

William E. Parker, Lecture at Visual Studies Workshop, April 1971 reel 6

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

Additional information set in { }.

Transcribed by Bob Martin

...Decision making, formal aspects become so strong that we might even begin to get more involved in just the media in which this appears, and as a result there seems to be a displacement of human psychological affect and an introduction of simply a transformation of the identity. And when I say transformation it is truly a totally new object that has linkages only through the medium of light and its effect upon something independent of the human factor.

Student: The way I am hearing it, you seem to be talking about two processes that really almost confuse each other because you start speaking of the physics of light and the possibility of removing a direct time sense in picture making, you have the photographer as observer, right? Rather than in the first photograph you put up where the viewer would be the observer, and also the photographer because of the ground glass. And the other process being, well I don't know I can only guess, I would assume from what has been said today, that would offer maybe some possibility that some sort of objective motifs would recur independent from what you and Nathan called intrusion. In other words, getting human hands on it, right? These things would occur just because they occur, period. That does not clarify much for me.

...The necessity to appreciate the legitimacy of the event independent of the photographer. That it also requires a greater dependence upon our discussion let's say of the nature of how the human mind, or human disposition, wishes to engage this evident process, not necessarily self-evident.

Nathan: Where you have gone through as possibility, that is not what we were experiencing.

I thought you were asking what was one of the unique factors relevant to the medium, and I feel this is very central.

Nathan: You can say that that is it.

It's not only it.

Nathan: That may be something we can only discern in the behavior within a silver halide crystal. You can set up a level of description about process, reduce it as finely as possible, and it will come down to the silver halide crystal, and find that we don't know why at that point. Well, that may be beyond what we can comprehend. What we may be able to comprehend is what reactions people have to that object, whether it be, I don't want to get caught up, I can see it either way: I can see it, when you went through this

whole description of possibility, I would have to say yes to all of it. Because pictures can function on totally different terms for totally different reasons. Some of them can be contained within the same picture. I don't see that it is exclusively one path in. Now is that making any sense?

It is, except that I am not trying to exclude other factors. What I am trying to say is that, I will have to use another illustration, it may be totally divergent, and I have used it before, but it fascinates me. Bill Burback, you know, did the *One-Eyed Dicks* exhibition. {MOMA 1970} We have in Muybridge and others sequence images. That is we can see moments in time, fixed, identifiable, in sequence. Now what happened in the *One-Eyed Dicks* exhibition was the, at least for my mind, the constellation of possible identities that could have been fixed in a still photograph, like this. Obviously there were sequences that were not continuous because you have it like this, click, click, click, you have every sequence. Now I was suggesting this earlier: you have people engaged in a particular event in a bank, you have the robber coming in, you have him pulling out the pistol. The variations of possibilities that could have been, obviously each one of these are emitting potentials for being recorded. The field out of which one might record one of those events, or be the individual through which this would occur, camera plus mind/eye, multiply perceiving and recording agent. It is so highly variable that we might suggest there is a tremendous amount of validity we might put upon the fact of the conjunction between an individual's mind and what is happening in the world of physical and active events. There in reality may be the necessity to consider the gestalt principle as operative in both the physical constellation plus the psychic event. And there is this *conjunctio* that we talked about in the last several days: this coming together, not of the intention of the artist to simply dispose his idea, or project his ideas, or his particular thought or structure concerning configurations, the way objects will be disposed is space, the way they will be structured, the way they might be identified in the photographic medium. But that there is basically a kind of predisposition, there is already a set in existence prior to his actually becoming the media through which it is recorded, that is in company with camera. This seems to be uniquely true of only the photographic medium. And as a comment I come back to the fact one of the unique dimensions of photography, or in answer to your question, one of the unique conditions of the photographic medium and act is this idea of synchronicity. The synchronic event implies not so much the determinism factor: I as the artist determine what will be constellated as form. But it is I as artist simply intersect an already pre-ordered, preordained, preexistent event, or series of dispositions of objects in space. This seems to be central to Les's idea, when asked the question, are these inventions, no, they are real. My setting them up has nothing to do with it. My recording of the objects is the real issue. Not my, but my enabling of the recording of the objects. And as a result, the prelude is not the measure of the reality that is seen in the photograph. If we extend that one step further we would say that this does stand not necessarily as a re-presentation, or representation, but simply as a, I am going back to your term now, whether or not you accept it, a transformation, topologically, of another kind of identity.

Nathan: An intersection more than a transformation.

Student: Why intersection?

Nathan: Based on what you just said. It exists. The artist as agent in intersecting existence.

Oh yes, yes in that sense, but I am not talking necessarily about it is an intersection of the artist with the reality form, I am saying that this photograph stands as the transformation of another type of existence, of another type of presence.

Student: A reality form and an artist form?

They are both real. Representation implies that...

Nathan: I was talking about a primary order of possibility, we never got past that.

{Laughs} Well don't walk out yet. In fact, the idea is that I think there is something central in the idea of, at least in the observation of this photograph we started indicating a number of variables: association with original figure, potential toward what one might become, age, pure formality. It is interesting, I don't know how many of you observed this, Jim expressed a number of things that may differ totally different from my own perception of this, but I see this as so formal, almost to deny the emotive aspect...And it has to do with the frontality of that figure. It starts off with a kind of lack of action on the part of that figure or anything that moves off the symmetrical axial motif. Out of the context of displacing space, things seem to be so completely centered or balanced in terms of spatial atmosphere, the space, or the figure standing in the space. The transformed figure, we better put that adjective in there.

Student: That is all I am saying.

But you are implying that when I use the word figure I have to be referring to only one kind of identity, an actual human being. Figure can be another mode in which that human being is manifested.

Student: And I said that is there too.

Oh you are saying both are there.

Student: Yes.

Well, Alex, you have to carry me further than that, I am not sure I can understand that.

Student: Let's just go back to this other thing. Here we have one picture. Is that formal? I mean is that purely formal, that photograph? This one.

{Students talking simultaneously}

Student: Are you asking me?

Student: Yes, you are the proponent of the formalistic approach.

Student: ...That had a high degree of formalism in it too but not as high as that one, I said there is a difference in degree.

Student: And how do you establish the difference in degree?

Student: How do you establish it? Well I suppose because I am more conscious of this person as an individual than I am in that one. Roland was saying that is a photograph of an individual and I respond to it in that sense, I don't, partially, so yes, I have been made aware of too many formal characteristics as a picture, do you follow me that far?

Student: Yes the old kind of portraits are very formal, you stand up straight and you confront the camera.

Student: No, no, I don't mean that I am talking about the picture, I am not talking about the way the picture was set up, I am not talking about the posing of the model, or anything like that. I am simply talking about the elements of that picture that we see there, the way in which lights and darks are in balance, the way in which form and shape and the suggestion of plastic shape has been treated, it has been given a certain kind of very beautiful simplicity, and we are made aware of that as such, and that these things are very strong in that picture. Unlike the average photograph of an individual where we won't be aware of those things at all, perhaps because the dominant thing is the topographical reproduction of the individual...What I've just said exists to a higher degree in that thing on the wall than it does there, does that answer the question?

Student: Yes, I say I agree. Because although if we were to take a section of that photograph and blow it up and end up with that woman's face in this format, and then present it as such, it would be what people think I am talking about, as saying this is that photograph. All I am saying is that this format is like a very small thing in that photograph, it is not dominant as you say as this figure is dominant in this format, but nevertheless...it is a question of degree. But this identity is still in that individual.

Student: By association, by where you are going to look?...What do you mean by that? You can look at a photograph it has been suggested as a series of separate photographs, right?

Student: I am trying to focus on that individual.

Student: Alex, your language, you are saying that individual, that woman, and I think we are trying to suggest that it is no longer a real woman, nor a real individual, that it is a photograph.

Nathan: Suppose that it is and it isn't, Dennis. That is a quality that we have to control

{or confront?}

Student: Yes, it can go one way or the other. It is easier to read back to the original event, transformed to us by light on a recording surface. Sometimes it is easier to do that than in other photographs, and sometimes you get very far away from it.

And Alex you are insisting that both levels are present, but I would suggest that there is perhaps a kind of polarization in terms of the typical collective determination that some will see it uniquely photographic, others will see it uniquely referential to a subject, an original subject source.

Student: And I say it is both. To call it uniquely one or uniquely the other is to make a mistake.

Student: Are you talking about in theory or that particular print?

Student: I am talking about this particular print but I think it has extension beyond this particular print and covers a whole range of images.

All right, the question that arises up out of this, does it have anything to do with the disposition of the figure in a frontal pose? That one might find a highly ambiguous, I mean this on a deadly serious level, is it possible that frontality incorporates within its structure the potential for one having a confirmation of reality, that is we already have the original source confirmed. You were talking earlier about the idea of poignancy of not age, of the tragic, pathetic quality.

Student: You look at the face and you can read that.

But you see you look at the face. Now what I am saying is that frontality may prompt a high degree of reflection back to source. Or it may prompt a high degree of emphasis upon formality.

Student: I think it does.

Does just frontality do that or do others? Does it happen in Julia Margaret Cameron? Or is that just nonsense, frontality, or does frontality seem to create the highest level of ambiguity between reference and between formal fact.

Nathan: It might be between acculturated picture ambiguity.

All right, in what sense, Nathan?

Nathan: In the sense that we have been conditioned to respond to certain kinds of entrances into pictures. It is almost inculcated: the order of picture response within our culture is almost too readily predetermined. Frontality, framed, is a contradiction of disposition within space.

Indeed. It is a highly contradictory aspect even in this photograph.

Nathan: Surely, but a very intriguing one, it recurs. It recurs beyond that picture, it will continue to recur. It could have a wide range of things to do with social significance: inability to confront, which was a term that you had started to say something about just a few minutes ago. You used the term, not to confront, but I thought of confronting as an order of possibility in this kind of experience for dealing with confrontation. Now a position of confrontation in one sense almost pushes us out of the picture. There are other kinds of pictures that we can bring someone into picture, but there is a basic ambiguity here between the utilization of light and dark, because you could certainly remove that figure and derive many of the essential experiences out of that picture that people have been forming associations. You don't need that figure for the vehicle for the experience.

Though, remember, of course you weren't in here earlier, some people did speak of the figure being there to attract us into the space, not to play some symbol...

Nathan: The light would do it...

Dennis made the strong point toward the fact that the light factor is extremely important.

Student: Except for one thing, Nathan, nobody has mentioned this and I am wondering if this is just a personal reaction, the potential for motion in there, which is part of the formality of it too. The more I look at that thing...

Nathan: But that is...

Now, wait, listen to this, I swear I want to hear what...

Student: The more I look at that thing, the visual tension that has been set up between the glowing light around the figure and the lightness of the figure itself and then that skylight, I swear that at any moment she is going to take off into space.

Exactly. Not only take off into space and moving up, but the possibility that she can change her size. She can come forward, or even get smaller. In fact the doorknob is a telling signal to that possibility, that Alice in Wonderland disproportion. The picture is suddenly terribly ambiguous as far as her placement in space. Ironically...is it not conceivable that it would only occur because she is frontal. Put the figure in contrapposto. There will be a totally different indication of her association with space: engaged leg, free leg. The very notion of greater weight disposed upon the forward plane...I am not in argument or need a rebuttal, I simply want to get to it, if that was all known beforehand well fine then I have wasted your time...And the other thing is, now wait just a moment...the potential that since frontality seems to introduce such a strong emphasis upon bilateral symmetry, the frontal silhouette, the use of pure shape consciousness as in Stella, reduction of multi-planality. This figure has a high degree of

volumetric identity, or mass identity, only on the frontal plane, which is as though we might expect to step around the figure and sense even the shadow structure seems to confirm this, sense as though it is only one half of the coin, or perhaps there has been a slicing through of the donut this way along its edge and making two donuts. The frontality seems to reconfirm the possibility that this figure, as fixed in space as it may be, remember earlier when we were talking about, and it is debatable, it is not a dogmatic statement, that there was a framing effect, but then the minute you say framing there is an entry into space, and I can't imagine anything more axially fixed. Whether you want to fix it this way according to the perspective and then imagine the diagonal fixing here or along the vertical or horizontal axis. And here is the figure, and suddenly we find that as something is made static it has the great potential of variation of position in space...The more I look at that, it appears as though it can, rocket-like, right out of this skylight. Or I see it possibly that way, or then it began to dawn on me that this figure, and I have tried, honestly, tracing overlays and so on, getting figures of similar size, altering slightly the turn of the body, changing the head, it slightly tilts forward and this creates an extraordinary tension, at least for me visually. And that it is conceivable that I can make that figure remain fixed within that very pinioning structure, of space and so on. This then becomes fascinating as a possibility that frontality is associated, now this is a metaphor, this is an example where symbol begins to operate. As we go back, frontality, shape consciousness, the idea of contourism, even when there is relief. For example, imagine the Justinian and Theodora mosaics in San {Vitale} you have a high degree of rendering of three-dimensionality in the robe structures, even in the mosaic technique, though contourism and basic frontal pose, including the idea to show authority as the overlapping figure against the foot of the courtier or priest or what have you. Things are subject to overlapping. But there is an extraordinary sense that those figures become highly representative of an atmospheric quality, variability, potential for change. The possibility that they can become larger or smaller at will. Thus we might say that there is an association with the spiritual as such...We talk about decorporealization, and I am wondering if it is the fact that it is all that reflection, as one walks toward the apse in...San Vitale... in any of those mosaics people respond perhaps to the reflected light or those aspects of atmosphere. Is it not possible that the very frontality introduces something that is very physically there and through a certain period of observation it begins to transform itself, and the potential for complete movement, change, alteration, which would not occur if we have a strong turning of the figure, three-quarter view, in which the idea of space surrounding the figure fixes it. Here we have the fact that space becomes not operative in defining the figure. Light, yes, but I am talking about space as such is simply a vehicle in which the figure can change, alter its identity, move, become highly spiritualized. Do you see that? Just out of curiosity, do you see that as having any direct connection to frontality, or is that something else?

Nathan: I see what is happening is, I thought there was something else occurring, which may be coming in and out. Because the relevance was the photographic act, in my mind, and not a picture existence, because we have discussed this certainly without the necessity of engaging photography at all.

That's right. Well yet on the other hand I would like to say is it conceivable, and Alex to return to your concept in just a moment, because none of this is a denial, because what we tend to do is start differentiating but we lose the complexity...

Nathan: Where I picked up was that part of Alex's reaction may have to do because it is photographically rendered and not rendered in another form. That may be too much of a condition, of both positively and negatively. That may be a question of our not coming to terms with the relevance of photography in this.

Yes, because in other words, conceivably there could be a rendering of the figure that might be a reasonable facsimile in another media or something. Or perhaps the uniqueness of photography is very much the credibility factor, or it convinces us of its presence more adequately than other...

Nathan: I don't think you can deny certain aspects of that in response, historically, it has verified itself. There is something about the nature of this kind of picture that forms a pattern of associations.

Student (Betty): Well there were two questions. The first one, well one of them, was what was uniquely photographic, and then second one that came was what was unique to frontality. And in between there came a response to the picture which got all tied up with both of them. And then it never got sorted out.

Nathan: The strange thing is that in photography, the return to frontality was very dominant, more dominant than a variety of other media existing simultaneously.

That is quite true, in fact...Mr. Witter, is his first name John? John was saying that in the things that we are going to look at this evening that some of you may have seen before, I thought it might be interested to read, look at a volume, a body of things, and some of the things that Nathan has, and then see what other ideas emerge relative to the idea of frontality. And perhaps this is the middle ground between, not necessarily resolving, Betty...

Student (Betty): Well I know you are not going to resolve it... {laughter}

No, we won't. But what I wanted to ask you was this: it seems conceivable, that it has been inferred that instrumentation requires, suggests, sponsors frontality. The clamp, etc. Or is there not something to be said about the possibility that if reality is to be confirmed through a unique medium, then frontality is the appropriate positioning to confirm...

Student (Betty): One appropriate.

Nathan: ...Two possible ways, we can say in periods of time the implication may slightly vary, the attitude of frontality as presence: the emperor, the pope, many of the classic renderings of the individual is directly frontal, overpowering, in frontal disposition. The

suggestion of extreme presence, not moving into or out of the frame, but dominating the frame.

Betty: A god-like gesture. Perfect, perfection.

Absolutely, to the point you can almost say there have been two major mainstreams of the idea of frontality confirming physical presence in association with hierarchical size.

Betty: It is interesting to think about the Greek statues, and the ones that were striving for a god-like perfection too, but there isn't that kind of frontality.

No there isn't, except in the early work. In early Greek preludes, Cycladic sculpture, there is a high degree of reduction of physical detail in those female figures, but there is a high degree of frontality. And yet the seemingly evident feature or response...is that it physicalizes, not spiritualizes, right? In the Archaic Greek Apollos, they are deeply influenced by Egyptian sculpture. There is definitely a migratory effect. We have the possibility that the entry into space is still a frontal gesture, the figure coming forward, Mycerinus and his queen, whatever it may be. Or even Khafre on his throne...

Betty: But his foot moves forward. It is not this kind of moving forward, his foot is literally...

That is right, it is a literal gesture, then obviously we introduce the first major differentiation is the idea of contrapposto, which establishes the physical identity of the object in space.

Betty: Anchors him sideways.

Yes, it anchors it, it has no potential for movement. You don't think of the figure as then following a sequence of potential movement. Obviously there are a variety of patterns. Gombrich points this out, etc., as we go through various periods...

Betty: Yes nailed to the wall but on a horizontal kind of plane is no longer able to....

Nathan: Yes, but it is transferred over to actual physical space, architectural space that appearance was essentially frontal.

That is right, or reality was frontal, and then it also that frontality has that peculiar ambiguity that it can equally introduce the idea of the non-corporeal, the nonphysical, the very, I don't have another metaphor, the spiritual, the atmospheric, the potential for non-fixation. It is a strangely ambivalent, at least this is my particular interest, it may be that it has an ambivalent structure very similar to the way we talk about the ambivalence of the archetype having the potential for becoming plus or minus in its imagistic provocation, something destructive or constructive. Frontality may be, if we carry this one step further, we could say perhaps there is a possibility of measuring, in photography particularly, the variations of affect or purpose that frontality had in

different phases, it is amazing.

Nathan: Oh yes it is all there.

And as I said I am aware of the fact that this has been discussed and discerned but perhaps there is a need to find out whether there is, simply on the formal level. (laughs) It is a terrible denouement. It is like we said earlier, remember the difference between this {draws on board} and this. There is to me a highly divergent set of responses that are implied here. Perhaps this has basically a polarized identity, and this has the greater identity of being either/or: three-dimensional, two-dimensional, formal, reflective of the original physical. I am wondering, for example, Alex, just out of curiosity, if it could not be possible, you say it includes both but I'll take one side of the fence for a moment.

Alex: One at a time.

If the other identity of the poignancy...

Alex: I know how to say that very simply.

Okay, say it.

Alex: Keeping in mind all that has been said about frontality, agreed, no argument. Now add to it, I'd like to pose one question. What about that blackness and that figure? Keeping in mind all that has been said about frontality. Because I think an answer to that question involves the medium of photography.

I don't know whether it involves the medium of photography or whether it involves the absolute inevitability of us making metaphorical associations. That is the transfer, because of age to my potential, yours, mine, every one's, to age. Or the metaphorical concept or identification with her identity: take your choice, former mother, now isolated, alienated and so on. Those seem to be allusions we bring, as Nathan said last night, it is not the artist/photographer's biography, it is our biography. I accept that as even a reasonable way of expressing the fact that we will inevitably find ourselves ensnared by the black, by the bathing of light. Jim calls it, pardon me if it is a misquote, but you said something like, you found it extremely beautiful in the modulation of light, or something of that nature. That it wasn't a question of something necessarily negative, it has almost been removed from a negative quality and is simply a beautiful form.

Alex: Ok but keep in mind now I wanted it both ways. So let's remove the figure from the environment, and say there is a vehicle that is operating. Now let's put the figure back into the environment and question the nature of that figure's relation to the blackness.

All right, do we then have to get involved with 'blackness' as unique to the photographic medium here? Or do we think of black as metaphor: isolation, alienation, the end of things, the end of consciousness.

Alex: Formally that is the way it is. She is isolated by that black board.

But I cannot disturb the two and say formally one is therefore related to the other. I can't say black is isolation: one is that we are attaching a kind of metaphorical affect to something that is physically there. Why can't I say that the black is in essence with the light falling upon her, an image of high identity. That the black is serving no more than to call attention to her, not necessarily to show her isolation.

Alex: I agree.

{Laughs} Ok, good then there is no need to say anymore.

Nathan: Her bodily gesture may have more to do with isolation than the black, the attitude of the figure. You would have to maybe be careful about where the response was coming from. The easiest thing to do is to form the association with blackness. But this is like a traditional argument, something that I spent maybe three years trying to transform black into the possibility of other associations than remorse, isolation...the black field. If it has become so associative, from child dreams to leave the light on in the room because it is dark: there is a whole range of possibilities. But can you transform the meaning of that black from conventional associations?

Alex: After our discussion this morning, I think that might throw some light on this particular...

Well now Alex what I think Nathan is pointing out is the fact that black, or white...

Nathan: If it is the scope of the palette. The strange thing is, this is maybe something else about the monochromatic photograph which becomes very important, because that is the extent of your palette: black through gray to white. And it means that you have got to be intrigued by the problem of taking black beyond conventional associations to understand the nature of your medium, which very few photographers do. They rely black monochromatically as much as they do on red in color photographs. That is very easy, it is the easiest thing imaginable.

Nathan, could we say that there are certain associations with value structure, black, starting at that end of the scale, that are conventional associations, part of them are experiential, lights out in the child's bedroom means no longer be able to identify one's position in space, objects that are familiar are not accompanied. They can also be certain almost philosophical associations, for example, there is considerable evidence that chiaroscuro is not simply born out of an impulse to be able to render forms more naturalistically. That is tonality, gradations are not bound to contours, but are very strongly associated with identity being formed out of matter, and the Renaissance and Leonardo of course writes on this very concretely, talking about penumbral radiations, is not to talk about vibrations or something emanating but is to talk about that nothing is separate from its environment. That there are transfers, overlappings if you will, which is

a bad term but nonetheless that was the Aristotelian term. Chiaroscuro introduced the idea that forms emerge from undifferentiated matter, often the light/dark, meaning light source falling upon shadow, postulated the scientific concept that matter contains in itself varied potentials for varied identity, and also contains within itself, or that we need become aware of atomistic structure: constellations of atoms, configurations of solid bodies, things emerging from a very undifferentiated state. That would be more or less a philosophical association that black represents undifferentiated matter, figure identified by light represents an evolution from undifferentiated matter, so you have this polarity between things that are put in terms of physical forms we can identify...and the other is that we have the configuration of matter being delimited, more or less being formed and therefore fixed... And the great mythologies imply the same association: black is considered to be netherworld. You remember the first discussion, the rite of passage of the sun god going into undifferentiated matter and then being reborn, re-constellated with physical identity, etc. A continual passage: good, evil, whatever it may be. The thing that I take as a presumption, perhaps more than some fact, is that inevitably we will associate with natural phenomena, light or dark or whatever it may be. There will become patterns of identity that may be extant from childhood experiences or what have you. But ultimately when we look at the form it seems as though we are bringing our background, our identity, our associations, or collectively held ones, and we tend to project them upon the work, it is not that they are innately there. Whereas we can say frontality (laughs) as the last little group of us still (laughs) most people just frontally left (laughter)...The possibility that certain formal structures, I call them formal dispositions, innately carry affects that are highly ambivalent. They have the potential of either/or, for being physical or non-physical.

Nathan: One point past it, Alex, in terms of your response that gray may be more important than black.

That I agree with completely.

Alex: I am not trying to isolate, I am trying to see it as a system. I am not saying black is evil, bad, I am just saying there it is, and it exists in relationship to white.

Nathan: There it isn't. I've got to bring that up.

Student: That's, that's it, yes.

Nathan: Maybe you have to understand something beyond just that picture, the option of relating it to pictures beyond that picture, or pictures within the context of his own work. And the terms of meaning may be further clarified by the experience of other photographs that he made, or they may not. This may be like a unique kind of a moment in his response that doesn't fulfill itself in any other photographs that he makes.

I think that is quite probable. There is another way of reconnecting this back to the whole concept of the archetype in Jungian theory in the sense that notice the kind of polarization that we got involved in, and...resolved nothing, but just simply constellated

various identities. This diagram I have before me here. It is not a question of reiterating it but just to describe the typical association we have is to split mind/psyche, and world/matter. We tend to think of the two as being highly differentiated, and this is a relatively recent development that then represents literally two worlds: the world of the form, physical matter, and the world of the psychic response to it, or opinion about it, or associationism, or our own biography or what have you. But it is conceivable that the archetypal field might see these in combination, as continuously interpenetrating. And you can look at this chart later and I will be happy to go over it with you, it is from Neuman's complex essay called *The Psyche and the Transformation of the Reality Planes*, in which he says there is a point in which there is a gradual, we talked about the ego magnetizing archetypal forces to it as well as there is a pull of the archetypal forces upon the ego, so there is a kind of pulling of them closer and closer together, in which, as Neuman describes it, suddenly the idea of polar identities, the psychical and the physical begin to fragment, and they start becoming confluent, that is joining into a larger or more unitary field in which perhaps a form, even a formal structure. In this essay he uses an illustration from photography which I find fascinating. I'll read it later, but the point is that where a formal unit, just by virtue of its structure, may be the best insign of a combination of psychic and physical. And it seems to me that we often have unit ideas that begin to spring from the very nature of the form that we are observing. It is conceivable that if we were to talk about "X said it." It has nothing to do with what you just said, if this picture strikes a person as an example of an expression of sentiment and they begin to involve themselves in, which could be classified as a highly projective system, that is, that poor woman, or how tragic it is that she is alone, etc.. They have obviously infected reality with biography and with personal associations, and in a sense that work has become animated, highly animated by psychic projection. If one intrajects, that is, withdraws the projection of that nature, one gets caught up in a high degree of formal analysis, that is one can almost dismiss the idea of importance of the subject. Remember earlier we talked about (laughs) if I start saying this could be a vase of flowers, it could be an apple, an animal of some sort or what have you. Now I think that might have to do with the inability of the person to be able to identify with that figure. But it is almost as though the association factor becomes less important the very physical nature of the formal unit or the formal structure, like frontality. And therefore it may be not be a question of dividing into two parts, but seeing where these two units are simultaneously interpenetrating one with another... Take Heisenberg's uncertainty principle. A glib little note, and now I will pay homage to science, and I can't. But the point is, it is not any longer respected in science. But as a philosophical principle it is considered highly important. Essentially summed up, you measure something generally by virtue of instrumentation of some sort, whether it is a microscope, the laser beam, or what have you. The very nature of the measuring instrument plus the measurer, the person who controls the instrument, is basically disturbing the thing being measured, infecting it. The light may cause a different disposition, or the heat might cause a different organization of the matter components and their energies, or energy reactions or transactions. The idea of magnification, because of the inoperability of the eye, may terribly distort what is happening in a field behavioral system in a series of cellular studies. We see it, we see the protoplasm pulsating...receiving and emitting, etc. But it may be an entirely different structure as it relates to a protoplasmic field...In terms of we

don't know yet, at least that is what the scientists tell us. They say therefore since we don't know and to a degree since Heisenberg's principle of uncertainty is so, that we cannot get any particular notions about matter of any concrete nature. It is suddenly that whole principle seems to extend over and becoming terribly effective in terms of literature, philosophy, attitudes toward art, and so on. As I mentioned before, maybe Arnheim will have something to say about the uncertainty principle and the second law of thermodynamics that may be unique. Maybe he is going to get into something that will satisfy me for a change instead of leaving me with, here is the perceptual fact, but I am still left with why or how or what happens. This is subject to a high degree of uncertainty. The moment we wish to identify with it: the subject, the formal, it enantiodromically begins to become constellated.

Alex: Does Arnheim identify the perceptual experience with a mental concept?

He does indeed. He says virtually they are automatically related, but he does not imply whether one is the chicken or one is the egg, and he does not answer it satisfactorily at least for me, that anything that speaks to the possibility of ambiguity. He is just simply saying, it is. This is the possibility that there are potentials for selection of polarities: a high degree of subject associations, including the black...this reminds me of, or what have you, or a high degree of formal association. And it may be carried by virtue of the structure and the form of the particular unit itself. And that the ambivalence is not created just by the certainty of the frontality factor. The frontality factor may constellate the uncertainty of which way we wish to view it, as highly formal or highly psychological. At least I think this as a potential. Now I can't find, you need to inform me of something that offers opportunities for exploration that would allow me to find the possibility of constructing a field that was neither this way or that, but possibly inclusive of both polarities or multiple variabilities. I have yet to find a system that satisfies my own reaction to photographic images, that I can say this is the measure.

Alex: Because there is a contradiction between language, or one form of language, and another form of language, like visual versus verbal language.

All right, we all know the experience recently so I will use it: Minor {White} would have us rid ourselves of language, would he not? Now what would Minor do, notice the expression upon the physical: Minor would virtually have us rid our mind of the associational image. We would be in essence told to sponsor a high degree of sensory associationism. The breathing, the elimination of mind with images. We are then informed to let the physical sensation pass from toe-tip to head-tip and so on. And experience by gesturalism, following the passage by the sudden leap as your eyes are closed and then you open them up and it jumps forward, and so on...We are informed that this may be a better potential for witnessing the affect of a photograph. I say that is a polarized identification. On the other hand, there is enough (laughs) I guess there isn't enough, I can't turn to any examples except the hard true ones, just like, I'll use it: Sidney Tillim and the essay on Walker Evans {Walker Evans: *Photography as Representation*, *Artforum* 5, March 1967}: would say to us that, and this is just one fragment of what he says but I'll use it as an example, that continuous tonality in a

photograph dismisses the potential for the photograph to ever be art. He states that it is still too close to reality. That we cannot get what we might call that marvelous solution that the painter can achieve by altering tonal value and by altering spatial ambiguities and so on. He almost suggests that the photograph is such reality that it can never become art. Thus nature stands in the way of creation. It lags on, and says 'you will not be the artist because I am present,' and that is almost the thesis of Tillim's commentary on Evans when you follow it through. He states that the problem of Robinson and Rejlander, you know I quoted that once but it is important because he has followed that thesis in a number of other comments he has made. Canaday will become exhilarated by the fact that, my god, I went to Philadelphia to see a show... and what did I see, I happened to amble into a room, and I suddenly saw that perhaps that drawing is dead... I find underlying that a kind of unit perception that says, he was struck by the possibility of altered reality, not recorded reality, and that the interest was not so much in the graphic medium... the qualities of variation in linearity, or the surface elements, or the translucency of a wash or whatever it may be...but he was struck by the fact of the physical credibility of the idiom and the fact that innumerable variations can occur.

Nathan: But primarily based on his experience.

Oh yes, I agree with that.

Nathan: To satisfy that. It is the same with Sidney. The thing that neither of them will confront is the photograph.

You are quite right, I agree with you there, completely. In fact for Canaday it was like a discovery of something that has been totally absent in his ability to perceive anything in painting. He saw it again as reality, but what has happened is there is a tendency for the attentions being given to split realms, to see them as one or the other: formal, or highly subject to association or what have you. Rather than seeing it that perhaps certain formal structures present a high degree of uncertainty. And as an example, someone said to me today, and I think it is an interesting subject, what do you do with the photograph that has been... we will accept this as photographic and there is no introduction of drawing and combination media and so on. There is something, to me, very real and suggesting that if John Wood incorporates drawing with photography, or with graphic processes, or if Todd Walker still insists upon the legitimacy of the photograph even though it was... a zinc plate, then plate ink, then run off as a print, it is still to him a photograph. Is it not possible that the photographic source has now become indeed reality: coloration, drawing upon it, lettering upon it, coloring it, Jerry's sepia or color toning, suggests an ancient act of polychroming, or an ancient act of reconfirming reality by giving it coloration. We can't deny certainly the Paleolithic period...

Nathan: It may also be something equally important. Equally important as a discourse.

Between two levels?

Nathan: To determine the nature of each.

Good point. I don't deny it but I can also accept it completely on the level of an intermarriage of media.

Nathan: Right, but until the marriage could be made, and it was a long time in coming, because the marriage previously had been highly unsuccessful. One of the important things that I think John was able to achieve was a marriage beyond the obvious montage position. Well the minute that you can equalize or unify terms, maybe you can begin to relate back to understand more about each. It was in many conversations with John, it was the credibility of that intersection that was the major problem. That drawn element and its quality, and that photograph and its quality.

Being absolutely balanced with...

Nathan: Totally acceptable across a surface.

Yes, in many ways he is not necessarily the best example because there is often the total absence of the idea of the drawing or whatever other technique might be deployed, disturbing the actual photographic aspect of it...

Nathan: There is a whole discourse to his early work in dealing with the problem. What we are caught up in, too often, is the evidence of the product.

Instead of the act. Well of course Nathan I am implying that the idea of inter-mixture of media or inter-cooperation of media...may imply a high degree of, it is the act. I can't imagine anything quite as paramount in our most distant past we have the possibility of constellating a very physical form and then staining it. Paleolithic art is a typical example of the idea that color is not necessarily used to render, color is simply used to amplify what has already been rendered, beautifully with contour and shading, etc.

Nathan: Right, color is a dimensional kind of process in an unknown space, and in relation to the progression of kinds of marks, those which preceded the existence of others, and now we have almost completed a cycle of fusing the drawn with... and now in terms of less upon, specifically is now drawing on the figure in a much different way than body art. But just try to follow maybe what that progression might imply, whether it completed some type of cycle, and subsequently what can occur now very freely which couldn't before. I can recall maybe finding two or three photographs that had to do with the mark on the figure, but obviously the fascination with tattoos, which has been there, which has an order and meaning, credible, like the Japanese adornment of figures through tattoos. Well, the archetypal suggestivity here in interconnecting, I may think it is not just the rising, and being evident, but the interconnecting that becomes important. And I don't know whether I am making that clear because specifically this one: this photograph here, beyond those elements which are physically identifiable: light, figure, space, it carries forward with a wide range of attitudes and associations that one experiences in terms of sculptural gallery lighting. Transferral to known statues, the

attitude of statue, on exactly the same terms. What is very important to me is that this is a photographic occurrence that someone felt the need to reconstruct this. Not just make a photograph of it because this is a reconstruction. This is not the intersection, he did not turn, he did not walk around the corner and that woman was standing there bathed in this light. There is a simultaneous conscious and unconscious need to articulate something on these terms and photograph it on these terms. Because he has other options, photographically, the same physical situation, the same light, but it is that.

Indeed it is, but it is also that and its particular structure implies multi levels rather than just the singular that...

Nathan: To me, purely what that does is unify it as an energy with existing energies. Meaning that that is almost like a combination, on contemporary terms, of information that enables me to dial the number that I really want. If there is a variable in that, I'm going to plug into another circuit. That is the telephone I am talking about. It is going to get me the voice I want to hear, to the information I want to hear or obtain...

Do you have the possibility of getting the wrong number? I mean that, really, are you saying there is only one phone number, using that metaphor?

Nathan: All right, on this metaphor, I would say that there is a possibility that he may get the wrong number, I may not.

Student: And the wrong number being perhaps just...

Nathan: A busy signal...

{Multiple conversations, inaudible chatter}

Having seen and heard your comments, sort of at my urgent request, I would like to thank you very much and actually to indicate several things popped into my mind that went well beyond the conversations today about frontality, although indeed I would like to make a few comments in summary of some of the ideas that I presented during the course of the three days. Without any effort to review, to simply reflect upon the fact that I introduced the Jungian theory of the archetype and then also commented on various aspects of archetypal constellations. And what you seem to prompt in my mind is something that I think becomes absolutely reflective of a type of concern that we might begin to apply relative to the concept of the archetype, particularly its relationship to photography. The range of identifications that you presented, the idea of the verifiability of experience, we are taught to see by virtue of, in the development of photography. Things may have been in our field of vision but we are taught to arrive at new perspectives or to inspect new dimensions of the way we might observe something. I was particularly struck by, when you asked me about the comment concerning the native figures and what had happened to that figure, I guess simply a shocked figure or something of that nature. The dead man: the extraordinary detachment that was implied in those pictures, the idea of the peripatetic photographer simply moving into new

territories bringing back information that does not have a strong degree of emotional association with it at all. The thing that astounds me is that those could appear on the same page without any particular referential association, almost as though that is how they fell into the sequence into the pasting into the album. And it is interesting how the Bob Heineken print that we were looking at in the very beginning just as a contrast factor shows the decapitated heads held by the young soldier superimposed on the cosmetic ad, whereas you pointed out a moment ago, where we have not necessarily the advent of a new idea but simply another form of amplification of the idea.

Student: Sex and death has been...

Yes, wasn't that remarkable, the number of metaphorical levels...The emphasis on the long ago and the far away was prior to the nineteenth century basically based upon the literary allusion, visual images that really idealized the possibility of our vision. It is astounding to think that even in the Renaissance with the number of measures of cultivating images that would reflect the way we see: aerial and linear perspective alone do not cultivate what we might call natural vision but idealized vision. And with the advent of photography we seem to have the real combination of an archetypal impulse that had been virtually present since the beginnings of man, or at least since we can plot various evidences of his concern to engage matter and also engage the configurations of matter and be able to have them become self-evident. This is certainly not complex but just to touch upon a few of the concepts that might relate to this idea that photography began to introduce the widest range of confirmations of the way we see in our identity. For example the idea of information storage, the long ago and far away is no longer idealized but brought directly into our midst. The information insigns of our experience need not be visited on location but brought directly into our milieu. Our environment is no longer what we see, but basically, not what we see directly but what we may even see in relation to the photographic image. If we thought of this in terms of, if the medium of photography might be the material expression of an archetypal impulse, we might look at it in a sort of split sense, it is not only a necessity of nature to reflect upon itself, as I touched upon today in terms of light as perhaps being the medium, it could also be reflective of the psyche's need to be able to find an appropriate parallelism for what it thinks it sees, for what mind believes it sees. And that perhaps in the fixing in the identity of the photographic image there was an opportunity to not only make reality more physical: for example those frontal portraits of Hine, and the parallelism in Strand, and the variations are an example of what I was trying to state this afternoon where you have a strong emphasis upon not just mimetic portrayal, but substance, constellating physical presence. On the other hand you have frontality maybe being introduced today, or in our time, as a kind of presentation of the ambiguity of substance, almost parallel to the kind of thing that is happening in the fragmented image or the multiple image or what have you. Where there seems to be in the frontality not so much a confirmation of physical presence but perhaps the idea of what I call in quotes spiritual presence. That remains to be reviewed in a wide range of pictorial images, and only as a hypothesis for possible study. But remember in the earlier period we talked about the self-field, and what we call the ego-conscious center of the conscious mind, in other words the self-field in the unconscious and the ego-field in the

conscious mind basically as expressed from energy to archetypal forces being expressed basically through the self-field and rising up to become filled out. The magnetic pull of the archetypal self-field upon ego consciousness and the clustering of extraneous awareness as well as that which is ego-centered awareness, seems to me to find an appropriate parallelism in various periods of art that are concerned with the proving of reality, in the confirmation of reality. In other words, rather than speaking of specific periods in depth, just a broad hint, and it may interest someone to deal with this relative more to the history of ideas rather than the history of just visual thinking. Probably the first example of the need for mimetic portrayal, or to mime reality, or to at least have a medium carry the most direct image possible of what was observed, could be considered to be Paleolithic Art. Altamira and Lascaux reflect extensively a very careful observational sense. Now I'll deny this in a moment {laughs} to show you the distinction. I mentioned the use of twisted perspective, the development of contour definition that uses the idea of value variation, shading, the introduction of very careful delineation of detail as far as parallelization of the hind quarters, the death-tuck, as it is often called. There are innumerable representations that wall paintings incorporated a high degree not of abstraction or not of simplification but of an attempt to make the image real. In fact we might say that they are definitions really...we would almost have to eliminate this as a possibility, this isn't a conscious decision-making factor. If we took the attitudes of maybe Breuhl or if we dealt with some of the concepts that are often categorized under the term 'participation mystique' or mysterious participation, we do not imply that Paleolithic painting represented reality which was differentiated from the real world. It was not necessarily mimetic in the sense of intentional portrayal. It was basically a matter that in order to have reality as experienced, and this is twentieth century man speaking on another level of effect, but I will have to use these words to at least describe the suggested form of reality in Paleolithic art. It is as if man did not have the ability to consciously differentiate between animal outside in the field and the animal in the deeper recess of the cave. But interestingly enough, in order for the animal in the cave to become virtually the same as the animal outside, he needed certain visual presences that would confirm for him that there is no difference. And I find a curious parallel in the fact that it is not until the advent of photography that we had literally...a full cyclical development where we return to the importance of the credible image. That the photograph stands not in place of, now granted this... gets into some kind of conversation about re-presentation or representation, or perhaps it stands as another form or transform of in-sign of the actuality of the experience outside. The believability is the fact that one is there, one is in the presence of, one is experiencing reality. The idea of participation mystique may represent the idea of the archetype having been expressed or at least being formed around or through indicators that were not necessarily cognitional: almost as though they were not subject to differentiation but we often speak of this as a magical rite, even the production of the images. I don't think we can really discuss if there was any kind of definite cortical function or ego-field oriented with the development of those works. We can certainly say that in comparative basis, in terms of behavior of primitive tribal groups, and even groups that represent later Neolithic thinking, that there is a kind of autonomous self-governing process where reality factors are virtually expressed not through tutored, trained craft, but...as if they are automatic responses. But what happens in time is, it is as if we have the self-field

which literally links to nature, as well as to psyche, wishing constantly to reflect upon itself as though there has been a resurgence, almost a hinting at in periods of time, of the interest of the archetype as such. Jung speaks of the archetype *on zich*, meaning that which encompasses the world of nature, the world of spirit, the world of matter, the world of mind, having a necessity to find some expression that will literally incorporate and constellate both dimensions, in union. We might suggest that in the development of forms that might reflect adequate reality, it is as if the human mind as well as human emotions could not bear the possibility of immediate reflection of identity. In idealism, for example, we have the insistence that we are but mere reflections of a reality beyond this veil. We have a constant emphasis upon the idea that our visual field is basically temporal, is basically fleeting, is basically non-substantial. We have for example in Greek art, I spoke of the idea of frontality as constellating a high degree of a spiritual dimension, at the same time the geometry, the very concreteness that might be expressed in the Proto-Geometrical structure as being highly ambivalent. In Greek Hellenistic art, you have a strong emphasis, imagine for example *The Dying Gaul* figure, literally where we can inspect the rope burn upon the neck. The absence of pathos, the absence of the definition of the earlier idealization of death and the presentation of the matted hair, the introduction of loss of limb vitality, etc. It is a very short lived dimension. It is curious to me that it is not until after the advent of photography that we can even accept in a later period the reality of early Republican Roman art. A totally unacceptable identity as such...and one can make a parallelism between the art historical scholarship that would identify the Roman contribution as not simply a pastiche upon Greek art, distorted by an emphasis on mimetic portrayal, but perhaps talk about the earlier examples of Roman portrait busts as being highly neutralized...You could almost make a parallel between those Hine portraits and those early Republican bust figures as being too physicalized to make basically identifiable without any characteristic emotional expression implied. I am not talking about the observer, I am talking in terms of the effect of the image, as if the archetypal constellation was to simply present an indicator in form of, natural form, without necessarily getting involved with cultivating some expressed emotion. As we move through Roman art there are a number of stages, but there are particularly these stages where you start from a deliberate...physically un-emotive portraiture... that proliferates as an expression but then is not suitable and the idea of idealization returns. When the realism begins to emerge back into focus we have the concept of the expressive form, the knitting of the brow, the anxiety figure. Look at something as obvious as a Jansen text on occasion and see how, or compare it to an earlier edition. Pick a Helen Gardner first edition and take the recent fifth edition and notice the way we have seen a revision of the kind of introduction of images to represent the advent of reality concern in the art of Rome. You will find that the later examples of Roman art show what we might suspect to be a high degree of mimetic portrayal. In reality they begin to show an internalization, as though the archetype of direct portrayal, direct credibility cannot be, at least the provocations toward where consciousness could create a form that might be accepted on that level, were unacceptable. Now obviously that would require amplification, but it is as if we have emotion, or rather the introjection of experience and we do not find an increasing interest in portraying the external figure but basically a spiritual crisis is introduced. And with the Constantinian figures, in the late Imperial figures we have virtually the loss of

physical identity: figures flatten out, they become frontal, they tend to become subject to high coloration rather than neutral coloration. There is an emphasis upon de-substantiation, decorporealization.

Student: This coincides with this Christian work that you are talking about now?

Exactly, but late Roman art that we find often stolid, blocky representing physical substance or even those that show a high degree of emotion, the knitting of the brow, the expression of anger, or anxiety or what have you are not reflective of something that will evolve into a greater realism, or mimetic portrayal, but will eventually disseminate and become very abstract, simplified, reduced not in volumetric terms but to graphic terms. But we have probably the last reflection of a high degree of...archetypal impulse or provocation of inspecting the nature of reality in late Gothic painting of the late 14th and early fifteenth century: Van Eyck, Campin, the concept of the observable botanical specimen, the idea of the nuance of detail. It is a return to, rather than manifesting the realism in terms of figure, it becomes also expressed in the analyzation of type and the marble-graining, or the manifest differences in tactile sensations, a strong emphasis upon the atomistic or microscopic. And in the Renaissance we have virtually the return, we have the introduction of space and we have the experience of the distribution of objects in space but they tend to demand almost, it is as if, to look at a Leonardo or a Raphael or a Michelangelo, we have a denial of our visual field. We have something that is made probable, or desirable, or possibly reflective of a quest for rather than the experience of. The only viable realism is basically the concept of the optical defect, perspective. Aerial perspective becomes, as I mentioned earlier this afternoon, there is as much evidence to suggest that it was a philosophical development rather than a development that cultivated the idea of emphasizing form or three-dimensionality. The concept of, from undifferentiated matter emerges differentiated form. Light and dark are not just expressions of light sources to describe planarity, but to describe a condition in terms of a scientific attitude: how forms emerge from constellations of matter. The emotive strains seem to have stronger appeal during the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. In the development of photography... starting in the seventeenth century you have a displacement of the attitude toward nature from being outside to an internalization of nature. The whole attitude toward optics begins to describe not what we see in terms of just what we see outside but also how we view it internally. The concept of human nature. That may sound like a ridiculous parallel but it is a reasonable connection of even word-usage. Human nature begins to observe the idea of the human being, or even the self-ego field, as being virtually interconnected with the world outside. And there is Descartes' announcement of the split in the seventeenth century but this still does not deny the idea of the seventeenth century dictum that nature was internalized. Descartes, finding this a severe problem, goes to bed one night and has a rather dramatic dream after struggling over the problem of what is the nature of mind, what is the nature of matter, and has revealed to him in a very peculiar intrapsychic form, the concept that we often see as the nugget, "I think therefore I am." Books opening, burning candles, tumultuous winds, and of course the great split between mind and matter emerged from basically a highly personalized, intrapsychic event, rather than from a scientific or mathematical observation. Descartes would confirm the importance

of reality being measured by the mind: matter is simply *res-extensa*, things extended into infinity. It is almost like the dismissal of the world outside and a super concentration upon the intrapsychic realm. With the development of photography we have almost as though there is a necessity to reconfirm the external world. It had been dismissed two centuries before, and now appears as a medium that will reconfirm this dismissed material presence that we are made up of and reside in. Coleridge's introduction, I used a fragment of this once in an article on Jerry {Uelsmann}, in the first article on Jerry, that Coleridge's essay, *The Interpenetration of Mind and Nature*. In the nineteenth century, in the two or three decades prior to the development of photography we have a gathering concentration, almost as though we feel this sense of separation, mind has become all now, matter is extended, we have almost a hyper concentration on the importance of linking mind back to matter. Coleridge talks about rays of energy emanating from the world of nature and entering into confluence with the mind. He also speaks of the mind penetrating nature. And he also speaks of synthesis and marriage, or of conjunctio. And we find that in the development of photography there is this extraordinary bringing back of matter. Now I extend matter in this sense to a metaphor for things of the world, back to the attention of consciousness. Frith, in the pyramidal structure that a person may have read about, or knew historically, or through illustration, one through the photograph is there, one experiences this as a viable proof of reality. Whether one is seeing a Nubian personage or someone from the South Sea Islands, or perhaps observing exotica that would be totally beyond the range of their usual environment or their usual field, there is a constant reaffirmation of the world, even beyond one's own environment. The concept of the flaneur, the idea of traveling about, the peripatetic photographer moving into areas and beginning to develop images that are in one's own environment as though we needed to have reconfirmed the fact that we see. Or even needing to be retaught. Nathan, there is a richness in the idea of the phrase, I wrote it down and can't seem to find it on this list, but where if we have information storage, say on a carte-de-visite, that is not simply the idea of collected-information on the card. I mean I agree with this, but it is a powerful idea: the importance of reconfirming multiple identities. Find the number of babies in the photograph. Find in the world of matter how many identities are there. The verification of event: something has happened, Crimean War, now instead of reading the journalist's report, seeing the engraving, there is an equal report of being in the presence of, instead of sitting on the hill observing the cannon shooting. In the reclining woman, we can hardly imagine how one can take a pose of such absurdity, of such really unattractiveness, unless we say that one has the lingering or nostalgic reminiscence of the Odalisque, or the reclining Venetian figure and wishes to identify not with that strain of Classicism, but to identify one's own reality in that particular emotional mood, or perhaps even in that setting as it were. But not from the emphasis of necessarily the imitative instinct because it does not imitate the Ingres or what have you. It imitates the reality of the person behaving with adoptive identity, but then being able to believe in that identity as a physical form. The figure of the man and the woman, the woman with the beard. For some reason that strikes me as the gradual introduction of the possibility of the acceptance of the bizarre as not necessarily, again, something that would be witnessed covertly or just intrapsychically, but the confirmation that it could exist in the world of matter, outside. A need to draw back in the grotesqueness or the bizarreness of the world. It is almost as though the grotesque and

the exotic had become, and notice the various strains of literature that provoke a need for man to become re-aware of the consciousness of the existence of the grotesque and the exotic within one's own environment, Zola for example. Basically a kind of introduction of the necessity for man to re-engage reality, to draw back into his presence the very nature of the matter that had been extended. There is also a point that perhaps there is, in evolutionary stages, we have different levels in which consciousness was able to control or be able to be magnetized by the archetype that might, I don't think there is a name for this archetype, unless there is an archetype called, 'reality.' And I don't think we have quite decided upon what reality is but at least we have enough evidence to say that there has been a continual dialogue between whether it is internal or external, whether it is above or below, whether it is inside or outside: simple metaphors for talking about this constant concern for the splitting or the polarization of reality functions as well as reality proofs as well as reality presences. There has been considerable attention given to the idea that schizophrenia may be born out of this concentration upon intrapsychic confirmation. That since the seventeenth century and the hyper concentration upon the "I" constellating in my mind what is outside eventually led to the impossibility of mind being able to stand its own necessity to identify the world. And perhaps one of the cures in terms of schizophrenia through media techniques, the painting experience, the photographing experience, the confirmation of one's visual image through the photographic medium, that is now being used considerably for the treatment of the insane. Filming of the patient so that he is able to confirm his physical presence, not his psychic presence. And this would suggest again that there has been a lowering, instead of a separation between these two there has been basically a kind of re-engagement of the two: where the archetypal field coming through the self is becoming closer and closer, or more and more available for inspection by ego consciousness. But it requires not just the inspection of the observer's viewpoint, or the biography of the photographer, but perhaps even the behavior of matter itself. The medium of photography seems to be best reflective of the factor that something happens that does not demand the intrusion of a human being. It is as though one form of matter is affected by another type of energy associated with matter: light, silver-bromide crystal affect. A painting cannot be cultivated. Now I am not saying that certain patterns and that certain constructs of design or even the possibility of certain configurations could not be developed in painting by contrivances. We have seen these absurd identifications on television where the man brings out, this is an aside but I think it a way of at least defining it, where the man brings out the bottles of paint and a can of worms and a canvas and Jack Paar stands up and says we will invite these critics in later, and the man dips the worms in the paint and the worms crawl across the canvas, and then the various art critics are asked to respond to the form later not knowing how it was done. And there must have been some innate wisdom in the sense that they described it or responded to it as form, and would not discuss anything about biography or the intention of the artist. There was a little "hardy-har" laughter from the audience particularly when it was revealed as to how the painting was done and the critic said, well it is still a human act, you just simply used an imaginative brush (laughter) and the idea that of condition, the conditioning, it was just another idea of it is almost impossible to imagine any other graphic or formal medium...that could be developed through complete mechanical contrivances. In Orange Park, Florida, the

Yerkes Institute has spent a considerable number of years, I can at least speak peripherally from hearsay from my brother who worked there for a number of years, of the conditioning of chimpanzees to configure. And the Colliers Magazine some years ago had a marvelous essay showing this chimpanzee and the letters were wonderful, people weren't interested in evolution they were interested in how this became a disclaimer concerning Modern Art. Because if a chimpanzee can really cultivate that sailboat on the Atlantic Ocean, then there must be something wrong with those guys doing those crazy paintings. Again, it was a matter of an imaginative extension of human identity through an imaginative vehicle, a brush extension. The chimpanzee did not select the paint, the size of the canvas, or even the figure except by constant ingraining. However in photography we do have the possibility that something can be constellated without the intervention of, by necessity, a human act. We might say, oh no, because even if we set up instrumentations: the automatic triggering of contrivance, or, I can't think of the word for it, the development of devices that might record without necessarily a high degree of human intervention. This almost relates to what you were speaking of a moment ago, Dennis, we still have to reconsider the possibility that a human being still has to serve as an agent to determine the type of film, the exposure, etc., etc. What is more important is not whether the medium offers itself independent of human action, it is that matter uses matter, or energy uses matter in an almost reciprocal relationship. There is the possibility in terms of immediacy, in terms of time reduction, time span reduction. The possibility that out of the multiple range of potential sets of movement, gesture, identity, that one can be constellated highly dependent upon the very nature of light to be recorded, or light recording itself, so to speak. By the same token it depends upon the cultivation to a degree of a kind of ego-consciousness that can accept the possibility that matter itself is engaged in some productive act or some productive presentation. I started to say even an invention of itself. And is there, I would leave this question because I think it gets into a personal level, is it possible that one could suggest that there is something unique for the photographer? Is there a possibility that he can sensitize himself more uniquely than any other type of creative individual to a distinctly unique medium?...We do not have the necessity to obligate the painter or other graphic artist to necessarily sensitize themselves in a particular way. It may be that the photographer has a greater demand, a greater responsibility made upon his identity. Not only a greater need to inspect the nature of matter, a greater need to inspect the nature of ideas that arise not from the medium of photography but from the medium of science, or scientific experimentation. A better need to understand how sets of events are constellated independent of human intervention. And perhaps by doing so, not by doing so, but by the same token, a need to be able to more or less plumb the possibilities that his interests in the medium is representative of a unique personality type. I don't think we can call any individual, we can't call the artist a thinking, feeling, intuitive or sensation type. But it may well be that one can find a closer affinity to the medium in photography more particularly than in other arts by understanding his own typology. It perhaps even in certain cases directs one to the kind of things that he may not recognize are his particular subject, his particular type of experience. You remember I mentioned earlier if there is supposedly an unavailable function, it is as if saying if one can cultivate an awareness of the three that are most operative, maybe the one that is most hidden also has a way of defining, almost like by command, sets up a certain field

of experiences that would make it possible to reveal this hidden, unconscious function. Most of the ideas are simply speculations that cannot be grounded in fact until they have been set into something that came up today that Nathan discussed and I think most of us felt strongly about, and should be the proper vehicle for the exploration of some of these ideas, not to necessarily set a single photograph in focus, which may even prompt the idea of simply a greater opportunity to project our own personal opinions upon it, but perhaps to study the field of work by a photographer or better, the whole field of visual history of similar typology. Or perhaps showing its relationship to visual traditions at large rather than necessarily relative to the chronology of the individual photographer or relative to the developments of confreres or persons within his stylistic domain...period of time. And perhaps trying to see whether the visual ideas in photography are not, as has often been the case in painting, reflective of the iconological aspects, written thought; painted thought, but perhaps visual thought; visual thought. Experience being transferred not as a secondary representation of something but as the reconfirmation of something that was originally experienced directly, in and of itself, as a combination of the psychological and the physical. I am going to stop there... That is just an attempt to at least suggest some of the things that we talked about and to put them into focus...What questions do you have? Final notes, goodbyes, complaints, {laughs} whatever it may be.

Student: One thing that has been puzzling me, and it really goes back to your first day here, when you were talking about Jerry Uelsmann and the *Turtle Blessing* picture. And your question was repeatedly over quite a long time, why now, why now? And I think you suggested that sometime during the nineteenth century there was a confirming upon the part of the Catholic Church of the co-equality of Mary in the trinity.

That is right.

Student: Now, whether this is historically true or not, I don't know, but, are you implying that Uelsmann, I mean you are not implying, I think, that Uelsmann was aware of it.

No I am not.

Student: Ok, are you implying then, that the same thing that pushed the archetypal potential, what is it, the provocativeness of the archetype, that this energy force that prompted the fathers of the Church in the nineteenth century to reevaluate Mary in this way, might also still be operating in some vestigial way in Jerry Uelsmann? I didn't quite get what you summed up with.

All right, take your idea of vestigial. That would imply that Jerry then is experiencing some unit aspect of the archetype that causes him to constellate the image *Turtle Blessing*. Let's use a term that Jung uses: he calls it, transgressional ideas. He talks about field ideas. In other words if we said that there was a paternalization, you see it is all metaphorical, there are no living proofs, but I said just a moment ago, take for example in Descartes we have an over emphasis upon the internalization of reality: mind is nature. The world outside is things extended. This is a further extension of the

paternalistic attitude that had been in existence virtually from the second century AD until the fourteenth century. And then extending virtually through the seventeenth century but with a host of variations: paternalism or logos-oriented attitudes suggest the idea that matter is either something that is basically unimportant, simply there to be inspected. Later it is something there to almost be discarded. To be treated as something that can be analyzed, but not necessarily felt or one does not get involved with it. Transgressional ideas would imply that the emphasis upon consciousness: there are hundreds of metaphors, consciousness, logos, light, paternalism...almost what Jung calls the over emphasis on cortical experience. That there became a gradual necessity, almost a revolt of the Eros archetype, or the chthonic, or as often metaphorized, the Great Mother or what have you. I don't think we need to do that, but it is as though matter that had been treated simply subject to analysis, inspection, began to create a revolt, or began to exercise a revolt. Jung makes a, and I think we see this sort of thing in *Dr. Strangelove* and we have all these images of the destructive potential of matter. Matter, instead of being able to be manipulated becomes terribly destructive in the negative aspect of the chthonic archetype is something that we discover that matter is not going to lie still while we dissect it. We discover its energy potential, a bomb goes off, and we find out that we can even become disseminated, we can become particles of matter. Jung says this is basically the revolt of nature of our dismissing matter, dismissing nature. He talks about, as these ideas develop, then we find in religious projections, and he considers the greatest event {laughs} I hate to tell you this, I almost didn't tell you the other day...the most momentous event on the threshold of the twentieth century, and in fact someone has got to check that date. It is historically correct about the establishment of the fourth dimension, adding the fourth unit to the trinity with the virgin mary, there is no question of that. I don't recall the date, I know it was discussed first for several centuries, it became very important in the nineteenth, and he considers it to be the most important identity of the twentieth century. We don't know the effect this has upon us, and he is not Catholic, and he is not expressing an idea that would necessarily be pervasive just in a secular group, not just Catholics, or Christians. He is talking about that there are often cultural representatives: that one institution or one group may reflect something that obviously all men need. And in the introduction of the Eternal Trinity, one neuter and the two other highly paternal, the introduction to create a quaternary, basically you can do it as a square and consider them as the four points or you do it as a mandorla: father, son, holy ghost, Mary. And it is almost like the idea of the above and the below. You have now basically the feminine, you have the possibility of the neuter, or at least the potential to become either the paternal or the maternal, masculine or feminine in psychological identity. And then you have the idea of prime source plus extensional identity. Christ was often known as the hermaphrodite, not from the standpoint of some gender factor, some physical anomaly, but that he is basically the man-god that expresses the idea that he comes from a source and becomes evident in the world of form as we know it, and the hermaphroditism is not a combination of male and female but a combination of that which is never to be defined: hermaphroditic in the idea of the combination of two disparate opposites. And it is almost as if he is formless and he is formed, and the two are in union. But it is particularly the advent of the feminine that becomes important. Now I said that we must ask ourselves why does Jerry constellate this image with no

apparent discursive evidence from Jerry or otherwise to say why he used these particular motifs. It is as though an idea like this transgresses Jerry Ueslmann's psyche, or it enters into the mainstream of thought that might be apparent in a number of dimensions in our time. Look at Rider Haggard's *She*: she who must be obeyed. There are a number of not only nineteenth century novels but twentieth century ones that deal with this idea of the revolt of nature or the assimilation of the feminine. Nature being associated with the feminine. *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*. Woman has not had a necessarily attractive treatment in our time, and one of the interesting things is that we might find underlying all of these unattractive images is basically the idea of the negative aspect of the archetype because it has been dismissed and it returns in its most destructive form. By the same token there has been considerable evidence that the concept of differentiation is becoming lessened. I mention again Women's Liberation: the necessity to dis-identify typology, identities. Feather the nest and go out and go out and get the bacon. I was saying why because Jerry's, that is one unit, only one, that might show evidence of sharing in a much larger construct, the return of the archetypal feminine as Jung calls it. And not necessarily with it identified as negative, it may be a very positive aspect of it.

Student: This brings up a second question. Let's say, I am referring now to Henry Adam's book *Mont Saint Michel and Chartres*, and he makes pretty clear in that there has been a big change in consciousness and attitude toward the avenging angel as ideal and the Virgin Mary to whom Chartres was, she physically informed the construction of that building that began around 1185. Would that then in his thinking be an emergence of the same need to...

Absolutely.

Student: Ok, then in theory it would go underground and then re-emerge during the nineteenth, what I really want to ask is, is there any kind of time schedule for the emergence, disappearance, reemergence, new apparition of archetypes?

Dennis, no...when I say no I am saying I don't know, there is no evidence in Jung, there is no evidence in Neumann or in fact in any realm of analytic psychology that would show that there is a cyclical theory that follows periods of time, etc. We know there are instruments that follow time sequences and so on, prophecy, etc., etc. But no, basically, this is cultivated in the theme of enantiodromia that I mentioned. Basically we find in our life the problem of the over emphasis upon something, and as a result, over emphasis often creates a counter action: that is we observe the color red for any length of time, the cone receptors become exhausted, and as a result there is a neutralization effect, because the cone receptors for green autonomously turn on. We press our eye and we see the phosphenes, we can have automatic configurations, star-like motifs and colors and so on. It is as though anything that makes extreme one dimension of experience and over emphasizes it automatically causes a counter balance, the other extreme. And Jung we perhaps should give up the problem of enantiodromia and find ourselves centering, gradually focusing not toward a median ideal. I described today that one of Jung's theories...even in the individual, in the process of individuation as well in what he

might suggest is a cultural requirement. Now this is a highly simplified diagram, but it is as though we talk about opposites: plus/minus, is it constantly subjected to the idea of swinging between these two? Where do we start balancing? Well Jung says that we don't balance by finding the compromise or the median, or the ideal center: we must commit ourselves to constantly move between these and gradually we come to a point where we project directly in continuum with a total awareness of both. Remember when we mentioned the idea that Les Krims, it was an idea suggesting that if we have more images of that nature, and to quote Nathan, it creates an environment in which we are no longer identifying it as bizarre or peculiar or nothing, whatever it may be, banal or what have you. We have the possibility of saying that then we have the right to make a choice among the widest and most varied range of images. We are not necessarily talking about, we are not necessarily thrust into the necessity of evaluating on the basis of our response, the photographer's intention, style, etc. We actually can find ourselves not necessarily polarizing experiences but simply directing our attention to both and then of course making highly individual choices.

Student: Would this be Jung's theory of the function of the artist, to constellate extremes, or widen experience?

Yes, indeed. Right, in other words, Jung as well as Erich Neumann and the four essays, *Art and the Creative Unconscious*, define this, but I don't think you will find any of these statements completely satisfactory because they are not in depth studies applied to artists, although Neumann has done so. *The Archetypal World of Henry Moore* is a very splendid example of analysis and if we pay witness to the testimony of Moore, he feels this is the best understanding of his intentions and found it quite remarkable as a revelation of himself. Interestingly enough, Moore's comment on Neumann's book, the study of his work, is the best example I know of a man admitting that he was aware, not of his work, but not aware of certain reasons or certain foundations for it. And there is a very thorough study of the development of Henry Moore's sculpture and applying archetypal analysis to visual form over the earliest to the most recent, that is as of Neumann's death. The other one is the study by Neumann called *Leonardo and the Mother Archetype*. Now going back to your question, if I understand you right, that Jung saw the function of the artist basically under this theme of the shaman: he is the one who reveals the necessity of the culture, the necessity of all individuals, Dore Ashton took this thesis and wrote, took the Critics Prize award, called *The Unknown Shore*, in which he takes the whole shaman thesis, she delivered this manifesto relative to Abstract Expressionism. There is a high degree of autonomism, but perhaps Germain Bazin introduces the concept of Pollock or Kline, de Kooning's early work...as returning us to sources, pure energy, traces of physical sensation. There has been a heck of a lot written that would imply that the artist is being reinterpreted, not necessarily a new, but being re-realized in the service of mankind, and serving mankind, but not by directive. And as if also that he is to a degree inevitably selected in some manner to serve this purpose. Now, again, that is subject to a great deal of debate. Remember that definition, art is the innate drive which seizes the artist and makes him its instrument, that is Jung's insistent dogma, that he is not really trying to make a mystical theory that art is some force that resides and visits the body (laughs). He is basically stating that the human

being who constellates forms that are indeed therapeutic, balancing for a society or a culture. It is beside the point whether he is saint, sinner, alcoholic, da-da-da-da-da: the personal biographic pack is totally unimportant. It is the fact that often, as Jung puts it in more severe terms, he may be well unable to help himself, or avoid the fact of his creativity... I don't know whether you could, that may be an interesting factor to discern. That may be one aspect of a biography of an artist that may be an important dimension.

Student: As you have suggested, every archetype has a positive and negative aspect. Can there also be art that has a negative value for a society?

You mean art that...

Student: It comes around at the wrong...I don't know.

Can it become destructive?

Student: Yeah.

Oh absolutely. I think that varied forms of propagandistic art. Generally it...manifests itself in semiotic systems, more sign oriented badges, emblems, etc. There has been considerable connection made in the history of art, for example eighteenth century painting as a complete denial of the reality a culture is involved in. And regardless of what we think of these, I can't think of the name, it is a most recent study.

End of reel 6

