

**William E. Parker: RISD or ROCHESTER Side B: (From the collection of Nevil Parker)**

Comments made by Parker while quoting other texts set in ( ). Additional information set in { }. Transcription by Bob Martin.

...his chosen...delivering his sensation function, I knew it was there, it is not like we are missing the color purple, I don't know, he still might be there today saying, "color number eight billion four hundred thirty-two... {laughs, makes loud snoring sound followed by laughter}... We would have gotten to a point where the entire traffic of New York would have come to a standstill still waiting on John to finish his...treatise. I must tell you that I did see him approximately three years later, walking across the street with his wife, when I say his wife, I never met her but I'd been in communication on the phone, through the police and so on. She came there that night, they'd come and gone and took him away. I walked out of the New York streets and went down into a diner for breakfast, and Dickie is going, "Oh Jesus," {huge sigh} And I'd say, {in a high-pitched peppy voice} "How d'ya like the eggs?!" (laughter) I was saying something so I wouldn't have to worry anymore.

Student: Did you ever find out why he associated with you? There was no...

No, he worked in the faculty of sculpture and I was in Graphic Art and Design.

Student: So you did have contact with him?

Oh yes, yes: we'd speak in the hall on occasion...

Student: Like in faculty meetings and stuff like that?

Well, no because he was in another department, but we used to talk just in the hallway, and I don't think he ever heard a lecture, but we did share certain students. And then too we'd go out to these graduate presentations when they had their shows.

Student: So he might have heard you talk?

I really don't know, I have no idea. I know that one night I walked in...and it was almost like atomistic particles in which the power of a collective psychic complex becomes visible. In a way you might say that it is not unusual to leave someone like Michael Bishop, in a set of statements referring to his work, not just a single picture but a group of images, and...I'm not going to show you this last slide, it is not important... you can

take any of this information and apply it as you wish. But I would like to say that two books that I think would be extremely helpful, obviously...it is a must. Another book to read that would be helpful to the person who is not quite sure of what I would call certain drifts of consciousness that precede the Modern tradition, originally intended for students of literature: it is called *The Modern Tradition; Backgrounds of Modern Literature*... The authors are Richard Ellmann and Charles Feidelson, Jr... Ellmann is from Northwestern, and Northwestern Press published a great deal of Hillman material, the former president of the Institute of Depth Psychology Studies at Zurich...He recently lectured at Yale and other places...Feidelson is at Yale, and still is. And those two collaborated to create this source book called *The Modern Tradition*. What is interesting is that the entries are somewhat thematic, and the first chapter is on Symbolism, and they make a very clear analysis that you fully understand that symbols are not signs, but signs can work symbolically. And the entries are things like, *The Revolt Against Nature in the 19th century* that persisted into the 20th and made nature a metaphor for our states. So everything I have said to you is not some sappy little notion that I have had. Like if you read Oscar Wilde's *The Priority of Art*, and you think about the play, *The Importance of Being Earnest*, and what does nature do? It imitates art. And what does the equivalence do? It displaces nature of its own integrity and makes nature become the imitation of a psychic identity that is posited so to speak in the photograph. Rilke: *The Unnatural Will to Art*. Picasso: *Art as Individual Idea*. Malraux: *Art as the Modern Absolute*. You read that and you will be terribly informed about the complex of Edward Weston's work without ever reading anything by Edward Weston. *The Interaction of Imagination in Nature*. On my earliest text on Jerry Uelsmann: I was not that attracted by the work, I was attracted by this whole idea of the juncture, and why it had become so popular because it had been around for a long, long time. And I mentioned a passage from that Infinity publication in which they wanted an essay but then they took out the greater part and used the first three pages as the essay and left out all of the content without asking me. If they didn't want the article, why did they ask me for it? I used an essay by Samuel Taylor Coleridge, which is in this book, *The Coalescence of Mind and Nature*. Now you cannot possibly look at a book like *Under the Sun*, or think about the attitude of Nathan Lyons, Walter Chappell, or Syl Labrot, or even read the Encyclopedia Britannica entries that are written by Weston and that are included illustrations in Beaumont's influence of people like Caponigro and Nathan Lyons. And read the attitudes on nature and not understand that it is Coleridge who posits the whole idea that the spirit is in nature, the spirit is in me. I am in the apple and you are in the tree: you know that kind of thing. The interaction between the two, but ultimately between me and thee, the spirit is internal. We see things through which the spirit may be realized, amplified, but ultimately is for the service of psychic detachment from nature. And that comes from Coleridge. And we see that the Coleridge attitude is also posited in someone like Yeats who has whole systems of vision. Have you ever read a

vision by Yeats? People think that he was sappy, he was just experiencing another level of the same principle that had been emerging in the 18th and 19th century, that was... Things like *Jean Arp: Concrete Art*. Not nature, but the thing itself. Realism, the object that becomes a new nature, because it doesn't refer to nature. Like in Color Field painting we often say it isn't a confirmation of the world, it is a proof that the world isn't there. Because the object has no reference to anything outside of itself. *Symbolic Nature: William Blake, William Wordsworth, Charles Baudelaire, William Butler Yeats*. Have you ever read Paul Klee's *Eternal Genesis*? Where the artist/god theory, he uses that marvelous metaphor of the tree with its roots stuck in the earth... decided that it is more than that, you are like gods, you don't depend upon the world, you bring the world to bear. All of these things led to what we've been referring to...

Student: inaudible

Exactly. And whether or not anyone who works pictorially ever heard of Rilke, or read Jean Arp or looked at anything by William Blake, or encountered Coleridge. The point is the psychic complex was active already positing a wide variety of theories and theses that would also be posited in the collective consciousness and would persist right up until today in the idea that now that there is a revolt of that kind of displacement of nature and a return to it, a confirmation of it. There is a whole section on *Imagination and Thought. The Autonomy of Art. The Purification of Fiction. The Objective Artifact. Essays on Art* by Jean Dubuffet. *The Value of Materials*. So it is not just literature because it also introduces statements by artists and so on. To me it is the most astounding collection of essays that if anyone can live in the 20th century and not take advantage of this book, then you're just not to be excused. I'm being serious because you are not going to read Plato! Nor am I, all of it. Nor are you, all of it. When someone says I read everything. I say no you didn't. Not to take Plato as a metaphor, but you can't read all this stuff totally, but you can read about something that is trustworthy, that delivers to you the essential areas of consciousness that exist in a field. For example, he feels that if you want to understand the relationship of the artist and society, because you might be in Sekula's course, or someone else concerned with that field of concern, that you might want to read Gustav Flaubert's *An Aesthetic Mysticism* and discover that when Flaubert, in *The Sacred Heart*, has that maid servant being chased by a bull, and her grand revelation comes in the form of her pet parrot, who descends from the sky, he says, let's recognize that mysticism is bound in things: pets and animals chasing you. Not mythical beasts, not mythical birds. Naturalism or symbolic naturalism as it is called. Or E.M. Forster: *Art as Evidence of Order*. Or Rimbaud: *The Poet as Revolutionary Seer*. Or Mallarme: *Art as Aristocratic Mystery*. Auden: *Poetry as a Game of Knowledge*. Auden: *Poetry as Rite*. And by the way, these are not fragments, they are complete essays on the subject.

Or Wallace Stevens: *Art as an Establisher of Value*. Have you ever read that essay by Stevens? And notice that the supreme fiction for Stevens is that eternal conflict between the interference of our subjectivity with the presence of the world. And he dealt with that problem as he worked for an insurance company. *Realism, Objectivity*. Elliot: *A Realism of Love*. Shaw: *Thoughts and Ideas Exposed*. Flaubert: *Heroic Honesty*. Chekov: *Dung Hills as Artistic Materials*, eating those horse apples. *Historical Determinism*. Balzac, *Society as Historical Organism*. Taine: *Art as Historical Product*. Flaubert: *Shortcomings of Taine's Theory*. Flaubert was one of the most extraordinary aestheticians and theoreticians and psychologists and philosophers that ever existed. He posited some of the valuable...don't even have to know it but he dealt with it...all we have to think of is...and her problem and he tells the court, it is you people who sees the evil in her. She just lived out your life. As I was saying about Les Krims, represents the typology of iconography: he plays the trick on us by putting together a series of events and they are tableaux. And then he tells us you are the ones who invest them with the dirty thought, the dirty meaning. Tolstoy: *Man as a Creature of History*. *Naturalistic Determinism*. *Melioristic Realism*. *Socialist Realism*. *A New Realism*. Alain Robbe-Grillet: *The Dehumanizing Nature*. He was one of the first to start talking in our time about, my god, do you people know what you are doing to your world? Your'e gonna get it, and you don't have a purple handkerchief to keep the energy down. DeKooning's women is a hint of it prior to...that witch goddess, tumultuous, Haddie, Hurricane, when something is going on the television and finally says, don't mess with Mother Nature, bang! All those bits and pieces...tumultuous...Nature is the third category concerned in this book. Struggle, Darwin: *The Struggle for Existence and Natural Selection*. Schopenhauer, *The Will in Nature*. Again, they are not just fragments, generally the essays are complete or of sufficient portion that you get the text in full. Whitehead: *Nature as Organism*, under the title, *Organicism*. Marcel Proust: *The Life of the Hawthorn*. Rilke: *Nature, Man, and Art*. Gide: *Natural Joy*. Lawrence: *The Death of Pan*. Mechanical Force. Adams: *The New Multiverse*. Marinetti: *The Joy of Mechanical Force* Futurism... Lawrence: *The Physics of Human Character*. James: *Pluralism: Pragmatism and Instrumental Truth*. Dewey: *Thought as a Natural Event*. Heisenberg: *Non-Objective Science and Uncertainty*. If anyone has a cartel on...read this book and at every cocktail party you make people drop their glasses. (laughter)

Student: What are you getting paid for this review?

No reviews, it has been out for ages. *Cultural History, Idealism, Patterns of Repetition*. Giambattista Vico: *The Three Ages of Man*. Friedrich Nietzsche: *Eternal Recurrence*. Oswald Spengler: *The Organic Logic of History*. Yeats: *History as Symbolic Reality*. Malraux: *The Triumph of Art Over History*. Religion and History. Berdyaev: *The Historical*

*Meaning of Christianity.* Have any of you read Nicolas Berdyaev? That will tell you what went on in Russia and Germany, and what he feels about it in relation to matter. Primitive Survivals. Darwin: *The Pre-Human in the Human*. Don't think that Freud missed *that* one. Don't think that Jung missed that one when he said at the bottom of psyche is simply world...Henry Miller: *An Archaic Mystery*. The Unconscious is the next chapter. Just look at the idea of the titles: from symbolic into the realm of nature, then realism, cultural history. Going either way: expanding or contracting, looking at the world and into the dynamics and interactions of humans in the world, then the unconscious. A great deal by Freud here. A great deal by Schopenhaur, Goethe, an essay called *The Demoniac* which traces art to the daemon, the inspiring forces that Plato wrote about, those psychic archetypes, and Goethe knew about them as well. And then Freud, Thomas Mann, Lawrence, Tzara, Breton. Read Tristan Tzara's commentary on Dadaism. Talk about a manifesto. And read Breton's original manifestation about what Surrealism means, because it is a whole testament here... You start reading on page 601 and you realize that there was not an attempt to try to be...the thing about the fantastic is that it is no longer the fantastic: there is only the real. The internal psyche which you yourself cannot subjectively interfere with your ego infection can become the most objective. So these artists tend to present the kind of possibilities that exist in the objective psyche so we look like we are doing bizarre things in our work: peculiar composites and admixtures when we were oddly confessing to something that may appear to us to be called Primitive. We want the ouroboros back again in the rational world. And there is a complete manifesto there about Surrealism and there is no doubt, it goes on and on, the last line is, "Whoever believes with us that it is time to have done with the provoking insanities of 'realism' will have no difficulty in adding to these proposals for himself." And realism by the way is in quotes, and realism to him infers analytic differentiation. And then we go on to Existence. I might add Dostoevsky's *The Perverse Self* will give you a whole vocabulary on the proper use of the word "perversity." You think back to *The Idiot* and other Russian Literature, who might relate to these kinds of constructs. Nietzsche's *Self Overcoming*, is a wonderful essay on delivering oneself from the constrictive aspects of conscious orientation.

Kierkegaard, Sartre: *Existence Precedes Essence*. Camus: *Value and Existence*. Jaspers, Martin Buber: *The Primary Words* is a magnificent essay. Even the title sounds archetypal, the first imprinting words. Karl Jaspers: *The Encompassing*. Heidegger: *Recollection of Being*.

Then Faith: Christianity and Christendom. Deified Man. So we can go from the *Lord's Prayer Modernized* by William Blake which is to be thought of as a very magical form of modernizing it and then we go to Nietzsche: *The Death of God and the Antichrist*. And then we can go to Lawrence: *The Resurrection of the Body*. So *Lady Chatterly* and *The Gamekeeper* were telling us about raw things and about physical matter and about the

need to re-engage it, and DH was a most priggishly pure and conservative man. It was like that with Flannery O'Connor: I used to make that slip up when I would announce the words, have you ever read her short story called, instead of saying *A Good Man is Hard to Find*, I'd inevitably slip up and say, a hard man is good to find, and they'd all go and snicker, and that is the way his wife felt about himself. And yet all of his work, those paintings, those terrible paintings, Eve throwing the apple back at God, all these things about getting rid of the spiritual and let's get back to the earth and sensuality and physicality, and things that imply matter: well it is all part of the story. Santayana: *An Allegory of Human Life*. Gide: *Salvation on Earth*. Tillich: The last entry in this whole book is, *The Meaning of Meaninglessness*. Read it as a conclusion. *That* is a blockbuster. It has been around for some time. It could be summer reading too! (Laughter)

Student: Did you mention *Real Things*?

Yes, that is what I want to mention now.

Student: What was that about?

A lot of exhibitions like, *The Photograph as Object*, and I mentioned the Dennis Longley essay for the Hudson Museum show *Light Lens*, in which purportedly the whole theme is: light, lens, and the photograph as object. With people like Linda Connor, Michael Bishop, and dozens of others. This is... *The Real Thing: British Photographs, 1840 to 1950*. A survey exhibition and, I mentioned this before, it was published and the exhibition was funded by the Arts Council of Great Britain. You can join this art council and get some of the most wonderful publications. I don't represent them or get involved, but it shows the Hayward Gallery...Bolton...Birmingham, Bristol City Art Gallery. And this show deals with an aspect of photography which deals with the emphasis upon things, objectness. It now puts that whole idea into perspective, the only one I know of that's done it successfully, into the realm of the photograph as object, and deals with a certain type of imagery and one that I so appreciate is the first one in which they give credence to what you might call the Regionalist Photography of British figures and would include, on the left, Neil Silvy, who we know is around and known, and on the right, Harry Potts Gardner, a picture from the East Anglian Museum. It is unmarked itself so the author is of course anonymous. The omission can be as important as historical evidence. It is shot through this thing, from Talbot to unknown. There are essays in here: *British Photography from Fox Talbot to ER Humphrey* by Ian Jeffrey. *Patterns of Naturalism, Hopper to Harvey* by David Miller. And then there is a series of notes to the exhibition and lenders of what I call mini-essays in the catalog on things like calotypes and daguerreotypes, art photographers, and portraits of industrial photographs. You

don't get just a list of names, but you get a little summary of the publications and so on. And those of you who realize that the initial essay by Ian Jeffrey, to me, beautifully delivers the concern with how maybe high art photography was performing a different function than simply allegorizing, and traces through to those photographers who eventually, like *Patterns of Naturalism*, Hoppy to Harvey tends to introduce the import of not only whose that are reportorial: thingness, what does that thing look like, a ladder against the wall or what have you, but also how works that appeared in publications extended that consciousness to the public. If you visually just read, if the text disappeared and you just looked at the nature of the imagery, you will see that these are anything but at the service of equivalency, metaphor-ism, or what have you. There are any number of ideas involved in each one of these, but the main thing is that the way things look: the way things were made into objects, so that even ideas will not stay in here but then be forced into the realm of a material conjunction. And I think it is a good catalog for approaching what we were talking about in general as the major theme. You see, summing up, I believe that there are not really typologies of iconography. You might expect to come in and get that neat little package. Let's start here: Minor White, da, da, da, dot, Paul Caponigro, and so on. We've done that. You can do that yourself. The main thing is that there are not typologies: there are works that are variables on one grand type, symbolic type, and I think you know what I think it is (laughs) and you might think it is something else. The simple issue of that Weltanschauung that seems to be giving intimations of a need to recover our relationship to the world. It isn't a replacement of the world, it isn't a substitute for it, it is just, "I and the world are one." And then we enter into a relationship that requires us not to lose our differentiating powers, our thinking, we don't have to avoid metaphorization, or engage our intuitive powers. We don't have to cheat ourselves by not putting our feet on the ground when engaging matter. And we don't even have to worry about losing the potentiality of disturbing our selecting value function and our approving function, feeling. In essence we might be able to so to speak engage and through evidently what has been the most prototypical way in which those realizations are expressed, pictorial organization, whether it enters into conceptual art, environmental, painting, photography, or what have you. A way of saying that my experience is not isolated from yours, yours is not isolated from mine. We are not really involved in a mission, or involved with a form of therapy: we are in the simple act of confirming that the psychic sub-stratum, or surface of our life: the thinking aspect, the confirmation through our own determination, is worthless without the physical substratum, without the material substratum. And that the latter is worthless without the other. And then we might, so to speak, many are trying to heal the split, bring the two together, and say we know how to differentiate. Therefore, what we don't know how to do is synthesize. And it is like I was telling someone the other day, I was saying to her that we share the same astrological sign, and I don't go around asking everyone, let me see if I can figure out your sign. But Jung

mentioned what he called eons, grand ages, he talks about the Alexandrian period as associated with Aries, the Ram, often told in mythology as a story, but there are, and Astrology will tell you that when Alexander the Great, his father and then himself, that the ground of the summary constellation of that grand period was Aries. And Jung likes the fact that sometimes you turn to a system that seems totally out of the realm of reason, and yet who makes up those stories about aggression, a ram butting its way through, about cutting Gordian Knots, and taking over grand territories without asking, "Can I come in?" Or, "Could we cooperate?" Then he loses his life in the final inflation, by butting too far and too long. And we are talking about a student of Aristotle, and Alexander was a real man. We are talking about a man being deified, shown with horns on his head: a man who became projected upon. The populace, the collective consciousness, projected their whole psychic energy upon him, or they lived out his psychic complexes. Jung says about all the imagery associated with the Piscean Age, "I didn't invent all those fish stories." Or call the man the Ichthys Christ, or scratch at the sandal's cryptic signs. Or talk about the dividing of the loaves and the fishes, or, talk about the Baptism, the immersion into water, or proscriptions of eating fish on Friday... He says those as if tales tell us something about the fact that it just so happens the Piscean period is connected with that particular age of the new god. Or you can go even further back and talk about more chthonic periods in which another astrological sign might be constellated. He says, but interestingly enough, purportedly, people say that we are witnessing the dawning of the coming of the age of Aquarius. Now you know that little song, from *Hair*? And all those people I used to go down to Central Park and watch, they'd say peace brother. Aquarius, and those signs would be made in the dirt. People would have peace signs and they would have the Aquarian idea and then of course the music would inevitably evolve. Out of the tragedy of the West Side comes *West Side Story*, so we displace out and get entertained by adding *Romeo and Juliet*, classicizing that problem. Or out of the struggle of people who try to express the situation of a new order of feeling and would be beaten on the head by police... The idea that this was all a revolution in the service of the coming of the age of Aquarius, as the song goes, but ironically what we have to discover, Jung says no: when the motifs, the semiotic signals or the signs, those symbols begin to be expressed, emphatically, you get it in popular songs, you have people discussing it, and ritualizing it, and I call ritualizing when we all collect together for the next dawning of the new consciousness and everyone is news on the head of Woodstock...is one of the largest confluences of mankind in the history of human gatherings, see? Something was happening. And all of that return to the earth, and natural birthing, and you name it, are valuable. And you see those things...All those people following Bob Dylan, were standing there with spaced out eyes holding tin cups...the man who would lead them like the Pied Piper to the new brotherhood, the new revolt, then becomes a multi-millionaire...one of the chief investors of the twin towers complex in New York. That is irony, of course. A student



bought me a ticket to go hear Rolling Thunder and I said I wouldn't pay a cent to hear that monster. The music is wonderful, the guy is great, and it had a lot of effect. But the tragic residual debris of humanity that was left after that golden-throated Hitler musician led people to not new consciousness, but to a new despair while he himself residually benefits by doing exactly what he encouraged them to bomb, and to revolt against, and so on. That is where you can see in our culture, what we praise can also be the most insidious influence imaginable. You might not feel that way but I went to hear Rolling Thunder and I loved it! I just adored it. I didn't worry or not if the music was valuable or whether I had a hate campaign against Bob Dylan. I just said the complex that was being lived out was hideous and grotesque. The only thing I said afterwards was, oh well, he's hyping it again. And what did he wear? White face, cap with feather. And he became the Carlos Castaneda deliverer. Everyone was reading *Journey to Ixtlan*. He got on the hype, and again there was that interest in the culture that thinks indeed they too can send out energy systems from their bellies and walk across rocks and waterfalls. I sat there and tried, remember that early Castaneda book, I kept trying to go, "woooooo"... (laughter) and I'd walk into a wall. What I am trying to suggest is that there is more at work in those forms of literature whether real or not real. Whereas in Castaneda, we know the ultimate effect, that it is a psychic invention that was perhaps one of the most impressive and powerful documents in the history of human consciousness. The whole series, if it started as sociology and then became fiction it makes no difference, it still is one of the most powerful expressions of a psychic complex I've read in our time, or any time. And if Dylan can do that, and at least when I am out in California I can see those poor people, and the remnants of the flower children in New York who are cutting each other's throats, or sitting there like idiots on the sidewalk. I can remember a time standing out there and watching people come down there, all the escapees and saying, "Are we going to California tonight?" When I said it was dangerous, and I did a lot of weird things. And I used to live among the bums and I would go down with the flower children, and you know I was older, they called me "old man," but I did a lot of things that I'll never tell anyone. But on the other hand, that was the only way I knew, to find out by being in it. And that was my way... but I don't recommend it. That is like Janet: you go to hell to get to heaven. You commit the major crime or you get redemption. I didn't do that. I almost did but didn't. That is when I decided I better be careful. Found out that I had a very big shadow. That is why you saw films like *Joe*, and you saw things like the person who...and that's why you had Texas towers, and that is why you had assassinations: for people to live out our unlive life until you find out you're the one projecting it. You do too. You know, I did it my way, you do it your way. And the idea that those people there, and if you go back right down by St. Mark's Place, they're still there, many of them. Just see what you see. Be very careful around bums, be very careful. But on the other hand, see what you see. And it is not much to imagine seeing that person sitting there expressing peace, love,

extraordinary generosity: extraordinary revelatory experience. And that now being turned to the other side of the coin: seeing the most grotesque forms of attack and criminality and degeneration. And I think they were led there. They go there, no matter where it was, Haight-Ashbury, or anywhere else, and I think someone like Linda Connor was approaching it, and saying let's start finding out what things look like. The ancient look of things. You know the substantiality of the way things might be placed in conjunction, rather than affect, so we explain our world. Because you see that Jung mentioned that the astrological age, when it starts becoming manifest in the imagery and behavior, you know signs and symbols, that age is really over and a new one is beginning. That is to say, the Ichthys Christ is about the concretization of the psychic complex that was building up on a collective level and then the figure and the sacrifice and the tradition and the canonic religion that evolves from it is no more than the embellishment of what you say the death of a symbol when it becomes a sign. So he would imply in the twenties in interviews, in the thirties: it is not the Aquarian age for him. We are now beginning to feel what you might call the first signs of the manifest nature, how the Aquarian age becomes the semiotic motif for the new consciousness. So it, like Christianity becoming the end sign...when the symbol becomes known and starts becoming sign: you know the *Time* magazine cover, "Is God Dead?" The popular question, not the theological one. You also have an effect on the building of the Aquarian imagery, so that finally he sees in the sign, the water-bearer. A human holds the pitcher and the water goes down into the mouth of two little fish. And there is the constellation. I went to my little *National Geographic* map and found what they call, *fomalhaut*, named for a constellation for two little fishes, and they are fish with gaping mouths, like you see in aquarium fish, you know, that bubble up, bubble up. They keep their mouths open, and it is a very ancient sign, and an important one. And Jung says, the fomalhaut receives the content, you follow the direction out of what is being poured out of the water pitcher, it is the fomalhaut who are receiving it. He says it is not because they are two, or anything like that, he says the fomalhaut is the point where the old content is being poured into a new possibility. They are not powerful in and of themselves. He identifies Freud with the fomalhaut: for the man who would articulate out an idea, not a personal problem, he felt he was dealing with culture. Something that said it's not up there, where the god is, or the force, or the motivating energy: it is in here, you see what I mean? It is the system of the unconscious that is formulating, not the canonic laws. So it is like he was getting the old content and trying to see it in a new way as though he was the little fish articulating the new idea. And then Jung says, that is already becoming apparent, there will be in the new content a new possibility: that the minute people say, maybe I am the problem then maybe I can have a way of communicating socially with my brother or sister or what have you. You see, out of the little content in me can come the change in the world. No longer the idea of us but each of us knowing ourselves thus we each of us collectively in a larger group. He says the

first signs of a new age are beginning to appear. And he says this is the coming of the age of Capricorn. This is what we are entering into. You got the fomalhaut, and you've got the fish in the sea right? And you've got...the goat monster. He refers to the goat-monster as a kind of composite beast. But he says it also represents, that is a monster also represents logos/eros. Mortal, primal, material...goat scales mountaintop, lives in various places, leaves the earth. Look at your current issue of National Geographic and see how those goats hold on to the side of a mountain, it is amazing. And he says the Capricorn image is grotesque because it is one of the first to appear in either purely animal, or purely human form, like the archer and so on. Associates with earlier periods, but nonetheless, he first says this in an interview in the forties, although he made statements about this in earlier works, "I don't dare to interpret what this means" and it was posthumously published in *Memories, Dreams, and Reflections*. He goes even further and suggests that it is the coming of the age of synthesis. And that is as far as we will go. And now synthesis, he says, that is on top of, I might add, the age of differentiations. For example, the Ichthyean Piscean period was an age that would associate not only a need for a relationship to a series of canonic, theological structures that would lead us also to differentiating in other structures. And that the Aquarian age that was emerging was a need not to synthesize but to understand individual motivation that then becomes social, that we have to go from the social structure of the canonic law the previous age gives us and then turning it back to that law being in me, as opposed to being just outside in the institution. And then finally he says, now we will have to have a greater synthesis, and he said it will be a monstrous birth. So if Yeats says, "What beast now slouches towards Bethlehem to be born?" He doesn't mean a monstrous birth in the sense that what is going to happen is a horror show, he means it won't come about with a little happy, you know, the new content. We tend to suggest that the Capricorn age is coming with things like *The Exorcist*, and *Rosemary's Baby*, *Omen 1* and *2*: all those cornball issues {makes a sound and gesture} Or it is always, we say the bizarre leads to what? Satan. Or God. Or we try to articulate the issues of synthesis by the planetary beings who come down, {makes BAAAAP sound, pauses, laughter} These are all the images presented in highly stunning technical forms that indicate the coming of the age of Capricorn: one group of people synthesizing with another; one evil force synthesizing with the human. Certainly a little bit less than the grander themes of that kind of union. And then he also says that what happens when one idea is synthesized with another: it is not just intuition. What happens when matter becomes synthesized with spirit? What happens when we see the signs that a person will say, "That is nothing. That ain't worth looking at." And that reaction in itself is a testament to the fact that the pictorial form is already sponsored the way we devalued the obvious. You get the idea? And Jung will say, things will happen in the dawn of the Capricorn period in which the impossible will happen. So whether it worked or not, whether it succeeded...and Sadat did go to Israel, and...was born in the Capricornian

period, because that broke a tradition that was a thousand years old. And it may not have worked, but the point is, he tried to synthesize. And I'm showing no Arabic sympathies: it is just simply saying it is unheard of. And I think you heard that in every newline and headline. And you also heard enough about how it failed. But the point is that it was unexpected, wouldn't you agree? And he was born in January too. And it is not surprising that Alfred Stieglitz was born on January 1. You know, New Year's baby. The principle of, his attempt to try to move the work toward spirit while using a medium that was a preeminent measurer of the presence of the world. It is not surprising that I was born on January 1st (laughs). It is not surprising that Noel (student) might have been born, we were laughing, do you mind if I tell them what we were saying? I just thought it interesting that she starts telling me about her background. She has had a number of different dimensions of choice, that she and her partner who she relates to, she came to Rochester to be with someone that she admires and regards, but nonetheless, the issue is that the more she said, I could see this synthesizing, this weaving of a pattern, that showed how these things were integrated. And I don't know, and then I asked her: didn't I ask you when you were born?

Noel: No.

How did it come up?

Noel: You said New Year's Day

I said something about the synthesis idea and then you told me. Or like Molly and her etymology analyses talking about the synthesis occurs when we find out the different shade of words that may show a connection that goes back to our body. Or words that will have polar opposites, like dragon and demon and blackness, and then those can become associated with their oppositions in an etymological string of interweaving to the most positive values of seeing. Do not see overtly. Where the positive can become...I see signs of the capricorn in that little as-if story that Jung speaks of occurring in much of the art of today. It is that variable footnotes, or as I call it, another curl on the new wave is one thing and this is just another curl on it. You see what I am saying? It is not the thing that there is a grand complex of synthesizing, and you have the variable permutations, the variable vectors if you want to think of it in that way, the directions in which the synthesis is occurring. Someone asked about the 50s and 60s, we had the first moment in which we don't have typologies, or say that we have differentiations, we don't have typologies but we speak a type. And I would suggest to you that if you looked at works, and they will never know it, by those like Dave Freund, or Joe Deal, or Stephen Shore, or others, that is one variation. And then there are differences on the type. You know if you look at John's work (Pfahl) or George Blakely,

I'll show you some examples of people who do things *to* nature. Or those who present work that is already a testament to the residual effects of throw away: people who use things that are thrown away and they use them as the picture...or when the discarded becomes the subject. Then you build up an idea, backing up the imagery that George Blakely who tends to take, you have seen this kind of thing before, where he will take the throw away part of the Polaroid picture and re-photograph it. That is the subject. Or the sugar packet: a grand panoramic view. Or when they make balloons and keychains and so on, they punch out of SX-70s, you know, he keeps the thrown away image and shows the pictures. Like some of you like to take snapshots and collect snapshots, he keeps the cut out images and shows you what happens when you know that image of the face has been removed to be put on a keychain or a necklace or costume jewelry or what have you. So he just mounts up the evidence of removal and says there is still something left over. Or he will take a series of images from a vast collection of snapshots and show how many variations there are on blue skies. You know, that kind of thing. So as I am closing, I might have a word. I'll just flash through his slides and see if you don't think he's also another current in this same archetype that we are experiencing in our time. One type of variation...George Blakely...If you think about the negative, it is always, except for in certain types of Primitive photography, the negative was also exhibited...alongside the positive, particularly in paper negatives. Generally in our tradition of photography, the negative is thought of as hardly more, although it is valued in how you make it or expose it or what have you, it is thought of generally as the matrix out of which the positive will occur,. Do you understand what I mean? So the value is in the print, not the negative. In the 20's, you had Moholy Nagy valuing the negative as a formal construct, OK? Or negative printing, like Caponigro's leaves, or Bart Parker's portrait of his wife, where she holds the positive of her identity against the negative image of herself. Or Jerry Uelsmann's portrait of Nathan and Aaron, where they are a negative on a positive field. As if that interest in the principle of the materiality of the negative and the positive and their conjunctions started expressing something about the presence of and not the presence...and then someone picks up what the people throw away, which is the better insign of their presence? This: what they put in their album, or reject? This, he {Blakely} says, "Is the ghost of the flesh they carried away." He says, where is the light effect most radically expressed? Where does the physicality of their body which emitted the light: not emitted, I mean reflected the light, and so as to become most stunningly manifest? He says here, so much for the Eros in photography. What does he say about Polaroid, and instantaneous photography? And the throw-away life and culture and so on. He says it is peculiar, it is koo-koo. So what does he resurrect out of the trash can, the dust bin: *res extensa*. Where does he deliver those things extended into nothing? Like sugar packets and throw-aways...Picture within a picture. And they will ask questions, those photographers in our time, certainly of the 60s and the 70s about the pictorial, the real, you know...showing the Polaroid

within the field of the drawing, and Blakely will show the Polaroid within the field of the Polaroid. And guess what he did? Polaroid agreed on a grant to do this for him. See what you think he is saying about Polaroid images. He would send them in and they would enlarge it and he would then append the polaroid image to the new Polaroid picture...The reject: notice what the public threw away: these are SX-70s or Polaroid images of any sort that he picked out of trash cans. You see this is what the public didn't want to be identified with, evidently...But on the other hand, this is the stuff he did pick out of the trashcan, then he sends the rejected picture *back* to Polaroid and gets them to enlarge it, and when he gets it back, he tapes the reject of Disneyland against the new image. He says it is strange how these people are rejecting, notice how these images appear: exactly what the fine art photographers are confirming. So you might have a particular twist on the principle that what Wessell, and Eggleston, or what Shore, or what Linda Connor, what they are doing is in essence confirming what the public needs *not* to reject. It is a very, very powerful thing, the matter of intention when you realize they were thrown into trash cans.

Student: inaudible

The totality of the entire frame...identify the position by enlarging the border or not. To see the picture on the enlarged picture, this makes a commentary on what you might say, "live large" in the pictorialist's types of recent photography, this is the throw-away and that would be confirmed by simply enlarging it...as art... Let's see some others, let's see what people threw away...Notice the height of concentrations when you look at these kinds of mural values, just a section of one, thousands upon thousands of concentrations upon the animal world. If you added accomplishment of...in the picture, also a projected value and his concentration on the animal world, and you've got, generally things like, cats and dogs...Look at the one on the upper right, isn't that beautiful? Have any of you seen Larry Miller's exhibition out on Long Island at Light Gallery's extension with Harry Callahan? Well this group of people rejected this. It is strange...This man is doing very powerful work. You have the postcard blue sky, of what you call blue is blue, and like my childhood friends who say... inaudible, (laughter)...a sense of being rejected, here from one simple batch of photographs...variations on sky (students *ooh* and *ahh*)...I'll get this in the right order and look at them: the stunning array of the desperate effort of a culture to see one blue. (laughter)

Student: That's what they call democracy in reverse order.

And he added a variety of positions and types. Let me get this one in right. Those are actual prints, they are some assemblages. Like I mentioned before, the last one I'll show is this one, it shows what happens with those polaroid prints where you put it up

with archival tape so what you get , see what happens when it is writ large, put it, the frame, and gives it more advantage to the print, then turn to this little rejected piece of trash, from the trash can, how suddenly on one level, if he didn't put this on, and put this into the gallery, where he will have a show next year. Because someone added something to someone else and the whole symbolic affect would be quickly forgotten or not even recognized. I think those people who build fences in environments, material forms, or place things in environments and remove them once they made the record, or place pictures within pictures, are all in an act of reminding us of the simple things like the shape of something; the continuation of a line, or the strange way that the ancient even absorbs the toilet, that is healing! See! That is missional work, it ain't Christian! (laughs) It's Capricornian! It is the synthesis in which there is a possibility that the space at the end of our fingertips is indeed enough because it really reconfirms that which we all touch, and psychically respond to, and cooperate with, and relate to: so that we can say, "I and it are one." And yet you don't lose your distinctions and fall into the category of the schizophrenic, split personality: catatonic, absorbed by the complex, you know?

End Side B.