

William E. Parker, Visual Studies Workshop, April 1971, reel one:

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

Additional information set in { }.

Transcribed by Bob Martin

...What we might get involved in during the period that I was here and I might send out the bibliography, etc., but I chose not to mainly because of the fact that I thought it might be more interesting to do that later, and second, to prompt some ideas that were central to interests but I am not terribly sure how they apply to yours. What I sketched out as a possible direction subject to your interests would be to start off this morning and present a kind of overview of some of the ideas that I wish to be concerned with and then make them very specific as they apply to the photographic image and I am choosing to concentrate on an area that I have a great deal of interest in, Jungian psychology, but I also plan to argue against the thesis that is presented. (laughs) So it is like one session dealing with the basic information, many of you may already be completely familiar with it and if so, then we will stop it mid-way and then perhaps to offer you an alternative. Some of you may have already read Arnheim's book, *The Psychology of Perception*, and you may have strong or indifferent opinions to it, but he did a rather remarkable study of an analysis of a cosmological symbol, the mandala, and he argued against Jung's interpretation of this being an intra-psychic, or internal psychic expression. In fact he wiped out thirty-thousand years of culture in writing this article but it is a very fascinating study and it deals primarily with how a motif is born out of distinctly perceptual factors rather than necessarily intuitive or instinctual factors. And I will want to comment on that at a later session. But for this morning I thought it might be wise to simply introduce some ideas relative to Jungian psychology and find out they are not typical of Jung necessarily but somewhat represent a strain of consciousness that is quite ancient and even pervasive to the present day. And that the information can be basically applied as an approach to the study of iconography and also the history of ideas. What I did, and this is not proselytizing but I bought a reprint from Quadrant called *Notes on Analytical Psychology* and it is an outline of Analytical psychology that might be helpful for those of you who want a quick introduction to Jung's philosophy, psychological types, synchronicity, structure of the psyche, archetypes, a complete discussion on psychological development, and so on. It is very much telescoped in outline form. And also, before I even begin...Jung's psychology has a strong relationship to, the winter 70/71 issue of the *Art Journal* has an excellent article that I think is central to the whole theme of a new approach to iconography. In fact I would suggest that this is the first major article to appear in a relatively popular periodical that defines one of the new approaches to analyzing and interpreting works of art. It doesn't actually mention photography in here but it doesn't mention painting, sculpture or any other area, it uses references from a number of historians' views. This article is by W. Eugene Kleinbauer, *Geistesgeschichte and Art History*. And "geistesgeschichte," as he defines it, loosely translates as "the history of ideas," particularly, the history of *mind*. Not the study of form, not the study of perception, not the study of symbols as such, not the study of creative process, point of view of the artist, etc. But primarily suspends the

work of art, almost removes it from the individual, may lose it specifically from the locale of the artist and tries to deal with it as an expression of the world view. And what he does, Kleinbauer, is trying to suggest that this area of study has been realized for some years but it has not come to flower in terms of application of works of art. And perhaps there is a reason for us re-approaching and understanding a work of art on new levels. At any rate, I think you'll find this fascinating, it is a kind of survey of ways of approaching historical thought. And it also gives some implications as far as how an individual responds to a medium. That is, what kinds of inquiries are made by a person concerning their own approach to art. And one of the interesting things is, is that this kind of theory, the geistesgeschichte theory, the study of the history of ideas or intellectual history, or as he says, or even less accurately, it is a history of the human mind, more or less does not require that one establishes a methodology. There is no way you can say, "This is my creative process." Basically it assumes that you are influenced by various unit ideas, they are almost in the air as it were, and that you somehow absorb these ideas. Now this is a crude way of expressing it. And your work becomes expressive not only of your own individuated identity but it becomes expressive of something that is pervasive in every part of the world. Not necessarily in your own locale or your own milieu, but extends well beyond that. And using a kind of sentimental phrase, you find strangely enough that your own processes are brother or sister to a process that may be occurring unknown to you. It's almost like a surprise of discovering that certain concerns of the human figure in photography, or concerns with multiple printing certainly cannot be traceable in history just to the nineteenth century innovators, Rejlander and Robinson obviously, or to Jerry Uelsman in the twentieth century. But that it may well have a source in something much broader and larger in terms of the human mind and its need to bring together varied images, and it is a hallmark of the twentieth century in reality. Well, let me return now for a moment to sketch out the concerns, or the foundation that will apply to the ideas that I hope to be able to present during the course of my stay here. I am thinking for a moment that it is kind of boring, to be didactic, and I hope it doesn't appear that I am playing the role of the teacher, but I am (laughs). But I think we have to at least look at a few ideas that relate to the field of Analytical psychology and then to also understand some ideas that relate to the concept of the geistesgeschichte. In the first place, there is a rather radical view of the human mind, as opposed to what western consciousness has typically been inculcated with as a view. Traditional theories assume that the mind is a kind of empty tablet, tabula rosa, we associate this typically with Locke, and certain extensions into Positivist thinkers and philosophers. The Behavioral school of psychology assumes that you are not necessarily innately endowed with any kind of pre-determinants for awareness. But that you come into the world basically kicking and screaming and then you are influenced by things: love, hate, burned by a stove, kick the rock and it hurts the toe, etc., etc. It is as if you were a screen upon which are imprinted variables in experience. And then of course the cerebral cortex and the (thalamic) response of the mind begin to create syntheses out of these varied units of experience. It is quite true, we cannot deny that we are influenced by what we experience and what we eventually know, but nonetheless, the basic thesis is that you know nothing prior to experience. Another view of human consciousness and in the way it develops is similar to this except that it implies that there is a point at which reasons dawns upon an individual. In

other words there is often the reference that we are born into a world, Jung uses this term but it is not typical of Jung. You will find it in Spinoza and Schopenhauer, we are born into a world which is much like an ouroboros. Ouroboric literally means "great round." It is symbolized by the ancient Greeks as the tail-eating serpent, supposedly implying that what is devouring itself is also nourishing itself. It is an eternal cycle. As the snake eats its own tail it is not only destroying but also creating, that is through nourishment. This view of the human mind assumes that we are born basically into a level of ouroboric consciousness, and that means that nothing is differentiated. Things are just fragments. All of these experiences that are written on the empty tablet are basically loose, they are not at all connected to one another. They are being distorted by certain instinctual needs, therefore the explanation of the emotional tone and contents of the mind being attached to, let's say in Freudian psychology, to something like early life experiences, childhood trauma, etc., etc. But then there is a point, we usually assume, that begins to dawn surprisingly enough around the age of seven, not earlier, that speaks of the idea of differentiation becoming a factor. It is as though reason visits the tail eating serpent. In the guise of what? Tutor, teacher, mother, daddy, whatever it may be. But that one is taught to distinguish between things. Certainly it occurs earlier. There are preludes to the change, the transformation of ouroboric experience that occur in simple number systems, learning words and so on. But it is not until approximately seven that supposedly the mind is able to completely operate on its own in relation to differentiation. Now, differentiation is again just a word that simply implies that one learns to distinguish between things. Learns to differentiate. Learns to put these elements together. And that the synthesis that is provided by cortical functioning of the brain basically becomes autonomous, or self-sponsoring. Not necessarily self-governing always because they are definitely influenced from outside. And thus mind emerges, grows and continues on its great journey. Now Jungian psychology and many of you will find strains of this, I know for example the Kleinbauer article gives a great deal of credence to Wilhelm Dilthey's work, and Jung's psychology is absolutely not based upon some personalistic revelations, it follows a distinct course of what we might call humanistic development. That is, it is concerned basically with certain philosophic strains that are actually pre-Heraclitian, but basically start with Heraclitus and come right forward into the twentieth century. But the main factor or the main foundation for mental operations is a-priori: that is there is something already there. Now this implies that for Jung...that there is a pre-forming or pre-determinative series of what he calls complexes. But we have to get rid of the idea that that word is a negative, like a negative complex, an inferiority complex, he simply defines them as energy. There are predeterminate functions that are present basically within the fundamental cellular structure of the human being and are determined primarily by chemical components that exist at the moment of inception. And that a child is definitely born into the world already with a high degree of potential functions not realized, not expressed. And he does imply that these pre-determinants, he calls them archetypes. And I think most of us are familiar with this word. If you think of the root origin of the word, *arche*, first, *type*, from the word "typos" meaning 'first imprint' or 'first blow.' It is almost like you have a Cecil B. DeMille movie and you think of God's finger coming out of the heavens (laughs) and inscribing on that tablet: this would be the idea of the archetype of the revealed law or order. In Jung's concept, the archetype is simply, for

example, he was the first to write on the potential, this was actually in the 30s, and the possibility of finding out that we will discover pre-determinants within the cellular structure, and thus later DNA and RNA psychical aspects. He was the first to express the, not as an innovator, the first to express this as a potential for a new way of understanding sources for all human experience that almost founded a new attitude that is radically affecting criticism in the realm of art. Let me give you an example. If you were to look in, this will work, take a popular art history text that students use in a survey course. When you start finding ideas feeding into the collective mainstream then you must say they must be given some attention and someone is paying some mind to them. In the new revision of Helen Gardner's book, it has been revised by two people from California, Richard Tansey and Horst Delacroix. In this book, in the twentieth century they have introduced these little time lines so that everyone can know exactly when things happened. The last two items that are expressive of the *zeitgeist* or the spirit of the times, well it is the world view: the *weltanschauung*— man's first landing on the moon, and there's a little picture of the moon (laughs) and right prior to that they have the DNA double helix kind of expression, and that also has a little picture and a diagram of that. They make no mention, whatsoever, in the text, of the influence of these two events. But one day I asked some students, now that is surprising, if you had to develop a thorough analysis of a cultural milieu, or a world environment in which a work of art appeared, where would you begin? Well, certainly looking at almanacs and time lines and you are dealing with the nitty-gritty of factual data. Then perhaps you would get involved with more research concerning the artist or the art style, or whatever it may be that you are working with and you would begin to construct more through discussions based on historical writings and critical writings, etc. But I say why do these two motifs appear in this text? Since there is nothing virtually stated in the text, it seemed to escape them. In the first place, and perhaps this is just a possibility, whether it was in the author's mind or whether they just simply indicated that as hallmarks of development. It is conceivable that if you look at an area of a so-called style that has emerged in contemporary painting such as Minimal Art: you would describe that basically at least by expressed intentions on the part of people like Stella, Noland, Gene Davis, etc. And not that we can always trust intentional statements on the part of an artist, but we discover that much of the artwork suggests a return to sources and an extraordinary minimal foundation for the work of art itself. Typically: shape, color. There is not the strong presence of any kind of overt symbolism. Now I think that is debatable but nonetheless it is not overt. It is not going to communicate to someone immediately. You imagine a Stella painting and you see basically protractor shapes and brilliant color and you are not necessarily given any immediate cues to what you are expecting to experience. And it only emerges in time that perhaps you are dealing with very simplified and fundamental units that at what time were embellished: brought together in a rather remarkable manner to create the grand, let's say nineteenth century Salon machine, or the great Renaissance panoramic view with the Bacchanal, etc. And that there is almost a return to triggering units, or fundamental units that might have at one time informed art just as the DNA structure might be typified by referring to it as an archetype. It is something that makes an imprint upon the genetic structure. It is a fundamental, simple unit that causes the progression of complexity as obviously genetic development occurs, and cellular development occurs. So we have coming into view

some rather popular images that begin to imply that there are pre-determining mechanisms. In this case, obviously DNA is certainly something that happens that we would primarily think of as relative to the physical rather than the psychic, though ultimately we would not distinguish the two. Now Jung's idea of the pre-determinative structure and calling them archetypes is not— you almost have to dismiss out of your mind any notions of pre-birth consciousness— there is nothing mystical about this because he definitely founds this on a very physical level, initially. Although he talks about the possibility of an "*impotentia*" psychological experience as the child emerges and is born. The best example or expression of this is in a book by a man named Edmund Sinnott, *Cell and Psyche*. Sinnott is the dean of graduate studies at Yale University. He is basically a biologist in terms of his background. And he has taken very seriously this idea of pre-determinative archetypal structures. And in this little paperback, it is published by Harper Torch Books, it is a remarkable explication of the concept that even the cellular structure engages in a kind of psychological activity, mental activity. We might not wish to call it that because it is on a very subordinate level, not comparable as we might experience mind in its operations, but nonetheless it is also interesting because he applies this concept very definitely to art and he is at the vanguard of the new concern of biology and physics and other areas that are trying to find pre-determinants for any type of experience, human, physical, whatever it might be. Now that is a kind of broadside of several ideas, but let's talk for a moment about how Jung defines the nature of an archetype. Even Edinger's...Jung speaks of the archetype as basically expressed in nature as well as in man. Now so many of these things that I'm saying are gross and crudely expressed but it's the only way I can describe it. For example, one can never arrive at an idea like Synchronicity without accepting the fact the archetype is not posited in the human experience alone. It is almost like it has its own field. You have the world of nature, and that includes all things informed by energy, and then you have man, and of course we begin to use the term that Jung uses, psyche, and he does not imply that psyche as meaning only inferential toward mind, brain: it means man, in total.

Student: How does Jung define nature?

He defines nature as virtually all things informed by energy and of course that includes everything. If you think of atomistic structure and so on. He does not separate— in fact it is a little paradoxical to write nature and man separately {refers to his diagram on chalkboard} because he spent most of his life trying to deny that split between mind and nature. But basically he still uses the distinction. He has an essay in a volume called *Civilization in Transition*, and it is called *Mind and World*. It is the best explication of this whole concept. And he constantly uses them as split and then at the end talks about the fact that there is no separation between them.

Student: inaudible

Absolutely, absolutely. In fact we would say that, well I can't get into one thing about this, it is not a cop-out, but Jung takes very peculiar views as far as where energy stops emanating an affect. And so as a result you do have a point in Jung's psychology or

philosophy where you have a closure as far as the possible affect, not effect, but affect in any particular unit of nature. That is a rock has a very limited affect. Whereas the human being has a high potential of affect. Jung considered art objects to have an even higher affect than human beings as such. But he also implied that they are intimately connected as an expression of psyche, or of mind. Now that gets a little bit heady and perhaps is the most debatable part of Jung's whole psychological system. Because he does in many cases take inanimate materials: words on paper, the effect upon silver crystals, etc., and he perceives those often to be of a higher order of energy-affect. But of course it does require a recipient mind, a receiving mind. Well anyway, but the first basic understanding that we have to have is that the archetype is not just posited in the human mental experience but basically is pervasive. He has often referred to this as simply emanating ordering energy. And I would agree with anyone who says, "C'mon, that sounds fine, or may seem acceptable, but it doesn't seem like something you can hold onto." Agreeable? But the point is, Jung does not believe in certainty of these things, and this is why he is often called the world's greatest escape artist in psychology because he believes that you cannot necessarily prove some of these things scientifically. That they are born out of empirical evidences, they are known by experience. There is often a kind of religious strain he often has that says, "Well, that is where faith still operates." However, all of those comments were made in the 20s and 30s, and interesting enough, most of the developments like Eysenck, is he Norwegian or Danish I can never remember. If you ever want to read some really clinical studies, he took as a purpose to prove or disprove Jung's concept of introvert/extravert, the four psychological functions: thinking, feeling, intuition and sensation. So after Jung's death, most of the things that he said were based upon empirical proofs, that is known by experience, have now become very much in the laboratory. Test tube proofs as such. Just the basic studies that Sinnott has done: other levels in which this is being proven. Most of the proofs are coming from the fields of the sciences rather than the creative fields: the arts, literature, painting, photography, sculpture, whatever it may be. At any rate, to know this distinction, the fact the archetype is not posited just in mental experience but is pervasive throughout the entire universe as it were. It is an emanating ordering energy that expresses itself in all forms. We suddenly realize that man has been displaced. Terribly displaced. Because in reality—the concept of individuality—Jung dismisses. He accepts a concept called individuation. (laughs) I know some of you are going to start throwing rocks and saying shut up, I'm sick of hearing all these terms and words. I'll ask you to be forgiving for a while so we can get through this. But we have to look at the difference between these two: the idea of individuality posits, if we take an earlier theory of mind. The Edinger, by the way, does discuss individuation, but he applies it to a doctor/patient experience, and that you cannot get the full source of Jung's concept from, but nonetheless it is discussed. Individuation is not a matter of starting off as an empty tablet and growing by virtue of experiences and then suddenly becoming an individual. You know: I am the master of my fate and captain of my soul, and go west young man, the world is yours, what is my style I am trying to develop, know my own mind, etc., etc. Jung says in reality it is already there. There is not a question of discovering your individuality, you basically get involved with what is known as individuation. It is almost as though you have your own descent into— using a religious image because he has used it quite often— you descend into hell. Now Jung

does not refer, it is not a Christian image at all, he talks about you descend into your own archetypal sources. And as a result they are hidden, and as a result the basic level or the basic source of the energy is very much unknown to one. And there one finds his individuation potential. And basically one comes closer and closer to the threshold of a kind of emanating ordering energy that informs his life, or her life.

Student: Is he saying that you are born unique?

You are. You are born unique, absolutely. He expresses strongly that concept that you don't earn your uniqueness, you don't develop it, it is there. But the task is to find out where it is. Now of course that gets into behavioral attitudes, (laughs) how to become total or what have you. For the moment, at least accept that distinction that he does not apply the concept of the archetype just as existing in the realm of mind and he does not apply the concept of individuation to discovering individuality outside or through one's expression...it is discovering its presence. Its already present dimension within one's own psychic structure. Well, if you take both of those ideas it implies again that man has been disassociated from the main schema of development. Man does not order his own life. He is ordered. You can take that as a radical definition of art that Jung developed. This is dealt with extensively. There is a book that has been out for four or five years. If one were interested in taking certain Jungian concepts and applying them to art, *An Outline of Jungian Aesthetics*, by Morris Phillipson, published by University of Indiana Press... It comes under the heading of a debate with a New York analyst, a Freudian analyst named Edmund Glover. It gives a very strong presentation of Jung's whole concept of the creative process and how art emerges, how it works, etc. But Jung's concept of art is pretty fancy, if you take both of these ideas, the concept of individuation being there and the concept of the archetype in nature and in man prior to either form of expression: he says, "Art is the innate drive that seizes an artist and makes him its instrument." So let's say you have been involved with the Platonic concept of the daemonic, being seized by the demon that then provokes you to realize something. Or the concept of the muse, which is a very pervasive concept. You have another idea that you are informed by something. But still the daemon and the muse experience are essentially personified, often in works of art, as external visitations. What Jung is saying is that the archetypal force selects certain individuals, selects persons, and I don't think it is a hierarchical level of selection, you don't get to earn merit badges and then get selected, it either happens or it doesn't. And it is one of the neatest ways to explain the vagaries of, let's say, artist biography. Like my god, how did Jules Pascin ever possibly draw all those beautiful nudes. After all he was a millionaire, he could have spent his time doing something else and he was also extremely, at moments of his life ill, a kind of super-sensual personality, constantly suffering from hospitalization for venereal diseases, etc. What about someone like Van Gogh, what about Jackson Pollock? etc., etc. You can go through and say well it is beside the point, because what they became as individuals—as we use the word—the biography does not speak to the emanation of the art. And basically Jung's concept displaces man. He says that you are not creating the art form, *it* is creating you. And so it is *art* that is the innate drive that seizes the human being, or seizes the artist, and makes him its instrument. And of course when this was first written, it was commentary on literature, it was considered to

be an utter absurdity. And if you've never read Jung's two essays, one is on James Joyce's *Ulysses*, and the other one is on Picasso. Those two essays that Jung wrote created more enmities, this is like the gossip column but I think it is fun. One night I was at a party in New York, this was years ago, I was reading Siegfried Giedion's first volume of his trilogy, on architecture, *The Eternal Present, The Beginnings of Art*. It is a marvelous study of Paleolithic cave paintings. And this man was telling me, he was the editor of that book for the Bollingen Foundation, and I asked him why is that Giedion speaks to everything that Jung wrote, but he always uses his pupils. He will say, Eric Neumann says, the name of Jung never appears once. So every theory, like archetype and so on, is discussed thoroughly. And he said well that is because of the James Joyce article, the essay that Jung wrote. And I said well what do you mean? Joyce wrote to Jung having read some of Jung's early work, and said, I wrote this book called *Ulysses* and I am currently involved with one called *Finnegan's Wake*, and I am having a few problems because I really wonder where all this is coming from and I wonder if you would be willing to analyze *Ulysses*. And Jung said why don't you come see me and we'll discuss this. And they did, they actually met. And Jung said, I will have to read more material, and he did, and they had just a brief meeting. And what happened in time was that Jung proceeded to write this analysis. The thesis is that Joyce had to write *Ulysses* and *Finnegan's Wake*. That if he had not done so he would have simply been shattered...But that the emanating ordering energy that was visiting his mind was so powerful. Now that is a Cro-Magnon way to sum up the essay, which is very beautiful. But it was as though, if he had not done so that his consciousness, the part in control, the cerebral cortical field would have been absolutely shattered. In essence he was implying that Joyce had the potential for insanity and of course people totally misunderstood the article. They assumed that he was accusing Joyce of some kind of mental wreck. And that the art form thus became an expression of psychosis. And Jung, in these early essays, in the 20s and 30s, used words like psychosis, not negatively, because of the overtones of Freud. Psychosis to Jung is one of the most powerful forces that a man can experience because it means a high level of energy. It can be shattering, but Jung also implied that it is the kind of thing that can be ordered and that one does not turn away from one's insanity, that is one's health, is Jung's philosophy. Secondly, in the article on Picasso, he definitely called Picasso a schizophrenic. And this is one of the few times Picasso was really enraged, and was very disturbed by this, in fact they kept it away from him for some time. But again, Jung used the concept of schizophrenia not as a negative concept. He used the idea that, it is a very peculiar phrase, but once Jung shocked a group of people by, he was asked, "Dr. Jung, if you were to define, what is the most important dimension of creativity that a human being can experience?" And Jung said, "Masturbation." {laughs} And they said what is this peculiar man talking about. He said well I am not talking about a physical aspect, I am talking about the idea of masturbating the mind, bringing things up, pumping the mind, etc. And he began to give a complete analogy of showing how in certain earlier sexual rites, the idea of masturbation was transformed from the physical literally into mental exercises to make the mind have visions. We might suggest that certain drug experiences were originally intended...or to have the effect of prompting visionary understandings. Of course the problem was that they wanted to bypass the cortical foundations. Now take your choice on that, this is what Jung, even in his later

years, wrote about this possibility, he was never talking about having a vision without being able to structure it around some symbol of consciousness, some ego function. Well anyway, as I said, Picasso was very upset, and Jung's whole commentary concerning schizophrenia was the idea of the split personality. The artist is graced if he has polarities operating and he can use these polarities and be able to reflect upon himself, reflect upon interior aspects of himself. Not necessarily analyzing but be aware that they are there. Be able to have a highly varied consciousness, that it is not to fit into one particular mold or another, but constantly mercurial. Thus those two essays stand as an expression of his earliest commentary on the creative process. And then he wrote an essay called...it is a discussion of poetry and literature, and he is talking about two modes: the visionary mode and the analytical mode of consciousness. This has become a foundation for a number of his concepts concerning the creative process. The visionary mode being basically this kind of attitude, something is given to one, or one is grasped by something, and thus art is born. The other is, the analytical mode, that one may have a certain process of thinking out in order to experience, it doesn't deny the analytical nature of art. Well, at any rate, within the whole construct of these ideas, it might be necessary to get some kind of image of Jung's concept of how an individual mind is structured... Let's just imagine a circular structure at first, and then we will reveal typical little boxes of experience. Jung does speak of the realm of the conscious and the realm of the unconscious. And he talks about the ego as being at the center of the conscious and he talks about the self being the center of the unconscious. He only separates these for the purpose of explication, he thinks that they are integrally related. As opposed to the concept of mind as an ordered field, through memory, or through thinking one can more or less find a field of synthesized elements. He thinks of the mind as simply being made up of complexes: both on a conscious and unconscious level. You have this idea of little seeds everywhere. These complexes, and they are little pockets of energy, basically. These are very simple minded ways to define an idea but I think it is better to at least get the concept across because there are innumerable theories of mind that imply that there are definite fields of perpetual potentials. That is the whole study of visual perception implies that there are definite, set, physical and mental, optical and perceptual fields that can be analyzed. Jung does not necessarily accept this, he talks about units of energy that impinge upon one another. There is no such thing as an ingraining of a group thought, or something like that. You have an experience and you say aha, that reminds me of such and such, Jung would say that is just simply the impingement of two separate complex energy forms. They impinge upon one another and out of the marriage of the two a third thing emerges and that becomes a third complex. It is like we are a giant atomic reactor, mentally, and where these units are constantly impinging upon one another and forming other energy units. He also says that the mediating aspect of the mind is the *persona*: this is a Greek word which means mask. Now in the Edinger you'll find that the idea that the persona is the mask we wear, some people identify with their mask and can't take off their face, and that is their whole life is what they appear to be to other people. Jung simply says it is like a shell. The way the personality and the mind expresses itself to a world or to other people. And it is a very accessible area to explore as far as one's own mental operation. Then of course he talks about the ego as being the center of consciousness. It is an imaginary structure, it certainly hasn't been scientifically found. And it is the "I,"

basically what we might think of as the individual known to each person. And then he has this peculiar area, the threshold between the conscious mind and the unconscious mind consists of two levels: what Freud called personal unconscious Jung calls the shadow. You might note already that Jung uses all these very metaphorical terms, highly literary terms, and anything but scientific. I might add though that if one wanted to debate these terms, one should know that Jung was the first major experimenter in terms of the exploration of what we call the hallmarks of typical clinical psychology: the mechanisms of clinical psychology. Measuring electrical impulses, studying chemical components, the chemistry of the psyche, etc., and Jung's earliest work was all done in the laboratory. And then it is as though he turned his back on it. I will...choose names, labels, etc., that have a highly humanistic characteristic so that people do not get involved with these restrictive levels. So when he speaks of the shadow, the persona is the light side of the psyche, it is that which is known, the bulb is turned on. And the shadow is that which is not known, as opposed to Freud's concept where the shadow is that area of repressed desires and forgotten impulses or those in need of control. Jung said that the shadow, and another thing called the *anima* or *animus*: these were components. Now Edinger takes a slight variation on this but that is because he is not distorting but he is simply presenting it in a different way. These two are components of the personal unconscious. In other words we have the conscious mind: personal, ego. Then we have the personal unconscious which is centered around the shadow. And the first mediator from the unconscious is the anima or the animus. The shadow is basically that kind of reservoir of experience as well as a priori determinants, certain archetypal strains, that are not immediately accessible to the individual. Well then how do we know them? Again Jung deals with this very poetic idea: every male, and this is indisputable as far as our genetic structure, that there is a certain point in embryonic development literally expressed in the first natal stages in which one is neither male nor female. According to the genetic structure there is a triggering mechanism and thus the masculine and feminine components on a physical level emerge. And there is what we call a hermaphroditic stage and that is now absolutely established and there is no point in even debating it any more because it can be proved with the most exhaustive clinical proofs. So there is a kind of undifferentiated stage, if you wish an ouroboric stage or hermaphroditic stage and then of course from the genetic complex in you and I something triggered and caused the emergence of dominant masculine or feminine characteristics. Thus Jung takes a view that in the emergence of the child, in the growth and development of the individual, there are certain traits that are based upon determinants that carry certain "traditional" associations. Now as corny as it may sound, the man brings home the bacon and the woman sits at home and weaves the carpet waiting for the hero to return. And in all the great myths: think of Ulysses, the perfect expression of it, going around the world, having a great time, descending into hell, not being turned into a swine, enjoying Cerce instead of being destroyed by her. Penelope sits at home, feathers the nest, weaves the tapestry, turns away the suitors. In other words it is the old conventional idea of, and no wonder the women's liberation movement is considerably annoyed by this kind of traditional imagery, that implies that the man externalizes his experience and the female internalizes hers. Basically the anima and the animus are those components that reside— anima to the male, animus to the female— intrapsychically as forces. They are the regressive aspect of psychic

and physical development that were left behind as the dominant characteristics were expressed during development. You can see this in operation. Here is a typical example of Jung's empirical proof: If a woman has in her unconscious an inferior masculinity, and if a man has in his unconscious an inferior femininity, (laughs) it sounds a little bizarre but nonetheless, you can see it operate. A typical example is in an argument between a woman and a man...it starts out on a major level when you find what Jung calls the "spinning woman," the old archetype of the woman weaves us in nets and gets us caught up, begins to operate. Here is a typical scene: you come home from work and you sit down in a chair and you decide to have a beer, and you are relaxing, and then you are being told, let's say my wife comes in and starts telling me about the bills and other things that have to be taken care of, and I am trying to concentrate. Things work out ok, there are little annoyances here and there and I annoy her and she annoys me but there may be in that moment in time something in the air, and then we sit down and we are having supper, and it is a very enjoyable time, and then something, generally, radically separate from your personal experience begins to emerge: in other words the seeds of a debate on some subject, and this is where it generally begins. (laughs) Art is life: that is terrible, but you know this kind of thing, it is something very abstract and very foreign to one's everyday experience and you find that you begin to discuss this on very rational terms, "Oh really, well now so and so said this," and "I feel this." It is a strange way how certain personal experiences get fed into the abstract argument. And the heat of the debate begins to rise, people getting nervous, quickly lighting cigarettes, plates are being hit, a fork drops into the glass accidentally, the dog leaps up on the table and grabs the bread. It is a funny thing how suddenly the whole atmosphere becomes imbued with a kind of peculiar energy. And things are getting upset. There is inevitably a point, and use your own illustration but surely you have seen this, there is a point in which the heat rises and that there is a sudden transference of personality factors: the man generally becomes very caddy, he suddenly leaps around the argument and saying things like, "You goddamn bitch you are driving me out of my mind." Or he... walks out and slams the door and you can almost hear his high heels clicking against the floor, and they are emotionally overcome with very caddy, bitchy kinds of attitudes. The woman astoundingly enough, surely you men have experienced this, she becomes very authoritarian: the finger goes up, "They say that...like you shall!" Or the crossing of the arms, the refusal to speak, the kind of dogmatic separation-ism: a kind of dictatorial attitude. And we say those are, as trite as some of the illustrations might be, it is as though the quality of the expression is not at all based upon those earlier archetypes: the man going out and being the aggressor and the woman feathering the nest. They are basically transferences of inferior aspects of what we supposedly associate with the feminine traditionally and the masculine. And they are changed: so the woman becomes an inferior man and the man becomes an inferior woman. And what they might as well do, it is like that old advisement, you might as well withdraw until you get back to your own personality because what has happened basically is the anima has taken over the man, the feminine in his spirit has taken over the man and the animus, the masculine spirit has taken over the woman. There are hundreds and hundreds of parallels of how this works...peripherally, a study of the pre-political events in Vietnamese countries...If you think of Madam Nu, it is almost like the woman behind the force, you will find an extraordinary study of the animus function moving through a very

anima-oriented masculine political structure. It is rather frightening, and now people are beginning to take the total social structure and what happens in time when the energy rises and fuels the force behind the throne, etc., etc. In a cultural sense, the anima function is often expressed, if you imagine the thirteenth and fourteenth century expression of the cult of the Virgin Mary, you have a profound anima function. And all those medieval images of saint figures and so on feeding from the fluid of the breast of the Madonna are not accidental. They are a strong reaction against the paternalism of early medieval art and the emergence in the interest in the masculine participating in the feminine spirit. There are innumerable parallels in the development of women's liberation: it is one of the most profound archetypes to emerge in our time, at least from my view and from what I've read about it. It is not a question of equal rights, etc., etc. It is the idea that since the Renaissance there has been a re-engagement of the feminine function within psychic consciousness. As it stands now it is an archaic expression of a woman's animus, the masculine function, and that it may well require that there be a co-equal balancing of the man's anima function. Rather than being projected upon the typical collective strains, like the Marilyn Monroe or whatever it may be. The Goddess that emerges, a mythical creature. Do with what you want with that. At any rate, Jung speaks of these two levels, and the anima for the man became typically the muse. And the animus for the woman became typically her provoking and inspiring masculine force. He says this is the avenue towards the discovery of what is happening in the unconscious. And of course this is where we say that what is happening is basically a series: imagine a string of psychical series of archetypal impulses are expressing themselves, and they are expressing themselves rather than around a conscious ego function, they are expressing themselves around the Self.

Student: Are male and female differentiated by the fact that they have different kinds of impulses?

It is debatable. If you look at it on the conscious level, according to Jung, they do have different potentials on the conscious level according to the anima/animus function. It is almost like a traditional swag heap of identification and Jung would insist upon us being aware of what kind of function, traditionally, and that means in the whole history of biological and mental development did man go through and what did woman go through. He says these operate on a more subliminal level rather than deciding, "I am going to do this as a man, I am going to do this as a woman."

Student: But are they biological in origin? Two different things?

Exactly.

Student: So they do come out of a biological place, so there is something in the psyche that is masculine and something in the psyche that is feminine.

According to Jung there is, absolutely. But the thing is, one does not accept that as the ultimate goal, to become masculine or feminine, one synthesizes. The whole process of individuation implies that the woman must know her animus, the man must know his

anima, and thus the poetic metaphor of the mysterious conjunction: a mysterious coming together, a marriage takes place and therefore the synthesis emerges out of the balancing of these two components within the mind. You take what was bio-genetically and psychically regressive and you bring it forth to greater consciousness and as a result you have, I don't know for what purpose but you have, Jung uses the term from literature, *hieros gamos* the sacred marriage takes place. All of the Alchemists' studies have nothing to do with turning base metals into gold. These were experiments in psychology: a very early form, like when the adept was working with the tincture and talking about the *lapis philosophorum*. Have you got the stone yet? No, but we are working on it. And people are looking from without through the shop window would say, good god, look at all those beakers, and retorts, and furnaces going, and people doing all sorts of bizarre things to discover something, well they were playing a trick, literally, and we know now from a reinterpretation of Paracelsus' writings that the entire experience was the idea of projecting upon matter something psychological. So that when one did discover the philosopher's gold, or the philosophical stone at the center, one discovered the self, the rock. You can see how things like this have informed all sorts of images from religious imagery to, it is a little far-fetched, but you might even take a parallelism like rock music. It is not just rhythm but about central core experiences and so on. And have amplified this to imply that they were discovering this from within. The alchemists were known for abandoning their projects. Absolutely noted for this. The closing up the shop not because of economic necessity but because they discovered the gold. People would say, well let me see it. (laughter) And they'd say, sorry man, you can't see it, but it's there (laughter) Isn't it marvelous? It was an intra-psychic process of individuation... There was a marvelous article in the New York Times Sunday magazine on women's liberation, on the arguments, is there a physical, psychological uniqueness to a man, or a physical, psychological uniqueness to a woman? Many people are getting very exercised over this subject, about are there differences? Is one more superior or inferior? And I think it is a foolish argument. In reality if we follow the strain, perhaps yes, on certain conscious levels, but intrapsychically, Jung would express that our process is to engage both and to synthesize them... So is Jung's psychology suggesting that maybe one should become somewhat neutral. Not at all, because this is all expressed on the basis of how these realizations are directed outward. Take for example, and these are just hints, and I will want to deal with these later. How do we determine what happens in a work of art? I don't care what it is, we are looking at something that was intended to appear in our field of vision: a photograph, painting, sculpture, whatever it may be. And it is almost assumed that we are to have some kind of experience. Well, think of the dozens of ways in which we might interpret that experience. In the Kleinbauer article, hear the kinds of things he sums up as to the ways people might study a work of art. He says, "Art historians adopt any one or several of a number of avenues of approach in their intellectual study of the visual arts: materials and technique, problems of authorship and authenticity, dating, provenance, structural and symbolic elements, function, iconography and iconology, artistic biography, archival documentation; psychology, psychoanalysis, phenomenology, social, religious, cultural, and intellectual determinants." Even Marxism. And then he goes on to give even more lists. But those are just very general ways of approaching how one might become involved in the

analysis of a work of art. Jung would say it is not so much the way you interpret the work but perhaps becoming involved in what were the determinants for this particular image. How they strike you, intrapsychically, and how you might discover how they emerged out of the individual creator. This gets involved with a course of study that often biography will not reveal the fact, the evidence. Really it gets back into the idea of the *geistesgeschichte*, the history of ideas, the history of intellectual units, and not necessarily rational units, but psychical units, that are pervasive in a field and how they were selecting this individual to express them... Let's say Bresson's concept of the decisive moment, only the idea of being ready on the spot, or is it more the idea of a certain kind of consciousness that is ready to perceive an event that is happening simultaneously in his mind as well as in nature. If we take, and would like to only because I have spent some time involved in it, it is almost becoming like a single-minded concentration. It really isn't, this is something later. I will try to show later on, looking at a Jerry Uelsmann print that he seems to feel very strongly about. We know there are certain intellectual thinking determinants for the print called "Turtle Blessing," that became the frontispiece for his Philadelphia catalog show. But he doesn't have a clue as to why he put together certain motifs. And I trust that. But one can say, come on, he has a secret little book of symbols hidden in his back pocket. I think it is absolutely based upon the idea of a kind of field determinant: something that was happening in what we call the *weltanschauung*, that is he was influenced by certain concepts that are in the air. And that he was also influenced by having a susceptibility to certain archetypal potentials that what he produces in his photographs is not at all unique but really just another variation on a theme... That is a terrible way to consign his work to that kind of expression, but nonetheless, it is as though how one could propose to deal with this, you could discuss this from the standpoint of the printing process, according to the coloration that was used, according to Jerry Uelsmann's biography, who was he influenced by etc., etc. But ultimately you are going to find that you are left with something, a super-plus, that is left over, and then we ask ourselves, well how do we deal with it. Can this be done relative to photographs that do not have a high implication of some kind of symbolic or semiotic sign? What about the so-called straight photograph? I was mentioning last night to Nathan, and I hope that we will be able to do this during the course of the sessions. He has had a strong interest in the idea of frontal portraiture. And I have been equally concerned with the archetype of iconic frontality. What does it mean when something is photographed head on? And independent of the contrivances that may have been used in early portraiture, head controls and rests and so on, what do we have as a strain within the history of human consciousness that speaks to frontality as implying certain symbolologies, certain ideas. And I do not think there is any access to these if they are to be considered credible except by assuming some type of archetypal foundation... Imagine something popular, you have all had some type of art history already, think of that marvelous gigantic portrait bust of Constantine, the late-empire image. The staring eyes, frontal massive head, fixed planal treatment. Or if you think back to the Sumerian, Mesopotamian standing figures, those little figures with the gigantic, space-aged eyes. Or think to some of the Ravenna or Byzantine mosaics where the gradual development of the Christ figure from the *athebe*, the classically eternal youth, beardless, not even really of any kind of descriptive type. There is a very neutralized idealized face and then the gradual

evolution of frontality in the figure. I hope this is clear to you it is terrible to be tossing out images but most of these are popular. In the mausoleum of Galacacedia the very famous lunette mosaic of Christ seated in the garden and he has a three-quarter turn and the sheep on either side and he holds a cross instead of a staff. You find the typical classical image and then you have basically from the fifth century until the time you reach the thirteenth century you see the very bearded frontal absolutely rigidly frontal, reduction of pure shape consciousness, etc. These things are not accidental, they emerge in differing periods of time according to the archetypal field that is pervasive. And how ideas become expressed not so much through the influence of the literature or the theology, or the structure of politics, or whatever it might be. This article really presents this beautifully.

Student: I have two questions: one, I am getting lost, if you could reconcile archetypal energies and individuation, as Jung would do it.

Basically, well, I have to do it in another way...I agree, I am glad you stopped me, {laughs} I am just chatting on here. He reconciles it on the level of, to your question, individuation with archetypal foundations or energies, he definitely reconciles it on the individual level. That is the archetype has its cross-cultural expression but it then has its most manifest expression in the individual and for that we have to deal with what he calls the basic compass of the mind. This is discussed in this little outline of Analytical psychology. He talks about four functions in the human psyche, and every individual is basically running full tilt on one, a second tilt on two, third one they have access to and one they never will except to an archetypal expression...Jung defines these four functions as thinking, feeling, intuition and sensation. This is one of the studies that Eysenck, the Scandinavian clinical psychologist, developed and absolutely insists that these are testable. It is like saying, know your own type or see if any of these fit you. I can't give them a better expression, it is sort of crude how I am defining them. Imagine, let's construct a typical function diagram: he says thinking is the opposite of feeling. And sensation is the opposite of intuition...It can go either way, clockwise or counterclockwise...These are functions of the human mind, and the simplest definition, because in order to get to how an archetype affects individuation we have to see what is happening on conscious levels as well as what is residing on the unconscious level. Every human being experiences a dominant one of these types. Thinking on the simplest possible terms would be an analytical function of the human mind: a high level of being able to deal with units, high differentiation, high distinguishing characteristic, and you put these units together in linkages and you come out with another structure that you then apply to others. Thinking perceives the world with discrete units of information. Edinger talks about the four types and he gives an interesting commentary concerning thinking: "Thinking is the rational capacity to structure conceptual generalizations." He is not talking about generalizing, but he is talking about how units are put together to come up with a generalization and that generalization becomes a unit that is put together with others to become another generalization with a high degree of bringing together and synthesizing discrete data, units of information. Sensation is more or less the feet on the ground type of thing. You ask somebody a question and they say, "Like man why are you asking me that? It just is." They feel it, it is the gut

feeling, a high degree of somatic awareness, body awareness, creature feeling. And there are old trite cliches: we say a person is a sensation type if they have common sense, the green thumb, the ability to put one's hand on the part of the clock or the automobile and know how it works. They are just *with* matter. This is the idea that they have a strong association with matter. Edinger says that sensation is "that function which proceeds and adapts to external reality...of the senses." All of the fundamental sensory experiences that give one information. Intuition: I am going to leave feeling for the last because it is the most inaccessible one in our culture and the one most difficult to define. Intuition is: cloud nine...the idea of projective awareness and not necessarily based upon some rational source, or upon even a physical experience of the world, sensory experience. But fundamentally the idea that a person sees possibilities in some experience. The hunch, "I have an idea" can mean I have a thinking idea or an idea of something possible. A typical example is when you are exploring something and you do not know where it is going to lead but you are seeing what kind of bait you are casting out into the future and then dragging it back in. Edinger says, "Intuition is defined as perception via the unconscious, that is the perception of representations or conclusions whose origins are obscure." A highly intuitive type is a person who sees constantly possibilities but not fact. Also a troublesome personality dimension. All these can apply on any number of levels. And then of course feeling. He mentions feeling is the function which determines value. It is the function that values and promotes human relationships. Now that just doesn't do it because feeling is where a person does think of how does this suit me, personally. Do I like it or not, implying a judgment. It assumes a kind of sensation aspect by asking how does it feel, in my own body so to speak, but everything is evaluated according to the aspect of value: value to the individual. And as I said, it is absolutely the least operative function within human consciousness. Perhaps one might say, well when was it? According to Jung, it would only be present in very ancient civilizations or certainly present still in primitive groups, where the "thing" is not to be known by thinking, not to be known by possibility, not to be known by physical experience, but it is to be valued according to whether it is good or not for the tribe, and often on totally irrational grounds. I can't really describe it much better than that, but I have only met one person...that I know positively is a feeling type, and they will absolutely drive you out of your mind because you don't know what to do with the way they respond to the world...You say how did you come up with that idea? I don't know, it is just there. You cannot get any edge or something that you can hold onto specifically.

Student: What is the origin of these types?

They are functioning around the archetypal structure that is within the individual. Jung does not say they are born out of experience. Again, this denies the idea of the blank tablet upon which something is imprinted upon.

Student: What is the archetypal origin?

Jung would sum this up, like he does in his essay *Mind and World*, as part of the variableness, or the variation in nature. Nature clothed in variety, these are the four functions in which the mind is clothed in variety.

Student: Could you do the same thing with Nature?

Basically yes. But he will not, well I shouldn't say he only, but maybe that is what we call the frontier. If these are such, they are testable as far as their manifestation, but they cannot seem to be measured *back* to some kind of earlier experience.

Student: Yes that is what I mean. What is the core? Or where does it start? If we start with matter, where does...

It starts in the way, this would not apply except in the human field, thinking, feeling, intuition, sensation...

Student: What about the variations?

The variations would start in the genetic stuff and would be obviously based upon certain factors that are transferred in the genetic structure. But he says they are there prior to any kind of human consciousness. That your typology, for example, is predetermined. It is not predestination but there is a pre-determinant to experience that you are going to view the world through one of these aspects.

Student: But he doesn't tell where they come from.

He doesn't tell where they come from at all. In fact no one has, I don't think, really at this point.

Student: There has been no relationship, or lines to be drawn between what kind of human variations and some kind of variation in nature, like this table.

No, no parallelism there and there is really no proof, no structure of proof, or viable way of measuring this except by virtue of the way it is expressed. This comes under the catchall that empirical evidence proves the point. And experiential evidence proves the point. And Eysenk's studies deal with the idea of early childhood experiences right through adult and the way people seem to respond to certain sets of problems: do they think them, do they sense them, intuit them, da-da-da-da. In Gate school studies of creative activity and even the act of perception, we see differently according to these functions as well. I might add that educationists are getting very interested in this, I guess they have to have something to validate their field. It is the idea of 36 school children sitting in a class and they are all learning through a typically thinking function, and that perhaps we need to disseminate the whole bag and find out that people operate on different levels as the way they receive and become aware of information. To get back to your question, he says that one of these {functions} is dominant: let's say that intuition is dominant in a person. Generally you have a secondary function. Now the minute you find out what the dominant function is you know that say sensation is the opposite. It is the unknown factor, it is not going to be operative on the level of any kind of assessable conscious level.

Student: But it is still going to operate?

Oh it will operate, oh yes. In fact it becomes the source for all creativity and it becomes the source for archetypal expression. So let's say an intuitive person may have access to thinking and he may have access to feeling. But the one level he does not have access to on a conscious level is sensation. Now it is the old Saturday Evening Post cartoon, the absent-minded professor, or the person who walks through glass walls because he did not see the sign that says, "This is glass." Use your own illustration, I know that one is trite. Intuitive types generally do not want to get bound up in the day to day expression of matter. They are always seeing possibilities: cloud nine types.

Student: Is there no way to integrate the four?

Yes there is. {laughs} It is like at the end of the soap-opera your life can be beautiful {laughter}. But the idea is that Jung insists, and you asked the question, what is the association between individuation and the archetypal level? Well, Jung's concept of individuation is that the process one tries to bring: you have a dominant function. The intuitive type need not develop his intuition any further? Have you ever met any intuitive types? I don't know if any of you have ever heard of him, is an industrial designer named William Havalos. That man, it is impossible to sit down with him and have a conversation because you will find that his mind is leaping. It is like you are going across a great river and he is already on rock 43 before you are on number one. And suddenly he sounds very disconnected. Now I have a certain dose of intuition that causes me to sometimes skip the links. (laughs) And then as you said a few moments ago, "I am getting a little lost." Well then I am lost and not you necessarily because I am seeing linkages that are based upon the intuitive fabric rather than one that is rational or according to thinking or what have you. You might suggest that in the history of art there are innumerable expressions of individuals. The one that pops into my mind immediately, if you study the background of Bosch, you will find out that he had a very high level of analytical thinking. He was not only well read but he was quite aware of certain symbolologies that occurred in Alchemy and so on. But, what he did to transform these images, in the triptych, *The Garden of Earthly Delights*, you have a high degree of imaginative synthesizing, a very intuitive form of synthesis. And thus the work still exists today for further and further interpretations. But as I said, take your choice. For example, Uelmann, surprisingly enough, does not have intuition as his dominant function. I always use that as an example of someone whose images occur out of the unconscious function of intuition. Whereas perhaps sensation and thinking are the very predominant levels. But at any rate, let's say that this person has as their dominant function this and will have access to the other two and then this one is the least realized. The individuation process posits that one's work is to try to find or try to integrate, or try to constellate that missing typology. And this is never done through intellection or thinking, or sitting down and saying now we will have a soul-searching episode. It generally occurs through some manifest expression. And in the creative artist particularly that it is the source for their invention. Maybe you have had this experience yourself, saying, I don't want to talk about it. I worry I may infect my

development. I do not want to analyze my work. Alchemists often talked about the disturbance of an experiment by analyzation. Walk into a painter's studio and they say I am not ready to show you the work. Canvases are turned against the wall because to have someone see them may disturb the process. In fact, certain anti-intellectual concepts are extremely important, at least according to Jung's concept, because a person who says don't tell me about it I don't want to think about it, don't give me a book to read, don't give me all these theories, is really saying, this is happening to me and I don't want something to step in and disturb it. Because what they are really saying is to tell me what is happening in my work here is to more or less make me arrive at an awareness of it through one of these other levels rather than have the raw experience continue. There are innumerable examples and innumerable documents concerning the interruption of an artist's process. The one I enjoy most of all is Botticelli. After all, can you imagine such supreme expressions of Neo-Platonic ideas and then Savonarola steps on the scene and preaches a little bit and then suddenly we have these really corn-ball paintings: terrible paintings. A total loss of technical ability, a total loss of the use of motifs in an exquisitely ordered manner. It is as if he had revealed to him certain sources of his own primary function which he did not have access to: sensation. Botticelli was a supreme example of the intuitive type and the sensation function was not operative, thus his paintings become the most sensate and sensual, in a highly idealized way in the history of the early Renaissance. But once knowing, associating his sensation with certain concepts of negativism, or negative behavior, paganism, and so on, it is as though he had the negative aspect of his own inferior function presented and as a result he lost his ability to be able to let this emerge. Jackson Pollock: I think it is quite possible, if any of you saw the exhibition of psychoanalytic drawings at the Whitney Museum. If you read the study by Campbell and the young man who wrote the summary of the study. Pollock's work, I think we would all agree, expresses a high level of sensation functioning. You know, the dancing around the canvas, the dripping of the paint, all the guttural expressions of his existence. He was a very crude man and yet had no access to understanding why he was crude. Now basically Pollock was not a sensation type, that is the interesting thing. If you even read his little summary statement, I only know when I am *in* the painting and so on: this is a very discursive kind of presentation of a thought. Basically Pollock was highly intuitive, and he had a high degree of thinking, and perhaps in his social life feeling was the only measure of things, the only measure. Everything was evaluated according to whether he found it valuable to himself or not. His work emerged out of a high degree of sensation orientation. When he began to want to re-cultivate figuration, the double portrait in green, or the last great black and white series of the figurative images, faces appearing: it is as though he were trying to say I will find within these skeins of paint some kind of intuitive awareness of the figurative form. Or I will literally *think* these images of male and female figures and as a result he almost denied the sensation function. He did not try to come to grips with it and of course we might say that he was visited by a high level of sensation energy, his alcoholism, his kind of bull in a china shop attitude, was something that he had no control over. But it was also the area in which primarily the major archetypal function of his mind was operative. So Jung would say that basically the archetypal, motivational series comes out of one's inferior function... The archetypes that are really functioning come from the least realized area of the psyche. And that they manifest themselves...

the Self is generally again, has as its core, the least realized function. And thus it becomes capable of very negative or very positive expression. And the only way I can say it is that this is a highly ambivalent function of the mind. When Edinger talks about archetypes, and a lot of people find this silly, but he will talk about, the archetype of the great mother, the archetype of the transformation, the archetype of the self... Take the great mother for example: the great mother can be polarized in certain cultures. The Virgin Mary, or we will have in India, you have some minor bodhisattva, or some major goddess figure particularly who is expressive of the regenerative principle in nature. But we have side by side with her, Cali Dirva, the Indian goddess of death who dances on the body of Siva. Even today, after all, even three months ago you could pick up the paper and read about those ritualistic slayings in India, bandit robbers along highways, they were bloodletting to appease Cali Dirva. There are still temples where you find the sacrificial victim, not necessarily human but animal ones to appease the great mother goddess of death. Where side by side you can go to another temple and praise the goddess of re-generation. So the least known function is also the source of the archetype but it is also the one that has the greatest potential for either positive or negative expression. Let me just stop there, you had a question.

Student: You were getting into a kind of related question, you sometimes talk in terms of the archetype as a potential energy and then things manifest themselves within whatever limits are there. And then you also use it in a way that I can't distinguish between cultural determinism, such as I think that the archetype of the great mother, how do you distinguish that between something that is just simply culturally determined?

One does by primarily assuming that cultural determinants are also based upon prime moving experiences, whether those are in politics or literature, or poetry or painting or whatever it may be. Jung did not delve that thoroughly into the cultural level, it was more or less the individual level. You would have to read Erich Neumann, he has a marvelous little book called, *Art and the Creative Unconscious*, and there is one essay, *Art and Time*, that deals with the whole concept of cultural determinism. He measures this, and he talks about how archetypes emerge from individuals, prime movers within a social structure. And then you have cultural canons, on any level, political behavior, social, whatever is being expressed in the society. And what explains the rise and fall of culture and civilization is that there are constantly new archetypes being revealed, new archetypal energies emerging, and therefore you have a great crisis of culture when people resist change. Take your own choice of an illustration: what happens when a new attitude comes into view? The whole thing of Les Krims' pictures, his photographs having such a profound effect upon an individual, you can look at that as some "sickie didn't like the nude," or you can look at it as though, perhaps it is inevitable that Les's work would eventually start striking a chord that maybe many people share but they are not going to go out and kidnap someone, you follow me? As a result, the new morality, the new attitude toward nudity, on whatever level they are expressed, but nonetheless we cannot escape it, it is there. There are certain canons concerning the fig leaf: and then an archetype emerges that says it has nothing to do with being unclothed or nude but has to do with a direct *persona* experience. This archetype begins to emerge and starts breaking apart the canons.

Student: Where does the archetype originate?

Again, it originates, and this is where we have to end up and maybe it is a big joke, or we end up and at least we can take it seriously in terms of its evidences as it is expressed by human beings. Again, Jung goes no further than saying it is emanating ordering energy that is expressed virtually in the whole structure of matter as energy. And as a result this goes back to the original question of mind or nature. When you read the last little section on synchronicity, Edinger gives you a brief summary of what the idea is, this implies that nothing is born out of, you don't find the experience, it is already there in nature and in man. Now this comes back to your question: it doesn't make a distinct parallelism on this level with the table and the four functions but the energy is in a field as it were and finds its manifestation in various forms, whether it is something inanimate or whether it is something human...admittedly, if he were pressed to the point, he never identified this with any particular theological image or what have you. He said we simply do not know. We don't know basically what the source of this energy is. And then most people say well are you saying then that this assumes a kind of deity? Someone who is ordering this energy. He said no. It is a kind of energy that is ordered out of, I guess this is where you say the laws of physics, chemistry and so on would have to begin to...

Student: This is where my question is, cultural determinism allows for the fact that this is a fabrication of the cortex, whereas viewing it as some kind of an archetypal energy seems to imply that it exists independently and we are just some kind of vessel through which it manifests itself.

Well, that is true, that is exactly what he said. But now on the other hand if we took cultural determinism, cortical functioning prompting, almost triggering, certain responses. It is like saying again, where do they come from? Do we have a lineal effect, starting out with the evolution of consciousness as being a series of awarenesses that develop over a period of time, or do we have something that is more cyclical: there is a kind of core, prompting energy that then manifests itself in different ways within human as well as social experience. I think the question still remains to be answered...Going back to that illustration, we know now what prompts genetic mechanisms through DNA and RNA constructs. But where do they come from? That has yet to be discovered. At least though we find them sequentially, we are not necessarily saying what is the projection of the, it seems like the great thrust of our scientific experience of the twentieth century is not being necessarily, to point out what science becomes relative to technology, we see enough of that in pretty disastrous circumstances. Now it is the idea of going back in and finding the primary sources and basically we are left with some very definite determinant development. They follow a distinct structure and they have a definite pattern. And as a result, one has to say, does this go back any further, and what will we find. Now, obviously we can foster developments, cellular division, construction, and so on. It is that old Frankensteinian idea, what monster or force prompted the structure in the first place, that I guess is the great quest.

Student : Is there any kind of idea that perhaps this energy existed before man and needed to create a creature such as man to produce certain types of things, such as a creature with hands, does this type of concept enter into it...

It does, I don't think you will find much in Jung than I think you would find in certain theological levels. And of course the eminent example is Teilhard de Chardin. I mentioned him before, but Chardin as a paleontologist, as a scientist, and also as a Jesuit priest. It is always interesting to keep reminding ourselves that Chardin's works were never published until after his death and would not have received any...from the Catholic Church. But his new book, *The Future of Man*, deals with matter as energy and mind as energy. And the two in combination create different manifestations. Jung articulated the same ideas but Chardin in theology has prompted the relationship between, it is almost like saying that the energy itself is so pre-determinative that it has to find modes in which to manifest itself. This goes back to the old idea that if you took a typical theological doctrine like, 'man is created in the image of god,' well reverse it and say god found it necessary to find a vehicle through which he could express himself, reflect upon himself. Thus one of the major themes of the great biblical literature: he did not reflect any light, therefore punishment, or what have you. That does get into a highly speculative theoretical foundation as well, of theological, philosophical concern. Jung sponsors the idea that the "measurable proof" of the archetype is the consistency in the way that it grasps as individual, prompts an individual to identify itself. Now that is on a highly individual level. The measurable proof of the archetype is most evident in collective strains: groups of people who stop at a certain level of psychic development and then again we have social determinants. He says there is a next level in which certain individuals do not seek to understand the typology of their own individual identity, but there is what he calls, Jung does not include just an unconscious, personal, but he also speaks of a collective consciousness, social fabric, everyone with similar thinking on a conscious level, and he also talks about a collective unconscious. Now the collective unconscious is not, as it is often misinterpreted, even Edinger will present you, well let's see what he says about it...he says...it is as if the individual has a conscious, personal unconscious, and collective unconscious. The collective unconscious is the broader strain of the species: certain determinants that would be born out of our own bio-psychological tradition... Think of a parallel like *2001*. Throw the bone at the moon, that kind of thing. There is also a social factor that is involved here. There are cultures that Jung would say that are highly oriented around the thinking function. There are certain cultures that are highly oriented around the sensation function, but it simply does not imply that all individuals sense that way. I think one of the most evident proofs are in the recent studies by Mircea Eliade, University of Chicago, on the whole subject of shamanism: who becomes the guru, the priest, the religious leader in a tribe? Generally it is the person who has a different function from what the collective tribal group function is. It can also be expressed as the shaman typically being albino, or physically deformed. The shaman is often a person who has been seized by an archetypal function which is totally different from the tribal canons, or laws. Certainly in preliterate societies, the intuitive type is virtually the shaman, and in all the shamanistic lores, songs, chants imply the world beyond the world that is. The great dream: we dream little dreams, the shaman dreams the great dream of the tribe.

He sees into it the possibilities, and you can imagine if a person were growing up with a number of sets of differences, whether physical or psychological, it is quite possible that his only measure of an identity within a collective group would be either one, destroyed, or two, to serve some function to reveal to the group their unconscious function. The whole level of prophecy, or prediction, or even the interest in our time in astrology, is part of the idea that there is another level that will mediate what we don't know. Perhaps one of the strongest, let's say the representation of the drug experience has been, whether one experiences this under controlled or just natural, personal, selective situations, is the idea of discovering some dimension, a realization that is not necessarily accessible to one's normally functioning levels.

Student: How does the archetype work in terms of non-human things? How would it work in the realm of the oak tree?

Ok, now, this is difficult, I am not that adept to talking about the actual, let's say the autonomous processes that take place in the oak tree, such as the photosynthesis process. Jung would insist that nature follows certain pre-determinative laws, from the idea of genetic transfer, but also of a cycle of continuum that not only applies to the individual unit but also applies to the collective unit. He speaks of the energy as differentiating itself into varied forms, as I said before, there is a plenitude, it is a Platonic concept, that you have certain things that spill over. This idea of plenitude can manifest itself on the level of the rock. Does the rock have the potential of plenty that can then turn into, metamorph-ize into another form? Basically no, except by erosion, which is affected from the outside. Does the human being have archetypal plenitude that it can transform itself, certainly not except in the aging process, but in terms of the expression in art it has the ability to extend itself. He feels that the energy source is the same, you follow me, but that the way it manifests itself...

Student: But what I am questioning is the way you made the jump, you take art out of the realm of other activities.

What do you mean?

Student: You said that there are certain activities of man in which he is like the rock or like the tree, can't realize certain potentials, but then you say art is another activity which then lets him extend himself and deal or manifest different aspects. You distinguish it from other types of human behavior, is what I am asking or other types of behavior in nature perhaps.

Now I am generalizing when I say this, and there are shadings of import here, Jung would define, and by virtue of influence I feel this very strongly, that there *is* a unique dimension to creative behavior, to the cultivation of art that is totally unrealized in any other dimension in the world, including and in nature. So the question to ask is why? Because Jung would say that there is a point at which man can constellate psychic dimensions into matter. Into matter that we would normally think of as inanimate.

Student: Then I think maybe a more basic question is whether that is true.

Well I think it is highly speculative. None of the concepts of Jung, except as they have been extended into psychological types and the functioning of introversion/extraversion have really been tested, so it is highly theoretical. However, when one starts dealing with works of art, you have only, at least by virtue of tradition, the association with background development, etc. And there has been an increasing interest in trying to, as I mentioned in relation to this article here, to try to understand what about the history of ideas. Now ideas not as pre-established one influencing the other, but as fundamental archetypal units. The world view units are not considered to be posited like here is an individual had an idea, and then he influenced another individual and so on. It is the idea that he was visited by a particular energy, psychological energy force within a cultural fabric. He gave it most manifest expression, generally rising up from some unrealized function of the culture. And as a result, it was delivered, so to speak, to the next group, and so on. The only person I know, I was sitting here pondering and thinking about your question, the only person who has tried to give expression to this dimension is Kubler in *The Shape of Time*.

Student: I am sure you read *Rage for Chaos*?

No I have not.

Student: By Peckham. His basic idea is that art is just another form of biological adaptation. It is not distinct from other forms of human activity.

That is fascinating, I certainly will read it. Have any of you read *The Shape of Time* by Kubler? What did you think of that Dennis? Did you have any particular opinions about it?

Dennis: I found it very interesting.

I did too. Because what he does is not really deal with any kind of intra-psychic levels, but he talks about linkages: what he calls early and late— now these are my words and not Kubler's— early and late provocations. He doesn't really deal with the idea of sources, like, 'where do these things come from?' He leaves us with a great veil in front of what is the source for all this, but he starts off with the idea that if you don't think of art as a kind of unique series of paintings, sculptures, photographs, pottery, crafts, whatever it may be, but you think of these as units linked in a kind of structure where they impinge upon one another. And these units of structure, or of semiotic/sign information are examples, when he speaks of early informational, technical, physical, expressions, they are generally something where an idea is being formed: something is emerging. They find their culmination in what we generally identify as the great master. According to Kubler, we would take someone like Leonardo, Michelangelo, or Raphael as being late developers of a unit idea that emerged, and the linkage occurs...when it reaches its culmination. Then the unrealized aspect of their work becomes the next unit that fosters the shape of the next event in time. The hardest part about Jung, I guess

like most theories, can be dismissible on the basis that there is no overt proof, no overt scientific proof for many of the ideas. However, there are empirical evidences that there are certain levels of interpretation where you can no longer find access to the meaning of something without turning to a concept of its nature. And the entire mainstream of contemporary art history is pushing more and more toward that level, and it's been around for years. Rather than dealing the direct influences, it is like saying, in the realm of photography, since it has that unique dimension of proliferating images rapidly, do we find something that links these images together within an individual. Do we look for direct influences upon the photographer's work or do we discover that perhaps photography has innate to the medium itself that causes a more immediate synapse or relationship between the figurational thought and response from what is happening in nature.

Student: How are new archetypes created?

Well, they are not. The point is, they are not, they are just there. And of course, supposedly the great concept of the progress of human civilization and human behavior is not that a new archetype is revealed, it is already there.

Student: Well then is there a limited number or is it such that the human mind would never have to worry about running out of things to do.

I would accept the latter part as being basically the concept.

Student: Question about archetypes, inaudible.

Let me think of a good one now. What is it that prompts? Take something like this, who is the author of, the book is titled *Homo Ludens*, it means 'man-play.' Now an archetype is not a set of determinants that you can analyze and say this is what this archetype is, you call it this, well they do, like the archetype of the Great Mother, or the archetype of transformation, they are labeled, but you cannot necessarily analyze an archetype according to a specific identification. You simply say there is obviously a level of provocative energy, a series of impotentia energy levels that are in themselves, as Jung, quote, are empty and formless. In other words you cannot say it is anything except a provocative form of energy. It manifests itself as a form through whatever physical or mental experience expresses it: how it emerges and finds its avenue of expression in mental or physical constructs. Now the idea in *Homo Ludens*, "man-play," evidently there is an archetypal level in which man likes to engage in the logistics, the movement of information, the movement of materials from one place to another, the impingement upon other human beings. You would have to deal with very abstract ideas. The idea of the archetype of play can extend itself all the way up through as this author does {Johan Huizinga, 1938} to the realm of war. But war is another expression of play. Now the archetype itself is in itself none of those things. It is the energy that provokes man to behave in certain characteristic manners and has done so, century upon century.

Student: If you took the concept of animism in primitive societies, or... souls, then the archetype would be whatever force brought about that concept of animism.

Absolutely.

Student: But are there certain kinds of energy? Is that what you are saying? But can't we say there is just one energy?

Well ultimately the thesis is that behind it all there is just one energy. I don't try to skirt the issue but I don't think you will find in any area an answer to that particular question, it has yet to be found. Which is not an escape but not within any discipline, science, art.

Student: A continuation of Mike's question, a certain type of energy that produces the phenomenon of animism, could that same energy intersect something else, such as a tree or a rock or another culture and produce another thing?

Absolutely.

Student: So in that concept, individuals in that society will have different objects: I might have, my bush soul might be a rock, yours might be a tree.

Student: No, that's still the same phenomena to me. What I am talking about is, does that energy intersect the oak tree and make the oak tree do certain things.

Are you saying, does the oak tree itself, if I get what you are saying, does the oak tree have some kind of operative function that in turn influences something else?

Student: Well, how does the oak tree relate to that energy? How does something that is non-cortical relate to the archetypal energy is what I want to know?

Well, I don't know. All we can deal with are the evidences. I don't think you know or I know or anyone knows. I mentioned this the last time I was here, a very popular form of expressing this kind of concept, *The Teachings of Don Juan*, and *Further Conversations with Don Juan* {Carlos Castaneda}. If a man can emanate from his belly region, whatever that energy tentacle series is, and grasp the rock, is the rock grasping the man or is the energy grasping the rock? I don't know how many of you have read this, but the comment is that, the principle of vibrations, of auras— sure, one can walk into a room and you can tell when there is ill feeling, it hangs off the walls like poison. Or you can tell when there is good feeling. There are atmospheric energies {laughs} I can't put it any better than that.

Student: My question is slightly different. There is an implication that man intersects some type of archetypal force and produces something that may be recurring, some form of a symbol or expression. What my question is, for one you imply that the archetypal force has a certain unique kind of manifestation that controls the behavior of

man. My question would be, does that uniqueness manifest itself in other things, other than man?

Oh absolutely. Yes, I mean maybe I am giving it a different edge, but just the evidences of the transformation in evolution, in plant life, animal life, that is one manifestation. Certain energies express themselves and they have a reduction of plenitude, a reduction of potential for affect. I know that is a pretty elementary way of saying absolutely, but the very nature of evolution in itself, not only in body type, physical structure, and so on, is part of the example of an archetype manifesting itself in varied forms. And supposedly, according to the history of evolution, reaching higher levels of potential. Even the popular television show now takes seriously this idea of talking to plants and behaving kindly to them and therefore they will grow and so on. This can become either some fat-headed apartment-living mysticism or it can become something that suggests that energy is inter-penetrable.

Student: If that is so then there is a way to integrate the four types, right?

Oh yes, and I would say that, let's take a simple idea like matter can neither be created nor destroyed: it is transformation. Obviously the energy doesn't dissipate, of course that does not take care of the second law of thermodynamics and the concept of entropy and the ultimate heat death of the universe, but that is another potential variable of energy, right? I haven't read it, but have any of you read Arnheim's new study on art and science where he takes the whole second law of thermodynamics and applies it to the implications for art? It has just been published. I haven't read it and I am looking forward to it because he obviously is the first person to really deal concretely with the subject of certain scientific concepts relative to art.

Student: I guess I would like to know, like with Stan, why is there, are there many archetypes or is it just one base energy?

One base energy that manifests itself in its own series of provocations.

Student: Differentiation comes from the manifestation.

Student: It is not a series though.

Yes it is.

Student: Is it one after the other?

No, when I say series, I mean linked, almost as though you have a flank of archetypal energies and some are manifest according to your conscious fabric.

Student: It is up to each person, we can talk about it that way...how they understand that single energy. How they extrapolate its series.

Absolutely. In other words there is a great allowance for variety in the expression of the archetype. There is also the greatest allowance for restriction, that is, the restrictions generally express themselves in social determinants, according to what the fabric of the collective consciousness experiences as a predominant type and shares. The individual is generally the person who has sought to involve themselves deeper in their own individual structural type and they are as variable as there are individuals.

Student: In terms of the repeatability of certain types of symbols or signs of human experiences, cross-culturally. It is being described as the intersection of a repeating energy, as opposed to thinking of it in terms of just a limitation of the human being. Why?

I don't think there is an answer to that, but let me take a stab at something. Where does the recent interest in ecology and conservation come from? We can ask a question like that. What would be an answer to that? Where does that come from? Why are we so interested in ecology and conservation, etc.?

Student: I am not sure that we are, really. For me it would come from things like, 15 years ago I could go into the woods and there wasn't all kinds of shit laying around. Or I could swim off the beaches in Staten Island, now you can't even walk near them. This is the source of my kind of...

Absolutely, in other words we say there are very definite sources, are there not? In terms of environmental waste, progressive misuse of environmental sources. We can discern innumerable examples of, why, and on very concrete reasons we can talk about what happened to the bald eagle, we can trace it back to the advent of certain chemical dusting. But the point is, the response is different from the original effect: the cause and effect principle is one thing. Where do people find their response increases as a result of environmental waste and they find that they are responding on a level that is much deeper than the manifestation of the shit in the woods. There are several studies, for example Erich Neumann, not so much relative to conservation, but prompted a concept that we will have a re-emergence of, since the 16th century there has been a gradual evolution, now you cannot apply this in terms of, well you can't be concretistic and say you can find a link of series, but he said that the original earth archetype manifested itself in fertility rituals in the Paleolithic period with strong concentrations of images of the feminine as being associated with the earth. A strong and measurable extension of man's concern with the earth into art. Skip a period, or two {laughs} in this nutshell summary of the earth archetype, we have a gradual idealization of the earth archetype. That is, if you think of Greco-Roman art and the two facets of the idealization of the body type or the mimetic portrayal of body type, the imitative portrayal of body type in Roman art, you have a functioning of an earth archetype not in a general field of fertility, regeneration mysteries, etc., but upon the human carriage, the human body is the ultimate expression of nature and of the earth. You see its perfected form. Then what happens when we have a transformation? Then you have a denial of body type and earth archetype. What do we find manifest in a gradual development in the Middle Ages but a kind of denial of corporeal fact, physical fact. The gradual reduction of things to

two-dimensional shape consciousness. A strong emphasis upon sensate color, coloration. A strong emphasis upon, not the spiritual, a denial of mass, volume, physical structure. A strong transcendent function in the sense that the paternal, a complex of... world to be obtained beyond this world. In Christianity there is a constant projection not upon this plane but another plane that can be reached. And that in itself is a denial of the earth archetype. Then you have in the Renaissance, through the engagement of forms of analysis, in the way we perceive, the development of perspective, perspectival approaches so that man can measure his optical dimension relative to what he paints, you can see a connection there. A re-concern with physical types, things that have weight and density. And then you have, what Neumann calls, in the Renaissance not the emergence of scientific inquiry, but the earth archetype reemerging after the Middle Ages clothed in a new form called scientific inquiry. He stated that in time, going through the various passages, in the seventeenth century the earth archetype was posited not only in the external body type or idealization but on personality type. These might sound like clichés but let's take an example, we read about Rembrandt's internal light, a light that seems to emanate from within the body substance, as though we are looking *into* matter to find the earth archetype, not seeing it in its externalized form. He says that we are destined to find the *enantiodromia*; the simplest definition of that is to run counter to a principle. An automobile drives from Florida to Chicago, and then it gets to Chicago and realizes that it really should be going to Florida, so it keeps going back and forth between two opposites, two locales. Neumann said that we would find a point at which the gradual expression of the earth archetype would become highly positivistic, that is man would assume he could control the earth, ala technology, etc. He could know the nature of matter, and the more we progressed toward this awareness of matter and its behavior, there would be a constellation of the negative aspect of the archetype. So every archetype has this idea of being capable of functioning on a productive, beneficial level or a destructive level. This was written before the advent of atomic energy, and Neumann said that there would inevitably be a physical manifestation of a highly destructive energy form. That is where matter itself would be unchained where it could become self-destructive, or at least transformative, we shouldn't say self-destructive because then we would end up with nothing, this is just a change in matter. Look at the art that became manifest long before the advent of a response to conservation, ecology and so on. DeKooning, and I use him as an example but it is certainly in another field, but DeKooning introduces the Woman Series. They are often titled, "Woman as landscape." Multiple images of various anatomical parts, often having root-like structures, natural forms, bird wing-like extensions from the body and so on. And the kind of concern in painting for getting back to the raw energy levels: Pollock again. That it isn't what I paint it is the rhythms. My body action being projected into the matter itself. A kind of turning further in not to get the internal soul of the sitter, ala Rembrandt, but to try to get to the very fundamental energy levels in the way matter is behaving, and the way it might be constellated. I would assume that photography in its earliest developments was a kind of enantiodromiac polarity: not to disseminate the field of physical fact but to constellate it, to show its presence, to prove that it is there. You follow me? In other words, to record the very physical presence. Thus one of the reasons for the believability of the photograph. That it confirms the nature of the earth archetype of matter. The realization of the earth archetype in its negative costume, so to

... speak, re-emerges and we find ourselves suddenly becoming aware of environmental waste and the destruction of the landscape, etc. Well one says yes but what does that have to do with the issue? It has to do with how man responds again and re-engages *the earth* through that one archetypal manifestation called ecology or conservation or what you will. Are we simply subject to a series of events, whether they are environmental, political, social, or are there certain traditions operating where the earth has its different manifestations? If we follow that concept through, we might say that the earth is in revolt. Mistreated therefore destruction. Where does man then engage this on some other level than simply getting governmental controls, how does he understand ...

(end tape 1)