



California State University, San Bernardino
CSUSB ScholarWorks

Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations

Office of Graduate Studies

6-2016

Goodbye to All That Again

Charles Bradley Von Nordheim
chuckvon38@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Fiction Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Von Nordheim, Charles Bradley, "Goodbye to All That Again" (2016). *Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations*. Paper 386.

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of Graduate Studies at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

GOODBYE TO ALL THAT AGAIN

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Fine Arts
in
Creative Writing:
Fiction

by
Charles Bradley Von Nordheim

June 2016

GOODBYE TO ALL THAT AGAIN

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Charles Bradley Von Nordheim
June 2016

Approved by:

James Brown, First Reader

Chad Luck, Second Reader

Copyright 2016 Charles Bradley Von Nordheim

ABSTRACT

GOODBYE TO ALL THAT AGAIN concerns the odyssey of an Iraq War veteran who must complete his journey past desert combat and academic strife in order to reclaim his heroic identity. The novel uses a fragmented storytelling mode that offers readers thirteen years of the protagonist's timeline in a nonlinear sequence. Through this technique, the novel evokes the cognitive disassociation experienced by individuals who suffer Post Traumatic Stress and echoes the postmodern practices employed by American military novelists such as Joseph Heller and Tim O'Brien for the last sixty years.

GOODBYE TO ALL THAT AGAIN seeks to intervene in the discourse of the American war novel by updating the depiction of military members from unwilling draftees, the situation Heller and O'Brien portray, to that of career-driven volunteers. The novel also considers adjustment concerns raised by the political correctness movement, a bar to civilian reintegration unknown by prior generations of veterans. In doing so, the writer hopes to adjust the zeitgeist, a major concern of his practice as detailed in his STATEMENT OF PURPOSE, toward a more accurate representation of military members so that society can more effectively meet their needs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE—CASTING SPELLS IN THE FORM OF FICTION: AN OVERVIEW OF JUNGIAN WRITING PRODUCTION	1
WORKS CITED	21
APPENDIX: GOODBYE TO ALL THAT AGAIN.....	22

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Casting Spells in the Form of Fiction:

An Overview of Jungian Writing Production

Introduction

The author intends this document to serve as an overview of the principles he employs in his practice of fiction production. It begins by outlining the theory of the collective unconscious and its adjustment, as articulated by psychoanalyst Carl Jung, and then proceeds to consideration of a depiction of the traits of commercial fiction offered by novelist H.G. Wells. Next, the overview describes how the author uses the principles extracted from the above theories to guide his practice in regard to the selection and shaping of material, responding to the demands of the current vogue of verifiability in the zone of autobiography, and, finally, resisting the privileging of direct over indirect experience through a rereading of Ernest Hemingway. A reviewer will find the promised section on Carl Jung and the collective unconscious below.

Jung and the Collective Unconscious

Psychoanalyst Carl Jung broached the idea of the collective unconscious and first expressed the dire need to return humanity to its ego-regulating regime in the early years of the twentieth century. His work provides the theoretical underpinning of my writing practice. Using extended extracts from The Portable Jung permitting the psychoanalyst, in a certain sense, to speak for himself, this section desires to reacquaint reviewers with the tones of meaning sounded by

these concept within their original context. I begin with a thumbnail sketch of the concept of the collective unconscious from his 1927 essay, "The Structure of the Psyche."

The collective unconsciousness contains the whole spiritual heritage of mankind's evolution, born anew in the brain structure of every individual. His conscious mind is an ephemeral phenomenon that accomplishes all provisional adaptations and orientations...The unconscious, on the other hand, is the source of the instinctual forces of the psyche and of the forms or categories that regulate them, namely the archetypes. All the most powerful ideas in history go back to archetypes. This is particularly true of religious ideas, but the central concepts of science, philosophy, and ethics are no exception to this rule (45).

Unlike Freud, who tended to characterize the unconscious as a repository of infantile impulses that psychoanalysts needed to purge, Jung conceived a psychological model where the conscious and unconscious worked in tandem, providing compensations for the deficiencies and curbs for the excesses in the two separate zones of psychic activity. The conscious facilitates the focused mental directedness humans require to support their logic-driven civilization. The unconscious, on the other hand, permits humans a mean of escape from the trap of quotidian existences premised on individual personhood, especially should the evocation of the transcendent come from a shaman:

Whoever speaks in primordial images speaks with a thousand voices; he enralls and overpowers, while at the same time he lifts the idea he is seeking to express out of the occasional and the transitory into the realm of the ever-enduring. He transmutes our personal destiny into the destiny of mankind, and evokes in us all those beneficent forces that ever and anon have enabled humanity to find a refuge from every peril and to outlive the longest night ("Poetry" 321).

Civilization threatened this needed balance between these two mental domains because ever-increasing level of logic-bound directness demanded by complicated technological systems tended to enmesh humans in conscious cogitation. By means of a properly mechanistic metaphor, Jung outlined the chief dilemma faced by man in the machine age: to this extent, the psyche of man is no longer a self-regulating system but could rather be compared to a machine whose speed-regulation is so insensitive that it can continue to function to the point of self-injury ("Transcendent" 286).

How does one save humankind from this self-inflicted peril? One attempted to realign the out-of-kilter psyche. One sought a means to reengage the compensatory operations of the collective unconscious. While Jung believed a psychoanalyst could perform the necessary adjustment on a case-by-case basis, he opined that only an artist could perform this feat on a species-wide level:

The creative process, so far as we are able to follow it at all, consists in the unconscious activation of an archetypal image, and in elaborating and

shaping this image into finished work. By giving it shape, the artist translates it into the language of the present, and so makes it possible for us to find our way back to the deepest springs of life. Therein lies the significance of art: it is constantly at work educating the spirit of the age, conjuring up the forms in which the age is most lacking. The unsatisfied yearning of the artist reaches back to the primordial image in the unconscious which is best fitted to compensate the inadequacy and one-sidedness of the present. The artist seizes on this image, and in raising it from deepest unconsciousness he brings it in relation with conscious values, thereby transforming it until it can be accepted by the mind of contemporaries according to their powers ("Poetry" 321-322).

If, as Jungle Book author Rudyard Kipling maintains in his poem "In the Neolithic Age" there abound "Nine and sixty ways of constructing tribal lays," then an equal number of reasons exist for a creative-writing practitioner to generate new texts. For example, some take up the task to bear witness about what they have done and what others did to them. Others seek to defend the interests of their race, class, ethnicity, or affinity group in their writing. I produce fiction and poetry driven by the hope that one or two of my pieces will chart a path for their readers out of the drylands of logic to the infinitely renewed waters of the collective unconscious.

Before I discuss the means and methods I use to select and shape material to promote species-wide psychic realignment, it seems apt to consider

what story elements a practitioner might stress in order to attract a broad audience. After all, if my practice disguises a bout of therapy as an entertainment, then I want it consumed by as many readers as possible so that it has the maximum hygienic effect. Reviewers will find a section that considers that issue below.

Wells and Commercial Fiction

Novelist and social critic H.G. Wells, for several decades the most widely-read author in the English language, provided a snarky precis of the presumed readers of commercial fiction and the inherent qualities that persuaded them to sample it. I would argue the presumptions and traits Wells noted when he wrote “The Contemporary Novel” in 1911 remain in force. The only adjustment needed to make the article fit our contemporary popular fiction marketplace is perhaps the inclusion of exhausted truckers and fatigued Amazon warehouse workers to presumed audience of tired barristers and weary bankers. In any case, let us allow Wells to make his case in his words:

There is, I am aware, the theory that the novel is wholly and solely a means of relaxation. In spite of manifest facts, that was the dominant view of the great period we now in our retrospective way speak of as the Victorian, and it still survives to this day. It is the man’s theory of the novel rather than the woman’s. One may call it the Weary Giant theory. The reader is represented as a man, burthened, toiling, worn. He has been in his office from ten to four, with perhaps only two hour’s interval at his club

for lunch; or he has been playing golf; or he has been waiting about and voting in the House; or he has been fishing; or he has been disputing a point of a law; or writing a sermon; or doing one of a thousand other of the grave important things which constitutes the substance of a prosperous man's life. Now at last comes the last weary interval of leisure, and the Weary Giant takes up a book. Perhaps he is vexed: he may have been bunkered, his line may have entangled in the trees, his favorite investment may have slumped, or the judge may have had indigestion and been extremely rude to him. He wants to forget the troublesome realities of life. He wants to be taken out of himself, to be cheered, consoled, amused—above all amused. He doesn't want ideas. He doesn't want facts; above all, he doesn't want—Problems. He wants to dream of the bright, thin excitements of a phantom world—in which he can be a hero—of horses ridden and lace worn and princesses rescued and won. He wants pictures of funny slums, and entertaining paupers, and laughable longshoremen, and kindly impulses making life sweet. He wants romance without its defiance, and humor without its sting; and the business of the novelist, he holds, is to supply this cooling refreshment (192-193).

Although Wells adopts a stance of satirical opposition vis-à-vis the dominant traits of commercial fiction, he does surface tendencies worthy of consideration by writers who wish to appeal to wide audience. First, the text should facilitate a projective fusion—allow the reader to be a hero—with the main

character. A practitioner might achieve this condition in many ways, but the construction of a main character bereft of idiosyncratic turns of thought—a social average, a subjectivity attuned to centrist positions, an everyman—represents one tactic a writer could use to accomplish it. Second, the practitioner should include units designed to evoke cathartic laughter—amusement—especially at the expense of persons deemed ridiculous—insert those idiosyncratic thinkers in these slots—from those who hold centrist attitudes. Third, the text should supply readers a surfeit of kinesthetic simulacrum—the sensation of horses ridden—and also other appeals to the senses—tactile renditions of worn lace, visual depictions of slums and their inhabitants—in order to perfect the deceit of a relocation to an on-the-page reality. In short, a successful commercial text allows its consumers a brief respite from their mundane worries via an immersive interface—driven by projection, catharsis, and sensorial stimulation—that does not involve the cost or inconvenience of actual travel.

While I agree, often with equal satirical opposition, each of the three traits of successful commercial work outlined above promote the immersive interface that attracts broad audiences, I will, for the sake of space, limit discussion to amplification of sensorial stimuli in regard to this issue for what remains of this practitioner overview. Please keep in mind, however, that considerations of projective character design or the insertion of cathartic triggers could have taken their place and that I devote equal time to these features in my practice.

Thus far, this overview has detailed the psychoanalytic theory that undergird the goals of my practice and the literary theory that influences the tactics I use to attract the widest possible audience for my work. After these preliminaries, most would desire a demonstration of how these concepts offer a guide when a practitioner selects and shapes his material. Reviewers will find that section below.

Choices Driven by Aesthetics Instead of Predilection

When poets and storytellers reflect on their work, half of their discussion reduces to attempt to answer why they chose to address topic X instead of Y. To put it another way, all writers seem infected with a compulsion to defend their choice of focus. Here, one writer expends eleven or twelve thousand words in his overview of his collection to explain its insistent emphasis on the emotional echoes of an acne-rife adolescence. There, another writer fills twenty-seven pages with a rationale of the social benefits of exploring the biological details of imagined mermen in her trilogy. These frantic explanations emit a thick textual fog that obscures the fact that without a governing aesthetic to privilege the choice of B versus C, what topic any practitioner opts to make the mainstay of their attention will always amount to an act of whimsy on their part. However, a disclosure of this nature would undercut their claimed status as deliberate shapers of text. Would readers willingly pay for a novel whose structure is contingent on caprice? Would colleges bestow professorates on creative-writing teachers who have no methods to offer students aside from submission to the

constant inflow of mental vagaries? The majority of my peers prefer to mask this obvious fracture in teachable, accessible technique—this threat to possible sales of their novels, this risk to the continued transfer of university dollars—through the composition of the above described post hoc rationales. Of course, a reader could excavate some thoughts of value from an essay that argued for the sociological benefits of considering an imagined biology. But the crucial practice point—the criteria for selecting the function and operation of merman genitalia as the topic of focus rather than those of a centaur or a sasquatch—the item of highest interest for a novice, stays unanswered because practitioners who lack a governing aesthetic can only offer some form of non sequitur when a student dares to broach this issue.

On the other hand, a practitioner who anchors his craft to a Jungian aesthetic premised on the hygienic restoration of the balance between the ego and the unconscious does not equivocate if asked about the selection of topical focus. This variety of bard can proffer an answer in a sentence of less than ten words: One picks topics that resonate against collective archetypes.

To demonstrate how a writer might put the above principle into practice, assume a scenario where a publisher solicits a proposal for a novel set in the California San Joaquin Valley. The solicited novelist develops two different story ideas. The first possibility concerns a pair of itinerant farmworkers, one of whom possesses mild mental impairments, the field boss who hires them, and his wife. The second deals with a single mother who operates a prosperous pistachio

orchard, her naïve daughter, and a disreputable boyfriend who manages a copper mine. Both of the potential plots suggest engaging lines of conflict between the characters. But the second plot contains a strong, obvious archetypal linkage that a skilled practitioner could tease out—an overlay of the myth of Demeter and Persephone—while the first plot, while rife with melodramatic tension, fails to offer any clear bridge to the patterns of the collective unconscious. In the above case, adherence to a Jungian aesthetic would prompt a writer to produce a proposal based on the second possible story.

If the domain of potential narratives yields multiple plots with archetypal resonance, the Jungian practitioner would select among them according to the urgency of the particular zeitgeist reset each might mediate. For example, the San Joaquin proposal could have generated both a potential narrative that echoed the Demeter/Persephone pattern and a potential narrative that echoed the Midas archetype. Since material greed constitutes a greater threat to humankind at the present moment than romantic naiveté, the writer submits a proposal based on the Midas-redolent story in hope that its circulation will precipitate an adjustment to harmful current attitudes.

As a final consideration criterion, the writer engaged in the shamanic task of generating narratives to enhance psychic integration will pick the material likely to reach the broadest audience in situations where the range of potential stories seem linked to zeitgeist resets of equal urgency. As discussed in the section on the weary giant and popular literature, a factor that tends to mark

mass market texts is their greater reliance on the rendition of embodied sensation as a way to immerse the reader in the plot. A Jungian practitioner could use comparative levels of apparent sensorial appeal as a means of distinguishing between two possible San Joaquin Midas narratives—one set in the domain of Bakersfield bank and the other along the raked ditches of the California Aqueduct—and by doing, deduce the story likely to appeal to a wide audience. The bank narrative unfolds mostly through the dialog of financiers convincing to corner the almond market; the rosewood accoutrements of boardroom remain fixed as a visual symbol of the static privilege of the financier class. On the other hand, the aqueduct narrative supplies the acoustics of exploding concrete as well as the headlong rush of hydraulic momentum via a plot about former CIA operatives hired by a hedge fund to sow sufficient chaos to facilitate the privatization of the Department of Water Resources. While both possible stories might trigger a zeitgeist adjustment vis-à-vis current attitudes related to resource monopolization, the above analysis shows the second story delivers a higher level of sensorial stimuli. Given this, the writer will submit proposal based on the aqueduct tale since it will likely reach more readers and, therefore, provide more opportunities for psychic adjustment.

This section considered how Jungian principles can assist writers in determining which among an available array of topics to develop into submitted work. It attempted to illustrate these principles in a fashion ascertainable to any novice practitioner instead of hiding the function behind a fog of confused post

hoc explanation. However, the above discussion fails to address how these principles might drive material selection in the subset of narratives that originate out of the events and circumstances of the personal life of the writer. For many of practitioners, this subset—which includes the popular genres of confessional poetry, memoir, and the autobiographical novel—merits a separate huzzah of praise because of the demand of quotidian verifiability they apply to it. While those who privilege archetypal authenticity over validation of the mundane may question if this insistence results in added value, the issues raised in regard to stories originating from one’s own life nonetheless deserve examination if only to better grasp the Jungian practitioner’s opposition to them. Reviewers will find these issues addressed in the section that follows.

The Exigencies of Autobiography

Many poets and writers cannot suppress the urge to preface the discussion of their work with an impassioned recitation of autobiographical details. Fellow practitioners seem disposed to disgorge these personal histories because they confuse the basis of their authority to speak on a topic with the peculiarities of innate ethnicities and chosen affinities—this writer asserts a license to explore the situation of savvy outsiders because they are a child of Mexican immigrants, that poet claims the right to lecture on the intertwined exigencies of cadence and physicality based on their decision to letter in marching band and wrestling in high school—outright errors in regard to the source of bardic authority that a student of Carl Jung tries to avoid. To put it

another way, a writer does not require a past history of abusive acts committed by a psychotic father in order to interrogate the deeds done by a tyrannical patriarch, the archetypes held within the collective unconscious of Iphigenia at Aulis and of Isaac at Moriah supplies ample support. However, despite its irrelevance to the production and purpose of fiction and poetry, I must in some way recognize this autobiographic impulse since the habits of my peers has made it a near ubiquitous element in the genre of practitioner self-reflection. If I neglected to issue a list of personal life data, a reflection of this kind might now seem incomplete. If I failed to brood on how these autobiographical facts influenced the emphasis given to certain events within the narratives I opt to represent on the page, a piece of this sort might now seem to lack adequate self-critical awareness. As this is so, I include a catalog of some of the individual events and specific circumstances that pertain to my life in the paragraph that follows.

I lived within the limits of these California cities: Santa Rosa, Palmdale, and Anaheim. Respectively, but not inclusively, I received taxable pay from these employers: the Bureau of the Census, Native Sun Solar, Carl Karcher Enterprises, and the US Air Force. I resided in military dorms in the following foreign nations: the Republic of the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Kingdom of Bahrain, and the Republic of Iraq. Digging up through the degrees of my subjective grief, I lost the following kin: a sister to suicide, a grandmother to Marlboros, and a father to inherent dementia.

Within my fiction production, autobiographical datum of the sort tallied above primarily constitute a means of comparison to their mythic counterparts. For example, given the human tendency to construe themselves as denizens of a specific polis, is Chuck of Palmdale so different from Oedipus of Thebes or Gilgamesh of Uruk? If I incorporate a father-and-son relationship that hinges on random instances of paternal psychosis incumbent on life-long pharmaceutical noncompliance, I do so in a way that raises the pattern of Zeus striving against mad Kronos from the collective unconscious so that the described incident stands as an instance of a recurring universal archetype rather than an idiosyncratic agony. In other words, in the practice of fiction and poetry the chief value of autobiographical elements lies in their capacity to mirror the mythic.

For Jungian practitioners, an important ancillary function of autobiographical material rests in its ability to imbue texts with authentic sensorial inputs that create the sort of embodied reading experience that appeals to broad audiences. Since I have tromped up suburban Sonoma County streets in quest of homeowners eager to install solar heaters, the impressions my memory stored in the course of that experience—the dank stink arising from the adjacent wetlands, the staccato clank of bamboo chimes dangling from a porchlight, the viscid oiliness of wind-driven Eucalyptus pollen—remain on call for an immersive invitation to perception if I ever chose to shape this material into a story that invokes the archetype of trickster exhorting the foolish to sign dubious deals. Likewise, if I opted to make the autobiographical events from my tenure in

Philippines the basis of narrative that mapped on the pattern of Odysseus among the lotus eaters, stored sense data—the monsoonal thickness of air before a storm, the caws of parrots, the chalky sweetness of plantain-derived catsup—would offer a means for the story to engage readers on a kinesthetic modality beyond the rational/intellectual one triggered by its words. Let me stress again, though, that sensorial appeal stands as a secondary concern for those who employ a Jungian aesthetic. Regardless of its kinesthetic density, I would still decline to shape any autobiographical experience into prose or poetry that failed to incite the collective unconscious in some fashion. In short, the question of mythic resonance guards the threshold for creative action.

The issue of mythic resonance also forks the creative road that I travel with other writers in relation to autobiographical veracity. My peers usually insist any autobiographic assertion—that my abusive father broke my four-year-old arm, that I played flute in high school band—should align with available documents—emergency room registers, class record books—for the specified timeframe. On the other hand, as a Jungian practitioner, I hold the need to realign our collective unconscious trumps the demand for agreement with contemporaneous accounts. For example, if the insertion of an ibis into my Philippine material facilitates the surfacing of the archetype of the self-begotten god Thoth, then that is what the parrots become despite the fact that Robert S. Kennedy, Pedro C. Gonzales, Edward C. Dickinson, Hector Miranda, and Timothy H. Fisher, the five naturalist-authors of A Guide to the Birds of the

Philippines failed to locate a single trace of this species anywhere within the archipelago.

Similar divergences in practice vis-à-vis those who follow Jung and those who do not arise concerning the importance placed on known experience as a generative hub for creative output and as a boundary marker for forbidden creative activities. However, since this difference of opinion stems from a somewhat different constellation of contention than the arguments that inflame the hotly fought ethical controversies that center on the authority granted by and the necessary verifiability of autobiographical material, this topic deserves its own section. Reviewers will find that section below.

Hemingway and the Battle Over Direct Experience

The value assigned to narratives that limit themselves to representations of events and situations personally experienced by the practitioner creates a line of demarcation in the theory and praxis of contemporary creative writing along which writers and poets arrange themselves. This assignment of value carries a particularly fervent emotional charge for US writers due to the tendency of American creative-writing professors to iterate the four-word command attributed to the iconic Ernest Hemingway of write what you know in order to signal their endorsement of the limited representation position. Now, in concurrence with Brett Anthony Johnston who considered the long, cold shadow cast by the Hemingway command in the 2011 fiction issue of The Atlantic, I would argue that Hemingway's actual thirty-four-word quote says something quite different than its

four-word reduction suggests. But I will return to the fraught issue of the proper reading of the advice left by this mid-twentieth-century prose master at the end of this section. First, let me map out the opposed poles of practice created by this insistence in the American literary establishment on a scale of value that elevates representations derived from direct personal experience and denigrates all those grounded in other sources. I will then pinpoint the coordinates a Jungian practitioner typically occupies along this axis based on their interest in rapprochement with and the revivification of the mythic elements of the collective unconscious.

The critical reception typically afforded to narratives of racial or cultural identity provides the clearest example of the privileging of direct over indirect experience by the American literary establishment. Narratives of this variety generated by practitioners who lived in neighborhoods or who participated in activities associated with the particular division of humanity highlighted by the text usually earn kudos for documenting the struggle for survival faced by that social group. Narratives of this variety produced by practitioners who gain knowledge of the same neighborhoods and activities through research instead of by residence or physical enactment usually earn boos for committing the crime of cultural appropriation. In short, the establishment privileges the work of the first practitioner because he or she wrote about what they presumably directly knew and condemns the work of the second because they gleaned their knowledge through second-hand sources. This stance by the literary establishment remains

firm even if the periods of residence and participation asserted by the first writer lack verifiability and the second writer can confirm the validity of their representations with a dozen pages of citations.

The disparate critical reception described above creates a bifurcation in the practice of fiction production between those who reject the current prohibition against representations based on indirect sources, usually the generators of commercial novels who require a diverse cast list to appeal to a broad audience, and those who accede to the representational constraints the American literary establishment imposes, usually generators of small press meta-fictions read solely by small circles of self-diagnosed intellectual elites. The self-appointed guardians of literature bar the works of first discussed practitioner cadre from the temples of the college classroom because of their sin of writing on topics they do not directly know. The second cadre of practitioners satisfy the gatekeepers who incorporate their output into the secular genuflection that passes for university instruction, but, caught in the bracket of possessing Z identity whose direct experience supplies the authority to address topic E and D, these writers rarely find readers outside of the narrow limits of their asserted affiliations.

Writers who scrutinize their output through a Jungian lens tend to distinguish the noted tension between literary usage of direct and indirect experience as a symptom of pathological ego dominance. Jungian practitioners place the experience of contact with collective archetypes, a phenomenon of universal occurrence across the full extent of humanity regardless of race or

culture as Joseph Campbell documents in The Hero with a Thousand Faces, above epiphanies derived from personal identity. Within Jungian practice, the assertion of shared mythic traits outweighs claims connected to the divisive markers of tribe, affinity, and race.

Creative Writing practitioners who characterize themselves as Jungian shamans, though, do wish to wish to reach the widest possible audience so their proffered psychic adjustments, a pill that the overt form of the novel or poem sugars, will succor the largest number of sick egos. So, to the degree it is possible, these modern-day shamans heed the limits imposed by the American literary establishment's interpretation of Hemingway's dictum in order to stay in its good graces since its influence determines the amount of a circulation afforded a novel or poem among the petty intelligentsia where the most truly damaged psyches abide.

However, if my shamanistic mandate demands I assume the persona of a Navajo police chief so I can surface the images of Spider Woman and Coyote from the collective unconscious, then I will take up that mask even though I would likely stand accused of unseemly cultural appropriation by the literary establishment.

While the literary establishment might indict me for such effrontery, I'm not sure Hemingway would since the thirty-four-word quote that seems the source for the oft-iterated four-word dictum lacks the imperious tone of the reduction. The quote runs this way: "From all the things that you know, and all those you cannot know, you make something through your invention that is not a representation

but a whole new thing truer than anything true and alive” (qtd. in Johnston). When I overlay Coyote, the trickster who cavorts in my dreams, against a Navajo cop whose subjectivity I must construct by means of tribal council budget reports and other indirect sources, do I not stand a chance of birthing the whole new thing Hemingway envisions through the act of my invention? Further, if my invention stirs an awakening of mythic archetypes within my readers, incites a reconciliation of ego and unconscious in my audience, will humanity not live lives more true and alive on balance? This hope continues to move the hands of this practitioner over his keyboard. This dream drives this shaman to cast new spells in the form of fiction.

Conclusion

The author hopes reviewers have gleaned an understanding of his practice of fiction production by reading this overview. As the overview explained, the theories generated by Carl Jung and H.G. Wells concerning the collective unconscious and commercial fiction provide the principles that guide this practice. Through their deployment, he makes decisions about which possible story to develop into a full-fledged piece, about the ethics involved with the use of autobiographical material, and about his stance in the direct-versus-indirect-experience debate that continues to roil the creative-writing community. Beyond mere production, though, this writer prays this overview will demonstrate how a fiction practice might lift some of the spiritual darkness that affects his species.

Works Cited

- Campbell, Joseph. The Hero With a Thousand Faces. New York: Pantheon Books, 1949. Print.
- Johnston, Brett A. "Don't Write What You Know." *The Atlantic*. 2011. Web. 5 March 2016.
- Jung, Carl G. "On the Relation of Analytic Psychology to Poetry." The Portable Jung. 1971. Ed. Joseph Campbell. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. New York: Penguin Books, 1976. 301-322. Print.
- . "The Structure of the Psyche." The Portable Jung. 1971. Ed. Joseph Campbell. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. New York: Penguin Books, 1976. 23-46. Print.
- . "The Transcendent Function." The Portable Jung. 1971. Ed. Joseph Campbell Jung. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. New York: Penguin Books, 1976. 273-300. Print.
- Kennedy, Robert S., et al. A Guide to the Birds of the Philippines. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Print.
- Kipling, Rudyard. "In the Neolithic Age." Kipling Society. n.d. Web. 7 March 2016.
- Wells, Herbert G. "The Contemporary Novel." H.G. Wells's Literary Criticism. Ed. Patrick Parrinder and Robert M. Philmus. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press Limited. 1980. 192-206. Print.

APPENDIX
GOODBYE TO ALL THAT AGAIN