Montclair State University

Montclair State University Digital Commons

Theses, Dissertations and Culminating Projects

1-2015

Archetype of Freedom : the Dialectic of the Phantastical Imagination

Joseph David Todd
Montclair State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/etd

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Todd, Joseph David, "Archetype of Freedom : the Dialectic of the Phantastical Imagination" (2015). *Theses, Dissertations and Culminating Projects*. 74.
https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/etd/74

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Montclair State University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations and Culminating Projects by an authorized administrator of Montclair State University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@montclair.edu.

ARCHETYPE OF FREEDOM:

THE DIALECTIC OF THE PHANTASTICAL IMAGINATION

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of

Montclair State University in partial fulfillment

of the requirements

for the degree of Doctor of Education

by

JOSEPH DAVID TODD

Montclair State University

Upper Montclair, NJ

2014

Dissertation Chair: Tyson E. Lewis

Copyright © 2014 by *Joseph D. Todd*. All rights reserved.

MONTCLAIR STATE UNIVERSITY

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

DISSERTATION APPROVAL

We hereby approve the Dissertation

ARCHETYPE OF FREEDOM:

THE DIALECTIC OF THE PHANTASTICAL IMAGINATION

of

Joseph D. Todd

Candidate for the Degree:

Doctor of Education

Dissertation Committee:

[redacted]

Department of Educational Foundations

Dr. Tyson E. Lewis
Dissertation Chair

Certified by:

[redacted]

Dr. Joan C. Ficke
Dean of The Graduate School

[redacted]

Dr. David Kennedy

1/21/15

Date

[redacted]

Dr. Jeremy N. Price

ABSTRACT

ARCHETYPE OF FREEDOM: THE DIALECTIC OF THE PHANTASTICAL IMAGINATION

by Joseph David Todd

This dissertation examines a conceptual paradox within the mounting crisis of imagination in education. I introduce the concept of *phantasy* (Marcuse, 1955) to, first, disrupt the dominant definitions of imagination found in educational policies such as Common Core State Standards and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) initiatives. These documents instrumentalize imagination in order to meet global economic initiatives (Committee on STEM Education (CoSTEM), 2012; CoSTEM, 2011; U.S. Department of Commerce, 2012). Against such instrumentalization, I propose to reunite imagination with phantasy. The result is a philosophical groundwork for what I call "phantastic imagination" which returns imagination to its radical, disruptive, and utopian roots. As such, this study has three central goals: to provide an overview of the current paradoxes and aporias in contemporary educational policy related to imagination; map a philosophical dialectic that helps to resolve these problems by returning to the question of phantasy; and posit educational alternatives based on an emerging theory of phantastic imagination.

The dissertation utilizes a dialectical methodology to map the convergences and divergences of imagination and phantasy throughout philosophical history. This analysis serves two primary purposes. First, it reveals the historical origins of the current crisis in the conception of imagination in educational policy. Second, it emphasizes the

productive moments in the dialectic where the tension between imagination and phantasy is not repressed but rather embraced and even heightened. The resulting philosophical analysis develops criteria for uncovering points within in existing research, educational theory, and pedagogy where phantasy can return to disrupt the instrumentalization of imagination. In sum, this dissertation offers insight into understanding the phantastic imagination and how a hospitality towards phantasy can be made relevant to teachers who are interested in nurturing dimensions of the imagination beyond economic utility.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1: DAEMONION IN ANCIENT GREECE	45
CHAPTER 2: PLATO	66
CHAPTER 3: NIETZSCHE	85
CHAPTER 4: MARCUSE	108
CHAPTER 5: THE RETURN OF PHANTASY IN EDUCATION	126
EPILOGUE: THE RETURN OF MYTH	162
REFERENCES	175

INTRODUCTION

> Under the reality principle, the human being develops the function of *reason*: it learns to 'test' the reality, to distinguish between good and bad, true and false, useful and harmful. Man acquires the faculties of attention, memory, and judgment. He becomes a conscious, thinking *subject*, geared to a rationality, which is imposed upon him from outside. Only one mode of thought-activity is 'split off' from the new organization of the mental apparatus and remains free from the rule of the reality principle: *phantasy* is 'protected from cultural alterations' and stays committed to the pleasure principle. (Marcuse, 1955, 14)

This dissertation conceptualizes a dialectical understanding of imagination in the context of education for the purpose of (a) interrupting the current view of imagination found in educational policy and (b) forming a philosophical groundwork to develop a pedagogy of imagination beyond the current limitations. In recent policy documents and education reform initiatives, the idea of imagination is invoked as a silver bullet meant to overcome the gulf between education and employment [Committee on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education (CoSTEM), 2012; CoSTEM, 2011; U.S. Department of Commerce, 2012; Robinson, 2001]. Within these documents, however, reductive and/or contradictory conceptions of the imagination exacerbate confusion surrounding the idea of imagination, which makes it difficult for educators to bring the concept into practice. When it can be clearly ascertained, the dominant definition of imagination in most educational discourses reduces the idea to a purely instrumental and technical method in the contexts of employment and future information economies (STEM, 21st century skills). Here, I am defining instrumentalism as any attempt (a) to reduce imagination's radical potential to disrupt the status quo, and

(b) to orient imagination toward predetermined social, political, and economic ends. This dialectical reframing of imagination will have potential implications for revising policy and informing educational pedagogical theory that is genuinely concerned with higher levels of creativity, inventiveness, and procedural knowledge beyond such instrumentalism. My dialectical analysis will assist with the identification and inclusion of alternative learning models that are more appropriate for nurturing what I will call the *phantastic imagination*. Phantastic imagination highlights the gulf between instrumental imagination and a more artistic or erotic imagination, and will indicate how each concept of imagination can be employed in education successfully without the exclusion of the other.

The Introduction will cover 4 topics. The first section, *Imagination in Educational Policy*, will identify a dominant definition of imagination found in policy documents and indicate how this definition is linked to a pragmatic educational crisis. The second section, *Beyond Instrumental Imagination*, will argue that a dialectical philosophy of the imagination promises to help overcome these problems by reuniting the concept of phantasy with that of imagination. The third section, *Phantasy, Philosophy, and Education*, will explore the educational implications of this analysis for philosophy of education and pedagogical development. The final section, *Chapter Overview: A Precedent for Phantasy*, outlines the philosophical history of the dialectic of imagination and phantasy that each chapter will analyze.

To signify the two dimensions of the imagination in this dissertation, I use two terms, *imagination* and *phantasy*, both with roots in ancient philosophy and following

Marcuse's use in *Eros and Civilization*. I use the term *imagination* to denote the educational instrumental imagination that is prevalent in 21st century skills policy documents and other similar historical or educational texts, which argue that it is a skill to be trained (CoSTEM, 2012; CoSTEM, 2011; U.S. Department of Commerce, 2012). This instrumental version of imagination can be contrasted with that of *phantasy*. I use *phantasy*, as Marcuse defines it, to denote a dimension of the imagination that is missing at the level of policy and difficult to find in more progressive education discourses since the term *phantasy* implies a dimension of imagination beyond intentional thought. I will be avoiding the term *fantasy* in order to prevent any confusion with the literary genre, though there may be overlaps worth exploring. The term *phantasy* also helps maintain some distance from the purely psychological and clinical terminology of fantasy that neglects philosophical/mythological underpinnings. It must be understood that Marcuse does not use the terms imagination and phantasy distinctly, and as such, we will need to be especially sensitive to his usage of both terms in order to identify which concept is being referenced. In analyzing the space between these definitions, I theorize a complimentary dialectical relationship—implied by Marcuse's work—that I call the *phantastic imagination*, thus establishing a conceptual balance between conscious and unconscious creativity.

Imagination in Educational Policy

Moving into education, we see how the dimensions of conscious and unconscious creativity can overlay two mutually exclusive goals of education, namely the social/economic objectives and the developmental/academic objectives (Egan, 2010), but with a key difference: within phantastical imagination the very terms of social/economic objectives are not predefined, and instead come from radical possibilities of the phantastical imagination to disrupt and re-envision all values. Since the research on phantasy within education is slight, we must also be especially sensitive to the way in which imagination is described, in case these descriptions actually imply phantasy. That is, some theorists may approach a concept of phantastical imagination but have not articulated it as such within the dialectical poles of imagination and phantasy. For instance, within more progressive and radical educational discourses, imagination can be understood as a dimension that interrupts entrenched educational paradigms, whether through exposing sociocultural norms (Dewey, 1934; Greene, 1995) or through individualized learning experiences and personal development (Egan, 2005; Eisner, 2002).

Current cultural, philosophical, and educational theorists consider both mainstream and alternative concepts of the imagination as pivotal to the attempt to understand complex issues in our globalized society through novel approaches and innovative solutions (Csikszentmihalyi; 1997; Deutsch, 1992; Hardt & Negri, 2004; Johnson, 1993; Kearney, 1998; Mills, 2000). Within education, 21st century skills

programs and related policy have identified imagination and creativity as forms of human capital development linked to new information technologies (Armstrong, 1998; Pink, 2006; Robinson, 2001). However, within 21st century skills programs and similar strategic programs such as STEM, the ways in which imagination is conceptualized and situated are either (1) generalized and ambiguous, or (2) instrumentalized and narrowed (CoSTEM, 2012; CoSTEM, 2011; U.S. Department of Commerce, 2012). Because of such conceptual confusion, it is therefore difficult to understand what exactly is being addressed. Indeed, throughout such policy, imagination emerges as a pseudo-concept that can be appropriated and used in potentially contradictory circumstances. This is evident throughout 21st century skills documents and educational theory where imagination is used as a catch phrase for everything from cooperation and divergent thinking to exposure to the arts and innovative uses of technology (Robinson, 2001; Greene, 1995; CoSTEM, 2012; CoSTEM, 2012; U.S. Department of Commerce, 2012). While the future seems to hinge on the development of imaginative skills, the very meaning of imagination remains vague and conceptually opaque.

Furthermore, the multitude of tasks assigned to imagination seem to indicate that imagination is a catch-all solution for solving a host of problems that may be at political, economic, and social odds with one another. Both of these problems indicate a larger issue: the crisis surrounding the conceptualization of imagination and creativity in education. The vagueness of *imagination* is precisely what allows it to be instrumentalized, cultivated, and applied to specific issues and problems in hopes of discovering novel and innovative solutions. Because *imagination* can mean anything and

is denuded of any particular power, it obscures the gap between theory and practice. We might call this the *instrumentalization of imagination* and will argue that this definition is eclipsing a philosophically robust concept of imagination in education. I contrast and explore alternatives to this concept of imagination with that of phantasy which, through Marcuse's articulation, cannot be instrumentalized.

Critical theorists in education are sensitive to such instrumentalization and to the coupling of imagination with capitalist consumerism. Citing Joel Spring in *Math Education for America?: Policy Networks, Big Business, and Pedagogy Wars,* Mark Wolfmeyer (2013) illustrates how "the Gates Foundation considers education for its potential in preparing a digital mind ready for a long life of consuming digital products" (p. 140). In addition to technology, this instrumentalization applies more generally to education and trends that "prepare" our imagination according to economic principles (Linn, 2004; Linn, 2008; Singer and Singer, 2005; Kellner, 2003; Kellner and Share, 2005). Again, Wolfmeyer's (2013) analysis of educational policy focuses on connections between imaginative, innovative, and creative practices endorsed by STEM education and future employment (p. 150). By defining imagination as a form of human capital, general skills such as independent thinking and problem solving become narrowed for assessment purposes in order to make the assessment creation and administration process more efficient (i.e., cost effective); we narrow our concept of imagination down to that which can be quantified (Wolfmeyer, 2013, p. 152). The result is an instrumentalized form of imagination that confines it to strictly observable outputs already determined as "valuable" by policy standards.

For example, in a report prepared by the Department of Commerce titled *The Competitiveness and Innovative Capacity of the United States* (2012) a definition of innovation is put forth that is extremely relevant to understand the overall crisis in imagination that I describe. First, the document clearly sets up the crisis as economic by citing a slowing "pace of innovation" in the 21st century United States; as compared to the 20th century, "various parties have raised alarms about whether this nation's economy can continue to be competitive" (p. 1-1). Creativity, particularly in STEM disciplines, is seen as a solution to quickening the pace of innovation. The alarms raised in this document fall into six categories: employment and job creation, wages and the middle-class, domestic manufacturing, innovation, education, and infrastructure of all sorts, especially technological infrastructure. Innovation and education are the most poignant for the purposes of this argument and are central to how the issue is framed and how proposed solutions are carried out. The crisis in creativity is correlated with the country's failure to make any progress "in its competitiveness since 1999 …[It] now ranks fourth in innovation-based competitiveness" (p. 1-7). Thus the document connects our global economic competitiveness, without evidence of a correlation, to our inability to "prepare U.S. students in math and science" (p. 1-8). This vague correlation is often repeated in the interpretation of international test scores, as Diane Ravitch illustrates:

> American students have never performed well on international tests. When the first such tests were given in the mid-1960s, our students usually scored at or below the median, and sometimes at the bottom of the pack. This mediocre performance is nothing to boast about, but it is not an indicator of future economic decline." (2011, para. 2)

Such an observation is in contradiction with the policy document which claims that the falling economy is directly associated with a failure of education. In fact, we find that even during the 20th century, when the report specifies that innovation and economic stability were at their highest, our international test scores were already low. Such a correlation, even if "proven" true, is misguided precisely because it limits our understanding of what "imaginative" or "creative" "innovation" might be. The document only cites instrumental innovation that solves current problems according to the very logics that are responsible for the very same problems. Nowhere is there the possibility that imagination could exceed the scope of status quo logics or quantitative assessment. Thus there is no possibility of a phantastical imagination.

The report goes on to define innovation, which merely throws into relief how such terms can be easily instrumentalized. In a 2008 Advisory Committee report to the Secretary of Commerce titled *Innovation Measurement: Tracking the State of Innovation in the American Economy*, "innovation" is defined as "The design, invention, development and/or implementation of new or altered products, services, processes, systems, organizational structures, or business models for the purpose of creating new value for customers and financial returns for the firm" (p. 2-2). This definition is a clear indicator of how imagination is understood within current policy. Although the potential exists in the definition above to expand such innovation to realms outside of the economy, this possibility is reduced by the caveat that the *purpose* of innovation is staunchly economic. We measure innovation itself in purely economic terms, further reinforcing the instrumental forms of imagination and creativity that pervade educational

policy. Education is stripped of qualities of social justice and politics in these documents; instead, "education is a key element for promoting economic growth and increasing the innovative capacity of a firm or a country" (p. 4-1). This innovative capacity is then correlated directly with STEM and similar disciplines and the need to educate a workforce accordingly, all in the name of the national economy (p. 4-1).

More concerning perhaps is that STEM can be understood beyond fulfilling economic capacities. In a report from the Committee on STEM Education (CoSTEM) titled *Coordinating Federal Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education Investments: Progress Report* (2012), STEM is understood as fulfilling needs beyond economic objectives. The report explicitly states, "A robust and capable STEM workforce is crucial to United States competitiveness. Multiple reports link STEM education to the future security and economic success of the United States" (p. 2). This correlation is seemingly as tenuous as that which Ravitch critiques above in relation to international test scores and global economic competition. As troubling as these trends are, I am most concerned with the way imagination is shaped because of such pressures—how imagination is narrowed down to purely instrumental ends predetermined by economic and security pressures.

There is evidence that the Core Curriculum Content Area standards, although not directly naming imagination, do not hinder the development of non-instrumentalized forms of imagination (Baer, 2003; Sheve, 2014). This is partly due to the ways teachers are implementing the standards, or the ways in which states and districts have reinterpreted the standards. The example below shows how such work begins to unpack

hidden dimensions of creativity and imagination that may be present in all content areas but not yet assembled together in a comprehensive document. Often creativity is present but not necessarily applicable with performance indicators in the dominant Core subjects of English Language Art (ELA) and math. Additional examples and representations of imagination and creativity can be found in other subject areas such as Library Media/Information Literacy, Art, and Technology Standards. As a researcher and professor in Montana, I am limiting my analysis to the Montana Office of Public Instruction Common Core Standards documents.

Within the *Montana K-12 Information Literacy/Library Media Content Standards Framework* (2008) we find examples of more robust language that gives educators opportunities to nurture imagination and creativity beyond economic imperatives. The work begins with finding ways that imagination can be expressed and the personal connections one can make to aesthetic objects, both literary and graphic/plastic: "the student will pursue personal interests through literature and other creative expressions" (p. 11). Educators will be able to use such standards to open up an aesthetic dimension in children's lives. In addition to Library Media standards, *Montana K-12 Technology Content Standards Framework* (2010) offers educational objectives where imagination and creativity are more pronounced. First we see this in problem-solving abilities: "The student will use digital tools and resources for problem solving and decision making" (p. 7). Proficiency at graduation should approach a fully informed and creative ability to problem-solve. This would require a great deal of divergent thinking and the consideration of alternatives (both important facets of the imagination). As well as

judging the merit of one's alternative ideas, the standards ask for a cultural dimension, asking students to "use multiple approaches and diverse perspectives, including Montana American Indian, to explore alternative solutions" (7). This is partly a regional trend, but it provides a type of learning that is beyond the intercultural relationships of one's backyard and will directly resonate with Maxine Greene's use of art in education in expanding our capacity to empathize. Beyond creative problem solving, this document addresses the personal expressive dimension of creativity and imagination. However, since they are found within the Technology standards, there are some concerns over the lingering economic "preparation" of such creative expressions. The rationale in this sections reads:

> Digital tools can support creative and innovative expression, which is increasingly necessary in our changing world. The use of these tools can also facilitate the realization and fulfillment of one's talents and interests. The education community has the responsibility to provide access to the new avenues for creation and require nuanced understandings of digital citizenship and ownership. (p. 9)

This statement addresses the individual experience and value of imagination and creativity, yet such emphasis is also given credence *if and only if* imagination is oriented toward solving instrumental functions within a changing world. Thus predetermined concepts of "digital citizenship" and "ownership" of digital property put brackets around disruptive forms of imagination that challenge the roots of such notions (as in digital hacking, cyber piracy, and so forth).

Finally, I mention the Arts. The College Board prepared an innovative document in order to address the hidden dimension of imagination and creativity across the Content-Area Standards in an effort to infuse such concepts and skills with the Arts: *The*

Arts and the Common Core: A Review of the Connections Between the Common Core State Standards and the National Core Arts Standards Conceptual Framework (2012). This document is in itself innovative because of what it sets out to synthesize, independent from federal agendas. The document's intention is to fill a gap between the Common Core Standards and Art Standards:

> While a specifically arts-focused branch of the Common Core does not exist, and these standards are not meant to replace arts-specific benchmarks, there is evidence in the standards documents that Common Core goals and objectives are meant to apply to subjects outside the realm of ELA and math. (p. 4)

As an example of phantastic imagination, this document finds ways to expand conceptions of imagination beyond ELA and STEM—therefore beyond purely economic capacities. The report serves two purposes: First, in terms of content, it identifies "explicit art references already present in the Common Core State Standards [providing] an inventory of the instances in which the arts are mentioned" (p. 5). Second, in terms of specific skills, this review identifies "elements of the Common Core State Standards that reference the same broad goals and thinking skills" (p. 6). These broad goals include: Arts as Communication, Arts as a Creative Personal Realization, Arts as Culture, History, and Connectors, Arts as Means to Well-being, and Arts as Community Engagement. The synthesis in the report serves an incredibly rich purpose by providing teachers with a much more robust and specific set of guidelines that identify creative content. As stated above, it is not always true that policy documents are lacking in a robust pedagogy of imagination; rather, the concept of imagination is not central to the policies and therefore is likely to be underutilized in relation to ELA, Math, and Science. This is especially the case given the policy document trends at the federal level, which never mention creativity

or innovation in the context of well-being or personal realization. Such policies are nevertheless limited even when presenting non-instrumentalized forms of imagination. For instance, Common Core still frames imagination in terms of critical and creative *thinking* or *skill* development. Lost here is any notion of imagination that exists below conscious thought or outside intentionally oriented skill development. In this sense, certain documents might open up a space wherein imagination can take hold in classroom practice in ways that interrupt instrumental, economic policy models, yet even here, imagination is a pseudo-concept lacking philosophical rigor and erotic depth.

We see a similar trend repeated in academic research in that creativity is narrowed by the questions that are asked about it. A review of two of the most well-known texts on creativity points to such shortcomings in research and education. Mark Runco's *Creativity Research Handbook* (1997) and Robert Sternberg's *Handbook of Creativity* (1998) serve as excellent resources for understanding the field of creativity, particularly in research. However, Mumford (2003) argues that there is a tendency for such research to avoid, ignore, or side-step "the effects of creativity on people and social systems" (107). These are the same worries I have with the dominant conception of imagination being controlled by narrow economic objectives. As outlined above, instrumental imagination might also be able to find creative solutions to economic problems, yet what is at stake here is total avoidance of the potential for imagination to incite social, political, and existential change.

Because of this repressed dimension of imagination, there might very well be a contradiction between the economic justification for imaginative curricula and recent

findings that draw a strong correlation between imagination/creativity and student autonomy/independence/freedom (Crocco & Costigan, 2007; Jeffery & Craft, 2004; Walker & Parker, 2006; Runco, 2006). The same policies that call for imaginative curricula also create an assessment-driven climate that limits students' experiences and limits spaces and opportunities for engaging and educating their imagination (Bracey, 2008; Crocco & Costigan, 2007; Walker & Parker, 2006). Specifically, Thomas Armstrong's (1998) *Awakening Genius* explains that far more important to the awakening of "genius" than specific resources and experiences are the broader attitudes and overall atmosphere of the classroom. Armstrong himself advocates for more open-ended exploratory opportunities than most standardized schooling models currently allow. Such a correlation requires recognizing how we need to change our thinking about imagination in the current educational model, as well as how the current educational model must change to allow for the open-ended, autonomous experiences that Armstrong calls for. This applies not only to the student but also, as noted in the work of Crocco and Costigan (2007), the creativity and autonomy of the teacher. In addition to encouraging students to be creative and imaginative in the learning process, Jeffery and Craft (2004) address the importance of using these tools to reflect on their own educational experiences in order to fine-tune curriculum, pedagogy, and discipline within this context. Runco (2006) explicitly states the need for additional research in this area and makes theoretical contributions that would help justify such a study. He maintains that:

> Independence and autonomy, mentioned earlier, should be explored further. It makes good theoretical sense that these would be related to creative potential; originality assumes a kind of independence. It assumes an independence from

> conventional ways of thinking, and independence from norms and sometimes expectations. (Runco, 2006, p. 125)

In light of this research, it could be argued that to allow for environments that are conducive to creativity, both for teachers and students, is to allow for nonconformity and difference. This may in fact oppose the standardizing, economizing, and socializing functions of public education under large-scale reform like STEM.

The revolutionary potential of the imagination regarding such matters as social justice, ecological sensibility, and political freedom and autonomy exposes the fallacy of the education-employment-economy pipeline (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Jenkins, 2009; Kuenzi, 2008; Trilling & Fadel, 2012). While such pipelines might call for imagination, they never include an imagination that challenges the very logic of human capital development itself. In summary, imagination as addressed in educational policy often finds itself serving differing, if not contradictory goals. Even in the most progressive of policies (such as the Common Core), there are still conceptual problems that limit imagination's scope and critically transformative potentials.

In sum, this overview has provided justification for questioning (a) the nature and (b) the role(s) of imagination as it is currently articulated in educational policy and research. I have demonstrated a growing tendency toward instrumentalization, conceptual ambiguity, and psychological reductionism. In the next section, I will begin with a phenomenological example of how imagination is often *experienced* which will lead toward a new possibility for re-imagining imagination beyond instrumentalism.

Beyond Instrumental Imagination

To move toward a conceptually rich definition of imagination, we need to recognize an important distinction between imagination and phantasy. In *Eros and Civilization*, Herbert Marcuse (1955) goes into detail about the redeeming qualities of phantasy for human consciousness, since it acts from a space that, he argues, originates from a utopian freedom. Although he speaks about traversing this space a great deal, he never settles on a concrete definition of phantasy; that will be part of the task of this dissertation. He does, however, provide clues as to how phantasy might differ from imagination, the mental domains each inhabits, and the ways they interact. Specifically, we find that:

> Phantasy plays a most decisive function in the total mental structure: it links the deepest layers of the unconscious with the highest products of consciousness (art), the dream with the reality; it preserves the archetypes of the genus, the perpetual but repressed ideas of the collective and individual memory, the tabooed images of freedom. (Marcuse, 1955, p. 141)

In this passage we find that phantasy has something to do with finding knowledge unhinged from the culturally conditioned conscious thought processes. But, as we will see, it is imagination that helps to bring this vision from the unconscious into conscious understanding through art. Furthermore, Marcuse makes a justification for this dimension by claiming that phantasy provides the initial visceral experience of freedom from the existential angst of reality, but imagination is the mediator that would help to bring such experiences into the realm of the reality principle through changing our

perception of reality and altering the nature of the relationship with the physical and cultural world. Marcuse argues that:

> As a fundamental, independent mental process, phantasy has a truth-value of its own, which corresponds to an experience of its own – namely, the surmounting of the antagonistic human reality. Imagination envisions the reconciliation of the individual with the whole, of desire with realization, of happiness with reason. While this harmony has been removed into utopia by the established reality principle, phantasy insists that it must and can become real, that behind the illusion lies *knowledge*. The truths of imagination are first realized when phantasy itself takes form, when it creates a universe of perception and comprehension – a subjective and at the same time objective universe. This occurs in *art*. (Marcuse, 1955, pp. 143-144)

From this we learn that the experience of phantasy is a unique mental state, but simultaneously operates consciously within the dimension of imagination and art. However, imagination that is not tempered or informed by phantasy does not and cannot reconcile the dichotomy, since, by separating phantasy, the dichotomy is hidden or ignored. Since Marcuse provides no hard definition, we can begin to understand this distinction by matching dichotomous concepts along the poles of phantasy and imagination. This distinction between phantasy and imagination recurs throughout history and has been articulated in a variety of contexts and disciplines which all allude to a fundamental aspect of human experience which history has shown to have been systematically repressed. For Marcuse, this divide "corresponds largely (but not entirely) to the distinction between unconscious and conscious processes" and from there we can speculate as to which concepts are aligned with phantasy and imagination (1955, p. 12). Further, Marcuse (1966) later illustrates how "Freud singles out phantasy as one mental activity that retains a high degree of freedom from the reality principle even in the sphere

of the developed conscious" (p. 140). This degree of freedom is what interested Marcuse, and why I seek to trace education back to through phantasy.

Summarizing the analysis developed in Chapter 4 of this dissertation, Marcuse's critique of civilization contrasts the reality principle (understood through sociocultural contexts as well as instinctual contexts) and the pleasure-principle (understood as lying outside of the reality principle and at home within the instincts) and shows how, at the expense of the pleasure-principle and all that is situated in this form of consciousness, the reality principle influences imagination and conforms it to the purposes of production, thus inserting itself into the equation of economic and informational production. The pleasure principle, on the other hand, is not interested in the collective devices that allow for the progress of civilization. Instead, pleasure is derived from the uninhibited desire for freedom, but is just as threatening to civilization precisely because it is situated beyond the collective civilizing function of the reality principle. For this reason, I question whether imagination is indeed a space of freedom as it seems to be colonized by industrial civilization, whether it is be able to meet the expectations placed upon it by 21st century skill discourses, and whether the dimension of phantasy might better initiate the ambition to reconstruct current educational politics.

To more fully understand the difference between imagination and phantasy along phenomenological lines, I turn to a classical philosophical thought experiment concerning the origins of phantastic images such as those of mythological creatures. Within this model, the *origin* of the idea/imagining is vital to understanding the distinction between imagination and phantasy. I begin with the image of a Pegasus. By combining the image

of a horse and the image of an eagle, placing the wings of the eagle onto the body of the horse, and creating the phantastic image of the winged-horse, the intentional dimension of imagination creates the mental image of a Pegasus. Here the conscious mind directs the production of a representation of a winged horse internal to the mind itself. The content used to generate the representation is drawn from the stock of internalized images of horses and birds found within the culture. However, on a phenomenological level, this experience will be entirely different, as if the image of the Pegasus came as a vision.

In some way the vision arises externally to the conscious mind and varies drastically from intentional cognition. The fact that the vision being is *received* rather than *created* offers a new challenge in the way phantasy and imagination can be distinguished. It seems to come from without, and is therefore beyond the control of the intentional subject. It is *presented* before the mind's eye of the subject rather than *represented* by this subject. For this reason phantasy is utopian because it emerges from a space that is not produced exclusively by an intentional subject reproducing cultural norms and values through the context of the reality principle (Marcuse, 1944, p. 140). In other words, the vision of the phantasy may have the capacity for escaping ideological distortions, especially as we consider the dialectic of imagination. Phantasy, coupled with a utopian impulse, surpasses the playful conceptualization of utopian forms such as Plato's *Timeaus* or Moore's *Utopia*, and offers a real, felt experience of freedom in these nonexistent spaces (Jameson, 2005). The experience of these new forms of freedom help to guide, along with the theorization of new forms of political organization, projects which might offer unfolding freedoms. For education this dimension alerts us to the

chance for new possibilities beyond the mere training of imagination for instrumental ends defined in advance, and beyond the discipline and educational management of subjective powers (creativity, for example).

Phantasy, Philosophy, and Education

Unless educators begin recoupling phantasy with imagination, it is likely that schools will continue to close themselves off from the possibility of authentic innovation or reform that can escape today's exclusive economic edicts. Placing imagination in relation to the pre-conscious powers of phantasy will not only impact the current conceptualization of imagination but also honor the experience of imagination outside of market principles and the exploiting of imagined ideas. Part of this work will include an analysis of schools themselves and how unsuitable the current paradigm is for authentically educating the phantastic dimension of imagination as well as arguing for the pedagogical potential of phantasy itself. In sum, to accept the instrumental form of imagination as intentional representation means rejecting phantasy as pre-conscious presentation that is either dangerous or irrelevant in the aims of global capitalism. We are faced with a radical either-or split that does not seem to be able to reconcile the divide, for which we turn to the dialectic to better understand this relationship. The dialectical analysis will move us beyond the *either-or* and instead put forth a complimentary state of *both-and* where imagination and phantasy can be seen as complimentary in the name of a civilization that does not isolate itself to stagnation and

collapse (imagination at the service of the reality principle) or free itself from social-cultural accountability (phantasy in the realm of the pleasure-principle). Rather than regarding the dualism formally as mutually exclusive domains or collapsing them into a single entity, the dialectic focuses on both simultaneously striving for a transcendence of the opposites which (1) justify the rejection of the perceived dualism, and (2) reintroduce phantasy within the conception of imagination and clarify the integral relationship that the aforementioned dualism perpetually kept veiled. Such a transcendence of opposites reveals that imagination and phantasy share something in common and understanding both parts involves understanding their relationship in the whole system, specifically education. Revealing existing and ascertaining new definitions of phantastical imagination will provide a new starting point, from which this dissertation will ask several questions:

1. Why has phantasy fallen out of our conceptualization of imagination?
2. How can philosophy help us return to a richer notion of the relation between phantasy and imagination?
3. What are the implications of phantastical imagination on curriculum development and pedagogy?
4. How does a turn to the phantastic imagination interrupt the current emphasis on creativity and imagination in policy like 21st century skills?
5. What are possible models/resources we can draw upon to reconnect phantasy and imagination?

Imagination has received a great deal of attention in the history of philosophy and psychology (Socrates, Plato, Aquinas, Kant, Piaget, Vygotsky, Freud, Jung, Sartre, Foucault, Brann, Kearny). However, few of these tomes do justice to the dimension of phantasy. This trend appears even more so as we move into contemporary sources and blatantly when we explore education, which seeks to employ imagination in the strictest sense. Yet in all cases, the dialectic between imagination and phantasy, which Marcuse alludes to, is lost on many of these theories. More comprehensive philosophical dictionaries cover phantasy as part of imagination's history as a concept, rooted in the ancient Greek concept of *phantasia*, but few offer a definition that is useful for us today (Audi, 1999; Craig, 1998; Edwards, 1967; Honderich, 2005). Aside from philosophical dictionaries, which first lead the reader from *Phantasy* to "see *Imagination*," where an entire discussion of the history and current interpretation of imagination is laid out, we find concrete definitions of phantasy in psychological dictionaries, but these definitions often lack the ancient and aesthetic dimensions of phantasy and often interpret it through childhood trauma and ongoing psychosis (Corsini & Auerbach, 1996). There are aspects in these more clinical definitions of *fantasy*, which, although not entirely synonymous with our use of *phantasy*, can be useful for education and finding clarity. We find, fantasy can be understood as "a) the fantasizing ability as well as b) the product of that function" (Wick, p. 342). In addition, "In its *primary* form a fantasy appears spontaneously from the unconscious to the receptive subject. *Secondary* fantasies are initiated and pursued from the conscious level, being evoked intentionally for a specific purpose" (Psychology, p. 342). Dialectically, phantasy can be both spontaneous and

unconscious or can be guided/manipulated consciously, but with its contents and its experiential effects drastically different. This dialectic will help us move into the forth category of a utopian imagination mentioned above and illustrate how phantasy, unlike imagination, necessarily partakes of this dialectic space due to its very nature:

> Fantasy holds a position between thinking and sensing or perceiving. When the mind actually produces fantasies, the fantasizer experiences that inflow on a receptive level. Although the output of fantasies can be elicited and their direction and content influenced by conscious intentions, usually fantasies emerge unconsciously, determined by memories, by past and primarily current emotional states, and by hopes and expectations for the future. Fantasy produces what is not, what someday may or may not be, and what never has been. Fantasy also can merely distort reality. The production of the unreal generally takes place in the service of the ego. Whether fantasy as a creative function can produce anything authentically new that is not merely a new combination or a formulation of contents or content fragments already available to knowledge and experiences has remained a philosophical question ever since Aristotle's *De anima.* (Wick, p. 342)

Phantasy mediates between states of conscious and unconscious thought and experience as it moves between sensing and thinking. This space between thinking and perceiving is the fourth category for which we search. Freud is guilty of this too when he uses the term primarily in the context of psychosis as in *Dora: A Case Study in Hysteria* (1963), but at times does pull back and use it more casually as in *The Creative Writer and Daydreams* (2003). Although these collections and studies are informative, they lack a more dynamic and dialectical model that would be able to account for imagination *and* phantasy, including their distinction and their interplay. In order to address 1) how the relationship between imagination and phantasy has shifted over time, and 2) how the two can synthetically be reconnected, I will use dialectics as a methodology, to understand the entirety of this relationship so we can first move back into the dichotomy before

understanding how each part is found within its opposite and the distinction washes away as illusory.

Philosophical Methodology: A Dialectic of Imagination and Phantasy

To describe the method of dialectical critique would initially require a deliberate simplification of the process, reducing it to a series of steps or practices that one can apply in order to understand the full story and the history of a dichotomy. In short, dialectics, as a method, unveils how each conception of the imagination arises out of the tensions and contradictions of the previous historical reality (Jameson, 1971). As a starting hypothesis based on my current research on imagination in philosophy, I speculate that there has been a gradual elimination of phantasy from imagination throughout history, interrupted occasionally by a philosophy or theory that emerges from and puts forth a phantastic dimension of the imagination, but as is so often the case, this rupture is identified and overcome either by reincorporating it back into imagination or labeling it as taboo and having no relation with the imagination but instead with madness. As these moments arise, so too does the consequential management or, in a Foucaultian sense, the increasingly sophisticated forms of discipline that curtail the potential interruption phantasy introduces, both at the individual and the social level, and further reinforce the logic of imagination. These interruptions and the resulting discipline will be explored in the following chapters.

I have chosen dialectics because this method is in a unique position to critique and contribute insights into the three problems identified earlier, to resolve the dichotomous thinking hampering educational reform, and to furnish a genuine understanding of the benefits of supporting phantasy in schools:

1. Dialectics historicizes the problem by providing an outline of the evolution of the concepts of imagination and how they were applied to society, politics, and education.

2. Dialectics also enables us to find the connections between seemingly unrelated elements such as education, economics, and politics in order that we might begin a critique of the totality of these relationships, at least through the topic at hand.

3. Dialectics can provide a more dynamic and useful understanding of the scope of imagination, which can then be applied to designing and identifying tools and strategies to reintroduce imaginative phantasy in education, curriculum, and ultimately politics.

4. Lastly, the moment of the dialectic emerges from the precise historical moment that calls forth the critique. For this reason, turning our attention to phantasy is not merely speculative, but grounded in the current educational crisis with real-world consequences.

This work will be a dialectic in the lineage and spirit of other educational philosophers who have employed the methodology, such as Dewey in his theories of

school and society, Maxine Greene with her work in the arts and social justice, and Henry Giroux with his critique of popular culture in the context of youth, education, and society—all with an overarching concern for democracy. On a more technical note, this dialectic analysis will be guided both by direct insight from theorists such as Erich Fromm and Fredric Jameson and by Herbert Marcuse, whose work factors heavily into the analysis of the content of imagination and phantasy. So far, dialectics has not been applied to the question of imagination, phantasy, and education in any substantive way.

Generally speaking, this dialectic will begin with situating the content of the phantastic imagination in the present, acknowledging and exploring the lineage of the imagination and phantasy in diachronic historical realities, and then advancing into the future by projecting and anticipating the phantastic imagination as a logical next step in the evolution of culture and education in the name of freedom. Specifically, tracing the dialectical reversal is a first step to understanding how every concept contains its opposite and how this internal tension leads to dynamism where concepts evolve over time (Jameson, 1971). This tension is noticeable in the movement from the mythical era of the Eleusinian mysteries, through the Classical era with Plato, understanding the loss initiated in our own era through Nietzsche, and arriving at Marcuse to bring the cycle of phantasy back to its origin as a space for alternative forms of resistance mounted against reality. Using dialectics to situate this evolution, these movements have three dominant phases. They:

1. Isolate the key factors that are covered by the concept of phantasy in order to track these factors throughout the history of imagination. These involve but are not limited to: attention, memory, play, pretend, day-dreams, etc.

2. Initiate a diachronic analysis to uncover the changes in the language that are used to describe imagination in successive historical moments, thus tracing the formal concept within historical reality.

3. Complete the cycle by revealing the whole of the history of phantasy and imagination in its totality, if only for a brief moment when we can glimpse something more at work than the accumulation of a sequence of changes. A temporal flash of the space beyond either-or thinking, this moment comes when we find Marcuse defining phantasy in ways that point back to ideas Plato may have been trying to articulate philosophically and poetically.

Overall, as we move through the widening gulf between imagination and phantasy, dialectics can act to replace either-or logic with a more dynamic both-and logic. This dialectical analysis is part of that ongoing conversation, and the current contradictions we are observing are not only that phantasy is threatened, but that now imagination, too, is losing the robust multi-dimensionality which is dependent upon phantasy. Phantasy has been so thoroughly severed from imagination that the hope for it to break through and find a voice is further suppressed as the instrumental conception of the imagination becomes generally understood and widely accepted as the only meaning of the term.

The chapters that follow will be situated along the dichotomous extremes of instrumental imagination and phantasy. This dissertation, as a dialectical analysis, will focus on how the extremes conflict but also converge, especially in relation to education. Summarizing the structure of the analysis will also reveal the moment of dialectical reversal that Marcuse presents and which recontextualizes the relationship of imagination/ phantasy, freedom/democracy, and education today.

The two moments and philosophers that will be placed in diachronic opposition are Plato and Frederick Nietzsche, precisely because of how the concept of phantasy figures into each person's thought. These philosophers figure centrally in the evolution of imagination and phantasy, and my analysis will lead directly into the thought of Herbert Marcuse, who articulates the concept of phantastic imagination in his *Eros and Civilization*. Where Plato might be representative of the material imagination which is useful for exploring the *form* of freedom, Nietzsche would sit at the other extreme—the Dionysian extreme—where phantasy prevails, providing the immediate *experience* of freedom. In order to more fully understand this trajectory, the first chapter of the analysis will be a description of imagination and phantasy in key mythic, religious, and Socratic texts and practices. This is the origin from which Nietzsche draws inspiration for his Dionysian extremism, but which, as we learn from Marcuse, can lead to dangerous consequences if unchecked Eros denies reality for the sake of pleasure. With each phase in the dialectic, I will also look specifically at the educational implications, providing tentative descriptions of particular practices that emerge as phantasy and imagination are split apart and then ultimately reunited in the work of Marcuse. These descriptions will

also be helpful to draw from as we move through the chapter analyzing Marcuse's call for phantasy and into the chapter on education, which will offer practical advice on how phantasy can actively and effectively be embedded into school models and curriculum (Dewey, 1934; Egan, 200; Greene, 1995; Robinson, 2001)

Chapter Overview: A Precedent for Phantasy

The point of the first chapter is to identify a moment and to set a cultural precedent for a time where imagination and phantasy were not removed from one another, conceptually or experientially. In the writings of the pre-Socratics, we can glimpse a time when phantasy and imagination were fully integrated. Whether through lifestyle practices, rituals and ceremonies designed to rekindle the phantastic (mystery traditions), and even the cultural acceptance of consulting those who were experts in receiving the phantasm (Socrates' daemon, Oracle of Delphi, etc.), accessing and drawing from these experiences featured prevalently in the ancient world. This point of time is not only a glimpse of what once was, but is also a remembrance to reclaim this state as what might still be in a utopian future. Infusing multiple conceptions of the imagination into education will likely require a different type, or multiple types, of learning communities that place less emphasis on the instrumental imagination at the expense of other spaces of creativity.

The mystery traditions' use of tragedy was designed specifically to educate the mythical dimension of human experience, give life to the material world, and celebrate

the frailty of existence. These mystery celebrations are important because they were deliberately educative at the societal level, as many of them involved thousands of initiates on an annual basis. The various mystery traditions (Grecian and Egyptian), and specifically the Eleusinian Mysteries in the Greek tradition, will be helpful in understanding how phantasy once was and still might be educated. These mysteries will be of significant importance since they might also provide mythical archetypes that oppose the Promethean imagination in Western culture, something that troubled Nietzsche and Dewey.

Finally, Socrates himself provides insight into the shape of phantasia prior to Plato, where it is first named in his dialogues and *The Republic.* First, Socrates, as interpreted through Plato, claimed to have received the impetus that began his philosophical interrogation of generals, politicians, artists, aristocrats, etc., from the Oracle of Delphi. The fact that he was visiting and seeking guidance from the Oracle at all illustrates the accepted reverence associated with knowledge that was arrived unintentionally or phantastically from the channeling by oracles and seers. Instances such as these will provide historical and cultural artifacts that will help with interpretation and analyses when the conception of imagination was robust and expansive enough to include the phenomenon of phantasy. In addition to establishing a general cultural approval of phantasy, this chapter will also compile examples of Socrates mentioning his own *daemon* that compels him to interrogate the respected citizens of Athens. Since the term *phantasia* emerges in Plato's *Republic*, the historical parts of this analysis will have to rely on artifacts that provide evidence of the accepted cultural paradigms. Such

daemons reveal troublesome qualities of experience that must be carefully worked into the Platonic model, but are entirely at home in the pre-Socratic world, which it can be argued, Socrates fits into because Plato had not yet severed phantasia from meaning-making, truth, and experience, and which Socrates himself may have questioned upon reflecting on his quest.

This section is going to be the most speculative, since there has been very little by way of philosophical or historical research into the imagination prior to Plato's articulation of phantasia in the dialogues and *The Republic*. The most comprehensive texts in the field (Brann, Kearny), shy away from this epoch, and in Brann's case explicitly makes attempts to justify its exclusion. Often, in these early passages, phantasia is spoken of in a narrative rather than a descriptive context, meaning that it is difficult to discern between phantasy and imagination. Because of this blurring of boundaries I will discuss examples of both the concept of imagination (form) and the phenomenon of imagination (experience) while being sensitive to the fact that we might be speaking of imagination or phantasy, or in fact the conception of a previous era that did not draw a distinction. It may also benefit the analysis to extend to ancient mythological and literary texts because philosophical primary sources reference such phantasy experience as being visited or in a possessed/maddened state.

It is here, in the move from the pre-Socratics, through Socrates, and into Plato that we find familiar territory, at least in terms of the language we are used to in education. Socrates is representative of the transition from phantasy to imagination. Most of the research and reviews of the philosophy of imagination begin with its explicit inception in

Plato's work (Beardsley, 1966; Brann, 1991; Kearny, 1988; Rugg, 1963; Warnock, 1976). However, this immediately misrepresents and narrows the concept of phantasy to within the dominant definitions of imagination that have been mostly stagnant since and merely rearticulating the same poles of the dichotomy, i.e. body/mind, objective/subjective, truth/opinion, rational/irrational, conscious/unconscious, etc. (Beardsley, 1966; Brann, 1991; Kearny, 1988; Marcuse, 1955). Although he may have been the first to articulate the term and delineate the mental qualities assigned to it, his heirarchization of knowledge and placement of phantasia (imagination) on the bottom has determined its fate in modern civilization. Within Plato's hierarchy of cognitive levels, art belongs at the bottom (*eikasia*).

I find resonance with Plato because his understanding of phantasia is akin to the current concept of imagination, which sees it as a cognitive faculty. This is complimentary to the current objectives of education to reinvigorate the imagination for use in STEM disciplines and 21st century skills discourses. As I explore more deeply several of Plato's dialogues and *The Republic,* the overlap with current education will become more obvious, as will the need to offer alternatives that complicate these trends. However, as is the case in the dialectic, I am not arguing for a removal of imagination and a reckless embracing of phantasy; Nietzsche will provide an example of the opposite extreme which will necessitate a unification or partnership.

Plato attacks the arts and artists, with poets and painters alike facing the barrage of his critiques, but it is in these passages where descriptions of the imagination that more closely resemble/approximate phantasy are found. When the poet is described as "out of

his senses" and that "he works in a mad state with the irrational part of his soul" (Beardsley, 1975, p. 38), Plato is separating out productive imagination and the excesses of phantasy, which must be censored if not banned from the republic. Plato offers two ways to reconcile the ecstatic poet and the calculating architect. The poet and the architect are representative of the two dimensions, imagination and phantasy, but for Plato the distinction falls along the lines of seekers of beauty and those who are mad or possessed. This is helpful for overcoming the dualism because we now see even Plato was aware that imagination and phantasy applied to a range of arts and could not be easily described as either/or; in fact, in this model, they can be complimentary because they have different aims. Here are the two ways to overcome the dualism:

> The more radical one would be to say that implicit in all of Plato's writings about the arts there may be a fundamental distinction between two types of art. Beauty and measure are generally discussed in connection with visual arts; when he talks about poetry, he introduces madness and inspiration. […] Perhaps the second, and less far-reaching, suggestion is more plausible: though different arts (from, say, the architect's to the rhapsode's) may require more or less deliberate calculation, and though to analyze the beauties of a work once it is completed may require rational thought, still, wherever beauty is captured in sensuous form, some abandonment to the creative *eros*, some inspired access to ideal beauty, is involved. (Beardsley, 1975, p. 45)

Plato's work is heavily situated within the central civilizing ideas of government, education, and society. Nietzsche, on the other hand, distinguishes this moment as the death of tragedy (which we can interpret as a dimension of phantasy in the Ancient Grecian sense) and throws himself behind Eros, and as we move through *The Birth of Tragedy*, we can witness this movement away from the equilibrium in an altogether different direction. From this dialectical vantage point we can support Marcuse's theory that when phantasy and imagination are unbalanced culture implodes, whether by losing

its access to the phantastic or privileging phantasy over reality at the expense of sustaining a culture altogether.

Nietzsche too works within these dichotomies, framing everything within the concepts of Apollonian and Dionysian impulses. Never wholly escaping the dichotomies, he aligned himself with the Dionysian, the impulse that is antagonistic to modern civilization. In *The Birth of Tragedy* (1956) he describes the dichotomy of aesthetic and political life:

> "The Apollonian spirit is cool—a love of order and measure, expressing itself in an art of formal beauty and proportion. The Dionysian spirit is wild—glorifying in a state of elation or intoxication (*Rausch*) that accepts fully and joyfully the excitement and pain of existence. Dionysian man, the worshipper of life, the taster of all its ecstasies, comes face to face with 'the terror or the absurdity of existence. (*7*)

While Nietzsche describes the perils of modernity as Apollonian, he glorifies the opposite force of the Dionysian spirit. He mainly does so because he recognized, most likely through his critique of Plato, that the impulse to create art could not be found in the education, culture, and civilization of the *kallipolis* in *The Republic*.

He was aware of the cultural stagnation that civilization begot and "wanted to probe more deeply than had ever been done the deep sources of artistic creation, the nature of the impulse to make works of art" (Beardsley, 1975, p. 276). Even in his understanding of Socrates, Nietzsche finds the movement back to phantasy; Socrates asks if art might be a correlative form of knowledge, not the hierarchized notion that Plato would have been forced to recognize as nonsense:

> And though there can be no doubt that the most immediate effect of the Socratic impulse tended to the dissolution of Dionysian tragedy, yet a profound experience

> in Socrates' own life impels us to ask where there is *necessarily* only an antagonistic relation between Socratism and art, and whether the birth of an 'artistic Socrates' is in general a contradiction in terms...As he tells his friends in prison, there often came to him one and the same dream-apparition, which kept constantly repeating to him: 'Socrates, practice music.'…The voice of the Socratic dream-vision is the only sign of doubt as to the limits of logic. 'Perhaps' – thus he must have asked himself – 'what is not intelligible to me is not therefore unintelligible? Perhaps there is a realm of wisdom from which the logician is shut out? Perhaps art is even a necessary correlative of, and supplement to, science?' (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 55)

As I've mentioned Socrates' vision in the outline of the first chapter, I will not go into detail about it here. Socrates saw a value in these visions and revealed that the phantasm of a dream-vision specifically impelled him to rediscover art counter to the Platonic ideal of forms, something at odds with the Apollonian spirit. Nietzsche not only returns to the artistic impulse but describes it with the narrative vigor of the pre-Socratics:

> Art, that sorceress expert in healing, approaches him; only she can turn his fits of nausea into imaginations with which it is possible to live. These are on the other hand the spirit of the *sublime*, which subjugates terror by means of art; on the other hand the *comic* spirit, which releases us, through art, from the tedium of absurdity. The satyr chorus of the dithyramb was the salvation of Greek art; the threatening paroxysms I have mentioned were contained by the intermediary of those Dionysiac attendants. (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 52)

We see here a return to the status of art in the Eleusinian Mysteries: that of finding meaning within the meaninglessness of existences. The reenactment and interpretation of the Demeter myth as these festivals helped provide a similar message offered by art, that of hope in the cycle of death/life: "Though he had been in danger of craving a Buddhistic denial of the will, he was saved by art, and through art life reclaimed him" (Nietzsche, 1956, 51). We approach the moment of the dialectic, where the experience of reconciling the dualism can be dreamed; and not just dreamed, but created through cultural play in the interest of a new form of reality. As a metaphor this is similar to the way Plato

describes the technical ability of architects and craftsmen to make large marble columns appear the same size from the bottom to the top with the use of forced perspective. In the same way the marble columns *play* with one's perception, phantasy and art have the ability to change the form of reality, to manipulate sensual perception with the purpose of amplifying the sight. We also find from the passage above that irrational truths are useful; we need the lies brought to us through aesthetics so that we might, in a similar way through phantasy, amplify hope within the discontent of civilization. Nietzsche describes this through his fascination with the impulse to make art (Belshaw, 2012; Binderman, 1998; Hadaegh & Shams, 2014; Moschella, 2012). Educationally this is where imagination is being charged to extend beyond art and be used for innovation and invention in technological (21st century skills) and scientific research (STEM). From the above summary, I have shown how, within Nietzsche's philosophy, we find resonance with Marcuse who states that phantasy, understood as the *impulse* to create art, could not be manipulated or conditioned, which has been the case with imagination. The dimension of phantasy (though never articulated with the exact terminology) can be found in the ideas offered by Nietzsche. The relationship between phantasy and imagination, according to Nietzsche, could compliment education and life by shaping how we experience reality. In addition to the artistic or what might be called a phantastic *impulse*, we can include Nietzsche's own comments on and secondary literature on childhood and creativity or play (Byrum, 1974; DelCaro, 1989; Kretchmar, 2007; Sharp, 1975; Spariosu, 1989).

The final movement of the dialectic brings it back to society, culture, and education, moving back into the fundamental nature of experience and its role in understanding and shaping reality. Marcuse, and his interpretation of Freud, provides a new way to understand our own access to this relationship and to reposition phantasy in a favorable position to both reality and the experience of reality.

In *Eros and Civilization,* Marcuse puts forward the concept of phantasy as somehow distinct yet inseparable from imagination, as a dimension of human thought whose products are not defined by culture. In this way phantasy is a force to move us to utopia because it is not and cannot be disciplined in the same way that imagination can and has been. For education, and 21st century skillsets specifically, phantasy shows us that not all ideas, insights, innovation, and revolutions are the product of intentional, imaginative, or creative abilities; ideas, at times, do seem to have a point of origin outside conscious thought, outside ourselves and societal conventions even. Marcuse analyzes the space between the two extremes of phantasy and imagination. Politically,

> Imagination envisions the reconciliation of the individual with the whole, of desire with realization, of happiness with reason. While this harmony has been removed into utopia by the established reality principle, phantasy insists that it must and can become real, that behind the illusions lies *knowledge.* (Marcuse, 1955, p. 143)

Marcuse isn't so much making a concerted move back into phantasy, but instead wants to rehabilitate phantasy in the realm of imagination and ultimately in culture and civilization. Rather than making a judgment placing phantasy above imagination, in a move opposite to Plato's, he sees them working together, maybe not synchronistically, but in a partnership. From the above passage we can also see how Marcuse did not

articulate the ideas completely separately and does sometimes use the terms interchangeably. In spite of this, two clear concepts of imagination emerge and are clear even if not specifically named. Imagination (instrumental) can offer ideas to inform models of utopia, even in the face of the irrationality of such possibilities, but regardless of such irrationality, phantasy can offer images and visions with the accompanying experience of utopia.

Beyond the definition and conception of imagination at the cultural level, Marcuse describes how changing the conception of imagination would alter the experience of imagination. For instance, he states, "the basic experience in this dimension is sensuous rather than conceptual; the aesthetic perception is essentially intuition, not notion. The nature of sensuousness is 'receptivity,' cognition through being affected by given objects" (Marcuse, 1955, p. 176). We find it is receptivity, not creativity, which compliments and informs phantasy in a similar fashion to the coupling of creativity with imagination. This coupling can be traced back to Plato, who speaks of the inspiration of the poet and artist, often in disparaging tones, but yet not entirely willing to condemn the message or vision they bring forth. Instead he maintains his distance and takes solace in his desire for rationality, by criticizing how the poet does not understand the messages they proclaim, even if those visions of pure beauty do originate from the gods divine.

In this sense, phantasy, as a dimension of imagination, can be encouraged as a form of receptivity, better understood as inspiration or intuition, but it is important to

make clear its point of origin as beyond conscious intellect. It is not a perception of ideas or concepts but a perception of a specific type of experience. Socrates states in *Ion*,

> A poet is a light and winged thing, and holy, and never able to compose until he has become inspired, and is beside himself, and reason is no longer in him. So long as he has this in his possession, no man is able to make poetry or to chant in prophecy. (Plato, *Ion*, p. 534b-c)

This definition, although potentially dripping with sarcasm, finds resonance in the descriptions offered by Marcuse. In this way, if phantasy is a form of perception, it is one that receives sensuous experience without the backdrop of the cultural/conceptual world. Phantasy then seems to be relegated to times and spaces when one is "out of his senses, and the mind [society's civilized mind] is no longer in him." The perception and experience of phantasy is not of the material world, but an immaterial world where possibility can not only be posited but also experienced.

We find that all that has been written is after the fact, and it is not about the ambitious Promethean drive to create new models of imagination, infusing technology and innovation in ways that are revolutionary and design oriented. Social, political, and economic organization "affect the very content of the reality principle. For every form of the reality principle must be embodied in a system of societal institutions and relations, laws and values, which transmit and enforce the required 'modification' of the instincts" (Marcuse, 1955, p. 37). In order to find, not an escape, but a point beyond this cycle, we need not create; we need to relearn *how* to receive these insights beyond those bound by the reality principle, with the understanding of the importance of and how to access the dimension of phantasy. It is appropriate that the dialectical reversal is here because it takes us back to Plato, with a new lens to find phantasy lurking in his philosophy all

along, and which he was unwilling to remove from culture altogether, even if it did invite a sense of fear because it always carried with it a dimension of political freedom possibly beyond societal control. As we have seen, there are some redeeming moments in Plato, heavy-handedly dismissing the mumblings of the inspired rhapsode, but often backtracking and claiming the source of "the nonrationality of the poet may not be beneath, but above, reason itself" (Beardsley 1975, p. 38). This irrationality of the poet described as above resonates with Marcuse's attempt to move consciousness beyond the reality principle. We find traces of this, peppered with irony, throughout *Ion*, *the Apology*, and *Phaedrus*, where irrationality is described as divine inspiration, genius, or madness (possessed by the Muses.) Again we find this in *the Republic:*

> It may be difficult at times to distinguish the real craziness of the insane, and perhaps of the rhapsode, from the apparent wildness of one who is really inspired – like the philosopher who only seems mad because he is transported and reels at the sight of true beauty. (p. 249d)

Although Plato might be suggesting that the insights from phantasy could be valuable, he shares with Marcuse the fear of an unchecked phantasy. Instead, phantasy must operate in conjunction with imagination if it is to have any effect on the reality principle at the level of civilization itself. Marcuse unites imagination and phantasy in a way that seems more of a reunification, or dialectical sublation, into a new category that transcends the boundaries of each. Marcuse seems to posit phantasy as outside the subject/object dichotomy, which can then be used to reconstruct the reality principle according to different economies of instinctual pleasure, in a way that preserves freedom and identifies phantasy and imagination as tools to be used in political critique, action, and social revolution. He recognizes the potential of phantasy to overwhelm the subject-object

dichotomy and overcome the dominance of what he calls the performance principle. It is this dimension that seems most promising and also that which education has done little with. New models and methods will be required for phantasy to find a home in schools and education to value phantasy.

Now that we can begin to see how the concepts of imagination and phantasy relate to each other and the consequences their relationship has for the individual and society, we can see how far off the mark current educational reform movements truly are. The infusion of phantasy could catalyze current efforts to reintroduce imagination in schools, as well as entirely new efforts that might be found beyond 21st century skills and the economic promise of STEM.

In the first several chapters of the dissertation, I will provide a dialectical analysis of the divergences and convergences of imagination and phantasy. We can learn from the historical moments that an alliance is central to the new theory I am articulating. The result of the preceding dialectic will be a robust theory of imaginative phantasy that equally emphasizes receptivity to the mystery of inspiration and the creativity of imaginative skills. In the final chapter, I will use this theory to critique standing models of imagination in educational philosophy, including those offered by John Dewey, Maxine Greene, Kieran Egan, and Ken Robinson.

A reading of these four authors in the context of the dialectic and a refining of the language of phantasy allows for a more comprehensive and reflexive understanding of how phantasy can and does affect education. Dewey gives us an understanding of the aesthetic experience that can be nurtured in learning environments. Maxine Greene

builds on this by applying the education of the imagination to social justice mandates within the larger context of democracy, freedom, and society. Egan constructs an understanding of how important educational tools (media, technology, curriculum, pedadgogy) are to shaping the foundations of cognition, knowledge, and civilization. And lastly, I return to Robinson, who at first seems entirely in the realm of the economic instrumental imagination, but upon closer analysis we find traces of phantasy, the uninhibited rapture of the aesthetic moment, in his description of the creative (aesthetic) experience. This turn both redeems Robinson from how his ideas have been capitalized and exploited and highlights the importance of creativity in the dialectics of phantasy.

Included in this chapter will be a practical side that seeks to inform education explicitly. I will move from educational philosophy to practice and look for pedagogical practices that bring phantastical imagination into the classroom. Educational practice has already seen the inclusion of the instrumental imagination, particularly within early childhood education, but will need further theorizing to create more robust methods accounting for the phantastical imagination within art education, theater/dance, story-telling, and play (Rodari,1996; Greene, 1995; Dewey, 1934; Marcuse, 1955; Piaget, 1962; Vygotsky, 1967). In addition to restoring phantasy, this effort will also mediate between the states of phantasy and imagination and the role of each and their respective importance in the cycle of bringing forth experiences and ideas not bound in or by the reality principle. For example, the vision of the Pegasus would still require some technical art or poetically descriptive skills to make such a vision understandable to the community. Plato still valued the technical abilities of architects, but feared crossing the

boundary of aesthetic freedom, and therefore sought to censor and limit the political dimension of phantasy and freedom. Reintroducing phantasy into the curriculum will likely face similar fears, misunderstandings, and censorship. It will be important, but not difficult, to align phantasy with imagination. Although the research and theory have not distinguished these concepts quite the way we have here, they do not necessarily separate so artificially. The two must be valued in unison, so they complement each other's qualities.

For pedagogical practice, it is important to remember the contribution of Marcuse: phantasy is receptivity. Since it is not an active state but a passive state, we can find a theoretical thread with some amount of empirical research to support curriculum and established practices to nurture and leave students open to an experience called phantasy. Aside from accessing this dimension, it will be just as important to find methods that allow individuals to bring insights back into the reality principle from the dimension of phantasy. This movement from receiver/dreamer to creator/doer, a creativity tempered by receptivity, is one that Marcuse anticipates but does not fully flesh out. He provides some preliminary vocabulary and concepts that will be useful to describe this movement between dimensions, and possibly articulates why the civilized consciousness may be more prepared to bring artifacts back from phantastic experiences. Educational practices involving day-dreaming, pretend/make-believe, play, dreaming, somatic imagination, and story-telling can facilitate an education of phantasy (Baker, 2006; Balinisteanu, 2008; Bateson, 2006; Boske, 2011; Fettes, 2011; Gold & Cundiff, 1980[Jan]; Gold & Cundiff, 1980[Oct]; Haldrman, Zelhart & Jackson, 1985; Leafgren, 2011; Smith & Mathur, 2009;

Teague & Gold, 1981; Trotman, 2006; Wiebe & Snowber, 2011; Wood & Latham, 2011).

The epilogue of the dissertation will move back into philosophy and engage phantasy at the level of myth. Since, as we learn in Plato, knowledge of the divine is, for the philosopher, a matter of interpretation, then reinterpreting myth, in the lineage of Freud and Marcuse, can be an essential first step to track the loss of phantasy, understand its consequences, and, most important, offer ways to reclaim it as a human dimension of mental activity. By revisiting the Pandora myth, which antagonizes the Promethean ethos that drives civilization in general and 21st century skills and STEM discourses, we can reclaim hope—a hope to return to phantasy, and find ways, through myth, to make this partnership a possibility that can be tested and new ways created to entice phantasy to reappear.

In summary, this dissertation will seek to accomplish three tasks: to provide an overview of the current paradoxes and aporias in contemporary educational policy related to imagination; to map a philosophical dialectic that helps to resolve these problems by returning to the question of phantasy; and to posit educational alternatives based on an emergent theory of imaginative phantasy. The challenge to the dissertation will be to first create a theoretical groundwork for understanding the phantastical imagination and then make this relevant for teachers. In this way, a pedagogy of the phantastical imagination might at least expose the conservative underpinnings of much of the current market-driven rhetoric steering the educational policies that appropriate a notion of imagination circumscribed by economic utility and instrumentality.

Chapter 1: Daemonion in Ancient Greece

This chapter introduces the concept of phantasy in the practical contexts of ancient mythology, religious mystery celebrations, and the concept of the *daemon.* This analysis will make it clear that phantasy factored heavily into the ancient mind. This era illustrates clearly a time when not only were the two forces of phantasy and imagination compatible, but complementary. The tension between the two seems to arise after we break the concepts into a dichotomy. For this reason the complementarity of phantasy and imagination came to a dead-end, and we will need dialectics to re-situate the extremes rather than cancel them out.

Before proceeding into examples, it will first be helpful to introduce the concept of the liminal space of the *eschatia*. An understanding of this space and how it was understood in ancient Greece, specifically Athens, will prepare us for a deeper understanding of phantasy and uncover a dimension of the current crisis of imagination and the difficulty in returning to phantasy, both in terms of the educational crisis and, more important, a broader cultural crisis that has relegated phantasy to the margins so thoroughly that we don't even consciously perceive its absence. This framing will offer a contemporary clarification of ancient practices and art forms as we rebuild an understanding of the overall experience of phantasy, all the while reconceptualizing imagination.

Liminality and the Eschatia

The eschatia is defined as:

> "[A space not only] betwixt and between the land of the dead and *polis* as the land of the living, but also between an Olympian and a chthonic divine sphere, the uncultivated geographical periphery represented an ambiguous and primordial landscape, where men had still not been distinguished from the realm of the gods, the animals, and the dead. (Endsjo, 2000, p. 351)

This space represents a truly unique dimension for human thought, for not only can one encounter nonhumans in this space, but possibly become one. It can be further understood through the concept of *liminality* – residing between the modes of (being) fully human and (non being) animal/god/dead (Endsjo, 2000, p. 354). This paradox lies, at least in part, in this space conceptualized as "an [area] defined by what it is not […] something like a spatial remain, a non-structuralised [sic] border area that appears only as other" (Endsjo, 2000, p. 356). This space of the other is the source of both the artistic creation that we will see in Neitzsche, as well as the urge to censor the poet that will be prevalent in Plato's *Republic*. In fact, where Plato moves further and further away from this space, denouncing its productive capacities, Nietzsche can be seen tracing the path backwards, following a line of decensoring poetry to revitalize myth, in an effort to alter both the individual and cultural experiences of phantasy. The difference lies in the space that Plato fears and Nietzsche revels in: man coming to know the gods through intelligence, or man becoming god through desubjectification. Desubjectification can be understood as moving beyond the boundaries of the ego into new states of consciousness where subject-object dichotomies dissolve.

We can see why Plato would seek to censor such a confounding space, since it can cloud and misdirect the intellect through sheer sensual overstimulation. It is in this dimension of the eschatia where:

> Every element of existence may be found severed from its usual context, juxtaposed by its usually mutually exclusive opposite, and assembled into new, totally nonsensical combinations. Thus, all the usual social states of gender, age, hierarchy, as well as even more basic opposites such as human versus divine, human versus animal, and dead versus alive, may be negated and reverted in the liminal space. (Endsjo, 2000, p. 354)

Here we have a space, if only a momentary one, where the perception and organization of knowledge along polarities or dualities was suspended; a crack in this fabricated veil of reality revealed itself with a dialectic completeness/totality. This will also be important as we move into the Eleusinian mysteries where the initiates came from a wide variety of cultures and social stations. And it is precisely because of this "continuous confusion of human, divine and all other elements of the Greek cosmos, the space of the *eschatia* and everything that it enclosed had apparently escaped the primeval separation of the elements into proper categories" (Endsjo, 2000, p. 378). Escaping the civilizing tendencies of other human dimensions, the eschatia is released from maintaining civilized behavior as a constant referent. In short, the eschatia may be both uncontrollable yet productive.

This space was to be found not only in the mental dimensions of phantasy, but in the very real, physical, material space beyond the walls of the polis. It was both a conceptual realm of the gods, and the space beyond the reach of the civilizing forces of the polis:

> "all the areas not under the cultivation of the Greek *polis* may, in fact, be summed up by the term *ta eschatia*, the furthest part […], the landscapes that the ancient Greeks repeatedly related to the experience of the rites of passage, stretched accordingly from the hinterland just outside the *polis* to the uttermost periphery at the end of the world" (Endsjo, 2000, p. 359).

It is the space conceptualized as the end of the world where the boundaries blur, and the borderline between myth and reality fades. The eschatia is both the underworld that can be experienced through death or initiation in a mystery festival, as well as the land in myth that lies beyond the end of the world. The eschatia is contrasted with the polis, which:

> not only defined the *eschatia* as its geographical periphery, but was also the area that represented the only place of true humanity. Without *polis*, man was 'either a beast or a god,' as Aristotle pointed out. The city defined a space that in itself was humanizing. The space of the *polis* constituted a stable and culturally recognized geographical condition representing a certain cultural pattern that pertained to all aspects of the proper human existence. (Endsjo, 2000, p. 359)

Pushing deeper into the dialectic between Plato and Nietzsche, we find that the polis is the space of the Apollonian, which is fueled, informed, and given a dimension beyond the static plastic arts, by the Dionysian impulse that has its origins in the eschatia. This movement is the dialectic between imagination and phantasy. There exists a perpetual dialectical tension between the eschatia and the polis which, in a similar way as we see in Neitzsche, kept each from collapsing into themselves, and in fact, such opposition provided a rupture in the interstitial space between, where the boundaries of each could be superseded; new forms of existence emerged from this space in between (Endsjo, 2000, p. 362).

It was in this space that the burdensome aspects of consciousness as a consequence of civilization could be shed, both conceptually and physically. In fact it

was recognized that by living on the fringe, "on the very margins of the human world, the *eschatoi andron,* or the peoples of the periphery, were repeatedly said to be closer to the gods," where foreign and exotic lands such as Egypt and the Near East were said to still be inhabited by gods (Endsjo, 2000, p. 372). Aside from gods, the eschatia housed "zoomorphic hybrids like centaurs, satyrs, sirens, and sphinxes" (Endsjo, 2000, p. 373). Experienced through myth and lyrical poetry at the cultural level, phantasy was institutionalized in the Eleusinian mysteries. However, the ritual introduces a primary feature of phantasy that can be seen as an inherent limitation but may in fact be a failsafe: the experience is only temporary, and the understandings gleaned are equally fleeting and impermanent. More specifically, the "liminality of the rites of passage […] was in spite of its primordial aspects only a passing moment when the structures of human civilization were reversed" (Endsjo, 2000, p. 381). Again, the dialectic emerges in the experience, and although it touches a dimension of human mental activity not situated in civilized and conscious thought, it cannot—and, I will argue as I move from Nietzsche into Marcuse, *should* not—be sustained at the individual level. It would remove a person too far from the polis to be recognizable as human, but on the other hand, it seems the experience can be institutionalized in a set of practices designed for the very purpose of rekindling that primordial state of existence, in order to inform, educate, and temper civilized states of existence, as evident from the Eleusinian rituals.

The Eleusinian Mysteries

We find commentary on the Eleusinian mysteries in ancient texts, even though the rites were sacred and initiates took a vow of secrecy. First:

> Euripides indicates that there was a close relation between the experience of the [Eleusinian] mysteries and that of traveling in the uncivilized landscapes. […] Going through the mysteries would in some way prepare the traveler for the extreme journey not only to the land of dead, but also to the uncultivated landscapes of the periphery. (Endsjo, 2000, p. 353).

The journey into the eschatia that the Eleusinian Mysteries necessarily involved was preparation for life after death. This preparation was phantastic because it removed the individual from themselves so that they might discover alternative knowledge in the liminal space of these experiences.

These mysteries, as opposed to others, begin with a ritual that centered on a cultivated, but still phantastic experience. We have some general and ambiguous descriptions concerning the ritual and the final vision of the hierophant. Despite the psychedelic nature of the descriptions and what anthropologists have reassembled about the Eleusinian Mysteries, "some of the formative minds of Western civilization, the ones that helped bring Democracy, Reason, Mathematics, Science, Philosophy, and Theater into the world, thought these *entheogen*-inspired Eleusinian Mysteries were the greatest experience of their lives" (Wasson, Hofmann, & Ruck, 2008, p. 6). What was it that the initiates beheld that distinguished it from theater? Surely it could not be reduced to a cultural mythos. The experience at these festivals was one that held significance for nearly 1,500 years. And they received much prominence, as the poet Pindar describes:

"They saw something which validated the continuity of existence beyond the grave, the 'end of life as well as its divinely granted beginning'" (Wasson, Hofmann, & Ruck, 2008, p. 87). Aristotle, too, mentions the revelation of the mysteries, which gives us insight into what transpired compared to theater, as "an experience rather than something learned" (Wasson, Hofmann, & Ruck, 2008, p. 94). This experience was decidedly visual in nature, both in terms of setup (the initiates were blindfolded during part of the procession) and in terms of experience (there was likely a performance which took on otherworldly qualities because of the preparation). These otherworldly visions Plato referred to explicitly as *phasmata*, ghostly apparitions, or holy objects depending on the translation (Wasson, Hofmann, & Ruck, 2008, p. 90; Plato, 1961, p. 496). It was primarily an observed visual experience stimulated both by the *kykeon* and preparation the initiates took to learn and understand the Demeter myth; on the one hand, the study, fasting, journey, and ablution in the night in a material sense (Wasson, Hofmann, & Ruck, 2008), and on the other an experience that was also mythically mediated (Petridou, 2013).

Regarding the visual aspect, the "Greek language did not distinguish between madness and inebriation because Dionysus was the god of all inebriants and not of wine alone" (Wasson, Hofmann, & Ruck, 2008, 99). This indicates a misrepresentation in Plato's overall disregard for the Orphic mystery traditions, describing their states of drunkenness as a mistaken virtue, but also a flaw in the *Republic* because the vision of madness describes both the poet and the philosopher who is visited by the Muse, and it is in this dialectic where Plato stumbles, as we will see in the next chapter.

Now that we have some basic idea of how the Eleusinian mysteries were experienced and described, let us move onto what actually occurred during the event. The event was open to anyone. That fact above all else is exemplary of the nature of the final revelation--that it expanded beyond sociopolitical, cultural, and even gender differences and directly into universally human experiences of joy of rebirth and fear of death. The inclusive and egalitarian policies of the Eleusinian mysteries allowed radical diversity among the initiates, including women, children, noncitizens, travelers, and even slaves, which was unprecedented in other mystery traditions (Evans, 2006; Petridou, 2013; Wasson, Hofmann, & Ruck, 2008). Even more amazing is that despite such radical diversity the Eleusinian mysteries were able to convey a shared experience among the initiates, allowing them each "to *see* the same things" (Petridou, 2013, p. 313). That the experience was able to find a common fabric to project the vision onto is in itself quite mystical.

Upon closer inspection however, we find that the preparation required the study of the Demeter myth—its language, imagery, and symbolism—in order to prepare the initiate to read the symbols during the event and experience the vision collectively. The event itself was divided into separate categories or levels of initiation. The Lesser Mysteries took place in Athens temple at Eleusis and consisted of learning the mythical backdrop to the final revelation. The preparation for the Eleusinian mysteries was extensive and would include the Lesser Mysteries and the Greater Mysteries, and would often take a month or more of learning and ritual before the final initiation (Wasson, Hofmann, & Ruck, 2008). The final initiation began with a procession to the temple in

Eleusis from Athens, a journey of about 14 miles. Initiates were blindfolded for part of this walk, so as to symbolize the transitioning of worlds into the underworld—a metaphorical death in order to set the mental stage before the final event (Wasson, Hofmann, & Ruck, 2008, p. 85). Besides the performance that likely took place inside the temple at Eleusis, the prior knowledge of the Persephone/Demeter myth facilitated the revelatory experience. This educational primer before phantasy is important for us to remember for contemporary learning: phantasy must be nurtured, and myth might be a way to invite phantasy back into experience.

Embedded in the story of Demeter and Persephone, aside from the violence and brutality of death, is the knowledge that life is cyclical and that there will be a rebirth. For the initiates, "In this communion [with the divine], life was reclaimed from its chthonic captivity and they all shared in the joy of a rebirth that reconfirmed the metaphysical compact with the sources of life in the dark realm of death" (Wasson, Hofmann, & Ruck, 2008, p. 127). But it was not just in the cathartic sense that Aristotle talks of theater as purging one of false desires. This experience was one that was "intensely visual, [where initiates] saw something that took the terror out of human mortality" (Evans, 2006, p. 19).

This knowledge that was bestowed was the result of an experience that had been ritualized at Eleusis and persisted for more than two millennia (Wasson, Hofmann, & Ruck, 2008). Plato (1961) describes clearly the experience in a passage in *Phaedrus*, with the tone of one who has had the mystery revealed:

> Beauty it was ours to see in all its brightness in those days when, amidst that happy company, we beheld with our eyes that blessed vision, ourselves in the

> train of Zeus, others following some other god; then were we all initiated into that mystery which is rightly accounted blessed beyond all others; whole and unblemished were we that did celebrate it, untouched by the evils that awaited us in the days to come; whole and unblemished likewise, free from all alloy, steadfast and blissful were the spectacles on which we gazed in the moment of final revelation; pure was the light that shone around us, and pure were we, without taint of that prison house which now we are encompassed withal, and call a body, fast bound therein as an oyster in its shell. (p. 497)

The language that is used to describe both the communion and the journey to this space that the divine inhabits is powerfully visual and spatial in its metaphors. The body, as a metaphor of the prison for the soul or spirit, prevents the soul from escaping into the world of Forms and also bounds the experiences of the soul by introducing sensual experience and bodily appetites and the corruption of the soul. This illusion of the body can be understood by experiencing the space in-between where gods are both visible and can see you in return (Evans, 2006, p. 9). This in-between signifies a spatial movement or possibly a world between the world of human ordeals and the world of divine affairs and decisions. Also it is described as a communion, "the essential event in those [pre-Grecian, agrarian, feminine-centered] religions was the Sacred Marriage, in which the priestess periodically communed with the realm of spirits within the earth to renew the agricultural year and the civilized life that grew upon the earth" (Wasson, Hofmann, & Ruck, 2006, p. 438). The communion again represents a meeting space where such a meeting between human and nonhuman subjectivities could occur in the first place, even in a conceptual way.

Again, the movements between spaces can be seen in the ritual of the Eleusinian mysteries. The guided procession was "mimetic of a journey to the other world to claim back from death the daughter of the grain mother Demeter, whose sorrow for her lost

maiden could be assuaged only through the mystery of rebirth" (Wasson, Hofmann, & Ruck, 2008, p. 85). In ancient pottery depicting the Eleusinian mysteries, we find a clear distinction between the world of human affairs and the world of the gods. In this description we begin to see the clarity of phantasy and imagination as dichotomized concepts, and in doing so, recognize the tendency to depict these world as separate. On an ancient urn depicting the rites at Eleusis, "the Eleusinian grain and the poured libation interrupt the line that separates the two figures [of a human and Demeter] into different realms [Dream/Reality]" (Wasson, Hofmann, & Ruck, 2008, p. 119). The line is the veil that keeps the worlds separate. The libation is the mediating between those worlds, which allowed for, if only momentarily, access to a space where one is "allowed to look upon and be looked upon by the divine" (Petridou, 2013, p. 311).

The ritualized visual nature of the experience facilitates the temporal (desubjectification) whose aim is to undermine a culturally engendered secular visuality, and to prepare, usually through a process of physical and meta purification, the self for the possibility of meeting with the divine (Petridou, 2013, p. 315). Most important is the connection here between the entering the liminal space to encounter the divine *and* the centrality of desubjectification to get there. This will be the primary issue at stake for Plato's intelligible world of Forms, that the philosopher does not loss oneself to the divine, and in fact reaches it through knowledge and understanding, rather than madness. But the fault we will explore continues to be the notion of visuality that creeps into Plato's work, which we can see most specifically in the *Symposium*.

To summarize, the eschatia is the educational time and space of phantasy. Indeed, we might describe it as an "exo-pedagogy" (Lewis & Kahn, 2012) wherein the human, the polis, and the binaries defining worlds are suspended, opening up the self to that which is neither fully self nor other, material nor immaterial. In such a space, we are educated to be "otherwise than" what we are—and this process is decisively mystical and utopian in nature. Through this suspension of the human world, the self achieves a kind of maximal openness and receptivity to receive the gods and others. Also, it is important to note that while certain constraints are placed upon the participants (in terms of culture, language, and symbolic education), the mysteries are owned by no one in particular—it is an experience held in common. These are important "lessons" to be learned from "mysterious" exopedagogy.

Phantasy and Daemonion

Aside from the ancient mystery traditions at Eleusis, the general concept of the *daemon* will be helpful to describe phantasy that is not associated with ritual or mythology, and which points to everyday phantasy instead. The examples to follow represent a nearly exhaustive collection of Socrates' specific mentions of his own daemon. This clarifies phantasy in a context that can be applied to education in less dramatic ways. Here we find some of the traces that may help us find our way back to phantasy through experiences in the contemporary world. Before merely listing these

daemonic experiences of Socrates we can frame each experience by first understanding Plato's conception of a daemon.

In the *Symposium,* Socrates "gives a speech in praise of Eros" which culminates in an understanding of how Eros mediates the "relationship between human and divine" (Evans, 2006, p. 2). This concept of Eros as a mediating agent is virtually synonymous with how Socrates describes his daemon; it will however, diverge from the way Marcuse frames Eros and how Eros operates with respect to imagination and phantasy. Socrates references Diotima, a woman priestess who was in charge of a form of mystery ritual, when he describes Eros as "one of the *daemons* that mediates between bad and good, and between human and divine" (Evans, 2006, p. 11). This mediating nature defines the daemon as he transfers understanding between the earthy world of the civilized reality principle and phantasy. It may be that Plato is disguising the phantastic nature of this reception by distancing the experience of the divine through the mediating forces of the daemon, without which one has entered the uncivilized space of the eschatia and potentially has already lost his or her intellect. This concept of mediation is one that may not work once we move from Marcuse back into education. The experience of phantasy, although present in the notion of the daemon, is not fully released since the daemon mediates the experience, thus preventing direct interaction of the dimensions which phantasy allows access. This conceptualization of the daemon can be seen as a way in which Plato attempted to appropriate both the language on the one hand, and the ritualized experience of the mystery on the other, while still denying that such experiences could bestow knowledge.

Evans (2006) lays out a convincing argument that "the singular experience of the goddess Demeter and of her rites celebrated yearly in Eleusis helped lead Plato to imagine anew the possibilities for a mutual encounter of the self and the larger cosmos" (p. 23). It was this experience that Plato attempted to recreate in philosophy, which sought to understand human's place in and comprehension of the world. Greek mysticism allows us to reconsider "the reasons why what is now known as a 'philosophical' text by Plato contains the imagery and language of the Eleusinian Mysteries" (Evans, 2006, p. 6). For example, in the description of Eros:

> [The] higher grades of rites of Diotima's lesson in erotics are given the same name as the most advanced stage of initiation into Demeter's mystery rites at Eleusis: the *epoptika* […] derived from the verb that means 'look upon,' has no other meaning in classical Greek outside of the meanings uniquely attached to the Eleusinian Mysteries. (Evans, 2006, p. 18)

Situating this in the larger context of Greek culture, outside of mysticism, Dodds (1951) depicts how the "Greeks never spoke as we do of *having* a dream, but always of *seeing* a dream" (p. 105). The nature of the visuality of the dream is important for phantasy because it is not a metaphorical seeing as Plato is attempting to argue, but a sensuous seeing, a direct experience of phantasy, rather than an experience mediated through a daemon. The distinction lies in the idea that understanding comes directly from sensuous experience in phantasy versus understanding coming from intellect (creativity), after an experience that approaches the divine but never fully crosses from the polis into the eschatia. In terms of the divinity of the intelligible that Plato seeks to establish and teach, I examine his appropriation of the language of Eleusis in the dialogue *Alcibiades I*:

> And do we know of any part of our souls more divine than that which has to do with wisdom and knowledge?

> There is none.
> Then this is that part of the soul which resembles the divine, and he who looks at this and at the whole of things divine, will be most likely to know himself. (1875, p. 505)

But we see the problem arising, and will see it again and again in the *Republic*: The intelligible world does not account nor allow for the desubjectification that is necessary to see the divine, a transcendent experience associated with the experience of the Mysteries. Perhaps this is exactly the state Plato wishes to avoid entirely, but, as will be shown, there will be consequences at the level of civilization. Not only does the experience of phantasy reach *into* the human dimension in how we experience the world, but *beyond* the human dimension and immediate experience of the world. In addition to being the same instinctual drive of sexuality found in animals, "Eros also supplies the dynamic impulse which drives the soul forward in its quest of a satisfaction transcending earthly experience" (Dodds, 1951, p. 218). Eros seeks to find meaning and delight beyond the human world in an effort to bring such meaning and delight into it. However, although Plato disavows the logic of desubjectification, he does, at times, seem to touch the psychological concepts that we will find when we arrive at Marcuse, especially in the context of recognizing and reshaping the forces at work on the psyche. Evans (2006) locates in Plato's speech on Eros "a different conception of human experience and its relative distance to and difference from the divine" (p. 7). It is in this space of reconceptualizing this distance and difference that we seek to engage and play so as to find phantasy and rekindle an archaic relationship. In this sense, Eros is the dialectic, and although a mediating agent, it can begin the process of reawakening phantasy, and hopefully restore the immediate experience of the beyond—the mystery.

Before I move onto the *Republic*, a more thorough review of the concept of the daemon found within the Socratic dialogues may help to uncover the way Plato understands the experience of the divine as mediated, not direct. In the same passage above where Socrates is praising Eros, Diotima "proceeds to teach Socrates that between mortal and immortal is *to diamonion* [sic], a term that has no proper analogue in English, but which may be rendered 'god-like' [and] the noun daemon [which could] indicate a god or goddess, a supernatural power, a spirit, or a semidivine entity" (Evans, 2006, p. 9). What is clear is that while the individual experiences the eschatia in terms of an interaction with a daemon, they themselves never quite enter the eschatia, but instead communicate through it. In the Symposium, daemons are described as "between god and man" (Plato, 1961, p. 555)--messengers that communicate and offer understanding through interpretation. In *The Apology*, the daemon is described further, but still firmly situated both *in* and *in-between* mythology (eschatia) and the material, civilized world (polis). The daemons are either "gods or the children of gods?" or "bastard children of the gods by nymphs or other mothers, as they are reputed to be?" (Plato, 1961, pp.13-14). This is again addressed in *The Apology* when Socrates describes how he has received his vocation:

> This duty [of examining those who think that they are wise when they are not] I have accepted, as I said, in obedience to God's commands given in oracles and dreams and in every other way that any other divine dispensation has ever impressed a duty upon man. (Plato,1961, 19)

Not only is the daemon experienced in a phantastic dimension, but for Socrates it holds some level of authority--he allows the voice to compel him to wait for his friends so that a dialogue may commence in the beginning of *Euthydemus* (Plato, 1961).

It is difficult to make the distinction between the daemonic possession of a poetic Muse and that of the philosophic Muse, but this distinction is one that delineates madness or beauty, respectively, in the case of the poet and philosopher. The dialectic emerges as we understand that the eschatia, for Plato, is not to be directly experienced by an individual, but understood through the mediation of the daemon. There seems to be a danger that threatens civilization, knowledge, and the polis in direct experience of the eschatia on the periphery of human culture. The essential rupture comes from how the daemon informs: "Diotima proposes that because humans are mortal (and lack beauty, goodness, and wisdom), they experience the communicative and hermeneutical aspects of divinity when the daemonion relays to them divine orders, precepts, and commands" (Evans, 2006, p. 12). This is the dialectic of the daemon. The experience of the daemon is the closet humans can get to experiencing the divine—at least, I will argue, without any corresponding desubjectification. The daemon as a mediating agent does not allow for the direct experience of the divine, but communicates it through interpretation; the intellect remains intact, but the understanding must be worked through with reason rather than immediate experience of the divine. In this way, the daemon allows one to keep his distance from madness, and the divine is not to be immediately experienced by humans, but made intelligible with knowledge, reason, and methodology, not sight or any form of sensuous experience.

It is most likely in this distancing from madness that Plato sought to rework the language of the Eleusinian mysteries and the concept of the daemon. In *Phaedrus* we

begin to see the distinguishing of madness, and therefore the dichotomy of imagination and phantasy to surface:

> The unreasoning desire that overpowers a person's considered impulse to do right and is driven to take pleasure in beauty, its force reinforced by its kindred desires for beauty in human bodies – this desire, all-conquering in its forceful drive, takes its name from the word for force and it is called *Eros.* (Plato, 1955, p. 18)

Eros, situated in purely human/animal contexts, is isolated to sexuality and pleasures of the body. However, situated in the realm of the divine and the intellect as described by Diotima through Socrates in *The Symposium,* Eros is an agent that can transcend the human/animal dimension in order to find higher, more fulfilling states of pleasure. As I move into Marcuse this process will be called, after Freud, *sublimation*, and is a hallmark of imagination. Additionally, without such a reading Eros remains connected to phantasy, Socrates elaborates in *Phaedrus:*

> We said, did we not, that love is a sort of madness?
> Yes.
> And that there are two kinds of madness, one resulting from human ailments, the other from a divine disturbance of our conventions of conduct.
> Quite so.
> And in the divine kind we distinguished four types, ascribing them to four god: the inspiration of the prophet to Apollo, that of the mystic to Dionysus, that of the poet to the Muses, and a fourth type which we declared to be the highest, the madness of the lover, to Aphrodite and Eros. (Plato, 1961, p. 510-511).

This divine madness makes this path murky to travel since Plato is introducing contradictions into his concept of imagination and knowledge. In the next chapter I will explore how Plato seemingly attempts to reconcile this inconsistency with Socrates' heirarchization of the muses regarding music, poetry, and philosophy in the *Republic*. However, this introduces additional flaws since Socrates places philosophy with muses associated more with music than poetry.

This is explicitly evident in *Phaedo* where Socrates reveals his doubt about how he has thus far interpreted his daemon. Devoting his life to philosophy may have at best been a misunderstanding on Socrates' part, and at worst a blatant and conscious effort to ignore the message of the daemon, thus subverting the pretext of the divine. Upon being asked about the prose he has been composing to Apollo and putting into verse stories by Aesop, Socrates responds:

> I was trying to get at the meaning of certain dreams which I had had, and discharging a sacred obligation, thinking that it was this sort of music they were bidding me to compose. I must tell what the dreams were like. Often in the course of my life the same dream-figure has visited me. Differing in its visible form but always saying the same words, 'Socrates, be diligent and make music.' In the past I had supposed that it was urging and encouraging me to go on with what I was doing, just as people urge on runners to run; I was to 'make music' in the sense in which I was already doing so: the highest music was philosophy, and philosophy was my business. […] It occurred to me that possibly the injunction of the dream might be to compose music in the commonly accepted sense, and I thought I ought to obey by doing so; it was safer, I felt, not to depart until I had fulfilled my sacred obligation by composing what the dream enjoined. (Plato, 1955, p. 34)

This passage is extremely revealing as to how phantasy is both experienced and how it is approached. We find here that the approach—the cultural conceptualization through which one meets phantasy—dictates to a large degree how phantasy is experienced. As I will argue in Chapter 6, there is an obligation to phantasy in education with how it is approached with a certain degree of hospitality, receptivity, and passivity. Socrates does not seem to oblige himself with such conditions regarding phantasy, and instead attempts the exact effort I have highlighted in education, that of controlling and exploiting the imagination and phantasy for the material/conceptual benefits (in his case, exceedingly selfish) that could be brought over, and which I are arguing vehemently against, and may

in fact be insulated from such exploitation due to its position in the psyche. Without desubjectification, an individual can at best approach phantasy, but never fully experience and reside in the dimension of the eschatia.

At the end, perhaps, Socrates had fears that at best, his life had been imbalanced because he did not compose music which would have been the erotic balance to his life of intellect, and at worst, his life was misinformed—misinterpreted since we exist at the level of communication and hermeneutic regarding the experience for the divine without direct understanding and comprehension. However, besides this singular brief moment, Socrates makes little attempt to transcend subjectivity, and in fact is firmly rooted is his own subjectivity, that of the persona of a philosophical sage that seeks to re-envision society in the form of Beauty and Perfection. Even in his death Socrates reinforces this quality, rather than turn away: "If you doubt whether I am really the sort of person who would have been sent tot this city as a gift from God, you can convince yourselves by looking at it this way" (Plato, 1961, p. 17). Such trajectory, which is only continued in *The Republic,* puts us further and further off the trail of a hospitality for phantasy, both in education and culture at large. Self-effacement begins the process of inviting phantasy, but we will have to wait until Nietzsche to understand what this looks like and why it should be avoided to some extent.

The mysteries and consultation with daemons are representative of an exopedagogy that stands in opposition to the civilizing functions of society. Perhaps even more descriptive than an exopedagogy is a pedagogy *beyond* the dichotomies of imagination and phantasy, and one that nurtures the productive tension between the two.

In this sense, phantasy emerges as a commons that can be accessed by all, except those who cannot break the dichotomous barriers that civilization erects and reinforces. The eschatia where phantasy can be found places new emphasis on the hospitality and the receptivity of the mysteries and daemons, even though they are unpredictable and possibly dangerous. Without such spaces and the invitational hospitality required, phantasy is lost to the West after Plato. In light of this, we will not be able to revisit these themes until Marcuse's dialectical reconstruction of Eros and Reason and continue the work of identifying a set of practices capable of informing teaching that nurtures phantasy.

Chapter 2: Plato

As we move from a mythical pre-Socratic disposition to that of more familiar educational terrain in the Republic, it is important to take note that Socrates himself is a Platonized figure (Hackforth, 1972; Grube, 1992). In Plato's later writing we see more of his own philosophy, his ontology, his increasing conviction in the Pythagoreans, mathematics, and the Forms coming through. Moving into *The Republic* provides deepening insight into Plato and the consequential direction western education has followed. This moment seems to be the inception of the dichotomy of imagination and phantasy (though articulated with different language) with the additional infusion of power relationships into the equation—forces of power seeking to contain and censor the Dionysian impulse.

Whereas the mysteries located education in the exopedagogy of the liminal space of the eschatia, Plato firmly roots education in the pedagogy of the polis, thus severing any possibility for a dialectical understanding of phantasy and imagination, outside and inside, self and other. Plato sought to remove this tension, convinced that dissonance was troublesome for the education of youth in the *imagined* city of the Republic, the *kallipolis*. This chapter will first introduce Plato's schema of a hierarchy of knowledge where he places phantasy at the bottom of knowledge. This has implications for our research but also has consequences for the way Plato's work developed and has subsequently been used in culture and education. There are direct educational implications for those who are to become the Philosopher Kings of the kallipolis.

Finally, I discus Plato's concept of censorship, which is a logical conclusion to a philosophical system based on the Forms (one that denies all other alternative forms of knowledge) and also introduces Nietzsche's immediate and visceral rejection of such censorship.

Plato still receives a great deal of attention and respect in education. For our purposes, we look to research that has critiqued Plato's concept of imagination as well as his ascension to his foundational role in education. First, there exists a recognition of the severely limiting dimensions to Plato's philosophy despite his own conviction in his writing as to the certainty of philosophy as opposed to poetry, virtue or savagery, and knowledge or experience (Lines, 2009). Going a step further, Kieran Egan, who will be explore more thoroughly in Chapter 6, speaks of the incompatibility of Plato's educational model with more progressive educational models that can be found in Dewey and Rousseau (Egan, 1992, 1997). The hierarchy of knowledge that Plato created is the same model many critical and utopian educators are working against, trying to get radical dimensions of the imagination embedded in the world. Plato is representative of the standardizing forces at work in education that seeks quality control and order rather than space that allows for poets. In this respect, Plato is often contrasted with Aristotle, who found a medicinal, health-related aspect in tragedy and theater in that such experiences could be cathartic (Penwell, 2009). Plato's abhorrence for poets and poetry leads him to deny any social value to epic or lyrical poetry precisely because of the non-instrumental experiences they could induce. Lastly, this dimension of phantasy is associated with unreality, as the opposite of reason. By encourages children to transcend their

immaturity through denying phantasy, traditional schooling suppresses the imagination except in cases where it can exploit it for economic purposes instead educational or self-fulfilling purposes (Bleazby, 2012). With imagination securely at the bottom of the hierarchy, Plato can attend to moral responsibility, virtue, and why the imagination, as a site of the eschatia, is an impulse to be purged from the polis. It is these didactic elements that threaten phantasy and seek to devalue its educational dimensions, thus leaving us with a model of imagination that forms the crux of our current instrumentalized and institutionalized forms.

The Republic and Imagination

There exists an internal tension that is immediately worth exploring in the teachings of the *Republic* but also in its form and structure. This tension is reinforced by something that I think is indicative of the strength of imagination and phantasy. Those in dialogue with Socrates—as well as his readers themselves—must begin to visualize the concepts that Plato is asking us to think of, which is true of many of the Socratic dialogues but especially *The Republic*, which asks us to imagine fictitious cities, despite chastising the imagination as the lowest form of understanding. Perhaps Plato is humoring his audience by using strategies they will find familiar; just as a master artist uses his tools to create art objects, Plato can employ the imagination in the virtuous teaching of non-philosophers. The more likely scenario is that imagination itself, as a fundamental human mental activity, cannot be escaped. Plato asks us to imagine because

of the effectiveness of our internal ability to create mental representations in the absence of the object. About halfway through *The Republic* we begin to see the glimmer of the imagination, like light, peeking through the holes in Plato's narrative. From this moment the dialectical relationship between imagination and knowledge (as Plato employs the terms) is reintroduced, though it is implied and must be teased out as I have done—otherwise it appears to have nicely tucked away and forgotten, as Plato wants it to seem. The experience of sight in the imagination is central and problematizes the experience of the poet and the philosopher. Even Plato sees similarities, though argues out of it by drawing a line of intelligibility between the two:

> Are we to say that these people [those who attend and sing to the chorus in the Dionysian mystery festivals]—and those who learn similar things or petty crafts—are philosophers?
> No, but they are *like* philosophers.
> And who are the true philosophers?
> Those who love the sight of truth. (Plato, 1992, p. 150)

From the previous chapter, Plato is speaking about different accounts and experiences of knowledge with corresponding truth-value. The difference that Plato may be able to argue is that the philosopher is able to recollect the experience and make it understandable to other through reason and language, while the poet tries to makes his truth-value understandable through music, art, and language. The point I would like to further draw out for the remainder of this chapter is the heavy reliance of imagination itself on making the language understandable and intelligible. The final words of the above quote make it quite clear: Truth is something that can be "seen." not just understood metaphorically, but also experienced in a sensuous, dare I say phantastic,

way. The experience of truth might be the difference between the philosopher and the poet.

The following examples illustrate this point: Understanding or making language into truth *must* utilize the imagination, the lowest form of thought. The individuals that Socrates is dialoguing with and the reader must clearly conceive and visualize, picture in their mind, or imagine the analogies or allegories of the Line, the Sun, and the Cave. However we begin with this image, the phantastic creature, the

> multicolored beast with a ring of many heads that it can grow and change at will – some from gentle, some from savage animals […] then fashion one other kind, that of a lion, and another of a human being. But make the first much the largest and the other second to it in size. […] Now join the three of them into one […] then, fashion around them the image of one of them, that of a human being so that anyone who see the outer covering and not what's inside will think it is a single creature, a human being. (Plato, 1992, p. 260)

The Line analogy places knowledge (*noesis*) and thought at the top of a vertical line representing intelligible thought, with belief and imagination (phantasia) at the bottom representing the visible world (sense perception). Plato's engagement of the imagination is an invitation for deeper understanding and truth, but it also implies a certain ability for imagination to bypass the world of opinion and be used as a tool to increase understanding and knowledge. In fact, if we combine Plato's passage with Diotima from the previous chapter with the Line analogy, we find a relationship between imagination and Reason that is representative of the phantastic imagination. For Plato, noesis is an "intellectual vision," a seeing of the Forms brought about through high levels of education and conceptual understanding, but which seems to transcend mere rationality and reasoning. Noesis is a culmination of intellect that goes beyond reason and the

mediating forces approach the daemonic. If we take the Line analogy and bend it, without breaking the poles, we can find a new interpretation that allows for a relationship between the bottom of the line and the top of the line. By bending the two poles of the line and stretching them to infinity, in a way similar to an artist drawing in perspective and tracing two parallel lines, which never meet in theory, to the vanishing point, we can create a figure that is nearly a circle. Rather than bend the two ends of the line into a circle, which would be all too easy, the illusion that the ends meet in the vanishing point is more appropriate for my argument. Instead of finding a space where the ends of the line meet, we anticipate this three-dimensional space in the way our perspective sees a road receding into the horizon infinitely, rather than meeting and creating the two-dimension shape of a cone. This space on the horizon line is the liminal space of the eschatia and where the experience of phantasy, daemonic vision, can be visited from multiple access points; the key is a moving beyond, a desubjectification that allows for unbridled experience of a world or concept saturated with felt-meaning.

Within the world of *The Republic*, imagination can be used in education as long as it is controlled and used for instances where knowledge will be gained. Indeed, imagination needs constant management on the part of the Philosopher King, which might lend weight to philosopher's suspicions because they recognize a lack of intrinsic authority within this dimension. In this way, the imagination can become a powerful teaching tool with very specific purposes that prevent the seeping in of uncontrollable phantastic possession. Imagination is productive in this case for the purposes of the intellect that twists and shapes it to convey abstract, allegorical ideas.

First I focus on some of the basic language and metaphors that Plato uses when trying to make abstract thoughts more clear through the use of descriptive imagery and story-telling devices, which may be traced to his youth as a poet and writer of prose before he devoted himself and his writing to philosophy. Plato, through his use of images, does seem to backtrack and allow for images to bring truth; the difference is that the truth is not *in* the image, but in the knowledge the image *brings*, just as in poetry the image is an imitation of truth, as a reflection or shadow. Nietzsche and Marcuse will both have more to say about imagination and the image of shadows that will lend itself to the nature of the darker Dionysian forces, which Nietzsche seeks to resurrect. Expounding upon the Line analogy, Plato first describes the use of images themselves: "These figures that they make and draw, of which shadows and reflections in water are images, they now in turn use as images, in seeking to see those others themselves that one cannot see except by means of thought" (Plato, 1992, p. 184). He even adds that although the image does have its origins in the world of opinion, imagination, and sense perception, when it is *seen* properly—that is, with the eyes of intelligible thought—the images take on a deeper meaning and a truth can be revealed, "but using as images those very things of which images were made in the section below [the world of opinion and imagination], and which, by comparison to their images, were thought to be clear and valued as such" (Plato, 1992, p. 184).

And finally, we ask how the truth reveals itself. Is it something seen and may be understood by all? The difference between the poet and the philosopher can be found in the diversity of their approach to the unknown; phantasy or intellect. But we do find it is

something that is just beyond reach and must be enticed to come closer, out of the shadows, and in this light use of an image can be a tempting device. We find the truth is "that which reason itself grasps by the power of the dialectic" (Plato, 1992, p. 185).

The understanding emerges from the tension of the image (an object from the imagination) and the use of the image to uncover knowledge; how imagination itself shares knowledge is not always reasoned, but *grasped*, as if it is trying to get away immediately after we catch a glimpse of it. Immediately upon perceiving a truth initiated through imagination, the understanding slips through our fingertips. The very nature of phantasy illustrates that to grasp this understanding is phenomenologically related to sensuous experience rather than being illuminated exclusively through the intellect. Just a sense of perception is fleeting without the stimuli; phantasy too quickly fades to a shadow of what was experienced. It is in the dialectic of the experience and reflection upon the memory of the shadow where truth can be found in the space of phantasy. The ability to use images in the process of abstracting as key to building knowledge, using images that arise from the lowest form of thought, can be a tool of the philosopher (and maybe the poet) to grasp ideas through their dialectic tension. This tension may in fact be part of the immediate experience of the direct divine or daemonic inspiration, and will be taken up by Nietzsche in *The Birth of Tragedy*. Plato continues with the images that reinforces the darkness of imagination and the sensual world as well as the light and truth of the intelligible world. In the Allegory of the Cave sequence, Plato describes the truth of the cave-dweller as "nothing other than the shadows of those artifacts" (Plato, 1992, p. 187).

I would like to ask, then: Who is the true master of the images? Regarding the construction of the best instrument, those suited for the kallipolis, not those too emotionally evocative, Plato tells us it is bound in the relationship between the maker and the user.

> It's wholly necessary, therefore, that a user of each thing has most experience of it and that he tell a maker which of his products performs well or badly in actual use. […] a maker—through associating with and having to listen to the one who knows—has right opinion about whether something he makes is fine or bad, but the one who knows is the user. (Plato, 1992, p. 272)

Regarding images and the use of imagination, how is the philosopher in a position of authority over the poet? Both use and manipulate images to convey truth. In this sense, both are shadows or imitations of the truth they seek to capture. We may grant that philosophers use images, and their truth-value is certainly more discernable to them, but regarding phantasy and the use of epic or lyric tragic poetry, the philosopher is not the most experienced user because he has already made his value claims against it and does not use such images, so the images of phantasy are best understood by those who use them—which, as is often the case, is the same as one who revealed them. The philosopher uses the imagination in an exploitive way so as to make his ideas understandable. The poet, on the other hand, does not exploit, but rather engages in an erotic relationship with phantasy, a partnership where insights can emerge and be brought forth into reality. The difference again falls to the intentional aspects of imagination. There may find more to say on this matter when we get to Marcuse and speaking of the difference between creation and reception, which might be helpful to think about the philosopher and the poet. But regarding phantasy, the poet or the artist is the most

experienced user, since he or she partakes in the process of communicating an incommunicable understanding of an irrational image of truth.

The Republic and Education

Plato seems to have difficultly grasping the distinction between the philosophic Muse and the poetic Muse, when in fact they were the one and the same, sisters Calliope and Urania, whose domain was philosophy and music (Plato, 1961, p. 504-505). He sought to sever the poetic impulse, inspired through bodily erotic desires, from the philosophic impulse—and likewise sever the inspiration through reason and the Forms or Ideas of the intelligible world from phantasy. The primary pedagogical assumption in *The Republic* concerns the type of imitating children engage in which has been predetermined, "namely, people who are courageous, self-controlled, pious, and free" (Plato, 1992, p. 71). In addition, any imitating must also be "law-abiding" in order to nurture justice and obedience that will be required in adulthood in the kallipolis, while imitation of lawlessness and irrationality will introduce corruption into the beautiful city (Plato, 1992, p. 100).

Interestingly, one dimension that Plato does seem to recognize as advantageous is that of play. The dimension of play, for Plato, is one that introduces a deep form of learning that precedes any formal education. He advises, "don't use force to train the children in these subjects; use play instead" (Plato, 1992, p. 208). The philosopher kings, not average citizens of the kallipolis, were to receive this exclusive education, but this is

not to say that the play was the type we will be watching for (that which also entails a playing with freedom). This will be important as we move from Marcuse into current educational paradigms and spaces where phantasy can be invited. However, a primary difference will be that Plato seeks to censor this space of play and dimension of imagination or phantasy above all else, by first censoring the poets and forms of poetry that anyone, children included, can possibly be exposed to (Plato, 1992, p. 50). This censored play and even more rigid education would create "courageous, pious, free" guardians and citizens (Plato, 1992, p. 71). Paradoxically, however, this productive play will not include the experience of freedom. Regarding education, Plato writes: "It's also our aim in ruling our children, we don't allow them to be free until we establish a constitution in them, just as in a city, and – by fostering their best part with our own – equip them with a guardian and ruler similar to our own to take our place. Then, and only then, we set them free" (Plato, 1992, p. 262). The previous concepts of justice, fairness, piety, self-control, and courageousness were all to be imitated in play, and freedom, too, was to be imitated (Plato, 1992, p. 71). How will citizens move from childhood, where they lack freedom, to adulthood, where they are supposed to gain freedom through education and understanding of the intelligible world? This is never explicitly stated, but from the above, we can infer that the freedom that children would experience and introduce into their play was an imitation of freedom—censored freedom that was to mature into a self-controlled freedom, tempered by reason and intelligence, never sensual appetites and experiences of pleasure and pain. After poetry, education was to be equally censored and fortified:

> Those in charge must cling to education and see that it isn't corrupted without their noticing it, guarding it against everything. Above all, they must guard as carefully as they can against any innovation in music and poetry or in physical training that is counter to the established order. (Plato, 1992, p. 99)

Plato uses the term *phantasia* to describe the inspiration of the poets, the artist, and the philosopher, but the philosopher sees truths of an intelligible kind, and for this intellect is placed at the top of the hierarchy of knowledge. It seems this is the moment where the dichotomy is revealed completely, even if not articulated completely. The use of imagination, in the sense similar to that of the Eleusinian mysteries, is far different from that of the poet, who would be described more as in a state of phantasy. For Plato, there are three problems with poetry that make it incompatible with philosophy. First, as I have shown, poets might not have knowledge of that which they describe, which produces false-impressions. Second, poetry as the product of phantasy encourages imitations of what individuals are not (which can act as a model for impressionable children). Third, poetry can overstimulate the senses and cloud reason, turning people from the intelligible world. Plato's treatment of art in *Ion* describes the breaking apart of phantasy and imagination, and privileging imagination at the expense of phantasy:

> Heretofore in all the arts in Athens the emotions and the intellect had worked together. There was a balance of power. That is the uniqueness of Greek art; it is an intellectual art. In the *Ion* Socrates disputes the possibility of such a balance. (Plato, 1961, p. 215)

Art is a form of knowledge since it partakes in an act of creation, but poetry, as a process of possession that does not create but receives, is not knowledge. Plato denies any truth-value of the poet since he does not know that which he says. But, in doing do, Plato denies alternative truth-values which cannot be established through philosophy. He

denies that phantasy has an exopedagogical force that is disruptive but also highly educative.

For instance, the education of the youth, especially those who would hold power (the Guardians), was to be precisely managed in the Republic. This management begins and focuses almost entirely on the censoring of poetry. Socrates explains that "the more poet they are, the less they should be heard by children or by men who are supposed to be free and to fear slavery more than death" (Plato, 1992, p. 62). The enslavement of the body or psychological bondage due to deliberate or cultivated ignorance would disrupt the harmony that he envisioned for human life in the *Republic*. This enslavement of the body was akin to the way poetry and tragic myth held captive folk knowledge and, therefore, the conceptions of right, wrong, justice, freedom, or love that were based on the experiences of the sensual world.

Knowledge obtained or received through the sensual realm is opposed to that which was revealed with science, math, and reason form the intelligible world. Unless one had reason and knowledge from the intelligible world, he would be susceptible to the rhapsodic utterances of the tragic poet. Poetry itself is categorized as an enticing enemy that will distort intelligent thought, "unless he has the knowledge of what it is really like, as a drug to counteract it" (Plato, 1992, p. 265). Plato explicitly denies any truth-value to poetry and labels its knowledge as misguided and for the weak-minded, and instead finds truth-value in the world of reason alone. Plato acknowledges that

> hymns to the gods and eulogies to good people are the only poetry we can admit into our city. If you admit the pleasure-giving Muse, whether in lyric or epic poetry, pleasure and pain will be kings in you city instead of law or the thing that everyone has always believed to be best, namely, reason. (Plato, 1992, p. 278).

Revisiting the hierarchy of Muses established in *Phaedrus* we find the pleasure-giving Muse, although censored here, was acknowledged as the highest form of divine disturbance and with a certain degree of truth (Plato, 1955). But perhaps for this exact reason it is being censored, since it is the most removed from reason and rational thought: It is entirely detached from reality, and therefore the most dangerous. However, the truth-value, too, seems to have diminished between *Phaedrus* and *The Republic.* Plato calls all poets "beginning with Homer" imitators, with nothing more than an imitation, a shadow of truth, and for this reason the poetic Muse is not worth consulting or encouraging (Plato , 1992, p. 271). Removing the truth-value from poetry is a first step in distancing the cultural experience of phantasy from reality. The value cast upon phantasy and the ability to remove it from experience sought to censor the most dangerous qualities, those opposed to reason and rationality, but in doing so, it also removes its most innocuous qualities, like finding ideas and even truth in daydreams and dreams. Plato describes how a traveling poet, made to look like a fool, would be received at the kallipolis. He states:

> if a man, who through clever training can become anything and imitate anything, should arrive in our city, wanting to give a performance of his poems, we would bow down before him as someone holy, wonderful, and pleasing, [mockingly] but we should tell him that there is no one like him in our city and that it isn't lawful for there to be. We should pour myrrh on his head, crown him with wreaths, and send him away to another city. But, for our own good, we ourselves should employ a more austere and less pleasure-giving poet and storyteller, one who would imitate the speech of a decent person and who would tell his stories in accordance with the patterns we laid down when we first undertook the education of our soldiers. (Plato, 1992, p. 74)

The pattern of education above was to suppress the bodily appetites while still honing the physical body so as to balance harmoniously with the cultivation of the intellect. The type of poets and poetry that would be permissible and created for such purposes would be "austere and less pleasure-giving" and would not stoke the phantastic impulses but would reinforce the qualities desired in *The Republic*. These poets would be the focal point of censorship because as a consequence, all individuals and all institutions would be equally censored from images of injustice and dissonance (Plato, 1992, p. 77).

In addition to the content of poetry and eliminating the tragic and epic lineage, Plato describes the censoring of the form of poetry and verse. Specifically Plato is determined that the form and content be balanced and always in precise harmony so no dissonance is ever tolerated. He affirms:

> Further, the mode and rhythm must fit the words.
> Of course.
> And we said, that we no longer needed dirges or lamentations among our words.
> We did, indeed.
> What are the lamenting modes, then? You tell me, since you're musical.
> The mixo-Lydian, the suntono-Lydian, and some other of that sort.
> Aren't they to be excluded, then? They're useless even to decent women, let alone to men.
> Certainly.
> Drunkenness, softness, and idleness are also most inappropriate for our guardians.
> How could they not be?
> What, then, are the soft modes suitable for drinking-parties?
> The Ionian and those Lydian modes that are said to be relaxed.
> Could you ever use these to make people warriors?
> Never. And now all you have left is the Dorian and Phrygian modes. (Plato, 1992, p. 75)

Again, the form as well as the content will be controlled and manipulated in the education in the city, especially that of the guardians. In the same way that Plato seeks to eliminate musical dissonance through controlling the modes one is allowed to play as well as the

instruments one is allowed to make, the kallipolis, too, will eliminate all forms of dissonance—i.e., social, political, educational, and ecological. However, as was somewhat implied in the previous chapter, and as we shall see more clearly in the following chapters, removing dissonance signifies an incomplete knowledge, for to understand harmony and a balanced tension or complementary pairing, one must also have experienced and come to know dissonance—both in the literal sense of music instruction, experience, and performance, as well as the metaphorical/dialectical sense of the dimensions of pain and pleasure. This will have implications for education that we will see much clearer in Chapter 6, where I discuss Maxine Greene, who specifically mentions the experience of others as informing our moral education. Without the dissonance introduced by the other, we reinforce a shallow and selfish understanding of the world. In a sense the level of maturity offered without dissonance is lacking because it does not get beyond one's subjectivity. Dissonance, as an educational tool, can interrupt the space of the performance-principle and expose places where imagination and phantasy can return. For Plato, dissonance breeds imbalance:

> Haven't you noticed the effect that lifelong physical training, unaccompanied by any training in music or poetry, has on the mind, or the effect of the opposite, music and poetry without physical training.
> What effects are you talking about?
> Savagery and toughness in the one case and softness and overcultivation in the other. (Plato, 1992, p. 87)

Those results—savagery and toughness, or softness and overcultivation—are the consequences of an imbalanced, dissonant education in *The Republic*.

Plato and the Censorship of Poetry

Last, and perhaps most telling of all, is the dichotomy between poetry and philosophy that Plato is trying to remove by excising one of the poles entirely, rather than balancing them. He writes, "Let's also tell poetry that there is an ancient quarrel between it and philosophy, which is evidenced by such expressions as 'the dog yelping and shrieking at its master,' 'great in the empty eloquence of fools,' 'the mob of wise men that has mastered Zeus,' and 'the subtle thinkers, beggars all'" (Plato, 1992, p. 278). In this passage, he treats poetry and any truth-value it may have with contemptuous authority, thus reproducing the dichotomy and placing value judgments on imagination and phantasy and inserting a sociocultural power dynamic into the tension. Plato goes so far as to describe phantasy and falsehood as such: "though of no use to the gods, is useful to people as a form of drug, clearly we must allow only doctors to use it, not private citizens" (Plato, 1992, p. 64). This passage presents a problematic situation for the kallipolis in that the falsehood is to be managed, in a similar way that poetry is censored, and prescribed by doctors when falsehood will get one to health and is not made available or relevant to the masses.

Countering this logic, we might ask what "falsehood" private citizens, women and children will be prescribed in the name of truth. The guardians will be masters of truth, as well as falsehood. But again we find a problem: To be a master of falsehood, one would have to experience it, but the education will be devoid of all falsehood thanks to the previously censored poets. In this case, phantasy prevails through the imagined world

they live "as a form of drug" and ruptures the experience of the censored world while pointing to an alternative truth value of phantasy or falsehood. In practice the guardians ought to have no experience of phantasy or falsehood, which have been censored out of their education and the governing of the city. While the mature Plato might write "The daemonic and the divine are in every way free from falsehood," as we have seen in the previous chapter, the daemonic can be understood as an experience with phantasy (Plato, 1992, p. 59). In this case, phantasy, understood as originating with the divine or the daemonic, is not deceitful and in fact has a truth-value of its own.

Plato's legacy in education is nearly insurmountable. The ideas of censorship are still prevalent in education both at the level of books allowed in school libraries and those on the banned books lists and the topical coverage of material in textbooks, specifically history textbooks and their framing or erasure of certain moments in American history. This ongoing censorship is the same impulse that seeks to reallocate the instrumental imagination to that of the market. In the same way that the philosopher king can use imagination, so too can students learn to manipulate their mental representations without consequentially experiencing higher degrees of freedom. In these 21st century skill discourses, the philosopher king is supplanted by the expert bureaucrat who knows how to train the imagination, so that everyone can find employment and an economic harmony may be achieved. In both cases, the educational possibilities of liminality are denied relevance. Education is precisely within and for the flourishing of the polis. Whatever dangers are to be found in the exopedagogical blurring of boundaries between self and other are mitigated by an instrumentalized view of imagination that is always subservient

to reason. Marcuse will clearly illustrate the fallacious nature of such logic and expose that such educational programs will have little effect on the economy or politics without also exploring the dimension of phantasy alongside imagination.

The urgency for this project to revisit phantasy in education will become more and more apparent as policy keeps asserting the merits of imagination at the expense of phantasy. The dialectical analysis to follow is a counter to this trajectory and establishes an alternative genealogy where the logic of phantasy can in fact be seen as one of the only forces capable of disrupting the trend begun with Plato and reaching its full, bureaucratic heights with today's 21st century skills initiatives.

Chapter 3: Nietzsche

Socrates "is the great exemplar of the *theoretical man*" who,

> like the artist […] takes infinite pleasure in all that exists and is this saved from the practical ethic of pessimism with its lynx eyes that shine only in the dark. But while the artist, having unveiled the truth garment by garment, remains with his gaze fixed on what is still hidden, theoretical man takes delight in the cast garments and finds his highest satisfaction in the unveiling process itself, which proves to him his own power. (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 92).

Nietzsche seeks first and foremost to reawaken the spirit that Plato sought to censor, to rekindle the Dionysian impulse stirring under the skin, and release the orgiastic truth of the phantastic image as well as the imagined image. Where Nietzsche begins in content—the mystical nature of imagination and phantasy—sits in firm opposition to Plato's Form, which was at most, according to Aristotle, "between poetry and prose" for Plato was a "philosopher and poet, but not a mystic" (Plato, 1961, xxv). Nietzsche does not follow the lineage of the philosophic tradition of ancient Greece, but instead the language that this philosophy sought to isolate and contain, that of the epic poet and tragic drama, the voice of Dionysus. Nietzsche picks up his project at precisely the point where the ancient Greek philosophers (and ancient Greek culture in general) left it, casting away the primordial power of phantasy and instead elevating, inharmoniously, the Apollonian dimensions of the intelligible world. These images might have given truth to reality, but a reality that is censored from the dimension of phantasy instead of being tempered by it. Nietzsche very clearly describes the dynamic tension between Dionysian and Apollonian impulses—phantasy and imagination—but seems to lose sight of this

tension and falls victim to the Dionysian embodiment of pleasure. In the same way Plato consciously tosses out phantasy and employs the instrumental imagination, Nietzsche unconsciously embraces phantasy and perhaps instrumentalizes reason. In both cases, an equality between the two is lost, and one force is submitted to the other.

This chapter will first explore the dynamic tension between the Dionysian and Apollonian polarity as an example of the dialectic I am exploring. While repeatedly recognizing the importance of retaining the tension between the Dionysian and the Apollonian, Nietzsche increasingly abandons the Apollonian and returns to phantasy in a way the Marcuse would recognize as dangerous and at odds with civilization. An example of this abandonment is found in his interpretation of Raphael's *Transformation*. His reading performs a dialectical reversal of the heirarchization of the Muses and the arts that Plato described. In the end, he appears to be deeply suspicious of the redemption of the Apollonian, even in the name of the Dionysian, and the dialectic falters; the Apollonian imaginary is buried next to where Plato discarded the poetic Muses. Here I will use a dialectical method of analysis to outline Nietzsche's insights but also point out his limitations. In the end, we must attempt to resurrect Nietzsche beyond Nietzsche in an effort to honor that which he argued for: the dynamism between imagination and phantasy.

The Dialectic of Dionysus and Apollo

Directly and unapologetically, Nietzsche (1956) declares:

> I have borrowed my adjectives from the Greeks, who developed their mystical doctrines of art through plausible *embodiments,* not through purely conceptual means. It is by those two-art sponsoring deities, Apollo and Dionysos [sic], that we are made to recognize the tremendous split, as regards both origins and objectives, between the plastic Apollonian arts and the non-visual art of music inspired by Dionysos [sic]. (p. 19)

This quote is important to begin with for two crucial points in this dissertation. First, we find a modern description of phantasy, which will become more useful as we transition through Marcuse and into education. Second, it will be important further along when I talk about education and phantasy in terms of a dialectic regarding the origin and subject of an object of artistic creation. It also points out that the experience of phantasy may be one that is embodied, while the experience of imagination in the Apollonian sense is conceptual. Nietzsche helps to expose the dialectical relationship of imagination and phantasy, not merely the dichotomous either-or that Plato sought to rationalize the problem away. Although faltering at a crucial moment, Nietzsche's dialectic does offer a more productive path for phantasy's appearance, if we are looking for it. But the looking also involves a looking beyond—a looking into a different consciousness, where subject-object dichotomies, momentarily, fall way. Nietzsche describes how:

> The sculptor, as well as his brother, the epic poet, is committed to the pure contemplation of images. The Dionysiac musician, himself imageless, is nothing but original pain and reverberation of the image. Out of this mystical process of un-selving, the poet's spirit feels a whole world of image and similitudes arise, which are quite different in hue, causality, and pace from the images of the sculptor or narrative poet. (1956, p. 39)

The difference between the narrative poet and the lyrical poet is that the narrative poet maintains an awareness of the illusion of the poem ("his mirror of appearance protects him from complete fusion with his characters") while the lyrical poet loses this awareness and "becomes his images" (p. 39). In the state of phantasy there is a certain sense of losing oneself, a moving beyond oneself—an abandonment of the self to phantastical powers that break the continuity of the self with any given identity, interest, or social role. This suspension of subjectivity denotes the risk involved with phantasy as it involves transformation of consciousness or the body. Plato too speaks of (and in fact places value constraints on) those forms of poetry that he's determined to censor. His description mentions that "One kind of story-telling employs only imagination—tragedy and comedy, as you say. Another kind employs only narration by the poet himself—you find this most of all in dithyrambs. A third kind uses both—as in epic poetry" (Plato, 1992, p. 70). But again, for Plato this reduces down to poetry and philosophy in the context of imitation. Plato is unwavering in his dismissal of poetry, going so far as to claim "that all the tragic poets, whether they write in iambics or hexameters, are as imitative as they could possibly be" and therefore "not to be taken seriously" (Plato, p. 273). Plato feared the corruption of the intellect that the poet could introduce through his claims against reason:

> An imitative poet isn't by nature related to the part of the soul that rules [the rational and quiet] character […] for he arouses, nourishes, and strengthens [the irrational] part of the soul and so destroys the rational one […and] puts a bad constitution in the soul of each individual by making images that are far removed from the truth and by gratifying the irrational part. (Plato, p. 276).

This will have further implications with Marcuse, since the instincts of pleasure are not governed by rationality and instead will engage in the realm of irrationality. For Nietzsche, however, this means a turn to the dithyrambic chorus, the creation of music or poetry, which Socrates had admitted and even composed in *Phaedrus.* Although I did review this quote in the pre-Socratic chapter, it is interesting to review Nietzsche's retelling of the quote with his own commentary throughout:

> It appears that this despotic logician had from time to time a sense of void, loss, unfulfilled duty with regard to art. In prison he told his friends how, on several occasions, a voice had spoken to him in a dream, saying 'Practice music, Socrates!' Almost to the end he remained confident that his philosophy represented the highest art of the muses, and would not fully believe that a divinity meant to remind him of 'common, popular music.' Yet in order to unburden his conscience he finally agreed, in prison, to undertake that music which hitherto he held in low esteem. In this frame of mind he composed a poem on Apollo and rendered several Aesopian fables in verse. What prompted him to these exercises was something very similar to that warning voice of his diamonion [sic]: an Apollonian perception that, like a barbarian king, he had failed to comprehend the nature of a divine effigy, and was in danger of offending his own god through ignorance. These words heard by Socrates in his dream are the only indication that he ever experienced any uneasiness about the limits of his logical universe. He may have asked himself: 'Have I been too ready to view what was unintelligible to me as being devoid of meaning? Perhaps there is a realm of wisdom, after all, from which the logical is excluded? Perhaps art must be seen as the necessary compliment of rational discourse?' (1954, p. 90)

What is interesting here is how long it says Socrates was able to ignore or defy the dream instructing him to take up music…until the end, when he is about to meet death. Is it phantasy, is it clearing his conscience? Either way, he turns to music for solace even though he held it in such low regard for his entire life. Phantasy intrudes—it overwhelms and forces its experience upon us, and its truth value is not always immediately available, but the reality of the experience cannot be denied or easily forgotten. A Dionysiac perception ruptures experience and rationality, and for that reason made Socrates

suspicious and dismissive, but returns as a possible source of truth against that very state of rationality. The final section of this quote throws into question the very nature of the hierarchy of knowledge Plato conceptualizes in the Republic. The hierarchy of Muses mentioned in *Phaedrus* might shed some light on how the dialectic of philosophy and poetry relies on the internal tension between the two (Jameson, 1971). In concluding a story about the season of cicadas, Socrates finishes:

> …after which they go and report to the Muses how they severally are paid honor among mankind, and by whom. So for those whom they report as having honored Terpsichore in the dance to win a Muse's favor, for those that have worshipped in the rites of love the favor of Erato, and worth all the other, according to the nature of the worship paid to each. To the eldest, Calliope, and to her next sister, Urania, they tell of those who live a life of philosophy and so do honor to the music of those twain whose theme is the heavens and all the story of gods and men, and whose song is the noblest of them all. (Phaedrus, 1961, pp. 504-505)

Traditionally, Calliope is associated with heroic poetry, which Nietzsche has categorized as that of the dithyramb and the narrative poet. Plato avoids the dialectic of pain and pleasure, Dionysian and Apollonian, and phantasy and imagination by rationalizing "the notion of philosophy as the highest music" (Hackforth, 1972, p. 38). By stating so, Plato puts philosophy above poetry, not next to it within a dialectical tension, but in a position of power and authority. Nietzsche, however, shows how dialectical tensions, even at the individual level, can return. For Nietzsche states the exact opposite as Plato and values Calliope's more humble offering of tragic poetry. He announces to the reader, to those still living in the failed Apollonian take-over, that another pathway can be found, if one can invite the dimension of phantasy to break through: "I beg to inform of my conviction that art is the highest human task, the true

metaphysical activity" (1956, p. 17). Nietzsche begins precisely with the moment of Plato's rejection of art (phantasy) but is still intrigued by Socrates' doubts.

Apollo and Imagination

Nietzsche (1956) regards Doric art as "perpetual military encampment of the Apollonian forces" (p. 35). Only an art so defiantly austere, so ringed about with fortifications—an education so military and exacting—a polity so ruthlessly cruel—could endure in a continual state of resistance against the titanic and barbaric menace of Dionysos [sic]" (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 35). This is interesting because it implies an ongoing and ever-present threat against the Apollonian imaginary from the Dionysian source, phantasy. This will become more important as we move into Marcuse for we find that this threat has all but been eradicated and has fled to the confines of the spaces of the unconscious hidden from culture and reality. This Dionysiac source, for Nietzsche, was recognized as "a triumph over subjectivity, deliverance from the self" (1956, p. 37). In these moments beyond the Apollonian dream-state, the conscious individual is temporarily lost, allowing another dimension of human awareness to force itself through. Nietzsche elaborates further:

> The artist had abrogated his subjectivity earlier, during the Dionysiac phase: the image which now reveals to him his oneness with the heart of the world is a dream scene showing forth vividly, together with original pain, the original delight of illusion. (1956, p. 38)

This calls to mind not only the cultivated state of consciousness and the revelation of an image so profound as to defy interpretation or articulation associated with the Eleusinian

mysteries, but also the separation that Plato attempts to make by casting off the experience of pain, and even more important, the simultaneous dialectic experience of tragic pain and earthly pleasure. Within this dialectical space that sits beyond reason, the initiates at Eleusis faced the very experience of a simulated death—the truth of human mortality—and found hope, not despair; found celebration, not defeat; found the very opposite of that which Plato argued would result from experience of pain and pleasure: corruption. Without phantasy, we are lost in the Apollonian dream-world that sought to soften the brutal truths and experiences brought on through phantasy—and without phantasy to remind us otherwise, the Apollonian is sustained as the only reality, as a projected realm of knowledge onto the nature of reality. Phantasy is the force that can momentarily destroy the illusion of the Apollonian imaginary, and the only force that balances dialectically with (and even gives deepened meaning to) the nature of Apollonian myth. This dialectical tension prevents a harmonious balance or equilibrium—the dynamic tension can only change and wrestle in a process of becoming, which is inherently destabilizing. Perhaps this is the reason Nietzsche fails to sustain the dialectic, because the equilibrium he seeks to achieve is not a static one but a dynamic momentary suspension of the illusion that conceals the dialectic. Nietzsche sought to move beyond the momentary suspension of the dialectic and instead tried to overturn it altogether. When trying to trace back to the loss of the phantasy, Nietzsche's eyes "come to rest on the sublime and much lauded achievement of the dramatic dithyramb and Attic tragedy" (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 36). Only here do we find the creations informed by

phantasy, in a dimension that is situated beyond individual subjectivity and therefore seems to speak with a foreign/alien voice that is at the same time chaotic and profound.

Dionysus and Phantasy

> In this moment beyond reason, beyond subjectivity, Nietzsche describes how:
>
> > Dionysiac excitation is capable of communicating to a whole multitude this artistic power to feel itself surrounded by, and one with, a host of spirits. What happens in the dramatic chorus is the primary *dramatic* phenomenon: projecting oneself outside oneself and acting as though one had really entered another body, another character. This constitutes the first step in the evolution of drama. This art is no longer that of the rhapsodist, who does not merge with his images but, like the painter, contemplates them as something outside of himself; what we have here is the individual effacing himself through entering a strange being. (Nietzsche, 1956, pp. 55-56)

Here Nietzsche seems to be elevating the experience of the painter and not acknowledging the desubjectification of the rhapsodist that Plato is direly concerned with and seeks to censor and depreciate. It seems from the progression of the dialectic that the rhapsodes—at least as portrayed in ancient Greece culture and theater—were tragic and epic poets who often would leave themselves as they sang through a Dionysiac chorus. The focus of this quote is the description of the painter as "outside of himself" and "effacing himself through entering a strange being" as similar to that of the Eleusinian mysteries and the experience of phantasy for which I am searching. Moving from the conscious awareness of our thought processes to the surrendering of the faculties and the abandoning the body for the sake of the sensuous or the divine/daemonic is a hallmark of phantasy. This is a space where Plato sought to control/suppress the appetites, and in

doing so ensured the space of phantasy maintained as an equally safe distance. Dodds recognizes that Dionysus is "the god who by very simple mean, or by means not so simple, enables you for a short time to *stop being yourself*, and thereby sets you free" (1951, p. 76). However, Dodds also problematizes the notion of phantastic possession. He argues that the epic tradition represented the poet as deriving supernormal knowledge from the Muses, but not falling into ecstasy or being possessed by them: "The notion of the 'frenzied' poet composing in a state of ecstasy appears not to be traceable further back than the fifth century" (Dodds, 1951, 82) For this reason, the concept of frenzied creation may be misguided and may actually serve to strengthen and ally resistance to phantasy. The shift in subjectivity is present in each of the conceptions of phantasy I have thus far explored. Nietzsche illustrates as such:

> Being the active center of that world he may boldly speak in the first person, only his 'I' is not that of the actual waking man, but the 'I' dwelling, truly and eternally, in the ground of being. It is through the reflections of that 'I' that the lyrical poet beholds the ground of being. (1956, p. 39)

In this sense, and using this argument in the context of phantasy, the "I" of phantasy is a transcendent "I" that is moved beyond the conscious Apollonian imaginary. Nietzsche directly references Plato and how he also:

> speaks of the creative power of the poet for the most part ironically and as being on a level with the gifts of a soothsayer and interpreter of dreams, since according to the traditional conceptions the poet is unable to write until reason and conscious control have deserted him. (1956, p. 81).

Irony aside, the latter portion of Nietzsche's comment does in fact seem to be a hallmark of phantasy, that of losing conscious thought or even physical control to this dimension, and only being able after *returning* to describe or record the experience. The words we

seem to be using suggest a spatial change in some sense; whether it's solely metaphorical or possibly literal implies the concept of the *eschatia* and liminal relations between nonhuman others. In addition to the spatial metaphors are the visual metaphors.

Plato already expounded on the concept of light as analogous to philosophic understanding, but which I problematized by confirming a knowledge of poets that could be equally illuminating. Nietzsche describes the experience of the poet's abilities as "nothing more nor less than the luminous afterimage which kind nature provides our eyes after a look into the abyss" (1956, p. 61). This glimpse of something beyond conscious comprehension is the offering of phantasy. But, as I will argue in the following chapter, the contemporary intellect or psyche needs to, and already may, be in a position to acknowledge allow for the full experience of phantasy.

There will be aspects of this psychic organization, such as memory, attention, and metacognition, that will lend themselves to finding and familiarizing ourselves as individuals and a culture/species with the experience of phantasy (Marcuse, 1955). The dialectical experiences of tragedy—where pain and pleasure are united in the moment beyond rational thought—are more at home in the truth of the deception. For Nietzsche, "the delight created by tragic myth has the same origin as the delight dissonance in music creates. That primal Dionysiac delight experienced even in the presence of pain, is the source common to both music and tragic myth" (1956, p. 143). The experience is a dialectical one precisely because of the opposites playing together in the moment. We even see some of this dialectic emerging in *Phaedo,* where Socrates mentions the firm relationship between pleasure and pain, but he does not quite reach the dialectic where

knowledge is obtained in the tension. He speaks instead about how the appetite for pleasure will ultimately lead to more intense experiences of both pleasure *and* pain. This understanding reinforces, for Plato, a model of self-control when it comes to *all* appetites, even the philosophic must be balanced with the athletic/physical. Socrates remarks:

> What a queer thing this pleasure, as they call it, seems to be, my friends! How remarkable is its relation to what we regard as its opposite, pain! Think of it: they won't both come to us at the same time, but if we run after one of them and grasp it, we are practically compelled to grasp the other too; they are like two creatures attached to a single head. I fancy that if Aesop had thought of it, he would have composed a fable telling how God wanted to put an end to their hostility, but found he could not, and so fastened their heads together, with the result that anybody who is visited by one of them finds the other following it up afterwards. (*Phaedo*, 33)

In Socrates' case one cannot experience pleasure and pain as experienced in tragic drama or music. We also find that with *The Republic* the appetites were to be controlled through a rigid education and in doing so this tension between pleasure and pain was to be overcome entirely. The mind of the philosopher was to be *above* the pain- or pleasure-inducing qualities of the body, and he should balance pleasures of the mind with the cultivation of the body. The tension was to be managed with a delicate balance, a harmony that strove to keep the phantastic element of the poetic from breaking through. Plato reproduces the hostility against tragic poetry by trying to negate the tension rather than accept it as inevitable.

So what exactly happens in this moment where the Apollonian/Dionysian equilibrium is imbalanced and phantasy sneaks in, if only for a moment? Nietzsche's description of the Dionysiac experience of creating art gives us an insight into the nature of the dialectical relationship of phantasy and imagination, Dionysus and Apollo: "Both

[music and tragic myth] have their origin in a realm of art which lies beyond the Apollonian; both shed their transfiguring light on a region in whose rapt dissonance and the horror of existence fade away in enchantment" (1956, p. 145).

Phantasy, Tragedy, and Myth

Music and tragic myth, informed by and seeking to awaken in the spectators the experience of phantasy, have the ability to enchant and give meaning to the Apollonian dream world, the world of the gods depicted through myth. Without such, the illusory nature of myth would be revealed, and the truth or horror beyond the deception would be experienced. It is phantasy that first gives life to saving ourselves from an existential reality. Meaning in this liminal space is both experienced and created in the dialectic interplay and gives life to the stories we tell. Meaning of a phantastic nature is what seems to propel stories to the level of myth; otherwise we know that they are just stories. But thinking beyond Nietzsche, what happens when not only the stories lose truth, but even truth itself loses its relevance? Then we may find the replacement with individual truth and a strengthening of the individual subject where the forces of phantasy are kept at bay by the complete lack of balance of phantasy and imagination; not only have the Dionysian forces long gone dormant in some respects, but also the Apollonian veil grew entirely too delicate and simply blew away in tatters against the onrush of the individual. A rebirth of tragic myth would also mean first and foremost a reawakening of phantasy, through the very force that kept it in check: subjectivity. We begin to see why the

mysteries were so essential in the tragic world-view, because they were able to simulate a death of the individual experience in order to glimpse the phantastic dimension beyond rationale thought. It is even more remarkable that this was dome collectively for two millennia. We find:

> Every hope of the Eleusinian initiates pointed to a rebirth of Dionysius, which we can now interpret as meaning the end of individuation; the thundering paean of the adepts addressed itself to the coming of the third Dionysius. This hope alone sheds a beam of joy on a ravaged and fragmented world—as is shown by the myth of sorrowing Demeter, who rejoiced only when she was told she might once again bear Dionysius. In these notions we already find all the component of a profound mystic philosophy and, by the same token, of the mystery doctrine of tragedy; a recognition that whatever exists is of a piece, and that individuation is the root of all evil; a conception of art as the sanguine hope that the spell of individuation may yet be broken, as an augury of eventual reintegration. (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 67)

The experience gave the community *hope* in the dramatic participation of art as a constant reminder that the dichotomy of self and other, of pain and pleasure, can be reintegrated or reconceptualized in both productive and negative tensions, and the knowledge of this comes directly from the experience of phantasy. However, it is in the tension between phantasy and imagination that we find a productive aspect to both, for lack of temperance might lead to the death of civilization. Dionysiac forces are equally detrimental because they would lead to the eventual death of civilization and culture itself. Apollonian forces, without the Dionysiac rupture, would eventually exhaust all creativity, reappropriate other cultures' creativity, and exhaust those too. The death would be more symbolic of the end of the dream of *reintegration*. It would be driven by a fleeting hope that continuously escapes us even as we try to grasp at shadows of long-forgotten dreams of unconscious desires satisfied by false needs. Nietzsche saw the need

for the tension and a moving between the two dimensions as necessary for the sustainability of tragic myth. Imagination without phantasy will eventually "[entirely destroy] the meaning of tragedy—which can be interpreted only as a concrete manifestation of Dionysiac conditions, music made visible, an ecstatic dream world" (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 89). The Apollonian is lost on civilization without the Dionysiac to stir the unconscious occasionally:

> Imagination is what breathes life into the phantastic visions, but without the phantastic inspiration, the imagination replicates eternally, "let us consider abstract man stripped of myth; a culture without any fixed and consecrated place of origin, condemned to exhaust all possibilities and feed miserably and parasitically on every culture under the sun. (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 137)

In *The Republic* Plato tried to design a city where the Apollonian had triumphed over the Dionysian—a city where the lurid temptations of the chorus were controlled and held in contrast to the esteemed philosophical knowledge. Nietzsche notes, "Socrates' tragic art failed to even 'convey the truth,' although it did address itself to those who were 'a bit backward,' which is to say non-philosophers: a double reason for leaving it alone" (1956, p. 86). But as we have seen, it is the type of truth a philosopher can access through intellect or a daemon, and in doing so, he closes himself off from the nature of the dialectic by firmly seating himself to one side of the dichotomy while rejecting the other.

If imagination needs phantastic supplement then so too does phantasy need imagination. Without imagination, or the Apollonian imaginary, we are lost as to how to regain the clarity of the original phantasy. The music or the drama is a memory of that experience. The dialectic describes the relationship where

> Apollo must incorporate that thin line which the dream image may not cross, under penalty of becoming pathological, of imposing itself on us as crass reality: a

> discreet limitation, a freedom from all extravagant urges, the sapient tranquility of the plastic god." (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 21)

As we will see with Marcuse, the uninhibited lure of phantasy, the passion of Eros, is lethal to the individual and civilization, and the Apollonian prevents this inevitable death by reclaiming the truth of the Dionysian phantasy in the world of culture and civilization. As we have seen the likely sterilization of creativity in the kallipolis, Nietzsche returns to music and the type of music which would have absolutely been denied in *The Republic* that can invite the Dionysian: "the lyrical poet must employ the whole register of emotions, from the whisper of love to the roar of frenzy; moved by the urge to talk of music in Apollonian similitudes" (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 45). But this contemplation of images is still firmly rooted in the Apollonian, so it does acknowledge the importance of the interplay of imagination and phantasy. As we have shown with *The Republic*, the use of imagination, and our reinserting Plato's use of imagination in his Line analogy, illustrates the conceptual value of the imagination in articulating and understanding abstract concepts, and whether they are arrived at through the controlled use of philosophical reason or the chaotic outburst of poetic inspiration, the Apollonian provides the "redemption through illusion" (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 78). Plato sought redemption through reason, but doing so drastically imbalance the dialectic that he investigates.

The dialectic is the space where Nietzsche's insights are most helpful. Though it must be said that as *The Birth of Tragedy* progresses, Nietzsche himself seems to more and more embrace the Dionysian both in his writing and in his overall attention; he even goes as far as to state, "Believe me in this Dionysiac life and in the rebirth of tragedy!

Socratic man has run his course" (1956, p. 124). It is clear that Nietzsche's embrace of Dionysius and the casting off of Apollo is antagonistic to Plato's removal of poetry and music from the kallipolis, but unlike Plato, Nietzsche redeems himself repeatedly by backtracking and declaring the importance of the Apollonian imaginary in the dialectical tension. It must also be said that in spite of his own tendency toward the Dionysian, he does add important components of the Apollonian imaginary along the way, even if these are more in passing. It is almost against his own interpretation how Nietzsche fixates on the Dionysian, even though he seems to be aware of the dangers of phantasy, without the tension of imagination. Nietzsche asks, "What esthetic effect is produced when the Apollonian and Dionysiac forces of art, usually separate, are made to work alongside each other?" (1956, p. 98). The aesthetic effect is the chorus, the rhapsodic poet, and the tragic drama. Within drama, "we may recognize a drastic stylistic opposition: language, color, pace, dynamic of speech are polarized into the Dionysiac poetry of the chorus, on the one hand, and the Apollonian dream world of the scene on the other" (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 58). The aesthetic exists in the dialectic tension of the Apollonian and the Dionysian. In addition to drama we see how "the chorus is a living wall against the onset of reality because it depicts reality more truthfully and more completely than does civilized man, who ordinarily considers himself the only reality" (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 53). The truth of the chorus and the poet sits beyond individual subjectivity, and therefore beyond rational thought; for this reason, it touches a truth that supplants the hierarchy of reason.

In the dialectic experience of the tragic drama, the union of plastic arts and poetic music, "archetypal man was cleansed of the illusion of culture and what revealed itself was authentic man, the bearded satyr jubilantly greeting his god. Before him cultured man dwindled to a false cartoon" (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 53). This is the nature of the more truthful depiction of reality, one that places our own frailties and mortality before us as a caricature, one that subtly makes us aware, as if were being brought in on a secret, of the Apollonian as illusion, as if we begin to see the stitching on the veil that depicts the dream made manifest. Nietzsche also suggests a fault line of imagination and phantasy by speaking of *archetype or authentic man* and *cultured man*. This foreshadows some of the language Marcuse will use as the dialectic is bound up in the cultured or civilized side of the psyche. This description might prove useful as we are try to move beyond the dichotomy of "cultured or authentic" and instead reclaim a culture that remembers and revisits the authentic, one where phantasy undergoes a revaluation.

Nietzsche speaks of the dialectic of phantasy and imagination, of Dionysus and Apollo as such:

> Understanding kills action, for in order to act we require the veil of illusion; such is Hamlet's doctrine, not to be confounded with the cheap wisdom of John-a-Dreams, who through too much reflection, as it were a surplus of possibilities, never arrives at action. What, both in the case of Hamlet and Dionysiac man, overbalances any motive leading to action, is not reflection but understanding, the apprehension of truth and its terror. Now no comfort any longer avails, desire reaches beyond the transcendental world, beyond the god themselves, and existence, together with its gulling reflection in the gods and an immortal Beyond, is denied. The truth once seen, man is aware everywhere of the ghastly absurdity of existence, comprehends the symbolism of Ophelia's fate and the wisdom of the wood sprite Silenus: nausea invades him.
>
> Then, in this supreme jeopardy of the will, art, that sorceress expert in healing, approaches him; only she can turn his fits of nausea into imaginations with which

> it is possible to live. These are on the one hand the spirit of the *sublime*, which subjugates terror by means of art; on the other hand the *comic* spirit, which releases us, through art, from the tedium of absurdity. The satyr chorus of the dithyramb was the salvation of Greek art; the threatening paroxysms I have mentioned were contained by the intermediary of those Dionysiac attendants. (1956, pp. 51-52)

Art, the aesthetic impulse of imagination, tempers the overwhelming experience of phantasy. But we also see here a balance that is reminiscent of how Plato sought to train the body and the mind through a harmony of physical exercise and mathematical, political, and philosophical training. However, we do see here the danger made obvious with Marcuse that "only so much of the Dionysiac substratum of the universe may enter an individual consciousness as can be dealt with by that Apollonian transfiguration; so that these two prime agencies must develop in strict proportion" (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 145). This, in terms of this research, defines the nature of the dialectic of phantasy and imagination. Imagination, the cultured side of intellect, makes phantasy intelligible, without which, it is lost to a world of logical comprehension, and only can be observed in the Dionysiac state, otherwise it is as Socrates describes as a poet as out of ones senses. Too much phantasy is overwhelming and dangerous to the survival of the individual and civilization. Marcuse introduces the possibility that the modern mind has features that do many other things, but those features don't necessarily make phantasy more accessible. If the relationship that Nietzsche describes is achieved, the modern psyche may find the space of phantasy more fertile. However, technology will have consequences in this relationship, and the point of access will still be a crucial one for education.

Nietzsche recognizes the truth-value of phantasy and locates this value in tragic myth. Which in order to "understand the tragic myth we must see it as Dionysiac

wisdom made concrete through Apollonian artifice […] the world of appearance is pushed to its limits, where it denies itself and seeks to escape back into the world of primordial reality" (Nietzsche, 1956, 132). The veil is lifted at the moment it is recognized for what it is, a shroud over reality, and wool over our eyes. Nietzsche adds:

> The Dionysiac element, as against the Apollonian, proves itself to be the eternal and original power of art, […] if we could imagine an incarnation of dissonance – and what is man if not that? – that dissonance, in order to endure life, would need a marvelous illusion to cover it with a veil of beauty. This is the proper artistic intention of Apollo, in whose name are gathered together all those countless illusions of fair semblance which at any moment make life worth living and whet our appetite for the next moment. (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 145)

We see here a complete description of the complementary tension that could result in the dialectic. The relevance of both phantasy and imagination to each other becomes more dialectic in the making of meaning. This tension is sometimes difficult to locate in *The Birth of Tragedy* but, when found, can serve to clarify dense passages that may be difficult to interpret. We find one here:

> We interpret music as the immediate language of the will, and our imaginations are stimulated to embody that material world, which speaks to us with lively motion and yet remains invisible. Image and concept, on the other hand, gain a heightened significance under the influence of truly appropriate music. Dionysiac art, then, affects the Apollonian talent in a twofold manner: first, music incites us to a symbolic intuition of the Dionysiac universality; second, it endows that symbolic image with supreme significance. From these facts, perfectly plausible once we have pondered them well, we deduce that music is capable of giving birth to myth, the most significant of similitudes; and above all, to the tragic myth, which is a parable of Dionysiac knowledge. (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 101)

It is important here to recognize the way "image and concept"—the tools of the philosophes, as exemplified in the structure and devices of the *Republic*—are made more significant and meaningful through the exchange of phantasy, a productive aspect of phantasy that Plato failed to recognize entirely, and he only half-heartedly atoned for his

blatant dismissal in *Phaedrus*. In the final act of phantasy, which was lost on Plato since art too was for the most part thoroughly censored, Apollo and Dionysus complement each other's dimensions and experience:

> In the final effect of tragedy the Dionysiac element triumphs once again: its closing sounds are such as were never heard in the Apollonian realm. The Apollonian illusion reveals its identity as the veil thrown over Dionysiac meanings for the duration of the play, and yet the illusion is so potent that at its close the Apollonian drama is projected into a sphere where it begins to speak with Dionysiac wisdom, thereby denying itself and its Apollonian concreteness. The difficult relations between the two elements in tragedy may be symbolized by a fraternal union between two deities: Dionysos [sic] speaks the language of Apollo, but Apollo, finally, the language of Dionysos [sic]; thereby the highest goal of tragedy and of art in general is reached. (Nietzsche, 1956, 131)

We see the movement (again, in a spatial analogy) beyond the Apollonian imagination and into the irrational experience of Dionysian frenzy/phantasy, but it still firmly situated in the Apollonian veil of myth. This dialectic uses the productive tension. The tension is maintained with different social devices than those in ancient Greece: "All that is now called culture, education, civilization will one day have to appear before the incorruptible judge, Dionysos" (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 120).

Overall, Neitzsche presents us with a dialectical tension between imagination and phantasy that is missing in Plato. He thus attempts to rekindle some of the pre-Socratic mystery of phantasy. Yet at a crucial moment in his analysis, Neitzsche loses touch with the delicate tension which he otherwise endorses, overly emphasizing the phantastical. This is most apparent in Nietzsche's interpretation of Raphael's painting "Transfiguration." First, through his reading of Raphael's final work, we find a clear distinction between the form of phantasy and imagination and also a simultaneous conflation of both. The possessed boy and other figures in the lower half represent the

ecstatic Dionysian spirit while Christ emerging after his resurrection in the upper portion represents the Apollonian imaginary. The figures in the lower half gesturing between the possessed boy and the figure of Christ in heaven conflate the cultural forms of the ancient and the modern and, in doing so, eliminate Dionysian phantasy by equating it with Apollonian imagination. Second, it is in the moment of this interpretation of Raphael that Nietzsche further rejects the Apollonian spirit from his analysis—in much the same way Plato removed Pan from the Academy—and alternatively embraces the Dionysian impulse, which we can observe as his work becomes increasingly frenzied. This interpretation describes the reductionist point of view that conflates conceptions of phantasy/illusion. Therefore Nietzsche, at a crucial moment, opts to discard the dialectic, reverse the power dynamic, embraces phantasy, and discards the Apollonian. Evident of this is Nietzsche's insistence that phantasy, or the Dionysian experience of the tragic poet, *ought* to reduce the subjectivity to:

> "becoming wholly identified with the original Oneness, its pain and contradiction, and producing a replica of that Oneness as music, if music may legitimately be seen as a repetition of the world; however, this music becomes visible to him again, as in a dream similitude, through the Apollonian dream influence" (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 38).

The Apollonian reinterprets the experience of phantasy so that it may be revisited. Without the original material of the phantasy, the content of the Apollonian will be less than a dream-world and more of an illusion that cannot be escaped. The tragedy here is that the dialectical synergy and tension is cut, leading Nietzsche toward an increasingly phantastical point of view.

This is precisely the point of view that I wish to avoid. Nietzsche, at least in his earlier writings, reduces the dialectic and returns (in a similar fashion as Plato) to dichotomous, hierarchical thinking. Although he does repent in *Attempt at a Self-Criticism* and recognizes his own rapturous embracing of tragedy, Nietzsche, at least in *Birth of Tragedy*, destabilizes the dichotomy by identifying with phantasy (read: Dionysus) over and against imagination (Apollo). Educationally, I seek to reclaim the space of the dialectic, the space of productive tension, in order to avoid both the entropic effects of imagination and the destructive forces of phantasy. I seek to eliminate the hierarchy that has existed since Plato, and which Nietzsche attempted to turn on its head. Marcuse will offer a way to reclaim the dialectic and the liminal space of the *eschatia* in order to incite a rebirth of phantasy that will be used to guide my final analysis of educational theory.

Chapter 4: Marcuse

This chapter is primarily focused on the antagonistic relationship between the reality principle and the pleasure-principle. This will introduce an argument for phantasy as a force or impulse that could bring us back into a dialectical relationship with the world and ourselves. It will also cover criticisms against *Eros and Civilization*, specifically the ideas of optimism and repressive-sublimation, including Marcuse's own as he reflects on the limitations and false-promises of *Eros and Civilization*. It will end with an articulated model of phantasy as a tool to rekindle the dialectic and inform education in a *new* reality. Marcuse helps to return us to the dialectic between phantasy and imagination that Plato and Nietzsche tried so desperately to overcome. The space of the dialectic, with its dynamic tension, is in a way a liminal space itself since it contains contradictory categories simultaneously. Marcuse provides a way for this tension to be used productively in education and society. There is a distinction between current "training" of the imagination for capitalist productivity (reproduction) in education versus "inviting" phantasy for radical interruption. Inviting something means that you do not necessarily have control over it, nor do you know what is likely to happen. Further, invitation has a connotation of receptivity and passivity and entails an educational hospitality toward phantasy.

I will proceed with two precautions. First—and this is inherent in *Eros and Civilization* itself—the distinction Marcuse draws between imagination and phantasy. There are times when a distinction is not always clear as Marcuse seems to use them

interchangeably, and there are also times when both are used in the same sentence to highlight diverging aspects of a shared impulse or instinct. Second, stemming from Marcuse's reflection after *Eros and Civilization* (chiefly in his later work of *One-Dimensional Man*), there is an optimism that runs through *Eros and Civilization* that is tempered with the disgust from repeated social failures leading to more sophisticated forms of desublimation.

Marcuse himself recognized the possibly naive optimism of *Eros and Civilization* when it was first published. The basic thesis—that hope lies in the fruits an industrial society and the satisfaction of basic needs—might be utopian in the worst sense:

> This optimism was based on the assumption that the rationale for the continued acceptance of domination no longer prevailed, that scarcity and the need for toil were only "artificially" perpetuated—in the interest of preserving the system of domination. I neglected or minimized the fact that this "obsolescent" rationale had been vastly strengthened (if not replaced) by even more efficient forms of social control. (Marcuse, 1955, p. xi)

Here Marcuse begins to unravel the thread of repressive desublimation that he will trace in *One-Dimensional Man* and critique further the degree to which civilization has contained the dialectic impulses of pleasure and performance. Concerning imagination, Marcuse warns that within the advancing technological society,

> the 'other dimension' is absorbed into the prevailing state of affairs. The works of alienation are themselves incorporated into this society and circulate as part and parcel of the equipment which adorns and psychoanalyzes the prevailing state of affairs. Thus they become commercials – they sell, comfort, or excite. (Marcuse, 1964, p. 64).

Aesthetics and pleasure are manipulated to such an extent that a libidinal release of the instincts is possible without posing a threat to the system or civilization. Phantasy could be the only dimension able to remain rooted in the instincts, but, due to the very

constraints that allowed for the instinctual release of energy in the first place, it remains shielded from the realm of possibilities in the reality principle.

Marcuse and Education

In education, Marcuse is applied to a wide variety of projects, but few theorists focus on imagination as it relates to education. Most theorists instead latch onto Marcuse's optimistic transformative or emancipatory theories, or his pessimistic critique against advanced-industrial society (Bourassa, 2011). In this vein, philosophers outside of education critique Marcuse's notion of repressive desublimation in the context of consumer culture (Bowring, 2012; Renaud, 2013; Huffer, 2012). In education, Marcusian applications run the gamut from oppression through technology to the transformative potential of imagination in the classroom focusing in the physical classroom environment and the nurturing of a classroom community (Wakefield, 2001). There is a significant amount of research that looks specifically at Marcuse's ideas as they might inform higher education, especially student protest groups and collective resistance, but there is virtually nothing applying his radical ideas to children in the early childhood or elementary education classroom (Brookfield, 2007; Cunningham, 2013; James, 2006). An outlier here is David Kennedy's work concerning the elementary classroom as a site to reconstruct the relationship between children and adults in an effort to establish space of a new reality principle (Kennedy, 2014). This is the type of work

(and nontraditional use of Marcuse) I seek to carry out so that his ideas can reach a wider audience in order to facilitate an education of phantasy and imagination.

Educational theorists interested in critical theory, emancipation, or imagination have not addressed the importance of the distinction between phantasy and imagination in Marcuse's work. Such a gap in the research illustrates a fear that Marcuse himself was aware of: that there was a focus on the pessimism in his work, particularly *One-Dimensional Man*. In relation to this book, Marcuse argued, "I think the Freud book was much better" (Marcuse, 2011, p. 229). Marcuse was wary of the role *One-Dimensional Man* played in the cultures of resistance he sought to analyze, and he advocated reading *Eros and Civilization* instead. Avoidance of *Eros and Civilization* is indicative of a trend in educational research that avoids the murky space of not only distinguishing between phantasy and imagination, but also devising educational, social, and political programs in its image.

Phantasy and Freud

In order to better understand the concept of phantasy in his work and why this is important for education, an analysis of Marcuse's main argument in *Eros and Civilization* is in order. My analysis will look for moments when the dialectic is emerging and we are able see the hope of phantasy through the cracks of repressed desires. It is in these cracks that we find not only phantasy but also the tools to coax it out of hiding. Building on Freud, Marcuse traces two movements in the history of man concerning the control of

pleasure. The first, and that which is simultaneously the source of *all* artistic, social, political creations, is instinctual pleasure. Marcuse reminds us that Freud understood that "the history of man [the history of civilization] is the history of his repression" (Marcuse, 1955, p. 11). This initial repression Marcuse calls *repressive sublimation* of instinctual pleasure, and it is important to note the productive capability of this form of repression. As we saw earlier in chapters 2 and 3, Western civilization's movement sought the conditioning of thought and action through censorship (Plato) while Nietzsche argued that we had severed the Apollonian and the Dionysian so completely that the dialectic no longer held any power or mystery over human life. Repressive sublimation created a dimension beyond the instincts that complemented and empowered the Dionysian impulse with what I have called the Apollonian spirit. However, as we have seen repeatedly, this dimension severed from phantasy cripples itself, and even more so when parts of the pleasure instincts become desublimated. Marcuse infers that "If absence from repression is the archetype of freedom, then civilization is the struggle against this freedom" (1955, p. 15). This freedom was nearly lost after the death of tragic poetry—in a literal sense because we can no longer inhabit that mythical landscape of the *eschatia.* As we will see later in this chapter, Marcuse's notion of phantasy may be a way backwards into that landscape, a nonrepressive sublimation; an imagination freed from the stronghold of economic forces and allowed to freely seek pleasure in sublimated forms. Before we get into that, however, we need also to understand *repressive desublimation*, because this makes it increasingly difficult to locate phantasy within the

pleasure since the pleasures have been reintroduced within the framework of the reality principle as a tool of reinforcement rather than one of revolt.

Within the concept of repressive desublimation, there is first a concentration of the reality principle within the context of aggressiveness and pleasure within and across human relationships, both at the individual and societal levels. The reality principle can be understood as the Apollonian imaginary. It is the civilized world that is overlaid onto the natural world with its expectations, beliefs, and assumptions present and fully intact. This more specific and distilled reality principle Marcuse calls the *performance-principle*, and it is representative of a shift in power from sovereign power (as Foucault would call it) to disciplinary and finally biopower, with the underlying pretext that it is "organized by the competitive economic performances of its members" (Marcuse, 1955, p. 44). This movement of civilization through stages of repressive sublimation and into repressive desublimation was, in some way, more clearly articulated in *One-Dimensional Man*. However, where *Eros* can be said to have a rampant optimism for the future, that future is far more bleak and distant in *One-Dimensional Man,* where a thread of pessimism taints everything, with a similar taste as Foucault's *Discipline and Punish,* at least on this reading. The one-dimensionalizing effect of contemporary, advanced industrial/technological cultures leaves even fewer and narrower interstices for which phantasy may creep back through.

The process of desublimation takes the form (at least in the context of art and aesthetics) of imagination and phantasy, and additionally sexuality. We find that imagination is opened at the level of the instincts but still conceptualized, and therefore

limited, at the level of consciousness and subjectivity. Through desublimation, imagination is released for economic/entertainment purposes, while phantasy, seemingly impervious, remains firmly rooted in the unconscious. In *One-Dimensional Man* Marcuse makes this clear:

> The traditional images of artistic alienation are indeed romantic in as much as they are in aesthetic incompatibility with the developing society. This incompatibility is the token of their truth. What they recall and preserve in memory pertains to the future: images of a gratification which would dissolve the society that suppresses it. (1964, p. 60)

The original function of art was to bring about an awareness (if only a momentary one) of the dialectic—of the contradiction between the reality principle we simultaneously inhabit and recreate and the pleasure-principle which we dutifully delay in order for more fulfilling gratification later—and of the antagonistic relationship that left us to have with our own self. The incompatibility of tragic poetry seen in the previous chapter was what gives it its transcendental quality. Without such a tension, and when a perceived harmony is achieved, the Apollonian prevails and then too dies. However, in this last movement, rather than a death, Nietzsche too foresaw the commercial aspect of the Apollonian industrial society that had lost it instinctual connection with the Dionysian. In this state, culture is left to exhaust its symbols and memes until it must cannibalize other cultural symbols for the purpose of a shadow of Apollonian art turned commodity. Because of this, perhaps as a direct consequence and realization of the inevitability of cultural entropy, there is a desublimation of imagination. This is the moment of desublimation, when art itself can be released. Art loses the Dionysian, and in so, becomes a shadow:

> Artistic alienation is sublimation. It creates the images of conditions which are irreconcilable with the established Reality Principle but which, as cultural images become tolerable, even edifying and useful. Now this imagery is invalidated. Its incorporation into the kitchen, the office, the shop; its commercial release for business and fun is, in a sense, desublimation – replacing mediated by immediate gratification. (Marcuse, 1964, p. 72)

Art is appropriated for the commercial; aesthetics is redefined as advertisement. This release of the censorship Plato described allows for art to flourish, but it is art that seems incapable of becoming art, at least in the tragic sense. But the dialectic returns in the understanding that the sublimated forms of art and aesthetics have given way to the desublimated forms of the commodity. Desublimation is a betrayal of the promises of sublimation; it "has also betrayed the hope and destroyed the truth which were preserved in the sublimations of higher culture" (Marcuse, 1964, p. 56)—a hope that had been close to destruction since, as Nietzsche has illustrated, the time when Dionysian tragedy was first subverted. We find that desublimation, more thoroughly than ever, strengthens the reality principle as in fact the only or actual reality. And in doing so, "the reality principle 'safeguards' rather than 'dethrones,' 'modifies' rather than denies, the pleasure principle" (Marcuse, 1955, p. 12). Only in the space of the tension, in the frustration of the dialectic, will phantasy have any effect.

This is the inevitable result of repressive desublimation: It fails to produce a pleasure not already rooted back into the established reality principle. But this desublimation, similar to the liberation of sexuality, remains a repressive desublimation because of its narrow means that do not serve to subvert power relationships, but to reinforce them through the need for technological, scientific, and media innovation and invention (Renaud, 2013). The imagination is wrought into a caricature of itself by the

powers that seek to exploit its potential. The imagination is bound by precisely managed charges and even more direct goals, which prevent the dialectic tension central to creating art. In education, and STEM programs specifically, imagination is charged with increasing student innovation, invention, and creativity, but no policy ever mentions that imagination can be used to envision alternative realities.

In the next section, I will cover the antagonistic side of this relationship, that of the pleasure-principle and the domain of phantasy and freedom. It will be in this section where I begin to identify and fully appreciate the educational implications of Marcuse's theory. I will distill four characteristics of the nature of phantasy that educational theory must account for in sympathetic treatments of phantasy in theory and practice.

Phantasy, Instincts, and Consciousness

By exploring certain counter-arguments that have been waged against Marcuse around the issue of repressive desublimation, we find a Freudian reflection of the relationship of the instincts to consciousness. Foucault in particular makes a sweeping critique against such forms of analysis as too simplistic because they reduce power relationships to a purely negative form and do not take into account the productive aspects of power (Foucault, 1978). Upon closer inspection of his counter-arguments, Foucault may have been too sweeping in his lumping of all of the Frankfurt School or critical theory together, and in fact not recognizing the productive aspects of power in Marcuse's work (Foucault, 1978; Guilbert, 2002; Marcuse, 1964; Renaud, 2013).

Marcuse himself is relevant here because of his development of thought between *Eros* and *One-Dimensional*. In fact, Foucault's arguments in *History of Sexuality, Volume 1*, and the loosening of sexual pleasure beyond mere reproductive function share a great deal of similarity with Marcuse's notion of repressive desublimation, where freedom is granted (in certain contexts) and power is evenly distributed—but for Marcuse, however, it still tightly bound within economic frameworks. Marcuse's argument about the perpetuation of scarcity, even if illusory, helps to pinpoint the difference between himself and Foucault, and why economic domination cannot be understood as freedom within the context of the pleasure-principle because it is a pleasure *for* the reality principle, not beyond it. To get beyond would be located in a space of pleasures of the body that Foucault advocates beyond sexuality (Foucault, 1978, p. 114). In fact, with a framework of repressive desublimation, Marcuse argues that control is exerted at the level of consciousness and no longer needs to operate at the level of instinctual pleasure. This is an essential feature of phantasy and one of the criteria I will explore in the next chapter.

Once we move out of instinctual pleasure, we move out of the domain of phantasy. This management of consciousness offers different forms of pleasure, and in an analogous way, imagination is suffering a parallel fate—one where it is removed from instinctual pleasure, and the ability to present the dialectic, to conscious pleasure, which is determined by economic principles and undermines the dialectic by rejecting its possibility. Educationally, this is important in terms of identifying the productive pedagogical tension between consciousness and instincts. This helps to guide this research. Since imagination is no longer a sublimated source of artistic creation, but a

desublimated source of anesthetic reproduction, we cannot find our way back into phantasy solely through consciousness. Richard Kearny's work on the postmodern imagination mentions that "we no longer appear to know who exactly produces or controls the images which condition our consciousness" (Kearny, 1988, p. 3). This is problematic because the forces at work are not transparent. We need to reclaim the dialectical space of the eschatia working backward to the instinctual aesthetic pleasure where we might find phantasy, as opposed to the imaginative forces of consciousness.

The Slow Spread of Phantasy

Phantasy dwells within the (liminal) space of the pleasure-principle, and it is here where we seem to shed the confines of a singular reality principle. Phantasy has the potential to define new forms of production and performance, without which:

> where repressive sublimation prevails and determines the culture, non-repressive sublimation must manifest itself in contradiction to the entire sphere of social usefulness; viewed from this sphere, it is the negation of all accepted productivity and performance. (Marcuse, 1955, p. 208)

It lays bare those accepted rituals of the performance-principle. However, it is not an explosive revolutionary moment; it is instead a directed action against the accepted constraints of productivity and performance:

> It is a spread rather than an explosion of libido—a spread over private and societal relations which bridges the gap maintained between them by a repressive reality principle. […] The free development of transformed libido *beyond* the institutions of the performance principle differs essentially from the release of constrained sexuality *within* the dominion of these institutions" (Marcuse, 1955, p. 202).

This spread may also explain the slow release of imagination as it relates to creating our utopia in our daily lives and societal relations. It will also explain the instrumentality of the education model embedding imagination into the curriculum in accordance to the performance principle, working within consumer/producer, national competitiveness, and meritocratic societal structures. Working beyond such models would necessarily entail a working against their domination and unsustainability as the driving force of civilization. It is a spread because it happens at the level of the instincts and not consciousness.

Playing *With* and *In* Phantasy

For education, it is important to understand how teachers can access the instincts. It may be through an aesthetic approach to teaching and learning that phantasy can once again become part of education and society. The "aesthetic value, the non-conceptual truth of the senses is sanctioned, and freedom from the reality principle is granted to the 'free play' of creative imagination" (Marcuse, 1955, p. 185). This free play is an interesting concept that Marcuse luckily elaborates on to some degree, and will be highly informative for education. He argues:

> The play impulse is the vehicle of this liberation. The impulse does not aim at playing 'with' something; rather it is the play of life itself, beyond want of external compulsion—the manifestation of and existence without fear and anxiety, and thus the manifestation of freedom itself. […] Freedom is thus, in a strict sense, freedom from the established reality: man is free when the 'reality loses its seriousness. (1955, p. 187)

This citation clearly situates phantasy within the context of the Eleusinian mysteries and epic tragedy. From the above we can see how, on the one hand, playing *with* would

denote a subject-object relation, a reinforcing of ego/subject and thus repression of pleasurable fulfillment precisely because this boundary of subjectivity is never broached or dissolved. On the other hand, playing *in* would denote a partnership, perhaps an erotic partnership, which can go beyond subject-object and fulfill pleasure at the instinctual level. There is a great deal of literature concerning play, but within it, we would be looking for a very specific type of play, where, the subject is suspended in the moment of a phantastic event, happening, or specific experience.

Phantasy and reality must enter into a partnership in the human psyche so that we can recreate the experience of freedom and happiness we experience in our dreams—or are our dreams too already thoroughly colonized and commercialized? Perhaps not:

> Beyond its domain [the performance-principle], productivity has another content and another relation to the pleasure principle: they are anticipated in the processes of imagination which preserve freedom from the performance principle while maintaining the claim of a *new* reality principle. (Marcuse, 1955, p. 156)

This quote is indicative of the optimism of *Eros. One-Dimensional Man,* on the other hand, points out that freedom in a desublimated form could return, but I would argue it is only a perceived freedom, in the same way that the reality principle is a perceived reality. But imagination, in the context of instinctual pleasure, is, in the way I have understood Marcuse and am using these terms, phantasy. The instincts denote a tension beyond consciousness.

Marcuse was aware of this tension and does admit that "the fate of human freedom and happiness is fought out and decided in the struggle of the instincts—literally a struggle of life and death—in which soma and psyche, nature and civilization participate" (1955, p. 21). The fact that he uses the term "participate" is telling, as it

signifies an elegant relationship that is not based on the current performance-principle which overwhelms subjective freedom and establishes as a key feature the use of domination at all levels. Instead, Marcuse's use of the term "participate" indicates (in a very indirect but important way) a relationship built on democratic practices and mutual trust—a partnership, suggesting a balance of antagonisms, not an either-or, reality or pleasure, but beyond and together, without the perversion of performance. Through such participation, we reclaim the dimension of instinctual pleasure.

Finding Productive Tension in Creativity and Receptivity

One final thought before moving on, and here I try to define more precisely what phantasy is, how it is distinct from imagination, and how the participation with each and between dimensions will be useful in education. I begin by drawing our attention to a passage from *Eros and Civilization* that offers many insights into what I am talking about. Marcuse tells us regarding phantasy that "the basic experience in this dimension is sensuous rather than conceptual; the aesthetic perception is essentially intuition, not notion. The nature of sensuousness is 'receptivity,' cognition through being affected by given objects (1955, p. 176). The first two ideas tell us that the experience of phantasy will touch the senses and thus be sensual, as opposed to conceptual and purely thought-based. The experience will be understood intuitively rather than through logic and reason. The final sentence—and the one I find incredibly intriguing for our purposes—also emphasizes receptivity. This description seems much more at home in the language

of the Eleusinian mysteries or that of tragic poetry that Nietzsche traces, rather than in the contemporary world of imagination, which emphasizes conscious intentionality and willful creativity to produce a reality that reflects back to us our concerns and interests. The nature of phantasy also has its own knowledge system:

> As a fundamental, independent mental process, phantasy has a truth value of its own, which corresponds to an experience of its own—namely, the surmounting of the antagonistic human reality. Imagination envisions the reconciliation of the individual with the whole, of desire with realization, of happiness with reason. While this harmony has been removed into utopia by the established reality principle, phantasy insists that it must and can become real, that behind the illusion lies *knowledge*. The truths of imagination are first realized when phantasy itself takes form, when it creates a universe of perception and comprehension—a subjective and at the same time objective universe. This occurs in *art.* (Marcuse, 1955, pp. 143-144)

Above, we find some of the ambiguity Marcuse employs in *Eros* and which I will have to clarify. Phantasy, when held distinctly from imagination, seems to describe a singular experience, while imagination is described more as a process. The distinction between creativity and receptivity may help to explain this further, providing we accept that phantasy denotes receptivity and imagination denotes creativity. I fixate on this concept of receptivity because it stands in such clear opposition to creativity and the language of 21st century skills. Creativity is the force in the reality principle; it is partnered with imagination in an instrumental sense in that it affects objective reality. Receptivity is the force of the pleasure-principle, is in the sensual domain of phantasy, and is affective in subjective reality.

The language of imagination, and most of education for that matter, is that of production; productivity, above all others, comes to define "the existential attitude of industrial civilization; it permeates the philosophical definition of the subject in terms of

the ever transcending ego. Man is evaluated according to his ability to make, augment, and improve socially useful things" (Marcuse, 1955, p. 155). This ability to invent, innovate, and reconceptualize in the name of the established reality principle is at the heart of most STEM and 21st century skills discourses, with direct references to employment, international competitiveness in the global market place, next generation labor markets, etc. And by extension, the hyper-rationalism of the bureaucratized testing system becomes increasingly irrational and inefficient. Similarly, this "education for consent to death introduces an element of surrender into life from the beginning—surrender and submission. It stifles 'utopian efforts'" (Marcuse, 1955, p. 236). And education plays an essential part of this veiling of the dialectic. Educational processes reduce the antagonism and thus subvert the longing of instinctual pleasure. Marcuse brings this in focus in the qualities that mask phantasy:

> Consciousness, increasingly less burdened by autonomy, tends to be reduced to the task of regulating the co-ordination of the individual with the whole. […] The individual does not really know what is going on; the overpowering machine of education and entertainment unites him with all the others in a state of anesthesia from which all detrimental ideas tend to be excluded. (Marcuse, 1955, p. 103)

Education plays its role in immunizing the instincts against pleasures by closing down the space of phantasy and promoting vain attempts at narrow access points for imagination, aimed at future exploitation in the market place.

Marcuse is not entirely silent on these matters and offers other ideas, beyond play, that could be useful in informing education. In its least sublimated forms,

> the opposition of phantasy to the reality principle is more at home in such sub-real and surreal processes as dreaming, daydreaming, play, the 'stream of consciousness.' In its most extreme claim for a gratification beyond the reality principle, phantasy cancels the established *principium individuationis* itself. Here

> perhaps are the roots of phantasy's commitment to the primary Eros: sexuality is 'the only function of a living organism which extends beyond the individual and secures its connection with its species.' (Marcuse, 1955, pp. 145-146)

Dreaming, daydreaming, play, stream-of-consciousness, and tragic poetry all evoke the erotic dimension of the pleasure instinct, and might be part of a pedagogical landscape in which the eschatia can be reclaimed and a new exopedagogy ignited. Because phantasy is incapable of being shoehorned into the reality principle, hospitality toward phantasy will become increasingly important as an educational issue. The final chapter will explore educational ideas both on the practical side and the mythical side so as to illustrate the importance and usefulness of phantasy for transformative pedagogical practice. The next chapter explores primary theorists in imagination and education, arts and education, arts and society, and creativity and education. I will use the theory of phantasy and imagination developed here in order to recognize and articulate spaces in which phantastical imagination might be found in a wide variety of educational theories. These then can act as launching pads for a new pedagogy that does not merely make imagination into the midwife of capitalist production.

To conclude, I have offered four main ideas that will be useful in identifying overlapping theories and practices found in educational literature. First, that receptivity, not creativity, is the experiential state of phantasy. This can be traced back to Chapter 1, but can also be seen as the force that Plato sought to censor and the impulse that Nietzsche readily embraced. Second, educational programs and practices must not neglect the roles of the instincts in the space of phantasy and its dialectical role with imagination and consciousness. The instincts factor into the mythical dimension of

phantasy and will be explored in the final chapter. Third, the change will not be a singular, explosive moment, at least not in the collective sense of rekindling a cultural affinity with the pleasure-principle and phantasy, but a wide dispersal of *new* reality principles, with an acceptance in a multitude of alternative reality principles. If Marcuse once emphasized the great refusal, here we must think of great refusals in the plural as multiple sites where phantastical events can occur. Lastly, the spread of phantasy and instinctual pleasure will begin and disseminate through a *playing with* and *playing in* forms of freedom and pleasure, aesthetics and phantasy. Play can be traced throughout the previous research but will see it contextualized in education in the next chapter. These concepts can provide navigational points in the educational theorist I will explore in the following chapter.

Chapter 5: The Return of Phantasy in Education

At the end of the previous chapter, I pinpointed four main ideas that will be useful in identifying overlapping theories and practices found in educational literature. The first is situated in the space of the dialectic between receptivity and creativity specifically, and phantasy and imagination more broadly. This is the space of what I am calling *phantastical-imagination* as a dialectical tension. The second concerns the connections of instincts/pleasure/aesthetics to phantasy and of consciousness/reason/subjectivity to imagination, and how access to these respective dimensions can inform educational programs and practices. The third details how such a move back into phantasy will not be an explosive, global paradigm shift that takes place over a short period of time, but will instead be a slow revolution that seeps into the unconscious and *spreads* into culture, consciousness, and understanding and with it will be *new* (and a variety of) reality principles. The fourth and final criteria—and one that is a rich place to begin future educational projects—is that phantasy will be extended through a *playing with* and *playing in* forms of freedom and pleasure, aesthetics and receptivity. There is an immense body of literature in philosophy, psychology, and education concerning play. The literature on play that lends itself most readily to phantasy will be explored, but there is still much work that needs to be done here (Kritchevsky & Prescott, 1977; Linn, 2008; Rodari, 1973). This concluding chapter hopes to begin this process by focusing on the nexus between play, education, and phantastical imagination.

The analysis that follows covers several of the most prolific educational theorists in the field of education who have commented on and published a body of work revolving around the concept of imagination. Other individual theorists were left off this list so as to isolate this analysis to:

- an historical but immensely relevant example (John Dewey);
- a transitional figure that builds heavily on Dewey and pushes the dimension further into ethics with the exposure to works of art (Maxine Greene);
- another theorist whose work on imagination in education ranges from both the deeply theoretical and analytical to the educationally practical (Kieran Egan); and
- a figure that is situated somewhat within the economically motivated reasons for including imagination and creativity in education (Ken Robinson).

This analysis is by no means comprehensive, nor is it meant to be, but is instead indicative of the evolution of education and imagination in this country. It also follows a similar trajectory of the dialectic where tension exists between theorists and how they are conceptualizing, or making/leaving space for, phantasy, even if it is not articulated as such.

Aside from the four identified criteria above, we should also be on the lookout for references to poetry as well as myth. Poetry is directly responsible for carrying the phantastic beyond the reality principle (Nietzsche), while myth is employed to understand the dialectic and rekindle the (erotic) mystery that could be a path back to phantasy (Marcuse). I will limit my concern to elementary education. This is in part practical, since much of my current work is situated in elementary educational settings. But there

is also the hypothesis that children are not as fully implicated in the performance-principle and thus given over to phantasy more readily than young adults or teenagers.

John Dewey

John Dewey's work *Art as Experience* is an important point of reference within educational literature on the topic of the imagination. In this short analysis, I will explore specific passages from this work in order to compare and contrast his analysis with the criteria I have developed throughout my own dialectical analysis of phantastic-imagination. The parallels that exist between Dewey's body of work and phantasy will help to find ways phantasy can be included in the education of the imagination.

Concerning the first category of the dialectic of receptivity and creativity, Dewey is situated more in the latter. However, he is deeply aware of the qualities of receptivity in imagination and their origins in ancient Greek poetry and theater. Dewey explains:

> More perhaps than any other phase of the human contribution, [imagination] has been treated as a special and self-contained faculty, differing from others in possession of mysterious potencies. […] It is a *way* of seeing and feeling things as they compose an integral whole. […] When the new is created, the far and strange become the most natural inevitable things in the world. There is always some measure of adventure in the meeting of mind and universe, and this adventure is, in its measure, imagination. (1934, p. 278)

This primarily reinforces creativity, as indicated by the use of the faculty of imagination to create the new, but it is guided by a receptive way of seeing and feeling. Furthermore, it can be understood that exposure and engagement with this process of creation brings closer the possibilities of exploring strange, alternative reality principles. Even though there will be limits to how individuals or cultures accept the *new*, creativity may be a

stepping stone or at least get us turned in the right direction. However, direct experience of the tension that is embodied in creativity, and the creation of a work of art, is more promising than mere exposure to works of art. The artist is in a unique position in the relationship between the object and the message, but the spectator can also *see* the tension between the object and the sensually communicated message. We find:

> Possibilities are embodied in works of art that are not elsewhere actualized; this *embodiment* is the best evidence that can be found of the true nature of imagination. There is a conflict artists themselves undergo that is instructive as to the nature of imaginative experience. The conflict has been set forth in many ways. One way of stating it concerns the opposition between inner and outer vision. There is a stage in which the inner vision seems much richer and finer than any outer manifestations. It has a vast and enticing aura of implications that are lacking in the object of external vision. It seems to grasp much more than the latter conveys. Then there comes a reaction; the matter of the inner vision seems wraith-like compared with the solidity and energy of the presented scene. The object is felt to say something succinctly and forcibly that the inner vision reports vaguely, in diffuse feeling rather than organically. (Dewey, 1934, p. 279)

The above passage introduces another dialectical tension. Whereas initially the inner experience is much richer and deeper in meaning than the static object, their relationship undergoes a reversal of sorts where the object itself more clearly communicates something that otherwise would have been left unintelligible. This tension is situated between the art object and the phantastic/sensual experience it is attempting to capture or invoke (communicate).

This is the same tension that Plato sought to excise from art objects through censorship, of which Dewey was deeply aware and concerned with the consequences that would result. Dewey comments on Athens specifically:

> We regard [Athens] as the home par excellence of epic and lyric poetry, of the arts of drama, architecture and sculpture, [and] the idea of art for art's sake would not, as I have already remarked, have been understood. Plato's harshness toward

> Homer and Hesiod seems strained. Plato's demand of censorship of poetry and music is a tribute to the social and even political influence exercised by those arts. (1934, p. 341)

Dewey seeks, in a manner not nearly as radical as Nietzsche, to rekindle this space by decensoring works of art and encouraging exposure to them, recognizing the political advantages for democracy. Dewey takes an approach opposite to Plato's. Whereas Plato thought the influence of poetry was ill-informed, misguided, and downright dangerous to political reason, Dewey positions art as integral to human understanding and highly relevant to a healthy democratic society. Similar to Nietzsche, Dewey argued that this shift away from poetry resulted in the creation of "[theories] about art and the cultivation of grammar and rhetoric took the place of creation" (1934, p. 342). Art became an object of analysis rather than a part of human experience, a dimension that in the ancient world, carried a significant sensual quality. Prior to this break art, understood in the ancient Grecian sense, art "manifests the idea of separation, of disharmony, of man and nature" (Dewey, 1934, p. 346). After the break away from phantasy, away from myth, away from the process of creation (in the context of the ancient world I have described), art no longer invokes such tension. Instead, art masks it because art is unaware of and denies such tension to begin with. Dewey's final words redeem art from the shadows and declare the importance of its truth-value. He discusses not only the receptive qualities that go into creating a work of art, but also the receptive qualities in experiencing a work of art. Turning his back fully on Plato, Dewey declares that "[art] is a mode of prediction not found in charts and statistics, and it insinuates possibilities of human relations not to be found in rule and precept, admonition and administration" (1934, p. 363). It

introduces ideas containing the possibility of the *new* that the world of intellect would not have conceived let alone thought possible.

There is not much that Dewey has directly to say about the instincts. From the above citations we can ascertain some of his ideas concerning consciousness and imagination. But concerning instinct and phantasy, I have to delve into his ideas and think them through with the language of phantasy I have been articulating. The most interesting space where we find an analogue to instincts and phantasy is in Dewey's concept of intuition, which builds on Kant's concept of intuition and imagination. Dewey defines it as such:

> 'Intuition' is that meeting of the old and new in which the readjustment involved in every form of consciousness is effected suddenly by means of a quick and unexpected harmony which in its bright abruptness is like a flash of revelation; although in fact it is prepared for by long and slow incubation. Oftentimes the union of old and new, of foreground and background, is accomplished only by effort, prolonged perhaps to the point of pain. In any case, the background of organized meanings can alone convert the new situation from the obscure into clear and luminous. When old and new jump together, like sparks when the poles are adjusted, there is intuition. This latter is thus neither an act of pure intellect in apprehending rational truth nor a Crocean grasp by spirit of its own images and states. (1934, p. 277)

There are several interesting ideas packed into this passage. The first is that intuition resides in the space of dialectical tension; it works between opposites, in the polarity of entrenched and perceived dichotomies. Learning more and more about the background of such dualisms in all their subtle incarnations, can provide momentary glimpses where a harmony of sorts if achieved. This harmony or dialectic sublation temporally alleviates the tension, or makes it a productive tension, and is achieved not through a guided intellectual or philosophical methodology, nor a divine intervention or daemonic

possession, but through a dialectical movement. In this way Dewey distances himself from Nietzsche and Plato. He is not willing to release subjectivity entirely, but he is unwillingly also to keep such a possibility from happening. His balancing is helpful for our purposes because we, too, seek to avoid the complete implosion of subjectivity that results in a Dionysian abandonment of creativity within civilization. But whereas Dewey sees this sublation as a momentary balancing, I would argue it is instead a maximally productive tension. It is not about balancing the forces themselves, but rather the complementary nature of both of these spaces and spending time in both of them. Lastly, from the above, we can see that Dewey is in some way implying an unconscious process to fleetingly comprehend the dialectic, and in this way, although maybe closer to Plato, leans toward phantasy. Intuition, for Dewey, touches the instincts or at least mingles in the eschatia between phantasy and imagination.

There is a significant amount of secondary literature on Dewey's moral imagination, and a great deal with the arts and aesthetic education, but very little about phantasy. From what I have gathered from *Art as Experience*, I have found some instances where art is used as an invocation of alternative possibilities and new reality principles. For Dewey, "It is a matter of communication and participation in values of life by means of imagination, and works of art are the most intimate and energetic means of aiding individuals to share in the arts of living" (1934, p. 350). This also indicates the situatedness of the dialectic in art and how such exposure brings one closer to intuition and, as I have argued, phantasy. This situatedness is important for Dewey, and for the

revitalization of art in respect to reawakening the dimension of phantasy. It is important because of the space that art currently holds as a commodity. Dewey insists that:

> The isolation of art that now exists is not to be viewed as an isolated phenomenon. It is one manifestation of the incoherence of our civilization produced by new forces, so new that the attitudes belonging to them and the consequences issuing from them have not been incorporated and digested into integral elements of experience. (1934, p. 351)

Here Dewey describes clearly the concept of the established performance-principle, and how art, understood in a new relationship, is able to rupture this establishment by reminding the unconscious human dimension of forms of forgotten pleasure and ways to be in the world. Dewey describes a transition that civilization has been and still seems to be experiencing: an increasing frustration and discontent in the face of increasing technological domination. We may in fact be incapable at this point of representing such frustrations in art—on one hand because of the space that art takes in our culture, and on the other because of the distance we are from intuition and phantasy—but there is still the hope that aesthetic play can be a space of exopedagogy.

In this final section I explore the concept of play in Dewey and how play can be encouraged in education, as well as the forces that seek to censor it (or at least bound it) outside of education. I've already mentioned how imagination is a way of seeing and feeling the multiple dimensions of the world. Building on this, Dewey describes aspects of this dialectic relationship that are similar to that of the Eleusinian mysteries, that the *measure* of the adventure of dialectical understanding is in fact imagination (1934, p. 278). Aside from finding the phantastic in the dialectic relationship of imagination and adventure, Dewey describes how consciousness is affected in a Marcusian fashion:

> The psychological conditions resulting from private control of the labor of other men for the sake of private gain, rather than any fixed psychological or economic law, are the forces that suppress and limit esthetic quality in the experience that accompanies processes of production. As long as art is in the beauty parlor of civilization, neither art nor civilization is secure. (Dewey, 1934, pp. 357-358)

First we see the same argument that it is labor, the market, and now consumerism that both define and deny freedom. This has the consequence of exploiting an already stunted imagination but also offers hope that since art does not remain in the function of civilization it once held, civilization too is in jeopardy, not just art. This dialectic tension between civilization and works of art as works of art highlights part of the problem: art's unsituatedness in advanced industrial/technological civilization. Art may be redemptive, but only if it escapes the clutches of the market, and phantasy is the ripest dimension to meet this demand. Through societal discontent, phantasy will first reemerge. Censorship thus can produce the very thing that is attempts to control and ameliorate: instinctual dissatisfaction with the status quo. Dewey describes this process. He finds:

> Only imaginative vision elicits the possibilities that are interwoven within the texture of always found in works of art. […] Change in the climate of the imagination is the precursor of the changes that affect more than the details of life. (1934, pp. 359-360)

There is no doubt the climate of imagination has changed and is still undergoing change— change at the expense of the market principles guiding educational policies. Hope will re-emerge when art is able to resist commodification, and art informed through phantasy might be best able to meet civilization beyond market dictates.

Maxine Greene

Building on much of Dewey's work, Greene establishes many of the same theoretical features. There exists a similar dialectic in that their aesthetic education is not about the creation *of*, but the engagement *with*, works of art. Greene also moves much of this deeper into the field of social justice and uses art to emphasize empathy or the process entering other subject's realities. She refers to this as a moral imagination.

Regarding the concept of receptivity, Greene's theories hint at the dimension of phantasy that lurks beyond imagination and the reality principle:

> Where oppression or exploitation or pollution or even pestilence is perceived as natural, as a given, there can be no freedom. Where people cannot name alternatives or imagine a better state of things, they are likely to remain anchored or submerged. If we teachers are to develop a human and liberating pedagogy, we must feel ourselves to be engaged in a dialectical relation. We are more likely to uncover or be able to interrupt what we are experiencing if we can at times recapture some of our own lost spontaneity and some awareness of our own backgrounds, either through communication with children, psychotherapy, or engagement with works of art. Any such engagement may provoke us to recall that rationality itself is grounded in something prerational, prereflective—perhaps in a primordial, perceived landscape. (Greene, 1995, p. 53)

First we see that if the imagination is so thoroughly colonized, then we have to accept the impossibility of a better future. In this way, phantasy is utopic because it points to a dimension of the imagination that looks for, finds, and experiences alternative forms of being in the world, of changing the reality principle to suit the instinctual pleasures as well as collective strivings. The denial of such dialectical relations denies the possibility of alternatives. Situated within the dialectic of phantasy and imagination, new possibilities emerge and can be experimented with. Without phantastical imagination, we

cannot create the new; instead, we only rearrange the old to create a shadow of the new. Greene also offers three ways that one might recollect the "lost spontaneity" of subjectivity still in touch with the dialectic of phantasy and imagination; the two that concern us most for the purposes of this research is working with children and engaging works of art. Greene goes even further to proclaim that rationality is grounded, in a sense, in phantasy. This shows similarities with Marcuse in that phantasy is a dimension of human thought. Both imply that phantasy not only lurks beneath the surface, but it in fact informs, to a greater extent than we realize, the intelligible world—the reality principle. Phantasy is able to name the lack in the reality principle because it envisions and experiences new possibilities, while imagination may not be able to break free from the reality principle it works to serve and reinforce.

Imagination in isolation cannot provide the tools needed to resist the reality principle since it offers no alternative; phantasy, and more specifically the dialectic between phantasy and imagination, represents the liminal space of refusal. In fact:

> Such resistance can best be evoked when imagination is released; but, as we all know, the bombardment of images from the divinity of Technological Communication frequently has the effect of freezing people's imaginative thinking. Instead of freeing audience members to take the initiative in reaching beyond their own actualities, in looking at things as if they could be otherwise, today's media present audiences with predigested concepts and images in fixed frameworks. Dreams are caught in the meshes of the saleable; possession of consumer goods is the alternative to gloom or feelings of pointlessness. Ideas of possibilities are trapped in predictability. But our imagination, as I have been illustrating, obviously deals in unpredictablilities, in the unexpected. It then requires reflectiveness on our part to acknowledge the existence of these unexpected and unpredictable vistas and perspectives in our experience. (Greene, 1995, pp. 124-125)

In some ways, Greene's insistence on exposure to works of art implies a certain amount of receptivity; in the sense that one must repeatedly encounter a work of art until that work of art is understood on increasingly profound levels, one is receiving aspects that are communicated through the artwork. In this way, attentiveness to a work of art offers an excellent practice for invoking a similar or complimentary receptivity for phantasy, and it also akin to the daemon that Plato describes as a mediating agent. In this case, the work of art is the mediating agent, opening up the dialectical space of the sensual and the eschatia.

Although instincts are not directly referenced, Greene does articulate a utopian theme in her writing. Specifically, she describes: "a mode of utopian thinking: thinking that refuses mere compliance, that looks down roads not yet taken to the shapes of a more fulfilling social order, to more vibrant ways of being in the world" (1995, p. 5). This utopian thinking is, I would argue, informed by phantasy since it partakes in that which does not yet exist. It re-envisions new ways of being in the world that might provide a deeper more satisfying fulfillment of the instincts while still maintaining the sublimated form of consciousness civilization begets. Certainly Greene is correct in indicating the thoughtful and thus mental dimension of phantasy, yet I would also like to remind the reader that the structure of phantasy which has been developed in this dissertation focuses first and foremost on the embodied and sensual level. It would seem that the dialectical framework Greene advocates needs to be returned to the nature of presenting the phantastical rather than merely representing it in the mind. Such embodied visioning itself is a refusal, for it begins with the dissatisfaction of the current gratification of the

instincts and, in a way, is suspicious of forms of pleasure that would reinforce repressive desublimation. Utopian instincts that push beyond the performance-principle focus on a nonrepressive sublimation so that phantasy can be unleashed on civilization, tempered with imagination so it does not destroy itself. Phantasy might be able to resublimate imagination; while phantasy undergoes a nonrepressive sublimation, imagination would likely undergo a nonrepressive resublimation as a consequence.

Greene has much to say about new reality principles and alternative reality that can be accessed through engagement with works of art. The primary limitation in the way she applies her work (not to say that it is irrelevant) is merely that phantasy has not been explored fully. She seeks to makes one's world larger or richer through understanding what life would be like in another's shoes, and she employs art to achieve this. If we were to return to Chapter 1 and speak about phantasy providing access to the space of the eschatia, it is not entirely clear that Greene's method applies. It certainly does not get beyond the human experience, but it catalogs the great variety and complexity of human experience. In this way, imagination is reinforced since subjectivity is muddled with empathetic experience, but not suspended. Experiencing the beyond of subjectivity is therefore left out of Greene's aesthetic education. Here I must creatively appropriate Greene and read beyond her in order to see how aesthetics can not only be a human venture but also partake in the divine and the alien. For instance, when specifically describing how imagination leads to empathy, we can clearly see how such a process or individual experiences approaches the eschatia. Greene acknowledges:

> [one] of the reasons I have come to concentrate on imagination as a means through which we can assemble a coherent world is that imagination is what,

> above all, makes empathy possible. It is what enable us to cross the empty spaces between ourselves and those we teachers have called 'other' over the years. (1995, p. 3).

Here we have Greene moving between two spaces, that of the human world and empathy, and the interrelation that such entails, but she also implies a mingling with the "other," an other that need not be conceived purely in human terms. We can expand such a crossing of spaces to the phantastic such as the daemon, Dionysus, and Eros, with the use of art. Imagination is above all what "permits us to give credence to alternative realities" (Greene, 1995, 3). Here Greene speaks of imagination as accepting the truth value of experiences that cannot be rationalized and can only be understood through phantasy. Phantasy, however, must bring forth these alternate realities from beyond merely human dimensions of thought, limited to the reality principle of the civilized mind. Greene recognizes this dialectical space even if her language does not make a distinction between where a significant amount of the tension exists.

The dialectic space is key for Greene, for although she limits her ideas to empathy, imagination is the dimension where one can have experiences in a space beyond performance-based modes of subjectivity. When this dialectical space collapses and imagination is no longer coupled with phantasy, as in the repressive-desublimated forms of imagination Marcuse mentions in *One-Dimensional Man*, its utopian impulse is lost. It becomes a tool of civilization, one that is made to serve the performance-principle; its connections to pleasure, at least at the instinctual level, are severed and it operates now in desublimated forms. Greene warns that "a general inability to conceive a better order of things can give rise to a resignation that paralyzes and prevents people

from acting to bring about change" (1995, p. 19). Imagination in the grips of the performance-principle denies and devalues alternative realities as inferior. After all, in its desublimated forms, imagination is thoroughly repressive, in that the illusion of gratification of pleasure is so strong as to hide the unconscious frustration and discontent that is the springboard for phantastical receptivity toward the beyond. Tapping into the dialectic, into the space where imagination is "able to break with what is supposedly fixed and finished, objectively and independently real [the reality principle]. It is to see beyond what the imaginer has called normal or 'common-sensible' and to carve out new orders of experience" (Greene, 1995, p. 19). These new orders are those that can only be introduced through phantasy and the dialectical space of moving between receptivity and creativity. Greene is so convinced and encouraged by the hope and promise that she reveals "it may be the recovery of imagination that lessens the social paralysis we see around us and restores the sense that something can be done in the name of what is decent and humane" (Greene, 1995, p. 35). If this is to be the case, the imagination that she references can only be understood in the context of the dialectic with phantasy. Without the context of phantasy, we turn to the desublimated form of imagination that no longer understands the experience of phantasy and discovering/experiencing the new; even if it is radically different and represents an alternative possibility of higher degrees of fulfillment and satisfying pleasure at the instinctual level and not just the conscious level. The imagination, in this case, is left in a state where the new cannot be envisioned.

For education, this means we are working against the desublimated forms of imagination and pleasure. As such, teachers "must make an intensified effort to break

through the frames of custom and to touch the consciousness of those we teach. It is an argument stemming from a concern about noxious invisible clouds and cover-ups and false consciousness and helplessness" (Greene, 1995, p. 56). If we can reach beyond the desublimated form of imagination, touching consciousness would also mean touching the instincts. Such receptivity would also be an invitation to return to and play with the instinctual/conscious animal/human in the space of the eschatia.

This type of engagement with children and students—this exopedagogy of the eschatia—is extremely helpful in two ways. First, understanding instrumentalized imagination versus phantastical imagination can be a difficult and tricky task. Second, it shows that we do not necessarily need to find immediate access to phantasy, and if it does not come, we cannot assume we have failed. On the contrary, we can see how first understanding and moving away from the desublimated forms of imagination, finding sublimated forms of imagination and pleasure, can introduce the dialectic. This is hopeful because we see some of the first educational practices that will yield an exopedagogy of phantastical imagination.

This brings us to the final criteria we are considering: that of playing with the pleasure of freedom in the context of education. As I just stated, resurrecting the sublimated form of imagination reintroduces the fertile space of the dialectic and will "help us to think in ways that move beyond schooling to the larger domain of education, where there are and must be all kinds of openings to possibility" (Greene, 1995, p. 5). The space itself can be used to reconceptualize education and learning; it suggests a *playing with* education, even for teachers. Greene writes:

> Imagination is as important in the lives of teachers as it is in the lives of their students, in part because teachers incapable of thinking imaginatively or of releasing students to encounter works of literature and other forms of art are probably also unable to communicate to the young what the use of imagination signifies. If it is the case that imagination feeds one's capacity to feel one's way into another's vantage point, these teachers may also lacking in empathy. (1995, p. 37)

This introduces a parallel dialectic that can be used to navigate this space more readily, since there will be subjects in the classroom community that represent both extremes. The dialectic of phantasy and imagination in some ways is analogous and parallel to that of children/students and teacher. Reconfiguring the power dynamic and the degrees of freedom experienced by all members can reintroduce a space of the dialectic in the classroom where phantasy may be found. However, as I have previously stated, there may be a risk with Greene equating imagination with a moral imagination. For our purposes, her model can be used to go beyond the space empathy and into that of utopia. But the potential of the space cannot be denied as a space of resistance: "Art offers life; it offers hope; it offers the prospect of discovery it offers light. Resisting, we may make the teaching of the aesthetic experience our pedagogic creed" (Greene, 1995, p. 133). Art, as a source of the dialectic experience, offers insight into play as resistance, alternative realities as pretend, and new subjectivities as role-play.

Kieran Egan

The next theorist I turn to is Kieran Egan. Since it has an entire section devoted to the preliterate and developing-literacy mind and can be directly applied to elementary

education, I will concentrate on Egan's text *An Imaginative Approach to Teaching* (2005). However, Egan's *The Educated Mind: How Cognitive Tools Shape Our Understanding* (1997) is also worthy of note in that it equally relates to imagination and phantasy. This latter book speaks directly to the contradictions that arise because of competing ideologies that are present in schools. These contradictions can be understood in the argument I have made so far between the instrumental imagination being written into educational policy and guiding educational pedagogy and practice, and the phantastic imagination, which has always been misunderstood and is censored without appreciated what is being given up. However, for Egan, this tension between ideologies is not always productive, and we must be mindful of using his ideas directly for our purposes.

Egan does not say anything directly about the relation between receptivity and creativity that I have been developing. However, an intriguing upshot to this is that, in order to perceive any tension at all, the concepts of (in this case) imagination and phantasy must first be linguistically (conceptually) divided. Without such division, we have a unified whole and, thus, we may not even perceive the whole as a dialectical synthesis. Egan describes this phenomenon as the development of understanding:

> We first have to divide things into opposites in order to get an initial grasp on them; so we easily divide the world into good/bad, high/low, earth/sky, hot/cold, courage/cowardice, and so endlessly on. Holding onto such opposites instead of recognizing the complexity of the world can create problems. But we're unable to avoid using these forms, so we had better learn how best to use and control this further important cognitive tool that comes along with oral language. (2005, p. 16)

It is important to take note of how he follows up the necessity of making distinctions at this stage. Maintaining such distinction can be dangerous and create problems rather than

deepen one's understanding of complexity. The role of the dialectic is to intervene and make contradictions understandable and productive. The tension that emerges is that which we are looking for between imagination and phantasy—creativity and receptivity. This space is the eschatia, the dimension of the Eleusinian mysteries, the place where the phantastic is real—the place of exopedagogy as a pedagogy beyond the performance principle.

Egan mentions a great deal about the concept of mystery or wonder in the elementary education classroom. These descriptions contain similarities to some of ideas that were presented in the first chapter. Mystery is not to be brushed aside or avoided because of its trivial nature. For Egan, mystery is a tool for understanding:

> I think we can see ways in which a sense of the mystery of things is an important component in the growth of understanding. It is a tool that allows us to recognize that whatever we learn is at best only a tiny fragment of what is to be known. The sense of mystery makes this realization not disabling or depressing but exciting and enticing—drawing the student toward the vast riches of understanding that remain available. So I don't simply want to dismiss that sensational aspect of mystery as it might appear also in the headlines of such publications as the *National Enquirer*, but rather to work out how it may be turned to educational purposes. (Egan, 2005, pp. 32-33)

It is in the above section that we begin to see the glimmer of phantasy emerging in Egan's theories; the grasping of the mystery is, underneath all epistemic knowledge, a sensual experience, an experience of the possibility of phantasy. For this reason, engaging with the concept and experience of mystery is an excellent precursor for phantasy since it touches something beyond the intelligible precisely because the knowledge surrounding mysteries is often incomplete, surprising, and beyond immediate

rational explanation. In this way mystery guides toward the utopian and to the education of phantasy. For Egan:

> Mystery enables the mind increasingly to recognize that the world around us, the world we can see and hear and earn how to behave within, is only the immediate surface under which, or behind which, or beyond which are intellectual riches and experience barely guesses. Mystery is our sense that there is more that we can see and hear and experience in our environment. By opening our minds to this wider, stranger, and less easily accessible world, we create the first tool for its exploration. I suppose poets have best expressed this drive to go beyond the routine. (2005, p. 33)

Playing in the space of mystery is in itself a pedagogical tool, as Egan describes it, because it enables us to gain further access to and explore this dimension of incomplete understanding, where authentic learning can still take place. The last part of the above passage, although somewhat of a throwaway for Egan, is entirely at home with what we have explored thus far. His mention of poetry is profoundly relevant for phantasy given our trajectory from the Homeric epic poems and Eleusinian rituals of Chapter 1, through the censorship of poetry in Plato and the return of lyrical poetry in Nietzsche, and finally to education and our attempting to assemble a pedagogy of phantastical imagination through a dialectical curriculum. It seems poetry can be a useful tool in the classroom to introduce mysteries and ideas and understanding that "go beyond the routine." Egan argues how in the imaginative classroom, "we will expect to see much greater emphasis on mysteries. These can indeed involve the more sensational kinds trumpeted by popular papers, but should also move constantly in the direction of the deeper mysteries beyond our range of knowledge" (Egan, 2005, p. 34). Engaging students in this process of mystery will not only introduce them to ideas that are beyond our realm of understanding, but also protect against situating oneself within a fixed dichotomy and refusing to engage

the complexity of the dialectic. Mystery commands a moving into the dialectic since dichotomies cannot always offer clarity and often reduces mystery to an either-or binary.

In a similar thread as poetry, Egan mentions the concept of myth as well, which can be understood best through my third category of finding new reality principles and locating alternatives. He makes this connection by referencing the need to record ideas (history):

> [Because] of the importance in oral culture of preserving information in the memory, all cognitive tools were bent to support this socially vital activity. So we find myths, for example, full of vivid and bizarre images. As has been evident for a long time, the more exotic, surprising or strange the image that we form, the more memorable.
> (Egan, 2005, p. 26).

However, as I have argued throughout, it was not just that these myths were memorable and were full of vivid and bizarre imagery. They were alternative forms of knowledge that came from the periphery, from the eschatia, where phantasy has relevance and truth-value. It is important that we make this distinction because Egan points out the flaws in partaking of myths to a certain extent at both the individual and cultural level. For this reason, and with phantasy as our beacon, we must be especially sensitive to the myths we introduce and the interpretation of these myths. Here we can recall the rituals of the Eleusinian mysteries, which used the Myth of Demeter and Persephone to facilitate a phantastic experience of the mystery of mortality that took place in a very literal sense on the eschatia of the polis where the gods were manifest. Without such specifically designed myths and dialectical interpretation, using such stories will not mediate phantasy. Egan warns:

> The archetypal hero in the Western tradition has been a male, power-oriented doer of usually violent deeds. What characterizes the hero is an unusual degree of what I am calling great human qualities. Our stock of heroes provides a wide range of qualities with which we can associate. The hero can embody unusual degrees of such qualities as sanctity, compassion, selflessness, elegance, wit, ingenuity, patience, or whatever, equally as well as testeronic violence. (2005, p. 88)

The dialectic of these myths is lost when their interpretations are not situated in a productive tension but rather, as I argued in the first section, situated within a dichotomy. In the final chapter I will discuss and employ the concepts of myth and interpretation, honoring the promise of the Eleusinian mysteries, in an effort to better uncover the human traits that can mediate phantasy and consciousness.

Drawing on Egan but also Greene and Dewey, what I am advocating for is a *playing with* myth. Playing with myth is an attempt to make the dialectic manifest (in a similar ways as the gods in Eleusis). Play is a "tool that develops that meta-level of thinking; it helps us to think about the world in a way freed from the constraints that the world's normal forms, behavior, and everyday purposes impose on us" (Egan, 2005, p. 31). Through play, we find an open receptivity to phantasy as well as the creativity needed to communicate such phantasy to others. In this sense, play contains some hope to make the dialectic of phantastical imagination visible as well as a material force for unveiling the performance-principle for what it is. Without the dimension of play in the interpretation of myth specifically and the interpretation of freedom and pleasure more generally, learning becomes nothing more than mere "character education" in the least dialectical way possible. In fact, Egan illustrates that

> Play provides a great experimental situation in which children explore the rules of their society and culture. Electronic 'play,' which is working hard (to some

> people's profit) to disrupt this immensely valuable negotiated play among children, has been described as 'fast food for the imagination.' Overindulged—which doesn't take much—it has similar effects on the arteries of the imagination. (2005, pp. 31-32)

This last remark is important as I transition to the final theorist, Ken Robinson, who in many ways, supports the argument for an instrumental imagination and is associated with both 21st century skills and STEM discourses. To call into question electronic play, connecting it to the logic of the market at the expense of authentic or creative play, is to call into questions such entities which are directly associated with such technologies such as schools. If we apply this inference to 21st century skills and STEM discourses, then such policies and practices will have little to no effect inciting a phantastic imagination. In the end, STEM and 21st century skills serve to further desublimate the imagination, making it useless for purposes of producing and highly useful for political and economic purposes of sustainability; no change, no innovation, no alternatives offered because phantasy has not been invited. It is doubtful that phantasy would emerge in the first place without a space where the dialectic can come into play thus igniting a productive tension between phantasy and imagination.

Ken Robinson

Because Ken Robinson is so thoroughly identified with the instrumental imagination, I will focus on his ideas that are taken as reinforcing the economic and employment paradigms in education. As with my readings of Dewey, Greene, and Egan, I will read Robinson carefully in order to find moments wherein the phantastical emerges.

In these moments, I find an opening that will allow me to creatively appropriate Robinson for my own project.

Nowhere does Robinson directly address the need to mediate receptivity and creativity. Instead we have to do some digging and make some associations in order to uncover what he has to say about this dialectic. First, I want to remind readers what I mentioned in Chapter 5: Marcuse describes a distinction between instinctual and conscious pleasure which can be understood as the distinction between sublimated pleasure and desublimated pleasure. Keeping this in mind, Robinson describes how

> [There] is a common-sense distinction between mind and consciousness. In one sense, consciousness is what you lose when you go to sleep and regain when you wake up. It is a state of being awake and aware of your surroundings. But consciousness has a second meaning, that of understanding. It is in this sense that we talk of raising consciousness of an issue. The mind is what is being conscious. Babies are born with a brain. They develop a mind as they grow, absorb and reflect on their experiences. (Robinson, 2001, p. 99)

Using what I just said about Marcuse, we can see how Robinson is firmly situated in the instrumental imagination. With his equating of consciousness with understanding, he falls victim to the imagination exploited for the performance-principle and cannot see what is lacking because such a desublimated imagination denies the dialectic and the possibility for creating the new. He denies the possibility that understanding can come from an unconscious realm of sensory embodiment and instinctual pleasures. In this sense phantasy is beyond Robinson's conception of mind, which has parallels with Platonic censorship. Furthermore, Robinson adds, "creativity is not just a matter of letting go: it involves hanging on. What you have to hang on to critically affects the quality of the results" (2001, p. 113). This fits with what I mentioned about Dewey in the

creation of the work of art, but it does not recognize the inner vision that may have initially come from "letting go." It seems, in Robinson's insistence on creativity, that phantasy or receptivity is not even felt at the level of a loss. It has been erased and buried so thoroughly it is nearly impervious to being stirred. That is a hallmark of the desublimated imagination. As argued in the introduction, we find ourselves in a current situation where imagination can be used to fix any current economic, social, or political problem. Such vague indeterminacy comes directly from desublimation and the severing of creativity from any relation to receptivity to phantastical otherness. In this sense, Robinson can be read as the apex of dichotomous thinking rather than dialectical transformation.

However, although this desublimated and therefore conscious imagination is central in his writing, Robinson does introduce the dialectic to a certain degree in his lectures, where he articulates dimensions of the imagination beyond creativity, ways that understanding is achieved beyond the intellect or intelligible world. It is in this tension where we find some of the dialectic in Robinson, but we must once again do theoretical work to tease out how this process works. We see the first traces of this dialectic when he describes how college professors or scholars are disembodied because they are so isolated in the realm of the intellect. The intellect is not transcendent in the way that phantasy is. On the contrary, it is disembodied both from the sensuality of the body and from the instinctual pleasure of the body, even in their sublimated forms. Although he is critiquing what can be understood clearly through *The Republic*, Robinson remains fixed in the intelligible world but seeks to reintroduce the sensual experiences of the body into

understanding. In sum, his model seems to embrace the desublimated imagination, but it does leave some space for a sublimated imagination where receptivity and creativity are in dialectical tension.

This dialectic is further reinforced in Robinson's definition of creativity, which, to a great extent, has much to contribute to our search for new reality principles and alternative realities with antagonizing truth-value. First and foremost, he recognizes and advocates for the diversity found within creativity. Robinson goes into detail on misconceptions about creativity:

> Creativity is not a separate faculty that some people have and others do not. It is a function of intelligence: it takes many forms, it draws from many different capacities and we all have different creative capabilities. Creativity is possible in any activity in which human intelligence in actively engaged. The distinctive feature of human intelligence is imagination and the power of symbolic thought. Our lives are shaped by the ideas we have and beliefs we hold. New ways of thinking can transform us. (2001, p. 111)

Just as important as diversity (which is to be celebrated and understood as a tool to work against the performance-principle by bringing in alternatives) is creativity, which plays a central role in transforming our thinking, our subjectivity, and the world around us. This can be an active process and does not necessarily benefit from the entirely passive nature of phantasy, but instead benefits from the dialectical tension itself that serves to sublimate higher and higher forms of gratification. Phantasy alone does not transform the world; it takes imagination and artistic practice to execute a transformation. Conversely, imagination offers possibilities, but not necessarily new possibilities, since it lacks the dimension of phantasy that is hospitable to the new. It seems Robinson himself may be advocating for such a dialectic even if he is not articulating it directly or being interpreted

and applied in education in this way. Robinson (2001) devises a three-part definition of creativity: "imaginative processes with outcomes in the public world (p. 115), imaginative processes that produce outcomes that are original (p. 116), and imaginative processes with outcomes that are original and of value (p. 118)." (2001). The first criteria emphasizes that imagination transcends the mere intellect and becomes a material expression in the world to communicate understanding. Second, the products must be original. This is the most significant for us since this is the space of phantasy, which receives ideas and experiences from beyond our intentionally guided, intellectual projects. Remember Nietzsche's description of imagination devoid of the poetic Dionysian impulse: Culture is destined to exhaust its artistic resources until it resorts to reproducing and pillaging from other cultures in order to create the illusion that something new has been achieved. For this reason, creativity, at least for Robinson, includes a subtle nod toward phantasy, even if it does so without knowing why or how.

In this space of originality, we find Robinson advocating, as each theorist thus far has argued for, the educational value of play. Robinson defends this showing:

> [As] Carl Jung puts it, the creation of something new is not accomplished by the intellect alone but by the play instinct. The creative mind plays with the objects it loves. Creative activity involves playing with ideas and trying out possibilities. But creative achievement does not always require freedom from constraints or a blank page. […] The creative achievement and the aesthetic pleasure lie in using standard forms to achieve unique effects and original insights" (2001, p. 133).

He clearly understands the disciplined aspect of imagination and creativity that must be put to both serve and temper phantasy. Robinson adds:

> [Creativity] is not only a process of generating ideas. It involves making judgements [sic] about them. I said earlier that creativity is not just a matter being original, but of producing outcomes that are of value. Other people may come to

> their own views about the worth of a new work or idea. But the person creating is also making judgements [sic] as an integral part of the process of creation. In any creative process there are likely to be dead ends: ideas and designs that do not work. Evaluating which ideas do work and which don't involves judgement [sic] and critical thinking. Understanding this is an important foundation for creative development. (2001, pp. 133-134)

This clearly captures the imagination's role in its dialectical relationship to phantasy. The final aspect of his definition is that these outcomes have value in the public world. This value is quite ambiguous but can be understood in the context of practicality. For Robinson, this concerns mostly the utility of such products; for Greene, art objects are designed to increase empathy. What I want to emphasize, drawing on Nietzsche as well as Marcuse, is that "utility" cannot be predefined by status quo definitions of what counts. Rather, the phantastical imagination has the ability to introduce *new values* or a *transvaluation of all values*. In this sense, its "utility" must be "original" in a much more radical sense than Robinson describes. Without recognizing the ability of phantasy to introduce new values into the world of the performance-principle, then the call for utility all too easily results in mere instrumentalization of imagination in the name of current standards. Thus, at a crucial moment in Robinson's argument, his lack of understanding of phantasy results in a kind of watered-down pragmatism.

The last ideas of Robinson I want to address pinpoint the dialectic that I think illustrates that his work could very much be understood in a critical lineage, but has been appropriated by 21st century skills and STEM discourses. He does recognize cultural and economic forces as opposing creativity. Robinson does an excellent job of summarizing the crisis:

> There is a crisis of creativity, a war for talent, which is as acute as in Europe and in other parts of the world. In 1996 a national symposium was held in the United States entitled *American Creativity at Risk*. The symposium brought together artists, scientists, and others to discuss the conditions under which the creative resources of the United States could be best realized. The symposium was set against a mounting concern in many areas of education, the economy and the professions that national policies were deepening the crisis. […] The symposium concluded that universities and school programmes [sic] are now being run more like businesses, with an attention to the bottom line that is often detrimental to the quality of education they provide. (2001, p. 195)

These same business-oriented educational models seek now to include creativity in the name of STEM and global economic competitiveness. Robinson goes a step further than identifying the crisis of imagination and creativity at the educational level by directly attributing the overall cultural misunderstanding and crisis of creativity to the way it is framed/repressed in schools. This is most evident in the many lectures he gives globally, but here I draw from a TED talk he gave titled "How Schools Kill Creativity." In this lecture, Robinson recounts a story of a kinetic learner misdiagnosed with a learning disorder. Miraculously, the doctor, whom the mother was advised to see, declared that her child was not sick, and upon turning on a radio and watching her move unconsciously and naturally, proclaimed, "She's a dancer." Robinson uses this story to describe what schools do and continue to do to each student's individual creativity. However, this story illustrates a deeper, more phantastic dimension to imagination and creativity: that this child cannot sit still, that she needs to move to think, that to understand something she must experience it in a sensual way, a way that can be interpreted and communicated through movement. This introduces the space of phantasy, a dimension where knowledge is gained beyond intellectual control or intentionality and where the body is "possessed" by powers that move it. Rather than saying that the girl moves to dance, we

might say that dance moved the girl! *This* is the inspirational dimension of phantasy that more or less instrumentalized models of imagination miss. What is mistaken as a learning deficit to be corrected is actually the girl's intuitive receptivity and hospitality toward the mystery of rhythm, which she then creatively embodies and shares with the world through dance. In this sense, the girl is *playing with* dance, and thus embodying the truly transformative possibilities of phantastic imagination—possibilities that can transform the teaching and learning process.

Conclusion: Achievements and Limitations of the Study

This dialectic analysis began in the ancient past, at a time when phantasy and imagination had not yet been dichotomized and separated. Any tension between the two was nurtured and respected accordingly, but never removed or denied entirely. The conception of the eschatia is helpful in finding those liminal spaces in education where phantasy can be reclaimed. If the eschatia were housed in myth and located on the fringes of civilized culture then, where might we still find it now? And what myths will be able to give it a phantastic shape for our post-industrial, technologic minds? I hope to have laid the philosophical groundwork for a theory of the phantastical imagination that will aid in answering these pressing questions.

The analysis then led directly into Plato and the moment where we find the pedagogical dichotomizing of phantasy and imagination. This inception was not merely educational, but, with assigning hierarchies, it was the herald of new power relationships

that supplanted the old tension with a new authority. The censorship that Plato describes in *The Republic* is similar to the pigeonholing of imagination we find in policy documents that limit its use to "innovation." In this way, phantasy is denied liminal possibility, except in the isolated intellectual realm of the Forms, which precludes alternative phantastic experiences. The urgency of our current crisis can be felt in the loss of phantasy from the ancient Greece to a more classical Greece.

This loss is one that Nietzsche directly and, almost too wholeheartedly, tried to disrupt and overturn. Reawakening the long dormant sprit of Dionysus was, for Nietzsche, a way to balance the Apollonian and Promethean natures of humanity. However, perhaps because these forces were so long repressed, he lacked the ability to fully return from forces in the Eleusinian sense; after all, how could he, despite his constant warnings that too much phantasy was a bad thing? This is central to the dialectic that we find between Plato and Nietzsche. That, despite a certain value placed upon the antithesis—phantasy in Plato's case, and the Apollonian for Nietzsche—each loses sight of the productive tension between the two and disturbs an equality that can be achieved, instead devolving into a submission of one kind or another. For Plato imagination overtakes phantasy, resulting in the entropy of civilization Freud described, while for Nietzsche phantasy overwhelmed imagination, and with it the fully conscious or civilized subject. Important here is Nietzsche's eventual return in his later writings, which implies, to a certain degree, a desubjectification as a necessary stage, a rite of passage into a realm where phantasy is possible.

Finally the dialectic tension is reclaimed in Marcuse's *Eros and Civilization*. Marcuse shows the way back into the dialectic space, the liminal space of the eschatia, without suffering the implosion that Plato and Nietzsche experienced. For educators, this represents a vital category to offset the "training" of the imagination, and a chance to interrupt wrote educational processes by calling for an "inviting" of phantasy. Maintaining a focus on how these experiences connect to pleasure on the instinctual sense, further research will be well served by delving deeper into Freud and other psychological theory which can seek to counter economic drives beyond philosophical arguments.

The last chapter on educational philosophy and theory was meant to illustrate the way phantasy can be discovered in educational theory, curriculum, and practice. The tension has been wrestled with in education and philosophy throughout history, and how the tension was either overcome or nurtured will be beneficial for educators who seek to reclaim the dynamic tension experienced in the ancient past. In this chapter, I hope to have provided a new and innovative interpretation of authors such as Dewey and Greene in relation to the question of phantasy, demonstrating the usefulness of the category for discovering new possibilities within this literature for interrupting current trends toward instrumentalized imagination.

Although I have established a viable philosophical groundwork for phantastical imagination, there are distinct limitations to the current study. First, there is the dialectical method itself. As with Hegel's dialectical system, there is a tendency with this philosophical methodology to overly simplify and streamline rather dispersed intellectual

and social phenomena. This might very well be the case with my own analysis of phantasy and imagination. The next logical move, as the data set expands with additional texts—historical and contemporary, philosophical and beyond, is to set up the research as a genealogy. As opposed to the dialectic, a genealogical approach is more decentered, diffuse, and multidimensional, expanding outward. In framing the dialectic of the phantastical imagination, I removed parts of the analysis I had begun with Kant, Freud, Jung, the Romantics, and even other Nietzsche texts. Expanding the dialectic with other researchers will help to give more shape to the multiple ways imagination has been treated throughout history and can more fully inform our current situation. Other contemporary theorists to bring into the analysis include Foucault and Jameson, both of whom either reject the dialectic or seek to pluralize its meaning beyond even Marcuse.

There are also practical limitations with much of what has been discussed in terms of the use of time and space in the classroom. In the world of "accountability," taking the time to invite phantasy might be seen as frivolous and dangerous to one's job security. Beyond not fitting with current schooling practices, it will likely be feared because of its potential to disrupt, in the same way Plato sought to censor such possibilities. A further analysis of education would be helpful here to clearly illustrate that these ideas are not entirely new, have at times been embedded in public education, and can be useful to resolve some of the concerns the crisis has raised in the first place. Specifically, a deep review of Dewey's writings on aesthetics and education would be helpful, as there already exists a small body of secondary literature on Dewey and Eros (Garrison, 2010). But also looking at historical manifestations in teachers' practices in classrooms

(including alternative educational models) would also concretize phantastic imagination in ways that this dissertation has failed to do thus far. By illustrating that these concepts are by no means vanguard, and indeed have been utilized in actual practices, we may soften the blow of such potentially oppositional theory.

This last comment moves us into the question of specific practices that would be helpful for a hospitality of phantasy and which can be adapted to educational practices. Namely, two terms that Marcuse singles out in his list of mental processes partaking of phantasy and residing between conscious and unconscious thought: day-dreaming and play. These two terms open up other research possibilities and also give a sense of how difficult it is to do research on a concept that has no clear contemporary articulation. By using day-dreaming and play, we find new theorists to include in the analysis. Play itself has received a great deal of attention historically in philosophy, psychology, and education (Bateson, 2006; Bruner, Jolly & Sylva, 1976; Piaget, 1999; Vygotsky, 1967; Ward, 1966; Winnicott, 2005), but also more recently in elementary and early-childhood settings and as a direct result of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) policies, standardized testing, and media exposure (Ginsburg, 2007; Linn, 2004, 2008). This research will not only give new evidence and insight into phantasy, but it also can provide a glimpse as to how such concepts are treated in education currently.

In terms of daydreaming, there exists an interesting body of research that spans from clinical psychology studies to content-specific educational practice (Baker, 2006; Balinisteanu, 2008;; Boske, 2011; Fettes, 2011; Freud, 2003; Gold & Cundiff, 1980a, 1980b; Haldrman, Zelhart & Jackson, 1985; Leafgren, 2011; Smith & Mathur, 2009;

Teague & Gold, 1981; Trotman, 2006; Wiebe & Snowber, 2011; Wood & Latham, 2011). However, another reason for conducting a more thorough review through education would be to find instances that suggest not only tools for educational practices, but also ways that research is trying to instrumentalize such phantastic dimensions. The effort of some research does suggest that daydreaming could possibly be exploited and even desublimated for economic purposes (Gold & Cundiff, 1980a, 1980b; Teague & Gold, 1981). Indicative of this are the titles of some of these studies. A set of studies published by Stephen Gold and other researchers share similar themes of a conscious-awareness of daydream content or daydream occurrences: *Increasing Attention to Daydreaming by Self-Monitoring* (1981), *Increasing Frequency of Daydreaming* (1980), and *A Procedure for Increasing Self-Reported Daydreaming* (1980). In terms of the depth of phantasy, however, daydreaming is perhaps not as dramatic or overwhelming as the Eleusinian mysteries. The loss of self or desubjectification is not as complete or total in daydreaming. It might also be that these studies do not touch upon the phantastic dimension of some of these mental processes and thus would benefit from my philosophical groundwork on phantastical imagination.

A final note is that this research opens up the possibility to explore the nature of myth as it relates to phantasy, culture, education, and technology. I began in the first chapter by understanding the relationship of myth to the Eleusinian mysteries and how precisely and elegantly it was woven into such phantastic experiences. We saw a new set of myths take form with Plato, where the Gods were supplanted by the Forms, and the daemonic came to mean a more pure and intellectual from of neosis. These myths are

still at work in education and finding the right myth to reclaim the phantastic, without overturning the dichotomy, will be the work of future research along these lines. New myths and new interpretations of myth can help to inform the teaching and learning process in ways that are more hospitable to phantasy, and remove the hostility that the Promethean veil encourages. On this final note, I offer a brief afterward to this study that moves us from scholarly and philosophical dialectics toward the unveiling of a new educational myth for our times.

Epilogue: The Return of Myth

> If no other knowledge deserves to be called useful but that which helps to enlarge our possessions or to raise our station in society, then Mythology has no claim to the appellation. But if that which tends to make us happier and better can be called useful, then we claim that epithet for our subject. For Mythology is the handmaid of literature; and literature is one of the best allies of virtue and promoters of happiness. (Bulfinch, 1982, p. v)

In summation, this dissertation has accomplished three tasks. First, the introduction and subsequent chapters clearly trace the current paradoxes and aporias in contemporary educational policy related to imagination. The force of imagination that is championed in current policy is actually cut off at the heels precisely because of the abandonment of phantasy. The result is an instrumentalized, vague, and contradictory imagination incapable of the transformations that it is called upon to enact. The next chapters built an historical map of the philosophical dialectic that helps resolve these problems by returning to the question of phantasy. The concluding chapters posit educational alternatives and a return to myth based on an emergent theory of phantastical imagination. For Marcuse, "myth is felicitous if and only if it has politically transformative results, helping to conceptualize both the dangerous and the potentially liberatory possibilities within the present—unleashing new, emancipatory needs against the performance-principle and surplus-repression" (Kellner, Pierce, and Lewis, 2011, p. 60). The challenge of this dialectical movement has been to identify and create a theoretically robust model of phantastical imagination and then make this relevant for teachers by applying it to educational research and theory. In this way, a Pedagogy of Phantastical Imagination might at least expose the conservative underpinnings of much of

the current market-driven rhetoric steering the educational policies that appropriate a notion of imagination circumscribed by economic utility and instrumentality.

As I prepared for this conclusion, I began by outlining first a conclusion that offered practical and readily applicable strategies, one that would focus on classroom environment and teaching, curriculum, psychology, and education to nurture a space that would facilitate the rekindling of phantasy. The second outline followed a starkly diverging structure: one that followed a mythic/poetic pattern of interpretation in order to recapture the instinctual pleasure to be found in the interplay of aesthetics, phantasy, and education. Since I have covered the educational implications of phantasy in the preceding chapter, it seemed dialectically appropriate to switch domains and enter the real of myth in the context of phantasy. In the same way that the Apollonian eventually became a hollow shell of deeper human meaning beyond culture, so too does psychology only seem to allow for probing, defining, and perhaps informing education. However, it seems to me, as it has always been, that mythology will still play a role in the experience of phantasy, in locating and accessing the spaces of liminality where human dimensions play with nonhuman dimensions. In this way, the dissertation itself dialectically transforms from critical, to utopian reconstruction, to phantastical myth as the final threshold of phantastical imagination.

In tracing Marcuse's method, myth, "in a another set of dialectical reversals…contains the potential imaginative resources for a further dialectical overcoming of these destructive potentials [of the enlightenment's domination of nature], hence his insistence on rehabilitating Narcissus as well as Orpheus" (Kellner, Pierce, and

Lewis, 2011, p. 60). In contrast to reason and the performance principle, "Marcuse importantly articulates the complimentary second half of this rehabilitation process; saving myth from the jaws of rational instrumentality […] it is through myth that history can be adequately felt and, dialectically, it is only through history that mythology can be written as the sublimation of critical reason via the imagination" (Kellner, Pierce, and Lewis, 2011, p. 61). Mythology as critical reason can also describe the Demeter myth I explored in the context of the Eleusinian mysteries.

The Mysteries, The Cave, and Phantasy

There is a stunning triangulated tension between the ideas I have proposed about phantasy and imagination, the mythic hymn of Demeter who journeys into the underworld to bring back into reality her daughter, and lastly Plato's "Allegory of the Cave." In this instance, my dissertation research dialectically transforms into yet another retelling of such myths, and conversely, these myths emerge as a kind of educational research into the transformative powers of phantastic imagination. Demeter's hymn represents the phantastic forces that take us away from ourselves, into dark spaces, the space of the eschatia, in a space where the risk is great enough for Plato to censor since it is firmly antagonistic to the polis. The journey offers an exopedagogy beyond the self and its limited conceptualization of what counts or what is possible in the world. The journey from the cave represents the journey away from such false knowledge claims that originate in the ill-defined space of the eschatia. Plato recognizes no value that can be

ascertained from the darkness. Leaving the cave implies a full acceptance of the civilizing forces of the polis. This dialectic tension is analogous to the movement of receptive and creative impulses. Plato feared both the extreme freedom and erotic pleasure that is represented in phantasy. In the same way that I subverted Plato's Line analogy, we can make a similar move with a subversive retelling of "The Allegory of the Cave." The cave itself, as analogous to the underworld or eschatia, is actually the home of phantasy, and by leaving the cave, one leaves open education by and through the polis but loses any connections to the Dionysian. In fact, the cave dweller returns, to the detriment of him/herself, not to re-experience phantasy, but to save all the prisoners from their delusory worldview. Plato's story so thoroughly removed phantasy from the intelligible world that he does not see the illusory, Apollonian nature of his own world-view, his established reality principle. The allegory of the cave is the illusion of the illusion of the sensible and intelligible world, and we need a phantastic retelling of the cave that reveals it as a fiction (not a truth of Forms). There are parallels here between the Cave, Persephone's kidnapping to Hades, and Demeter's journey: All employed in myth in order to give hope to the cycle of death and rebirth. It is in the cave, in the space of the eschatia—which Plato feared and rejected—where "whoever entered the liminal state could never be sure within which category he or she would end up" (Endsjo, 2000, p. 374). But most important, the real space of the eschatia is not simply the cave but the liminal space of wandering around after one has been freed from the chains bounding one to pure phantastical play of images cast upon the wall. What I want to emphasize is the freedom to play with possibilities that emerges in the transformational zone of

indistinction between worlds. This is a space of pain and shadows for Plato, but it could also be seen as a space where phantasy and imagination meet. Only with this transformation, which comes from playing with the cave, could one re-emerge from the cave with an entirely transformed subjectivity—transformed by an impulse Plato sought to curtail.

Revisiting the definition of fantasy in the *Concise Encyclopedia of Psychology*, we find that "in its *primary* form a fantasy appears spontaneously from the unconscious to the receptive subject" (Wick, 1996, p. 342). And in this, the sense of the unreal is often not present while the fantasy unfolds: "Normally, in retrospective analysis, the nonreality status is readily assigned to a fantasy. Fantasies can be absorbing, rendering the fantasizing individual incapable of adequately attending to the demands of the environment" (Wick, 1996, p. 342). This implies that the Promethean ethos is in itself the most successful collective fantasy since it is what gives credence to the sciences and the destruction of nature, and allows us to remain ignorant to attending to the demands of nature. In the face of the irrationality of the Promethean, we deny, as we have inherited from Plato, the truth-value of the irrational, even if in this case, society is shot through with irrational rationality. However, the Prometheus myth stopped being a phantasy when it became an ethos, when it became institutionalized and embedded into a cultural practice: "If a fantasy is assigned a reality status, it stops being a fantasy and by definition enters the pathological realm, as is the case of delusions, hallucinations, pseudologia fantasia, and paranoia" (Wick, 1996, p. 342). In this way the Promethean ethos, without a dialectical mythological reversal, is nothing more than a collective

delusion that civilization has pulled over its own eyes. But the purpose of phantasy is not to cover our eyes from the truth we have created ourselves—rather, it is to find a way to transform such delusions. Phantasy may have a hand to play in finding a new reality principle and assigning it a reality status.

Myth and Education

In order to best position myth in education, it is first helpful to revisit the justification for doing so. As we have connected phantasy with the utopian forces of artistic creation and the Dionysian impulse, understanding how Marcuse envisions the transformation of culture will help guide the placement of myth in education. Marcuse reminds us that the "realization of a 'better future' involves far more than the elimination of the bad features of the 'market,' of the 'ruthlessness' of competition, and so on; it involves a fundamental change in the instinctual as well as cultural structure" (1955, pp. 272-273). For this reason, myth is poised for education because it can stir the instincts in their sublimated forms of pleasure (not the desublimated forms of pleasure that have been removed from instinctual pleasure). For Nietzsche:

> A philosophy of wild, naked nature looks with the bold countenance of truth upon the fitting myths of the Homeric world: they pale and tremble before the lightning eyes of this goddess, until the mighty fist of the Dionysiac artist forces them into the service of a new divinity. The Dionysiac truth appropriates the entire realm of myth as symbolic language for its own insights, which it expresses partly in the public rite of tragedy and partly in the secret celebrations of dramatic mysteries, but always under the old mythic veil. (1956, p. 68)

The force of the Dionysian impulse can be given shape through myth. Without myth, it remains nothing more than an abstract inner vision lacking the concrete manifestation that myth allows for. Myth shows us what has been concealed from us by reuniting us with those lost dimensions that civilization places behind the veil. Education can reclaim and appropriate myth as a tool, making visible the veil: "It is in the power of ritual viewing and ritual framing that allows the initiates to *see* beyond their (certainly beyond our) culturally imposed identifications and restrictions" (Petridou, 2013, p. 327). That is, it was just as much in the preparation for the experience as the actual unveiling of the experience itself that drove both the loss of individual and collective subjectivity. This is central to myth at the instinctual level because it moves beyond the reinforcing of individual pleasure and freedom and moves into a space where freedom and pleasure can be reinterpreted beyond the subjectivity of the current reality principle. Myth can provide an avenue for freedom. This freedom allegorized in myth must be interpreted at the instinctual rather than conscious level. In identifying relevant myths for use and critique, Marcuse proposes:

> We look for the 'cultural-heroes' who have persisted in imagination as symbolizing the attitude and the deeds that have determined the fate of mankind. And here at the outset we are confronted with the fact that the predominant culture-hero is the trickster and (suffering) rebel against the gods, who creates culture at the price of perpetual pain. He symbolizes productiveness, the unceasing effort to master life; but in his productivity, blessing and curse, progress and toil and inextricably intertwined. Prometheus is the archetype-hero of the performance principle. And in the world of Prometheus, Pandora, the female principle, sexuality, and pleasure, appear as curse—disruptive, destructive. (1955, p. 161)

If Prometheus can be seen to represent the freedom and pleasure in the reality principle, bent for our purposes around creativity, "then the symbols of another reality principle

must be sought at the opposite pole" (Marcuse, 1955, p. 161). It is in revisiting the Pandora myth that we may find the exact sensibility we seek: that of phantasy, or at the very least a space where the dialectic of phantasy and imagination can be accessed.

Before beginning our analysis of the Pandora myth in light of freedom and pleasure, it is important to recognize that such an interpretation has been attempted before in Ivan Illich's essay "Rebirth of Epimethean Man," found in *Deschooling Society* (1970). While this analysis gets us started on reinterpreting the Pandora myth for education and imagination, I am critical of Illich's analysis, which misses a prime opportunity to use the partnership between Epimetheus and Pandora to represent the dialectic and to show how the characters, as the embodiments of phantasy and imagination, provide the dynamic tension we seek.

Pandora, Epimetheus, and Phantasy

The reinterpretation of the Pandora myth provides insights into the dialectical space where phantasy and imagination can play together. Epimetheus, in addition to representing a keeper of hope, represents the potential of humanity to overcome dichotomies. Epimetheus, even though he is warned against it, partners and unites with Pandora, coupling Masculine and Feminine energies, Paternal and Maternal forces, Destruction and Creation, in order to generate a sublated tension in the libidinal model beyond fear of opposites, which Promethean fully embraced. This model might not necessarily lead to monogamy—in the sense of marriage as we understand it today—but

rather a metaphorical partnership that represents the union of opposites, thus eliminating the binary structure of sexuality that reproduces gender relations. Instead, it accepts a diversity of relationships. This union provides a model beyond domination, manipulation, guilt, and power associated with repressive sexual gender relations. In this sense the conceptual/sensual partnering with diversity, with the Other, with the very antagonistic forces that shape us, helps to overcome binaries.

The Pandora myth can be seen as an allegory for fertility and creation, birth and life, with the jar representing the earthly womb and the female as the source of mortal despair. Hope remains in the jar to be nurtured, collectively, so that it can be experienced in a way that reaches beyond the blind hope of imagination/Apollonian, and touches instead the sensual hope of phantasy/Dionysian. For education, this matters at both the individual level, beyond individual consciousness, but also at the cultural level where hope can be understood and experienced as a sublimated form of pleasure, freedom, and flourishing. In this interpretation, Zeus represents all human repression. Prometheus at first seems to represent freedom, but it is a freedom that antagonizes repression and in doing so strengthens repression. This is the cycle of a strengthening of the performance-principle and a weakening of the pleasure-principle to the point where the rational begins to transform into the irrational.

Epimetheus (as the receiver of Pandora) and Pandora (as the impulse of curiosity in mystery) introduce the dialectic to counter the Promethean sensibility to dominate and control through individual force. The strength of the Pandora myth is in the partnering, the union that exists where reception and curiosity nurture hope together, in spite of the

earthly woes that define civilization. This partnership is an allegory for the type of play that I introduced earlier. To restate, as opposed to playing *with,* playing *in* would denote a partnership, perhaps an erotic partnership that can go beyond subject-object relationships and fulfill pleasure at the instinctual level. Here my mythology of educational renewal coincides with recent scholarship on play and freedom (Baker, 2006; Balinisteanu, 2008; Bateson, 2006; Boske, 2011; Fettes, 2011; Gold & Cundiff, 1980a, 1980b; Haldrman, Zelhart & Jackson, 1985; Leafgren, 2011; Smith & Mathur, 2009; Teague & Gold, 1981; Trotman, 2006; Wiebe & Snowber, 2011; Wood & Latham, 2011). Specifically, Rodari's (1996) engagement with the Emilio Reggio schools provides a model of alternative education from Italy that allows for and encourages an active playing *with* and playing *in* freedom and pleasure in the context of education. Learning is a space of theater, story-telling, and play; a space where reconfiguration can begin. This argument stands to include a diversity of alternative educational models, all of which can be understood as increasing the amount of freedom or pleasure available to the students in the context of their education (A.S.Neill, 1995; Holt & Ferenga, 2003; Illich, 1970; Llewellyn, 1998).

There are two interpretations of the hope that remains sealed in Pandora's jar. The first is that, by closing the jar, hope was not able to escape into the world and was kept safe from the world. Pandora and Epimetheus are the keepers of hope, and in this relationship we find the allegorical coupling of curiosity and reception: Reception, because Epimetheus first receives Pandora as a gift from Zeus—a gift that comes from the liminal space of phantasy—and curiosity, because Pandora opens the jar, letting out

all of the earthly woes. Reception and curiosity are at home in the liminal experience of phantasy. The second, more negative reading of the Pandora myth is that hope, since it was sent with all earthly woes in the first place, is to be included in these earthly woes. It may be that since it did not escape, we do not have the blind hope to keep us ignorant from despair. Had hope escaped, we would find ourselves in the predicament of the performance-principle and desublimated pleasure, where we have the conscious sense of being fulfilled and gratified—but there would be a bothersome frustration that lurks beneath at the instinctual level precisely because hope, blind hope, cannot penetrate the dimension of the instincts. In this case, the keepers of hope prevent humanity from falling victim to the Platonic hubris of censoring poetry without realizing the accompanying dangers. Hope, in this sense, becomes Apollonian in that it covers the traumatic truth of existence with stories that everything is going to be "okay." But, as Nietzsche illustrates, without the Dionysian, hope also fades to obscurity, until the Apollonian stands in solitude, wondering what went wrong and why the world has become so intolerable and one-dimensional.

Without myth to give a phantastic quality to the increasingly irrational reality principle, this cycle will be difficult to break. Nietzsche describes with lovely cynicism the nature of individual consciousness in this state:

> Only as an esthetic product can the world be justified to all eternity—although our consciousness of our own significance does scarcely exceed the consciousness a painted soldier might have of the battle in which he takes part. Thus our whole knowledge of art is at bottom illusory, seeing that as mere *knowers* we can never be fused with that essential spirit, at the same time creator and spectator, who has prepared the comedy of art for his own edification. (1956, p. 42)

It seems we must sacrifice the spectator in ourselves to commune with phantasy and to find a level of experience beyond that of the painted soldier. Such a consciousness lacks awareness of the eternal—of the way phantasy dialectically plays with the reality principle. The Dionysian gives sensuality to experience, while the Apollonian gives it cultural form. In giving up tragedy, "the Greeks had given up the belief in immortality: not only the belief in an ideal past, but also the belief in an ideal future" and, in doing so, turned their back on the utopian drive of phantasy (Nietzsche, 1956, p. 72). For Marcuse, phantasy can glimpse the promise of utopia. Although it seems that phantasy, as a product of the unconscious mind, is uncontrollable, it makes one wonder how thoroughly the ancient Greeks were able to sustain the Eleusinian mysteries and maintain what seems, from our historical vantage point, a common experience for all initiates. Could a similar result be achieved in the contemporary era? I do not propose for mythology to take the place of curriculum in the schools. But mythology does give us a space where we may reclaim the dialectic and find a space to reawaken phantasy. In this sense, educational theory could be rethought of as containing two dialectical strands: the Apollonian study of curriculum and its structures, and the Dionysian study of myth and its phantastic power. Curriculum and myth, together, form a dialectical pair in tension with one another—yet this tension could be productive of a new set of values beyond performance.

In conclusion, phantasy is a force of disruption that can emerge in multiple spaces and take on a diversity of forms. Its primary function is to counter the permanence and authenticity of the established reality principle. Phantasy has been wrestled with

throughout history in an effort to subdue its radically transformative and potentially revolutionary impulse. Education can learn from this dialectic disciplining and the ways that phantasy avoided being co-opted. It may be that it continues to avoid such techniques, but it may be in civilization's fully desublimated forms that either phantasy, too, will become impotent, or that there will be even fewer and narrower spaces for it to emerge. The hospitality toward phantasy in education that I have been advocating needs not neglect other forms of learning, imagining, or creating. What needs to be remembered is the nurturing of liminal space where phantasy can emerge to challenge existing beliefs, norms, practices, curricular standards, and the cultivation of time to experiment in these spaces to find new forms of freedom and pleasure. Phantasy is beyond the concept of rational or irrational since its truth value is not judged according to the reality principle or performance-principle. To seek phantasy is to hope for change, disruption, and transformation. This hope can be used in the interpretation of the Pandora myth to identify the two hallmarks of phantasy: receptivity and curiosity (as in wonder in the existential mysteries in the first place). Such perplexity exposes the discontentedness of civilization, moves one out of the content of the desublimated pleasures, and champions being receptive to/curious about transformative, emancipatory tools that can be used in classrooms by (and with) students. It is in this partnership that we honor the allegory of Pandora and seek to reclaim phantasy in a collective space with receptive, curious students.

REFERENCES

Ahn, J., & Filipenko, M. (2007). Narrative, imaginary play, art, and self: Intersecting worlds. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *34*(4), 279-289.

Allam, C. (2008). Creative activity and its impact on student learning - issues of implementation. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International*, *45*(3), 281 288.

Armstrong, T. (1998). *Awakening genius in the classroom.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Audi, R. (Ed). (1999). *The Cambridge dictionary of philosophy.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Baer, J. (2003). The impact of the core-knowledge curriculum on creativity, *Creativity Research Journal, 15*(2&3), 297-300.

Baker, D. F. (2006). What we found on our journey through fantasy land, *Children's Literature in Education, 37*(3), 237-251.

Baldacchino, J. (2008). *Education beyond education: Self and the imaginary in Maxine Greene's philosophy.* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Balinisteanu, T. (2008). States of fancy: The role of fantasy and narrative in constructing social worlds, *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities, 13*(3), 1-16.

Bateson, G. (2006). A Theory of play and fantasy. In K. Salen & E, Zimmerman (Eds.), *The game design reader: A rules of play anthology* (pp. 314-329). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Beardsley, M.C. (1966). *Aesthetics from classical Greece to the present*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Belshaw, M. (2012). Nietzsche, Culture and the Fiction of the Artist. *Journal of Visual Art Practice, 10*(3), 191-200.

Bindeman, S. (1998). Echoes of silence: A phenomenological study of the creative process. *Creativity Research Journal, 11*(1), 69-77.

Bleazby, J. B. (2012). Dewey's notion of imagination in philosophy for children, *Education & Culture, 28*(2), 95-111.

Blenkinsop, S. E. (2009). *The imagination in education: Extending the boundaries of theory and practice.* Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars.

Boske, C. (2011). Using the senses in reflective practice, *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 27*(2), 82-100.

Bowring, F. (2012). Repressive desublimation and consumer culture: Re-evaluating Herbert Marcuse. *New Formations, 75*, 8-24.

Bourassa, G. N. (2011). Rethinking the curricular imagination: Curriculum and biopolitics in the age of neoliberalism. *Curriculum Inquiry, 41*(1), 5-16.

Bracey, G.W. (2008). Assessing NCLB. *Phi Delta Kappan, 89*(10), 781-782.

Brann, E. T. (1993). *The world of the imagination: Sum and substance*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Brookfield, S. (2007). Diversifying curriculum as the practice of repressive tolerance. *Teaching in Higher Education, 12*(5/6), 557-568.

Bruner, J. S., Jolly, A., & Sylva, K. (1976). Play: Its role in development and evolution. New York: Basic Books.

Bulfinch, T. (1982). *Bulfinch's Mythology* (2nd ed). New York, NY: Thomas Crowell Company.

Byrum, C. S. (1974). The concept of child's play in Nietzsche's 'Of the three metamorphoses'. *Kinesis, 6*, 127-135.

Committee on STEM Education & Federal Coordination in STEM Education Task Force. (2012, February). *Coordinating federal science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education investments: Progress report.* Retrieved from: http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/nstc_federal_stem education_coordination_report.pdf

Committee on STEM Education (2011, December). *The federal science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education portfolio*. Retrieved from: http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/costem__federal_s tem_education_portfolio_report_1.pdf

College Board, The. (2012, December). *The arts and the common core: A review of the connections between the common core state standards and the national core art standards conceptual framework.* Retrieved from: http://opi.mt.gov/PDF/standards/12Dec-Arts-and-Common-Core.pdf

Craig, E. (1998). *Routledge encyclopedia of philosophy*. New York: Routledge.

Crocco, M.S. & Costigan, A.T. (2007). The narrowing of curriculum of pedagogy in the age of accountability: Urban educators speak out. *Urban Education, 42*(6), 512 535.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention.* New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Cunningham, J. (2013). Praxis exiled: Herbert Marcuse and the one dimensional university. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 47*(4), 537-547.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st-century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(3), 300-314

Del Caro, A. (1989). *Nietzsche Contra Nietzsche: Creativity and the Anti-Romantic* (p. 56). Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Deutsch, E. (1992). *Creative being: The crafting of person and world*. Honolulu, HI: U of Hawaii Press.

Dewey, J. (1959). *Art as experience*. New York, NY: Perigee.

Dodds, E.R. (1951). *The Greeks and the irrational.* Berkeley: U of California Press.

Eckhoff, A. & Urbach, J. (2008). Understanding imaginative thinking during childhood: sociocultural conceptions of creativity and imaginative thought. *Early Childhood Education*, 36(2), 179-185.

Edwards, P. (1967). *The encyclopedia of philosophy.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Egan, K. (1992). The roles of schools: The place of education. *Teachers College Record, 93*(4), 641-655.

Egan, K. (1997). The educated mind: How cognitive tools shape our understanding. Chicago, IL: U of Chicago Press.

Egan, K. (2005). An imaginative approach to teaching. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Eisner, E.W. (2002). *The arts and the creation of mind.* New Haven; Yale UP.

Endsjo, D.O. (2000). To lock up Eleusis: A question of liminal space. *Numen*, 47(4), 351-386.

Evans, N. (2006). Diotima and Demeter as mystagogues in Plato's Symposium. *Hypatia, 21*(2), 1-27.

Fettes, M. (2011). Senses and sensibilities: Educating the somatic imagination, *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 27*(2), 114-129.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, vol. 1: An introduction*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Freud, S. (2003). *The uncanny*. New York: Penguin Classics.

Freud, S. (1963). *Dora: An analysis of a case of hysteria.* New York: Macmillan.

Garrison, J. (2010). *Dewey and Eros: Wisdom and desire in the art of teaching.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Ginsburg, R. (2008). The best of times and the worst of times, *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy, 5*(2), 32-35.

Gold, S.R. & Cundiff, G. (1980). A procedure for increasing self-reported daydreaming, *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 36*(4), 923-927.

Gold, S.F. & Cundiff, G. (1980). Increasing the frequency of daydreaming, *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *36*(1), 116-121.

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Base.

Grube, G.M.A. & Reeve, C.D.C. (1992). *Plato: Republic.* Indianapolis, IL: Hackett.

Guenter, C.E. (1994). Fostering creativity through problem solving. In Diane F. Helpern (Ed.), *Changing college classroom: New teaching and learning strategies for an increasingly complex world* (pp. 64-73). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Guilbert, G-C. (2002). *Madonna as postmodern myth: How one star's self construction rewrites sex, gender, Hollywood, and the American dream*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Hackforth, R. (1955). *Plato's Phaedo*. New York, NY: Cambridge UP.

Hadaegh, B., & Shams, P. (2014). The Child-murdering Mother: Dionysian or Apollonian? A Study of Nietzsche's View on Euripidean Tragedy. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *5*(2), 329-334.

Hamilton, E. & Cairns, H. (1961). *Plato: The collected dialogues.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.

Hamilton, E. (1962). *Mythology: Timeless tales of gods and heroes.* New York, NY: WarnerBooks.

Hardt, M. & Negri, A. (2004). *Multitude: War and democracy in the age of empire*. New York, NY: Penguin.

Haring-Smith, T. (2006). Creativity research review: Some lessons from higher education. *Peer Review*, *8*(2), 23-27.

Helderman, B.L., Zelhart, P.F. & Jackson, T.T. (1985). A study of fantasy: Determinants of fantasy function and content, *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 41*(3), 325-330.

Hern, M. (1998). *Deschooling our lives.* Philadelphia, PA: New Society.

Holt, J., & Farenga, P. (2003). *Teach your own: The John Holt book of homeschooling.* Cambridge, MA: Da Capo.

Honderich, T. (2005). *The oxford guide to philosophy.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Huffer, L. (2012). Foucault and Sedgwick: The repressive hypothesis revisited. *Foucault Studies, 14,* 20-40.

Illich, I. (1969). *Celebration of awareness: A call for institutional revolution*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Illich, I. (1970). *Deschooling society*. New York, NY: Marion Boyars.

Illich, I. (1973). *Tools for conviviality.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

James, B. (2006). Teaching Marcuse. *Javnost-The Public*, *13*(3), 17-28.

Jameson, F. (1971). *Marxism and form: Twentieth-century dialectical theories of literature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.

Jameson, F. (2005). *Archaeologies of the future: The desire called utopia and other science fictions.* New York, NY: Verso.

Jeffery, B. & Craft, A. (2004). Teaching creatively and teaching for creativity: Distinctions and relationships, *Educational Studies, 30*(1), 77-87.

Jenkins, H. (2009). *Confronting the challenges of participatory culture: Media education for the 21st century.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Johnson, M. (1993). *Moral Imagination: Implication of Cognitive Science for Ethics*. Chicago:University of Chicago Press.

Kahn, R. (2009). Anarchic epimetheanism: The pedagogy of Ivan Illich. In R. Amster, A. DeLeon, L. Fernandez, A. Nocella, & D. Shannon (Eds.), *Contemporary anarchist studies: An introduction of anarchy in the academy* (pp. 125-135). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kearny, R. (1988). *The wake of imagination: Toward a postmodern culture*. Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota Press.

Kellner, D., Pierce, C., & Lewis, T. (2011). Introduction: Herbert Marcuse, philosophy, psychoanalysis, and emancipation. In D. Kellner & C. Pierce (Eds.), *Philosophy, psychoanalysis, and emancipation.* (pp. 1-75). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kellner, D. & Share, J. (2005). Toward critical media literacy: Core concepts, debates, organizations, and policy. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education, 26*(3), 369-386.

Kellner, D. (2003). *Media spectacle.* New York: Routledge.

Kennedy, D. (2014). Neoteny, dialogic education and an emergent psychoculture: Notes on theory and practice. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 48*(1), 100-117.

Kotsopoulos, D., & Cordy, M. (2009). Investigating imagination as a cognitive space for learning mathematics. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 70*(3), 259-274.

Kritchevsky, S. & Prescott, E. (1977). Planning Environments for Young Children: Physical Space. Washington D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Kuenzi, J, J. (2008). *Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education: Background, federal policy, and legislative action.* (Paper No. 35). Congressional Research Service Reports. http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/crsdocs/35

Leafgren, S. L. (2011). "Hands at your sides!:" The severing of body and mind in the elementary school, *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 27*(2), 35-50.

Lewis, T. & Khan, R. (2010). Education out of bounds: Reimagining cultural studies for a posthuman age. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Llewellyn, G. (1998). *The teenage liberation handbook: How to quit school and get a real life and education* (3rd ed.). Eugene, OR: Lowry House.

Lines, P. M. (2009). Shackling the imagination: Education for virtue in Plato and Rousseau. *Humanitas, 22*(1/2), 40-68.

Linn, S. (2004). *Consuming kids: The hostile takeover of childhood.* New York, NY: New Press.

Linn, S. (2008). *The case for make believe: Saving play in a commercialized world.* New York, NY: New Press.

Marcuse, H. (2011). *Philosophy, psychoanalysis, and emancipation.* D. Kellner & C. Pierce (Eds.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Marcuse, H. (1966). *Eros and civilization: A philosophical inquiry into Freud*. Boston, MA: Beacon.

Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-dimensional man: Shifts in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. Boston, MA: Beacon.

Mills, C.W. (2000). *The sociological imagination*. New York, NY: Oxford UP.

Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI). (2010, January). *Montana k-12 technology contentstandards framework.* Retrieved from: http://opi.mt.gov/PDF/Standards/10ConStds-Tech.pdf

Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI). (2008, July). *Montana k-12 information literacy/library media content standards framework.* Retrieved from: http://opi.mt.gov/pdf/Standards/ILLMContentStds.pdf

Moschella, P. (2012). Educational myth: Persistence, resistances, breaks and connections. The secret of telematic art. *Technoetic Arts*, *10*(1), 17-23.

Mumford, M.D. (2003). Where have we been, where are we going" Taking stock in creativity research, *Creativity Research Journal, 15*(2&3), 107-120.

Neill, A.S. (1995). *Summerhill school: A new view of childhood*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Nietzsche, F. (1956). *The birth of tragedy*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Nietzsche, F. (2006). *The pre-Platonic philosophers*. Chicago: U of Illinois Press.

Penwell, D. L. (2009). Education in the Virtues: Tragic Emotions and the Artistic Imagination. *Journal Of Aesthetic Education*, *43*(4), 9-31.

Petridou, G. (2013). 'Blessed is he, who has seen': The power of ritual viewing and ritual framing in Eleusis. *Helios, 40*(1/2), 309-341.

Piaget, J. (1962). *Play, dreams, and imitation in childhood.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Pink, D. H. (2006). *A whole new mind: Why right-brainers will rule the future*. New York, NY: Riverhead Books.

Plato. (1992). *Republic.* G.M.A. Grube & C.D.C. Reeve (Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Hackett.

Plato, (1961). *The Collected Dialogues of Plato.* E. Hamilton & H. Cairns (Eds.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Plato. (1955). *Phaedrus*. A. Nehamas & P. Woodruff (Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Hackett

Plato, (1955). *Plato's Phaedo.* R. Hackforth (Ed.). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Plato. (1875). *The Dialogues of Plato.* B. Jowett (Ed.). Gloucestershire, England: Clarendon Press.

Ravitch, D. (2011, September 29). School 'reform': A failing grade. *New York Review of Books.*

Renaud, J. (2012). Rethinking the repressive hypothesis: Foucault's critique of Marcuse. *Symposium, 17*(2), 76-93.

Robinson, K. (2006, February). Ken Robinson: How schools kill creativity [video file]. Retreived from: http://www.ted.com/talks/ken_robinson_says_schools_kill_creativity?language=n

Robinson, K. (2001). *Out of our minds: Learning to be creative.* Mankato, MN: Capstone.

Rodari, G. (1996). *The grammar of fantasy: An introduction to the art of inventing stories.* New York, NY: Teacher and Writers Collaborative.

Rugg, H. O. (1963). *Imagination*. New York: Harper & Row.

Runco, M.A. (2006). The development of children's creativity. In B. Spodek & O. N.Saracho (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the education of young children* (pp. 121-131). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Runco, M. (1997). *The creativity research handbook (vol. 1 &2).* New York: Hampton Press.

Sak, U. (2004). About creativity, giftedness, and teaching the creatively gifted in the classroom. *Roeper Review*, *26*(4), 216-222.

Saracho, O.N. (2002). Young children's creativity and pretend play. *Early Childhood Development and Care*, *172*, 431-438.

Scott Kretchmar, R. (2007). The normative heights and depths of play. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, *34*(1), 1-12.

Sharp, A. M. (1975). Nietzsche's View of Sublimation in the Educational Process. *Journal of Educational Thought*, *9*(2), 98-106.

Shreve, M. (2014). Common core and fostering creativity: Make room for narratives, *California English, 20*(1), 19-21.

Singer, D.G. & Singer, J.L. (2005). *Imagination and play in the electronic age.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.

Smith, M. & Mathur, R. (2009). Children's imagination and fantasy: Implication for development, education, and classroom activities, *Research in the Schools 16*(1) 52-63.

Spariosu, M. (1989). *Dionysus reborn: Play and the aesthetic dimension in modern philosophical and scientific discourse*. Cornell University Press.

Spring, J. (2010). *Power, wealth, cyperspace and the digital mind*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Sternberg, R. (2006). The nature of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, *18*(1), 87-98.

Sternberg. R. J. (1998). *Handbook of creativity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Suissa, J. (2001). Anarchism, utopias, and philosophy of education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education. 35*(4). 627-646.

Teague, R.G. & Gold, S.R. (1981). Increasing attention to daydreaming by self monitoring, *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 37*(2), 538-541.

Trilling, B. & Fadel, C. (2012). *21st Century skills: Learning for life in our times.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Trotman, D. (2006). Interpreting imaginative lifeworlds: Phenomenological approaches in imagination and the evaluation of educational practice. *Qualitative Research*, *6*(2), 245-265.

Tucker, J. (1996). Encountering Socrates in the 'Apology'. *Journal of Education, 178*(3), 17.

U.S. Department of Commerce. (2012, January). *The Competitiveness and innovative capacity of the United States*. Retrieved from:

http://www.commerce.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2012/january/competes01051_0.pdf

Vygotsky, L. (1967). Play and its role in the mental development of the child, *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, *5*(3), 6-18.

Walker, K. & Parker, J. (2006). GCSE art and design: An arena for orthodoxy or creative endeavour. *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, *25*(3), 297-307.

Wakefield, P. W. (2001). Class in the cClassroom: Engaging hidden identities. *Metaphilosophy*, *32*(4), 427.

Ward, C. (1966). Adventure playground: A parable of anarchy. In L. Krimmerman & L. Perry (Eds.), *Patterns of anarchy: a collection of writings on the anarchist tradition.* (pp. 397-402). New York, NY: Doubleday.

Warnock, M. (1976). *Imagination*. Oakland: University of California Press.

Wasson, R.G., Hofmann, A. & Ruck, C.A.P. (2008). *The road to Eleusis: Unveiling the secret of the mysteries.* Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic.

Wick, E. (1996). Fantasy. In Corsini, R.J. & Auerbach, A.J. (Eds.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Psychology*. (2nd ed) New York, NY: John Wiley.

Wiebe, S. & Snowber, C. (2011). The visceral imagination: A fertile space for non textual knowing, Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 27(2), 101-113.

Winnicott, D.W. (2005). *Playing and reality.* New York: Routledge.

Wolfmeyer, M. (2013). *Math education for America?: Policy networks, big business, and pedagogy wars.* New York: Routledge.

Wood, E., & Latham, K. F. (2011). The Thickness of the world: Exploring the curriculum of museums through phenomenological touch. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *27*(2).

Zhao, Y. (2007). Education in the flat world: Implications of globalization on education. *Edge: The Latest Information for the Education Practitioner*, *2*(4), 3-19.