it disappeared. Jungians argue about it. They say Jung's great statement, yes we know, know about your stuff and that destroys the energy. Jung says that is bullshit. Only talent is snapped off, the slender twig of talent is snapped off. He said real psychic energy expresses itself regardless of what you know about the source of the energy itself. But there are cases where to know the unconscious function can very well cause it to no longer need to be projected in some kind of external form or media, and I would suspect that would be the case with Jerry. Final note on your life Jerry, {laughter} don't find out or you're dead {laughter}. You'll have to become a pianola expert.

Break

I was asked enough questions about one particular phase of what we were discussing yesterday that I do want to, it is not a question of reviewing but carrying to a somewhat greater depth. It reverses the order of my intentions, so as far as discussing the, actually I don't plan to discuss it but I want to use the Arnheim article that I mentioned to you that was...it happens to be a study of the mandala, and he applies the yin-yang motif, I'll wait until this afternoon. {laughs} It is this afternoon right now basically. I'll wait til later because it will introduce the point of discussion relative to photography again. Basically the kind of thing I'd like to concentrate on today, since yesterday, for what meaning was communicated, obviously these are words and not images, granted, and it

is equally important to recognize that...Jerry Ueslmann, that is not a question of valuing import of the work, or even suggesting any kind of direction, it is just simply put something into focus relative to a theory, and perhaps not in depth at all, but just simply constellates an idea. By the same token, I'll follow the same approach today to take a photograph by Ed Sievers, a California photographer, and try to look at it totally relative to its formal identity, now I am not talking about technical again, and I grant you that is lopping off extremely important relevance, maybe the most important, but nonetheless, in order to deal with certain factors within the image, I want to talk about just one aspect of it, and that is frontality...I don't know if we'll follow it up...but I know Nathan has shown you some works concerning frontality and I know a number of you work with this theme, and in many ways what I have to say is relatively simplistic, but it is to try to get down to the fundamental archetype that might underlie the appearance of some type of, particularly body figure, which is confronting us frontally. And what kind of not only symbologies are constellated by that kind of frontality, but also what type of perceptions, what perceptual factors are involved. Well at any rate, that lays out the schema for today. However, no less than five people asked me this question that came up yesterday about the nature of energy and its manifestation in archetypes and its manifestation in its being affected or conjoined with consciousness: what happens, how do these schemas work. I doubt that I can necessarily unravel or maybe I'll just make it more difficult in terms of accepting it as a theory. Because some of the things I'd like to just simply go a little bit further in depth on, it sounds like confessions of a word addict: you can read people like Jacobi and Jung and you can say there are all those neat little words, (laughs) and they begin to sound good, and then after a while they put one quickly to sleep. But at least the idea is to get some schema, and at least for my purposes, I could not manage to continue without some schema that would at least deal with one of these areas in depth. I mentioned this book yesterday, *Cell and Psyche*, it is a thin, spare book but it is a powerhouse. This is the Sinnott, *Cell and Psyche*... And I am going to be referring to a number of passages, so pardon the read-a-thon, but I tried to select them and keep them brief, but in some cases I can't say this as well as the author expressed it. Many of the passages I have chosen are not discursive passages...There is on page 72 his hypothesis, and there is a little poetic statement on page 94 that gives you a hint as to the kind of metaphors he is using... It is not a parade by the way of scientific evidence but there are very concrete hypotheses within this text. So keep in mind that while I am reading this to you that it is just simply a way of introducing that a scientist does share certain views that we were talking about yesterday, and also states that the question of where the energy comes from is as yet unanswerable, and perhaps if that it is ever discovered we will have some new dimension of reality. This is a passage that he has been talking about the nature of ideas, mechanisms, psychological events being posited not only in brain activity but also posited in cellular activity, and thus the meaning of the title, *Cell and Psyche*: cell and mind. He says, "Interpreted in terms of the present hypothesis, therefore, the whole conscious life of man, rich in ideas, in inspirations, in intellectual subtleties, in imagination and emotion, is simply (and I think these words sometimes we forget, the buts and the ands and the adjectival expressions, he is saying he wants to reduce it to its simplest fundamental unit) is simply the manifestation of an organized biological system raised to its loftiest levels." So therefore he is saying that conscious activity, or

conscious intellection, or conscious emoting, or conscious analysis: whatever dimension of the cerebral cortex and perhaps even on subliminal levels the thalamus manages to provoke, are part and parcel— terrible phrase— of the organized biological system raised to its loftiest levels. That is there is a kind of hierarchical order. So we have already implied in that sentence the fact that Sinnott would take the view that mind or psyche is simply a higher level of physical and psychological manifestation. That it begins somewhere, even on the protoplasmic level. And then of course he implies that it begins prior to that manifestation. He says, “Upon this the outer world impinges as a series of sensations, real or imagined, and out it comes actions, either actual physical responses, or the more subtle ones of the mind.” That is a very important sentence because we do see that Sinnott shares the Cartesian split: he does seem to imply that there is a separation between mind and matter. Or mind and external events— internal and external events— and that they impinge upon one another and as a result something happens as a result of their coming together. That is what we would suspect at least reading that sentence but we begin to discover later that he says there is a point in which they are inextricably bound together: psyche and soma, body and mind. He says, “What takes place between these events is, at bottom, the regulatory activity of the protoplasmic system. In its lowliest expression this appears as regulatory control of growth and function. This merges imperceptibly into instinct, and from these simplest of psychical phenomena gradually emerges the complex mental activities of the higher animals and finally the enormously rich and varied life in the mind and spirit of man. At no point is there a sudden break or radical innovation.” (And there we find his statement confirming that there is no radical break between matter and mind. There is a kind of transformational process that is occurring between the two levels) “The complex has come from the simple by a gradual process of evolutionary progression. The basic phenomenon from which all of this ultimately arises, the fact that living things are organized systems, is the fundamental problem, still unanswered. Upon its solution will depend not only our understanding not only of biology and psychology but of the whole of man.” And he begins to identify that this problem that is still unanswerable is the nature of energy and how it manifests in different forms. What we might call animate and inanimate, etc. End of statement number one by Edwin Sinnott. Second one, this is the poetic statement: “Man is indeed the paragon of animals. Arisen in a few score millennia from the rank of second-class mammal by his mastery of the power to reason, he has gained ascendancy over every living thing and is set off from the rest by differences which mark him as unique in all creation, the crown and climax of the evolutionary drama. But a human being, the organized self in which the life of man is expressed, is far more complex than a study of his evolutionary history might lead one to expect. He is no mere glorified robot, ruthless, weighing everything in the scales of survival and physical satisfaction. He is a vast deal more than a bundle of purposes with an intellect to help accomplish them. From” (And this is the key phrase, and it parallels Jung’s concept in the essay called *Mind and Nature*, or *Mind and World* as it is often translated. Jung says at the bottom of psyche is simply world. But this gets confusing: for example if you raise the theory of synchronicity, what we think Jung is saying in that phrase, he is arguing with, it is not the case, but it is not a contradiction, it is just a different perspective. But psyche, mind. At the bottom of psyche is simply world: world is referential to the world of matter, or substance, or body substance. Now, he says at the

bottom of psyche is simply world. Jung is articulating a thesis that mind and matter. Or basically the psychical and the physical are not subject to marginal defined dimensions: that is they are inextricably bound together. And he is also suggesting that, it is as if you were to remove layers from psyche. And starting off I don't know what you would first remove, the skull, whatever, imagine you are lifting veils, and the traditional theoretical constructs: so we remove persona, remove ego, remove consciousness and you have these various levels that you remove and at a certain point you would find that you have nothing left, psychically to remove, you simply get down to into the very protoplasmic nature of matter. And then of course at a certain point you find that there is a, whatever it is, you get down to basically pure energy, and then it is transferred until you are removing layers from the world itself. That is a very crude analogy but nonetheless it does apply to the concept that Jung develops and Sinnott in his concluding paragraph seems to say very much the same thing). He states: "From far down within him in that deep subconscious matrix where matter and energy and life are so inextricably mixed together, there surge up into consciousness a throng of emotions, longings, loves and hates, imaginings and aspirations, some exalted and some based, which form the most important part of what he is. Here are not only the passions, lusts, and cravings of a species but newly risen above the level of the beasts, but qualities foreign to the brute creation, longings for higher things than they can ever know. 'Man,' says Du Nouy, 'is not merely a combination of appetites, instincts, passions and curiosity. Something more is needed to explain the great human deeds, virtues, sacrifices, martyrdom.'" He implies within this deeper substratum of emotions, hates, loves, and so on...certainly there is a kind of metaphor because in reality Sinnott grants the action of consciousness to define whatever one's experience is, defines the basic structure of an emotion like love or hate, it is normally associated with an object, or with another subject. But he uses this as a way to say that there are primary sources deep down in the substratum: a matrix where physical and material are conjoined or inextricably linked. You might enjoy really getting into this thoroughly and reading the entire text. There are a series of books...For those of you interested in science and other areas, the Eranos...the Eranos Yearbooks...these are collections of writings of people. Let me explain this a little better: there was a woman named Olga Froebe Kapteyn...{laughter} Do you know her? (laughs)... She wrote some postcards to some very famous men throughout the world and she invited them to her estate in Switzerland and said I am going to sponsor this great collective event and would you please come and speak on this subject and I will pay you a considerable amount of money, she was very wealthy, and she invited innumerable people: Einstein, Jung, dozens. And everyone refused. (laughter) And it just shows that people are not just necessarily greedy, they certainly had something else at stake and Jung's response was I thought clever when he said, 'well, Mrs. Kapteyn, the point is a collection of the world's greatest men as you infer, meeting together in an arena of some sort is just simply, you are establishing the first potential for defining one collective idiot.' Well, she didn't let it rest there, she tried again...She wasn't undone by this negative response absolutely to a man, or woman, because there were other women who spoke at these groups. She wrote another letter...This time she said, 'I am establishing a theme, {laughs} and the themes throughout the entire Eranos Yearbook run like man and transformation: that is this year's meeting. Or man and time, or man and symbol, or man and war, and so on. And they are an extraordinary series of

thematic works. And she said I am not inviting anyone and I would like you to prepare a commentary on this subject and however we will have no measure as to what other people are going to present. And she said I am interested to find out whether there are any, remember we used yesterday the idea is the *weltanschauung* offering certain consistent ideas, where people might come together and independent of knowing what the other person is going to speak about, except through published material, she said I would ask you to make a completely unique contribution, not something that has been published or others have read, and that we simply determine whether there are certain strains of ideas that are collectively held, and everybody said yes. Now that is interesting isn't it, as a provocation, and absolutely to a person they agreed. Well if you read through at any time, just the indexes to these things, this is really a consortium of some of the most extraordinary scholars from every field. Since a number of you come from a variety of disciplines, as a result it might even interest you if you are involved in an area that permits you, which is rather rare, to bring varieties of disciplines to a central core media, surely there must occur in your discussions certain areas where ideas impinge upon one another without necessarily being able to preplan them: they come from different fields. This particular study, *Men and Transformation*, Mircea Eliade has an article in here called *Mystery and Spiritual Regeneration in Extra-European Religions*, and it is not boring, it is pretty exciting. Eliade is the director of the advanced studies program in Social Thought at the University of Chicago. He is a comparative mythologist and theologian. But then you look down and you find a physicist, Lancelot Law White, many of you have seen *Aspects of Form, The Development of Man, The Unconscious Before Freud*. White has a major interest in the history of ideas, but he is a physicist and a well-noted one. You have Paul Tillich invited in this particular year. Adolph Portman, an eminent Nobel Prize winning biologist. Can you imagine going from Eliade's *Mystery and Spiritual Regeneration in Extra-European Religions*, and then suddenly finding yourself hearing a talk on *Metamorphosis and Animals: The Transformation of the Individual and the Type...* Heinrich Zimmer, Gerardus van der Leeuw. There is just a compendium of the most remarkable series of essays that occurred yearly, and these things were held yearly until her death, and now they are held under a different aegis, but they continue. And each year they publish, *Papers from the Eranos Yearbooks*. This series would be the best way you could confirm what economists, psychologists, physicists, chemists, etc., feel about certain ideas that we are discussing, or I am presenting very abstractly. It is also a way of synthesizing certain strains of thought. In fact we might say that these books represent, and have been recognized, not just by my personal opinion, but probably the best records of the cross-cultural, cross-social, intra-world as well as inner-world concerns expressed each year. They are a kind of definition of the world view that seems to be present... And the subjects: one can find oneself getting involved at practically any level in the series...Just a quick statement on a couple of these things, they have now published...32 books. There are a lot of things... like yoga, spiritual guidance, the East and the West, the shaping of the idea of redemption, the mysteries, study on the problems of the archetypal, male in the mythical world, man and rite, spirit in nature, man in transformation, man and the sympathy of all things, man and energy, man and creative form. That might interest you really, from the standpoint of inquiring into works of art. Man and peace, Man and meaning...a whole study of the dictator complex, etc.

Student: Who are they published by?

They are published by the Bollingen Foundation and now handled by Princeton University Press, and they are very inexpensive...It is a foundation, the Bollingen foundation was established, it is a major foundation for studies in comparative mythology and areas where various disciplines impinge upon one another. Some stores carry them. In New York you can find them at the Eighth Street Bookshop, at Doubleday, Scribners, but I would say I wouldn't buy them at a bookstore because you can get them cheaper by writing to Princeton and they will get them to you in three days...I have the Princeton catalog, now I am not a representative, (laughs) it's just when you have a bargain like that you might as well take advantage of it...How much the collective works of Jung are, and at 17 volumes it could be expensive but it is not, when you think about the breadth of these, in fact it is less than \$200...The Bollingen foundation did not close their interest in the subject but they agreed to establish the funds for a period of...two decades...Now I go through that merely to indicate that some of the ideas that are presented relative to the concept of the archetype and how it functions, and also how there are ways in which we have to separate systems in order to view the way the interactions occur... As a prelude to using the terminology in perhaps constellating some new perspective as far as noticing one's own creative impulses as well as looking at works of art from new perspectives. Many of you saw this little chart slide, I have a series of them...It seems to be a convenient way of abstracting three levels of Jungian interpretation of the archetypal level and how it relates to various manifestations: physical world, matter, energy, the realm of man who combines both matter and psyche, then finally the level of the affective form, or what happens when psychic energy is cast into some medium— oil paint, photography, whatever it may be... {projects image of Jungian map of consciousness}...Start within the center of this mandala structure, in highly theoretical terms we do talk about a field of consciousness that has an ego as its center. An ego is suspended between conscious life and unconscious life. Now life is a metaphor for the kind of impulses, external/internal affects, that cause the ego to constantly measure, to make choices, to have to define positions, directions, put discrete units of information, synthesize them, bring them together in order to arrive at some conclusion, or just the simple act of the ego being operative on very fundamental physical levels such as the formulation of a word, even the formulation of being able to walk in a direction for a purpose. Decisions must be made, and in many of these the ego is caught between the provocations of this internal psychic area that consists of both instincts, archetypal provocations...and what Jung often calls *extrane* awareness. Extrane awareness means simply something that is not necessarily connected to the ego. As we are sitting our eyes begin to scan, as we know. And we are constantly having certain information *imbrant* upon the cerebral cortex. We have the experience of any number of events, a word, a sound, the apparent image of a letter form, regardless of what it may be, that does not necessarily center itself around an ego that will then use that immediately. Often *extraned* knowledge represents series of impressions from the external world. You can almost imagine them floating in the human mind, if you will accept that as a metaphor, and they become like little nuclear atomistic components, they are like little potentials for psychic energy or



affect, and these *extraned* units begin to cluster— there are synthesizing factors operative— and clusters of these units come together and as they gather, it is almost like saying as the data comes together, often it becomes important enough for your attention and the ego absorbs, those *extraned* units that have clustered together and thus we say there is also now in the ego field something that one is aware of. Now granted, that in itself is an abstraction, but at least it defines that the ego is not the just center of things, the ego is between awarenesses that are directly attached to the ego, and the simplest definition is learning a particular formula. You remember it, you use it. This implies that ego consciousness is quite aware of that data, it can function in relationship to it. *Extraned* awarenesses are the host of data forms that impinge upon your eye/mind and are not necessarily attached to the ego. Another factor about the ego: the ego tends to assimilate but it also discards according to Jungian theory. That is the ego becomes aware of information. I am going to use some very liberal terms here. It becomes aware of information but after a while certain information is either one, no longer used, or it has no emotional import because of other factors that are operative, which gets us into an entirely different subject which we won't enter into here. And basically we say that these fall away from the ego. You have something coming to the ego, clusters of data synthesized and attached to the ego, direct assimilations by the ego and information that has been attached to the ego and the ego discards, or at least they fall away...Do you remember me mentioning yesterday the idea of the shadow area of the personal unconscious? The personal unconscious is basically information that may have at one time may have been attached to the ego and was discarded or no longer used and thus becomes subject to not the Freudian principle of repression: the way Jung uses the term, repression means it is no longer subject to an attention factor. And as a result it is repressed. It does not mean it is moralistically repressed or that it is unacceptable, it means that it simply falls away and becomes posited in this reservoir which consists of discarded memory traces, or of events that at one time were realized but no longer function as an important factor of ego consciousness, and lie either latent to reemerge again, or, they conjoin with these clusters of *extraned* awareness factors. Now what happens is, the ego, according to Jungian psychology...the ego resides in what is called the self-field. The self-field is what Jung calls the *psychoid* realm of the psyche...In an attempt to synthesize...with all of the data that is written on this, and all the discussions, and all the complexities, this is the area of the mind which also has an attachment to the fabric of the body and to the fabric of nature. In other words the self-field is not like "know thyself" or know thy identity, or something of that nature. The self-field is, why it is called *psychoid*, basically the term implies something very objective. It is not psychic, not subject to affect; it is more like an object. Jung says at the bottom of psyche is simply world. The self-field has a tendency to be very much expressed in an individual but is also a field that can be shared by groups of individuals as well as subject to provocations that are based upon natural energy. That is a world of energy that comes from matter. It is very much a part of the body aspect of the human being as well the psychic aspect. That again I cannot carry further, there is no answer, it is simply a theoretical construct. But it has great meaning if one is ever to deal with certain ideas of where do creative ideas come from, how did I arrive at this conclusion, what was I inspired by, and many of you could care less about that as we have already discussed, but that is not the point. The point is others may wish to explore this, or, you may wish

to be attentive to the impulses or to the provocations that occur in your mind and also manifest in your work. And this concept of the self-field becomes necessary as a theoretical construct...The ego as our mediating function: that which enables us to do things, think things and so on, is also very much subject to the forces of conscious life, unconscious life and also the emanations of energy that express themselves in the self-field: those are associated with psychical, those are also instinctual, associated with psychic activity and physical activity. And those that are associated primarily with the variables of nature, the variables of energies as found in nature, etc. A "Cro-Magnon" parallel would be the idea that we need photo-synthesis, therefore we are part and parcel of the assimilation of oxygen that is also manufactured in other sources. So you can look at a number of levels of how the self-field extends itself into natural form. Now this simply implies a world, and world in the sense of a contained, ordered system...of the physical and the psychical as expressed most remarkably in human beings. But Jung says, and this is a terrible thing to do, to try to split the systems but nonetheless because they are all inter-operative in the self-field. But if we take out this and say what is it that is influencing the self-field, and what is it that is ultimately causing the ego to constantly be subject to variations in response...it is referred to as the archetypal source. And then we have this Jungian phrase: matrix of emanating ordering energy. Now physicists can give you a much finer edge on this and even point out that there is energy, and we know that energy provokes, and we know that energy causes certain constellations of matter, etc. But if you thought of it simply as there being an a-priori or innate within the human being, as well as within the world, a kind of primary source. I suppose that on one level a person might try to project this upon a deity. On another level, a person might project it upon electrical impulses. Whatever the source or how it is defined, there is the implication that we are seeking, or that Jung is trying to define a fundamental triggering mechanism...because it is to a certain degree a mechanistic theory. And basically this is the realm of the archetypes. Again, archetypes are not inherent in memory traces, they are not pictorial images, they are not specific. They operate on a pre-forming basis. They are basically formless in themselves, they are simply energy provocations. He says the closest identification that we can have to an archetype is instinct, and we all know what that is. Instinct expresses itself in the autonomic nervous system and it also expresses itself in terms of certain ego-conscious behavior.

Student: You were talking yesterday about the earth archetype. Now that is an example of what you are talking about, because yesterday I was slightly confused when you started to talk about archetypes because it got to the point where you were talking about, at times, specific images as being archetypal images.

That is right. That is right.

Student: Because when the time comes you should make that distinction.

I will, and I am glad you brought that up because this is exactly central to the questions that I was asked: what is the difference between an archetypal image and an archetype? Well there is no such thing as an archetypal image that resides somewhere

in the mind...Let me rephrase that there is no such thing as an archetypal image that resides on the level of this provocative energy. The archetypal image is constellated when this energy gradually rises, and in a moment I am going to turn to the commentary by Jacobi that talks about the various levels that this event goes through. But an archetypal image cannot emerge without some factors or some information from consciousness; from the egocentric consciousness. That is, an archetypal image is truly based upon the informational content that consciousness gives it. It is almost as if you start out with something empty, pre-forming, but it is an impulse. As it rises there are various clusters of extraneous material attached to, then conscious material attaches to it, and then there is basically, and generally, the expression of that in some kind of form. This could be not only transformed matter, it could be transformed behavior, it could be transformed action...and the projection of an idea into a work of art. You are constellating in matter a particular set of psychic circumstances or events or ideas or imaginations or emotions or what have you. And we can say that matter does behave in a way to adequately form itself to carry the traces of psychic activity. There are certain regulatory statements: something is disposed vertically, horizontally, curvilinearity, etc., all carry with them not typical types, not this cornball stuff we learned in elementary school like, 'a vertical line means ascendancy and a horizontal line means reposed,' and we all know that is B.S. The idea that there are fundamental patterns, constellations of form that can carry, adequately, certain psychic constellations.

Student: The question would be, what you are saying is that the information gathered in the ego is what determines the form of the archetypal energy.

Not determines the form, it determines its costume: what the archetype will wear when it comes out...

Student: And then you recognize its form.

Exactly.

Student: We were using yesterday the idea of a vessel that was created as an instrument for the archetypal energy to emanate from, to use...Does the energy take the form of the vessel or is the vessel formed to give the energy a certain manifestation?

Your illustration is beautiful. The vessel is basically the archetypal unit. What is poured into the vessel by consciousness becomes the drink, the content. The vessel is simply the structure into which something is poured, contents are poured.

Student: Then the vessel exists in the middle there, on your screen.  
{refers to a diagram of the ego-field}

Basically, yes, in terms of human expression. I think one could also apply this relative to levels of, Adolph Portmann traces this whole schema... from Erich Neumann with a couple of additions of material from Jung. But Adolph Portmann uses an incredibly

similar schema to discuss the behavior of mollusks, and the kinds of constellations of opening shells and closing shells, and how their valves release water and the intake, etc., etc. That is why I mention the Eranos Yearbooks because I wouldn't even bother—and this is not a separatist remark—but if anyone challenges me on at least the scientific credibility of this I would say well go read the scientists, because actually all of the proofs are coming from that area, not in the realm of comparative mythology or Jungian psychology. And the Eranos Yearbooks have the best compendium commentaries by scientists on the same kind of construct. You should read it if it interests you. But the proofs are there...In an elementary kind of metaphor, imagine that someone is confronting some kind of malleable material, clay, whatever it may be, and they are proceeding to form it in some way. There is an interaction that takes place between the material and the intention that will occur in the formation of this material. And Jung would say that the clay itself exists in the realm of matter, the intentional factors exist in this realm in the union of psyche and soma, or physical and mental operations. Obviously, the archetypal energy is somewhere expressed not only internally within the psychic structure but also within the potential, the energy potential of that particular medium to be transformed.

Student: And where does synchronicity come into this?

I'd rather wait. I am not avoiding the issue, but I don't think we can get into it because the terms seem to become paradoxical unless we get through this and at least get a grounding in it. I love the subject and would be happy to go off on it...But to make a simple answer to it, in advance, synchronicity is not based upon a connecting principle that there is energy in nature and energy in mind and the two come together: that is a way that you can get into the subject. Jung calls it a fourth dimension. You have space, time, and continuity: these are all subject to causal factors, synchronicity is acausal. And the simplest way to define it is that something happens that is not subject to conscious control. And it also manifests itself externally in the supposed split between world outside and world inside. There is a happy synchronicity, not always happy but there is a measurable form of union between external events and internal...

Student: One of the images that comes to mind when I think of synchronicity is...in harmonics, when the sounds that are being emanated from any number of tuning forks, when they become exactly in phase, another level is achieved of greater power than any of them vibrating alone.

Absolutely and that is a beautiful example. That would be the idea of synchronicity in terms of two co-equal forces synthesized by introducing a third. In art, and again, this demands inspection on deeper levels but let's just use it as a metaphor; the principle of the Gestalt. The idea of the unitary form that constellates out of a series of parts. There is a beautiful example of a level of synchronicity. That is, most of us in whatever art we work in...there are often points that are reached in the development of an image where we do not have a high degree of analytic control. We are outside of knowing what we are doing, and things fall into place. And you know this happens to you: you look at certain images and you say, it is there. We often get into these mysticisms, these

parallelisms of saying that the work has presence: we are not talking about some symbology, it is the fact that it is a uniquely ordered form. Often we forget that there are factors operating that enable us to perceive the organization of form, the right order... the Greek's goodness factor begins to gradually constellate. And at a certain point we are no longer able to cultivate it, it happens of its own identity. And as a result we say there is a kind of synchronicity between your manipulation, whatever that may be, and the medium itself, and the external event. And the gestalt becomes a field-gestalt rather than just innately in the structure of line shape texture color mass space, but it is a field-gestalt of psyche, of medium, and of energy itself. But synchronicity has its most profound implications in the idea of...what leads to answer to the question of...the question is how do I dispose myself to certain events? Or expose myself, or what happens in my work that causes this confluence of elements to create a satisfactory image? And there are some disciplines, not ritualized disciplines, but disciplines where one can open oneself up to this concept. What is the best term that we have seen in the history of photography for the concept of synchronicity?

Student: Decisive moment.

Decisive moment is one. There is another one, the concept of the equivalent: Stieglitz's equivalent and then Minor's writing about equivalence, the perennial trend, etc. These are expressions of the concept of synchronicity and are uniquely applicable to photography and cannot ever be applicable to any other medium unless some new medium is invented.

Student: {inaudible}

I don't think. I'd have to debate it with you. Film-making, holograms or heat transfers for photographic images are still another extension of the same principle of photography. I can't conceive of painting, or graphic systems that include drawing or printmaking, because there is an interruption of the time sequence. We have one medium that has the reduction of time lapsed. And as a result it is the eminently suitable medium to approach an equivalent, not in terms of so much the idea of the affect upon a person, looking at the cloud that is an equivalent, but time sequence in the internal equivalent.

Student: Wouldn't action painting or action sculpture involve synchronicity because the physical involvement in the process becomes the product itself.

It would indeed. But that is one polarity, that is on a highly physical level. The transfer of body action, kinetic rhythms: Pollock's paintings do become basically a tracing of body actions, not so much conscious control.

Student: Wouldn't dance be something like that?

Yes, but expressed on a highly physical level. It is almost like it is a polarization. There is a measure of art that is born out of primarily physical action...the hallmark, we start with Surrealism and we talk about psychic automatism, this is simply just not

measurable. I don't care if your favorite is Magritte, Dali, de Chirico or whoever it may be, there is a highly intentional and analytical structure to the use of dream imagery, etc.

Student: Could you express that again, photography was unique to the... gestalt because of the time sequence?

I will express it again but I don't really want to get into that yet. Here is the point: I am not necessarily talking about all photography, and I am not necessarily talking about all the variables that could be applied, because after all photography can have extraordinary time lapses involved. I don't mean that like time-lapse photography. But in the emergence of the medium in time, historically, there seems to be an absolutely parallel series of social, behavioral, aesthetic, cultural factors that demanded a reduction of the sequences of events in which man could perceive...and form...medium at the same time. When it emerges, the time factor, that is not just the labor factor but the time factor in which an image in nature could be constellated in terms of physical presence and a highly mimetic, imitative presence, was reduced. And as a result, in time, with the development of mechanisms and technologies associated with the receiving medium itself— film and so on, there was a reduction to where we can even measure the time sequence in terms of 1/5th or 1/60th, or whatever your choice, 1/250th of a second. And as a result there was a closer potential for synchronism, and Jung doesn't necessarily like that word, but it calls for an opportunity for simultaneity of cause, the human psychic cause and effect upon a subject as well as the idea of that subject matter having an effect, almost as if it is causal upon the human being. Bresson as someone mentioned a moment ago: Bresson's decisive moment is a perfect description of that. You prepare yourself, you become energized waiting for the constellation of nature. And you must be ready, so to speak, for its appearance. It isn't that you are defining it... You can interpret Bresson as you wish but at least we can interpret what he says: the principle is not I am there ready on the spot, I have this immediacy of perceptual ability. In reality Bresson is saying I am simply sensitive to the potential of an event to occur external to my camera. And I am in a state of synchronic relationship between the world outside and the psychic world of expectancy.

Student: Minor White said that as well.

He did indeed but it was a different level. But yes, it does come up. Let's come back to that...Imagine this upper diagram: it is called the archetypal form matrix of the affective identity...The symbol is not considered to be like a metaphor or a simile or a sign system. A symbol is, if you look at the root structure of the word itself it comes from two roots: SYN and then the other word is BOLEIN. And SYN means together or with, and BOLEIN means to throw. Toss the football to you and you catch it. I symbolize with you {laughs}...A *symboleic* experience is basically taking two sectors of events, or information, or whatever, and they come together and they cause this idea of, syntactically, there is a synapse function, they come together and what results is an image. The symbolic image is never to be considered as something interpretable. We talk about sign and symbol as being almost in the same category when we say what does the turtle mean in the Uelsmann? What does it symbolize? But we should actually,

if we were to correctly word that we should say, what is it as a semiotic motif? What sign is it? What does it communicate as far as specific data? Where does it appear? What did it mean in this culture or that culture? That is a study of semiotics. In relation to the symbol we actually say how does the symbol affect, almost causally, the development of an image, or the development of a sign system. The symbol is as Jung once expressed it rather loosely, a symbol is never to be understood. It simply opens up beyond itself and meanings increase as one begins to explore it. Because a symbol is an ordering level in the psyche, it also is a function that brings together conscious data and unconscious impulses or provocations...One of its manifestations is that the symbol is cast into material form, into a medium. And then we say it becomes affective. Not effective as causing a sign or image to emerge, and showing how the symbol carries itself further then we say someone looks at the work of art and as a result the symbol is then opened up beyond itself through the mediation of semiotic systems or images or signs and they in turn are affected and thus there is an intra-psycho experience on their part. Your physical form affects their reaction. Any questions on this? As far as the dynamics of the...As far as understanding the varied levels in which...There is a book, if you ever want to explore this more thoroughly called *Complex, Archetype and Symbol*. It is the best discussion of the actions...and this is like one of those testimonies: if you really want to know what you're about in terms of creative work, read this book. (laughter) And the point is it really doesn't tell you a thing about yourself, it just gives you something that is absolutely measurable as far as understanding some of these terms and then you can see them operative in your own process development. It is another in the Bollingen series published by Princeton: it is called *Complex, Archetype and Symbol*, by Jolandi Jacobi. Her great claim to fame...she was a very close compatriot of Jung's and at one time served as his secretary, so she learned a lot in the association...The book is divided up into some fundamental chapters...

End reel #3

