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ABSTRACT
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CHAPTER 1:
SAME TREE, BUT DIFFERENT BRANCHES

My interest in Jungian psychology began in high school. During my sophomore year of high school, I read a book written by post-Jungian, Carol Pearson (1986), titled *The Hero Within*. Loving Greek mythology throughout junior high and high school, I was immediately drawn to the symbolism and timelessness of the Jungian archetypes of the collective unconscious. The focus on myth and continuity across culture and time that the archetypes represented, offered me a more literary approach to understanding the hills and valleys of life’s experiences. Furthermore, I was a Medieval history enthusiast, and I was in love with Arthurian legends; therefore, the analogy of life’s experiences to a “hero’s journey” (Campbell, 1949, p. 211) captivated me. When I was first exposed to Jungian Depth Psychology, I did not have an understanding of life and the dark spaces of one’s unconscious that can overwhelm one’s soul. I was young and naïve. I was as a child should be. In my youth, I was protected and shielded from societal realities by my Innocent archetype. I had not experienced the “shattering” that would begin one of my many heroic journeys. In my eyes, the world was a place of equal opportunity for anyone who went to school, worked hard, and never gave up. I knew there was poverty and discrimination; however, I believed that if everyone just worked together, then these societal plagues could be stopped. At that point in my life, I had not been exposed to Paulo Freire’s (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and Jonathan Kozol’s (1991) *Savage Inequalities* had not been published. I am ashamed to say that I had quite an elitist and utopian view of education. Marla Morris argues,

> Utopianism is dangerous because it may perpetuate…*the evil of innocence*. Innocence is a refusal to hear the four horsemen of the apocalypse descending, to acknowledge that
bad people do exist, to understand that equality is often gotten at the expense of liberty, or that justice is often incompatible with law (Morris, 2001, pp. 198-199).

I believed that through education all things were possible and that everyone had a chance at the best education. I always assumed that my education was unbiased and straightforward. I believed my teachers had my best intentions in mind and that my education was for my betterment. I firmly believed that this was the case for anyone who truly wanted an education, and I held this as my philosophy of teaching during my first few years as a teacher. I believed that as a teacher I was offering every child an equal opportunity for an education and the events outside the classroom made no difference in the education that I was offering inside my classroom. When each child walked into my room, they were all the same, and I gave everyone an “equal” chance. I was each student’s personal cheerleader. I wanted them to be “happy” in my classroom and content in their learning. I wanted them to see the value in passing their end of grade tests. I believed that as long as my students wanted to change their future, anything was possible through their education. I was well-intentioned. I was naïve. I was wrong.

It wasn’t until I began my doctoral program at Georgia Southern University that I began to look critically at my own education and the education I was providing my students. It was at this point that I learned about autobiographical inquiry, critical pedagogy, and social justice teaching. I realized that my best intentions, throughout my early years of teaching, had fallen short of the real needs of my students. I had provided an education segregated from the experiences of my students. Marla Morris (2001) states,

Erasing lived experience, erasing human subjectivities in school life, endangers students and teachers alike because we have no sense of who we are. This absenting erases our
histories, memories, and our situatedness. Repressed human subjectivities and continual erasures deaden. (pp. 1-2)

I had perpetuated a curriculum that existed to maintain the stratifications of race, class, and gender. This was not my aim; however, this was the outcome of my teaching. My first few months in my doctoral program were my “fortunate fall” (Pearson, 1986, p. 62). I realized that the past and current state of education served to keep the wealthy in a place of prominence over the poor, whites in a place of power over blacks, and men in a place of authority over women. The history books that I taught and the stories that I read in class were written to maintain the lines of division with regards to race, class, and gender. The “happy places” that I tried to create in my classroom merely “concealed othering [while] those who do not fit into happy places [were] exiled or annihilated.” (Morris, 2001, p. 197) This realization mortified and scared me. How was I supposed to change such a huge systemic problem? I pondered the possibilities that I could offer my students. I realized that I was continually falling short of their needs, and I became overwhelmed by my Orphan archetype.

Through my Orphan archetype, I realized that I was not an individual within my school. On some levels, it felt safe to be part of the collective. If all of the other teachers were teaching the same way that I was, then there was no way that we were all wrong. At least this is what I thought at the time. This was a realization that was difficult yet enlightening for me. Teachers are no longer, “authentic individuals but rather automata” (Pinar, 2001, p. 20). It was upon careful and critical analysis of my situation in my classroom that I realized that once a teacher loses his/her soul, then the souls of his/her students are also lost. David Barton (2009) describes the loss of soul in mechanical terms. He states,
The loss of soul is usually understood in psychological terms as an absence of feeling and imagination that is replaced by anxiety, destruction, and stereotypical behavior, since one can only act in such ways when one has lost personal meaning…machine has become a natural symbol for the loss of soul (pp.134-135).

How can a teacher encourage the growth of his/her students when he/she is held stagnant within the profession? How can he/she create a relationship with his/her students, if he/she isn’t allowed to know his/herself as an individual? These are the questions that I began to ask myself at the beginning of my doctoral program. It is through this questioning that I began to ponder a different reality for myself and for my students. I was able to find the possibility of that reality within myself. Turning inward, I learned to approach my education and the schooling I provided my students autobiographically. Through the autobiographical process of currere, I learned to reflect on my education and critically analyze the curriculum that I had learned as well as the curriculum that I taught.

_Currere_ is the Latin root for the word curriculum: the running of the course (Pinar et al., 2004, p. 515). William Pinar and Madeleine Grumet describe _currere_ as “a method by means of which students of curriculum could sketch the relations among school knowledge, life history, and intellectual development in ways that might function self-transformatively” (Pinar et al., 2004, p.215). By encouraging my students to share their stories, I am offering them a way out of their silenced roles as spectators of their learning into the active roles of participants in their education. Furthermore, my focus on the autobiographical process practiced through photography, as opposed to writing autobiographically, adds new avenues for expression. “Autophotography” is the artistic process by which a person photographs both the people and places that are actual or metaphoric examples of his or her life world. Autophotography is used
in various learning environments to “trigger memories and/or old knowledge to make new meaning and inspire new understandings of the self” (Armstrong, 2005, p. 34). Autophotography gives one the opportunity to ground and conceptualize experience while “illuminating power dynamics and assumptions underlying experience” (Brookfield cited in Armstrong, 2005, p. 38). Photographic narratives, born through the process of currere, will “enable students to situate themselves self-consciously and tactically within the interdependent, multilayered practices of ecological, economic, cultural, and socio-political globalization/localization” (Singh, 2005, p. 120). Autophotographical witnessing provides opportunities for responsible actions that do not just rest on an “understanding, but recognize the importance of students becoming accountable for others through their ideas, language, and actions…[students] being aware of the conditions that cause human suffering and deep inequalities…is not the same as resolving them” (Giroux & Giroux, 2004, p. 248). Awareness leads to action but it does not equate action. Exposure to the stories of the oppressed begins the process of transformative learning; but, it does not guarantee it. Paulo Freire (1970) states, “Action and reflection occur simultaneously” (p. 128). The student must take ownership of his/her awareness and use it to transform the system that perpetuates the injustices in the first place. It is an easier path to “draw lines, act intelligent, and talk of the good, but actually [in doing so] one distances him/herself from the messiness of the world around” (Guggenbuhl, 2009, p.38). For this reason, awareness must result in formal action. Otherwise, awareness is only “lip service” that serves to distract and give one a false sense of solace, because he/she claims that awareness as his/her action, without actually creating change in the community around him/her. Through autophotography and the process of currere, the student can form a critical view of what has come to pass in his/her education and what is still to come. My “fortunate fall” from the critique of my own education, sparked my interest in the
transformative possibilities that may exist for a student who embarks on a Jungian journey of the soul through the autophotographic inquiry process of currere.

William Pinar (1994c) describes autobiography as, “A uniquely educational method of inquiry, one that will allow us to give truthful, public, and useable form to our inner observations” (p. 17). Furthermore, Pinar (2004) states, “After self-understanding, comes self-mobilization in the service of social reconstruction” (p. 204). Autobiography, specifically as the practice of autophotography, opens the door to conversations that are complicated, transformative, and educating. Autophotography in the classroom “regards dialogue as indispensable to the act of cognition which unveils reality” (Freire, 1970, p. 83). With the unveiling of one’s true reality, especially in the case of the photographic image, autophotography encourages one’s soul to change and morph towards a greater consciousness of the world around him/her. Within the classroom, autophotography becomes curriculum and “curriculum exists in our embodied relationships” (Sumara & Davis, 1998, p. 85). Relationships in a classroom are built upon the stories and the conversations that are told. Working autophotographically as well as viewing the photographs of others may expose intricacies whereby one “might gain an insight into our own genius and how to live it by studying how others did so notoriously, successfully, and also seeing their pitfalls, their tragedies” (Hillman 1996b, p. 183). Autophotography as curriculum is similar to Paulo Freire’s “problem-posing education.” They both are based on “creativity and [they] stimulate true reflection and action upon reality, thereby responding to the vocation of persons as beings who are authentic only when engaged in inquiry and creative transformation” (Freire, 1970, p. 84). As stated by Mary Aswell Doll(2000), “Only when connections are made to that which courses within can learners approach the outer problems of race, gender, and identity”(xiii). This dissertation will show that through the process of currere,
practiced through autophotography, teachers will have the opportunity to create classrooms that promote Carl Jung’s archetypal journey of the soul which in turn institutes a form of social justice teaching and learning for their students.

Within this dissertation, I engage in a conversation regarding curriculum as an autophotographic journey of the soul. When I refer to soul, I am not speaking of the religious concept of soul; but rather, a Jungian interpretation of soul. Post Jungian James Hillman (1975) describes the soul as “The deepening of events into experiences; second, the significance soul makes possible whether in love or in religious concern, derives from its special relation to death. And third, soul is the imaginative possibility of our natures, the experiencing through reflective speculation, dream, image, and fantasy” (x). I approach this autobiographical journey photographically and with the process of currere interpreted through Jungian Depth Psychology.

Within the corporatized and standardized schools of today, teachers often forget that their first priority should be to help students find their own personal voices. Education “shapes our values, beliefs, and who and what we become” (Boler, 1999, xvii). The work of becoming educated is a socio-political act because education can serve to maintain or alter the current state of society. Within the current state of education, teaching has been reduced to following the mandated curriculum rather than, “providing an intellectual environment that will encourage the learner to dispense with intellectual authorities and to become her own authority” (Aronowitz, 2000, p. 143). Education can offer the student and the teacher a collaborative path of reflection and rediscovery that might help the individual to redefine his/her values and in turn society’s values.

Schools exist to maintain the status quo for the betterment of those in power. Paulo Freire (1970) states, “Education as the exercise of domination stimulates the credulity of students, with the ideological intent of indoctrinating them to adapt to the world of oppression”
In order to do this, the typical goal of education is to perpetuate a certain stereotype of behavior and expectation for students. Teachers manifest this stereotype in their students by treating their students as “containers” to be filled with information, freeing them from any original thought or action (Freire, 1970, p. 72). This stereotype becomes the student’s persona, and everything the student does revolve around maintaining this persona, regardless if his/her inner self is being stifled. Carl Jung (1959d) describes the persona as “A mask, which one knows corresponds with his conscious intentions, while it also meets with the requirements and opinions of one’s environment” (p. 340). The persona is the obedient student who does not rebel, who maintains his/her given place in society, and who does not “rock the boat.” Students who want to “survive” in school maintain this persona. The education system helps and rewards students who maintain this persona because these students are easier to dominate. Students who look at others through the eyes of their persona are not a complete human being; rather, they are part of the social order that is continually perpetuated through their personas. Those students who are not able to maintain their personas are expelled, labeled as trouble makers, and deemed “uneducatable” because they do not conform to society’s role for them. Eventually, however, it becomes difficult for one to maintain a persona that is in contradiction to one’s soul, and he/she begins to project his/her inner plurality onto others. Carl Jung (1959d) states, “Everything which should normally be in the outer attitude, but is wanting there, will be found in the inner attitude” (p.343). Carol Pearson (1991) describes this occurrence as “A tension between who we really are inside and how we are expected to act” (p. 126). Jung calls this inner contradiction one’s shadow. The shadow is “the blind spot in one’s nature. It’s that which one won’t look at about him/herself” (Campbell, 2004, p. 73). It is from this contradiction, the dark within the light, that one can experience transformative growth.
Schools that practice curricula that seeks higher test scores with a competitive edge “deny and repress the students’ inferior function and this is psychologically damaging” (Mayes, 2005, p. 111). This inferior functioning is the students’ shadow sides and his/her denial and repression is very dangerous for the student as well as for society as a whole. It is at this point that racism, sexism, and homophobia take hold. James Hillman (1996b) describes the danger of a societal culture that does not allow one to reconcile the dark within. He states, “If a culture’s philosophy does not allow enough place for the other, give credit to the invisible, then the other must squeeze itself into our psychic system in distorted form” (Hillman 1996b, p. 184). This distortion occurs when one projects his/her inner shadows onto another, he/she is seeing the Other as the image of what he/she hates about him/herself. When one is projecting his/her shadow onto the Other, he/she is living “in the world, not with the world or with others. The individual is a spectator” (Freire, 1970, p. 75). This is an occurrence that moves counter to the goals of a social justice classroom. A classroom environment steeped in the autobiographic process of currere provides transformative opportunities for students to become their own authorities, who embrace their plurality rather than project it upon the Other. The use of autophotography within the classroom combats the standardization of the curriculum by creating an environment where the student can come of age under a “process of losing oneself to role, to a configuration of interpersonal, economic and political influences…[it becomes a] voyage out, from the habitual, the customary, the taken-for-granted, toward the unfamiliar, the spontaneous, the questionable” (Pinar, 1994e, pp. 131, 149). This “voyage out” can be analyzed in Jungian terms as a journey through the archetypes of the soul towards a greater acceptance and understanding of one’s self and others with an end result that supports the goals of social justice.
I align the soul’s journey with Joseph Campbell’s hero’s journey, which is a spiral journey of transformation (Campbell, 1949, p. 211). According to my interpretation, the goal of the soul’s journey and transformation can be accomplished through a social justice based curriculum from which positive societal change can occur. As stated by Joseph Campbell, “It is an adventure to bring into fulfillment [one’s] gift to the world, which is [him/herself]” (Campbell, 2004, p. 108). Carl Jung (1933) argues that man is completely modern when he is about to embark on his journey. He states, “He is completely modern only when he has come to the very edge of the world, leaving behind him all that has been discarded and outgrown, and acknowledging that he stands before a void out of which all things may grow” (Jung, 1933, p. 197). Within one’s self, is the potential for great undertakings which have the potential to bring about positive societal change. The soul travels along the journey as it “sticks to the realm of experience and to reflections within experience” (Hillman, 1975, p. 69). I view the autobiographic process of currere, practiced through photography, as “soul-making” (Hillman, 1975, p. 69). It is a natural alliance, because both are based on experience and the reflection on experience. Currere is concerned with the past, particularly the dark hidden places in one’s memory. Similarly, when one commits to soul-making, he/she “moves in circular reasonings, where retreats are as important as advances, preferring labyrinths and corners” (Hillman, 1975, p. 69). Dwelling in the “labyrinths and the corners” allows one the opportunity to embrace rather than flee from the dark that can envelop one’s soul. This embrace recognizes that within the dark there is also light, neither are exclusive of the other. There is no either/or; but rather, a duality that exists where there is a shine to the darkness. Jung calls this the lumen naturae (Marlan, 2006, p.11). Jung describes this light as illuminating “its own darkness… [and] turns blackness into brightness” (Jung cited in Marlan, 2006, p.13). Stanton Marlan describes this light as the
type that “darkness comprehends” (Marlan, 2006, p. 13). Dwelling in the dark, so that the light of the *lumen naturae* can shine upon one’s unconscious is part of the work of currere. *Currere* mirrors soul-making in that “the care of souls means…a prolonged encounter with what destroys and is destroyed, with what is broken and hurts” (Hillman, 1975, p. 56). Autophotographic inquiry, performed specifically as *currere*, can serve as a process in soul-making. With *currere* as soul-making, the individual is the focus, and it is through the growing awareness of the individual that society, in turn, can become aware. As stated by James Hillman, soul-making is not “aimed directly at the betterment of persons in society. Such events, should they occur, are the by-products, the result of re-visioning and ensouling the world” (Hillman, 1975, p. 189). Even though it is a by-product of soul-making, the betterment of society, as a whole, is the goal I seek in my argument for an autophotographic curriculum.

My appreciation for the transformative work of autobiography, through both the processes of looking at one’s own life autobiographically as well as working with the autobiographies of others, is not new to the field of curriculum. I am a branch on the tree that has roots in the reconceptualization of the curriculum field begun by William Pinar in the early 1970s. My work is fundamentally rooted in the autobiographically based curriculum work, specifically the *currere* process, of William Pinar and Madeleine Grumet. My quest for a social justice curriculum is steeped in the libratory education of Paulo Freire and William Ayers. These authors as well as many others within the curriculum field have been my teachers in my quest for a deeper understanding as to my purpose in education. I quote from these authors extensively throughout my work. I lean on their wisdom and guidance from which to bridge my own understanding and interpretation of autobiography, practiced as photography, depth psychology, and social justice curriculum. Where the collaboration of these three entities is not
new to the field of curriculum studies, I argue that my interpretation, analysis, and application of these three entities are unique to the curriculum field and they add to curriculum’s on-going conversation.

First, I offer a Jungian interpretation of the psychoanalytic nature of autophotographic inquiry in curriculum. Focusing on currere, I analyze the process through a Jungian approach that focuses on the soul’s journey. I align the process of currere to the hero’s journey described by Joseph Campbell in *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (Campbell, 1949, p. 211) and *Pathways to Bliss* (Campbell, 2004, p. 113). The hero’s journey described by Campbell can be seen throughout different religions, cultures, histories, and literatures. It is a common story of transformation that crosses boundaries across time periods and cultures. Joseph Campbell describes the hero as “the man or woman who has been able to battle past his personal and local historical limitations.” (Campbell, 1949, p. 14) Campbell’s hero begins with embarking on the journey. This is when he/she makes the decision to face and address the unknown. As one prepares to move through the gate, archetypal images help to induce the psyche willingly through the gate (Campbell, 2004, p. 52). This decision is followed by facing and slaying the dragon, which often symbolizes the depths of the soul that are often hidden and repressed, the shadow sides. The shadow is “the landfill of the self. Yet it is also a sort of vault: it holds great, unrealized potentials” (Campbell, 2004, p. 73). When he/she embraces the shadow within, then he/she no longer projects his/her darkness onto the Other. When one has stopped projecting onto the Other, then he/she is able to truly see the face of God in the Other. He/She no longer sees the Other as a reflection of the dark elements of his/her own soul that repels him/her with disgust; but rather, he embraces the Other as his/her Thou (Buber, 1916, p. 55). Finally, the hero returns from the journey individuated with a new awareness that creates within him/her a greater
understanding and a deeper transformation. When he/she has individuated, he/she has embraced
his/her shadow sides and his/her “ego is obliged to step down from its pedestal and realize the
state of individual, constitutional, and historical imperfection which is his/her appointed fate”
(Neumann, 1943, p. 81). The hero’s journey begins, as Stanton Marlan (2006) describes, with
one’s hesitation before the darkness. He writes,

[Before] the darkness, to pause and then to enter its realm of corpses and coffins, of
monsters and monstrous complexity, and to engage its most literal and destructive
depression, physiological and psychological decay, cancer, psychosis, suicide, murder
and death. Such experiences can traumatize and kill. They can also drive the soul toward
the unthinkable…To experience the above means to be in the grip of the mortificatio

The mortifactio is facing the possible death of the soul. It is the darkness within which carries
one to a point which can result in one falling to death, so as to emerge with life. Marlan describes
the mortificatio further. He states, “The mortificatio drives the psyche to an ontological pivotal
point…leading to a gateway that is both a dying and a new life” (Marlan, 2006, p.14).

Furthermore, Campbell (1949) describes the hero’s adventure as “The moment in life when he
achieved illumination—the nuclear moment when, while still alive, he found and opened the
road to the light beyond the dark walls of our living death” (p. 222). The hero’s journey is
never-ending and cyclical as one embarks on journey after journey with the goal of a continual
growth of self understanding and acceptance.

Along the journey, the hero is aided by the archetypes of the collective unconscious. Carl
Jung (1959e) defines the collective unconscious as “The deeper layer of the unconscious that is
not individual but universal; in contrast to the personal psyche it has contents and modes of
behavior that are more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals” (p.359). The archetypes serve as guides that help the hero to transform throughout the journey. Joseph Campbell (2004) describes the archetypes as “Mythic images that show the way in which the cosmic energy manifests itself in time, and as the times change, the modes of manifestation change. The gods represent the patron powers that support you in your field of action” (p. xv).

Carl Jung (1957) describes the power and potency of the archetypes, “They are ineradicable, for they represent the ultimate foundations of the psyche itself. They cannot be grasped intellectually, and when one has destroyed one manifestation of them, they reappear in altered form” (p.50). James Hillman (1975) describes the archetypes further by comparing them to Gods, and he argues that “Gods, religions sometimes say, are less accessible to the senses and to the intellect than they are to the imaginative vision and emotion of the soul” (pp. xiii-xvi).

Through the archetypes, the individual is moved through the states of his/her life and this process is a “pedagogical practice” (Campbell, 2004, p. 10). This is the place in the journey where education comes into play; whereby one is exposed to the multiple truths of society that can shatter his/her innocent comfort. Education can bring on the journey and the hero’s journey is a cyclical journey that everyone participates in repeatedly throughout their lives; therefore, one is never done becoming “educated.” As stated by Freire (1970) people who “authentically commit themselves to the people must re-examine themselves constantly” (p. 60). One’s work on him/her self is never completed. I align Freire’s belief with James Hillman’s (1975) where “each psychology is a confession, and the worth of a psychology for another person lies not in the places where he can identify with it because it satisfies his psychic needs, but where it provokes him to work out his own psychology in response” (p. xii). Similarly, I argue that through autophotographic inquiry and the process of currere, one can discover multiple journeys as well
as the archetypes of their collective unconscious that help them “to work out their own psychology” and lead them toward greater social responsibility and action.

The reflective processes of autophotographic inquiry help one to see the patterns in his/her experiences that are expressed in the archetypes. Every individual’s experience with his/her archetypes is different, and they all may lead each individual down different pathways. The archetypes are not normative and are not rites of passage; but rather, they emerge throughout the journey to guide the hero along his/her path of transformation. The archetypes are the multiple persons of the psyche. Carl Jung (1957) argues that archetypes serve to provide synthesis, an ordering principle to the unconscious. He states further that ego-consciousness would like to provide this ordering process; however, the ego cannot accomplish this feat because “it overlooks the existence of powerful unconscious factors which thwart its intentions. If it wants to reach the goal of synthesis, it must first get to know the nature of these factors. It must experience them, or else it must possess a numinous symbol that expresses them and conduces to synthesis” (Jung, 1957, pp. 60-61). James Hillman argues, further, that “Personifying is the soul’s answer to egocentricity” (Hillman, 1975, p. 32) and that separating the psyche into parts offers the ego an opportunity for “internal detachment, as if there were now more interior spaces for movement and placing events [as well as] identifying with each and every figure in a dream and fantasy” (Hillman, 1975, p. 31). This is the purpose for the archetypes: to break up the interior space of the soul, so that one is not engulfed and solidified to the needs and desires of the ego.

The archetypes present themselves “as guiding spirits with ethical positions, instinctual reactions, modes of thought and speech, and claims upon feelings” (Hillman, 1975, p.35). When one contemplates the archetypes and opens his/her self to their transformative powers, then
he/she is “given a steadying force that puts him/her in the role, as it were, that is represented by
that particular deity” (Campbell, 2004, xv). Looking at the four phases of currere: the
regressive, the progressive, the analytic, and the synthetic, I interpret and analyze each phase as a
process along the soul’s journey. I rely heavily on the psychoanalytic work of neo-Jungian Carol
Pearson (1991) and her work with the soul’s archetypal journey in *Awakening the Heroes
Within: Twelve Archetypes to Help us Find Ourselves and Transform Our World*. I align my
analysis and understanding of the four phases of currere with Carol Pearson’s descriptions of the
archetypes that are most prevalent at the three stages of the journey: the preparation for the
journey, the actual journey, and the return from the journey. The archetypes model and give one
an idea of the direction in which to go on his/her journey as well as the way in which to face and
handle the obstacles that appear along one’s path (Campbell, 2004, xvi). Pearson argues that an
understanding of the journey and the archetypes helps one to progress further along one’s path
toward transformation. While I agree with Pearson’s argument, I think her work is more closely
associated with the theme of “self-help;” whereas, I take my argument a step further. In this
dissertation, I draw specific connections and applications between the archetypal journey and
autophotographic curriculum with the goal of a better society through teaching and learning.

Some may say that ascribing one’s life experiences to an ordered process is too
structured, and it does not allow for the fluidity that exists in human experience. In response to
this argument, I argue that the hero’s journey that results from autophotographic inquiry is fluid.
The archetypes may be “pre-named” structures; however, their role in one’s life is not
regimented or predictable. As argued by James Hillman (1975), “The archetypal perspective
offers the advantage of organizing into clusters or constellations a host of events from different
areas of life” (xiv). The archetypal journey is cyclical; folding and twisting back upon itself
repeatedly throughout one’s life. It is not an either/or process where one develops according to a pre-set path of archetypal appearances. The archetypal journey counters the either/or because along the journey one unites the dualities of his/her soul. Light can exist in the dark and dark can exist in the light. Their existence and their power are not exclusive of each other. Through the archetypes, our minds are helped to “see things through other colors of the pluralistic spectrum” (Hillman, 1975, xv) that is offered through the collective unconscious. The archetypes do offer a sense of order for the psyche; but, their work and appearances are not structured. Rather, they serve the mind’s need for systemic meaning (Campbell, 2004, p. 6). The archetypes stem from a constant set of experiences that almost all individuals share (Campbell, 2004, p. 48). So, where some may interpret my argument as linear, I argue against that misconception. The journey of transformation that I argue for is not ordered. It does not follow a set pattern; rather, it is based on the individual’s experiences that are unique to him/her. One person’s journey is never the same as another’s.

Within the curriculum field, Mary Aswell Doll (2000) has done extensive work on dreams and curriculum, and she often draws on Jungian interpretations in her work, as in Like Letters in Running Water: A Mythopoetics of Curriculum. My work draws on Mary Aswell Doll because I am combining pedagogical practices with depth psychology much as she does in Like Letters in Running Water. I agree with Mary Aswell Doll’s (2000) argument that a “teacher is not a psychoanalyst…rather the teacher serves the function of introducing difficult cultural material with the intent of sparking student imagination and imitating the energy flow from within” (p. xii). Similarly, Paulo Freire (1998) states,

The fact that I may not be a therapist or a social worker does not excuse me from ignoring the suffering or the disquiet that one of my students may be going through.
However, I cannot ethically or professionally pretend to be a therapist even if, on account of my humanity and my capacity for empathy and solidarity, that very humanity is in itself therapeutic (p. 128).

It is not the goal of my work with autophotography to psychoanalyze my student, but rather, it is to provide opportunities for them, as well as for myself, to look closer at our personal lives, complicate what we know as our immediate truths, and discover what makes us who we are. I diverge from Mary Aswell Doll’s work as her focus is on fiction and the openings that are created in conversations based on reading fiction, while my focus is on autophotography. She argues that literature and fiction are equally transformative when compared to historical and nonfiction texts. This argument is similar to Nussbaum’s who advocates for “a humanist, democratic vision in which educators successfully enable students to imagine others’ lives through novel-reading” (Nussbaum cited in Boler, 1999, p.159). While I do agree with Doll’s assessment of the importance of fiction, I am looking at the archetypal journey of the soul through autophotographic work with the outcome of the soul’s progression and individuation being the practice of social justice.

Within education, Clifford Mayes (2005) argues for an “Archetypal Pedagogy” that is vested in the archetypal relationship of the teacher and student. His archetypal pedagogy is based on ten pillars which acknowledge the archetypal relationship of the teacher and student, the need for identifying archetypal themes in the classroom, allowing students to experience “the fortunate fall” of the innocent archetype, and the embracing of teaching as a “calling” (Mayes, 2005, pp. 3-4). I am particularly drawn to Mayes’ argument in favor of helping students to recognize their shadow sides and the shadow sides of society as a step towards a more ethical education as this assertion aligns with my pursuit of a Jungian interpretation of curriculum with
an outcome of greater social justice (Mayes, 2005, pp. 118-119). Furthermore, I embrace his support for allowing students to experience a “fortunate fall.” It was my “fortunate fall” that opened my eyes to the dire predicament of my classroom, my school, and the curriculum that I was teaching. Although difficult, allowing my students to experience a “fortunate fall” may be the impetus they need to push them pass the threshold into their own hero’s journey. I cite Mayes throughout my dissertation; however, my approach to Jung and education differs from his approach as I do not focus on the archetypal relationship of the teacher and the student as a foundation for my work. Although, I do recognize the archetypal relationship that exists between teacher and student; my approach is focused on working autophotographically through the currere process so as to help a student increase his/her awareness of society’s need for greater social justice. I align the currere process with the hero’s journey, and I argue that the progression of the student through the hero’s journey awakens within him/her an awareness of the Other and the need for greater equity in our society.

My final divergence from what has been done previously in the field is my advocating for autobiographic work beyond the written word. Many of the scholars on whom I build my understanding, argue for writing autobiographically within academic writing as well as the use of autobiography as text in the classroom. I, however, argue for moving beyond the confines of the pen and the written word, towards the freedom of the camera lens and the view of one’s life through one’s eyes versus one’s words. Language can be limiting and confining in a society that uses education as a privilege rather than a right and to “impede communication is to reduce men to the status of things” (Freire, 1970, p.128). The ability to write or communicate is not a skill or an ability that is shared by the masses. In fact, historically, education has been denied as a means to repress those considered Other. Education has served to manipulate and control those
Paulo Freire (1970) states that education is capable of “minimizing and annulling the students’ creative power and to stimulate their credulity serves the interests of the oppressors, who care neither to have the world revealed nor to see it transformed” (p.73). However, there are opportunities for expression in education that move beyond the acquisition and mastery of the written word. Artistic autophotographic expression can serve the same cathartic and enlightening work as writing and reading autobiographically.

For the purposes of my research, I am looking specifically at the work of “autophotography” (Armstrong, 2005) as a method of autobiographic expression. Autophotography is the autobiographic process through which a person photographs the people and places that are symbols of his/her life. The transformative process of autophotography occurs when one allows the meanings of the photographs to “shatter” his/her current understanding in exchange for a deeper understanding of one’s world. Autophotography seeks to ignite and embrace the “double-consciousness” that exists in the souls of the oppressed. W.E.B Du Bois defines double consciousness as “the sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others.”(Du Bois in Smith, 2000, p. 1) It is an awareness of how other’s look upon one’s self. This is an awareness that is a necessity if one is to rebel against the power structure of the oppressor. Autophotography offers the individual the opportunity to look at him/herself through one’s own gaze, aware of the look of the oppressor, but, free to see himself/herself through his/her own experience. I am greatly influenced by Zana Briski and Ross Kauffman and their work in the red light district of Calcutta in the documentary, Born into Brothels (2004). Through Briski’s work, children of prostitutes are given cameras to photograph their daily lives in the brothels. The children are given a voice that does not require them to know how to read or write,
since many are illiterate. They can experience the power of their photographed images. The images have the power to “give back and take away…[to] blind…. [to] embrace like arms that will not let go” (hooks, 1994, p. 44). The transformation that occurs in the children when they are given an opportunity to record their lives on film is awe-inspiring and it has fueled my advocacy for autophotographic curriculum in the classroom.

Sometimes an image is just an image. It is a picture taken for pure entertainment’s sake, and it may offer only nostalgia. These types of pictures are not what I am discussing in this dissertation. A photograph cannot “repair our ignorance about history and the causes of the suffering it picks out and frames” (Sontag, 2004, p. 117). Instead, a photograph is an “invitation to pay attention, to reflect, to learn, to examine the rationalizations for mass suffering offered by established powers” (Sontag, 2004, p. 117). The focus of this dissertation is autophotography, using photography autobiographically, as an act seeking transformation that is aligned to a Jungian journey of the soul. I am looking at autophotography as curriculum, a curriculum steeped in the social transformations that may result from the reflective processes of currere. I hope that through these processes students and teachers will break away from their “habits of inattention” (Boler, 1999, p. 16). Through autophotography, the student and the teacher are given opportunities to look upon an image differently, to see the what was overlooked before and act, rather than ignore it. When I argue for the use of autophotography as curriculum, I am also arguing for an active participation in the transformative processes by both the photographer and the viewer. Photography has been critiqued as an act based on distancing one’s self from the Other’s suffering. Photography, some argue, places one in a position of power and privilege over the pain of others. I argue that autobiographic photography and reflective viewing of images helps to reconcile the issues of power and privilege that surround the act of photographing and
viewing. Susan Sontag (2004) argues, “There’s nothing wrong with standing back and thinking” (p. 118) and thinking is an “indispensable precondition of revolution” (Freire, 1970, p. 149). Thinking is active, and active participation in the process is the only ethical path that this type of journey can take.

My combining the use of autophotography and a social justice curriculum is deeply tied to Paulo Freire’s (1970) belief, “the oppressed must be their own example in the struggle for their redemption” (p. 54). Through autophotographic inquiry, those who are marginalized and often forgotten have an opportunity to regain a place of prominence in society. Autophotographic inquiry as curriculum supports Freire’s (1970) “problem posing theory and practice [that] takes the people’s historicity as their starting point” (p. 84). This approach contradicts the current oppressive state of education which is based on a “banking theory and practice [that] fails to acknowledge men and women as historical beings” (Freire, 1970, p. 84). The current practice in education is to silence those who are different. Safety in schools depends on students following the line, both literally and figuratively. This silencing of students and teachers creates isolation in the schools. It creates students and teachers who are led by their orphan archetype. This orphaning of students and teachers creates an atmosphere where the oppressor is able to take easier control, because both, the students and the teachers, are seeking belonging through their orphan archetypes, and they are less likely to “rock the boat.” When one seeks belonging through his/her orphan archetype, he/she is no longer thinking, but rather, his/her ability to “genuinely reflect is replaced with the violence of calculating structures” (Barton, 2009, p. 138) that are defined by those in power. One’s own story and one’s relating to the personal narratives of others are the best tools to combat the oppression of silence induced by the societal structures that one faces. The first step in overcoming adversity is the ability to
name that adversity. Working autophotographically allows one to look critically at one’s life and the lives of others, so as to name that which holds him/her down.

This interpretation and use of autophotography is similar to Megan Boler’s (1999), Pedagogy of Discomfort in *Feeling Power: Emotions and Education*. Megan Boler (1999) states, “Education is also a potential site of critical inquiry and transformation, both of the self and of the culture” (p. xviii). I agree with her assessment of the potential for education. In my view, Boler’s pedagogy of discomfort is the call that summons one to begin his/her hero’s journey. She describes a “pedagogy of discomfort” as inviting “students to leave the familiar shores of learned beliefs and habits, and swim further out into the ‘foreign’ and risky depths of the sea of ethical and moral differences” (Boler, 1999, p. 181). Both Boler and I agree that the power of education lies in the social justice action that occurs as a result of one’s educated awareness. And I argue that this educated awareness, can result from a critical autophotographic inquiry process that can be aligned, in subject matter, to Boler’s “pedagogy of discomfort.”

However, my argument digresses from Boler’s concept of a “pedagogy of discomfort” in two ways. First, she argues for the use of various texts in the classroom, specifically, “testimonial text” (Boler, 1999, p. 158) which are autobiographical historical accounts. She argues that in reading and studying these texts, students and teachers are afforded opportunities for transformation. In comparison, I argue for the use of autophotographic images as well as photographing from one’s own place of situatedness. Throughout my dissertation, I cite Boler’s arguments of the power of text, yet, I replace her emphasis on text with my emphasis on image. I believe that the image and text hold equal power for witnessing.

individualized process with no collective responsibility” (p. 177). She argues further, “Self reflection, like passive empathy, runs the risk of reducing historical complexities to an overly tidy package that ignores mutual responsibility to one another” (Boler, 1999, p. 177). I disagree with Boler on this point. Autophotographic inquiry needs to be an individual journey first, before collective action can occur. Each individual’s journey is his/her own, unique to his/her experiences. Carl Jung argues that all culture begins with the individual (Mayes 2005, p. 83). The path that one takes towards individuation is not a collective endeavor; however, it does hold collective outcomes. The individual cannot begin to face and embrace the Other, until he/she has faced and embraced the demons within. Clifford Mayes (2005) argues “The political reform of humanity must begin with the moral reform of the individual” (p. 85). In order for social changes to endure, “there must be a change in people’s hearts and minds” (Mayes, 2005, p. 82).

There is a danger in placing one’s self in the “shoes of another.” One can never truly experience the pain of someone else’s experience, attempting to do so is a projection of one’s self onto the Other, rather than a true understanding of the Other. Marla Morris (2001) states, with regards to studying history, “We understand at the limits of our own situatedness, at the limits of our own horizon.”(p. 6). Similar to Morris, I argue that true understanding of the horrors that awaken social justice action can never be fully realized; however, we understand the pain of others as best as we can. My students as well as my self may not fully comprehend or understand the pain that we view in the image of another; however, through actively opening ourselves to the pain of others and participating in a dialogue surrounding the power of the image, we may gain a perspective through self reflection that might be life altering. To do the opposite is to be a voyeur to the pain of others. Becoming a voyeur occurs when empathy becomes “a fear for oneself” (Boler, 1999, p. 159). Megan Boler addresses this conundrum with her concept of
“testimonial readings.” Megan Boler defines testimonial reading as “a responsibility borne on the reader. Instead of consumptive focus on the Other, the reader accepts a commitment to rethink her own assumptions, and to confront the internal obstacles encountered as one’s views are challenged” (Boler, 1999, p. 164). Similarly, Marla Morris argues for a “dystopic curriculum” whereby, one looks “suspiciously at happy texts, happy histories, and happy memories. A dystopic curriculum seeks out monsters robed in the rhetoric of utopian thinking” (Morris, 2001, p. 199). With similar goals to Boler and Morris, I argue that for true personal transformation to occur, students and teachers need to approach social justice learning from both, the photographing of their own lives as well as the viewing of the lives of others, in order to fully embrace one’s own place of situatedness and to embrace one’s limitations in the understanding of the Other.

My argument for a transformative autophotographical curriculum is based on my belief that to be an educated person is more than knowing historical facts, great literary works, and algebraic equations. Throughout this dissertation, I seek to answer the question: What does it mean to be educated? I share Megan Boler’s (1999) view of education where “education is a means to challenge rigid patterns of thinking that perpetuate injustice and encourage flexible analytic skills, which include the ability to self-reflect and evaluate complex relations” (p. 157). To be educated means that one has the ability to question and challenge the hegemonic curriculum that is entrenched in our schools. More often than not, the easier path to take is the one of least resistance, whereby one allows injustices to occur to the Other, so long as one’s own life is not effected too badly. An educated person has the knowledge, the skill, and the self-confidence to travel down the path of greater resistance. He/She does not run from his/her hero’s journey; but rather, he/she seeks the adventure with open eyes and an open heart. An
autophotographic curriculum that seeks to ignite one’s archetypal journey can, at the same time, lead one to become truly *educated*.

*An Overview of the Chapters*

In chapter 2, I review the use of autobiography as curriculum and *currere* as Jungian Depth psychology processes of remembrance and action. This chapter is deeply rooted in the work of the reconceptualization of the curriculum field. I draw from numerous scholars in this chapter; however, the majority of my research is steeped in the transformative work of William Pinar. I argue, much like Pinar, that autobiography as curriculum provides opportunities for learning to create a bridge over the river of standardization in our schools. Moreover, I argue that standardization squelches possibilities for psychic growth under the guise of a sameness that falsely claims “equality for all;” but in actuality, this standardization creates a mandated silence that destroys the possibilities for the questions that might ignite a soul’s journey. Furthermore, I argue that working autobiographically in the classroom offers students as well as teachers the opportunity to transform themselves through the psychoanalytic process of the *currere*.

Throughout chapter 2, I begin to enliven my discussion of Jungian depth psychology in terms of its relation to curriculum and to the autobiographic inquiry of *currere*. I begin the chapter by explaining the Jungian elements of a curriculum steeped in autobiography. I delve further into the intertwined nature of depth psychology and autobiographical work with my discussion of *currere* as a Jungian journey through the archetypes. In order for my readers with little Jungian background to understand this journey, I describe the divergence of Jung from Freud as well as some of the twelve predominant archetypes linked to the ego, soul, and self that I discuss throughout the remainder of my work. I focus on the experiences of the ego, soul, and self as a series of journeys that result in one’s psychological transformation. I discuss the
archetypes that may be predominant in each phase of a journey as well as their roles along the journey. Finally, I end the chapter with a discussion of *currere* through the lens of Jungian depth psychology. My Jungian interpretation of *currere* is steeped in my readings of Carl Jung as well as several post-Jungians like, Joseph Campbell, James Hillman, Thomas Moore, and Carol Pearson. I analyze the four phases of the *currere* process as a path on an archetypal journey that renews the self in hopes of promoting social justice action for the betterment of the world.

Chapter 3 approaches autobiographic curriculum work from another angle. Still focusing on the Jungian journey of the soul, I offer in chapter 3 a more open interpretation of the process and products of autobiographical work. In chapter 3, I argue that the traditional process of autobiographical work, reflecting on one’s life through the written word, while having libratory intentions, may actually serve to hinder those who are truly considered Other in our society. The acquisition and mastery of the written word is a difficult and a daunting task to many in society. The fear of written expression is overwhelming to those who are poor, uneducated, and on the fringe of society. In chapter 3, I offer a discussion of this problem as well as a possible alternative to the written word as the only approach to autobiographic work. Chapter 3 focuses on the use of “autophotography” as a form of autobiographic expression that opens barriers placed on those who do not have a mastery of the written word. As stated by Susan Sontag,

In contrast to a written account—which, depending on its complexity of thought, reference, and vocabulary, is pitched at a larger or smaller readership—a photograph has only one language and is destined potentially for all (Sontag, 2004, p. 20).

I argue that the reflective practice of *currere* is well aligned to autophotography. As stated by Roland Barthes, “Photography has something to do with resurrection” (Barthes, 1980, p. 82). Shedding light on the repressed corners of one’s inner soul, one must resurrect the pain of the
past to bring transformation to his/her future. *Currere* and photography both offer opportunities to do this. Autophotography is a form of memory work and “memory work is the work of justice” (Morris, 2001, p. 201). Autophotography provides certification of presence while allowing one to complicate and question his/her very existence through the shutter of the lens.

I include chapter 4 in this dissertation because my work is packed with conversations and discussions that I believe complicate and renew the reconceptualization’s quest for a curriculum of the people. First, let me clarify what I mean by “a curriculum of the people.” In the majority of our schools, the classrooms and the curricula are standardized monotonies. There is no place for imagination, creativity, or original thought. These academic luxuries are left to private schools and wealthy suburban public schools where students are challenged to think and question; whereas, the schools for the middle class, the working class, and the poor are limited to curricula based on rote memorization that maintains the social stratifications of society. Students in these schools see no connection between school and their lives. I believe part of the reconceptualization’s goal is to bring the curriculum back to its roots, back to the lives of its students. Autophotography as curriculum is an essential step along the path to reaching this goal. However, pursuing curriculum autographically can be dangerous. Part of the discussion in chapter 2 brings to light the possible problems or “shadow sides” that may emerge when working autobiographically through a Jungian interpretation of *currere*. Therefore, it is essential that an autophotographical curriculum be governed by ethical actions and intentions on both the part of those doing the memory work (Morris, 2001), as well as those viewing the memories of others. Specifically in the case of autophotography, the image carries with it the power of representation with regards to issues of race, class, and gender. As stated by Susan Sontag, “Photographs are a means of making ‘real’ (or ‘more real’) matters that the privileged
and the merely safe might prefer to ignore” (Sontag, 2004, p. 7). For those who do
autophotography and those who view it, an ethic needs to exist that can form a “critique of visual
culture that is alert to the power of images for good and evil and that is capable of discriminating
the variety and historical specificity of their uses” (Mitchell, 1994, p. 3). Walter Benjamin argues, “What we require of the photographer is the ability to give his picture the caption that
wrenches it from modish commerce and gives it a revolutionary useful value” (Benjamin cited in
Boler, 1999, p. 149). This caption may be literal or figurative, but, the purpose is the same for
both. The purpose is to move the photographer, as well as the viewer, away from the position of
voyeur. Approaching autophotography ethically means that one must practice the “skills of self
reflection and critical analysis [so that] they may displace meanings and shift their relation to the
world” (Boler, 1999, p. 149). Chapter 4 discusses the issues that surround the ethics of
autophotography as curriculum, with the premise that positive social change cannot occur unless
it is done under the umbrella of ethical action.

My final chapter opens the discussion on what I believe is the ultimate goal of a Jungian
autophotographical journey: action in the name of social justice. In a discussion of the
transformative effects of autophotographic inquiry as an archetypal journey through the ego,
soul, and self, chapter 5 summarizes my aspirations for a social justice outcome by way of
practicing a curriculum steeped in autophotographic work. Closely aligned with Megan Boler’s
5 argues for a curriculum founded on the principles of the hero’s journey and the memory work
that aligns itself with transformative social action. Megan Boler (1999) argues, “Numbness is
perhaps the most efficacious postmodern survival strategy” (p. 144). In chapter 5, I argue for an
autophotographic curriculum that combats this societal numbness. My argument is connected to
Freire’s (1970) belief that transformation of the oppressed can only occur by their own volition and through open dialogue. I argue that when one reflects autophotographically, then he/she is given the opportunity to become aware of the shadow side of his/her soul and embrace it.

Autophotographic inquiry provides one with a process that allows one to go into him/herself and hold a mirror that reflects back the face he/she never shows to the world. Carl Jung (1959e) states,

> Whoever goes to himself risks a confrontation with himself. The mirror does not flatter, it faithfully shows whatever looks into it; namely, the face we never show to the world because we cover it with the persona, the mask of the actor. But the mirror lies behind the mask and shows the true face (pp.380-381).

By facing and embracing the shadow, one no longer projects his/her self-hatred onto the Other. Carl Jung (1959e) describes the acknowledgement of the shadow as

> The first test of courage on the inner way, a test sufficient to frighten most people, for the meeting with ourselves belongs to the more unpleasant things that can be avoided so long as we can project everything negative into the environment (p.381).

If this projection does occur, then it is often the cause of racism, sexism, class inequities, and homophobia. When one stops projecting and embraces his internal Other, then he/she is able to relate to the Other as the Thou rather than his/her possessed It. Carl Jung (1957) argues,

> Virtually everything depends on the human soul and its functions. It should be worthy of all the attention we can give it, especially today, when everyone admits that the weal or woe of the future will be decided neither by the attacks of wild animals nor by natural catastrophes nor by the danger of worldwide epidemics but simply and solely by the psychic changes in man (p. 82).
Through the archetypal journey that ensues from autophotographical work, I argue that the resulting awareness in the individual will ignite a belief in self and a desire for positive and proactive action toward the betterment of society.

In summary, my work in this dissertation grows from the same roots as many scholars before me. It is on their work that I base my quest for a perspective that is unique to my vision of curriculum and the social justice possibilities that exist in the classroom when students engage in the work of currere and autophotography. I hope that my Jungian interpretation of the currere process, as well as my support for the transformative power of autophotography, become branches of new conversations sprouting from the sturdy tree that is rooted in the reconceptualization of our field.
CHAPTER 2:
FINING THE “I” AND COMPLICATING THE CLASSROOM: EMBARKING ON THE
ARCHETYPAL JOURNEY

Many would wonder, and I know that my administrators and many of my fellow teachers
would fall into this category, what does autobiography have to do with curriculum? How are the
two connected? And what difference, if any, does autobiography make in the classroom? I can
answer the questions in a brief statement: Autobiography is curriculum. Curriculum is made up
of our lived experiences and autobiography is an account of those experiences. Our lives do not
happen in a vacuum. They are deeply rooted in where we live, with whom we live, and how we
relate to one another. The study of autobiography brings the issues that occur within our lives to
the forefront. As stated by Peter Gay (1998) in reference to the telling of his story in his
autobiography My German Question, “but what mattered to me most that day was that I had
broken a long silence. It was as though a forbidding dam had finally burst, and now I might be
free to rethink my feelings about my German past” (p. 184). In addition, autobiographic inquiry
gives many of us who have been marginalized throughout history, a voice through which we may
finally be heard. Jonathan Kozol (2005) argues for the use of children’s personal narratives in his
own work. He states,

I have been criticized throughout the course of my career for placing too much faith in
the reliability of children’s narratives; but I have almost always found that children are a
great deal more reliable in telling us what actually goes on in public school than many of
the adult experts who develop policies that shape their destinies. Unlike these powerful
grown-ups, children have no ideologies to reinforce, no superstructure of political
opinion to promote, no civic equanimity or image to defend, no personal reputation to secure… They are, in this respect, pure witnesses (Kozol, 2005, p. 12).

The telling of our personal stories legitimizes the lives we have lived, and it illuminates the experiences from which we can learn and grow from.

Autobiography is living history. It is subjective, rooted in emotion and experience. It provides opportunities from which teachers and students can learn more than from any “objectively” based textbook. As stated by Joe Kincheloe and William Pinar (1991), “Autobiography can confront the meaning of the given world, reject it, reformulate it, and reconstruct it with a social vision that is authentically the individual’s” (Kincheloe & Pinar, 1991, p. 21). With autobiography, knowledge can no longer serve as a regulator that “restrains and restricts the re-creation of experiences, and our explanations of phenomenon” (Watkins, 2005, p. 115). The individual, not the state, the school, or the teacher, has ownership over his/her own experience. This ownership grants a freedom that is wanting in standardized education.

The Three Streams of Autobiographical Scholarship

Within curriculum studies, there are three areas of study that are linked to autobiographical and biographical text ((Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 2004, p. 516). Autobiography has often gotten a “bad rap” within scholarship as being too “soft” or as quoted in Understanding Curriculum, autobiography is viewed as “emancipation from research” (Tanner & Tanner, 1979, 1981 quoted in Pinar et al., p. 516). It is important that stakeholders within education realize the transformative power and nature of autobiographical study. The three streams of study recognize the strength of autobiographical study and its different levels of applicability to the study of education. The first stream is titled autobiographical theory and
practice. This area of study encompasses “currere, collaboration, voice, dialogue journals, place, poststructuralist portraits of self and experience, myth, dreams, and the imagination” (Pinar et al., 2004, p. 516). Autobiographical theory and practice will be the primary focus of this dissertation; however, I would also like to bring attention to the other two streams. The second stream is described as “feminist autobiography, major concepts of community, the middle passage, and the reclaiming of the self” (Pinar et al., 2004, p. 516). The reclaiming of the self, as a goal in the second stream, intersects on various levels with the work of currere and Jungian depth psychology, which I will discuss further in this chapter. The transitions between the archetypes of the collective unconscious seek a final goal of the creation and building of the self. This is a cyclical pattern that turns back on itself many times with a continual motivation or goal that is the reclaiming of the self. Finally, the third major area of study is the pursuit of an understanding of teachers’ work and lives, both biographically and autobiographically (Pinar et al., 2004, p. 516). This third stream has found importance within teacher education programs through the use of reflections as well as the study of teachers’ lives and work as social construction. This study of teachers’ lives and works as social construction “provides a valuable lens for viewing the new moves to restructure and reform schools” (Goodson, 1998, p. 14). All three streams of autobiographical scholarship hold a common thread, the lived experience. It is through the analysis of one’s lived experience that the grips of standardization in the classroom can be released and teachers and students alike can work together towards a society steeped in the principles of social justice.

Finding the Self in a Sea of Sameness

Standardization is the automation of education. Standardization is the direct result of the corporatization of our schools. It is the turning of our schools into sites of profit, where profit
translates into the acquisition of higher test scores and greater financial funding. In order to
insure that all students are getting the same information at the exact same time, schools have
adopted standardized curriculums, standardized lesson plans, and standardized instruction across
the classrooms. As stated by Marla Morris (2004), “American schooling is a wasteland of
sameness. Everyone in America is encouraged to be the same…Schools encourage it” (p. 38).
As a defense against No Child Left Behind legislature, administrators have mandated that
teachers teach the same and think the same so that proof can be shown across the board that all
students were taught the same thing. The premise behind NCLB is that no particular sub-group
of students, whether that sub-group is based on race, economics, gender, or learning capabilities
will be “left behind.” In other words, practicing standardization insures that schools can claim
that all students, regardless of their sub-group, received the same instruction. Administrators
hold the “illusion that the world of schooling and learning can be ordered” (Weaver, 2004, p.
24). In contrast to this delusion, the use of autobiography in classrooms complicates the very
essence of order and standardization. Each individual’s experience is wholly personal and
unique to him/her.

When teachers teach using the same methods covering the same material, then little is left
to the imagination. It is assumed that the students are ignorant and incapable of original thought.
The students must be saved from themselves and the harm that they could inflict upon
themselves and society as a result of their free thinking. Standardization requires that the
teachers believe that the students know nothing. As a result, the teachers project absolute
ignorance onto the students which “negates education and knowledge as processes of
inquiry” (Freire, 1970, p. 72). There is nothing left to question because all of the answers are
given. Rather than libratory, standardized education becomes oppressive. Now, of course, the
true purpose of education should be to instill within students the desire to question everything, even the answers that seem obvious; however, with the standardization of curriculum, this is neither promoted nor allowed. Standardization promotes a perplexity of knowledge that silences teachers and students into thinking that their questions and inputs are irrelevant. It is a systematized set of answers that are professed to be the whole, singular truth. As stated by Gerald Graff (2004), “It is by making us feel that asking questions would expose us as naïve or foolish that academia gets away with its mystifications” (p.10). Standardization insures that there is no room for questioning. Everything is presented “as it should be,” and teachers and students are tricked to believe that they have nothing to add to the conversation. It is in the realm of the mystic that true transformation can occur. It is in the grasping at the unknown, the questioning of the dark, that one can truly begin to transform him/herself into a being capable of positive change in him/herself and in the world. This quest is autobiographical, and it is guided by the archetypes in search of one’s meaning, one’s purpose, but primarily, one’s self.

Standardization does not promote the self, the individual stories that make us who we are. Rather, standardization seeks to silence any and all differences, and it is in the analysis of the differences that true, transformative learning takes place. Standardization destroys difference in favor of the “safety” of sameness. Some may call this sameness the pursuit of equality, but they are incorrect. Where schools are seeking “sameness” as a guise for equality, they should really be seeking equity. Equity and equality are not the same thing. Making each student like the Other and treating each student like the Other is not equity. William Pinar (1991) discusses the significance of place in one’s experiences and that each individual’s experience is determined by that person’s particular life and where that life has occurred. One’s life cannot be meshed together with those of others for the sake of standardizing the curriculum. The stories that need
to be heard are each unique. As stated by Pinar (1991), “The trend toward curriculum standardization mirrors the macro-trend toward cultural homogenization” (p. 166). Standardization squelches the individual and the different. However, opening the classroom to autobiographical inquiry allows for the different and the unique to take root. It validates the stories of the Other by accepting that each student and teacher have a unique story to share. The student and the teacher have an opportunity to grow through the sharing and listening of each other’s experiences.

With the guise of making everyone “the same,” making everyone “equal,” the individual selves of the students are being lost to the goals of achievement for the collective. Students are no longer seen as individuals with different stories and experiences; rather, they are seen as necessary parts of the corporate machine that produces good test scores, docile workers, and positive accolades for the school system. The mosaic, described by Serres (1991) as, “Juxtaposed millions of elements in various forms and various colors, whole limits outline a sort of network” (p. 153) does not exist for students within a standardized education system. There is no place for the unique. The individual parts of each students own story, own experience, does not matter. Within the standardized classroom, the mosaic of each student’s experience is inconsequential to their education.

The purpose and role of the teacher has been lost to the grips of standardization. We are no longer critical engagers of student thought, but rather, fillers of information with students as our input/output machines. Education has fallen to a “banking approach” (Freire, 1970, p. 72), where knowledge is deposited, and “students [never] critically consider reality” (Freire , 1970, p. 74). However, it is the critical consideration of reality that creates the widest spaces for change within the self and thus liberates the individual and the world. As stated by Paulo Freire,
“Liberation is praxis: the action and reflection of men and women upon their world in order to transform it. Liberating education consists in acts of cognition, not transferals of information” (Freire, 1970, p. 79). When one is blinded by the standardization of today’s education, then he/she fails to complicate his/her learning. He/She cannot seek the questions and answers that lead him/her on a transformative journey; rather, he/she becomes part of the “mass man” of technocratic society (Mayes, 2005, p. 98). Carl Jung (1957) states, “The individual is increasingly deprived of the moral decision as to how he should live his own life, and instead is ruled, fed, clothed, and educated as a social unit” (p. 12) He/She is robbed of the very uniqueness which helps birth an individual capable of instituting positive change in society.

Despite the dreariness of the current predicament of our schools, hope should never be lost. “It is possible for a ship to remain afloat in extreme conditions.” (Serres, 1991, p. 126) As teachers, we can seek to “stay afloat” within the dreariness of a sea of standardization. Through the use of autobiography and the currere process in our classrooms, “complicated conversations” can ensue, whereby students are transformed within themselves through their relationships to each other and their teachers. Teachers and students can have the types of public dialogue that uncover the hidden and “locate schools squarely within the context of power, ideology, property, and partisanship” (Watkins, 2005, p. 132). The teacher is no longer in authority over the student. Similarly, the teacher is not held to have all the right answers and the singular truth. Instead, the student and the teacher work together as equals sharing and learning from each other. They are co-investigators in search of solutions to the problems they pose together (Freire, 1970, p. 81). They are no longer isolated from one another in terms of power relations or privilege. As a result, the pursuit of an education rooted in the ethics of social justice is more probable.
The autobiographical inquiry, described by William Pinar and Madeleine Grumet as *currere* (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 2004, p. 515), is an anecdote to what is ailing our schools. *Currere* supports “education as the practice of freedom [that] denies that man is abstract, isolated, independent, and unattached to the world” (Freire, 1970, p. 81). Through the study of one’s own history, how it is constructed by issues of race, class, and gender, as well as the constructed histories of those around us, classrooms can become forums for the breaking down of the unquestioned foundations of standardized curricula. Teaching with autobiography for students and teachers is “the task of self formation, deformation, learning, and unlearning” (Pinar, 1994a, p. 217). Working autobiographically in the classroom, helps individuals to “develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves; they come to see the world not as a static reality, but as a reality in process, in transformation” (Freire, 1970, p. 83). Through *currere*, teachers and students are given strength from which to fight against the standardization of thought and the belief that there is “one true story…in which fact and fiction are mutually exclusive categories” (Gough, 1998, p. 98). Thinking becomes a legitimate and encouraged action in the classroom. Students’ and teachers’ thinking are no longer controlled and uniform. The act of thinking becomes a political conversation between teacher and student that opens both to a new awareness previously hidden by the oppressors. Autobiographical inquiry encourages thinking, and it supports learning as a transformative conversation between students and teachers.

It is the self-transformative nature of *currere* that makes it such an integral and necessary part of teaching. It serves both the teacher and the students through the self reflective and critical analysis nature of its processes. The underlying transformative nature of the *currere* process lies in the belief that the individual is continually becoming and changing. Man/Woman is not static.
When one becomes static and his/her reality becomes fixed, then education no longer serves a social justice purpose. The autobiographical inquiry processes of currere support Paulo Freire’s (1970) argument that

Education affirms men and women as beings in the process of becoming—as unfinished, uncompleted beings in and with a likewise unfinished reality….In this incompleteness and this awareness lie the very roots of education as an exclusively human manifestation. The unfinished character of human beings and the transformational character of reality necessitate that education be an ongoing activity. Education is thus constantly remade in the praxis…. [education] roots itself in the dynamic present and becomes revolutionary (p. 84).

So much of what is taught and learned in schools is objective, devoid of emotion and feeling. Schools are outcomes-based and the end all be all of a good teacher is believed by many in education to be the attainment of the necessary test scores to remove a school from the No Child Left Behind needs improvement list. Currere is a reaction against an outcomes based curriculum. It is a pursuit of the self and the relationships that the Self creates with a collaborative society. Currere opens the self to “its living abundance, (it) seeks out its susceptibility” (Jardine et al., 2006, p. 9). Through autobiographical reflecting and telling, currere brings to the forefront that which is often unnoticed and more specifically unquestioned within schools.

Transformative autobiographical inquiry in the classroom can not be minimized and degraded to the standardized “what did you do this summer” writing assignment. This regurgitation of details is not transformative. A “simple narrative, just a story, is not enough to make soul” (Hillman, 1983, p. 26). This type of narrative does not call into question one’s place
and role in society; rather, it is a regurgitation of facts that are reportable and verifiable.

Transformative autobiographical work is not simply the retelling of one’s story, but rather, the deconstructing of that story and the stories of others, which are so inextricably linked to one’s own. As stated by Paulo Freire, “The pursuit of full humanity cannot be carried out in isolation or individualism, but only in fellowship and solidarity” (Freire, 1970, p. 85). This fellowship and solidarity begins with the analysis of the subjectivity surrounding one’s story. It requires the story’s changing from a mere re-telling of an outward, factual event, to an act of internalizing and digesting the experience by the individual’s soul. Transformative autobiographical inquiry takes an experience and moves it from the outer occurrence to the inner experience while recognizing its alignment or misalignment to the experience of the Other.

Education based on the currere method holds transformative power for both students and teachers. It is the study of the individual’s experience of the public (Pinar, 2000, p. 400), and I argue, what is more public than education? Education occurs everywhere in one’s life. It is not limited to the school’s classroom, but rather, the streets, the television, the radio, the dining room table, the couch, and the movie theater educate us. In other words, students are educated throughout society and one could argue that the more powerful of their educational experiences are not those offered by their classroom teachers. As stated by William Pinar (2004),

Curriculum theory and the complicated conversation it supports seek the truth of the present state of affairs, not the manipulation of them for political purposes, in the present instance, higher test scores on standardized exams. Higher test scores may well result, but they are hardly the motive for a curriculum as complicated conversation. Erudition, interdisciplinarity, intellectuality, self-reflexivity: curriculum as complicated
conversation invites students to encounter themselves and the world they inhabit through academic knowledge, popular culture, grounded in their own lived experience (p. 208). The practice of *currere* offers an opportunity for teachers and students to participate in class together.

The “complicated conversations” between teacher and student, student and student, and student and parent all help to bring a different meaning to the experiences that surrounds us in our past as well as in our present society. Typically, one looks to his/her past historically whereby one recounts his/her life as a factual report of events. *Currere* diverges from this literal approach. *Currere* offers a “distinction between inner and outer” and it encourages “movement between soul and history to be a process that is continually internalizing and externalizing, gaining insight and losing it, deliteralizing and reliteralizing.”(Hillman, 1983, p. 26). This is not to say that *currere* dismisses the factual account; rather, it offers a different way of seeing, an inner psychological reflection on the past. *Currere* calls for a cultivation of an internal dialectic where one examines one’s response to all that occurs around him/her (Pinar, 1994e, p. 119). *Currere* is based on psychoanalysis from which it brings the hidden to light through a four step process. *Currere* involves four phases: the regressive, the progressive, the analytical, and the synthetical (Pinar, 1994d, p. 21). Analyzing the process in Jungian terms, the four phases help one along the journey of the soul that creates, builds, and rebirths the ego, the soul, and the self. Through a progression of twelve predominant archetypes, psychic guides who exemplify the way of being on the journey (Pearson, 1991, p. 5), the individual is guided on a soul’s journey of transformation. During the regressive phase, the individual is guided by the Innocent, the Orphan, the Warrior, and the Caregiver. During this phase, the past is confronted and the ego is built and developed, so as to nurture and contain the soul, or the psyche. The soul takes shape
and form throughout the progressive and analytical phases as the Seeker, the Lover, the Destroyer, and the Creator help to guide the individual along the transformation journey through analysis and interpretation of what is discovered during the regressive phase. Finally, in the synthetical phase, one’s own voice is developed and finally spoken. The true self is realized through the archetypal journey work of the Ruler, the Magician, the Sage, and the Fool. The trinity of the ego, the soul, and the self are synthesized together as the individual returns to a rebirth of him/herself along the archetypal journey of the currere process.

Currere offers a “passage out” (Pinar, 2001, p. 2) away from that which we believe to be known towards a restructuring or better yet, a breaking down of our previous concepts of truth(s). Currere holds the following to be true, “There are times in life when the question of knowing if one can think differently than one thinks and perceive differently than one sees is absolutely necessary if one is to go on looking and reflecting at all” (Duncker, 1996, p. 31). Currere proposes “a curriculum of the uncertainties, pains, and pleasures of breached boundaries, a curriculum of sex and gender, race and power deconstructed and reworked in new and exquisite forms and relations” (Damarin, 2004, p. 51). Currere is an integral part of the student’s classroom education if any significant, transformative education is to occur. It offers a psychological process where the soul transforms an event into an experience moving it from the outer to the inner (Hillman, 1983, p. 26). Currere is a process of thinking and remembering, whereby, the student and/or teacher remember the uncomfortable, the painful, and the hidden. Hannah Arendt (2004) states, “Thinking and remembering is the human way of striking roots, of taking one’s place in the world into which we all arrive as strangers” (p. 100). The roots that are planted allow for conversations to grow and bloom in the classroom.
The “complicated conversations” of *currere* can be best understood as a form of social psychoanalysis (Pinar, 2001, p. 2). It is a breakdown or a breakaway from that which has been known and unquestioned. Social-psychoanalysis seeks emancipation from its attempts to “subvert the given facts by interrogating them historically…[with] myth interrogation as an important step toward social progress” (Kincheloe & Pinar, 1991, p. 3). Working autobiographically is social-psychoanalysis. Through the photographing of one’s story, the telling of one’s story and the listening to those stories of others, “curriculum as social psychoanalysis implies that the progressive revelation of the past transforms the present. Knowledge is not static” (Pinar, 1994b, p. 246). Conjuring up the forgotten and the banished from one’s memories and one’s present is an integral part of social psychoanalysis. The “complicated conversations” that are born from the *currere* process seek to confuse what one believes is his/her singular truth. *Currere* embraces the ideal that there is no singular truth. It is the searching for and the acceptance of the ambiguous that allows for one to transform and acknowledge the Other. One can not embrace the foreignness of the Other without first embracing his/her own foreignness. The *currere* process “grounds possibility in the impossible, searching for a way to account for the unknown in the still more unknown” (Hillman, 1975, p. 152). As stated by Peter Gay (1998) in his autobiography, “I worked on luring memories from their hiding places, hoping that feelings would wash over me at the dramatic moments I tried to conjure up” (p. 8). The luring of memories from their hiding places spurs the transitions that occur on the archetypal journey of the soul. The hiding places Peter Gay speaks of bring forth new archetypes to help guide one on his/her soul’s journey.

It is the practice of *currere* as social-psychoanalysis that provides teachers an opportunity for transformation in their classrooms. The classroom should be “a place of
invention rather than of reproduction” (Hwu, 1998, p. 34). The maintenance of the status quo does not bring forth the change that is needed to revolutionize society. For revolutionary change to occur, “complicated conversations” need to be embraced, so that classrooms invent new possibilities rather than maintain the old hegemony. Students need to realize that they too “know things they have learned in their relations with the world” (Freire, 1970, p. 63), and their experiences are worthy of being shared. Especially in the face of standardization, when questioning the set and mandated is discouraged, using others’ autobiographies and promoting autobiographical reflection in the classroom, offer teachers opportunity to promote a freedom of thought and action within their students that seeks the practice of social justice.

Education today is dominated by outcomes based education. Despite the work of the reconceptualization of the curriculum field, the current trend in education is Tylerian at best. Objectives are standardized and dictated from the top to the bottom. Student performance is seen in linear, if/then patterns where if the teacher teaches the objective, then the student will pass. I argue that curriculum is not a linear process; but rather, a spiral one. The teacher and student return numerous times back onto themselves through various paths to awareness that uncover newer insights. The path to becoming educated is eternal and the study of curriculum and teaching in schools can not follow an if/then protocol. Human beings do not interact with each other on the deepest levels following a linear path. Rather, relationships are twisted together and based on emotions, memories, and experiences. The curriculum and teaching in schools should be based on a spiraling process rooted in the personal narratives of the students and those that they study. Autobiography as curriculum is a solution to the linear, modernist confines of today’s curricular trends. More specifically, teaching students how to work through the *currere* process (Pinar, 1994d, p. 19) and providing students opportunities to complicate their thinking
will lead the students toward positive changes in society. Remaining on the linear path, afraid to
diverge towards the unknown will only perpetuate the status quo of society. Staying along the path, the teacher and the student avoid the darkness of the shadows, and it is in the darkness that the possibility of a new awareness lies. Although divergence is dangerous for many students and teachers, it is the suffering one experiences upon diverting that acts “like an alchemical fire that distills desire into its essence. The essence of desire consists of the inner soul’s feeling-knowing and unswerving attraction to the spiritual realms” (Sardello, 2002, p. 90). Suffering leads to transformation if it is acknowledged and faced, rather than dispelled and forgotten. An education that does not engage “the person on all of the levels of his being—from the most concretely biological to the most mysteriously archetypal—such education is limiting, arid, and destructive” (Mayes, 2005, p. 101). Studying curriculum through a psychoanalytic lens that illuminates the coiled nature of our lives, rather than stifling us to the straight and narrow paths, offers a chance for redemption.

Curriculum and psychoanalysis have gone hand in hand since the reconceptualization of the field in the early 1970s. “Working from within,” (Pinar, 1994f, p. 10) scholars of the curriculum field have turned inward to reflect, analyze, and interpret their own past, their previous education, and their schooling, so as to critically approach the teaching relationships that they are creating with their students in the present day. Similarly, “working from within,” students embark on an adventure of self discovery. Facing their past, students begin the first stage of a mythological journey as they are called to an adventure to become their own heroes by initially facing the unknown (Campbell, 1949, p. 48). The purpose of this chapter is to analyze autobiographic curriculum as well as the autobiographic inquiry process of currere through a
Jungian interpretation. This interpretation places the student on a hero’s journey, guided by the archetypes, which leads to social justice action in the name of positive change.

The Beginning of the Journey: Defining the Archetypes

Carl Jung saw the unconscious as having two levels, the personal unconscious, which is identical to Freud’s theory of the unconscious, and the collective unconscious. Jung (1950) states,

When something vanishes from consciousness it does not dissolve into thin air or cease to exist, any more than a car disappearing round a corner becomes non-existent. It is simply out of sight, and, as we may meet the car again, so we may come across a thought again which was previously lost (p.196).

The personal level of the unconscious contains “the memories of everything that an individual had experienced, thought, felt, or known but that was now no longer held in active awareness” (Hopcke 1989, p. 14). For example, my memories of my mother’s Cuban cooking are not lost soon after I’ve eaten her meals. Rather, every time I smell garlic and olive oil, the aroma of green peppers and onions, I am taken back to the flavors of her delicious black beans and rice, and arroz con pollo (chicken and rice). My memories did not disappear; but rather, they were stored away for future remembrance. The collective unconscious organizes a multitude of experiences from different times in our lives and manifests them as numerous archetypes that unite our inner experiences with the outer and guide us through our present and future.

Splitting from Freud, Jung believed the collective unconscious contained the patterns of psychic perception common to all people, the archetypes. Carl Jung defines archetypes as “primordial images—symbols which are older than historical man; which have been ingrained in him from earliest times, eternally living, outlasting all generations, still making up the
groundwork of the human psyche” (Jung, 1933, p. 113). The archetypes can be seen across cultural myths, fairytales, religious text, and urban legends. The patterns of archetypes are often seen and explained as mythical metaphors from which entire cultures have been based. These myths represent the archetypes as “powerful picture language for the communication of traditional wisdom….They are symbols to move and awaken the mind, and to call it past themselves” (Campbell, 1949, pp. 220, 222) They are the commonalities that link the stories of different cultures and peoples across vast oceans and lands. As stated by James Hillman (1975b) in *Revisioning Psychology*,

Let us imagine archetypes as the deepest patterns of psychic functioning, the roots of the soul governing the perspectives we have of ourselves and the world…They are similar to other axiomatic first principles, the models or paradigms that we find in other fields (p. xiii).

Archetypes hold a common ground that transcends cultures, religions, traditions, and time. Carol Pearson (1991), in her work, *Awakening the Heroes Within*, states, “Carl Jung recognized that the archetypal images that reoccurred in his patients’ dreams also could be found in the myths, legends, and art of ancient peoples, as well as in contemporary literature, religion, and art” (p.6). The archetypes expressed as metaphors, myths, or symbols are “living things. They are always transforming into something new, something potentially revelatory” (Mayes, 2005, p. 64). The soul is in constant growth, and as a result, the multiplicities of the soul are in need of “archetypal containers or—like fallen angels in a maze—they wander in anarchy” (Hillman, 1975b, p. 203) Practicing autobiographical inquiry as an archetypal, mythical process, allows one to secure the multiplicities that are inherent in any individual’s soul.
Archetypes are “structures in process [and] this process is many-formed and mythical” (Hillman, 1975, p. 148). As stated by James Hillman, “Archetypes are the skeletal structures of the psyche, yet the bones are changeable constellations of light” (Hillman, 1975, p. 157). Archetypes derive themselves from “the language of metaphor and imagination” where they “inhabit neither the brilliance of the day [spirit] nor the darkness of night [soul], but speak simultaneously in light and shadow” (Romanyszyn in Marlan, 2006, 22). Archetypes interpreted as myths can “provide a field in which you can locate yourself” and these myths offer “the idea of the direction in which to go, and the way in which to handle the problems and opportunities that come up…. [by pointing] beyond the phenomenal field toward the transcendent” (Campbell, 2004, pp. xvi-vii). Living one’s myth is not a singular act; rather, it is living a multiplicity of meanings and processes where one myth may enact pieces of various other myths. One’s archetypes or myths fold back and forth onto each other (Hillman, 1975, p. 158). Living one’s myth is a cyclical process which starts one “imagining, questioning, going deeper. The very act of questioning is a step away from practical life, deviating from its high-road of continuity, seeing it from another perspective” (Hillman, 1975, p. 158). It is through these mythological images, the archetypes, that one’s “consciousness is put in touch with the unconscious. When one does not have his/her mythological images, or when consciousness rejects them for some reason or other, one is out of touch with his/her deepest part” (Campbell 2004, p. 87). Myth-making breaks down the dualisms that automate the majority of modern day thinking.

Following one’s mythical path does not create new experiences, but rather, it alters one’s perspective on those experiences and opens one to new ways of seeing and understanding. Carl Jung (1957) argues that “modern man can know himself only in so far as he can become conscious of himself” (p.79). Being conscious of one’s self is to be aware of the persona one
displays to the outside world and the instinctual primal nature of one’s inner world. When one is open to an archetypal experience, then he/she is given an opportunity to know him/herself beyond the persona displayed to society. When one is stuck in his/her persona, he/she is separated “from his/her instinctual nature and inevitably plunges into the conflict between conscious and unconscious, spirit and nature, knowledge and faith” (Jung 1957, p. 79). With regards to the helping aid provided by the archetypes, Joseph Campbell states, “Mythological images are the images by which the consciousness is put in touch with the unconscious” (Campbell, 2004, p. 87). Autobiographical inquiry that follows a mythical, archetypal path can question the practical and give “a new double interiority, an echo, to a plain word, so when we begin to mythologize our plain lives they gain another dimension…. [and] we are more richly involved” (Hillman, 1975, p. 159). When one is open to his/her own myth making, then he/she can awaken the awe that can seize him/her and pull one out of the stagnation that predominates society (Campbell, 2004, p. 89). James Hillman (1975) argues for conversing with one’s archetypes and embracing them as elements that represent the multiplicity of one’s soul. He states, “We have come to realize that each of us is normally a flux of figures, we no longer need be menaced by the notion of multiple personality. I may see visions and hear voices; I may talk with them and they with each other without at all being insane” (p.24). I argue that the fluidity and multiplicity of Jungian archetypal psychology lends itself to a cross-cultural analysis of society’s ills and one’s autobiographical journey to reconcile those ills with understanding and action.

Jung believed that all of the archetypes could be manifested in a positive manner that would create a productive environment for the ego and soul to travel their journey; however, there is the possibility for the emergence of the dark side of the archetype. This dark side of the
archetype is known as the shadow side, and its emergence and/or repression can be extremely detrimental in one’s journey through life. Carl Jung (1959e) describes the shadow as “a tight passage, a narrow door, whose painful constriction no one is spared who goes down to the deep well” (p.382). The shadow side is the “unpleasant and immoral aspects of our selves which we would like to pretend do not exist or have no effect on our lives—our inferiorities, our unacceptable impulses, our shameful actions and wishes” (Hopcke 1989, 83). Jung (1957) describes the shadows as existing “in our instinctual nature… where violation or neglect of instinct has painful consequences of a physiological and psychological nature” (p.81). The shadow archetypes are “deities who are not recognized [and as a result] become demonic; they become dangerous” (Campbell 2004, p. 24). The shadows are one’s secrets and as stated by Carl Jung (1933), “The maintenance of secrets acts like a psychic poison which alienates their possessor from the community” (p.31). One learns to identify him/herself with the demands and wishes of society and its “moral values.” This identification takes place when the ego identifies itself with the persona, the part of one’s personality that is tailored to fit the collective.

The persona is “responsible, continuous, and socially recognized; when he looks in the mirror, he sees the same familiar body” (Hillman 1975, p. 32). In order for this identification to occur, one must work to suppress or repress those thoughts that run contrary to the beliefs of the collective. These counter-thoughts are elements of one’s shadow side. As a result, the ego represses and suppresses the shadow side. The elements that are not accepted by the ego are “laid out somewhere else, into others, the political world, the dreams, the body’s symptoms, becoming literal and outer (and called historical) because it is too hard for us, too opaque, to break open and to insight” (Hillman, 1983, p. 27). When one ignores the internal speech of his/her shadow sides, then he/she will experience an overthrow in their conscious life when the shadows finally
break through (Hillman, 1983, p. 24). Often, the shadows will speak to the ego through one’s dreams. James Hillman (1975) describes dreams as

> Important to the soul—not for the messages the ego takes from them, not for the recovered memories or the revelations; what does seem to matter to the soul is the nightly encounter with a plurality of shades in the underworld, as if dreams prepared for death, the freeing of the soul from its identity with the ego and the waking state…In dreams the fragmentation into parts is held together by scenes and woven into stories. What we learn from dreams is what psychic nature really is—the nature of psychic reality: not I, but we: not one, but many (p.33).

When the ego is later faced with a difficult awareness, in both reality and in dreams, then the ego is shattered. At this point, the shadow sides have the potential to take root and flourish as the soul becomes disillusioned with the knowledge that was repressed, avoided, or dismissed.

When the ego is shattered, one may project his/her shadow side onto the Other and in turn justify a hatred, distrust, or prejudice against the Other. This projection serves two purposes: first, one mistakenly believes he/she is rid of the shamefulness of his/her shadow by purging one’s dark side onto the Other. Second, one now has “justifiable” reason to act with anger and violence against the Other under the guise of destroying the evil that has been falsely projected onto the Other. Of course, all of this occurs on the subconscious level and generally, one is not aware that he/she is projecting one’s shadow side(s). But, working autobiographically through one’s myths, brings the existence of shadow sides to the forefront. In turn, one can be more aware and work to question the reasons and justifications behind his/her behavior towards their fellow man/woman. To face the potential problems that may arise with the shadow side of the archetype one “must deal with problems…and the results can only be brought about when we
have ventured into and emerged again from the darkness” (Jung, 1933, p. 97). Although the shadow side is intimidating and fearsome, one must embrace his/her shadow side in order to truly bring about transformation. Otherwise, the shadow side simply remains as another hidden aspect of the collective unconscious. There is untapped potential within the shadows of one’s soul, albeit dark and intimidating; however, more often than not, the answers to what plagues one’s soul lies in the depths of his/her shadow. Carl Jung (1959e) describes crossing the threshold into the shadow side as a door that offers

A boundless expanse full of unprecedented uncertainty, with apparently no inside and no outside, no above and no below, no here and no there, no mine and no thine, no good and no bad. It is the world of water, where all life floats in suspension; where the realm of the sympathetic system, the soul of everything living, begins; where I am invisibly this and that (p.382).

But, facing and embracing one’s shadow is not without risk, as the act of accepting one’s shadow side poses a conflict for the ego. The ego will struggle to defend its values and beliefs as known to it. The ego will seek to repress the shadow or project it on another with the goal of ridding itself of the pain that comes with the recognition of the shadow. However, when one recognizes his/her shadow side(s), he/she begins on his/her journey of transformation. The shadow is “the guardian of the threshold, across which the path leads into the nether realm of transformation and renewal” (Neumann, 1943, p. 143). It is through the shadow that true soul making begins.

James Hillman (1975) describes soul making as a reflective moment that differentiates the middle ground between “us and events, between the doer and the deed” (p. x). James Hillman (1975) describes further that the dimension of the soul is based in depth and that the journey of
the soul is to “travel downward” (p. xi). The shadow begins one’s heroic journey of transformation but it also serves as a guide along the way. The shadow is

The paradoxical secret of transformation itself, since it is in fact in and through the shadow that the lead is transformed into gold. It is only when man learns to experience himself as a creature of a creator who made light and darkness, good and evil, that he becomes aware of his own self as a paradoxical totality in which opposites are linked together (Neumann, 1943, p. 147).

Accepting and embracing one’s shadow results in healing. One is allowed to begin to forgive him/herself for not being as perfect as they had once hoped to be; rather, one finds his/her perfection in the duality of good and evil that exists in his/her collective unconscious. Through facing one’s duality and imperfection, one gains insight into the fact that one’s psyche is analogous to a house with “connecting corridors, multi-leveled, with windows everywhere and with large ongoing extensions ‘under construction,’ and sudden dead ends and holes in the floorboards; and this house is filled already with occupants, other voices in other rooms” (Hillman 1975, p.42). When one embraces his/her shadow, “things fall apart as the one becomes many…and there is rebellion from within and below” (Hillman 1975, p.35). The acceptance of the shadow grants the ego a new freedom to experience life without the confines of maintaining one’s persona.

The ways in which one defines their experiences depends on which archetype is most active in their life at that moment. Archetypes often take the form of images or mythical metaphors that the psyche creates to help the individual to experience an event. As stated by James Hillman, “All consciousness depends on these images…ideas of the mind, sensations of the body, perceptions of the world around us, beliefs, feelings, hungers—must present
themselves as images in order to become experienced.” (Hillman, 1975, p. 23) Hillman (1975) argues further that “we sin against the imagination whenever we ask an image for its meaning, requiring that images be translated into concepts” (p. 39). The archetypes help the individual to gain certain perspectives on his/her experience of an event. They are the fantasy images formed by “every single feeling or observation that all occur as a psychic event” (Hillman 1975, p.xi). They serve as guides along the journey of transformation by providing insight; however, one’s propensity to seek order and define each image by constantly seeking a worldly meaning may at times hinder their ability to guide one through his/her journey. The archetypes are not of the day or of the light; rather, they are of the dark and often of the shadows. One’s attempts to define them according to the standards of the everyday are futile and contradictory to the archetype’s true nature.

In this chapter, I focus on twelve archetypes and the journey of the soul from one archetype to the Other through the phases of the currere method. The goal of the journey is self-awareness that results in positive social action and change. It is not only the search for understanding, but also, the search for the courage to act on the vision of that new awareness (Pearson, 1991, p. 3). The collective unconscious is not linear in nature and one archetype does not always precede another in a set pattern; however, for the purposes of this dissertation, I have organized the archetypes according to their phases in the journey of the soul in which they are most likely the guides (Pearson, 1991, p. 29). My interpretation of the journey parallels Carol Pearson’s (1991) description of the hero’s journey where I reference the archetypes that she describes at each stage of the journey. Her interpretation of this journey is modeled after Joseph Campbell’s hero’s journey (Campbell, 2004, p. 113). The journey begins with a preparation phase, in which the ego is most prevalent, where one gives up the comfortable and the known,
followed by the actual journey phase, in which the soul is dominant, where one comes to some type of transformative, symbolic realization, and it concludes with a return phase, where the self is established (Pearson, 1991, p. 29 and Campbell, 2004, p. 113). Through the analysis of the ego, the soul, and the self, a fuller understanding of the process of the journey is realized.

The Ego, the Soul, and the Self: An Archetypal Trinity on a Journey

Archetypal psychology honors all three arenas of the individual: the ego, the soul, and the self. I refer to this trio as the holy psychoanalytic trinity. Archetypal psychology holds that it is the union of the ego and the soul that makes the birth of the self possible (Pearson, 1991, p. 27). I parallel the three stages of the journey (the preparation, the journey, and the return) to the process of currere later in this chapter. Along the stages of the journey, one “first develops the ego, then encounters the soul, and finally gives birth to a unique sense of self” (Pearson, 1991, p. 27). This journey parallel’s Joseph Campbell’s hero’s journey where the adventure of the mythological hero is experienced through his/her separation from the known, initiation into the unknown, and his/her return to society with greater knowledge, awareness (Campbell, 1949, p. 23). It is the journey at each stage—ego, soul, and self that teaches one to be successful, real, authentic, and free.

Along each stage of the journey, different archetypes act as guides to help bring forth a successful transformation towards a rebirth of the self. At the beginning of the journey, the ego serves as the “container for our life” (Pearson, 1991, p. 28). This is the “I” you experience as acting on the world around you….The ego is the consciousness of your self, what you think you are, what you think you’re capable of, and it’s blocked by all of these unconsciously retained memories of incapacity, prohibitions, and so forth (Campbell, 2004, p. 69).
The ego helps to protect the inner child and later it helps one to build and mediate relationships with others in the collective society. The ego is the center of one’s consciousness; therefore, “it bears and represents the values of the collective” (Neumann, 1943, p. 36). The goal of the collective “is to achieve a way of life and living together which is disturbed to the smallest possible extent by forces operating in the individual” (Neumann, 1943, p. 36). The ego strives to help the individual to assimilate into the collective by two separate actions. It may suppress the individual’s natural inclinations that go counter to the morals of the collective or the ego may create a false personality that misleadingly reflects the standards of society that are contrary to the individual’s true feelings and emotions. The suppressed portion of the conscious becomes one’s shadow while the fake personality becomes one’s persona. As stated by Erich Neumann, “The persona is the cloak and the shell, the armor and the uniform, behind which and within which the individual conceals himself—from himself, often enough, as well as from the world” (Neumann, 1943, p. 38). The ego maintains the literal as a function of the individual’s assimilation into society and its maintenance of a believable persona. This literalism functions to protect the soul from the complications and the realities that exist in the world. Through its literal interpretations, the ego maintains the belief in the duality of life. A belief that professes there is good and bad, safe and dangerous, black and white. The ego dismisses the “gray area” as potentially harmful. Within the “gray area,” lie the questions that remain unanswered, the conundrums without solutions, and the contradictions of society. These uncertainties challenge the ego and the persona it has created to see the realities that are contrary to what society may profess. Beginning to see these different possibilities is the “going into the realm of adventure…and leaving where you are” (Campbell, 2004, p. 113) that begins the hero’s journey.
Initially, the ego protects and guards the soul. This often occurs when one is called to recognize the repressed, the unknown and embark on the journey, but fails to take this leap out of fear of treading into the unknown. Joseph Campbell describes the failure to heed the call as “a kind of drying up and a sense of life lost” (Campbell, 2004, p. 114). This failure to follow the call may occur when the ego either suppresses the feelings that are contrary to society or it represses them. When the ego suppresses these contrary feelings, it deliberately eliminates “by ego-consciousness all those characteristics and tendencies in the personality which are out of harmony with the ethical value” (Neumann, 1943, p. 34). The individual accepts that this suppression will cause them suffering; however, he/she perceives this suffering as the “better choice” over facing expulsion from society’s norms. Although suppression is dangerous for the soul, in the long run, the ego still has some connection to the feelings that were suppressed and this connection may offer hope of a later reconciliation between the ego and these squashed feelings. In contrast to suppression, when the ego represses the “excluded contents and components of the personality which run counter to the dominant ethical value lose their connection with the conscious system and become unconscious or forgotten” (Neumann, 1943, p. 35). It is from repression that the shadows of the unconscious are born. Within the shadow, “repressed contents lead an active underground life of their own with disastrous results for both the individual and the collective” (Neumann, 1943, p. 35). The shadow may manifest itself as physical or psychological ailments and even acts of violence against the Other. It is only in recognizing the shadow, one’s metaphorical dragon, that an individual can take the step required to cross the threshold into his/her journey of transformation.

The true journey begins when the shadow is acknowledged and the ego is shattered. When the shadow is acknowledged, things begin to “fall apart as the one becomes many”
James Hillman describes this occurrence as a “rock crumbling and a rebellion from within and below” (Hillman, 1975, p. 35). Mary Aswell Doll (2000) describes the shattering through the literary characters of Flannery O'Connor. Doll describes some of O’Connor’s characters as only seeing black and white within a world adorned with the multitude of colors created by God’s grace (Doll, 2000, p. 84). These characters experience a shattering of their egos when “they have their tiny moment of revelation, often by way of a blow or a piercing
[and]…something happens to their eyes” (Doll, 2000, p. 84). Both Hillman and Doll, describe the shattering as a violent act which disrupts the routine of the everyday as well as one’s prior beliefs. David Barton (2009) describes violence as “sometimes opening a connection to the sacred…whereby one breaks down and breaks through the surface of appearances” (pp.129-130). Furthermore, I argue that Doll’s focus on the changing in O’Connor’s characters’ eyes symbolizes a change in their soul that results from the shattering of the ego, as the eyes are often referred to as the windows to one’s soul. The painful physical, emotional, and psychological symptoms that one feels, when faced with an unwanted truth, are all signs of the violence that occurs to the individual when the ego is shattered. These symptoms are the events which wake the soul from its slumber and initiate one’s journey of transformation. It is a symbolic death “where death and renewal are expressed in the simultaneity of blackness and luminescence” (Marlan, 2006, p.15). The four archetypes that are most prevalent in the shattering of the ego are the Innocent, the Orphan, the Caregiver, and the Warrior, all of which I will discuss in detail later in this chapter (Pearson, 1991, p. 29). A journey cannot begin if it has no base to spring from and the shattering of the ego serves as this base. It is at this point that one’s innocence is lost. These four archetypes that prepare the soul for its journey help the ego to survive the realities that shattered its world, build strength from this survival, and establish the boundaries
necessary to develop the soul with an open, caring heart. It is the nurturing of the ego through the action of these primary four archetypes that prepare the soul for its journey.

It is the search or journey that springs from the shattering of the ego that gives the soul meaning in life. As stated by James Hillman, “Falling apart makes possible a new style of reflection within the psyche” (Hillman, 1975, p. 109). The beliefs that once sheltered and nurtured the ego are now devastated and the shadow sides of the archetypes are given roots to grow. These shadows break “the soul free from its identification with ego and its life…forcing the soul to a consciousness of itself as different from the ego and its life” (Hillman, 1975, p. 89). When the shadows are personified through the archetypes and metaphors of the collective unconscious, then it is easier for one to relate to his/her shadow. In personifying the shadow(s), one can “perceive its specific qualities and yield to it the specific respect it requires. What was once an affect, a symptom, an obsession, is now a figure with whom [one] can talk” (Hillman, 1975, p. 34). The shadows can serve a cathartic purpose in that they bring light, ironically, to the darkest, most repressed parts of one’s inner self. The shadows bring new awareness as a “mirror, not what’s in it or behind it, but the very mirroring process itself” (Hillman, 1975, p. 109). The shadow sides, albeit scary and intimidating to the ego, can serve as guides that aide the soul along its journey of transformation.

Problems arise with the shadow sides when one denies his/her soul. When one is without soul, then one is simply a cog in the machine, existing only in his/her persona form, doing and satisfying the biddings of others. As stated by Thomas Moore (1992), “When soul is neglected, it doesn’t just go away; it appears symptomatically in obsessions, addictions, violence, and loss of meaning” (p. xi). The shadow sides are acted out through one’s self destructive behavior and violence towards others. When the soul is denied, “the personal coefficient standing behind the
ego and its relation to the self and world is suddenly absent” (Hillman, 1975, p. 44). With this “depersonalization,” everything operates the same as before except in strict automation, devoid of realness and thought (Hillman, 1975, p. 44). As described by James Hillman, “One’s conviction in oneself as a person and the sense of reality of the world have departed….The sense of ‘me-ness,’ of emotional importance, has vanished, and now the world is as if behind glass” (Hillman, 1975, p. 44). With facing one’s shadows, one is provided the opportunity to reclaim his/her soul. Reclaiming the soul provides an opportunity for freedom of thought, belief, and action that exists beyond the realm of automated egocentrism. As stated by Carol Pearson (1991),

The journey requires us to establish and then let go of control over our lives; to put aside our horror at confronting death, pain, and loss to experience life’s wholeness. To do this, we must expand our ego’s narrow view. We must let go of sentiment, safety, and predictability, and even our concern with physical safety, effectiveness, and virtue. In doing so, we move out of the dualisms of good/bad, me/you, us/them, light/dark, right/wrong and into a world of paradox (p. 39).

It is in the realm of paradox, away from the constricted perspective of the ego’s persona; one’s journey can move forward and transformation occur. The four archetypes that are most prevalent at this stage of the journey, the Seeker, the Destroyer, the Lover, and the Creator, help one to “let go” of that which controls him/her and stifles the growth of the Soul.

These four archetypes parallel the individuation process in which “one explores his/her inner psychological world, clarifies his/her yearnings, integrates the shadow elements in the psyche, and balances the masculine and feminine aspects,” (Pearson, 1991, p. 48) so as to come to terms with who one is and birth the self. The individuation process is “the manifestation in
life of one’s innate, inborn potentialities. Not all the possibilities can be realized, so individuation is never complete. It is more a quest than a goal, more a direction of movement than a resting place” (Hall, 1986, p. 47). When one individuates, he/she no longer projects his/her shadow onto the Other. He/She embraces the shadow and “knows it and accepts it” (Campbell, 2004, p. 80). With individuation, opposites are unified and the ego’s concept of duality is destroyed. As one moves through the journey, the individuation process continues; however, it never ends. Just like the spiral nature of the journey, the process of individuation is never fully realized as new experiences and beliefs change the ego, then the soul, and finally the self.

The final stage is the return from the journey which leads to the growth of the self. The self is “an expression of wholeness, the end point of the individuation process” (Pearson, 1991, p. 49). The self emerges

By accepting evil, modern man accepts the world and himself in the dangerous double nature which belongs to them both. This self-affirmation is to be understood in the deepest sense as an affirmation of our human totality, which embraces the unconscious as well as the conscious mind, and whose centre is not the ego (which is only the centre of consciousness), nor yet the so-called super-ego, but the self (Neumann, 1943, p. 117). The self is what makes each person the individual that he/she is. Joseph Campbell describes the self as “the whole context of potentials….All the possibilities of your life, the energies, the potentialities—everything you are capable of becoming” (Campbell, 2004, p. 68). The rebirth of the self is rooted in “the desire to be something special…and without realization of that uniqueness it is not possible to individuate” (Von Franz, 1980, p. 131). The self is in constant flux and must continue to change and transform as a result of the repetitive shattering of the ego.
and the renewal of the soul. These renewals guarantee that one will not become stagnant in his/her beliefs and a slave to the previously held values of prior selves.

The birth and renewal of the self symbolizes the spiral nature of the journey that insures a continual quest for social justice in society. The archetypes that help to guide the return from the journey are the Ruler, the Magician, the Sage, and the Fool. These four archetypes help to mediate the return and birth of the self by helping one to “learn to express one’s true self and transform one’s life” (Pearson, 1991, p. 29). The growth of the self on the return of the journey helps one face life as a world abundant with possibilities and full of opportunities; as opposed to a world marked by scarcity and a lack of potential for change. Experiencing the self is not just about ‘doing the right thing,’ but rather, it’s about experiencing one’s full capabilities which also include the possibility of one to do harm (Pearson, 1991, p. 56). The incorporation of the ego, the soul, and the self symbolizes the “process of integration of the contents of the unconscious with the consciousness. This moves us toward wholeness and leads to our experience of a more authentic self” (Becker, 2004, p. 96). The self is a fusing of the dualities that exist between one’s conscious and one’s unconscious, where the archetypes of the collective unconscious guide lines of communication between the conscious ego and the subconscious self. This journey is not redemptive in nature, it is not comforting, but rather, it leads one towards a “Zen-like perception of the ordinary…an accepting of the unwanted” (Marlan, 2006, pp. 17-18). The arrival at an authentic self is temporary, at best, as the individual joins “one hero journey after another. Over and over again, [one is] called to the realm of adventure, [one is] called to new horizons” (Campbell, 2004, p. 133). The journey continues to spiral to new depths of discovery and greater transformation.
I explore the soul’s journey to illustrate its relationship to the phases of the *currere* process and its relevance to the practice of a social justice curriculum. The subsequent pages review, in greater depth, the twelve archetypes briefly mentioned in the analysis of the psychoanalytic trinity. It is my goal in the analysis of these archetypes to shed light and understanding on the nature of the archetypes, so as to later draw a connection and parallel between their psychoanalytic functioning and *currere*. Furthermore, I have focused more extensively on the archetypes that prepare the soul for its journey, the Innocent and the Orphan, as well as the Warrior, and the Caregiver. I view these archetypes as having the most active roles within a curriculum for social justice as they initiate the shattering of the ego. An awareness of the need for social justice can not occur without the shattering of the ego; hence, I see my role as an educator to engage these guides, especially the Innocent and the Orphan. I am the protective figure, like Merlin, who challenges my students “in academic terms to embark on a mythic quest in search of a valid ideological grail….I [draw] a line in the dirt and dare them to cross it—to cross this threshold of academic adventure—in order to find the complex elixir of their own ethical vision” (Mayes, 2005, p. 128) I help my students, the heroes, along their journey to face the dragon, slay it, and return transformed from their conquest.

The Archetypes that Prepare the Soul for its Journey

*The Innocent*

The archetype of the innocent/innocence can be found throughout cultures and histories. It is often portrayed as the Christ child, Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, Peter Pan, or the Greek God Eros. All of whom foster a naiveté and childlike ignorance to reality and its harshness and cruelty. The innocent is the optimistic and trusting archetype that believes all people are good, holds that people do not intentionally hurt each other, and speaks Rodney
King’s adage “can’t we all just get along.” It is the part of the self that keeps believing that good will prevail. All people begin in the innocent stage and rightly they should. Innocence is the backbone of childhood and in a world where childhood is often stripped away too early, it must be understood that innocence is a necessary and formative period in the journey of one’s life and soul. As stated by Thomas Moore (1992) in *Care of the Soul*,

> Politicians and educators consider more school days in a year, more science and math, the use of computers and other technology in the classroom, more exams and tests, more certifications for teachers, and less money for art. All of these responses come from the place where we want to make the child into the best adult possible, not in the ancient Greek sense of virtuous and wise, but in the sense of one who is an efficient part of the machinery of society (p.52).

Often within classrooms, teachers are guilty, myself included, of intentionally or unintentionally stifling the inner child within our students. The school system’s desire for better test scores and greater efficiency, attempts to place my focus as a teacher on the wrong things. I am told to make the student into a more efficient cog in the machine; completely stifling any possibility for imagination within the child, and it is imagination that is at the heart of the innocent’s optimism.

It is in innocence that students “believe what those in authority teach us, regardless of whether those authorities have our best interests in mind. The innocent in us trusts even when trust is not warranted” (Pearson 1991, p. 72). The innocent believes what is told and what is seen. James Hillman (1996b) argues that “political tyranny lives on a gullible populace, and a gullible populace fall for tyranny” (p. 239). As stated by Martin Buber, “The world wants to be deceived. The truth is complex and frightening; the taste for the truth is an acquired taste that few acquire” (Kaufmann, 1970, p. 9). Carol Pearson (1991) states further, “It is also the innocent
who too internalizes racism or sexism or homophobia, or class bias, who believes it is
fundamentally not OK to be anything that others condemn” (p.72). The innocent identifies itself
with whatever the ethical values of society are, whether equitable or not. This identification
takes place “by means of an identification of the ego with the persona. The ego confuses itself
with the façade personality, and forgets that it possesses aspects which run counter to the
persona”(Neumann, 1943, p. 40). I often see this side of the innocent within my classroom when
I raise controversial issues like gay marriage, prayer in schools, or standardized testing. My
students are afraid to speak their minds for fear of offending me. They wait quietly, silently
without voicing their opinions or beliefs. For those who do disagree with me, their disagreement
is always started with ‘Well, my mom said…” or “My dad believes…” Despite my efforts, they
never claim their dissent for their own. This is the trouble with the innocent. This is its shadow
side. Rather than face ridicule or disapproval, the innocent will back away from conflict and
debate; he will claim the voice of another, without ever realizing that his voice holds power.

The shadow side of the innocent is seen in one’s denial of what is really going on in one’s
home, work, culture, or society. Carol Pearson (1991) describes the innocent as “absolutist and
dualistic, they cannot admit they are imperfect without feeling horrible about themselves, so they
either get locked into denial about their own inadequacies or are controlled by guilt or shame” (p.
76). When the shadow innocent takes hold, the ego is “overwhelmed by a content which is
greater, stronger, and more highly charged with energy than consciousness, and which therefore
causes a kind of state of possession in the conscious mind”(Neumann, 1943, p. 42). This state of
possession prevents the ego and the conscious mind from seeking and seeing the reality of the
situation. At times it seems as if “innocence seems to ask for evil” (Hillman 1996b, p. 239). One
holds on to preconceived notions of a prior false reality because these fictions “gratify some
wish” for the individual (Kaufmann, 1970, p. 10). The common cliché, “Denial ain’t just a river in Egypt,” should be the motto of the innocent. Susan Sontag (2004) states,

Someone who is perennially surprised that depravity exists, who continues to feel disillusioned (even incredulous) when confronted with evidence of what humans are capable of inflicting in the way of gruesome, hands-on cruelties upon other humans, has not reached moral or psychological adulthood. No one after a certain age has the right to this kind of innocence, or superficiality, to this degree of ignorance or amnesia (p. 114).

The innocent will deny all responsibility in causing the pain in the Other or participating in the Other’s marginalizing.

Refusing all possibilities that challenge the status quo, the innocent will follow what those in the accepted power structure say is the truth, regardless of whether the voice inside pleads otherwise. Georges Bataille (1988) references the shadow innocent within his book, Inner Experience. He states,

The joke of wanting to be a man flowing with the current, without ever hemming oneself in, without ever leaving a leg to stand on—this is to become the accomplice of inertia. What is strange is that, in evading experience, one doesn’t see the responsibility which one has assumed; none can overwhelm more: it is inexpiable sin, the possibility glimpsed for once of abandoning it for the grains of a life without distinction (p. 37)

I see Bataille’s description as an interesting take on the goal of avoidance that the innocent perpetuates. According to Bataille, the responsibility and effort of trying to maintain the lies of society and shield oneself from the flux and change of life is more exhausting than facing what life and society truly bring to one’s doorstep or in this dissertation’s case, one’s classroom. In order to fully realize the transformative power that exists for the Innocent archetype, one must
“approach the power of the child not by fleeing its vulnerability, but by claiming it. There is a special power associated with the very ignorance and incapacity of the child figure” (Moore, 1992, p. 50). The exciting aspect of the Innocent is that in their unknowing there is fertility for newer thought. When the innocent finally falls from their “safe” place and the realization of the harsh reality of society takes hold, the collective unconscious may give birth to a second archetype in the Soul’s journey, the orphan.

The Orphan

When the innocent falls, the orphan often emerges and sees the fall as proof that one is on his/her own in the world. According to Jung (1933), “Problems thus draw us into an orphaned and isolated state where we are abandoned by nature” (p. 96). As argued by Carol Pearson (1991), the orphan archetype is activated by all of the experiences in which “the innocent/child feels abandoned, betrayed, victimized, neglected, or disillusioned” (p. 83). The orphan emerges from the shattering of the ego and he/she sees change “not as a sign of life, but a sign of death and decay” (Freire 1970, p. 108). Pearson (1986) describes the orphan as “the disappointed idealist and the higher the ideals about the world, the worse reality appears” (p. 40). The orphan must learn that the pains of life, its tragedies, and its sufferings are part of a reality that needs to be addressed and faced.

The orphan believes that life can be better but only in relative terms. Pearson (1991) states that it is important to remember, “The orphan is reacting to the unrealistic grandiosity of the innocent, who firmly believes that anything is possible with enough faith, imagination, and hard work” (p. 87). As stated by Pearson (1991),

We (Orphans) do not ask for Paradise or even freedom, only incrementally larger, more comfortable cages. We do not believe we can do work we really love, but we may look
for less degrading, alienating, or limiting work. We do not think we can have a really happy love life, but at least we try to find a partner who will not actively mistreat us. We do not expect real happiness, so we settle for buying things (p. 87)

I would argue with Pearson that orphans still dream the big dream; but it is the faith in the accomplishment of the dream that they lack. It is the constant reassurance by their society, their family, their experiences, or even their teachers that the dream will never be realized that turns the orphans to the acceptance of the mediocre. Their dream is deferred and confused with society’s pursuit for material gain, higher test scores, and better grades. As a result, the orphan will either “drift into total indifference, alienated from reality by the authorities and the myths the latter have used to ‘shape’ them; or they may engage in forms of destructive action” (Freire 1970, p. 155). The negativity with which the orphans view their surroundings, often turns them towards the comforts and acceptance of their peers. Like the innocents, the orphans want to bond with their peers, their collective. This can be seen within the positive realm of membership in social action and social reformation/reconstruction groups; however, the shadow side of the orphan can be seen in the formation of groups like Neo-Nazi skinheads and violent inner-city youth gangs.

When one is experiencing the shadow side of the orphan, cynicism and using the role of victim to manipulate society are prevalent. As stated by Pearson (1991), “When we turn against ourselves, we have gone too far” (p. 88). When one is in the shadow side of the orphan archetype, one desperately wants to be led out of his/her despair. This desperation can lend itself to one following a political, religious, or societal figure that promises rescue from a wrenching state of despair. A soul ruled by the shadow orphan is a soul without its own ideas. When one’s soul lacks its own ideas, then it becomes “in need of persons, unable to distinguish between the
persons and the ideas they embody. In its victimization it looks for masters” (Hillman 1975, p. 119). Jung states, “Collectivists ideologies are the greatest temptation to unconsciousness, for the mass infallibly swallows up the individual—who has no security in himself—and reduces him to a helpless particle” (Jung in Mayes, 2005, p. 83). This can be seen historically through the analysis of a number of historical political situations: Batista’s and Castro’s Cuba, Nazi Germany, and the modern example of U.S. President George Bush’s attack on Iraq. Carol Pearson (1991) describes this mentality as a gang mentality (p. 87). She states, “Orphans may be as conformists as Innocents, except that whereas Innocents more typically conform to societal and institutional norms, Orphans either do so cynically or refuse traditional norms while conforming slavishly to outsider norms” (p. 87). Furthermore, James Hillman (1975a) states, “From broken idealism is patched together a tough philosophy of cynicism” (p.72). The cynicism of the orphan is the fulcrum of its shadow side.

The United States is in a state of orphandom. Until September 11, our country had enjoyed, for so long, a land “safe” from foreign aggression. Specifically, the United States was free from the unpredictable gruesome nature of terrorist attacks that had plagued the rest of the world throughout the last century. Prior to September 11, the United States lived under a “mythical cloud of unknowing” (Hillman 1996b, p.247). Carol Pearson (1986) argues, “The truth is, when we feel the most helpless, it can be very comforting to find some authority, program of action, or theory and put all our faith in it” (p.49). President Bush was the nation’s hero, who swept in and embraced a scared and grieving nation with the promise that those who hurt “his people” would pay. Without question and with enthusiasm, we, the citizens of the United States, rallied around our President who gave us no proof or just cause for the forthcoming invasion of Iraq.
It was our nation’s state of orphanhood that allowed such brash action to be not only allowed, but also accepted without challenge. It made us, as a nation, feel better to be the ones holding the cards. Carol Pearson (1991) states, “Orphans may choose to go over to the Other side, feeling that at least victimizers have more power and control than victims” (p. 89.) Furthermore, Frantz Fanon adds that “the native is an oppressed person whose permanent dream is to become the persecutor” (Fanon, 1963, p. 53). We projected onto Bush our “God or Savior archetypes” which “endow the recipient with enormous power which they may, and usually do, cultivate in a thousand mischievous ways” (Mayes, 2005, p. 87). Similarly, the citizens have turned to President Barak Obama to lead our nation out of fiscal and social disaster.

When an individual is split between the collective values and those that are repressed by the shadow Orphan, this is often when he/she pursues the oppression of the Other rather than being the one who is oppressed. Erich Neumann supports this argument. He states,

The inner split caused by the apperception of the shadow will lead to an unconscious feeling of inferiority….The feeling of inferiority will be over compensated by a tendency to exaggerate self-vindication….The projection of the shadow will now become systematized, and the final result will be the paranoid reactions of individuals and whole nations (Neumann, 1943, p. 56).

The shadow orphan seeks a scapegoat onto whom it can project its inferiorities and exert some level of power over the Other. This scapegoat projection is evident in the oppressed when “in their alienation, the oppressed want at any cost to resemble the oppressors, to imitate them, to follow them” (Freire, 1970, p. 62) James Hillman (1996b) describes this projection as “leaving a place for the evil nightmare only in the “other,” where it can be diagnosed, treated, prevented, and sermonized about” (p. 247). When one projects his/her shadow side onto the Other, then
he/she has projected what he/she “involuntarily and secretly feels for his/her own evil over to the other side” (Jung 1957, p.96). This projection results in one “localizing the vile with individual criminals or groups of criminals, while one washes his/her hands in innocence and ignoring his/her general proclivity to evil” (Jung 1957, p.96). However, by embracing one’s shadow side, the orphan develops a realist’s perspective on the world through one’s fall from innocence. This fall and the subsequent growth of a realist perspective are as Edinger (1972) describes “the prerequisite of the conscious experience of individuality” (p.163). It is through the progression from innocent to orphan that one can claim one’s independence and exercise one’s right to free thought and action.

The Archetypal Journey with the Innocent and the Orphan

The progression from the innocent to the orphan can best be described as a “fortunate fall” (Pearson 1986, p. 62). One is sent out of a state of naïve faith and crosses into a world where one’s journey begins through facing the realities of life’s pain and suffering. One cannot be a productive citizen of society if one does not acknowledge the misery in the world. Denial of the “dark side” of human nature simply allows one to fall prey to those who seek to harm the other. Carl Jung (1957) describes the innocent as “a cholera patient who remains unconscious of the contagiousness of the disease” (p.94). Furthermore, if one is in denial of the evil potential that man holds, then he/she is likely to follow those who seem to hold the power. At the innocent stage, following those in power, whether they are morally right or wrong, is the safest path to take. As stated by James Hillman (1996b), “A society that willfully insists upon innocence as the noblest of virtues and worships innocence at its alters will be unable to see any [bad] seed unless it be sugar-coated” (p. 247). A simplistic dualist perspective can blind both innocents and orphans to believe that there is only good or bad, safe or dangerous. This dualist
perception is dangerous because the world and society do not operate in an either/or state. When one cannot recognize evil because it does not fit the mold of a dualist view, then this can lead to “projection of the unrecognized evil into the other” (Jung 1957, p. 94). In my experience, the majority of life’s joys and sorrows are found somewhere between the extremes of the dualist mindset.

Believing in the either/or of society is the downfall of the shadow side of both the innocent and the orphan. The journey with the two archetypes begins within the untrustworthy realms of life. James Hillman (1996a) describes the need for the unknown in his article, *Betrayal*; he writes,

> We must be clear that to live or love only where one can trust, where there is security and containment, where one cannot be hurt or let down, where what is pledged in words is forever binding, means really to be out of harm’s way and so to be out of real life (p. 67).

There is safety and security within the absolutism of dualist thinking; however, there is no soul making within a system of pairs. Understanding experiences in terms of opposites is too mechanical; it “presents all soul events within a compensatory system of pairs….But, soul events are not part of a general balancing system or a polar energy system” (Hillman, 1975, p. 100).

Living completely out of harm’s way, safely, within the light and goodness of the dual perspective, without the challenge of the unknown, is to be left out of real living. In his article, *From the Black Sun to the Philosopher’s Stone*, Stanton Marlan quotes Schwartz-Salant, who states “no matter how exalted the stage of any process in life, that stage lives within the context of whatever despair and failure accompanied its creation” (Schwartz-Salant in Marlan, 2006, p.23). Pain and suffering must be faced in order for one to progress within the journey. Jim Garrison (1997) argues that the either/or logic “does not allow for becoming or being born” (p.
Embarking on one’s hero’s journey necessitates one’s willingness to die metaphorically. It is the death of the Ego when one moves from one level of consciousness to another, not seeking redemption; rather, seeking a realization that within the dark there is also light.

When properly developed, the relationship between the innocent and the orphan can settle the pain and heartache that one feels when faced with the strange and the painful. These two archetypes are initially experienced as dualistic opposites, but a better understanding of the relationship would be “the equivalent of a yin/yang relationship” (Pearson 1991, p. 235). Pearson states that the ultimate resolution to the innocent and orphan dualism “comes not only when we can tell the difference between the good one and the bad one, but when the dualisms themselves start to break down” (p. 242). When one recognizes that the world is in fact not an either/or phenomenon, then one begins to realize the fusion of goodness and wickedness within all of society. This realization is the goal of one’s journey with the innocent and the orphan. As stated by Pearson (1991),

Developing a more balanced set of expectations about life that recognizes that all people and experiences will bring both joy and pain helps to integrate the Innocent and the Orphan, so we stop teetering between them (p.243).

It is the multiplicities, the nuances of life that bring us joy. The innocent turned orphan realizes that a pluralistic world, as described by William James (1975), is “always vulnerable, for some part may go astray; and having no ‘eternal’ edition of it to draw comfort from, its partisans must always feel to some degree insecure” (p. 290). However, with the innocent and orphan integrated, one learns “to develop a more balanced set of expectations about life that recognizes that all people and experiences bring both joy and pain” (Pearson 1991, p. 243). This integration gives way to further archetypal preparation in the journeys of the soul.
The Warrior

From the powerlessness of the Orphan, often emerges the strength of the Warrior archetype. Generally in the beginning, the Warrior is more like a “pseudo-Warrior” (Pearson, 1991, p. 97) that is trying to control all that seems out of control in the life of the individual; however, as the Warrior progresses to higher levels, it guards against the out of control while realizing that some chaos is the normal working of the universe. It tries to create order while working with the system in most cases rather than battling against it. The Warrior seeks to maintain the safety of the ego in the chaos by devising goals and plans from which to make order out of the chaos. One of the main goals of the Warrior is the challenge to live within an unknown world of chaos, without succumbing to that which tries to control and manipulate the ego. The Warrior helps one to find his/her individuality and it guards the borders of one’s soul, so that the soul does not succumb to the encroaching wills of the collective society. At its highest levels, the Warrior seeks to build strength beyond the ego and towards the betterment of humankind. It is the archetype of the Warrior that announces within us that something is unfair and corrupt. The Warrior drives us towards action beyond the complacency of the Orphan. The warrior archetype gives one the strength he/she needs to cross the threshold into the darkness of his/her journey of transformation.

Problems may arise when the Warrior takes on its shadow side of destruction and darkness. When the shadow side of the Warrior is active, one can see a change occur from focusing on a need to fight for a positive social change towards an unfaltering need to win at any cost. The abuse of power, ruthlessness, and viewing all thoughts and people different from one’s self as dangerous, all mark the shadow Warrior (Pearson, 1991, p. 101). The shadow Warrior is descriptive of the state of our nation’s government under President George W. Bush. In the name
of patriotism, the Bush administration abused its power and continued to go against the will of the majority of America to end the war in Iraq. Franz Fanon argues that “no leader can substitute himself for the popular will” (Fanon, 1963, p. 205). However, the Bush administration projected their will on the people and those who spoke against the war were named “unpatriotic and disloyal.” The events of September 11 marked the beginning of a Warrior cycle; however, the quest for further power and world dominance shadowed the initial need of the nation for a savior and protector from evil. The United States became governed by “pseudo warrior” archetypes, orphan shadows trying to control others because they felt so powerless. It is the transition of the Warrior from simple self-interest towards the interest of the betterment of humankind, as a whole, that brings positive change to society. As stated by Carol Pearson, “When the will is informed by the soul and the Warrior is acting in service of the soul’s call of the individual, there is often no conflict between what the individual wants to achieve and what contributes to the general good”(Pearson, 1991, p. 105).

It is the action of the Warrior that is an initial, primary step in a social justice curriculum for change. Action needs to occur in order for change to begin. It is with the aide of the other archetypes that the action results in productive and pro-active change. With the Innocent’s big dreams and the Orphan’s awareness that there are limitations to those dreams, one needs the Warrior archetype to take those dreams and devise a plan of action (Pearson, 1991, p. 98). The archetypal journey of the soul is spiral in nature and interdependent between the archetypes. It is the collective action of all of the archetypes that brings one’s soul to its highest levels of social action.

*The Caregiver*
The Caregiver is the portion of the ego that is associated with morality and care for self and others. It is the mother, the teacher, the god/goddess, or the tree of life that guards, protects, and nurtures one’s heart to deal with pain and suffering (Pearson, 1991, p. 109). It is concerned as much with one’s own survival as it is with the survival and well being of others (Pearson, 1991, p. 34). The Caregiver helps to balance the needs of the ego and the soul. The Caregiver begins, first, with the care of one’s individual needs and later as it matures within the soul, the Caregiver opens one up to helping and caring for the needs of others. It is the Caregiver archetype that allows for room for both the ego and the soul to mature and act (Pearson, 1991, p. 34). The Caregiver archetype helps to heal the ego when it is shattered, so that the soul can move forward in its journey. For example, when the individual is trapped in the shadow side of his/her orphan archetype, he/she is in desperate need of some intervention from his/her Caregiver archetype. This intervention will serve to nurture the broken spirit of the orphan and support the individual to carry on with his/her journey. The Caregiver archetype seeks to nurture and protect the self as well as others. Without the Caregiver, one would fail to embrace the shadow sides of his/her archetypes without ever experiencing the healing that the Caregiver could offer.

Working interdependently with the Warrior archetype, the Caregiver uses the strength of the Warrior to create boundaries while simultaneously creating environments that nurture and support the birth of something greater than the individual. However, the Caregiver must balance the conflicts that exist between one’s individual needs and the needs of others. It is at these points of conflict that the shadow side of the Caregiver may emerge. The Caregiver needs to balance the needs of others with one’s own needs without becoming a suffering martyr or an enabler (Pearson, 1991, p. 115). The shadow side of the Caregiver manifests itself as the suffering martyr that sacrifices the needs of the individual for the needs of society. When the
shadow Caregiver is at work, the socially accepted persona overshadows the ego and one continues to repress his/her innate wants and desires that run contrary to the goals of society. At some point, the Caregiver justifies the sacrifice as the “right thing to do” and professes that positive results will follow, where generally what follows is enabling behavior that continues to perpetuate the pain and suffering that the Caregiver is trying to alleviate. The Caregiver archetype is an essential guide in one’s journey of transformation. In order for the journey to be successful, one must understand and embrace the shadow of the Caregiver. When this occurs, one acknowledges that he/she has a wealth to give to others as well as to him/her. Additionally, he/she needs to recognize and abide by one’s limits of giving. Joseph Campbell argues, “The only way one can become a human being is through relationships to other human beings. And the first way is that of compassion” (Campbell, 2004, p. 80). The Caregiver prepares the ego for the continuation of the journey by teaching one how to relate to others with compassion.

The Archetypes on the Journey

The Seeker

The Seeker archetype is propelled by a desire to know and be known. It desires transformation, perfection, and becoming better through the quest for something greater than one’s self. The archetype of the Seeker is closely linked to the myth of the Holy Grail. It is the Seeker that propels one towards that which he/she desires most, whatever that Holy Grail may be. It is the Seeker that challenges one to face his/her fears and the unknown, so that transformation might occur (Pearson, 1991, p. 46). The Seeker “responds to the call of Spirit—to ascend” (Pearson, 1991, p. 123). In most situations, a life changing event will call for the Seeker to emerge from the shattering of the ego. “The Seeker is the archetype of transition from ego to soul” (Pearson, 1991, p. 131). The moments when one has wished for something better, a
new start, and/or a greater meaning, it is the Seeker that is most prevalent in his/her life. As stated by Joseph Campbell, “It is only those who know neither an inner call nor an outer doctrine whose plight is desperate” (Campbell, 1949, p. 17). Those individuals who do not accept their journey become “Wanderers closed off from others, terrified of intimacy, and mindlessly iconoclastic” (Pearson, 1991, p. 128). The shadow side of the Seeker often shows itself through excessive ambition, pride, or addictiveness towards a quest for self perfection (Pearson, 1991, p. 16). The shadow Seeker is motivated by the persona and its greater success as surpassing the norms of society.

The Seeker archetype dreams of “human perfectibility and social justice” (Pearson, 1991, p. 124). It is the desire for something better that propels the individual towards the journey of transformation. Without the Seeker active in one’s life, he/she will remain docile and stationary at the threshold of their journey or wandering aimlessly without a purpose. It is the Seeker who motivates one to continue on his/her quest for what is missing. Problems arise for the Seeker, when it projects its desire for perfection onto the world around it. The Seeker is the archetype behind movements of social justice and equality because the Seeker strives for the dream; however, this dream is never fully realized so long as the individual seeks perfection outside of one’s self. As stated by Carol Pearson,

We can fulfill this yearning, however, when we become real and give birth to our true selves. Because we feel partial, disconnected, and fragmented, we yearn to become whole and connected. The yearning gets projected on to a desire for an external paradise but can only be satiated when we realize that the real issue is expanding our consciousness beyond the boundaries of ego reality. We must find what we seek inside ourselves or we will never find it beyond (Pearson, 1991, p. 124).
Since the goal of the Seeker is newness and transformation, the end result of the Seeker’s path is ultimately a destruction of the persona that conforms to society and stands in one’s way of transformation. For the seeker, “the issue is conformity versus individuality” (Pearson, 1991, p. 126). This need to destroy the conformist persona and ignite the individuality of the Soul brings to the discussion the next archetype, the Destroyer or Thanatos, the death wish.

The Destroyer

The Destroyer is central to the path of change that one seeks on his/her journey of transformation. In order to change, one must be willing to give up that which confines and holds one to his/her previous life and existence. Whether this is a belief system, family members, friends, or habits, the Destroyer helps one to abolish the holds that may tend to keep one from making a positive change in himself/herself as well as in the society around him/her. The Destroyer may come forward at the time of the ego’s shattering. It is the death experience that helps one to move beyond the confines of the Innocent’s narrow view. This is not a literal death; but rather, a symbolic movement down and inward into one’s Soul (Hillman, 1975, p. 208). James Hillman compares the Destroyer archetype and its transformative power to the rape of Persephone by Hades. He states, “Hades’ rape of the innocent soul is a central necessity for psychic change” (Hillman, 1975, p. 208). In order for a transformation of the soul to occur, one must be willing to slay the dragons that exist to hinder one’s soul’s progression.

When one is struggling between his/her persona and the needs of the soul, painful symptoms emerge in the form of dreams/nightmares, addictions, compulsions, and neurosis. Rather than ignoring these symptoms or medicating them, one can gain great insight by listening and being open to their greater significance. As stated by James Hillman (1975), “Symptoms are death’s solemn ambassadors, deserving honor for their place, and life mirrored in its symptoms
sees there is death and remembers the soul” (p. 110). The symptoms signify to the individual where one’s pain and suffering lay, which moves one out of his/her ego attachments. They acknowledge the areas of one’s soul that are sick or neglected. James Hillman (1975) describes them as “the wounds that give me eyes to see with” (p. 186). They remind one that his/her soul exists. He/she is more that the literalisms that his/her persona projects. The symptoms separate him/her from the confines of his/her persona. Individuality comes not by “virtue of [one’s] common wounds but of what comes through them [to the individual], the archetypes of [one’s] myths in which lie [his/her] madness, fate and death” (Hillman, 1975, p. 112). Where the Seeker calls one to ascend to reach the goal, the Destroyer calls one to descend towards that which confines one away from the goal (Pearson, 1991, p. 146). The cycles of nature support the job of the destroyer as seen through the seasons of the year. After death, there is rebirth. The death of winter leads to the rebirth of spring. Following the work of the Destroyer, that which is destroyed gives way to newness and transformation.

Difficulty lies with the Destroyer when the archetype falls to its shadow side, Thanatos, the death wish. One is taken to the depths of Hades without hopes of a return for rebirth. The shadow side of the Destroyer overcomes one with impulsive behavior that leads to self destruction as well as destructive behavior towards others (Pearson, 1991, p. 145). The shadow of the Destroyer may appear as anger when one’s cherished assumptions are challenged and he/she interprets this challenge as a threat to his/her identity (Boler, 1999, p. 191). Megan Boler (1999) describes this anger as “not so much a righteous objection to one’s honor, but more as a defense of one’s investments in the values of the dominant culture” (p. 191). The shadow Destroyer tries to purge the individual of any guilt or shame that might compromise his/her persona and place of security in society. The shadow side of the Destroyer can be combated and
turned towards transformative good when one recognizes the darkness within and embraces it for positive change. It is when one ignores or succumbs to the darkness of the shadow that the Destroyer has the opportunity to kill the individual or someone else. As stated by Jung (1933), “Every good quality has its bad side, and nothing that is good can come into the world without directly producing a corresponding evil” (p. 199). Good can come from embracing the shadow side of the Destroyer. Carol Pearson (1991) argues,

Death, evil, and cruelty live inside the self. Knowing one’s death lives within is a powerful experience of the Shadow. This experience can either cripple or be transformative. Sometimes the walls come tumbling down, and we succumb to madness or cynicism; but when we can name the experience, we can let go of the old and open to the new (p. 141).

Those who have the strength to embrace their dark sides and face the difficult road have the potential for great transformation. In order to embrace the dark side, one must be willing to unite the dualities of his/her soul. This unification occurs through the work of the Lover archetype.

*The Lover*

The archetype of the Lover seeks to love the inner self. Only after the loving of the inner self, can one truly begin to love those around him/her. As stated by James Hillman (1975), “The soul is led to knowledge of itself through love” (p. 111). The archetype of the Lover finds its power through the union of the polarities of the soul: male and female, body and spirit, soul and ego, conscious and unconscious minds (Pearson, 1991, p. 47). According to Jung, the Lover is the uniting of the Anima (the male) and the Animus (the female) (Hopcke, 1989, p. 91). It is the bringing together of the opposites within one’s self towards a loving and accepting relationship of the other. The Lover brings about the end of duality within the soul. It becomes a union of
Jung called this experience the *coniunctio oppositorum*, the conjoining of opposites (Campbell, 2004, p. 139). Jung (1959a) states, “Without the experience of the opposites there is no experience of wholeness” (559). Joseph Campbell (2004) likens this uniting of opposites to the journey of the hero. He states, “[The hero] and the dragon are opposites, but it’s only when he has tasted the dragon’s blood and integrated the dragon character in himself that he hears the birds sing and knows what their song is saying” (p. 140). To integrate the darker shadow, one must love the differences that exist between the outer world and the inner world of the individual. The individual may encounter the shadow Lover when he/she tries to project his/her inner world onto a partner. Rather than trying to integrate one’s own outer and inner world, one projects the desires of his/her inner world onto a partner. He/She does this in hopes of uniting his/her opposites through a relationship with a partner, rather than, facing one’s own internal world. This is an action of the shadow Lover that may cause the individual to succumb to sex addiction and multiple sex partners all in a quest for the exhilaration that occurs when one finds his/her true love. This false quest of promiscuity shadows the light that is brought forth from facing the difficulties and pains that may exist in one’s inner world.

The Lover archetype is also known as Eros (Pearson, 1991, p. 149), and it occurs when one feels “drawn” towards something or passionate about a person, cause, or a belief. According to James Hillman (1996), “To change how we see things takes falling in love. Then the same becomes altogether different” (p.34). The Lover archetype offers opportunities for a fresh outlook and a new view on the sameness that preceded its fruition. The Lover archetype is essential to the journey of the soul as it provides the fuel that propels the Seeker forward, and it keeps the Destroyer from killing that which is most dearest to the soul. It is through love that one is led to better understand his/her soul. James Hillman (1975) argues that love is “a means for
the return of soul through the human and by means of the human to the imaginal, the return of
the human psyche to its nonhuman imaginal essence” (p. 186). In order for change to occur
within the individual, he/she must seek beyond the literalism of the ego and embrace the
imaginal powers of the soul. Seeking the imaginal brings forth the archetype of the Creator.

*The Creator*

The Creator is the integral muse that helps to awaken the selves that lie within one’s
greater self. Thomas Moore (1992) argues that “the soul lies midway between understanding
and unconsciousness, and that its instrument is neither the mind nor the body, but imagination”
(p. xiii). The Creator utilizes imagination, vision, and foresight to bring forth the creation of
something greater than what one originally imagined possible. It is the archetype that helps the
Seeker ascend towards the goal of transformation. In conjunction with the Destroyer archetype,
the Creator helps to envision and craft something new, while the Destroyer ends what is no
longer working towards the attainment of one’s goals. The Creator dreams of what might be and
makes it happen. It legitimizes the daydreams that one has throughout the day and it propels one
to act on those dreams so as to create a new reality. The shadow side of the Creator allows the
imagination to shield and hide the awareness needed to create change. Rather than use the
imagination as a spring board for positive change, the Creator allows one’s imagination to cover
the true pain and suffering of one’s experience, which in turn results in no action for positive
change. The shadow allows for a world to be created without the active participation of soul as a
citizen of that world. The shadow side embraces passivity whereas the higher stages of the
Creator seek to experiment and try new things so as to bring about the change that one
essentially seeks (Pearson, 1991, p. 169). It is the Creator that rounds out the journey of the soul
towards the return of the new self. One cannot create a new self or begin to face one’s new realities without the ingenuity and active participation of the Creator archetype.

The Archetypes on the Return

*The Ruler*

The Ruler emerges from the journey of the Soul towards the reclamation of the newer self as the symbol of order and wholeness. The Ruler signifies a unified, singular psyche (Pearson, 1991, p. 58). The goal of the Ruler is a harmonious and purposeful life that conjoins all of the work of all of the archetypes and integrates them into a cohesive self that is productive and proactive in society. The Ruler archetype helps the individual to take complete responsibility for one’s life “not only for *one’s* inner reality, but also for the way *one’s* outer world mirrors that reality” (Pearson, 1991, p. 182). When the Ruler archetype is active, one feels at peace with the inner and outer changes that have occurred along one’s journey. The Ruler helps one to feel in control of his/her life. Problems may arise with the Ruler archetype when its control manifests itself in tyrannical ways (Pearson 1991, p. 191). When the Ruler acts in ways that may stifle the voices and actions of other archetypes, so as to maintain power and control, then the soul has succumbed to its shadow Ruler. Additionally, the shadow Ruler may also be seen in the reclaiming of new habits and patterns of rigidity that support the newer self, but fail to allow for any future change of growth to occur. So long as the shadow side is faced, confronted, and embraced, the Ruler will help govern the work of the previous archetypes along the journey, as well as those journeys to come later.

*The Magician*

The Magician is the alchemist of our souls. It is the archetype that has the ability to transform metals, or in the soul’s case emotions and beliefs, into positive, proactive elements of
change. The Magician helps to make the transformation of one’s life a conscious choice (Pearson, 1991, p. 59). The Magician helps one to realize that positive change has occurred and further positive change is possible through conscious effort and action. It is important, as with all of the archetypes, that the shadow side of the Magician is integrated with the self so as not to let the actions of the shadow turn to evil (Pearson, 1991, p. 205). The Magician is a key archetype along a journey of transformation that results in a positive change in the individual as well as society. The Magician, along with the Ruler, recognizes that one’s outer world is a mirror of one’s inner world. As a result, one cannot hope to create positive change in the world around him/her, without first creating the change within. The Magician accepts that miracles do happen and one is an active participant in the creation of his/her own miracles. The shadow of the Magician can be overcome in favor of these miracles of transformation through the acquisition of greater wisdom that can be achieved through the archetype of the Sage.

The Sage

The Sage is the archetype that helps one reach his/her truest self through wise guidance. The Sage is the Wise Old Man or Wise Old Woman who gives one advice and guidance in his/her dreams (Hopcke, 1989, p. 117). It is the wisdom of the Sage that allows one to see the “error of his/her ways” and the propensities that he/she has had in the past to succumb to the same patterns of destructive or negative behavior. Furthermore, it is the Sage that helps one to realize that he/she is projecting his/her shadow onto others. The Sage represents awareness, and it is through this awareness that transformation occurs during the journey. Transformation may be stifled when one encounters the shadow Sage. The shadow Sage appears through harsh self criticism and critique, the harsh assessment of others and their beliefs, and extreme relativism (Pearson, 1991, p. 212). It should be the goal of the self to recognize and face one’s propensity
for harsh self analysis and embrace that which offers opportunities for growth and dismiss that which hinders and binds one to a previous way of being.

The Sage signifies the transition work away from the Innocent and the Orphan towards higher levels of consciousness. It is when the Sage is most active that one becomes aware of the fact that throughout his/her life, he/she is often unaware of the way things truly are in society (Pearson, 1991, p. 211). It is the archetype of the Sage that may often bring to light the harsh realities that the Innocent and the Orphan often fail to face. Through this awareness, the Sage offers opportunities for one to address the difficult and embrace it towards further transformation. It is with this embracing that the final archetype arrives, the archetype of the Fool.

The Fool

The Fool provides the individual an opportunity to express oneself as he/she truly is without regard for persecution from others. Supporting the soul, the Fool helps to balance the persona with the individual’s inner desires and needs that might run contrary to the norms of society. The Fool allows for the emergence of joy and frivolity in the pursuit of the self. It is the archetype that is often represented by the court Jester or the Trickster throughout mythology. The Fool offers humor in the face of difficulty or pain, and it represents the multiplicity of the consciousness (Pearson, 1991, p. 59). At first, the Fool offers the ideal that life is a game; however, through further awareness of the Fool and his/her gifts, one is able to bring forth the principles that cleverness can help one deal with obstacles as well as the belief that life should be fully experienced in the moment (Pearson, 1991, p. 225). Through the Fool archetype, one might use comedic happenings to take “joy in unplanned developments that spark the imagination” (Doll, 1995, 30). When one can experience life for its own sake, then one does not need to
shelter him/herself from the trials and pains of life like the Innocent or the Orphan. The Fool may look at life through the creativity and openness of the Innocent, but, without the Innocent’s propensity for denial (Pearson, 1991, p. 68). Through the Fool, life is experienced as a celebration with happiness and pain as part of the celebration. In one’s journey, the Fool brings the individual full circle so that the next journey may begin at a higher level of consciousness.

The importance of these last four archetypes is that they rebirth the self for further growth and transformation. The journey does not end when one’s Fool becomes pronounced; rather, the journey begins again as new experiences create new meanings for the individual. As stated by Jung (1933), “We cannot live the afternoon of life according to the programme of life’s morning—for what was great in the morning will be little at evening, and what in the morning was true will at evening become a lie” (p. 108). The archetypes do not emerge on the journey in any particular order, but rather, when the ego and the soul need them. The archetypes re-emerge throughout one’s life as new experiences offer opportunities for newer Selves to be born.

The soul’s archetypal journey opens the realms of the private and weaves them with the realms of the public. The elements of one’s soul that were once hidden and tucked away are now enlightened and open to analysis and interpretation. The entire process of the journey is one of transformation as it brings to the forefront a rebirth of the self. This rebirth is essential within the classroom as a necessary step in the direction of positive social change. One cannot move forward towards an embracing of difference if one cannot accept the difference that lies within. William Pinar (1994c) addresses the embracing of inner difference when he states, “Some synthesis of these methods needs to be formulated to give us a uniquely educational method of inquiry, one that will allow us to give truthful, public, and useable form to our inner
observations” (p. 17). *Currere* is a distinct educational process that helps to unite the inner archetypal journey to the unique outer realm of the classroom and education.

The *Currere Process, Archetypes, and Consciousness*

*Currere* is concerned with the conjunction of the private and the public. It is the act of making the private more public. As stated by Joe Kincheloe (1998), “*Currere* concerns the investigation of the nature of the individual experience of the public” (p. 129). It is the breaking down of what we don’t see or want to see. It is the reconstructing of our knowledge. *Currere* seeks to understand how society, place, academics, and individuals contribute to one’s understanding of his or her life. *Currere* is “not a matter of psychic survival, but one of subjective risk and social reconstruction, the achievement of selfhood and society” (Pinar, 2004, p. 4). The most important aspect of *currere* is the process. Jung (1933) states, “The meaning and design of a problem seem not to lie in its solution, but in our working at it incessantly. This alone preserves us from stultification and petrifaction” (p. 103). It is the process of *currere* that offers transformative effects.

*Currere* is a four-step process rooted in psychoanalysis. For the purpose of this dissertation, I will interpret the process through a Jungian Depth Psychology approach. This approach differs from the majority of the scholarship in curriculum studies which has interpreted the *currere* process from a Freudian perspective. Through the process of looking at the journey of the soul, as it aligns with the *currere* process, I will reference twelve different archetypes. For the sake of organization, each archetype appears as a set of four at different stages in the *currere* process aligned with the different stages of the hero’s journey (Campbell, 1949, pp. 14-15, Campbell, 2004, p. 113). Certain archetypes are more likely to appear at one stage over another; however, this is not a rule and each archetype may appear at any of the stages per the needs of
the soul. Each stage in the currere process, the regressive, the progressive, the analytical, and the synthetical (Pinar et al., 2004, p. 520), signifies different stages in the soul’s journey: the preparation, the journey, and the return (Pearson, 1991, p. 29). It is within the four stages of the currere method that the Jungian journey through the archetypes of the soul can be explored and understood in terms of its applicability to curriculum, education, and the classroom.

In Jungian terms, the soul begins in the stage of the Innocent. It is the archetype of the Innocent that can be seen in the stories of Christ child, Adam and Eve, and Peter Pan. It is the foundation stage of the soul where one still believes that the world is whole, perfect, and good. Everyone starts out an Innocent; however, the time and stage of their loss of innocence makes one’s experience unique to him/her alone. The regressive step in the currere process is the first step to bring one away from the archetype of the Innocent towards a journey of greater consciousness through the progression to other archetypes in the soul. An individual may experience tragedy and pain in life that may temporarily remove him/her from psychic confines of the Innocent, however, this is not always possible and many people remain tied to the Innocent because they cannot truly face the pain that might ignite their journey. The regressive step in the currere process compels one to face the pain, and it provides the impetus for the transition away from the Innocent.

The regressive step in the process of currere is probably the most difficult and painful for most. It is the action of remembering all that one has chosen to forget. The past is always present, even when one is not aware of it (Pinar, 2000, p. 16). The process of currere makes one more aware of the past. It is the rebirthing of the pain and suffering of our childhood, our broken hearts, the deaths of our loved ones. It is the reminder of how one came to be and the reason for one’s acting in a certain manner. James Hillman (1983) describes the process of remembering as
“a commemoration, a ritual recall of our lives to the images in the background of the soul” (p. 42). Our past is never truly “in the past,” gone from view, and “a repressed past comes back to haunt in terrible ways” (Morris, 2004, p. 42). James Hillman (1983) states further that “repression is built into each story as the fear of the story itself” (p. 42). Furthermore, Doris Lessing (1994) states in her autobiography, “Our lives are governed by voices, caresses, threats we cannot remember” (p. 24). One’s repressed stories are hidden away in un-chartered areas of the unconscious where they manifest themselves in the form of psychological symptoms. It is through the acknowledgement of these symptoms that one might catch a glimpse at the repressed unknown that is haunting him/her.

In practicing currere, the past must be “bracketed,” which means “looking at what is not ordinarily seen, at what is taken for granted, hence loosening oneself from it” (Pinar, 1994d, 22). Peter Gay (1998) describes his past as “a mosaic with central pieces missing” (p. 10). It is these missing pieces that are fundamental to the transformative power of currere. The awareness of the missing pieces shatters the ego and breaks one away from the comforts of their innocent archetype. They are propelled to a state of orphandom in which they must face the fact that what existed prior may not have been good. True transformative change can not occur if one does not first shatter and break the prior beliefs that restrain him/her from truly seeing the suffering around them. It is this point in the currere process that aligns to the preparation phase of the hero’s journey.

There is equal importance, if not arguably more importance, in that which is forgotten, missing or unsaid, as there is in that which is told. The final step in the regression stage of currere is the writing down of what was once lost. Through the documenting of what one has forgotten or repressed, the past is brought to the present from which it can be analyzed, studied,
Frantz Fanon addresses the importance of regressing to face the past as using “the past with the intention of opening the future, as an invitation to action and a basis for hope” (Fanon, 1963, p. 232). James Hillman (1975) describes regression as “the digestive mode of soul making” (p. 28). The regressive stage takes one from the tranquility of the innocent archetype towards the processing and turmoil of the pain that accompanies the archetypal stages of the Orphan-the cynic, the Warrior-the developer of courage, and the Caregiver-the teacher of humanity and compassion (Pearson, 1991, p. 34). These four archetypes signify the preparation for the journey of the Soul where attributes of strength are often built. These are the periods in one’s life known as the roads of trial (Pearson, 1991, p. 34) that one often associates with the phrase, “life is hard.” This is when the ego is shattered. Through the practice of currere’s first step, the regressive as well as the second step, the progressive, these four archetypes and their preparation for the soul’s journey are supported and developed.

The progressive phase seeks to find what the ego has covered up or denied (Pinar, 2004, p. 128). It is a passage way to the future that is ever present in our daily lives (Pinar, 1994, p. 24). This point in the currere process is symbolic of the hero’s passage into the threshold of the cave (Campbell, 1949, p. 77). With the encountering of the repressed, the hero is faced with the decision to pass the threshold and enter the cave. This decision symbolizes the self-annihilation that accompanies the ego’s shattering. The progressive phase is what is known by most as a reflection period. It is when the mind is allowed to dream of what could be. It is important at this stage that one remains open to possibility as well as to difference. This is the phase “when something addresses us” (Gadamer cited in Jardine et al., 2006, p. 40). This is the phase when
something calls the individual to pass the threshold and face the journey of transformation that lies ahead.

Awareness begins to develop during the progressive phase as one begins to take on the task of interpretation within the next phase, the analytical. Through the regressive and progressive phases, the four archetypes—Innocent, Orphan, Warrior, and Caregiver—help one to “learn to survive in the world as it is, to develop ego strength, and beyond that, to be productive citizens and good people, with high moral character” (Pearson, 1991, p. 29). One can bring images back from the past by seeking “illuminating hints from the inspired past” (Campbell, 1949, p. 213). This is the point in the process for one to take mental pictures of what one envisions and set them aside for further analysis in the next phase, the analytical.

The analytical phase loosens the individual from the holds that bind him/her to a certain belief or system. It is the analysis of all three elements of one’s self: the past, the present, and the future (Pinar, 1994d, p. 26). The analytical phase is the point at which one tries to interpret one’s life and its elements. This type of critical analysis demands a “great deal of self-reflection about the ways in which subjectivities, desires, and actions are mobilized through social interaction and established systems of meaning and value” (Leistyna, 2003, p. 122). At this stage in the *currere* process, the second four archetypes may emerge through this portion of the journey.

The Seeker, the Destroyer, the Lover, and the Creator all help in the journey as one encounters his/her truest essence, the soul, and he/she becomes “real”(Pearson, 1991, p. 29). The Seeker seeks awareness and transformation through the questioning of what one once considered truth (Pearson, 1991, p. 46). The Destroyer is closely linked to the myth of Thanatos, the death wish, and it is the archetype that seeks confrontation with the repressed. Along the journey, the
Destroyer archetype, along with the Warrior, face the dragon, the symbol of the repressed; the keeper of the past (Campbell, 1949, p. 289). It is through the guidance of the Destroyer and the Warrior that one gains the strength to challenge and analyze the knowledge that is enlightened from confronting the past. One can now destroy that which is discovered to be false and dangerous to the soul, while embracing elements that might encourage inner growth. The Lover archetype utilizes the analytic phase of currere to make a connection between itself and others. It is the Lover archetype that connects one to the outer world. The Creator archetype emerges from the future component of the analytic phase whereby the Soul seeks the future and the creation of possibilities. This is the stage in the currere process where one imagines the possibilities of what moves him/her to what could be. The individual learns to identify what moves him/her by acknowledging and living the archetype that governs his/her current stage in life (Campbell, 2004, p. 99). If the individual does not give due notice to the archetypes and experiences that surround his/her stage in life, then one’s soul will delve into the shadow. Embracing one’s possibilities, involves the exploration and realization of the interconnectedness of one’s past, present, and future. Acknowledging this interconnectedness will bring the practitioner closer to the final phase, the synthetical.

The synthetical phase is the final stage in the process of currere. This is the point when the private becomes public and the bracketed intellect is put back together, synthesized (Pinar, 1994d, p. 27). The entire process of currere brings one to a point of awareness and realization where the dualisms of one’s soul are united in the process of individuation. Carl Jung (1959c) defines individuation as

Becoming a single, homogenous being, and, in so far as ‘individuality’ embraces our innermost, last, incomparable uniqueness, it also implies becoming one’s own self….The
The aim of individuation is nothing less than to divest the self of the false wrappings of the persona on the one hand, and the suggestive power of primordial images on the other (pp. 181-183).

Clifford Mayes describes individuation as, “maturity, and maturity requires looking at both sides of things, taking the best from both, and reconciling the dialectical tension in the form of a higher synthesis” (Mayes, 2005, p. 69). Furthermore, Erich Neumann adds that the process of individuation is “the incorporation of the [suppressed and repressed] contents into a greater totality…Contents which were previously split-off and autonomous are joined up to form parts of a comprehensive psychic structure which is connected with the ego and the conscious mind” (Neumann, 1943, p. 99). During the process of individuation, the opposites that exist in one’s inner realm, “subsist side by side as reflections in our own minds of the opposition that underlies all psychic energy” (Jung, 1959b, p. 97). What was once unknown or repressed has been seen, addressed, and assimilated. Joseph Campbell (2004) argues that “perfection is inhuman. Human beings are not perfect. Individuation is to see people and [oneself] in terms of what [he/she] indeed [is], not in terms of all these archetypes that [one is] projecting around and that have been projected on [him/her]” (p. 76). At the synthetical stage, the shadow has been encountered and is now reconciled. One is much more tolerant of other groups, cultures, and people when one has reconciled his/her shadow (Neumann, 1943,p. 97).

During the synthetical phase, the extremes of one’s soul not only form a compromise, but also, they synthesize to form a new creation, “a ‘third’, as Jung often called it, that not only combines the best of two opposing things but goes beyond them in the form of a unifying symbol” (Mayes, 2005, p. 69). The “third” is the pairing of the opposites that Jung (1959b) referred to as “*complexio oppositorum,”* which he aligned to the definition of God himself (p.
The self emerges during the synthetical phase of *currere* when the mind of God and the mind of man meet to form the part of man that is made in the image of God (Mayes, 2005, p. 75). In other words, the self is made in the image of God. This is an important occurrence in the process of individuation. It is necessary for one to embrace the ‘third’ or the God within as a prerequisite to seeing the face of God in the Other. When one can see the face of God in the Other, then he/she is no longer projecting his/her shadows onto the Other; rather, he/she is accepting the Other for who he/she truly is. Jung states, “If people can be educated to see the shadow side of their nature clearly, it may be hoped that they will also learn to understand and love their fellow man better” (Jung in Mayes, 2005, p. 118). Overall, the process of individuation results in one no longer perceiving himself as center of the world, but rather, as one in relation to the world. As in Martin Buber’s I/Thou relationship, when one sees the face of God in the Other, he is in relation to him/her and in “relation is reciprocity” (Buber, 1916, p. 58). Acknowledging the importance of reciprocity is necessary for any social justice curriculum to be successful.

It is at this stage that one encounters the final four archetypes along the journey—the Ruler, the Magician, the Sage, and the Fool—all of whom help the soul return to its truest self and transform one’s life (Pearson, 1991, p. 29). In this final stage of the *currere* method, the Ruler emerges with the creation of psychological wholeness and order (Pearson, 1991, p. 58). The self has become unified with its many stories, those repressed and new. In addition to the Ruler, the Magician seeks to serve as an “inner alchemist who is able to transmute base emotions and thoughts into more developed ones, to help us learn new behavior patterns, and to turn primitive behaviors into more sophisticated and adequate ones” (Pearson, 1991, p. 59). Completing the synthetic stage of *currere*, the Sage and the Fool serve to notice one’s
pathological issues that guard one from new awareness as well as represent the multiplicity of one’s consciousness and its ever-changing nature (Pearson, 1991, p. 59). All four archetypes that round out the journey of the soul coincide with the synthetic phase of currere and bring one back to the center of a cyclical journey for awareness and action.

Overall, currere exposes the maintenance of social hierarchies of class gender, sexuality, and race (Gough, 1998, p. 116). It is this exposure that helps one to complete his/her journey of transformation. Even though one’s own reflections may perpetuate stereotypes and social control, the nature of currere is to self explore in a way that breaks these barriers down. As stated by Daryl Sharp (1995), one must “make friends with your fragments” (p. 30). These fragments arise from the broken down barriers that arise throughout the transformative journey. Along the hero’s journey through the process of currere, one accomplishes three tasks. First, he/she faces the past and pulls out the repressed to full light. Next, he/she reconciles his/her opposites and embraces his/her shadow sides. Finally, one reaches, “apotheosis, where [one] realizes that [he/she] is what [one] is seeking” (Campbell, 2004, p. 118). When one realizes that the answer has always been within, then the task becomes reintroducing this potential into the world (Campbell, 2004, p. 118). This can be accomplished through the nature of one’s relationship with others. The breaking of these barriers and the openness to new knowing signify the return on the archetypal journey of the soul; yet, despite the wonders of this journey, this is a journey that is marked with danger for the soul. It is the breaking down of barriers and the opening of one’s self to be in relation to others that brings about the transformation; however, this process is not easy and it demands a discussion of the different pathways to achieving it and the ethics that should govern it.
CHAPTER 3:
HAVING A ‘VOICE’ WITHOUT SPEAKING:
AUTOBIOGRAPHIC AND PHOTOGRAPHIC CONVERSATIONS

“Every life is in search of a narrative.” (Kearney, 2002, p. 4)

Autobiography is traditionally explored through the writing and telling of one’s personal narratives. Journal writing, diaries, and memoirs are all considered types of autobiographical work. Mary Aswell Doll states that “journaling is a way into the self, uncensored by bigger people—a way that yields the metaphors we need to self-define” (Doll, 1995, p. 33). These metaphors may be the archetypes that lead one along his/her journey of transformation. The genre of autobiography serves as part of a social justice curriculum, because it tells the stories or the un-told stories of those on the edge of society, those who are considered Other. Through analyzing autobiographies as well as working autobiographically, students, through currere, are afforded opportunities to reflect on their lives, deconstruct their realities, and in turn, work towards creating a more equitable society. In order for a person to be able to work in traditional autobiographical inquiry, he/she generally needs to be a master of the written word. In today’s society, language, both written and spoken, has become a commodity. It is often used to signify and separate the elite from the poor, the educated from the street, and the white from the non-white. For those in society who do not speak the language, they are often placed at a disadvantage to those around them. Language becomes a means through which they are reminded of their place in society, or better yet, their lack of a place. Autobiographical inquiry allows those who are often overlooked and forgotten to be heard. It gives them a voice; however, for those who do not possess the language with which to speak or the skills with which to write, autobiography remains a luxury for the elite and the privileged. In turn, autobiography
existing as a curriculum of the oppressed falls short of a true realization. For this reason, an alternative autobiographical process, beyond written or oral histories, needs to be explored. The purpose of this chapter is to explore autobiographical inquiry and its use in photography. Through an analysis of the autobiographical process of creating “voice,” the genre of autophotography is explored as a means of giving “voice” to the oppressed and the silenced of society.

Finding one’s “Voice:” An Autobiographic Quest

Autobiography has a significant place in the classroom. Autobiography opens doors to awareness and reflection whereby transformation of the individual can occur. Autobiography as curriculum offers a new way of teaching that “places priority on relationships” (Doll, 1995, p. 30). More often than not, students are controlled by the very curriculum that teachers seek to liberate them. The idea that “knowledge is power” becomes hypocritical when the knowledge that is taught is standardized and free of original thought. Autobiography offers a self examination that combats the perils of standardization, and it offers students and teachers an opportunity to open their minds to the realities that exist in society, not the metanarratives that are professed on the pages of the textbook. According to Giroux and Giroux (2004), “Democracy appears imperiled because individuals are unable to translate their privately suffered misery into broadly shared public concerns and collective action” (p. 1). Through ethical, autobiographical work, the private is made public and “the concept of a public sphere is anchored upon the notion of a liberal individual who participates in it, who can say that as a human, nothing human is alien to him (or her)” (Readings, 1996, p. 140). The curriculum in the classroom becomes focused on that which is unsaid, “alien,” or left out, so as to bring it to light. Through autobiographical inquiry, the student embarks on a journey of transformation where
he/she faces the dragons of his/her archetypal shadow sides. When a student’s awareness increases through autobiographical inquiry, then his/her shadow sides that are projected onto society are brought to the stage to be confronted and embraced. This is a necessary step in the process of individuation as well as the practice of social justice.

Students are often taught that their voices have no power and significance. As a result, students react with apathy and disengagement due to “the fact that nothing in their education encourages them to think of themselves as the heroes of the story of liberal education, embarking on the long voyage of self-discovery” (Readings, 1996, p. 138). The students see their education through the eyes of their shadow innocent or shadow orphan archetypes. When the shadows of the innocent and orphan archetypes cloud the students’ vision, then they see their lives as static, where they are helpless to change anything that might be unjust. In fact, they may even be blinded to the injustice that surrounds them. The personal narratives of students counteract these shadows and instill in the students a sense of power that is unparallel. With the use of currere in the classroom, for the first time in their education, students are given an opportunity to express themselves and their views without risk of punishment. Through the use of currere coupled with the study of autobiographical works, a curriculum steeped in social justice is born. Students who are classified as Other are finally given a voice. The students who have been privileged and sheltered are given opportunities to view life through an analysis of their own stories, as well as the stories of others.

The study of autobiography as curriculum does not seek to develop a collective voice through the analysis of multiple individual narratives. Rather, working autobiographically through the process of currere helps to give rise to the individual’s story so as to bring to light the many overlappings and commonalities across all life experiences. It is through the awareness
of the common between stories that one realizes he/she is not that different from his/her peer. Autobiography offers an opportunity for unity across racial, gender, and class lines. Students learn that the message that he/she has to share is just as worthy as the student sitting next to him/her. Autobiography as curriculum allows for each occurrence within society or the school to be experienced differently by each individual. Allowing students to work autobiographically acknowledges the power of the individual’s story. Although most students seek to conform to society, “fitting in is defined by the ways people are alike; individuality is defined by the ways people are unlike” (Pearson 1991, p. 126). Autobiography legitimizes the differences among individuals. As stated by Michael Singh (2005),

Meaningful engaging curriculum narratives provide students with the opportunity to analyze, interpret, and comprehend the multifaceted dimensions of globalization…narratives associated with individual actors might construct the local ordering and disordering arising from the practices of globalization in ways that differ from narratives about individuals in other settings. (p. 119)

The creation of a central voice destroys the individual and the histories that are connected to that person. As stated by Mary Aswell Doll, “If we do not do our own work, the work with others will ultimately ring hollow, our thinking will be false, and our writing will be flabby” (Doll, 1995, p. 32). The goal of a curriculum based on the “complicated conversations” of autobiographical work is to help students become “critical intellectuals prepared to swim against the current” (Aronowitz, 2000, p. 126). Students need to be allowed to think of the different and the strange as possible ways of being.

Autobiography offers opportunities for empowerment of the student in the classroom. It is the acknowledgement that one’s story is worth hearing that provides this empowerment. An
integral part of this empowerment is the acknowledgment that many of the workings of our schools seek to limit and maintain students in their current “place.” Paulo Freire (1970) argues that education often “conceals certain facts which explain the way human beings exist in the world” (p. 83). The acquisition of language, which is often considered a method of liberation, can function as a way in which society perpetuates the social classes and stereotypes that limit students, especially in the cases where the dominant language is one of the oppressing classes. Within the corporate and standardized schools of today, teachers often forget that their first priority should be to help students find their own personal voices. Sometimes finding these voices does not mean the literal. The use of art, more specifically photography, can be a way in which students are taught to express themselves and their stories where a formal understanding and mastery of the written and spoken word is not required.

The Pitfalls of Language

The written and spoken word is the main method of autobiographical work. Those who tell their stories usually do so through their writing or their verbal re-counts. The common thread is the language. In order for one to tell his story and for his story to be understood, then he/she must share a common language with the reader. This link to language has been an obstacle to autobiographical inquiry as transformative and social justice learning for the oppressed. As stated by Mark J. Jones (1995), “The major obstacle confronting self research has been the almost exclusive reliance on ‘dissertation and pencil’ measures, a problem particularly acute for minorities who face cultural bias”(p. 188). Working autobiographically frees and opens the minds of those of privilege as well as those who are oppressed; however, when an understanding of the dominant language does not exist, those who lack the understanding are left out of any participatory conversation that could exist.
Language is often viewed as a liberating form of communication. For example, Slave narratives have served as social justice curriculum by awakening those of us in states of privilege to the horrors and atrocities committed by man against man. However, in cases where a common language is not shared between the oppressed and the oppressor, then the voices and stories of the marginalized and oppressed are left unheard. The barrier between the languages and their understandings serve as cement, fixing the barriers that exist toward pro-active change. Bell hooks (1994b) describes the perils of language and its misuse. She states, “I know it is not the English language that hurts me, but what the oppressors do with it, how they shape it to become a territory that limits and defines, how they make it a weapon that can shame, humiliate, and colonize” (p. 168). Quite often, verbal methods can “perpetuate and exaggerate a wide variety of social inequalities” (Dodman, 2003, p. 294) where forms of language are associated with particular socio-economic classes and racial groups. Especially in societies that are steeped in colonialism and the oppression of one group by another, language can serve more as a barrier than a liberator. I argue that the goal of the autobiographical process of currere is liberation from the oppression of thought towards a transformation of the soul. The resulting outcome is mobilization for social action. Because of the importance of this social mobilization, other possibilities of expression need to be explored beyond the written word.

Having a “Voice” Without Speaking: Autophotography

“Voice” as a Photograph

In order to combat the limits of language and offer an extension of expression in autobiographical inquiry, the use of photography as a method of “voice” for the oppressed is a viable form of expression. Susan Sontag (2004) argues “photography is the only major art in which professional training and years of experience do not confer an insuperable advantage over
the untrained and inexperienced” (p. 28). Written autobiographical works cannot make this same claim. One needs a command of the written and spoken language in order to effectively tell his/her story through a written narrative. Helmut Gernsheim, quoted in Susan Sontag’s *On Photography*, states

Photography is the only “language” understood in all parts of the world, and bridging all nations and cultures, it links the family of man….it reflects truthfully life and events, allows us to share in the hopes and despair of others, and illuminates political and social conditions. We become the eye-witnesses of the humanity and inhumanity of mankind…

(Sontag 1973, p. 192)

Harry Broudy (1988) argues that “historically and theologically the material of the imagination-the image-precedes ‘the word’” (in Pinar et al., 2004, p. 569). Furthermore, W.J.T. Mitchell (1994) affirms that “all media are mixed media, and all representations are heterogeneous; there are no ‘purely’ visual or verbal arts, though the impulse to purify media is one of the central utopian gestures of modernism” (p. 5). Walter Lippmann quoted in Sontag’s *Regarding the Pain of Others* states “photographs have the kind of authority over imagination today, which the printed word had yesterday, and the spoken word before that. They seem utterly real” (Sontag 2004, p. 25). Photographs provide guides of reference, and “serve as totems of causes: sentiment is more likely to crystallize around a photograph than around a verbal slogan” (Sontag, 2004, p. 85). Photography offers opportunities for critical reflection similar to the experiences that may result from traditional, written autobiographical inquiry. Bell hooks argues that photographs for the illiterate members of her family offered “a necessary narrative, a way for us to enter history without words” (Hooks, 1994, p. 52). Photographs can serve as one’s voice. With photographs, “something becomes real to those who are elsewhere” (Sontag 2004, p. 21) from the event.
They, too, can tell one’s story. Photographing as well as the analysis of photography is a process that takes the artist and viewer away from the common and everyday, towards the complicated past and the possibilities of tomorrow.

When photography is a method of expression used by someone identified as Other, it becomes a proclamation of “what it means to be human at a particular time and place” (Pinar et al., 2004, p. 568). With regards to photography as an aesthetic curriculum, Maxine Greene (1998) states, “Old either/ors may disappear. We may make possible a pluralism of vision, a multiplicity of realities. We may enable those we teach to rebel” (in Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 2004, p. 567). Photography offers different ways of seeing where art is “a complex meditation and a reconstruction of experience” (Pinar et al., 2004, p. 567). As seen in W.E.B. Du Bois’ photographs for the 1900 Paris Exposition, photography of African Americans by African Americans offers a perspective that is lacking when similar photographs are taken by those in a state of privilege over them. Shown Michelle Smith states, with regards to Du Bois’ photographs as compared to the photographs of African Americans taken by whites during the same time period, that Du Bois’ photographs, “emblematize the complicated visual dynamics of double-consciousness…Du Bois’ ‘American Negro’ photographs disrupt the images of African Americans produced ‘through the eyes of others’” (Smith, 2000, p. 1). Through photography, the story of the Other can be seen without the limits of language, as well as the limits of the dominant societal prejudices that impede the understanding of both the photographer and the viewer.

Accepting photography as a method of expression and inquiry equal to that of the written word requires that the artist as well as the viewer analyze and deconstruct the image. The power of the image and the power of the written word need to be viewed as overlapping, equally
powerful, not separated and exclusive from one another. Roland Barthes (1972) states that pictures “impose meaning at one stroke….Pictures become a kind of writing as soon as they are meaningful” (p. 110). With regards to images of the Other, “the painful, stirring images supply only an initial spark” (Sontag 2004, p. 103) of awareness and reflection. However, the image, in this case the photographic image, holds a power that is still potentially transformative for the viewer as well as the photographer. This transformative potential may exist because of the photograph’s offering of images that can be concretely personified to the individual, thus, serving to torture the soul. As stated by James Hillman (1975), “If the soul is to be truly moved, a tortured psychology is necessary” (p. 93). When something is photographed, it is given importance (Sontag, 1973, p. 28). As stated by Susan Sontag (1973), “Photographs cannot create a moral position, but they can reinforce one—and can help build a nascent one” (p. 17). Photographs can offer an opportunity where perspectives are problematized and the viewer is offered a different way of seeing. When ideas are problematized, the soul is tortured in a way that calls into question everything that was once held as truth. The meaning in the photograph is determined by its viewer, whether that viewer is the photographer or a secondary observer. A photograph is “drained of its force by the way it is used, where and how often it is seen” (Sontag 2004, p. 105). Susan Sontag (2004) states “the photographer’s intentions do not determine the meaning of the photograph, which will have its own career, blown by the whims and loyalties of the diverse communities that have use for it” (p. 39). Essentially, images do not mean anything; however, they still speak to a part of you (Campbell 2004, p. 97). Their meaning is determined by how one sees the image. The photograph offers both the photographer and the viewer an opportunity to gaze upon the imaged reality and search for a meaning that goes beyond the
obvious and into the hidden. This gazing is a process of action that disturbs the soul and propels the individual along his/her journey of transformation.


Through a process of visual doubling, Du Bois’s “American Negro” portraits engender a disruptive critical commentary that troubles the visual and discursive foundations of white middle-class dominance by destabilizing their oppositional paradigms (p. 2).

W.E.B. Du Bois’s photographs, reproduced for the Paris expedition, offered the viewers insight into African Americans’ struggles against white domination. These photographs “work against dominant, white-supremacist images of African Americans perpetuated both discursively and in visual media at the turn of the century” (Smith, 2000, p. 2). Similarly, bell hooks (1994) states that walls of photographs in her childhood home “were essential to the process of decolonization. Contrary to colonizing socialization, internalized racism, they announced our visual complexity. We saw ourselves represented in these images not as caricatures, cartoon-like figures; we were there in full diversity of body, being, and expression, multidimensional” (p. 50). This view of the power of photography contrasts Walter Benjamin who argues that the power of the image, in this case the photograph, withers away within the age of mechanical reproduction. He argues that the power of the image lies in its aura which is lost through mechanical reproduction. He states, “That which withers in the age of mechanical reproduction is the aura of the work of art…by making many reproductions it substitutes a plurality of copies for a unique experience” (Benjamin, 1969, p. 221). I would argue against Benjamin in that the aura of the photograph is
not lost due to its reproduction. My argument coincides with that of W.J.T. Mitchell’s (2005), who states,

    We have to say that the copy has, if anything, more aura than the original. More precisely, in a world where the very idea of the unique original seems a merely nominal or legal fiction, the copy has every chance of being an improvement or enhancement of whatever counts as the original. (p.320)

In an age of digital reproduction, the aura of the photograph remains, especially in cases where the reproduction is an improvement upon the original where the reproduction “breathes life into the original” (Mitchell, 2005, p. 320). The uniqueness of the experience remains despite any number of reproductions, because a photograph can transcend our psyches where our memories often fail us. The photograph’s aura is the essence of truth that often fades from our conscious over time.

    A photograph is a “certificate of presence” (Barthes, 1980, p. 87). The original does not hold anymore power or aura over a fourth or fifth reproduction, especially in the case of photography where the negative lends itself to reproduction. I share Roland Barthes’ (1980) argument when he states, “What the photograph reproduces to infinity has occurred only once: the photograph mechanically repeats what could never be repeated existentially” (p. 4).

Therefore, the very essence of photography’s nature for mechanical reproduction holds its aura and its power. In fact, I would argue that the mass reproduction of images opens the power of the image to spread further beyond the confines of the singular viewer. Especially within the possible mass reproduction of a photographic image, the photograph holds equal transformative power to the written word. The photograph becomes “ways of worldmaking not just world mirroring” (Mitchell, 2005, p. xv). As stated by Barthes,
Language is, by nature, fictional; the attempt to render language unfictional requires an enormous apparatus of measurements: we convoke logic, or lacking that, sworn oath; but the Photograph is indifferent to all intermediaries: it does not invent; it is authentication itself. (Barthes, 1980, p. 87)

The photograph offers a view of a time, an event, and/or a place that is steeped in uniqueness. “A picture is less like a statement or speech act, than like a speaker capable of an infinite number of utterances. An image is not a text to be read but a ventriloquist’s dummy into which we project our own voice” (Mitchell, 2005, p. 140). A photograph offers a view into one’s personal history that is at the same time “a record of a community, a society, a nation, an age” (Hillman, 1983, p. 45). In the immediacy of the camera shutter snapping the photograph, the photographer bears witness that one existed at a particular time during a particular experience thus complicating one’s memory as he/she reflects back on the events at a later moment. The photograph is “a trace of something brought before the lens as a memento of the vanished past” (Sontag, 2004, p. 24). It is the voice of the photographer as well as the viewer that later gives the image its meaning and complicates the reality of the image.

The complicating of reality for the photographer and his/her viewer is equally possible through the creation and analysis of the photograph, as it is possible through the writing and reading of one’s experience. The creation of art allows for “an aesthetic transformation that demystifies the taken-for-granted” (Pinar et al., 2004, p. 605). The transformation begins with the analysis of the image which can be completed autobiographically. As stated by Richard Bolton (1996), “The photograph is not sufficient evidence by itself; an interpretive structure must be established—naturalized—before a stable and believable meaning can be read into the documentary image” (p. xvi). Photographs can both “reveal even as they conceal. They are as
opaque as they are transparent” (Hirsch, 1997, p. 2). A photograph is “always the image that someone chose; to photograph is to frame, and to frame is to exclude” (Sontag 2004, p. 46). Working autobiographically asks the student to “re-experience his or her past, imagine his or her future, analytically locate both accounts in his or her present, amplifying it multiperspectivally and temporally” (Pinar et al., 2004, p. 578). Roland Barthes (1980) describes photographs,

Not as a copy of reality, but an emanation of past reality: a magic, not an art…the important thing is that the photograph possesses an evidential force, and that its testimony bears not on the object but on time. From a phenomenological viewpoint, in the photograph, the power of authentication exceeds the power of representation (p. 88-89).

For the purpose of this dissertation, I will analyze photography and its autobiographical possibilities as a curriculum that encourages students, “to experience a subject on a level far deeper and richer than the intellectual level” (Trostoli cited in Mayes, 2005, p. 107). As stated by David Dodman (2003),

Photographs are able to engage thought, extend the imagination, and undermine the implicit authority of the written word. The use of photographs serves not only to question the hegemony of the written word, but also to provide an alternative to the use of language for descriptive purposes (p. 294).

Photography offers an opportunity for transformative autobiographical work that is not dependent on an understanding of a given language; but rather, an understanding of a shared image and its multitude of meanings.

Autophotography
“Autophotography” is an autobiographic process that begins when a person photographs the elements of his/her community that are actual or symbolic examples of his or her life. After photographing these elements, then he/she interprets, analyzes, and evaluates the photos for greater understanding of his/her life. Autophotography allows participants a certain level of freedom to use their actual surroundings to tell their personal stories. The people, places, and events that they choose to photograph represent their construction of self. Marianne Hirsch (1997) compares the camera to psychoanalysis. She states,

There are optical processes that are invisible to the eye: they can be exposed by the mechanical processes of photography. The camera can reveal what we see without realizing that we do, just as psychoanalysis can uncover what we know without knowing that we do: what is stored in the unconscious. The camera can expose hidden dimensions of our actions and movements through its artificial techniques of making strange (p. 118).

The photograph results as an object of three practices: to do, to undergo, and to look (Barthes, 1980,p. 9). Through the action of taking the picture, being the photographer, and the action of viewing the picture, being the spectator, one actively participates in these three practices with the goal of creating an authentic view of one’s world. Barthes argues that photographs offer an authenticity that is lacking in comparison to the written word. He states,

In front of a photograph, our consciousness does not necessarily take the nostalgic path of memory, but for every photograph existing in the world, the path of certainty: the photograph’s essence is to ratify what it represents…no writing can give me this certainty. It is the misfortune of language not to be able to authenticate itself. (Barthes, 1980, p. 85)
The photograph surpasses the confines and at times protective walls of one’s memory. Photographs can “help construct—and revise—our sense of a more distant past” (Sontag 2004, p. 85). The photograph serves to historicize the events of one’s life which Hillman (1983) describes as “a dignity that they cannot receive from contemporaneousness. History dignifies because it moves events onto the stage of history, becoming thereby tragic, epic, and imaginative” (p. 45). The photograph allows the photographer to open the walls of his/her mind and “in spite of suffering, view life as a creative and continuing adventure” (McDougall, 1985, p. 16). In Jungian terms, the photograph brings one to the threshold of his/her transformative journey of the soul.

For both the photographer and the viewer, the autophotographic image can serve to shatter one’s innocence. This is a prerequisite occurrence along the path of individuation and transformation.

Photography and autobiography share a common grounding in the seen and unseen, the spoken and unspoken. Marianne Hirsch (1997) argues that “photographs locate themselves precisely in the space of contradiction between the myth of the ideal… and the lived reality…” (p. 8). Photographers as well as writers choose and elect the information that is to be included in their pieces. Susan Sontag (1973) states that “even when photographs are most concerned with mirroring reality, they are still haunted by tacit imperatives of taste and conscience” (p. 6). Furthermore, Timothy Adams (2000) argues, “Interrelations between photography and autobiography demonstrate the inherent tendency in both to conceal as much as they reveal, through their built-in ambiguity, their natural relationship to the worlds they depict, which always seems more direct than it really is” (p. xxi). Similarly, a person’s history is often reduced to his/her own observations and interpretations; therefore, a viewer must be aware that what is known is through the eyes of the original observer (Modell, 1999, p. 76). In this respect, photography affords an opportunity for the experience to be shared in both actual and later time,
where the viewer of the image sees what the photographer saw. What is then lacking is the nature of the photograph at the moment it was taken.

When a photograph is taken, an exchange exists between the photographer and the spectator and a transfer of power occurs between the two and a relationship develops. Photographs offer two pathways of power, “Illusionism and Realism.” (Mitchell, 1994, p. 324). Mitchell (1994) argues that

Illusionism is the capacity of pictures to deceive, delight, astonish, amaze, or otherwise take power over a beholder. Realism, by contrast, is associated with the capacity of pictures to show the truth about things. It doesn’t take power over the observer’s eye so much as it stands in for it, offering a transparent window onto reality, an embodiment of a socially authorized and credible “eyewitness” perspective. The spectator of the realist representation is not supposed to be under the power of the representation, but to be using representation in order to take power over the world. (p. 325)

In the case of autophotography, the power pathway is one of realism, bound by the ethical considerations I will discuss later in Chapter 4. As stated by Susan Sontag (1973), “A photograph passes for incontrovertible proof that a given thing happened. The picture may distort; but there is always a presumption that something exists, or did exist, which is like what’s in the picture” (p. 5). Autophotography offers an “eyewitness” account of one’s experiences, one’s joys, one’s sufferings. Through the photograph, one is given “both objective record and personal testimony, both a faithful copy of an actual moment of reality and an interpretation of that reality. [This is] a feat literature has long aspired to, but could never attain in this literal sense” (Sontag, 2004, p. 26). All are offered to the viewer with the ultimate hope that the capturing of the moment will lead to one’s voice finally being heard. The power of the picture
lies in the immortality of the photograph that surpasses the confines and limitations of one’s own memory. The photograph authenticates the experience and shouts, “I was here!”

Telling one’s story is the telling of who one is. It is the answer to the question of “why” in all that one does. Understanding someone’s story is fundamental to understanding that person. As photographers of life histories, autophotographers give insight into their lives. Telling one’s stories establishes identity “both as content—I am the person who did these things—and as act—I am someone with a story to tell” (Eakin, 2004, p. 5). Autophotographers take their viewer into their inner world. Through their photographs, the autophotographers slice out a moment in time and “testify to time’s relentless melt” (Sontag, 2004, p. 15). Although the viewer is outside of the photographer’s experience, he/she is still allowed an exclusivity that once was solely left to the autophotographer and his/her memories. Susan Sontag (1973) argues that “to take a photograph is to participate in another person’s (or thing’s) mortality, vulnerability, mutability” (p. 15). I would agree with Sontag, and I would also add that the viewer also participates in an exchange with the photographer where he/she participates in the photographer’s mortality and vulnerability. As stated by Richard Kearney (2002), “It is only when haphazard happenings are transformed into story, and thus made memorable over time, that we become full agents of our history” (p. 3). Autophotography is witness work because it tells a story that once was locked away within the history and memory of the individual. Photographs are often deemed as representing reality. Photographs can furnish evidence of things one may doubt or question. An image provides, in some respects, a slice of reality. Photographing one’s story provides a unity in life, both individual and communal (Kearney, 2002, p. 4), through the threads of life histories shared across the autobiographical lens of the camera. Autophotography can offer a “narrative of the inner workings of soul through time, a history of memories, dreams, and
reflections…documents of the soul” (Hillman, 1983, p. 48). Through autophotography, one has the opportunity to do soul work, to face the difficult, and address the shadows of his/her collective unconscious. It is through this soul work that autophotography as witness work may emerge and bring to the conversation dialogues based in social justice.

The telling of one’s life history is witness work. Through working with one’s memories, autobiographers participate in a witness work that is steeped in the “work of justice” (Morris, 2001, p. 201). The stories that were once untold or forbidden have now risen to the surface for exploration and discussion. Memories “throw open wide windows to a view of the mind, to reminiscence, and to the sense of time” (Hillman, 1983, p. 40). The memories that one chooses to capture and share through autophotography are often those “moments that my backward glance lets rise to the surface, moments that have exercised a decisive influence on the nature and direction of my thinking” (Buber, 1967, p. 21). The photographed image already exists in a place of reality that often internal memories are exempt from within their repressed states. With an image, one is faced with a photographed moment in time in which the safety-net of repression does not exist. Where narratives “make us understand, photographs do something else: they haunt us” (Sontag, 2004, p. 89). A photographed image confronts. It calls into question understanding, belief, and perceived memory. Photographs invoke “the miracle of survival [when one] has undertaken the task of continually renewing, of creating memories” (Sontag, 2004, p. 87). James Hillman (1983) argues that one “historicizes to gain a particular kind of distance as a means of separating an act from actuality” (p. 43). With a photographed image, it is harder to historicize or cover up the memory since the image is testament to the occurrence of the event. Memory work is difficult and those who undertake such bidding are bound by ethical considerations within the telling of their lives.
Autophotography is a genre of expression that works well for the oppressed. In her essay, *In Our Glory: Photography and Black Life*, bell hooks (1994) argues that “cameras gave to black folks, irrespective of our class, a means by which we could participate fully in the production of images” (pp. 45-46). When language and culture are barriers in communication rather than facilitators, photography offers an opportunity for a participant to tell his/her story, express his/her pain or joy, without succumbing to the confines of a language and a culture that is not representative of his/her experience. Susan Sontag (2004) argues that “victims are interested in the representation of their own suffering. But they want the suffering to be seen as unique” (p. 112). The autophotographic method is “putting oneself into a certain relation to the world that feels like knowledge—and therefore, like power” (Sontag, 2004, p. 4). The power of autophotographic work comes from the understanding of one’s situation from within. This is an understanding that acknowledges the uniqueness of the individuals plight. For African Americans, “the camera was the central instrument by which blacks could disprove representations of [them] created by white folks….More than any other image-making tool, it offered African Americans disempowered in white culture a way to empower [themselves] through representation” (hooks, 1994, p. 48). Similarly, W.E.B Du Bois’ photographs of African Americans by African Americans at the 1900 Paris Exposition “begin to disrupt the authority of white observers by collapsing the distance between viewers and objects under view that is held traditionally to empower [white] observers”(Smith, 2000, p. 5). With autophotography, photographs become an “oppositional black aesthetic…challenging racist images”(hooks, 1994, p. 46). Furthermore, autophotography affords youth, particularly oppressed youth, the opportunity to “convey their lives as they present them, to portray the world with immediacy as they see it, to create a monograph on meaning in which these youngsters are conscious
collaborators” (Ayers, 1990, p. 271). Autophotography affords the photographer the opportunity to participate in a “genre of telling [that] corresponds to a reemergence of soul” (Hillman, 1983, p. 48). Autophotography does not provide a collective memory because each individual’s story is their own, unique to him/her and each viewer’s interpretation is distinctive of another’s. When one’s understanding is shattered through his/her autophotographic work, then he/she has entered “the forest at the darkest point, where there is no path. Where there’s a way or path, it is someone else’s path; each human being is a unique phenomenon. The idea is to find one’s own pathway” (Campbell, 2004, p. xxvi). Autophotography may not be collective memory; however, it can be “collective instruction” (Sontag, 2004, p. 85). The benefits of autophotography and its empowering of the oppressed can be seen in the documentary film, *Born into Brothels* (2004).

**Born into Brothels: Autophotographic pathways**

The most forgotten and forsaken people in Calcutta's red light district are not the prostitutes, but their children. They are the unwanted, and they epitomize what it means to be an Other. The sex workers of the red light district are afforded no protections or rights under the law, and this is the inheritance for their children. In the face of dismal poverty, abuse, and despair, the young girls in the red light district are destined to become prostitutes, “serving on the line,” like their mothers. As stated by Michael Eigen (1993), “In critical moments we are caught between hallucination, zero, and a tormenting reality. In optimal circumstances we use our tendency to anesthetize ourselves as a resting place and launching station for further encounter with our lacks and distortions” (p. 241). These children live in a continual “critical moment.” They are in a constant state of archetypal orphandom, abandoned in their pain and suffering. Their cameras and the genre of autophotography have given them a means by which to
anesthetize their pain and turn towards an embracing of their lives and a recapturing of their voices.

In *Born into Brothels* (2004), directors Zana Briski and Ross Kauffman chronicle the amazing transformation of the children they come to know in the red light district. Briski, a professional photographer, comes to the red light district to photograph and document the lives of women in the borough. As a white, English woman, Zana is seen as an outsider, a foreigner, and a symbol of the oppressive colonial past under the English. She is faced with many difficulties and challenges in her attempts to document the lives of the women in the red light district. During her years of living in the red light district with these women, she develops strong relationships with the children of the prostitutes. These children live in the brothels with their mothers, suffering the abuse of the brothel owners where they are discarded to the gutters of Calcutta’s worst prostitution district.

Zana Briski or “Zana Auntie,” as the children call her, gives the children lessons in photography and cameras to capture photographs of their surroundings. The children take photographs of their families, their streets, their homes, their friends, and their views. Giving the viewer an insider glimpse into a world closed off to outsiders, the photographs of the children serve as autophotographical remembrance of their experiences in the red light district. These children are afforded a sense of worth because Briski acknowledges that “children and youth are the experts on what fosters or fractures their personal sense of well-being” (Chawla in Dodman, 2004, p. 294). Through their cameras, they are able to document their loss of childhood amidst the sex houses while they simultaneously depict their attempts to grasp at whatever innocence they are afforded through flying kites, traveling to the beach for the first time, or riding bikes in the streets of Calcutta. The moments that the children are taking the photographs are moments of
power for them. W.J.T. Mitchell (1994) argues there is danger and a sense of remoteness in taking pictures of “human subjects [who are] damaged, victimized, and powerless individuals by a relatively privileged observer, often acting as the ‘eye of power,’ the agent of some social, political, or journalistic institution” (p. 288). The difference between the children photographers and W.J.T. Mitchell’s power play description between photographer and subject is that the children are also damaged, victimized, and powerless like their subjects. It is the action of taking pictures, the capturing of their moments that grants them the ‘eye of power’ that Mitchell speaks of.

The children are given a voice to tell their stories through the pictures that they take. As Deborah Britzman states, “The struggle for voice begins when a person attempts to communicate meaning to someone else…Voice suggests relationships: the individual’s relationship to the meaning of her/his experience and hence and the individual’s relationship to the Other, since understanding is a social process” (in Pinar et al., 2004, p. 525). The brothel children epitomize the old adage, “Children should be seen and not heard.” In fact, in the brothels of Calcutta, these children should not even be seen. Their birth-right is silence, but through the possibilities of photography and artistic expression, the children are given opportunities to validate their existence and they are given a purpose for living. One of the boys in the film, Gour, states, “I want to show in the pictures how people live in the city. I want to put across the behavior of man” (Kaufman, 2004). Even at such young ages, ages 10-14, the children have a sense of the injustices that they face as well as the cruelties of man. Furthermore, they seek to understand the person who is at the heart of their suffering, their mothers and crucial to their mental and soul survival is the understanding of their mothers (Lawson, 2000, p. 302).
The children of *Born into Brothels* use the methodology of autophotography to capture their lives in films and tell their stories. The use of their cameras to capture their lives as opposed to their writing their stories allows them greater freedom. These children are uneducated and barely literate. Their use of photography to tell their stories “circumvents some of the rigid power structures associated with the use of language” (Dodman, 2003, p. 302), and provides an alternate view into the ways which young people in the red light districts of Calcutta relate to their surroundings. Furthermore, the choice of subjects and places that the children choose to photograph demonstrates how the students construct their environments and relate to them. This gives the viewer of the photographs a glimpse at how the children understand their situations as well as a glimpse into areas and ways of life seldom seen by outsiders. The photographs of the children serve as a form of autophotography that is “ethically instructive,” where the viewer “encounters a perspective that makes us judge ourselves, helps us to reevaluate our moral practice or ideals” (Barbour 2004, p. 97). As the viewer looks upon the photographs of these children, it is his/her active engagement with the image as a process of self-revaluation that keeps the viewer from a place of voyeurism. To simply gaze upon the picture and not ask one’s self “How can this happen?” and “What can be done?” is to hold one’s self beside the sidelines, at a distance, and in a place of power over these children. Gazing upon these images without inspiring action crushes autophotography as a curriculum of social justice.

The children are aware of their situation. They are aware that the current states serve as the root of their possible futures. When faced with the pain and difficulties of their existence, the children have the possibility of depression, mental illness, or just becoming crazy, to look forward to. As stated by Christina Crawford (1997) in Lawson’s (2000), *Understanding the Borderline Mother*, “You just ease into being crazy…it doesn’t happen overnight…you get tired
of the constant battle with no victories. You become exhausted” (p. 29). For the children, photography becomes an opportunity to escape emotionally and mentally in the moment. One of the young girls in the film, Suchitra, states “When I have a camera in my hands I feel happy. I feel like I am learning something…I can be someone” (Kaufman, 2004). The photographs are truly windows into the souls of these children and their lived experiences. The cameras provide the children with an awakening to the “awe and zeal of the human mind…a new sense of what it is to be human is born” (Campbell, 2004, p. 93). As stated on the Kids with Cameras website, “The photographs taken by the children are not merely examples of remarkable observation and talent; they reflect something much larger, morally encouraging, and even politically volatile: art as an immensely liberating and empowering force”. The photography of the children serves as an autobiographical, political, artistic view of their world and their reality.

The photographs of the children of Born into Brothels are an aesthetic, autophotographical curriculum of awareness. Those who view the pictures are compelled by their sorrow and simultaneous joy of life. They serve as lessons of the triumph and power of the human spirit for all who view them. The Kids with Cameras website describes the essence of the photographs as “prisms into their souls, rather than anthropological curiosities or primitive imagery, and a true testimony of the power of the indelible creative spirit.” The autophotographical work of the children allows for exploration of “places of great and troubled history, reflection, controversy, and thought” (Jardine, 2003a, p. 72). Through photography, the children are afforded an importance that their families and home lives do not grant them. Paulo Freire states, “Any situation in which some individuals prevent others from engaging in the process of inquiry is one of violence. The means used are not important; to alienate human beings from their own decision-making is to change them into objects” (Freire, 1970, p. 85).
From the moment that they are taking the picture, the children are no longer objects, but rather, they become the owners of their own histories.

The children of *Born into Brothels* were afforded an opportunity to be heard. These are children who had so much to say; however, because of the social constructs of their society, they were silenced and forgotten. Autophotography gave them back the voices that were taken from them. By giving them their voices, the act of photography allows the children to face the objects that could succumb to their ambivalence and in turn manifest into depression in later life (Likierman, 2001, p. 107). If the children were to accept their realities as fixed and unchangeable, then there would be little hope for their escape from the Calcutta ghetto. They would remain idle at the threshold of their transformative journey, never facing the shadow dragon that stands in the way of their soul’s journey. Locked in their Jungian personas, steeped in the silence of their roles in the red light district, these children would remain forever restricted to the confines of their limited realities. However, their photography gave them the opportunity to face and “name” that which held them in their place; whereby, they are able to identify the root of their sadness and attempt to change it before they become cold to the possibility of a different reality. The children are able to see the face of the Other within their images. Similarly, those who view the children’s photographs are also given an opportunity to see the face of the Other in their images. Seeing the face of the Other, legitimizes one’s own existence, and it restrains him/her from defining the Other in terms of one’s self. When the photographer or viewer can truly see the Other, even when the Other is a self portrait, then the Other is no longer an object. As stated by Paulo Freire (1970), “The oppressor’s consciousness tends to transform everything surrounding it into an object of its domination…everything is reduced to the status of objects at its disposal” (p. 58). A relationship exists between the photographer and image, and
the viewer and the image. It is a relationship based in a “reciprocity of giving: you say You to it and give yourself to it; it says You to you and gives itself to you” (Buber, 1916, p. 84). When the photographer and viewer participate in this reciprocity, one is no longer in power over the image and a new awareness speaks to him/her. The image is no longer there for consumption; but rather, it exists as a relation that complicates, questions, and inspires action in the name of social justice.

Through their cameras, the children become the aggressors rather than the victims. The photograph becomes “not only like its subject, a homage to the subject. It is part of, an extension of that subject; and a potent means of acquiring it, of gaining control over it” (Sontag, 1973, p. 155). The children are able to face the shadow sides of their collective unconscious through their cameras and capture control. They change from “the person threatened to the person who makes the threat” (Freud, 1966, p. 113). The camera becomes a tool of inquisition in which the child is allowed to speak against those who traditionally silence him/her. With taking photographs, “there is an aggression implicit in every use” (Sontag, 1973, p. 7). With their cameras, they no longer view themselves as living on the fringe of society; but rather, they recognize that they have always been on the inside. They are no longer “beings for others,” but rather, “beings for themselves” (Freire, 1970, p. 74). Rather than deny his/her pain, which is a common reaction to external danger, the child faces it through the lens of the camera as opposed to repressing it (Freud, 1966, p. 109). The camera becomes the sword that the children use to face their dragons along their journeys of transformation. Overall, the action of the photography serves the mental health of the child and as a result, it serves the adults they are to become.

Despite being immersed in the horrors of their environment, the children are still able to identify and recognize the painful realities of their collective lives. Susan Sontag (1973) argues
that “the force of a photograph is that it keeps open to scrutiny instants which the normal flow of time immediately replaces” (p. 111). Photographs offer a second opportunity beyond the limitations of the present moment. As stated by Avijit, the most promising photographer of the children, while looking at a photograph taken by a fellow child photographer, “This is a good picture. We get a good sense of how these people live and though there is sadness in it and though it is hard to face, we must look at it because it is truth.” (Kaufman, 2004). The reality projected in the photograph, Avijit references, gives the children the humanity they need to help them live. The children are able to “recognize the imperfection around [them] with compassion. The principle of compassion is that which converts disillusionment into a participatory companionship” (Campbell, 2004, p. 78). It is through compassion that the children are able to alter their views on their environment. Despite being immersed in the horrors of their situations, the children still retain the capacity to compassionately, yet critically, analyze their lives.

Autophotography allows for multiple possibilities of expression and knowing. In a society where language can serve as both a liberator as well as a persecutor, the possibilities of other avenues of autobiographical inquiry beyond the written word are a necessity. Autophotography serves as a form of aesthetic inquiry that “questions the everyday, the conventional, and asks us to view knowledge, teaching, and learning from multiple perspectives, to climb out from submerged perceptions, and see as if for the first time”(Pinar et al., 2004, p. 605). Autophotography can work to counteract the risks that surround the “popular history of school textbooks and mass media” (Boler, 1999, p. 185). Autophotography offers one an opportunity to embark on a journey of the soul that “awakens one’s awe” (Campbell, 2004, p. 89) so as to pull one through and over the threshold of his/her journey of transformation.
Autophotography allows the photographer to discover his/her “creative urges and positive integrative forces and the photographer is enabled to look at what is inside the self to see whatever is there, the chaos, the tensions, the death, as well as the beauty and the innate liveliness” (Winnicott, 1949, p. 556). As seen in the photographs of the children in Born into Brothels, photography can be a form of autobiographic, aesthetic inquiry that opens spaces for conversation, questioning, and reflection. The photographs awaken one’s myths which “offer the multiplicity of meanings inherent in [one’s] life” (Hillman, 1975, p. 158). These myths ignite the possibilities of different realities based on multiple forms of knowing and living, “which start us imagining, questioning, going deeper” (Hillman, 1975, p. 158), so that the result is the emergence and practice of social justice. Through the process of currere, as it applies to the viewing and the deconstructing of one’s autophotography, he/she can bring about change within him/her and in turn bring about a change in the world. As a result, he/she is as an artist, “a magical helper. Evoking symbols and motifs that connect us to our deeper selves, they can help us along the heroic journey of our own lives” (Campbell, 2004, p. 132). In order for the autophotographic process to be individually transformative and socially revolutionizing, it must be approached ethically. Without ethics, any transformation and societal change will be lost to the devastation of the soul and the birth or re-birth of its shadow sides.
CHAPTER 4:
THE ETHICS OF AN AUTOPHOTOGRAPHIC CURRICULUM

A visit to a Barnes and Noble Bookstore, can make anyone aware that our society is truly in the “age of memoir.” At the entrance of the store, the front table is filled with autobiographies that tell the life histories of their authors and in turn those connected with them. More often than not, the book of the month in Oprah’s Book Club is an autobiographical account of some kind. Television shows with the highest ratings are often “reality shows” that follow the daily lives of a family, for instance, Jon and Kate plus 8, Jersey Shore, or the Real Housewives of Orange County or Atlanta. All of this leads to the question: Why is society so interested in the life stories of complete strangers? Is it our voyeuristic natures…are we wanting to peer into someone else’s life, so that we can justify that our life isn’t so bad or that we aren’t alone in our own misery? Could we be searching for an awareness and insight about our own lives in the reading or viewing of the lives of others? Why this fascination? I can only speculate as to why our society has placed itself into the “age of memoir;” however, this chapter’s purpose is not to find answers for this speculation. Rather, this chapter accepts the fact that society is obsessed with the stories of one another and, therefore, a need exists for an ethical discussion around the topic of working autobiographically, and specifically, in terms of this dissertation’s focus, autophotography.

What are the ethics that should govern autophotography? What are the ethical obligations of someone who is photographing his/her story? With regards to photography, when does a photographer become a voyeur? When does the viewer become a voyeur? What are the ethical considerations of the viewer who is viewing the life history of another? How can a photograph be art at the same time that it depicts tragedy and pain? Susan Sontag (1973) states,
There is something predatory in the act of taking a picture. To photograph people is to violate them, by seeing them as they never see themselves, by having knowledge of them that they can never have; it turns people into objects that can be symbolically possessed (p. 14).

Although I believe that working autobiographically, specifically through autophotography, can promote growth and understanding, there are risks that the photographer, the photographed, and the viewer need to consider. One must always be cautious when dealing with the life story of another, as well as telling his/her own story. James Hillman (1996b) argues, “There seems a curious need to falsify, disguise, or destroy the story of your life.” (p. 172). This chapter seeks to answer these questions and address these risks through an analysis of the elements of new awareness in autophotographical work, the ethical obligations of working through the currere process within autophotography, and the ethical duty of the viewer in his/her interactions or interpretations of one’s own life story or that of another. This chapter will conclude with an analysis of the ethics of autophotography as a genre of voice for the oppressed and silenced.

Finding Awareness

Exposing reality is the ethical objective of autophotographical work. Working autophotographically, specifically through the currere process, requires one to search for the masked realities within his/her life, not simply search for the best perception of things or events in his/her past. As stated by Martin Buber (1947), “I am not concerned with the pure; I am concerned with the turbid, the repressed, the pedestrian, with the toil and dull contrariness—and with the breakthrough” (p. 41). Reality is not always pure. In fact, the reality of one’s life is often dark and twisted. Sometimes the covering of one’s reality can hold as much power as the awareness of it, because these coverings often bring light onto the darker places in one’s soul.
James Hillman (1996b) argues, “The disguises and boastings are not mere cover-ups, daydreams, and grandiose fantasies. They are fears of loss, fears of colonization, fears of slavery to a normalizing system that, by capturing my image in biography, might take over and walk away with my soul” (p. 189). When one is made aware of what lies behind the false boasts, then those disguises serve to create spaces for breakthrough. These spaces are where reality serves the autophotographer and the viewer as a realization of the areas that were once hidden and forbidden. Megan Boler (1999) argues that with regards to uncovering a disguised reality, one must hold two understandings. First, that reality is not static and fixed. Second, in response to the power of the image, the viewer needs to accept responsibility as a co-producer of this reality (Boler 1999, p. 166). Awareness allows for the disruption of what is taken for granted, and it is through this disruption that discussion and learning take place. Embracing one’s new awareness, means that one is open to learn and grow whereby he/she will “have to leave the world and the experiences he/she knows” (Pearson 1991, p. 126). The awareness of one’s reality is at the heart of the regressive phase of the currere process. This is the point in the hero’s journey when the hero encounters the threshold of his/her journey. If one turns away from his/her reality and does not embark on his/her journey, then his/her failure to engage the real “correlates with passive empathy and risks annihilating the other” (Boler 1999, p. 166). Being open to this new awareness, is the action which propels the hero forward beyond the threshold and into his/her journey.

It is the moment when the Innocent is awakened and placed in a state of Orphandom, whereby the Seeker archetype takes hold and propels the individual farther in search of a deeper understanding. As stated by Janet Miller (2005), “Autobiography as an educational practice can construct categories as permanently open, sometimes unknowable and therefore undesignatable
fields of difference...these are the tensions with which one attempts to “do” autobiography as a form of educational inquiry”(p. 55). The reality of autophotography creates the tensions that Janet Miller references. It awakens the forgotten and taken for granted by opening doors to inquiry and reflection. When one does not face a new awareness, he/she stops short of committing to a true journey of transformation. Rather than the Seeker archetype propelling one forward, the Wanderer comes to fruition and one remains docile within the status quo deceiving himself/herself that he/she is content, while all the while dreaming of something different or better. The awareness that arises from autophotographical work brings forth an ethical duty to express this new awareness outwardly. Without this awareness, one is “hollowed out from inside and devoured by the lie which is concealed in repression and in its fatal unwillingness to look reality in the face” (Neumann, 1943, p. 113). But, there is always something inside that “doesn’t want to lay out the facts for fear they will be taken to be the truth, and the only truth” (Hillman 1996b, p. 176). However, an awareness of one’s multiple truths can open doors which allow one to move along the path of individuation, and individuation is the “precondition of all types of broader social change” (Mayes, 2005, p. 85). New awareness can transform the Wanderer to the Seeker whereby

Seeking takes on a different, deeper quality. Suddenly, [one] is seeking spiritual depth and authenticity, and [one] knows it is not just a change in environment—mates, work, place—[one] seeks but a change in him/herself. At the highest level, the Seeker finds the truth he or she sought....in this way [one] can be both Seeker and oracle, sharing [one’s] questions and [one’s] insights with one another (Pearson, 1991, p. 128).

Without awareness of the possibility of a different reality, one never feels a need to seek something different and in turn share his/her experience with another.
Autophotographical work should serve as a catalyst for communication and a tool through which thinking and feeling are unblocked (Morris, 2001, p. 166). Especially in the case of autophotography where “each photograph is only a fragment, its moral and emotional weight depends on where it is inserted” (Sontag, 1973, p. 106), it is essential that both the photographer and the viewer seek what is real behind the image and its telling. Captions may help to solidify the meaning behind a picture; however, “no caption can permanently restrict or secure a picture’s meaning” (Sontag, 1973, p. 108). The power of the image is still ultimately in the hands of interpretation. This is a dangerous place for awareness to lie. It is the space between the photograph as actual reality and the photograph as a version of reality where awareness exists. It is imperative that both the photographer, as well as the viewer, realize the propensity of one’s new awareness to fall in the “in between,” and they must actively seek it out. It is this active seeking that unlocks the transformation that accompanies the unblocking of the repressed.

Without a critical view of autophotographical work and an open discussion of those stories, the viewer risks succumbing to a piece based on “(a) dogmatic realism or (b) skeptical relativism” (Kearney, 2002, p. 69). As stated by Richard Kearney (2002), “Narrative remembrance is not always on the side of angels” (p. 83). Just because autophotography is “suppose to be” grounded in reality does not mean that it cannot succumb to becoming a piece of dogma.

Autophotographical work is biased. Within autophotography, every story regards the events told and the actors featured in some evaluative light (Kearney, 2002, p. 155). Similarly, Susan Sontag (1973) argues, “Although there is a sense in which the camera does indeed capture reality, not just interpret it; photographs are as much an interpretation of the world as paintings and drawings are” (p. 6). Furthermore, “Photography’s program of realism actually implies that
reality is hidden” (Sontag, 1973, p. 120). A photograph discloses at the same time what it seeks to explain. Through photographs, one may “depict realities that already exist, though only the camera can disclose them. And they depict an individual’s temperament, discovering itself through the camera’s cropping of reality” (Sontag, 1973, p. 122). A photograph reveals as much about the photographer as the memory that is captured in the still. At the moment the shutter of the camera closes, a judgment has been made by the photographer as to the value and reality of his/her picture. Photographers have the potential to persuade, influence, or deceive their audience. Autophotographers who fail to tell what is real, “do more than violate a literary convention governing nonfiction as a genre, they disobey a moral imperative” (Eakin, 2004, p. 3). Photographs shared autophotographically offer first hand glimpses into the realities of our past, and therefore they are bound by the same ethics of telling as all non-fiction work. I would argue that autophotography has more power than the typical historical record, for the stories told through the image are often immediately taken as real; they are visual evidence of an occurrence.

The harsh reality in photography can be shrouded by the search for the photogenic. Reality be ugly and hard to look at. The real world is often not photogenic. It may not make for a pretty picture. Susan Sontag (1973) states, “A way of certifying experience, taking photographs is also a way of refusing it—by limiting experience to a search for the photogenic” (p. 9). Autophotography that is to serve the purposes of social justice needs to expose reality, despite the possibility that it may not be comforting to look at. Susan Sontag (2004) argues, 

Transforming is what art does, but photography that bears witness to the calamitous and the reprehensible is much criticized if it seems “aesthetic;” that it is too much like art….Photographs that depict suffering shouldn’t be beautiful, as captions shouldn’t
moralize. In this view, a beautiful photograph drains attention from the sobering subject and turns it toward the medium itself (pp. 76-77).

Autophotography diverges from the goals of most photography in that its foundation is not in beauty, per se. Susan Sontag (2004) describes beautifying in photography as “a classic operation of the camera that tends to bleach out a moral response to what is shown” (p. 81). This is not to say that an autophotographic image may not be beautiful. On the contrary, awareness may come through the realization that a very basic image, such as a mother washing clothes or children playing soccer, may hold a beauty greater than anything previously viewed. Still, the principle behind autophotography is a capturing of a reality, even if that reality is ugly and painful to look at.

Roland Barthes (1980) describes his encounter with the truth in a photograph as painful. He states, “If my efforts are painful, if I am anguished, it is because sometimes I get closer, I am burning: in a certain photograph I believe I perceive the lineaments of truth” (Barthes 1980, p. 100). Pain is sometimes a result of facing the truth; however, pain can be transformative. Barthes (1980) states further that “Society is concerned to tame the photograph; to temper the madness which keeps threatening to explode in the face of whoever looks at it” (p. 117). The threat of the photograph is its potential to expose unwanted truths. In order to combat this threat, Barthes (1980) argues that society will either transform the photograph to art because “no art is mad” (p. 117) or society will “generalize, gregarize, banalize [the photograph] until it is no longer confronted by an image in relation to which it can mark itself, asset its special character, its scandal, its madness” (p. 118). Society’s goal is often to tame the photograph so that the threat of its reality might not move one to act in contradiction to society’s norms. My argument for autophotography as curriculum counters society’s goal. For autophotography to be an ethical
practice, it must unshadow the truths. The autophotographer must not seek the idealized image, but rather, the image that captures a moment, where the dualities of beauty and ugliness, hope and despair, joy and pain come together within the telling of a story.

Autophotographical work “invites us to become not just agents in our own lives, but narrators and readers as well” (Kearney, 2002, p. 156). Through the photographing of one’s life, he/she has the opportunity to place one’s self in the space between the inner self and the outer display. He/She may serve the dual role of photographer and viewer. By serving this dual role, one breaks down the walls between the private and the public; whereby, the private is made public. James Hillman (1983) argues,

> As long as the problem is locked into the old mechanical dualities of soul and world, inner and outer, psychological and medical, we chug down the same old ruts. Instead we have to see the inner necessity of historical events, out there, in the events themselves, where ‘inner’ no longer means private and owned by a self or a soul or an ego, where inner is not a literalized place inside a subject, but the subjectivity in events and that attitude which interiorizes those events, goes into them in search of psychological depths (p. 25).

Autophotographic work opens the door of opportunity for both the individual working autophotographically as well as the viewer of their work to see soul in the external. This view of worldly events helps one to battle the inner shadows that may repress a clear view and understanding of events. Working autophotographically, allows one to move past the “face” of the persona that he/she shows to society and address the truths that may transform his/her soul. Failing to see soul in one’s surroundings, maintains the grasp and hold of the Innocent archetype.
where nothing is challenged, the persona remains dominant, and the status quo is secured. Soul offers reality, and it is a reality that can be brought to light through the image of the camera.

Autophotography offers one the opportunity to capture a self-defining experience. The image is a powerful tool “for dealing with things everybody knows about but isn’t attending to. Photographs are intended to represent something you don’t see” (Gowin cited in Sontag, 2004, p. 200). Photographs are moving, powerful images that complicate one’s view through the images that they depict. Autophotography offers one the power of the image while telling his/her story; however, it is not free of risks and complications. Susan Sontag (1973) argues,

Photography reinforces a nominalist view of social reality as consisting of small units of apparently infinite number—as the number of photographs that could be taken of anything is unlimited. Through photographs, the world becomes a series of unrelated, freestanding particles; and history, past and present, a set of anecdotes. The camera makes reality atomic, manageable, and opaque. It is a view of the world which denies interconnectedness, continuity, but which confers on each moment the character of a mystery (pp. 22-23).

I would agree with Sontag that photography does have the potential to compartmentalize memory and the past; however, I believe the very nature of autophotography seeks to break away from this tendency. Autophotography is an approach to photography where one looks for the inward in his/her outward surroundings and experiences. It is the capturing of the exterior in a way that reflects the interior. This collapse of the duality of inward and outward lends itself to an understanding of one’s self that finds relationships between events. Whereby, the images captured are not separate from each other, not placed in an order so as to be manageable, but rather, they are congruities that rely on each other to tell one’s story autophotographically.
Working autophotographically serves a moral purpose for the one working through the process as well as for those participating outside of the cycle. People tell the stories that validate their existence and their ways of life. Whether autophotography serves a moral good, is determined by the meanings, judgments, and actions that are taken by both the person working autophotographically as well as those of the viewer. Autophotography has the potential to not only tell a story, but also, expose a structure. According to James Hillman (1983),

This structure is then applied to other events across time and to images regardless of context…No longer is it a question of what happened next and how did one move through this situation into the next one. Rather, it is a question of instances exemplifying principles, images as allegories, scenes as enactments in time of eternal verities (p. 22).

Autophotography surpasses the confines and restrictions of the temporal and offers an opportunity to expose the truth as a transformative act. Autophotography offers one an opportunity to become aware, visually, of patterns that exist in one’s relationship with others as well as within himself/herself. Despite this possibility for transformative awareness, one needs to be aware of the possibility of the photograph replacing memory. Replacing memory with a photographed image is not an action that embraces truth and transformation, especially if the photograph is a distortion of the memory. Roland Barthes (1980) argues,

Not only is the photograph never, in essence, a memory, but it actually blocks memory, quickly becomes a counter-memory….The photograph is violent: not because it shows violent things, but because on each occasion it fills the sight by force, and because in it nothing can be refused or transformed (p. 91).

Generally, people do not question the validity of an image and the reality that is behind it. Quite often they remember their memory as the photograph. Susan Sontag (2004) argues, “The
problem is not that people remember through photographs, but that they remember only the photographs. This remembering through photographs eclipses other forms of understanding, and remembering (p. 89). This is a dangerous occurrence if the photographer is not guided by exposing realities, as his/her recollection of the event can be later distorted as well as his/her audience can be easily controlled and manipulated by the false depiction of the photograph versus its truth. As stated by Nancy Miller (2004), “I believed that autobiographers could and should reach unequivocally for the verifiable truth that corresponded to the events they signed their names to” (p. 149). The telling of one’s story has great power. These testimonies are what “make our lives worth living” (Kearney, 2002, p. 3). As a result, there are strong ethical considerations when the telling of stories is based on one’s life and the lives of others. For this reason, the roles and duties of those working autophotographically as well as the viewers of autophotographical work should be based within an ethical standard of truth telling and social justice action.

Those who do the work

Autophotographical discourse provides meaning to the lives of its narrators and in turn shines light on their identities and their moralities (Howes, 2004, p. 246). Autophotography answers the question: “What is it good to be?”(Howes, 2004, p. 246). Through the actions of autophotographers, viewers are given glimpses at moral decision making and are expected to ask of themselves: “Is this what I would do?” Within autophotographical work, one’s “identity becomes crucially implicated in how she or he makes these choices because a person’s responses are a measure of his or her character” (Frank, 2004, p. 174). Viewers of autophotography look to the actions and responses of the Other in the face of decision-making, pain, and turmoil.
Viewers often cast themselves onto the experiences of the Other and therefore they look to see how the autophotographer handled a situation possibly similar to their own.

Autophotographies are stories of survival. Especially in cases of trauma or victim stories, viewers seek the knowledge that someone lived through whatever horror is being depicted. Perhaps, the viewer is seeking what Alice Miller (2005) calls a “helping witness or enlightened witness” (p. 27) that can help them admit the painful truths in their own lives. Therefore, those sharing their autophotographical work have an ethical duty to others within the presentation of their personal stories. First and foremost, their obligation is to reality, and within that obligation to reality, lays their ethical duty to tell their stories in ways so that growth, not harm, occurs. This is essential if autophotography and *currere* are to be transformative players in the archetypal journey of the soul.

Self-revelation needs to extend beyond “a form of flashing” (Eakin, 1999, p. 143). Alice Miller (2005) refers to the inner pain which is so often confessed in autobiographic works as a “suitcase filled with shame and suffering” (p. 180). In order for the opening of this suitcase to be an ethical action, it needs to spur discussion and thinking, rather than simply serve as a “tell all” that satisfies society’s voyeurism. As stated by Marla Morris (2001), “Testimony, if used to report facts is a way of not thinking and not feeling, may serve as a repression” (p. 166). Fact regurgitation is “a form of flashing.” It is a method of autophotographical work that supports no positive ends. Approaching autophotography from the stance of a mere reporting of facts removes the transformative possibilities of autophotography. This approach likens the photographer to a voyeur. Susan Sontag (1973) states,

Taking photographs has set up a chronic voyeuristic relation to the world which levels the meaning of all events….Photographing is essentially an act of non-intervention….To take
a picture is to have an interest in things as they are, in the status quo remaining unchanged (at least for as long as it takes to get a “good” picture), to be in complicity with whatever makes a subject interesting, worth photographing—including, when that is the interest, another person’s pain or misfortune (pp. 11-12).

This critical view of photography, albeit true in most circumstances, conflicts with the transformative possibilities that exist for an autophotographer. Autophotography does not seek the status quo, but rather, it seeks to disrupt it and call it into question. The overarching goal of autophotography is for the photograph(s) to bring to light the truths that have been repressed or hidden from one’s conscious. It is the tool that propels one across the threshold of his/her hero’s journey and into the regressive and progressive phases of the currere process. The photographer as a voyeur has no role in the transformative work of autophotography.

Through one’s photographing of his/her story, there is the danger of being judgmental. This does not mean that moral judgments should not be made, but rather, that “moral judgment is not negated but made more complex” (Barbour, 2004, p. 74). The process through which an autophotographer tells his/her story needs to be unique to his/her story. The stories cannot dictate an “all-sweeping” judgment towards the actions committed by others. Susan Sontag (1973) states, “The camera is a kind of passport that annihilates moral boundaries and social inhibitions, freeing the photographer from a responsibility toward the people photographed” (p. 41). Similarly, Frantz Fanon (1963) states, “Every onlooker is either a coward or a traitor” (p. 199). I would argue that Sontag’s argument does not match the goals of autophotography and currere as processes that pursue social justice. The autophotographer has a responsibility to the people photographed, and this responsibility should be governed by his/her ethics to tell and display truth. Furthermore, autophotographers should be given opportunities to reflect upon their
own photographs. This reflective action calls into question the issues of the unseen and the seen within his/her picture. Reflecting on the photograph, asks the autophotographer to look upon his/her subjects, address their meaning to him/her, and become a participant in their lives. This participation directly addresses Fanon’s critique of an onlooker as “a coward or a traitor.” Through their participation, the autophotographer does not stand idly by in the face of injustice.

Autophotography is a genre filled with responsibilities and ethical considerations. As a non-fiction genre, it should hold truth as its foundation; however, within the multiple truths of the autophotographer, there live the truths of those connected to him/her. One’s life is not based in solitude, and therefore, the telling of one’s life story cannot be a solo event (Miller, 2004, p. 147). Nancy Miller (2004) quotes George Sand on Rousseau’s Confessions, “Just as our lives exist in human solidarity, all of us inextricably ‘bound up with one another,’ so too does the genre” (Sand cited in Miller, p. 147). The genre of autophotography is not based in solitude. The life telling of any autophotographical work is intertwined with the life stories of those connected to and around the work. Claudia Mills (2004) takes it a step further in stating that,

If we don’t write/ [photograph] about the hurtful, harmful, dark, dangerous things, we won’t write/ [photograph] anything anybody will want to read/ [view]. And we won’t get published either. This is the complementary source of tension in a writer’s/ [photographer’s] life: we can’t use our most interesting family stories as material, but we can’t give them up, either (p. 105).

It is a catch-22 for those doing autophotographical work. Society wants the juicy, the dirty. How does one balance that desire of his/her audience with the sanctity of the privacy of those associated with his/her life? Similarly, how does a photographer capture an image that might be aesthetically pleasing while it simultaneously depicts someone’s tragedy and pain? An ethic of
photographing needs to exist that protects those associated with the autophotographer. A protection is needed for those people whose stories and pain are undoubtedly shared through the photographing of one’s own story.

With the photographing of one’s own story, there is always the risk of exhibiting the story of another in a light that is less than favorable to that person. There is a danger of the work’s audience judging someone, fairly or unfairly, based on “isolated bits of personal information that are taken out of context” (Rosen in Eakin, 2004, p. 8). It is often hard to tell within a story where one life begins and another ends (Eakin, 2004, p. 8). Paul Eakin (1999) argues, “Identities and lives are more entangled with those of others than we tend to acknowledge in the culture of individualism” (p. 186) and for this reason, one must revise his/her “existing models of privacy, personhood, and ethics” (Eakin, 1999, p. 186). The autophotographer has an ethical duty to the people involved within his/her story. As stated by Rosen in Eakin (2004), “There are few acts more aggressive than describing someone else” (p. 8). This fact is particularly true with the power of the photographic image. Capturing someone else’s experience, while shooting one’s photograph, is violating. However, the insight that may be gained by the photographer, as well as the viewer, may counter this violation if true thinking and reflection occur. The ethical approach to telling one’s story is to make something of the experiences (Couser, 2004, p. 33). This “something” is a conversation or a discussion of the truth. With the complexities that surround autophotographical work, the opening of discussion and the broadening of awareness on its issues are the first steps towards coming to terms with the genre’s ethical concerns. Autophotographical work that is used with the goal of transformation needs to link the desires of those doing the work to those exposed to the work, so that, one’s transformation can not be at the sacrifice of another’s.
Those who view the Work

Viewers of autophotographies are bound by ethical considerations. Viewing the life history of an individual is not a path to be treaded lightly. In our age of voyeurism, where society is filled with reality television shows, daytime talk shows, and tell-all-sex books, the duty and role of the viewer is as important as the photographer. W.J.T. Mitchell (1994) states,

There is something deeply disturbing, even disagreeable, about this (unavoidable) aestheticizing response to what after all is a real person in desperately impoverished circumstance. Why should we have a right to look on this woman and find her fatigue, pain, and anxiety beautiful? What give us the right to look upon her, as if we were God’s spies? (p. 294)

The questions Mitchell asks are at the heart of autophotography as an ethical practice. Especially in the cases of trauma stories “autobiography forces the reader to assume a position of masochism or voyeurism” (Gilmore, 2001, p. 22). When a viewer becomes a voyeur, it is an outcome that interrupts and disrupts the transformative possibility of autophotographic works. Being a voyeur is placing one’s self in a position of power over the image, where one has the option whether to be moved or unmoved by the reality and pain the image shares. Voyeurism allows one to “identify with dominant representations of good and evil while permitting a gaping distance between the self and other” (Boler, 1999, p. 184). Susan Sontag (1973) argues,

The quality of feeling, including moral outrage, that people can muster in response to photographs of the oppressed, the exploited, the starving, and the massacred also depends on the degree of their familiarity with these images….Photographs shock insofar as they show something novel (p. 19).
It is the shock of the photograph that may cause the “fortunate fall” and propel one along a journey of transformation. This may occur for the photographer who captures the image or for the viewer who sees the image at a later moment. The trouble with photographs that depict painful realities is that the more one views them, most likely, the more one becomes immune to the photographs’ transformative effects. When one has become anesthetized to the horror or the beauty that one might view in a photograph, then he/she has becomes a voyeur. Allan Guggenbuhl (2009) states,

We shake our heads when we see horrid pictures of a car bombing in Kabul, but stay glued to the screen. When we finally see the images, we are transformed, shocked, energized, and alerted. [And] although we consciously condemn violence, we are attracted to acts of brutality. It seems we continuously need to be fed with stories and images of the dreadful (p. 41).

Similar to Guggenbuhl’s description, the voyeur arises at the point when an image no longer disturbs or inspires one enough to move, to converse, to intervene, or to change. When one is a voyeur, he/she is not on the side of ethics. The photograph’s transformative possibility is shrouded and lost to the voyeur’s false expression of sentimentality or pity. The role of the voyeur is that of a spectator, of in-action. A voyeur is an accomplice to the injustice revealed in the image. In order for autophotography to be transformative, one cannot sit idly by as a spectator. He/She must develop an “ethic of seeing” (Sontag, 1973, p. 3) that encourages him/her to act and to become a participant.

An ethic of seeing is grounded in social justice action. It allows one to be moved and disturbed towards a direction that will bring about change within the self as well as society. An ethic of seeing removes the image from its role as an object, and it places it in relation to the
viewer so that reflection and transformation might occur. Susan Sontag (1973) describes an image “as an object, light weight, cheap to produce, easy to carry about, accumulate, store” (p. 3). In order for autophotography to be an ethical act, in both the taking of autophotographies and their viewing, one must not regard the power of an image as fleeting. It must not be looked upon as an object, but rather, as a reflection. Looking at images in this manner requires one to hold an active relationship with the image. This relationship will not occur if the viewer or photographer serves merely as a docile spectator. Roland Barthes (1980) argues that there are two relationships that one might hold with an image (p. 26). The first relationship is the *studium* which is “the application to a thing, taste for someone, a kind of general, enthusiastic commitment…It is by stadium that [one] is interested in so many photographs, whether [one] receives them as political testimony or enjoy them as good historical scenes” (Barthes 1980, p. 26). The *studium* regards pictures as historical images or pretty pictures that may be interesting or “nice” to look at. His second relationship is the *punctum* (Barthes, 1980, p. 27), which interrupts the *studium*. The *punctum* is “the element which rises from the scene, shoots out of it like an arrow, and pierces me…A photograph’s punctum is that accident which pricks me, (but also bruises me, is poignant to me)”(Barthes, 1980, p. 26-27). Autophotography as an ethical practice seeks the “punctum” that Barthes describes. Allowing oneself to be open to the “punctum,” is the first step in an ethic of seeing that combats voyeurism.

Autophotography may provide one a view into the life of the Other as a spectator, rather than a participant in a conversation. This is a dangerous possibility and one that is counter to an ethic of seeing and the goals of social justice. In order for autophotography to be on the side of social justice, the image should bring about conversations that disrupt one’s understanding and bring to light truths one has repressed. To be a participant in the conversation, one must ask not
only what happened, but also, why it happened. These questions provide a plot that can “reveal human intentions” (Hillman, 1983, p. 9). In seeking the answer to “why,” one becomes engaged in the telling and a participant in the understanding of the autophotographical work. The participatory act of asking “why?” and the seeking of a plot to the story or image, removes the photographer, as well as the viewer, from the sedentary role of spectator. Photographing and viewing the photograph become purposeful actions of thinking. James Hillman (1983) describes plot within psychoanalysis as the theories that help to explain the question “why?” He states, “They are the ways in which we put the intentions of human nature together so that we can understand the why between the sequence of events in a story” (p. 9). Understanding the “why” helps to bring to light the intentionality behind the action. This action may be the actual decision to choose a particular image to photograph, or it may explain the reason for the action within the image. Seeking the answer to “why” is seeking the truth in the image. It is the seeking of meaning or of a message within the picture. However, as stated by Susan Sontag (1973), “If photographs are messages, the message is both transparent and mysterious” (p. 111). There is a duality in photography whereby it reveals as much as it conceals. For this reason, seeking truth in the image entails asking oneself “why” with regards to the image in the frame, as well as “why” with regards to what is left out of the image. Both the inclusion and the exclusion from the image is purposeful on the part of the photographer, albeit unconsciously purposeful, but, purposeful nonetheless.

Seeking the “why” in an image is placing oneself in an active role in relation to the picture. Placing one’s self in a place of action goes against the maintenance of the status quo by society. To ask “why” is to begin to act, and this action is a primary step that counters the status quo of society. Society does not want one to ask “why.” As stated by Paulo Freire (1970) “No
oppressive order can permit the oppressed to begin to question: Why?” (p. 86). If the controlling order permits the oppressed to ask “why,” then it is supporting the first step in rebellion. One is not merely a spectator or a voyeur when he/she seeks the unknown within a photograph. He/She has begun a dialogue that might lead towards greater awareness and possibly transformation. W.J.T. Mitchell (2006) describes this relationship with the image as a “reading” (p. 5). The “reading” of an image may take two separate paths. One path, although necessary for a rudimentary understanding of an image, places the photographer or viewer in a place of voyeurism. Mitchell (2006) describes this reading as a “narrative reading” that “provides a date and a proper name to the figure, and a provenance of the photograph itself” (p. 5).

Autophotography practiced ethically necessitates a deeper reading. This deeper reading is defined by Mitchell (2006) as a “devotional reading” (p. 5). Mitchell (2006) states, “A devotional reading is contemplative and empathic, slowing down the time of the image to a kind of stasis that mirrors the bodily state of the figure in the mental state of the beholder. It puts the viewer in the position of the figure” (p. 5). While I agree with the necessity of a “devotional reading,” there is danger for the photographer, the photographed, and the viewer alike when one looks upon a photograph with passive empathy. Leigh Gilmore (2001) cautions, “Empathy hardly represents an ethic” (p. 23). At times empathy may disguise the viewer as a voyeur; therefore, the viewer should, according to Kearney (2002), “Listen and receive as if it [the photograph] were a part of you” (p. 65). However, despite this open reception, the viewer can never truly become a part of the work and although influential on the viewer, the work can never become a part of the viewer.

Photographs that depict horror are hard to “look at,” yet, we are drawn to their images like flies to trash. Sontag (2004) acknowledges, “Images of the repulsive can also allure…and
we have an appetite for sights of degradation and pain and mutilation” (pp. 95-97). Edmund Burke, quoted in Sontag’s Regarding the Pain of Others, states “I am convinced we have a degree of delight, and that no small one, in the real misfortunes and pains of others” (Burke cited in Sontag, 2004, p. 97). Susan Sontag (2004) describes the horrors of lynching photographs displayed in a New York gallery in 2000. She states that the images

Provided a shattering, revelatory experience for the thousands who saw them…The lynching pictures tell us about human wickedness. About inhumanity. They force us to think about the extent of evil unleashed specifically by racism. Intrinsic to the perpetration of this evil is the shamelessness of photographing it (p. 91).

In order for one not to fall into the role of voyeur, when one experiences a photograph, he/she needs to examine and critically analyze the image for what it shows and what it does not show. Susan Sontag (2004) argued that those viewers who experienced the lynching photographs were provided with an opportunity for an awareness that helps one to “understand such atrocities not as the acts of ‘barbarians’ but as the reflection of a belief system, racism, that by defining one people as less human than another legitimates torture and murder” (p. 92). Photographs can invoke the difficult question: “Whom do we believe we have the right to blame?” (Sontag, 2004, p. 93). In viewing a photograph, one is placed in a position of judgment over the past and what one would have possibly done, given that hindsight is 20/20.

It is arrogant to assume that simply by viewing someone’s story, someone’s pain, that one can truly understand their life and their suffering (Morris, 2001, p. 179). Susan Sontag argues “No ‘we’ should be taken for granted when the subject is looking at other people’s pain” (Sontag, 2004, p. 7). She states further that “It is intolerable to have one’s own suffering twinned with anybody else’s” (Sontag, 2004, p. 113). When one looks upon an image of
another’s suffering, one must be careful not to place one’s self in a position of judgment over the Other, where the viewer “evaluates the other’s experience as ‘serious or trivial’ and as ‘your fault/not your fault’” (Boler, 1999, p. 159). Rather, the goal of a careful and close viewing should be to open spaces between the work and the viewer where “complicated conversations” (Pinar, 2004, p. 37) can ensue. This can be the action that brings the image closer to one’s self.

Autophotography, as an ethical practice, asks both the photographer and the viewer to accept a level of responsibility in the truth that is exposed in the image. Megan Boler (1999) argues, “What is at stake is not only the ability to empathize with the very distant other, but to recognize oneself as implicated in the social forces that create the climate of obstacles the other must confront” (p. 166). Gaining an awareness of one’s role in the suffering and pain of the Other, is a primary and significant step in turning one’s gaze upon the image from one of mere voyeurism to one of social justice action. Megan Boler (1999) describes this type of active participation with autobiographical text as “testimonial reading” (p. 166). With regards to the autophotographic image, I am going to transfer Boler’s concept of a testimonial reading to testimonial viewing, whereby a testimonial viewing

Requires a self-reflective participation; an awareness first of [one’s] self as a [viewer], positioned in a relative position of power by virtue of the safe distance provided by the mediating [image]. Second, [viewing] potentially involves a task. This task is at a minimum an active [viewing] practice that involves challenging [one’s] own assumptions and world views (Boler, 1999, p. 166).

With testimonial viewing, the issue of viewer as voyeur and the Other as object is challenged, and a path of resistance to these two occurrences is forged. It is easier to turn a voyeuristic glance at an image of horror and think to oneself that “this is not happening to me, I’m not ill,
I’m not dying. I’m not trapped in a war” (Sontag, 2004, p. 99). Viewing images in this manner fends off “thinking about the ordeals of others, even others with whom it would be easy to identify [because] wherever people feel safe, they will be indifferent” (Sontag, 2004, pp. 99-100). In response to this type of thinking, testimonial viewing acknowledges that “one may recognize that he/she might imagine the photographer’s anguish (as one’s own). However, one also recognizes that he/she cannot know the other. Testimonial [viewing] recognizes its own limits, obstacles, ignorances, and zones of numbness” (Boler, 1999, p. 170), so that it might offer reconciliation for the ethical conundrums that surround the pursuit of truth.

The defining element of an ethical autophotographic curriculum is action. Without action, one remains static as a voyeur. Without action, “compassion withers” (Sontag, 2004, p. 101). Photographs looked upon through testimonial viewing allow

The atrocious images to haunt us. Even if they are only tokens, and cannot possibly encompass most of the reality to which they refer; they still perform a vital function. The images say: This is what human beings are capable of doing---may volunteer to do, enthusiastically, self-righteously. Don’t forget (Sontag, 2004, p. 115).

The autophotographic image holds the power to move, to trouble, to complicate the thinking of its photographer as well as its viewer. A testimonial viewing of the image asks the viewer to regard the image as reality; however, it is not static (Boler, 1999, p. 167). The horrific reality of an image is pliable so long as the viewer and the photographer do not view this reality as unchangeable. Through testimonial viewing, one can reflect not just on the pain and predicament of the Other, but also, the social relations of the image that correlate to one’s own socio-political environment (Boler, 1999, p. 170). Autophotographic curriculum does not seek to implore a guilty conscience because appealing to guilt will most likely result in one’s
“temptation to turn his/her back, to maintain a habit of denial, and to keep secrets from one’s self through the numb consumption of another’s suffering” (Boler, 1999, p. 172). Rather, it seeks a change in one’s awareness, one’s soul, and one’s spirit for the betterment of one’s self as well as for the betterment of the Other.

Telling one’s story is a difficult task, and the main goal of all autophotographers is most likely to be heard. For the viewer, their responsibility lies with what they do with the truth that the photographer tells. What the viewer does with this truth is his/her ethical duty. It is up to him/her to determine the various “value options proposed by a narrative” (Kearney, 2002, p. 155), or in autophotography’s case, the photograph. It is from these value options that he/she should move to act in a way that employs social justice, especially in cases of trauma or victim photographs. As stated by John Barbour (2004), “The best, most ethically instructive, kind of autobiography can’t simply be judged according to whether it fits our previous values. Rather, in it we encounter a perspective that makes us judge ourselves and it helps us to reevaluate our moral practice or ideals” (p. 97). This complication of our moral practices and ideals is the occurrence that ignites one’s transformation along the soul’s archetypal journey. It is the viewer’s ethical duty to ponder the events and experiences captured on film and ask him/herself what is the meaning that is revealed to him/her. According to Boler (1999), seeking the meaning in a text requires recognition of power plays. I apply this same argument to the power plays that exist within an image, substituting image for Boler’s text. Boler (1999) states “What calls for recognition [in the image] is not ‘me’ and the possibility of my misfortune, but a recognition of power relations that defines the interaction between the [viewer and the image] and the conflicts represented within the [image]” (p. 64). This is one’s ethical responsibility where one accepts “responsibility of knowing what [one] knows—and inquiring what [one] might know” (Pearson,
For the autophotographer, the act of capturing a defining moment may be the way through which he/she begins the soul’s quest. For the viewer, this may be the catalyst to ignite a burning fire of transformation and social action. Acknowledging what one knows and does not know, asks the viewer to be an active listener to the testimony that emanates from the image. Megan Boler (1999) describes the importance of the reader’s role, or in this dissertation’s case the viewer’s role, as listener. She states,

The listener’s work is crucial: the absence of a listener, or a listener who turns away or who doubts, can shatter testimony’s potential as a courageous act in truth’s moment of crisis….The listener plays a tremendous role in the production of truth, and relations of power are thus foregrounded (p. 168).

The viewer as an active listener opens spaces for complicated dialogue where awareness may take new roots and bring forth questions that ponder what one once thought he/she knew to be the truth.

It is when one becomes open to his/her denial of reality, as well as his/her participation in the professing of the lie, that autophotography has traveled along a truly ethical path. As stated by Jardine (2003b), the viewer “must attempt to ‘make’ something out of what [is] read and must read [his/her] life into the words. [He/She] must both make these words [his/hers] and must explore how these words make a claim on [him/her]” (p. 61). Although Jardine is making reference to the written word, I believe the same action can occur with the photograph. Both, the viewer and the autophotographer must be an active participant in the conversation. Similarly, I believe Marla Morris’ (2001) argument can be transposed to the viewing of an image. She states with regards to text that, “The unconscious messages transferred from text to reader and the reader’s transferrential relations with these texts, shape and reshape the reader’s unconscious in
uncanny ways” (p. 152). One’s emotional response to an image can shed some light on its effects on one’s unconscious. There is always an unconscious reason behind one’s dislike, horror, dismissal, or acceptance of an image. Being able to address the possibilities of these unconscious reactions, can provide one with an awareness of the archetypes that may be guiding one along his/her archetypal journey. Megan Boler (1999) argues that one must question one’s emotional response when placed in a position of privilege as reader, or viewer. She states that one “must learn to question the genealogy of any particular emotional response: [one’s] scorn, [one’s] evaluation of others’ behavior as good or bad, [one’s] irritation—each provides a site of interrogation of how the text [image] challenges [one’s] investments in familiar cultural values” (Boler, 1999, p. 170). If one is to become open to the messages transferred, both consciously and unconsciously, from image to viewer, then one needs to conduct a “productive looking” (Silverman cited in Smith, 2000, p. 12) of the image. Kaja Silverman describes “productive looking” as requiring

[A] constant conscious reworking of the terms under which we unconsciously look at the objects that people our visual landscape. It [Productive looking] necessitates the struggle, first, to recognize our involuntary acts of incorporation and repudiation, and our implicit affirmation of the dominant elements of the screen, and then, to see again, differently. However, productive looking necessarily entails, as well, the opening up of the unconscious to otherness (cited in Smith, 2000, p. 12).

To open up the unconscious to otherness, is an ethical act aligned to the regressive and progressive phases of the currere process. It is this opening that creates in the viewer a “spark of the soul, a blazing up of the response” (Buber, 1947, p. 109). This “spark” can lead the viewer further in his/her archetypal journey of transformation.
The interplay between the autophotographer and the viewer should be based on truth, openness, and honesty. In order for autophotography to serve as a moral good, it needs to open arenas of discussion regarding: “What ifs?” “How could that happen?” “Would I have allowed that?” “What role did I play in this?” The images should engage and interrogate both the photographer and the viewer. Shown Michelle Smith (2000) argues with regards to W.E.B. DuBois’ photographs of African Americans at the turn of the century, that “The photographs problematized the images of ‘negro criminality’ that worked to consolidate a vision of white middle-class privilege at the turn of the century” (p. 2). W.E.B. DuBois’ photographs of African American’s exposed the “shadow meanings” behind the cultural uses of images of African Americans by whites at the turn of the century (Smith, 2000, p. 6). Furthermore, images that problematize should bring viewers into “an encounter with strangeness, with the uncanny; [throwing] into question what they felt they knew” (Boler, 1999, p. 169). This exposure is the goal of autophotographic work and reflection. Autophotography seeks to complicate and trouble set societal beliefs and boundaries that may impede the work of social justice. It calls into question what is right and moral with regards to one’s relationships to others as well as with himself/herself. As stated by Arthur Frank (2004),

The best any of us can do is to tell one another our stories of how we have made choices and set priorities. By remaining open to other people’s responses to our moral maturity and emotional honesty—their practical criticism of making our stories part of their lives or rejecting those stories and telling different ones—we engage in the unfinalized dialogue of seeking the good (p. 192).

The ethical root of autophotography lies in the act of opening. It is within these openings that discussions and conversations grow and nurture a true “respect for the person, whether oneself or
another, as a guiding value” (Eakin, 2004, p. 15). Holding respect for the self and the Other as its “guiding value,” autophotography serves as a genre of the forgotten and the oppressed where one is given the opportunity to disrupt a system which continues to hold him/her in subordination.

Stories of the Other: Counterstories as an Ethical Practice

It is true that “the power of the dominant structures is expressed not only in the institutional structure of the school, but is brought into the classroom itself in the consciousness and lived histories of students” (Weiler, 1988, p. 124). However, there is no reason students cannot be taught to combat this power structure. An ethical practice of autophotography as curriculum seeks to interrupt the power structure of the oppressor. Autophotography provides an opportunity for “the oppressed to be their own example in the struggle for their redemption” (Freire, 1970, p. 54). Through photographing and viewing the narrative photographs of those classified as Other, one gains a greater understanding of his/her own history as well as the histories of those different from him/herself. “Autobiography has embedded within political, economic, sexual, and intellectual dimensions of lived experience…Autobiography has a political function as well” (Pinar, 1994e, p. 130). The essence of autophotography is that it tells one’s story from his/her perspective, the pain he/she suffers, or the hope he/she feels. It is through this understanding that new conversation is birthed and empowerment is created. This conversation allows the political and the strange into a realm of the once taken for granted.

Autophotography practiced ethically gives a voice to those who have been historically silenced. Furthermore, it is a genre that is not limited by literacy, and therefore, it can be utilized by those whose lack of education has previously silenced them. Generally, those who are Other, “often hear that they are good for nothing, know nothing, and are incapable of learning
anything—that they are sick, lazy, and unproductive—that in the end they become convinced of their own unfitness” (Freire, 1970, p. 63). An ethical practice of Autophotography as curriculum counters this predicament. It is one that embraces the stories of the Other and allows for their stories to become counterstories that bridge the gap between the truth professed by those in power and control, and the actual reality of the oppressed. Autophotography humanizes the Other. Practicing Autophotography ethically not only humanizes the oppressed, but also, humanizes the oppressor. It calls for awareness in both, that professes that dehumanization “is not a given destiny but the result of an unjust order that engenders violence in the oppressor, which in turn dehumanizes the oppressed” (Freire, 1970, p. 44). The resulting action based on this awareness is the spark that propels the oppressed along their hero’s journey of transformation. This journey is a struggle that calls for action and reflection; however, for the “struggle to have meaning, the oppressed must not, in seeking to regain their humanity (which is a way to create it), become in turn oppressors of the oppressors, but rather restorers of humanity in both” (Freire, 1970, p. 44). The struggle to feel human, as well as to be seen as human, is aligned to the hero’s journey. The journey begins with an awareness that life holds more for them, and their lives as oppressed people are not “a closed world from which there is no exit, but as a limiting situation which they can transform” (Freire, 1970, p. 49). The oppressed must face the shadows within and combat the duality that exists within their souls, and limits their freedom.

The awareness that can be gained through working autophotographically must propel the oppressed to act for their freedom if the process is to be ethical and libratory. The first step in a libratory journey is to become aware and then recognize the duality that exists within the souls of the oppressed. As stated in chapter 2, facing one’s dualism, one’s shadows, and embracing them,
is a necessary process along one’s journey of individuation. Paulo Freire (1970) acknowledges the dualism and shadows that exist in the souls of the oppressed. He states,

The oppressed suffer from the duality which has established itself in their innermost being. They discover that without freedom they cannot exist authentically. Yet, although they desire authentic existence, they fear it. They are at one and the same time themselves and the oppressor whose consciousness they have internalized. The conflict lies in the choice between being wholly themselves or being divided; between ejecting the oppressor within or not ejecting them…between being spectators or actors…between speaking out or being silent…This is the tragic dilemma of the oppressed which their education must take into account (p. 48).

Before one can embrace his/her shadow sides, he/she must be made aware of them. This awareness is a goal of autophotography as curriculum. Autophotography provides opportunities for an enlightened awareness of reality and self. Autophotography distances itself from voyeurism when it broadens one’s understanding of self.

Autophotography as a practice of liberatory transformation preserves it as an ethical process. Through increased awareness, autophotography can create spaces for conversation and dialogue. The action or practice of dialogue furthers autophotography away from the unethical act of voyeurism. When awareness spurs dialogue, then ethical action is more likely to follow. Paulo Freire (1970) argues, “Critical and liberating dialogue, which presupposes action, must be carried on with the oppressed at whatever the stage of their struggle for liberation” (p. 65).

Dialogue opens the spaces between races, classes, and gender. The dialogue that might emerge through working autophotographically can help to name that which holds one in his place of oppression. Dialogue can bring to the forefront the shadow sides that maintain control in one’s
soul. It is a challenge and it is difficult; however, the difficult and the strange are often the things that “shatter” one’s innocence and help to build a new self. Paulo Freire (1970) describes dialogue as

An act of creation… [that] cannot exist in the absence of a profound love for the world and for people. The naming of the world, which is an act of creation and re-creation, is not possible if it is not infused with love. Love is at the same time the foundation of dialogue and dialogue itself (p. 89).

Dialogue based on love needs the work of the Lover archetype to help guide one along his/her hero’s journey of transformation. As stated by Carol Pearson (1991), “Without love, the soul does not engage itself with life” (p. 148). Dialogue is an engagement with life and with the Other; therefore, it calls for the guidance of the Lover archetype. The Eros that arises through the Lover archetype fills one with a need to be connected to another. This desired connection can be a bridge between the oppressed and the oppressor where, through dialogue, each learns to see the humanity in the other.

The likelihood of supporting a student to become virtuous, kind, and compassionate is deeply steeped within the inner emotional connections that the student is able to make between him/herself and the Other. This is a development that is linked to an understanding of the ethics that surround autophotographical work. The viewing of autophotography allows for an emotional connection between the viewer and autophotographer. “Reading becomes a deeply ethical and pedagogical act” (Clifford, Friesen, & Jardine, 2003, p. 49). I would argue that viewing an image can be the same ethical and pedagogical act. Alice Miller (2005) describes a common thread between the childhoods of tyrants as a lack of understanding and support shown by their parents and their teachers toward the development and legitimization of these tyrants’ inner feelings as a
child. She states, “From an early age they were forced to suppress and ignore their true feelings. They were forced to put their trust not in those feelings but solely in the regulations imposed on them by their parents, their teachers, and the church authorities” (Miller, 2005, p. 93). Working, autophotographically, allows the student to reflect upon his/her inner self, and engage and trust their inner feelings. This is an important step in order for students to show compassion towards the Other. They must first show compassion towards their inner self.

The uniqueness of each child needs to be embraced, so that within the crowd, the individuality of the student is encouraged and the idea and acceptance of Otherness is not lost (Buber, 1947, p. 73). Individuality is an important element of autophotography as a genre for the oppressed. More often than not, the oppressed are collected and streamlined into a stereotyped group with given characteristics. They are set apart from society as a whole, classified into one dimensional beings. Autophotography as testimony refrains from placing the Other in a place of classification. Autophotographic images do not

[S]imply report facts but, in different ways, encounter—and make [one] encounter—strangeness; how the concept of testimony…is in fact unfamiliar and estranging, and how the more [one] looks closely at texts [images], the more they show that, unwittingly, [he/she] does not even know what testimony is and that, in any case, it is not simply what [one] thought [he/she] knew it was (Felman cited in Boler, 1999, p. 169).

Autophotography as testimony is an attempt to represent events in excess of the viewer’s frame of reference. One’s suffering or pain can retain an element of unimaginable status where the viewer cannot exhibit a familiarity with one’s pain so as to create a “cathartic, innocent, voyeuristic sense of closure” (Boler, 1999, p. 169). An ethical practice of autophotography as curriculum seeks a dual placement of the viewer and photographer; each is in a place of
knowing, while simultaneously remaining outside of the understanding, bringing to light the crisis of truth that exists in the image.

Using autophotographic works of the Other in the classroom empowers those students whose stories are seldom heard. Furthermore, it gives these students models and examples from which they may begin to photograph and narrate their own stories. Alan A. Block (2002) states, “We read autobiographies to discover strategies by which a life may be told” (p. 35). Students can model their own narratives, their own photographs, after the examples of those who have told their own stories before them. Especially when the stories are those similar to their own histories, students are legitimized in their attempts to be heard. Alan Block (2002) states in his essay, “If I forget Thee...Thou shall forget”: The Difficulty of Difficult Memories, that in writing there is meaning (34). He argues further that through the use of a curriculum of autobiography “the study of memory is the study of consciousness—of self—in the present” (p. 36). I propose that Block’s argument extends to autophotography. Autophotography is of the self, and it allows one to face both the apparent and the hidden within the image. Through the visual, one is confronted with personal history as well as the history of the Other, both of which can serve transformative roles. This confrontation serves to move one away from the naïveté of the Innocent archetype and past the disillusionment of the Orphan. When one faces the hidden and analyzes it critically, then he/she will progress along the process of his/her journey of individuation. Paulo Freire (1970) argues that

People will be truly critical if they live the plentitude of the praxis, that is, if their action encompasses a critical reflection which increasingly organizes their thinking and thus leads them to move from a purely naïve knowledge of reality to a higher level, one which enables them to perceive the causes of reality (p. 131).
Autophotography as an ethical practice invites its photographers, as well as its viewers, to seek the deeper and the hidden, so that, one might uncover the true impediments to his/her humanity.

Within working autophotographically, “places of great and troubled history, reflection, controversy, and thought” (Jardine, 2003a, p. 72) are explored. Through working autophotographically, students become mindful of the richness of their “lived experiences that can be so fleeting and ephemeral” (Jardine & Rinehart, 2003c, p. 76). Photographically documenting these lived experiences may provide an opportunity for those in privilege to see the reality of the lives of those who are different from them. In his study of African American photographs from the Depression, Alan Wieder (1997) sites Charles Watkins and his assessment of the three goals of African American documentary photographs. Alan Wieder states that the photographs “presented the Black children as ‘normal,’ enhanced race relations by getting white children to understand Black children, and put a good light on rural life” (Wieder, 1997, p. 47). These documentary photographs offered opportunities for re-assessment of preconceived prejudices due to the power and representation of truth that the photographs depicted. Overall, expressing one’s story allows for contemplation and reflection on one’s life and place, through which strength is gained in order to question that which surrounds one’s self. James Hillman (1975) states that the soul “must have ideas…the soul hungers for ideas. It is as if the instinct to reflect could not function without ideas, as if ideas were our means to reflect” (p.119). Reflection stems from an open dialogue in which both the oppressed and the oppressor communicate their ideas and beliefs through critical thinking. Paulo Freire (1970) states,

True dialogue cannot exist unless the dialoguers engage in critical thinking—thinking which discerns an indivisible solidarity between the world and the people and admits of no dichotomy between them—thinking which perceives reality as process, as
transformation, rather than as a static entity—thinking which does not separate itself from action (p. 92).

Reflection and dialogue are action, and they can lead to further action in the name of social justice. It is through reflection and dialogue that one can become open to the ideas of his/her own soul as well as those of the other. It is through ideas that we are

[G]iven eyes, they let us see. Ideas are ways of seeing and knowing, or knowing by means of insighting. Ideas allow us to envision, and by means of vision we can know… the more ideas we have, the more we see, and the deeper the ideas we have, the deeper we see…. Ideas engender other ideas, breeding new perspectives for viewing ourselves and the world (Hillman 1975, p. 121).

Studying the memories of those classified as Other, as well as working with one’s own memories, allows students to hear the stories of the people who are forgotten and bring the idea of the Other to the forefront of his/her soul. As stated in Richard Kearney’s (2002) *On Stories*,

For Primo Levi, the need to recount his memoirs was a duty to have others participate in the events which might otherwise be forgotten, and by being forgotten, repeat themselves. For Wiesel, the reason he tells and retells the story is to give the victims ‘the voice denied them’ by history…Recounting is a way of becoming such and ethical consciousness…The horror of moral evil must be retrieved from oblivion by means of narrative remembering (p. 48).

For those of privilege, an openness and awareness is achieved through one’s experiences with autophotographic works. For those students identified as Other, a realization of the equal value of their own worth arises. A testament to their stories, or stories like theirs, is acknowledged.
Bell hooks (1994) argues for the power of photography as a liberating genre for the Other. She states,

The word *remember (re-member)* evokes the coming together of severed parts, fragments becoming a whole. Photography has been, and is, central to that aspect of decolonization that calls us back to the past and offers a way to reclaim and renew life-affirming bonds. Using these images, we connect ourselves to a recuperative, redemptive memory that enables us to construct radical identities, images of ourselves that transcend the limits of the colonizing eye (p. 53).

Teaching students to be aware, to think, and to act *for* the Other, instills within them the power to make a change in themselves and their communities, regardless of their race, gender, or social class.

Within the teaching of tragedy and the teaching of the stories of the Other, I must be cautious of the paths I take within my classroom. This is difficult to do because I do not want to squelch the seeds of hope in my students; however, I do not want to romanticize the troubles of the world. It is this romanticizing or utopian belief that “tomorrow will be better” that has held those in subjugated classes under the power of the privileged, because “utopian vision is usually achieved by wiping out, eliminating, or annihilating whoever gets in the way of its final objective. Those who are considered weak, impure, dirty, or nonconforming must be controlled, manipulated, or killed” (Morris, 2001, p. 207). Utopianism is a “form of totalitarianism” (Morris, 2001, p. 200), and it is an unethical practice in the classroom. Utopian thinking does not support an ethic for the other; in fact, “Utopic thinking cannot manage the other, cannot manage difference…There is no place for the other in utopia” (Morris, 2001, p. 200). I don’t know if tomorrow will be better, and it is not fair to my students that I propagate this belief. Marla
Morris (2001) argues, “It is naïve to think that things are better in the past or that things would be better in the future if I can just create a new world. Transgressing the present is impossible” (p. 205). Rather, it is a transformative practice for my students to recognize their own potential for evil and darkness. This realization comes from their conversations with and embracing of their shadow sides. Carl Jung (1957) argues,

> We are always, thanks to our human nature, potential criminals…None of us stands outside humanity’s black collective shadow. Whether the crime lies many generations back or happens today, it remains the symptom of a disposition that is always and everywhere present—and one would therefore do well to possess some ‘imagination of evil,’ for only the fool can permanently neglect the conditions of his own nature. In fact, this negligence is the best means of making him an instrument of evil (p.95).

An ethical autophotographic curriculum requires that I face the present moment and not attempt to circumvent its legacy. I do not offer excuses for past transgressions, nor a utopian promise of a better tomorrow. This is a duty that I have towards my students as a collaborator on their journey of transformation. Paulo Freire (1970) describes the relationship of the teacher and the student as “co-intentional education” (p. 69). He states,

> Teachers and students (leadership and people), co-intent on reality, are both Subjects, not only in the task of unveiling that reality, and thereby coming to know it critically, but in the task of re-creating that knowledge. As they attain this knowledge of reality through common reflection and action, they discover themselves as its permanent re-creators (p. 69).
Furthermore, Clifford Mayes (2005) argues that if teachers are

[I]n humility truly learning along with our students, their questions will often become our questions too—questions that we cannot avoid by hiding behind an omniscient, teacherly persona (Craig cited in Mayes, 135). Lacking this humility, we will fall into the grip of the archetypal image of Icarus, and our wax wings will melt in the unforgiving daily sun of classroom reality. However, by honoring and participating in our students’ archetypal quests, we as teachers will be renewed by the same archetypal elixir (p. 135).

My role as an ethical educator is to help my students balance the goals of their Creator archetypes for a new understanding and a new reality with their enlightened knowledge and understanding of their current reality. Balancing both without falling into the grasp of the Innocent’s utopia, is a difficult task, but, a task I must face in partnership with my students.

Let the Circle be Unbroken

Autophotography is a powerful genre, where working autophotographically helps to shape political and social movements (Gilmore, 2001, p. 17). It is through the telling of stories through images that one might come to an understanding of himself/herself and others. It is through life stories that we become “full agents of our history” (Kearney, 2002, p. 3). One’s life story is inextricably linked to the stories of hundreds of others; therefore, it is important that autophotographers attempt to stay away from harming those that they film. Those who do autophotographical work are seeking validation in some form, even if it is merely from someone’s viewing their story. Autophotographers need to be careful not to strip the stories of others from their due validation in return. Susan Sontag (1973) critiques “Those occasions when the taking of photographs is relatively undiscriminating, promiscuous, or self effacing do not lessen the didacticism of the whole enterprise. This very passivity—and ubiquity—of the
photographic record is photography’s ‘message,’ its aggression” (p. 7). Photography can capture and release, destroy and rebuild. Its dichotomous nature is one of the primary reasons why it must be governed by ethical action. As a viewer, one’s ethical task is to “build from their words some kind of understanding so our humanity can be (re) built from the ashes of inhumanity” (Weaver, 2002, p. 170). This argument transfers to autophotography where, in the place of words, there are images that can serve to improve how one understands, and motivate one to seek responsibility and to act. This understanding is the element that defines the viewer as witness as opposed to voyeur. Megan Boler (1999) defines witnessing as “a process in which we do not have the luxury of seeing a static truth or fixed certainty (p. 186). Witnessing is a dynamic process, and cannot capture meaning as conclusion…as a witness we undertake our historical responsibilities and co-implication” (p. 186). For ethics sake, witnessing needs to become the new “habit of seeing” (Sontag, 1973, p. 99), a habit of seeing that implores a limited understanding of the Other, while simultaneously accepting one’s responsibility towards the other as a motivation for social justice action. Autophotography as curriculum is a powerful tool by which people, who have been historically unheard, are given a voice. The next chapter further explores the liberating effects of autophotographical work, where the lens of the camera offers liberation of spirit, self, and soul.
CHAPTER 5:  
A TRINITY FOR CHANGE: AUTOPHOTOGRAPHY, THE ARCHETYPAL JOURNEY,  
AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

Social justice teaching is the educating of students to question the standard, to think for 
themselves, and to speak so that their voices and those of others will be heard. It is the breaking 
down of what has been taken at face value throughout history, so as to keep certain groups 
marginalized and broken. Social justice teaching is the act of bringing awareness to students and 
encouraging the students to think for themselves and act on their new awareness. It is an 
education of inquiry and discovery, where the trials of the forgotten, repressed, or overlooked are 
brought to the surface for discussion, debate, and reflection. It is a process that takes teachers 
and students on a soul’s journey towards a place “beyond heroism into freedom and joy” 
(Pearson, 1991, p. 29). Social justice teaching creates situations that “might motivate students to 
combat the endless process of silencing found in so many schools” (Greene, 1998, p. xxxi). In a 
curriculum steeped in social justice, teachers and students are “concerned with the good, and it is 
never sufficient to simply think about the good or feel it; it must be engaged” (Sardello 2002, p. 1). My interpretation of social justice teaching, aligned with an archetypal journey of the soul, 
holds two central beliefs. First, I believe that the Other, the oppressed, must not wait for another 
to act on his/her behalf. I align my argument to Paulo Freire’s in that “The oppressed can 
overcome the contradiction in which they are caught only when this perception enlists them in 
the struggle to free themselves” (Freire 1970, p. 49). Furthermore, Joseph Campbell (2004) 
argues,

Revolution doesn’t have to do with smashing something; it has to do with bringing 
something forth. If you spend all your time thinking about that which you are attacking,
then you are negatively bound to it. You have to find the zeal in yourself and bring that out…Marx teaches us to blame the society for our frailties; Freud teaches us to blame our parents for our frailties; astrology teaches us to blame the universe. The only place to look for blame is within; you didn’t have the guts to bring up your full moon and live the life that was your potential (p. 104).

Although I do believe that society and parents do have a responsibility in the maintaining of social stratifications that impede the growth of the Other as an individual, I concur with Freire and Campbell in that the ultimate responsibility falls upon the shoulders of the individual to act on his/her behalf and, in turn, act on the behalf of those who are different from him/her.

Secondly, I believe that as a teacher it is my ethical responsibility to provide my students opportunities for reflection that will bring to light their role in their own struggle for freedom and renewal. Through an autophotographic curriculum, I hope that my students will progress on an archetypal journey of the soul that will lead them along the cyclical path of individuation. This is a path that seeks an end to the projection of one’s shadows and instead, seeks a vision of compassion towards those who are Other. Carl Jung (1957) argues,

Nothing promotes understanding and rapprochement more than the mutual withdrawal of projections. This necessary corrective requires self-criticism, for one cannot just tell the other person to withdraw them…One can recognize his/her prejudices and illusions only when, from a broader psychological knowledge of him/herself and others, one is prepared to doubt the absolute rightness of his/her assumptions and compare them carefully and conscientiously with the objective facts (p.100).

When one can recognize his/her shadow, delve into it, converse within, embrace it, then he/she is led “to the modesty needed to acknowledge imperfection…where the ideal is impossible” (Jung
1957, p.101). By embracing the shadow, one acknowledges that the journey begins not with seeking perfection, which is falsely sought through one’s projection of his/her self-hatred onto the Other, but rather, with his/her “learning how to die, how to decreate narratives of redemption, and thus allowing one to see, with Zen-like astonishment, the perception of the ordinary, the sheer mereness of things” (Marlan, 2006, p.24). It is in the “ordinary” that one may realize the harmony of these two beliefs, a responsibility for the self and a responsibility for the Other. Both of which, I believe, serve as foundations for the practice of a social justice curriculum based on an autophotographic archetypal journey of the soul.

Teaching for social justice is democratic education. It requires the participation of all students, regardless of belief, race, color, or sex. It transcends the pre-established lines of society so as to bring all students, as well as teachers, together for collaboration and discussion. More often than not, many political and education policies fail because they are designed in the personal reality of their creator, those in charge, rather than the personal realities of those who the program is professing to help. Paulo Freire (1970) reiterates,

Many political and educational plans have failed because their authors designed them according to their own personal views of reality, never once taking into account (except as mere objects of their actions the men-in-a-situation to whom their program was ostensibly directed….One cannot expect positive results from an educational or political action program which fails to respect the particular view of the world held by the people. Such a program constitutes cultural invasion, good intentions notwithstanding (pp. 94-95).

Teaching for social justice means “teaching what we believe ought to be—not merely where moral frameworks are concerned, but in material arrangements for people in all spheres of
society” (Greene, 1998, p. xxix). Social justice teaching offers “a more inclusive, historically situated, and critical public debate that educators can better understand the complex roots of inequality and violence in this country, and thus better inform themselves of the current sociocultural context in which students live” (Leistyna, 2003, p. 123). Social justice teaching asks the difficult questions: How has all this injustice come to pass? What part did I play in the perpetuation of these injustices? What can I do to change the status quo?

Within schools, knowledge is constructed through the use of textbooks and teachers’ lectures that hold the “aura of eternal truth” (Watkins, 2005, p. 116). Students do not question the historical “facts” that are dictated within the pages of their texts. Paulo Freire (1970) describes this type of teaching as a

Banking concept of education where the teacher talks about reality as if it were motionless, static, compartmentalized, and predictable. His [the teacher’s] task is to ‘fill’ the students with the contents of his narration—contents which are detached from reality, disconnected from the totality that engendered them and could give them significance (p. 71).

In order to battle this “banking concept” that places the teacher in a place of power over the student, the teacher must exchange his/her role of “depositor, prescriber, domesticator, for the role of student among students [in order to] undermine the power of oppression and serve the cause of liberation” (Freire, 1970, p. 75). In contrast, social justice teaching realizes that within historical study “facts are easy. It is the atmospheres that made them possible that are elusive… [It is] a talent for seeing the Emperor’s nakedness” (Lessing, 1994, pp. 16-17). Seeing the emperor’s nakedness can be accomplished through an autophotographic curriculum that launches
the student into a practice of testimony, “complicated conversations” that propel the student along his/her journey of archetypal transformation.

Making the Private Public

Autophotography and social justice teaching are completely compatible within the classroom. Social justice teaching requires that students as well as teachers be reflective over their multiple truths. It encourages a deconstructing of the past and a breakdown of the familiar and the safe. The best method to accomplish these tasks is an autophotographical one. In order to make the private and the forgotten come to the forefront of the student’s conscious, the student must be encouraged to examine his/her own past and his/her own story. Through the photographing of one’s story, the elements of the past, such as time, place, and society all come to the front. The elements of one’s belief system are analyzed and scrutinized through the photographs of the students. Photographs have the capability of disclosing that which is “imperceptible, fleeting” (Sontag, 1973, p. 121). The curriculum in the classroom becomes focused on that which is unsaid or left out, so as to bring it to light. William Pinar (1991) describes the use of autobiography as curriculum as,

Curriculum in this sense becomes a place of origin as well as destination, a ground from which intelligence can develop, and a figure for presenting new perceptions and reviewing old ones…[it is] the study of absence, the admission of denial, the integration of the culturally excluded (race), the denied (class) and the bifurcated (gender) (p. 186). The stories of the students as well as those of the teacher are united together to form understandings of the past and formulations for the future.

Using autophotography in the classroom complements a social Justice curriculum through its autophotographical exploration and architecting of the individual. Working
autophotographically enables students to deconstruct his/her private life and open it into the realm of the public. Working autophotographically, the student wrestles with his/her individual experiences and in turn reconstructs his/her passage through the social, intellectual, and physical structures of society (Pinar et al., 2004, p. 521). Aligned to Jungian depth psychology, working autophotographically offers a path for the soul to embark on its journey. Specifically through the autobiographical process of currere, the acts of reflecting and analyzing help to “shatter” one’s preconceived ideals and notions of truth. This shattering often begins one’s transformative journey. As the archetypal journey progresses, the soul begins to feel greater peace with itself and the world through its disclosing of “new structures in the process of naming the old ones” (Pinar et al., 2004, p. 521). With regards to photography, bell hooks (1994) argues that photographs can help one “to find a way back to the self he once was….Snapshots reveal, they enable us to remember” (p. 53). Through the power of the image, one can journey back and ask him/herself what it is he/she really knew. This complicating of one’s understanding is a necessary occurrence in the practice of autophotographic curriculum as social justice teaching. Carl Jung argues,

> Every individual needs revolution, inner division, overthrow of the existing order, and renewal, but not be forcing them upon his neighbors under the hypocritical cloak of Christian love or the sense of social responsibility or any of the other beautiful euphemisms for unconscious urges to personal power. Individual self reflection, return of the individual to the ground of human nature to his own deepest being with its individual and social destiny—here is the beginning of a cure for that blindness which reigns at the present hour (Jung cited in Mayes, 2005, p. 82).
Complicating one’s understanding, creating an internal revolution brings one to a better understanding of what in fact he/she truly knows to be truth. Working autophotographically, helps to deconstruct the sociopolitical agenda that surrounds classroom curriculum along the framework of one’s lived experiences. It promotes a collaborative experience within the classroom whereby all students are encouraged to speak their stories, share their truths, and analyze their lived experiences through a support system of their teacher and peers.

Autophotographic curriculum is a form of critical teaching that “is directed toward a retrieval, amplification, and support of ‘localized,’ ‘marginalized,’ and minor forms of knowledge and a dislocation of commonly held conceptions about experiences, practices, and events” (Hwu, 1998, p. 33). So often, students distance themselves from the pain of reality. Distancing one’s self from reality is failing to answer one’s call to his/her hero’s journey. Joseph Campbell (2004) states, “When the call isn’t answered [one] experiences a kind of drying up and a sense of life lost” (p. 114). As in the novel Hallucinating Foucault, the character, Paul Michel, discusses the “remoteness of his texts.” He states, “Maybe when you care, terribly, painfully, about the shape of the world, and you desire nothing but absolute, radical change, you protect yourself with abstraction, distance. Maybe the remoteness of my texts is the measure of my personal involvement” (Duncker, 1996, p. 109). Paul Michel’s abstraction and distance mimics the isolation of the soul practiced by the archetypes of the innocent and the orphan. Practicing a reflective autophotographic curriculum dissolves this abstraction through the creation of an environment in the classroom that creates “dialogical spaces where all of [the students’] lived experiences and worldviews can be heard” (Leistyna, 2003, p. 107). The purpose of autophotographic exploration in the classroom is to create this type of environment where students are given the collaborative support that they need to give “the difficult” its due
When one feels supported in his/her facing reality, then he/she is more likely to hear and follow his/her call to journey. When one follows the call, “The individual is invoked to engage in dangerous adventure. It’s always a dangerous adventure because [one is] moving out of the familiar sphere of [one’s] community” (Campbell, 2004, p. 114). Moving away from the familiar and the comfortable is a necessary step in practice of social justice teaching and learning. It is the scary step that helps one to cross the threshold of his/her transformative journey of the soul.

Creating one’s Personal “Voice”

Autophotographic curriculum as social justice teaching enables students to develop their own voices. They are given the opportunity to be heard and acknowledged for their stories. They are given a sense of ownership of their own pasts and a claim to what may be theirs in the future. Students make connections between their voices and the public space, so that “when personal voices are released among a few persons in a small space, a registering of others suffering may emerge in the very sharing of inquiry and exploration, when unexpected and deeply shared concerns arise as desire and thought” (Greene, 1998, p. xiii). Through autophotography, the student turns “inward, the process of individuation, is change of consciousness” (Pinar, 2000, pp. 412-413). The student develops his/her voice and he/she realizes that the stories that need to be told are his/her own stories. Photographs can be used by students to tell their own stories so that their “images can pose a critical cultural position” (Smith, 2000, p. 7). The photographs, especially in the case of self portraits, can offer the students an opportunity to gaze back at their beholders (Smith, 2000, p. 7) which place them in a position of equality to their viewer. The students are no longer, simply, the ones who are looked
upon. They can now return the look. Bell hooks (1994) describes the power of personal photographs in the African American community. She states,

They [the photographs] challenged both white perceptions of blackness and that realm of black-produced image making that reflected internalized racism. Many of these images demanded that we look at ourselves with new eyes, that we create oppositional standards of evaluation...These snapshots gave us a way to see ourselves, a sense of how we looked when we were not ‘wearing the mask’ when we were not attempting to perfect the image for a white supremacist gaze (hooks 1994, pp. 50-51).

Autophotography gives the photographer the ability to counter the stereotypes that are professed and manifested throughout society. Autophotography allows one to remove his/her mask, so that he/she might face his/her persona, in Jungian terms, and address that which conflicts with his/her inner self.

Each student is inextricably linked to the Other through his or her lived experiences. Presuppositions of the Other are broken down through the act of listening and through the conversations that surround the stories told by one’s classmates. “Voice is meaning that resides in the individual and enables that individual to participate in a community” (Britzman cited in Pinar et al., 2004, p. 525). The voices of students, telling their stories, help to encourage those students who would otherwise feel silenced to speak. The voices of the students serve as “democratic versions of the Muse, a comrade, a friend, a traveling companion, shoulder to shoulder, someone to share the cost of this long, painful journey. Thus the Muse functions as collaborator, sometimes as antagonist, the one who is like you, the Other” (Duncker, 1996, p. 58). In a way, one student’s story is the muse by which the Other student may be inspired. James Hillman (1975) describes that in the narration of events, “Narrative movement transposes and
transforms events, even invents them. [One] is different at the end of the story because the soul
has gone through a process during the telling” (p. 143). The telling of one’s story,
autophotographically, is soul work. It is a process that asks one to remember, reflect, analyze,
and act on behalf of one’s self and on behalf of the Other. It is a process that links one to the
Other; whereby, one might recognize the unity in each other’s stories. Autophotography,
practiced ethically, is a social justice curriculum that acknowledges the symbiotic relationship of
the individual and the Other.

The silencing of students throughout schools is a detriment to the pursuit of social justice
teaching. Students are often taught that their voices have no power and significance. This
silencing runs contrary to the nature of the human soul because “human beings are not built in
silence, but in word, in work, in action-reflection” (Freire, 1970, p. 88). The silencing of
students’ voices is society’s projection onto the student. In order for the student to remain “safe”
within society, he/she learns to maintain that persona of silence. All the while, his/her inner self
is screaming to be heard and acknowledged. The silencing of the student is an act of violence
that seeks to destroy the flame that burns within the student’s soul. They are silenced into
obedience and their imaginations are squelched in the name of standardization. This silencing of
the imagination is dangerous because the imagination is “the soul’s first freedom” (Hillman,
1975, p. 39). The students are taught to think the same, act the same, and believe the same.
Michel Serres argues that when all people become the same, when all people “speak the same
language and commune the same message or the same norm of reason, we will descend, idiot
imbeciles, lower than rats, more stupidly than lizards” (Serres, 1991, p. 124). There is no space
for questioning and all thoughts and actions are centralized under the guise of a standardized
curriculum with standardized outcomes. Under standardized curriculum, there is no place for
imagination and as stated by Marla Morris (2004), “Nightmares proliferate when one is not able
to ‘cast off,’ when one is not able to imagine, when one is forbidden to daydream. Repressing
daydreams produces a sort of sickness, a cultural sickness that is so much a part of the American
landscape” (Morris, 2004, p. 37). However, through autophotography, spaces can be opened for
those who have been marginalized which, in the case of the school, are most children; some
children, because of their race or gender, have been marginalized at greater levels.

Autophotography offers one the opportunity to expose the truth and shatter the reality that was
once held as fact. Bell hooks (1994) argues, “The camera became in black life a political
instrument, a way to resist misrepresentation as well as a means by which alternative images
could be produced” (p. 49). Autophotography can open spaces for the unknown, where
questioning what is seen is encouraged. William Reynolds (2003) states, “It is the questions that
are important, because in questions there is hope…” (p. 50). Rebecca Martusewiz (2001) adds
“The space between questions and all the possible answers, a space of pure difference, is where
the possibility and thrill of teaching comes from” (p. 57). Autophotographic curriculum offers
possibilities for transformative learning within a classroom that embraces the seeking and
complicating of society’s truths.

The creation of a centralized voice or a common voice of students is not the goal of an
autophotographic curriculum. Carl Jung critiques modern education as seeking to “pound the
individuality out of a person in order to shape him into a ‘mass man’” (cited in Mayes, 2005, p.
83). Autophotography seeks each child’s individual voice and story. This is not a narcissistic
quest, but rather, one that is necessary in the pursuit of social justice if all students are to be
valued for their contributions to society. The creation of a central voice destroys the individual
and the histories that are connected to that person. It creates an opportunity for “semi-official
narratives that authorize and provoke certain sequences of cause and effect, while at the same time preventing counter-narratives from emerging” (Said cited in Greene, 1998, p. xxxi). A centralized voice treats everything outside of its norm as an object to be possessed and manipulated by the masses. For those who are considered Other, they become the object, they become Martin Buber’s “It,” their place is to be ordered and controlled (Buber, 1916, p. 81). In Paulo Freire’s (1970) description of “banking education,” he describes the concept of the dichotomy between human beings. I align Freire’s dichotomy to Martin Buber’s (1916) description of the I/It relationship (p. 54), where the “I” is the self, the individual, and the “It” is the Other. Freire (1970) describes the “I” in the “I/It” as a,

A person who is merely in the world, not with the world or with others; the individual is spectator, not re-creator. In this view, the person is not a conscious being; he or she is rather the possessor of a consciousness: an empty “mind” passively open to the reception of deposits of reality from the world outside (p. 75).

Freire’s description aligns to Buber’s “I/It” relationship because the individual does not view himself/herself as part of the world, but rather, at the center of the world. This view perpetuates the belief that everything that exists around the individual exists for his/her procurement, objects to be possessed, manipulated, and controlled for the individual’s purpose. Historically, this has been the relationship between those in positions of power, the “I’s”, and those who have been classified as Other, the “Its.” As stated by Maxine Greene (1998), “The young have to be released somehow to move imaginatively between what is called the center and what is called the margin or the border. What conception of social justice holds meaning for the one who situates herself or himself at the center?”(p. xxxi). Situating one’s self at the center, is placing oneself in relation to the Other as an “It.” Autophotography provides the “amazing, disturbing
images that move us out of the center of normality….One finds himself/herself in a different space, where the unfamiliar beckons because it resists labels” (Doll, 1995, p. 129). If students are not allowed to view their realities autophotographically, if they are not removed from the safety of their meta-narratives, then any hope for transformative learning is lost. Moving one’s self away from the center enables one to acknowledge the Other in a way that he/she is no longer the “It,” but rather, the “Thou” (Buber, 1916, 54). Regarding the Other as the “Thou” is when one does not experience the Other, but rather, he/she stands in relation to the Other.

The Other as the “Thou”

The formal curriculum of the classroom often seeks to silence and minimize the lives of students. The curriculum sends this message to students based on “its selection of whose lives are worthy of serious study in school. The study of history typically focuses on the lives and accomplishments of rich and powerful people who contributed something to the market society” (Gabbard, 2003, p. 68). Autophotography offers those students whose cultures and people have been marginalized, forgotten, or overlooked an opportunity to be heard and seen. Autophotography offers a new curriculum steeped in the importance of each student’s story. Those who are identified as Other are brought in from their realms of silence and they are empowered to share their stories. Within a classroom committed to social justice, multiplicity and difference are welcomed (Greene, 1998, p. xl). When students are encouraged to show their stories and view the stories of other students, a dialogue or “complicated conversation” is started. Paulo Freire (1998) states, “To accept and respect what is different is one of those virtues without which listening cannot take place” (p. 108). Listening to the Other is an act that treats the Other as the “Thou” rather than the “It.” By listening, the individual places the Other in relation to the “I.” However, when one is closed to listening and prejudiced against the Other,
then he/she “cannot speak with them, only to or at them” (Freire, 1970, p. 108). This is treating the Other as the “It,” something to be possessed, manipulated, and controlled so as to maintain one in a position of power, above the Other.

The Other becomes the “It,” when “the different becomes not an ‘other’ worthy of any respect, but a ‘this’ or ‘that’ to be despised and detested” (Freire, 1970, p. 108). Autophotography as curriculum seeks to disrupt the “I/It” relationship in favor of providing one with a new habit of seeing the Other as one’s “Thou.” In an autophotographic curriculum, one’s reasons for being and the influences of power and control over one’s self are examined. Susan Sontag (2004) warns, “Photographs objectify. They turn an event or a person into something that can be possessed” (p. 81). I agree with Sontag that photographs may at times simplify and objectify their subjects; however, I argue that active autophotographic inquiry seeks to dismiss the photograph as something simple, an object. Autophotography becomes “a tool for dealing with things everybody knows about but isn’t attending to” (Gowin cited in Sontag, 1973, p. 200). The autophotographical stories of those students who have been estranged, colonized by history, and “born in a land without forefathers and without memory” (Camus, 1995, p. 284), help to bring to the forefront the injustices of society, whereby, the students may be inspired to change and transform the world around them. Through the photographs, the individual is offered an opportunity to “see a unified image of self in the photograph of the purported other” (Smith, 2000, p. 9). Seeing one’s self unified with the Other’s image is seeing the face of the Other as the “Thou.” It is placing one’s self in relation to the Other as opposed to in possession of the Other. When one places himself/herself in relation to the Other, he/she is living in spirit. To live in spirit means that one is no longer projecting his/her shadows onto the Other, but rather, he/she is living in relation to the Other with compassion. Martin Buber (1916) states,
Spirit is not in the I but between I and Thou. It is not like the blood that circulates in you but like the air in which you breathe. Man lives in the spirit when he is able to respond to his Thou. He is able to do that when he enters into this relation with his whole being. It is solely by virtue of his power to relate that man is able to live in the spirit (p. 89).

It is the understanding of the Other that offers transformative learning through a social justice curriculum.

Problems arise when one deals with outsiders (Hwu, 1998, p. 25). When one faces the Other, the Other is often the target of one’s projection. Clifford Mayes (2005) states, “Projection of the individual and collective shadow is the major culprit in intolerance and racism” (p. 86). Erich Neumann (1943) concurs with Mayes’ argument. He states, “Inside a nation, the aliens who provide the objects for this projection are the minorities…who are sacrificed by the masses, [where the masses’] basic intolerance makes them unwilling to budge from their own position at the center” (Neumann, 1943, pp. 52-54). When one projects upon the Other, the Other becomes the recipient of “the other within the self—that ‘inner other’ from which the self is most alienated” (Adams cited in Mayes, p. 86). These projections maintain one at the center, where he/she regards the Other as an object. Through one’s shadow projection, the Other represents the most despised elements of one’s inner soul, while the individual’s self remains a vestige of perfection. Out of fear of the shadow, the individual reacts violently against the Other in hopes of destroying his/her inner shadow that he/she has projected upon the Other.

Regarding the Other as “them,” separates the Other from one’s self. It places a distance between the Other and the self, so that the Other remains foreign, unidentifiable to the individual. The Other serves as an experience rather than a relation; so that, the Other comes to represent the shadow of the individual: the part of the self that one denies and represses. When one is
confronted with the Other, he/she is confronted with his/her own shadows. In the face of the Other, one sees all that he/she hates or is ashamed of within himself/herself. Even when one feels “sympathy” towards the Other, he/she has placed himself/herself in a position of privilege and power over the Other. Susan Sontag (2004) argues that sympathy is too simple an emotion when faced with the horror and truth that surrounds images of the Other (p. 102). Sympathy provides a false sense of proximity to the pain of the Other. Sympathy negates one’s responsibility toward the Other. It allows one to feel that he/she “is not an accomplice to what caused the suffering” (Sontag, 2004, p. 102). Even in sympathy, the Other is the “It” that the individual must dominate as he/she controls and represses the shadows that wage war within him/her. In order for the individual to see the Other as the “Thou,” one must embrace the dark within himself/herself before he/she can embrace the dark that is outside of one’s self. Erich Neumann (1943) states, “Love and acceptance of the shadow is the essential basis for the actual achievement of an ethical attitude toward the ‘Thou’ who is outside…It is only when [one] has experienced [himself/herself] as dark (not as a sinner) that [he/she] shall be successful in accepting the dark ego in [his/her] neighbor” (p. 95). To combat this projection, autophotography brings to the table an “autobiographical question that can begin an investigation of what is, including the status quo of race, class, and gender, an investigation particularized in place and person” (Edgerton, 1991, p. 77). Autophotography enables the student to “understand more fully one’s own, as well as the social and historical ties that link both lives to a particular place…linked with the construction of ‘difference,’ of ‘them and us,’ often resulting in the exclusion of the ‘other’” (Edgerton, 1991, p. 78). Autophotography can provide opportunities that bring awareness of one’s dark truths, one’s shadows. So that, he/she does not project onto
the Other, but rather, one might reflect on the difficult, analyze its deeper meaning, and embrace it as part of one’s self.

Autophotography as an ethical, social justice practice asks the individual, as photographer or as viewer, to inspire within “an empathetic response that motivates action: a ‘historicized ethics’ engaged across genres, that radically shifts one’s self-reflective understanding of power relations” (Boler, 1999, p. 158). Studying the lives of others and the links of those lives to one’s own story helps students to realize the inner-connectedness of their existence to the life of the student sitting next to him/her. The challenge with opening one’s self to this interconnectedness is that one needs to

[A]ccept a responsibility founded on the discrepancy of experiences. There is no need to consume through empathetic identification, or to recognize the words from the speaker’s perspective. There is no need to ‘rank oppressions’ in such a way that one is pitted against the other to produce guilt rather than empathy (Boler, 1999, 165).

The use of autophotography within the social justice classroom provides an opportunity for students to “witness” against the horrible atrocities our society has committed against the Other. Witnessing places one in a role of empathetic action as opposed to passivity. Susan Sontag (2004) argues that one needs to be careful with his/her sympathetic emotions toward the Other, so that they do not cloud his/her role in the Other’s circumstance. She argues,

Sympathy proclaims our innocence as well as our impotence. To that extent, it can be an impertinent—if not an inappropriate—response. To set aside sympathy, we extend to others beset by war and murderous politics for a reflection on how our privileges are located on the same map as their suffering and may—in ways we might prefer not to imagine—be linked to their suffering (Sontag, 2004, pp. 102-103).
Autophotography as historical witnessing brings to the surface elements of pain and suffering experienced by the marginalized people of our society. It helps to create an awareness of one’s role in the suffering of others.

The silencing and the squelching of the spirit within schools is brought to light under the study of autophotography as historical witnessing. William Pinar (2001) describes the benefit of these processes as “remembering [one] can see through layers of scar tissue that deform not just the skin but the entire body of the American nation” (p. 13). Through autophotographic witnessing, students are forced to remember that which they would rather forget or see for the first time that which they have left unnoticed. They are transcended through the archetypes of their soul’s journey toward an individuation in favor of peace and greater understanding.

Through autophotographic reflection, students see that “perfection is inhuman. Human beings are not perfect” (Campbell, 2004, p. 76). Marla Morris (2001) argues, “Perfection is not a natural inclination, it is a social construction. Perfectionism is dangerous for the soul” (p. 211). Within human relationships, there is no place for perfection and the seeking of this perfection results in further projection onto the other. Rather, to inspire empathetic action for the other, one’s relationship must

[N]ot be based on differentiation and perfection, for these only emphasize the differences or call forth the exact opposite; it is based, rather, on imperfection, on what is weak, helpless and in need of support—the very ground and motive of dependence. The perfect has no need for the other, but weakness has, for it seeks support and does not confront the partner with anything that might force him into an inferior position and even humiliate him (Jung, 1957, p.102).
The challenge for students is to view the stories of the abused and forgotten of society, and remind themselves that despite the world’s imperfection there is still a place for love. In the space that exists between empathy and action, there is a love for the imperfection of humankind. Carl Jung (1957) argues for the importance of love because “when love stops, power begins, and violence, and terror” (p.103). It is this love that allows one to see the Other as the “Thou,” rather than the “It.” Joseph Campbell (2004) states, “This is what Jung calls individuation, to see people and [one’s] self in terms of what [one] indeed is, not in terms of all these archetypes that [one is] projecting around and that have been projected on [him/her]” (p. 76). To individuate is to love the Other in all his/her imperfection, after first loving the dark within one’s self.

The pursuit of autophotographical teaching offers new insight and hope within the standardized classrooms of schools. The very essence of the autophotographical process promotes social justice. It legitimizes the stories of those who have historically been forgotten and abandoned by society. In addition, it awakens the minds of those students born to privilege. Standardization within the schools is a modern form of colonization. It is the ruling class’s last attempt to hold control and power over those it seeks to inculcate into the mainstream of society. Autophotography works as memory work within the social justice classroom to “incite [the] imagination to envision history in less diseased ways—where plot has no beginning, middle, or end, but is recursive and discontinuous; where historical texts induce contradictions rather than unitary story lines; and where paradoxes, rather than cause and effect, evoke action”(Munro, 1991, p. 284). Autophotography offers “a passage out” of the holds of society whereby its purpose is movement: autobiographic, political, and cultural (Pinar, 2001, p. 2). In order to combat the stifling nature of schools, an autophotographic curriculum should be a primary caveat in the teaching of social justice.
Transformation of the soul relies on the awareness and acceptance of the self as well as an awareness and acceptance of the Other. Joseph Campbell (2004) states, “[One] doesn’t get in touch with the nature force that includes both the [individual] and the other until [one] has accepted as part and parcel of [him/herself] the formerly excluded part, that which was seen to be other” (p. 140). Furthermore, Mary Aswell Doll (1995) adds, “Only when [one] achieves inner marriage with his/her opposite can he/she embrace that which is his/her opposite externally” (p. 43). Transformation of the soul, through autophotographical work, seeks an awareness that enlightens the self toward an understanding of the dark within. This understanding often takes the form of a “third” or that “which lies between all duos so as to lend dynamism to dyadic relationships, preventing them from becoming oppositional” (Doll, 1995, p. 34). When one understands and embraces the dark shadow within and unifies it with his/her persona, then the duality that exists between the ego and the soul is united. This is the creation of the “third” archetype or what Jung called the coniunctio oppositorum (Jung, 1959f, p. 31). This union of opposites into the third “implies growth, development, and movement in time” (Edinger, 1972, p. 182). It is the “trinity archetype that seems to symbolize individuation as a process” (Edinger, 1972, p. 193). This understanding of the dualities of the soul may come through a dialogue that complicates one’s beliefs or from an image that shocks and shatters. If it is an image, then the image may move the individual to fall away from the known and the comfortable. Through the image, the individual may gain an awareness that helps him/her attempt to confront his/her persona, his/her mask, and embrace the shadow within. He/She opens his/her eyes to the face of God in the Other and ends his/her projecting of his/her shadows onto the Other. Joseph Campbell (1949) describes this occurrence as the point at which the individual truly becomes human. He states, “The way to become human is to learn to recognize the lineaments of God in
all of the wonderful modulations of the face of man” (Campbell, 1949, p. 336). Seeing the face of God in the Other, is the goal of an autophotographic curriculum that is steeped in social justice. This transformation is possible with the practice of autophotography as a process along one’s archetypal journey. It is an autophotographical process that stems from the teaching of a “pedagogy of discomfort” through photography.

The Role of Education in the Archetypal Journey

Defining a “Pedagogy of Discomfort”

A “pedagogy of discomfort” entails elements of inquiry, study, and action. Primarily, a “pedagogy of discomfort,” as defined by Megan Boler (1999), “invites students to leave the familiar shores of learned beliefs and habits, and swim further out into the ‘foreign’ and risky depths of the sea of ethical and moral differences” (p. 176). She goes on to add, “Pedagogy of discomfort aims to invite students and educators to examine how our modes of seeing have been shaped specifically by the dominant culture of the historical moment” (p. 179). In concurrence with Boler, Jung (1950) classifies one’s moral and mental state along with one’s prejudices to be “the most serious obstacle to any moral or spiritual renaissance” (p.634). The functions of schools are to grow a “collective consciousness” (Von Franz, 1980, p. 143) where the masses operate on the same level on consciousness; however, a “pedagogy of discomfort” hopes to enlighten students toward a spiritual renaissance, an individual consciousness, with an open awareness of the dangers and deceptions of society’s hegemony. Hegemony is defined as “the maintenance of domination not by the sheer exercise of force but primarily through consensual social practices, social forms, and the social structures produced in specific sites” (Boler cited in Garrison, 2004, p. 121). Through an autophotographic exploration of the soul, the confines of hegemony can be uprooted across cultures, peoples, and classes. Students and teachers can
“engage in critical inquiry regarding values and cherished beliefs, and examine constructed self-images in relation to how one has learned to perceive other” (Boler, 1999, p. 176). A “pedagogy of discomfort” as autophotographic curriculum entails reflection, awareness, dialogue, and action.

A “pedagogy of discomfort” seeks to shake the apples from our trees. It is the earthquake that awakens us from our sleep at night. It is the fire alarm that goes off in first period during the final exam. A “pedagogy of discomfort” is the unexpected, the uncomfortable, and the unwanted. It is a curriculum that “understands the complexities of what it means to be an educated person has little to do with becoming happy or feeling better” (Morris, 2001, p. 199).

A “pedagogy of discomfort” causes “a moment of reflection, wonder, puzzlement, initiated by the soul which intervenes and countervails what we are in the midst of doing, hearing, reading, watching. With slow suspicion or sudden insight we move through the apparent to the less apparent” (Hillman, 1975, p. 140). A “pedagogy of discomfort” is deeply rooted in the regressive stage of the currere process, where one goes back to recognize the dark and the closed off of one’s life and educational experiences; however, it should not be mistaken that a “pedagogy of discomfort” is employed solely for the purpose of shattering accepted collected views of the dominant, controlling class. Boler (cited in Garrison 2004) states,

A pedagogy of discomfort invites not only members of the dominant culture but also members of marginalized cultures to reexamine the hegemonic values inevitably internalized in the process of being exposed to curricula and media that serve the interest of the ruling class (p.121).

Furthermore, as stated by Paulo Freire (1970) in Pedagogy of the Oppressed, “In order for the oppressed to be able to wage the struggle for their liberation, they must perceive the reality of
oppression not as a closed world…but as a limiting situation which they can transform” (p.49). Quite often, the oppressed of society are “likely to lead with the Orphan rather than the Innocent archetype…They are genuinely Orphaned by their culture” (Pearson, 1991, p. 277). It is the Seeker archetype that helps those who are oppressed reach for the goals of their transformation.

Teaching a “pedagogy of discomfort” in one’s classroom opens the eyes of both, the oppressed classes and the ruling classes, to the reality and possibility of change.

The teaching of critical thinking, analysis, and inquiry are the basis of any “strong” classroom. It is through these elements that I hope to give students the skills and opportunities to challenge and question the ideas and beliefs that they are taught. Education should convey a message. Parker Palmer (1983) describes this message as “not identified by words like ‘fact,’ ‘theory,’ ‘objective,’ and ‘reality,’ (though those words have their place.) Instead, the message is called ‘truth’” (p. 30). Students who are open to new ideas and change welcome the complex discussions surrounding the question “What is the truth?” This is a question that is central to a “pedagogy of discomfort.” However, those students who have remained within their Innocent archetypes often fight against the new and different that is offered. It is my goal as teacher to guide my students beyond the limitations of their safe habits. As stated by Dewey (1938), “It (habit) covers the formation of attitudes that are emotional and intellectual; it covers our basic sensitivities and ways of meeting and responding to all the conditions which we meet in living” (p.35). Gaston Bachelard (1943) goes on to describe the problems with habit even further; he states, “From my very particular point of view, habit is the exact antithesis of the creative imagination. The habitual image obstructs imaginative powers” (p.11). I believe the student must be removed from the safety of the known and the accepted in order to progress towards the different and the challenging. If I want to institute a positive change within my students, then I
must allow them to relish in the possibilities that emanate from their imaginations. Within their
imaginations lies the “greatest enemy of dogma: the imagination’s spontaneous freedom”
(Hillman, 1975, p. 144). This freedom allows one to imagine the novel, the different. Marla
Morris (2001) argues that imagination offers “other ways to think about the world, ways that
might admit ambiguity and paradox” (p. 200). However, imagination can be a slippery slope that
may maintain the grasps of the Innocent archetype as the individual imagines a utopian solution
that “reduces the complexities of lived experience into a recipe, or a method, for happiness”
(Morris, 2001, p. 198). With imagination comes the risk of blinding “the dark eye that can see
evil with bright hopes in human progress and faith in goodwill and peace” (Hillman 1996b,
p.239). For a student’s imagination to be transformative, it needs to “transport [one] out of
[himself/herself], out of [his/her] heroic ego stance, into the suchness of things….To educate the
imagination [one] should seek to achieve distance from [one’s] personal, merely literal self”
(Doll, 1995, p. 66). In order for the act of imagining to be transformative, the individual needs to
remove his/her self from the center. His/her movement toward the periphery is where he/she
might have a better perspective of an outcome that does not narcissistically place the self at the
center and is more open to the truth of things.

The imagination is closely linked to the archetype of the Creator. As a teacher, I can help
serve as the fuel that might ignite the imagination and allow the archetype of the Creator to
flourish. Bachelard (1943) describes the importance of imagination; he states that the
imagination is “the first principle of an idealist philosophy” (p.93). When the student is faced
with the multiple truths of the world, then he/she has the beginning knowledge needed to
institute a positive change. This attempt to create change needs the student’s imagination in
order to come to fruition. Bachelard (2000) states further in his work *The Dialectic of Duration,*
“We have come to realize that it is the idea that sings its song, that the complex interplay of ideas has its own tonality, a tonality that can call forth deep within us all a faint, soft murmuring” (p.154). The birth of ideas that will bring about change can only occur within one’s imagination. Furthermore, James Hillman (1996) supports the importance of imagination within the study of psychology. He states, “I want psychology to have its base in the imagination of people rather than in their statistics and their diagnostics” (p. 33). Imagination offers hope. It is the song that the idea sings or the faint, soft murmuring within one’s self that I would describe as the unrecognized possibilities of one’s imagination. When I speak of hope, I am not speaking of rainbows and sunsets, but rather, the belief that in hoping, one recognizes that something makes sense, it resonates reason, despite any knowledge of how it might actually turn out. Mary Aswell Doll (1995) states, “A well-defined inner life nurtured by creative imagination is essential for relating to others” (p. 33). Imagination is elemental to the act of empathy. One can not begin to understand the Other, if he/she cannot imagine, although remotely and at a distance, what living as the Other might be like. When one’s imagination is engaged, he/she is “both at play and at work, entering and being entered, and as the images gain in substance and independence the ego’s strength and autocracy tends to dissolve” (Hillman 1975, p.40). It is my removal of the student from the confines of the habits of his/her ego and into the possibilities of his/her imagination, that will progress his/her journey from Innocent to Orphan, through the dualities of the soul, to places beyond. Joseph Campbell (2004) states, “The idea in the hero adventure is to walk bodily through the door into the world where dualistic rules don’t apply…the hero journey through the threshold is simply a journey beyond the pairs of opposites” (pp. 114-115). When one’s imagination is ignited while working autophotographically, then he/she may be able to envision an existence that does not deny the past or utopianize the future, but rather, it places one
squarely in the present with a new awareness and an understanding of the possibility for something different.

The oppressed can never be afforded the opportunity to change their situation if they are not informed of the whole truth of their predicament. Being informed of the multiplicities of truth that exist means that the oppressed can no longer internalize the image of the oppressor, adopt his/her guidelines, and seek solace and security in conformity; rather, he/she must embrace a freedom from the false comfort of this image (Freire, 1970, p. 47). The knowledge gained by the oppressed through a “pedagogy of discomfort” classroom helps to shape their sense of self through the study of their culture’s untold stories. It gives them an opportunity to critically recognize the causes of oppression, so that “through transforming action they can create a new situation, one which makes possible the pursuit of a fuller humanity” (Freire, 1970, p. 47). A “pedagogy of discomfort” gives the oppressed a means by which to embrace the freedom that is a prerequisite of their transformation. Paulo Freire (1970) describes this freedom as an ideal that is pursued “constantly and responsibly. Freedom is not an ideal located outside of man; nor is it an idea which becomes myth. It is rather the indispensable condition for the quest of human completion” (p. 47). In support of autophotography as a “pedagogy of discomfort,” Smith (2000) describes the power of photographs to serve as “catalysts for action (Alexander cited in Smith) where witnessing the scenes of violence depicted in photographs can enable a first step toward African American resistance” (p. 10). Garrison (1997) states, “People who do not blaze with their own passions burn out” (p. 57). Furthermore, Jung (1956) discusses the importance of passion and the dangers of idleness in *Symbols of Transformation*, he cites La Rochefoucauld,

Of all the Passions we are exposed to, none is more concealed from our Knowledge than Idleness. It is the most violent, and the most mischievous of any, and yet at the same
time we are never sensible of its Violence, and the damage we sustain by it is very
seldom seen (p.174).

The overlooked, burned out, and forgotten students in society have the potential to ignite their
inner fires and awaken their idleness with their photographic stories. If awareness is not
achieved by these students, then repression of the unwanted truths is likely to follow. This is
dangerous for the individual because “forces excluded from the conscious mind accumulate and
build up a tension in the unconscious, and this tension is quite definitely destructive” (Neumann,
1943, p. 49). To combat this danger, the Lover archetype needs to be set free to burn with the
passions that will ignite actions toward freedom and change. Through the Lover, the repressed
elements that are deemed ugly and putrid are named and embraced. The oppressed no longer
have to hold the passions of the majority in order to maintain the safety of their personas.
Through their autophotographical work as a “pedagogy of discomfort,” they are recognized with
legitimacy, and they are empowered to claim their histories for their own.

The Role of a “Pedagogy of Discomfort” in the Archetypal Journey

The first leg of the student’s archetypal journey requires the “shattering” of the Innocent
archetype. The Innocent has dominated the soul and psyche of the student throughout his/her
educational experience. The student has remained safely within the bars of the reality that the
world is overall a good place, that people are treated fairly and equally, and that those in charge
are truly working in the best interests of all. This is the reality that the oppressors profess to the
masses, and that one of “the gravest obstacles to the achievement of liberation is that the
oppressive reality absorbs those within it and thereby acts to submerge human beings’
consciousness” (Freire, 1970, p.51). The first goal of a “pedagogy of discomfort” is to uproot the
Innocent’s grasp on a dualist perspective. A dualist perspective presents “soul events within a
compensatory system of pairs: mind and body, ego and world, spirit and instinct…But, soul events are not part of a general balancing system” (Hillman, 1975, p. 100). Maintaining the Innocent in a place of dualisms is to insure that he/she will not experience life as a soul event. This narrow view maintains the dichotomy of good and evil; whereby, the Innocent will never be able to see the face of God in the Other because he/she will not be able to reconcile the existence of the duals within the unity of God, the coniunctio oppositorum (Jung 1959f, p. 31 and p. 268). The shattering of the Innocent entails one realizing “that he/she has all the world within himself/herself, its best and worst…and to know both one’s mortal limitations and immortal potential” (Mayes 2005, p. 72). An ethical aim of autophotography as a “pedagogy of discomfort” is the willingness of the individual to “inhabit a more ambiguous and flexible sense of self…and engage in critical inquiry regarding values and cherished beliefs, and to examine constructed self-images in relation to how one has learned to perceive others” (Boler 1999, pp.176-177). Through a “pedagogy of discomfort” the Innocent is moved out of a dualist existence into, as Pearson describes it (1991), “a world of paradox” (p.39). It is an understanding and acceptance that one’s notion of consciousness “would reflect a world view that is diverse and unsettled” (Hillman, 1975, p. 42). This is a realization for the Innocent that “shakes the individual to his foundations at the inescapable necessity of recognizing that the other side, in spite of its undoubted character of hostility and alienness to the ego, is a part of his own personality” (Neumann, 1943, p. 79). Realizing that the dual, the good and the bad, are unified within one’s soul is a state of paradox for the Innocent. Facing the challenges that arise from working autophotographically, the Innocent is forced to put aside the comfort of a dualist perspective and the desire for blind security.
Along the archetypal journey a “pedagogy of discomfort” may be a catalyst for a change of consciousness within the student’s soul from the Innocent to the Orphan. If the Innocent is active in the student, then the student would prefer to remain idle in his/her existence safely protected from the truths of society. Fortunately for the student, a “pedagogy of discomfort” seeks to pry the Innocent away from its security blanket. Removal of this security blanket encourages reflection and action. James Hillman (1975) argues, “The soul’s first habitual activity is reflection…and reflection by means of ideas is an activity; idea-forming and idea-using are actions…[whereby] psychological ideas do not oppose action, rather they enhance it by making behavior of any kind at any time a significant embodiment of soul” (p. 117). A “pedagogy of discomfort” has done its duty when

The individual is driven by his personal crisis into deep waters which he would usually never have entered if left to his own free will. The old idealized image of the ego has to go, and its place is shaken by a perilous insight into the ambiguity and many-sidedness of one’s own nature (Neumann, 1943, p. 79)

When the student has “fallen” from innocence, then the next archetype that will most likely take form is the Orphan. Bachelard (1943) describes the fear of falling as a “primitive fear” (p.91). This is the place in the journey where

The disillusioning effect of the encounter with one’s own shadow, the unconscious negative part of the personality, is always to be found in cases where the ego has lived in identification with the persona and the collective values of the period….The naïve self-illusion of the ego, which has more or less identified itself with everything good and fine, receives a severe shock (Neumann, 1943, p.78).
Generally, when a student’s belief system is challenged, the reaction will be “defensive anger, a fear of change, and a fear of losing [one’s] personal and cultural identities” (Boler, 1999, p. 176). The Orphan archetype will take hold and the individual clings to a “pessimistic and deflationary philosophy that is an expression of the deep disturbance of consciousness brought about by the experience of the shadow side of life” (Neumann, 1943, p. 86). Often, the student may feel abandoned or lost from the world.

The student has felt the fall and feels unsafe, unsure, and unprotected. This feeling of abandonment often feels as if the Orphan has betrayed him/herself. James Hillman (1975) describes the experience of self-betrayal as a possible reaction to the unwanted truths, a betrayal in itself, within one’s journey of archetypal progression. He states,

> It is a strange experience to find one betraying oneself, turning against one’s own experiences by giving them the negative values of the shadow and by acting against one’s own intentions and value system. In the break-up of a friendship, partnership, marriage, love-affair, or analysis, suddenly the nastiest and dirtiest appears and one finds oneself acting in the same blind and sordid way that one attributes to the Other, and justifying one’s own actions with an alien value system. One is truly betrayed, handed over to the enemy within (Hillman, 1975, p.73)

This enemy within is the individual’s shadow side, and it is at this point in the journey that one may rid himself/herself of the guilt of becoming aware of his/her shadow and he/she may project the shadow(s) onto the Other. The shadow is then “experienced as an outside object. It is combated, punished, and exterminated as ‘the alien out there’ instead of being dealt with as ‘one’s own inner problem’” (Neumann, 1943, p. 50). The projection of the shadow by the Orphan helps to explain the proliferation of hate gangs who abide by beliefs in anti-Semitism,
homophobia and racism. The Orphan clings to the collective to assuage his/her abandonment while projecting the elements of his/her self that he/she deems may have been the reasons for his/her being abandoned onto the Other. In the eyes of the Orphan, this projection justifies the violence that ensues against the Other.

This sense of desertion can lead the student to turn to the shadow Orphan side. If this occurs, one of several possibilities may occur alone or together. The student may feel like a victim because the student feels that he/she has been deceived by society. Furthermore, the student may react with either anger or ambivalence towards the “new” truths and their purveyor, the teacher. With regards to photographic images, the images may begin to “anesthetize...The vast photographic catalogue of misery and injustice throughout the world has given everyone a certain familiarity with atrocity, making the horrible seem more ordinary—making it appear familiar” (Sontag, 1973, p. 21). When looking through the eyes of the Orphan, the individual may not be moved to act against the pain recorded in the image. Even worse, the Destroyer archetype may take hold and the student may delve into self-destructive behavior or harm others as Thanatos, the Greek mythological figure of death, takes control. However, through compassion and caring, the teacher may be able to facilitate a change within the student from the shadow Orphan to a higher level of consciousness. Hillman (1975) describes, “The broken promise or broken trust is at the same time a breakthrough onto another level of consciousness” (p.67) As stated by Megan Boler (2004), “[F]or those who feel significantly threatened by course content, something needs to be offered to replace what feels like loss or annihilation...it means that compassion is especially crucial for those who feel they are out on a limb” (p.127). This is the stage that the student needs his/her Caregiver archetype to help battle the pain that accompanies the disillusionment of working autophotographically through a “pedagogy of
discomfort.” Autophotography provides the student with an education that “helps the individual cast light on the shadow of him/herself and his/her culture” (Mayes, 2005, p. 119). As the student’s teacher, I need to make sure that I have compassion for the student throughout the growth process and perhaps my expression of compassion will motivate the arrival of his/her Caregiver archetype to nurture the ego within the student.

Autophotography as a “pedagogy of discomfort” can serve as a vehicle through which the Orphaned student can regain a sense of self and value. After the initial resistance to the unwanted truths of the pedagogy of discomfort, the student has the possibility of facing fears head on. As stated by Roland Barthes (1980), “Photography is subversive not when it frightens, repels, or even stigmatizes, but when it is pensive, when it thinks” (p. 38). An autophotographic curriculum that calls on the student “to think” is a curriculum of transformation. As stated by Minnie Bruce Pratt (1984) in Boler’s (1999) Feeling Power: Emotions and Education, the student will gain three things by stepping forward on the path of change (p.181). First, the student will expand the “constricted eye” and will embrace and face the fear around one’s heart (p.181). This is the point in the hero’s journey where one must cross the threshold into the dark of the unknown. According to Edinger (1972), this is a sacrifice of innocent purity that “implies a realization of the shadow which releases one from identification with the role of the innocent victim and the tendency to project the evil executioner on to God or neighbor” (p. 235). Second, the student will be able to realize and accept that to acknowledge the complexity of another’s existence does not in turn deny the student’s own existence (p.182). This is the point at which the individual has faced the “dragon” shadow on his/her hero’s journey and he/she has embraced/slain it. At this stage, one is no longer projecting the shadow on the Other. He/She has learned that one does not “have to identify with the other to assimilate the other and
recognize that what it represents is another aspect of that which one is” (Campbell, 2004, p. 140). The third and final gain Pratt mentions is the relief accorded from the chance to progress beyond the pain inherent to separating oneself from others because of the Other’s differences from oneself (p.182). Reconciling the pain of separating one’s self from the Other occurs on the journey when one is no longer projecting onto the Other and he/she is standing in relation to the Other. The Other has become the “Thou” where the individual and the Other are both recognized to possess the “inexhaustible and multifariously wonderful divine existence that is the life in all of us” (Campbell, 1949, p. 337). The individual is able to see the face of God in the Other.

The student is afforded the opportunity to progress further in the archetypal journey beyond the confinements of disappointment and discouragement inherent to the Orphan archetype. Jung (1953) states, “The way to the goal seems chaotic and interminable at first, and only gradually do the signs increase that it is leading anywhere” (p.28). In my view, archetypal progression is cyclical, not linear. It is a bumpy and winding road, often with few signs of a clear end, as it often turns back in upon itself. One cannot progress through life and grow, unless one faces both the joys and the heartaches that define life’s experiences. These heartaches that help to define life’s experiences can open one to a depression; however, “through depression [one] enters depths and in depths find soul. Depression moistens the dry soul, and dries the wet. It brings refuge, limitation, focus, gravity, weight, and humble powerlessness” (Hillman, 1975, p. 98). The journey of transformation that begins with “the shattering” of the ego and perhaps the onslaught of depression, can result in “the ability of the student to recognize what it is that one doesn’t know, and how one has developed emotional investments to protect oneself from this knowing” (Boler, 1999, p. 200). Becoming open to this awareness is painful and dangerous for
the ego; however, in order to dissolve the dichotomy that exists between the inner and the outer worlds of one’s existence, one must be open to the unleashing of one’s soul through the pain that comes with an awareness that shatters. Robert Sardello (2002) argues that when egotism is left to itself, it “follows a strict law of increase, separation from others, and self-absorption” (p. xvi). What is needed is a “reorientation of the ego toward an interest in others, care for the world, and the love of the divine” (Sardello 2002, p. xvi). The shattering of the ego can create an opportunity for this reorientation.

When one’s ego is shattered, he/she experiences an act of violence; however, this is an act of violence that is needed. I compare the need for shattering to Allan Guggenbuhl’s argument in support of internal violent acts. He states,

> Our psyche needs violence in order to be disturbed from time to time. It sees in violence an antidote to an ordered, structured, and over-managed society…Violence should be integrated into our lives as story, image, fantasy, or part of a ritual so it can keep on irritating us (Guggenbuhl, 2009, p.52).

Autophotographic images can serve as this type of violence. The autophotographic image can bring awareness to the individual that brings into light the shadows of one’s souls. When one delves into his/her depths to engage his/her shadows, then he/she is opening oneself to the possibilities that exist apart from the persona that he/she maintains. Opening one’s self to unifying the duality of one’s soul is a transformative moment along one’s archetypal journey. When one is open to his/her shadow he/she, “experiences the other in one’s self, and the other-than-one’s self experiences him/her” (Jung, 1959e, p.382). This is the time when projection ends and it allows for one to be in relation to the Other where he/she can see the infinite that exists
within the self and the Other. Martin Buber (1916) describes entering into this pure relationship as

Not ignoring everything but seeing everything in the Thou, not renouncing the world but placing it upon its proper ground. Looking away from the world is no help toward God, staring at the world is no help either; but whoever beholds the world in him stands in his presence (p. 127).

It is when one unleashes his/her soul into the universe that one is able to enter into a relationship with the Other as the Thou.

The Teacher and the Journey

Students can often become frustrated along their journey; however, it should be the ambition of the teacher, my ambition, to ease the students’ frustration when at all possible and help them reach their goal. Educators play a significant role in guiding students through this process. It is my job as a teacher to insure that this process has the possibility of beginning and developing within my classroom; whereby I provide opportunities for my students to combat the “habit of denial” (Boler, 1999, p. 156) that has enabled them to remain comfortable in a system that oppresses the Other. Traditionally, the teacher’s role in the classroom is “to organize a process which already occurs spontaneously, to ‘fill’ the students by making deposits of information which he or she considers to constitute true knowledge” (Freire, 1970, p. 76).

Teaching as if I hold all the answers is not conducive to a social justice classroom. I do not have the answers and professing otherwise is an act of prideful deception. I am on the journey with my students and my beliefs and truths can be called in to question just as my students’ are. Megan Boler (1999) states, “The educator should explore what it means to ‘share’ the students’ vulnerability and suffering” (p. 188). In the words of Paulo Freire (1970), my purpose as a
teacher is “not to regard cognizable objects as my private property, but as the object of reflection by myself and my students” (p. 80). My students will not progress on their archetypal journey if I claim to hold the “pot of gold” at the end of the rainbow. The “pot of gold” lies within their own souls and as educator of social justice I need to work with my students, so that they may see the treasure that exists within each of them as well as within those who are different from them. When the student answers the call to embark on his/her hero’s journey, I am the “helper that will come along the way to provide magical aid” (Campbell, 2004, p. 116). The magical aid that I provide is a nurturing and caring environment that embraces the student on his/her quest. I am the wise old woman, who they encounter along their journey, much like King Arthur and his Merlin. I can offer my students guidance, but they must find their own path. As a teacher, I need to help my students ask the difficult questions that challenge their learned apathy and encourage them to move past the comfortable distance of a voyeur. Looking critically at one’s life and one’s education is a difficult task at best; however, through autophotographic inquiry students are afforded the opportunity to embark on a journey of transformation, guided by the archetypes of their soul, so as to arrive at a place of greater understanding of themselves and the world around them.

When students have an understanding that life is a continual journey, with hills and valleys, then the classroom teacher has an easier job ahead of him/her. However, the luxury of this awareness is not usually the case. Generally, students cling to their Innocent archetypes or fall into a state of Orphandom when faced with truths that are difficult, or even worse, those difficult truths that they realize they have contributed to. Students who are sheltered from the difficult truth can not grow psychologically. Clifford Mayes (2005) argues, “The student who is perpetually shielded against the developmentally necessary reality of occasional failure must
ultimately succumb to a kind of psychic entropy” (p. 110). It is important for the teacher to offer a compassionate space where students can feel safe to face the difficult, the uncomfortable, and the unknown. This compassionate space is made through the opening of “complicated conversations” and critical dialogue. Paulo Freire (1970) describes dialogue as “An encounter between men, mediated by the world, in order to name the world. Hence, dialogue cannot occur between those who deny others the right to speak their word and those whose right to speak has been denied them” (p. 88). A classroom that supports an archetypal journey through the autophotographic shattering of one’s innocence needs to embrace the transformative work of dialogue. In dialogue, each person is in active participation with the other. One person does not dominate the discussion or profess to hold the solution to the problem, but rather, together, both individuals work to “name the world, transform it…. as the way by which they achieve significance as human beings” (Freire, 1970, p. 88). A teacher who supports this transformative dialogue helps to keep the students as well as himself/herself from falling into the habit of the voyeur’s gaze. The voyeur sees the image “as shock and the image as cliché” (Sontag, 2004, p. 23). He/She stares at the image as “the gruesome [that] invites one to be either spectator or coward, unable to look” (Sontag, 2004, p. 42). Susan Sontag (2004) argues,

Perhaps the only people with the right to look at images of suffering of this extreme order are those who could do something to alleviate it…or those who could learn from it. The rest of us are voyeurs, whether or not we mean to be (p. 42).

The teacher can help the student escape from the habit of voyeurism by encouraging the student to learn from the image, have hope that change might occur, and act to alleviate the injustice.

Creating a classroom that is nurturing to the student’s hero’s journey is not easily done. Just as I ask my students to consciously act and take responsibility for their role in the oppression
of the Other, I must recognize that my classroom, despite my best intentions, may serve to squelch the alchemical fires that burn in my students souls. As stated by James Hillman (1975), “A guilty ego is no less egocentric than a proud one” (p.83). It is easy to fall into a habit of professing that all will be fine in society, so long as “we” all get along. This is a utopian belief that may appear to be transformative; however, in actuality, it maintains the status quo in society because it never fully engages students on their hero’s journey. Marla Morris (2001) argues that utopianism hides beneath hope (p. 198). Morris (2001) states further that

A utopic curriculum, whether conceived as a blueprint, a static plan with objectives and goals, or as a dynamic current of lived experiences, runs the risk of blinding and thwarting understanding…the complexities of life have little to do with rainbows and paradise (p. 199).

Similar to Morris, Megan Boler (2004) defines this utopian ideal as “naïve hope.” She describes naïve hope as

Those platitudes that directly serve the hegemonic interest of maintaining the status quo, particularly by espousing humanist rhetoric. These platitudes include the rhetoric of individualism; beliefs in equal opportunity; the puritanical faith that hard work inevitably leads to success; that everyone is the same underneath the skin (p. 128).

Professing the rhetoric of Boler’s naïve hope, is easily accomplished in the classroom as it deceptively disguises the true inequities that exist in public education. Naïve hope supports the belief that ultimately, one’s failure to find success, in society, is one’s own doing. He/She didn’t work hard enough, take the right classes, or lift him/herself out of the depths of poverty with enough gusto. Claiming that all students have an equal chance at success is a lie, an easy deception to believe and aspire to, because the other alternative is to recognize that despite one’s
best intentions, despite my best intentions, there is still an unequal access to privilege in our schools.

Having hope that the world can be a better place is not a bad belief to have; however it can be dangerous if it blinds one to truth. Paulo Freire (1970) argues in support of hope. He states, “Hope is rooted in men’s incompletion, from which they move out in constant search—a search which can be carried out only in communion with others” (p. 91). The hope that Freire describes is the hope of the Seeker and the Creator archetypes. It is a hope that is based in action. Megan Boler (2004) describes this type of hope as

A critical hope that recognizes we live within systems of inequality, in which privilege, such as white and male privilege, comes at the expense of the freedom of others. A willingness to engage in in-depth critical inquiry regarding systems of domination accompanied by a parallel of emotional willingness to engage in the difficult work of possibly allowing one’s worldviews to be shattered (p. 128).

Teachers must help to create within their classrooms environments that allow for the emergence of different meanings and different ways of seeing, so that the old habit of seeing is shattered. However, both teachers as well as students, need to be aware that “morality can blind us to the intricacies of our shadow. [And] a consciousness of impurity is a prerequisite for dealing with the contents of our shadow. Without it we are unable to appreciate the dynamics and motives behind darker issues” (Guggenbuhl, 2009, 39). Teachers need to create an environment that acknowledges that inside one’s self, there is good and bad, dark and evil; however, one need not be possessed solely by one or the other. It is a balance, a yin-yang relation. Carl Jung (1959c) states, “One man’s optimism makes him overweening, while another’s pessimism makes him overanxious and despondent” (p. 155). It is an environment much like that of Umberto Eco’s
woods in *Six Walks in the Fictional Woods*. It is an environment created by everybody, not just by and for one individual. Eco describes the woods and his search for meaning in the woods as, “It is right for me while walking in the wood to use every experience and every discovery to learn about life, about the past and the future. But since a wood is created for everybody, I must not look there for facts and sentiments which concern only myself” (Eco, 1994, p. 9). Eco’s walk in the woods is similar to realizing that one can not live openly to the world, if he/she is living to possess it. Living to possess the world is living with the world as one’s “It.” Eco’s woods metaphorically represent the possibilities for new understandings and new meanings that may emerge within a classroom where autophotographic inquiry is practiced. When the conglomeration and collaboration of multiple autophotographic stories come together to create a multitude of new meanings for students, then the voices of the students, even the dark voices, are legitimized and the students feel empowered to act in the name of social justice, seeing beyond just themselves in the woods.

Many of the problems of society are due to members of society who are stuck within their shadow archetype. As teachers, we must instill within students the strength and power to face life challenges without succumbing to the solace that the shadow offers. As educators of social justice, “we endeavor to rattle complacent cages, we attempt to ‘wrest students anew’ from the threat of conformism, and we undoubtedly face the treacherous ghosts of the other’s fears and terrors, which in turn evoke our own demons” (Boler, 1999, p. 175). The ghosts that arise within our students when faced with the difficult and sometimes painful truths are the shadows of their collective unconscious. The shadow combats the persona, and it leads one toward self-destructive behavior, because one is not able to reconcile his/her persona with his/her shadows. The student pushes back away from reality, sometimes through violent action and sometimes
through quiet apathy. The realization of the shadow(s) makes one feel worthless, unlovable. Jung (1956) states, “It is hard to believe that this teeming world is too poor to provide an object for human love—it offers boundless opportunities to everyone. It is rather the inability to love which robs a person of these opportunities” (p. 173). It is when one faces, embraces, and loves his “internal devils that he/she can be instrumental in helping a people cleanse itself of its own hidden collective devils” (Mayes, 2005, p. 87). Too often, the student is incapable of loving himself/herself let alone another. There needs to be a rejuvenation of the soul where the Lover archetype is allowed to flourish within education. Parker Palmer (1983) links knowledge to love. He states,

> A knowledge that springs from love may require us to change, even sacrifice, for the sake of what we know. It is easy to be curious and controlling. It is difficult to love. But if we want a knowledge that will rebuild our broken world, we must reach for the deeper passion. We must recover from our spiritual tradition the models and methods of knowing as an act of love (p.9).

Within the confines of standardized classrooms and curricula, students need to be taught how to love those that they have been taught are the un-loveable, especially when the un-loveable are themselves.

> Loving one’s unlovable parts, one’s shadows, is to accept the duality of one’s soul.

Rather than seeing the persona and the shadow as opposites and in conflict with each other, one needs to experience them as something “more equivalent to a yin/yang relationship—being two sides of the same phenomenon” (Pearson, 1991, p. 235). Allan Guggenbuhl (2009) argues, “If we are ready to accept our ambiguity, our fascination, and failures, we have the right attitude to get to the core of the issue” (p. 55). Students need to use their knowledge of truth, however dark,
and of love, to make a difference. James Hillman (1975) writes, “Perhaps only through love is it possible to recognize the person of the soul” (p. 44). Students can arrive at a new awareness through the memory work of autophotography and the social justice curriculum of a “pedagogy of discomfort.” Thomas Moore (1992) argues,

To the soul, memory is more important than planning, art more compelling than reason, and love more fulfilling than understanding. We know we are well on the way toward soul when we feel attachment to the world and the people around us and when we live as much from the heart as from the head (p.304).

When the individual is healed, then the world can begin to heal. One of the first steps in healing is recognizing that the dark parts of one’s self are not necessarily “bad parts.” James Hillman (1975) writes, “When we are told what is healthy, we are being told what is right to think and feel. When we are told what is mentally ill, we are being told what ideas, behavior, and fantasies are wrong” (p.77). Acceptance of one’s shadow sides, is a necessary and preliminary step towards loving the Other. One must first love his/her unlovable parts, before he/she can give love to another. Samuels argues, “Connectedness between human beings is surely both spiritual and political which is why psychotherapy, politics, and religion all share, at some level, in the fantasy of providing healing for the world” (Samuel cited in Mayes, 2005, p. 89). Before the world can change, change must first begin in the individual.

Loving and seeing the Other outside of our selves as well as within, allows for a multiplicity in the Soul. It is through the multiplicity of the soul that one can truly see the different ways of being and more importantly, that those different ways of being are okay. Paulo Freire (1998) argues that the best way to allow oneself to be open to differences is “to refuse the entrenched dogmatism that makes one incapable of learning anything new” (p. 119). When one
loves the different on the inside and on the outside, he/she is open “to approaching and being approached, to questioning and being questioned, to agreeing and disagreeing. It is an openness to life itself and its vicissitudes” (Freire, 1998, p. 119). Seeing the Other as the “Thou” is an act of opening the soul to the unknown and the unsure. It is an act of love. Martin Buber (1916) professes that, “Love does not cling to an I, as if the Thou were merely its ‘content’ or object; it [love] is between I and Thou…Love is responsibility of an I and for a Thou: in this consists what cannot consist in any feeling—the equality of all lovers, from the smallest to the greatest” (p. 66). It is not those who are “unloved who initiate disaffection, but those who cannot love because they love only themselves” (Freire, 1970, p. 55). To love is to discover one’s soul. Seeing the Other as the “Thou,” involves having a reverence for his/her soul. As the I/Thou relationship holds soul in reverence, the nature of an entire community can change where a “community slightly shifts toward being more soulful and people begin to care for one another rather than compete against each other” (Sardello, 2002, xviii). When one discovers his/her soul, then one has rediscovered humankind, nature, and world (Hillman, 1975, p. 197). Opening one’s self to his/her soul is to open oneself to the Other, to the world. It is to see soul in everything and in everyone.

It is possible to ignite the alchemical fires of the soul through the shattering that might occur with an autophotographic curriculum. A teacher who can “constellate archetypal energy and imagery in his/her self and his/her students, [possesses] one of the great keys to truly memorable teaching” (Mayes, 2005, p. 104). Students, who are continually and increasingly posed with “problems relating to themselves in the world and with the world, will feel increasingly challenged and obliged to respond to that challenge” (Freire, 1970, p. 81). To be educated, in its truest sense, is not the acquisition of more factual knowledge and greater test
scores; rather, it is the continual pursuit of how one might live with more love in relation to the world. Love is “an act of courage, not of fear, love is commitment to others” (Freire, 1970, p. 89). In order for one to open his heart to the Other, so that he/she no longer experiences the Other as his/her “It,” projecting his/her own shadows onto the Other, he/she must live in continual praxis whereby he/she “reflects and acts upon the world in order to transform it” (Freire, 1970, p. 51). Robert Sardello (2002) argues

    In the past, practices centered around trying to restrain oneself from certain actions, keeping certain actions, keeping certain kinds of thoughts and feelings from intruding into consciousness, guilt, and penance as the way to virtue, today, self-observation is all important. We need to develop the capacities to observe the most subtle of our inner states and outer acts, the connection or lack of connection between them, and the subtle results of our acts (p. xvi).

    When one encounters the Other as his/her “Thou,” each is “neither ignoramus nor a perfect sage; [he/she is] only [a person] who [is] attempting, together, to learn more than [he/she] already know[s]” (Freire, 1970, p. 90). It is through autophotographic inquiry that students are afforded an opportunity to become more human, to love more deeply, and to embark on a transformative journey of the ego, soul, and the self, guided by the archetypes, that results in positive change and action for the betterment of society.
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