

Young Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman, and Walter J. Ong's Thought

Thomas J. Farrell

Volume 4, numéro 2, automne 2024

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1115379ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1115379ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

New Explorations Association

ISSN

2563-3198 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Farrell, T. (2024). Young Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman, and Walter J. Ong's Thought. *New Explorations*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.7202/1115379ar>

Résumé de l'article

In the first part of my article, I discuss the beautiful young Lynda Carter (born in 1951) who played Wonder Woman in the Wonder Woman television series (1976-1979). As I watched the beautiful young Lynda Carter in her wonderfully revealing Wonder Woman costume, I responded to her beauty by projecting the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype in my psyche onto her, thereby making her beauty appear more attractive to me. In the second part of my article, I discuss the work of the American Jesuit Renaissance specialist and cultural historian and pioneering media ecology theorist Walter J. Ong (1912-2003; Ph.D. in English, Harvard University, 1955) of Saint Louis. Also in the second part of my article, I discuss two books by the Jungian psychoanalyst Erich Neumann (1954, 1955) and five books about the masculine archetypes of maturity by Robert Moore and Douglas Gillette (1990, 1992, 1993). In the final part of my article, I return to the beautiful young Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman to offer my final reflections about Wonder Woman as a superheroine.

© Thomas J. Farrell, 2024



Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/>

érudit

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

<https://www.erudit.org/fr/>



Young Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman, and Walter J. Ong's Thought

Thomas J. Farrell

University of Minnesota Duluth

tfarrell@d.umn.edu

Abstract: In the first part of my article, I discuss the beautiful young Lynda Carter (born in 1951) who played Wonder Woman in the *Wonder Woman* television series (1976-1979). As I watched the beautiful young Lynda Carter in her wonderfully revealing Wonder Woman costume, I responded to her beauty by projecting the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype in my psyche onto her, thereby making her beauty appear more attractive to me. In the second part of my article, I discuss the work of the American Jesuit Renaissance specialist and cultural historian and pioneering media ecology theorist Walter J. Ong (1912-2003; Ph.D. in English, Harvard University, 1955) of Saint Louis. Also in the second part of my article, I discuss two books by the Jungian psychoanalyst Erich Neumann (1954, 1955) and five books about the masculine archetypes of maturity by Robert Moore and Douglas Gillette (1990, 1992, 1993). In the final part of my article, I return to the beautiful young Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman to offer my final reflections about Wonder Woman as a superheroine.

The beautiful and bold young 5'9" tall Lynda Carter (born in 1951), with measurements of 37-27-37, and weighing 122 lbs., and with beautiful eyes, played Wonder Woman/ Diana Prince on the *Wonder Woman* television series (1976-1979; for a total of 59 episodes). Season 1 was set in the 1940s, during World War II (1939-1945); seasons 2 and 3 were set in the 1970s. Seasons 2 and 3 were titled *The New Adventures of Wonder Woman*. However, for my purposes in this essay, I am going to refer to all three seasons of the television series as *Wonder Woman*.

In season 1, the beautiful and charming bespectacled Diana Prince, with her beautiful eyes and charming smile, wears drab clothes (in my estimate). However, in seasons 2 and 3, Diana Prince wears stylish clothes of the 1970s.

(The last name Prince suggests royalty; the first name Diana calls to mind the goddess Diana in ancient Roman and Hellenistic religion. According to the *Wikipedia* entry "Diana (mythology)," "Diana is considered a virgin goddess and protector of childbirth." In the *Wonder Woman* television series, the lovely and charming Diana Prince, with her winning smile and beautiful eyes, is portrayed as a virgin. However, she is not portrayed as a protector of childbirth, but as a protector more generally as she works as a government agent.)

Now, because of the comic-book origin of Wonder Woman, all 59 episodes on the *Wonder Woman* television series include fantasy elements – not realistic dramas. Especially in seasons 2 and 3, set in the 1970s, the plots of the episodes always involve a certain amount of fantasy, as distinct from realism. Put differently, the episodes in seasons 2 and 3 are not exactly like the realism of episodes of most television crime dramas or police procedurals. For example, the talking computer, personified as Ira, seems like something out of futuristic science-fiction fantasy – and the season 3 episode "Gault's Brain" strikes me as weird science-fiction fantasy! As a special feature in the DVD version of the television series, Lynda Carter herself provides a running commentary about one episode as we view the episode. She mocks Diana Prince's stylish outfits as straight out of the 1970s, for example. More to the point of my above critique, she even characterizes certain plot elements and even the plots in Seasons 2 and 3 as "corny." Nevertheless, she says that she liked the switch from the 1940s setting in season 1 to the 1970s setting in seasons 2 and 3. However, to avoid leaving any misleading impression here about Lynda Carter's commentary, she also clearly indicates that the DVD version should help bring the *Wonder Woman* television series to new viewers.

Now, I recently watched the DVD version of the *Wonder Woman* television series in my home. No, I did not see the original broadcast of the show. But, yes, I do remember seeing some episodes of the show on television in

recent years. That's what prompted me to order the DVD version.

As I watched each episode of the DVD version, I was moved to exclaim each time I saw the beautiful young Lynda Carter appear on the screen in her wonderfully revealing Wonder Woman costume, "My God, she is beautiful!"

You see, the image of Lynda Carter on the screen was activating and evoking in me the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype in my psyche. In short, I was projecting the optimal and positive forms of the feminine Lover archetype in my psyche onto the image of Lynda Carter on the screen.

My projection onto Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman was not a bad thing. On the contrary, it was a good thing. At the very least, my projection made me watch her perform more attentively.

Ah, but what would happen if I were to project the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype in my psyche onto a real woman in my life? Well, that woman would seem enormously attractive to me as long as I made this projection onto her. In short, she would seem to me to be a goddess.

Men may make this projection onto women in their love lives. However, you cannot marry a projection. You can marry only a real woman.

Thus, in the practical order, it might be best for men to reserve projecting the optimal and positive form of the feminine archetype in their psyche onto an actress, rather than onto a woman with whom they plan to develop a real love relationship. When men do this with an actress, they become fans of the actress and follow her activities with great interest.

To spell out the obvious, in the real world, no man can marry Wonder Woman in the television series, because she represents an archetypal figure, not an ordinary woman.

Ah, but may men project the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype in their psyches onto certain other actresses in other television series and in movies? Yes, they may – and do.

Ah, but what qualities about an actress evoke in men watching them perform the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype in their psyches? I have no idea how to answer this question. But I am sure that this does happen and is involved in the process of actresses attracting male fans.

For a Jungian discussion of love relationships involving an ordinary man and an ordinary woman, see the Jungian analyst John A. Desteian's 2021 book *Coming Together – Coming apart: The Play of Opposites in Love Relationships*.

Now, I agree with Lynda Carter that the DVD version should bring the *Wonder Woman* television series to new viewers. However, in the present essay, I want to suggest some new reasons for viewers to watch and appreciate Wonder Woman as more than a superhero and action figure – and even more than as a feminist role model (as the creator of the Wonder Woman comic-book character, William Moulton Marston [1893-1947; Ph.D. in psychology, Harvard University, 1921] imagined her – and as the feminist activist Gloria Steinem (born on March 25, 1934) imagined her when she put the comic-book Wonder Woman on the cover of the first issue of *Ms. Magazine* in 1972).

Disclosure: I once heard that attractive and stylishly dressed Gloria Steinem speak at Saint Louis University, when I was a graduate student there. She was an impressive speaker, albeit a controversial one at the time. However, I do not recall the exact year, but it was in the early 1970s. Yes, Steinem was stylishly dressed in a way that was fashionable in the 1970s. Yes, the stylishly dressed Diana Prince in seasons 2 and 3 of the *Wonder Woman* television series does resemble the stylishly dressed Gloria Steinem of the early 1970s. **End of disclosure.**

However, I do not see the archetypal connections that I suggest here as necessarily incompatible with the view of the erotic Wonder Woman of the comic books as a feminist role model for comic-book readers. Rather, I see the erotic Wonder Woman of the television series as evoking archetypal connections that the erotic Wonder Woman of the comic books does not evoke – or at least does not evoke to the same extent as the erotic Wonder Woman played by the beautiful young Lynda Carter does.

Ah, but why? If my interpretations in the present essay of the optimal and positive forms of the four feminine archetypes of maturity are correct, why would it be fitting and appropriate that the erotic Wonder Woman of the television series should manifest symbolically the optimal and positive forms of the three feminine archetypes of maturity that I discuss in the present essay in connection with her? Well, she is portrayed in the television series as a superhero – in short, as an action figure – with extraordinary powers. No doubt women who learn how to access the optimal and positive forms of the four feminine archetypes of maturity are thereby empowered in new and extraordinary ways.

Yes, I am making an extraordinary claim here about Wonder Woman in the television series. Let me clarify my claim. I differentiate two erotic appeals to the human psyche: one I style extraordinary and the other I style ordinary. The erotic appeal that I style ordinary is an erotic appeal to the level of ego-consciousness in the human psyche. All erotic appeals must begin at this level of the human psyche. But the erotic appeal that I style extraordinary is an erotic appeal to the archetypal level of the human psyche in the collective unconscious. I know of no way in which anyone can deliberately arouse an extraordinary erotic appeal in himself or herself. When a person experiences an extraordinary erotic appeal to the archetypal level of his or her psyche, that appeal seems to come over the person without the person deliberately or purposefully engendering it. It is a powerful experience to have. Indeed, it can be overpowering. That is, it can overpower the person's ego-consciousness and thereby cause a psychotic break. Nobody wants to experience a psychotic break.

Now back to watching the DVD version of the *Wonder Woman* television series. Yes, it is possible for certain viewers to experience the erotic Wonder Woman played by the beautiful young Lynda Carter as an ordinary erotic experience at the level of ego-consciousness. However, viewers may also try their best to open themselves to let her erotic appeal, appeal to the archetypal level of their psyches and thereby perhaps engender one or more of the feminine archetypes in their psyches. But there are no guarantees that activating one or more of the feminine archetypes in their psyches will necessarily be a positive experience for them – because each of the four feminine archetypes in their psyches has two “shadow” forms and only one optimal and positive form!

But let me be clear here about what I am saying about Lynda Carter's erotic appeal as Wonder Woman in the television series and ego-consciousness and feminine archetypes. No one ever has sexual intercourse with an archetype in his or her psyche. Nevertheless, the eight archetype that I discuss in the present essay do have an erotic appeal about them. Moreover, when we learn how to access the optimal and positive forms of each of the eight archetypes of maturity that I discuss in the present essay, we may characterize that inner accessing as a kind of inner intercourse with ourselves in our own psyches.

Of course, the comic-book fantasy in the portrayal of Wonder Woman herself (e.g., her ability to deflect bullets with her magical bracelets) is pronounced. But transcending the limitations of realism in the portrayal of Wonder Woman in the television series opens the door to seeing her as an archetypal figure resonating with the feminine archetypes in the psyches of all girls and women and in the psyches of all boys and men.

Now, the beautiful and bold young Lynda Carter appears in her wonderfully revealing Wonder Woman costume, which nicely fits her gloriously beautiful body -- with the cleavage between her nice big breasts showing on her chest, with the snappy tight-fitting “satin tights” of her costume (as the catchy theme song describes them), and with her attractive long legs -- like a woman's one-piece bathing suit.

Young Lynda Carter's wonderfully revealing Wonder Woman costume was designed by Donfeld [1934-2007].; he won an Emmy Award in 1978 for outstanding costume design for the episode “Anschluss '77.” Phil Norman won an Emmy Award in 1976 for outstanding achievement in graphic design and title sequence for the first episode of season 1 titled “The New Original Wonder Woman.” Lynda Carter was four times nominated for TV Land

Awards in the 2000s: (1) in 2003, for Superest Super Hero; (2) in 2004, for Superest Super Hero – and won; (3) in 2006, for Greatest Gear or Admirable Apparatus – For the bullet deflecting bracelets and invisible plane; and (4) in 2007, for Greatest Gear or Admirable Apparatus – For the indestructible bracelets and golden lasso of Truth.

The theme song of the *Wonder Woman* television series has catchy lyrics about her and a wonderful undulating rhythm. Norman Gimbel wrote the words; Charles Fox wrote the music. I love to hear the undulating rhythm of the theme song each time it is played in an episode.

Frankly, I am not surprised that the beautiful young Lynda Carter won the Miss World USA title in 1972, the year in which she turned 21. If the contest included a bathing suit contest, I am sure that Lynda Carter looked stunning in a bathing suit. She has a gloriously beautiful body! And a swimming suit would allow her to show off her gloriously beautiful body.

Thanks to the glorious beauty of young Lynda Carter 's body in her wonderfully revealing Wonder Woman costume, and thanks also to her beautiful eyes as both Wonder Woman and Diana Prince, Wonder Woman is a household name!

Has there ever been another series on network television in which the starring beautiful young woman ran around in a wonderfully revealing woman's one-piece bathing suit showing off her gloriously beautiful body?

Young Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman is a wholesome sex goddess. No, she does not have sexual intercourse in any of the 59 episodes – that is why I characterize her as a wholesome sex goddess.

She is a wholesome sex goddess in all 59 episodes because in her wonderfully revealing Wonder Woman costume, she boldly reveals the beauty of her sexy young body. I characterize her as a goddess because her bold way of revealing the beauty of her young body on network television evokes resonances with the collective unconscious in our psyches – as do the various goddesses we meet in the Homeric epics *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey*.

In all 59 episodes of the television series, Charles Moulton (the pen name of the author William Moulton Marston) is credited for having created the characters on which the television series was created. William Moulton Marston wrote the *Wonder Woman* comic books (1941-1947) under the pen name of Charles Moulton.

Superman was the first superhero to emerge in comic book in 1938. Batman was the second superhero to emerge in comic books in 1939. The erotic Wonder Woman was the third superhero to emerge in comic books – in 1941.

In 1945, around the end of World War II on September 2, 1945, Walter J. Ong published the article "The Comics and the Super State: Glimpses Down the Back Alleys of the Mind" in the *Arizona Quarterly* (Autumn 1945). In it, he discusses Superman and Wonder Woman repeatedly but intermittently. Ong mentions Wonder Woman on pages 36, 37, 38, 39, 40 (Wonder Woman's "total athleticism"), and 43. Without explicitly adverting to the *Wonder Woman* comics, Ong says, "Sex exploitation has often taken such sharp turns in the direction of sadism and masochism that groups of interested persons have felt it necessary to protest" (pp. 41-42).

Ong's 1945 article was written up in *Time* magazine (dated October 22, 1945, pp. 67-68) and then mentioned again subsequently in *Time* (dated November 5, 1945, p. 23).

Digression: In 1945, Ong was still in his lengthy Jesuit formation. From 1943 to 1947, he was in theological studies at St. Marys (sic), Kansas, where Saint Louis University had temporarily located its School of Divinity

(from 1931 to 1967). Ong was not ordained a Jesuit priest until June 16, 1946, after which he completed his final year of theological studies – and then he completed his final year of his Jesuit formation in 1947-1948. In 1948, Father Ong received a Licentiate in Sacred Theology degree from Saint Louis University – the third graduate degree he received from SLU.

In the fall of 1948, Father Ong began his doctoral studies in English at Harvard University, where he completed his oral comprehensives on December 9, 1949. Then he began working in earnest on his massively researched doctoral dissertation on the French Renaissance logician and educational reformer and Protestant martyr Pete Ramus (1515-1572). For three years (November 17, 1950, to November 16, 1953), Father Ong was based at a Jesuit residence in Paris – a short walk away from the location of Ramus' old residential college at the University of Paris. From his base at the Jesuit residence, Father Ong travelled to various libraries in Europe to located volumes by Ramus and his allies and his critics. Father Ong completed his massively researched doctoral dissertation at the end of the summer of 1954 and submitted it.

In 1958, Harvard University Press published his dissertation, slightly revised, in two volumes: (1) *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason*, his landmark pioneering study in media ecology (for specific page references to his discussion of the aural-to-visual shift in cognitive processing in our Western cultural history, see the "Index" [p. 396]); and (2) *Ramus and Talon Inventory*, his briefly annotated listing of more than 750 volumes by Ramus, his allies, and his critics that Ong located in more than 100 libraries in the British Isles and Continental Europe.) **End of digression.**

Now, in 2014, the Harvard historian Jill Lepore (born on August 27, 1966; Ph.D. in American Studies, Yale University, 1995) published the wide-ranging 400-page book *The Secret History of Wonder Woman* (the paperback second edition, 2015, includes "Afterword: The Hyde Detector," pp. 299-321).

In the front matter of Lepore's 2014 book, she has an unnumbered page of epigraphs. One of the epigraphs is a statement made in March 1945 by William Moulton Marston, the creator of the *Wonder Woman* comic books: "Frankly, Wonder Woman is psychological propaganda for the new type of woman who should, I believe, rule the world."

According to Lepore, William Moulton Marston fathered four children by two women, one of whom he was legally married to. Lepore characterizes the two women as strong women, and she says that they served as Marston's inspiration for the character of Wonder Woman – who is childless and not involved in a romantic relationship with a man. In any event, Wonder Woman is a byproduct of World War II (1939-1945).

Now, in Lepore's 2014 book *The Secret History of Wonder Woman*, she discusses Ong's 1945 article "The Comics and the Super State: Glimpses Down the Back Alleys of the Mind" (pp. 255-257). mentioned above. Lepore also indicates that she made use of materials in the Ong Archives at Saint Louis University's Pius XII Memorial Library. Lepore used archival materials extensively (see her "Notes" [pp. 341-416]).

Now, in part, Lepore says, "The most concerted attack on Wonder Woman came just after V-E Day, Walter J. Ong, a Jesuit priest [as I noted above, Ong was not ordained a priest until June 16, 1946] who had written a master's thesis under the supervision of Marshall McLuhan [in 1941 at Saint Louis University], and who was at the very beginning of what would be a long career as a literary theorist, had read [the *Wonder Woman* comic's creator William Moulton] Marston's *American Scholar* essay and found it both foolish and contemptible [but Ong does not use either of these terms in his 1945 article]. He [Ong] wrote a response called 'Comics and the Super State.' He sent the manuscript to the *Atlantic Monthly*, *Harper's*, the *Commonweal*, the *Yale Review*, and the *Kenyon Review*. Everyone rejected it. Finally, Ong placed his article in the inaugural issue [volume, not the first issue] of a new journal call the *Arizona Quarterly*. It appeared in the spring of 1945" (p. 255).

William Moulton Marston published his article "Why 100,000,000 Americans Read Comics: The creator of

Wonder Woman makes the case for superheroes – especially female one” in *The American Scholar* (Winter 1944). However, in Ong’s 1945 article “The Comics and the Super State,” he does not explicitly refer to Marston’s *American Scholar* article “Why 100,000,000 Americans Read Comics.” But Ong may have read Marston’s article.

Subsequently, in Lepore’s book *The Secret History of Wonder Woman*, she says, “Ong had read Wonder Woman comics carefully. And he’d read the work of both her critics and her detractors. He quoted the remarks made about ‘chained women’ by Josette Frank in a report she wrote for the Child Study Association of America. He repeated Lauretta Bender’s contention that comic books are modern-day folklore and dismissed it as ridiculous: ‘Only say that the comics are like folk tales, and all misgivings vanish. The taut muscles of the mind relax.’ Anyone who believed that was just plain gullible, Ong maintained” (p. 256).

Subsequently, Lepore says, “By the time Ong’s piece appeared, it was mostly obsolete. Wonder Woman had weakened. With the war over [on September 2, 1945], and Marston confined to bed, many Wonder Woman stories were being written by Joye Hummel, and those written by Marston had grown domestic” (p. 257).

Now, I have not checked Lepore’s characterizations here about Ong against Ong’s correspondence in the Ong Archives at Saint Louis University – and I do not plan to do so. However, in light of the views Lepore attributes to Ong here, I want to note here that Ong’s former teacher Marshall McLuhan at Saint Louis University published an experimental book titled *The Mechanical Bride: Folklore of Industrial Man* in 1951. Ong dispatched from Paris a positive review-article about it titled “The Mechanical Bride: Christen the Folklore of Industrial Man” to the now-defunct journal *Social Order* (Saint Louis University, where it was published in February 1952. Ong does not object in any way to McLuhan’s use of the term “Folklore” in the title of his 1951 book – perhaps because McLuhan doesn’t say anything further about the term “Folklore” in the book.

According to Ong, McLuhan had been compiling the illustrative material and writing the short essays that were eventually published in his 1951 book the entire time that Ong knew him at Saint Louis University. In any event, McLuhan’s example of commenting on popular culture inspired Ong to write articles about popular culture in the 1940s, including his 1945 article “The Comics and the Super State.”

Concerning Ong’s other articles in the 1940s about popular culture, see Thomas M. Walsh’s briefly annotated bibliography of Ong’s 400 or so distinct publications (not counting translations and reprintings as distinct publications): “Walter J. Ong, S.J.: A Bibliography 1929-2006” (2011, esp. 192-196 for Ong’s publications in the 1940s).

For further information about Ong’s life and work, see my book *Walter Ong’s Contributions to Cultural Studies: The Phenomenology of the Word and I-Thou Communication* (2000) – the winner of the Marshall McLuhan Award for Outstanding Book in the Field of Media Ecology, conferred by the Media Ecology Association in June 2001.

Now, on October 24, 2014, Dwight Garner published a review of Lepore’s 400-page book titled “Her Past Unchained” in *The New York Times*:

<https://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/24/books/the-secret-history-of-wonder-woman-by-jill-lepore.html>

On December 12, 2014, Carla Kaplan also published a review of Lepore’s 400-page book titled “Jill Lepore’s ‘Secret History of Wonder Woman’” in *The New York Times*:

<https://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/14/books/review/jill-lepores-secret-history-of-wonder-woman.html>

In any event, in 2024, two new short biographies of Lynda Carter were published: (1) Kimberly Howerton’s *Lynda*

Carter Biography: The Inspiring Story of a Wonder Woman (Independently Published, 72 pages); and (2) Taylor Winfrey's *Linda Carter and the Untold Story of Her Journey from Wonder Woman to Becoming an Icon* (Independently Published, 42 pages).

In Kimberly Howerton's short new biography of Lynda Carter, she says, among other things, "Lynda Carter's name is synonymous with Wonder Woman. . . . *Wonder Woman* premiered in 1975 and aired for three seasons until 1979. Developed by writer and producer William Moulton Marston, the series was based on the DC Comics character created by Marston and artist Harry G. Peter. Carter was cast as Diana Prince, also known as Wonder Woman, a superheroine with incredible abilities and a strong sense of justice" (p. 29).

Howerton also says, "Carter's portrayal of Wonder Woman was best known for her costume, which included a star-spangled bodysuit, tiara, and bullet-deflecting bracelets" (p. 31). In addition, Howerton says, "Wonder Woman, first gracing comic book pages in 1941, transcended fictional realms under Lynda Carter's iconic portrayal in the television series" (p. 33). "Carter's success with *Wonder Woman* established her as a global sensation and a cultural icon" (p. 32).

In Taylor Winfrey's short new biography of Lynda Carter, he says, among other things, "Lynda Carter's transformative role as Wonder Woman catapulted her into the realm of pop culture immortality, forever intertwining her identity with that of the iconic superheroine. Originating from the creative minds of psychologist William Moulton Marston and artist Harry G. Peter in 1941 [during World War II], Wonder Woman emerged as a beacon of empowerment and justice in a male-dominated comic book landscape" (p. 15).

In addition, Winfrey says, "The *Wonder Woman* television series, which aired on ABC and later on CBS from 1975 to 1979, showcased Carter's unparalleled talent and charisma, elevating the character to new heights of cultural significance. Clad in a comic-accurate costume and accompanied by a memorable theme song, Carter's portrayal of Wonder Woman epitomized the character's inherent goodness and unwavering commitment to justice" (pp. 16-17).

I agree with Winfrey here that young Lynda Carter, in addition to the glorious beauty of her body in her wonderfully revealing Wonder Woman costume, and her beautiful eyes, and her charming smile, showcased "unparalleled talent and charisma" (p. 16).

I see Lynda Carter's glorious beauty and her charisma as part of her appeal as a wholesome sex goddess and as an effective symbol of the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype that not only all girls and women but also all boys and men have in their psyches – as I discuss in the next subsection.

ARCHETYPES IN THE HUMAN PSYCHE

Now, the collective unconscious in our psyches is the home of the archetypes that influence our psychological lives in various ways. In the present essay, I will draw on the American Jungian psychotherapist and theorist Robert Moore's work on the four masculine archetypes of maturity in our psyches to suggest that there are also four corresponding feminine archetypes of maturity in our psyches. I will also discuss how young Lynda Carter's portrayal of Wonder Woman as a wholesome sex goddess can be analyzed in terms of three of the four feminine archetypes of maturity in our human psyches: (1) the feminine Warrior/Knight archetype; (2) the feminine Magician/Shaman archetype; and (3) the feminine Lover archetype – but not in terms of the Queen archetype, because Wonder Woman's mother is the queen, and Wonder Woman herself is a princess now far removed from Paradise Island, the home of the Amazons.

Incidentally, in addition to studying the five books that I mention in the present essay by Robert Moore (1942-2016; Ph.D. in psychology and religion, University of Chicago, 1975) and Douglas Gillette, I have carefully listened to many of Moore's audiotapes of public presentations at the C. G. Jung Institute of Chicago. In

addition, I visited his home office in Chicago for psychotherapy one memorable weekend in June 2006.

Now, my reflections here about the young Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman as a wholesome sex goddess call to mind a book that I have written about before: Edward C. Whitmont's *Return of the Goddess* (1982) – which also connects with my speculation here about the feminine Lover archetype in the female and the male psyches. In addition, I connect the return of the goddess in the human psyche with what Ong refers to as secondary orality.

In any event, the bold wholesome sex goddess Wonder Woman as portrayed by Lynda Carter in the television series is a national treasure! And the *Wonder Woman* television series (1976-1979), starring the beautiful and bold young Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman, is a national treasure!

The DVD version of the *Wonder Woman* television series makes this national treasure conveniently available for home viewing. (In 2020, Warner released a Blu-Ray version of the complete *Wonder Woman* television series – which I have not yet seen.)

Incidentally, *Wikipedia* has a lengthy entry about the comic book featuring Wonder Woman: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wonder_Woman_\(comic_book\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wonder_Woman_(comic_book))

In it, we are told the following: “[Gloria] Steinem, offended that the most famous female superheroine had been depowered [in the comic book in 1968; to be restored in the January-February 1973 comic book], placed Wonder Woman (in costume) on the cover of [the first issue of] *Ms.* [magazine] (1972) – Warner Communications, DC Comics’ owner, was an investor – which also contained an appreciative essay about the character” – which I have not read. I see the present article as another appreciative essay about the character – and about the beautiful and bold young Lynda Carter’s portrayal of the character in the 1970s television series.

Now, my favorite scholar is the American Jesuit Renaissance specialist and cultural historian and pioneering media ecology theorist Walter J. Ong (1912-2003; Ph.D. in English, Harvard University, 1955) of Saint Louis University. I have taken various hints from Ong’s work in my essay “Secondary Orality and Consciousness Today” in the carefully organized anthology *Media, Consciousness, and Culture: Explorations of Walter Ong’s Thought*, edited by Bruce E. Gronbeck, Thomas J. Farrell, and Paul A. Soukup (1991, pp. 194-209).

In it, I take certain hints from Ong and discuss the brilliant Jungian Erich Neumann (1905-1960) who published a marvelous synthesis of Jung’s wide-ranging work in his big book *The Origins and History of Consciousness*, translated by R. F. C. Hull, with a “Foreword” by Jung (1954). I first heard of Neumann’s book from Dr. Raymond Benoit in a graduate course in English that I took from him at Saint Louis University. Subsequently, I read Neumann’s book. I have re-read Neumann’s book several times over the years.

In it, Neumann describes eight stages of psychological growth. In broad terms, I see the ten-year war in *The Iliad* as aligned with stages four, five, and six of ego development that Neumann describes. I see Odysseus’s ten-year journey back home as aligned with stage seven in the eight stages of ego development that Neumann describes.

Now, for Ong, the term secondary orality refers to the orality accentuated by the communications media that accentuate sound (e.g., television, telephone, radio, tape-recorders, and the like). The resonances of secondary orality register on the human psyche and resonate with memories and pattern of primary orality at the level of the collective unconscious in the human psyche.

In terms of Neumann’s eight stages of consciousness, primary orality represents the historical manifestation of what Neumann refers to as stages one through three of the development of ego-consciousness. In effect, Neumann writes about these early stages in his other big book *The Great Mother: An Analysis of the Archetype*,

translated by Ralph Manheim (1955).

In Ong's book *Rhetoric, Romance, and Technology: Studies in the Interaction of Expression and Culture* (1971, pp. 10-11), he makes the following statement about Erich Neumann's Jungian account of the eight stages of consciousness:

"The stages of psychic development as treated by Neumann are successively (1) the infantile undifferentiated self-contained whole symbolized by the uroboros (tail-eater), the serpent with its tail in its mouth, as well as by other circular or global mythological figures [including Nietzsche's imagery about the eternal return?], (2) the Great Mother (the impersonal womb from which each human infant, male or female, comes, the impersonal femininity which may swallow him [or her] up again), (3) the separation of the world parents (the principle of opposites, differentiation, possibility of change), (4) the birth of the hero (rise of masculinity and of the personalized ego) with its sequels in (5) the slaying of the mother (fight with the dragon: victory over primal creative but consuming femininity, chthonic forces), and (6) the slaying of the father (symbol of thwarting obstruction of individual achievement, [thwarting] what is new), (7) the freeing of the captive (liberation of the ego from endogamous [i.e., "married" within one's psyche] kinship libido and the emergence of the higher femininity, with woman now as person, anima-sister, related positively to ego consciousness), and finally (8) the transformation (new unity in self-conscious individualization, higher masculinity, expressed primordially in the Osiris myth but today entering new phases with heightened individualism [such as Nietzsche's overman] – or, more properly, personalism – of modern man [sic])."

Ong also sums up Neumann's Jungian account of the stages of consciousness in his (Ong's) book *Fighting for Life: Contest, Sexuality, and Consciousness* (1981, pp. 18-19; but also see the "Index" for further references to Neumann [p. 228]), the published version of Ong's 1979 Messenger Lectures at Cornell University.

Now, in my recent *OEN* article "Emily Wilson on *The Iliad*" (dated August 23, 2024), I discuss both Emily Wilson's 2023 translation of *The Iliad* and her 2018 translation of *The Odyssey* -- in connection with the thought of Walter J. Ong:

<https://www.opednews.com/articles/Emily-Wilson-on-The-Iliad-Donald-Trump-Jesuits-Trump-Trump-Mental-State-240823-243.html>

In Neumann's terminology, I align what Ong refers to as secondary orality with what Neumann describes as stage seven in the eight stages of ego development. But I also align Ong's account of the romantic movement in literature, philosophy, and the arts with what Neumann refers to as stage seven in the eight stages of consciousness.

Consequently, I would also align Odysseus's ten-year journey in *The Odyssey* with Neumann's stage seven in the development of ego consciousness. In *The Odyssey*, the goddess Athena, the goddess of war, is, in effect, Odysseus's guardian angel.

For a fascinating discussion of the goddess Athena in *The Odyssey*, see Jean Houston's book *The Hero and the Goddess: The Odyssey as Mystery and Initiation* (1992). The hero Odysseus symbolizes ego-consciousness. Athena and the other goddesses that he encounters represent the feminine archetypes in the collective unconscious of the human psyche.

However, not all of the other goddesses that Odysseus encounters in his ten-year journey back home are as benign for him as Athena is. When I say that I see the beautiful and bold young Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman is a wholesome sex goddess, I mean to suggest that she in this role evokes depths in our psyches involving the collective unconscious in our psyches.

Of course, the character known as Wonder Woman is not just a normal woman, and this quality aligns her with

the various goddesses represented in *The Odyssey* – and thus with stage seven of Neumann’s eight stages of consciousness.

Now, for an accessible overview account of the four masculine archetypes of maturity that are in the psyches of all boys and men (and of all girls and women), see Robert Moore and Douglas Gillette’s 1990 book *King, Warrior, Magician, Lover: Rediscovering the Archetypes of the Mature Masculine*.

However, in addition to providing an accessible overview of the four masculine archetypes in the male psyche (as well as in the female psyche), this short book also provides a succinct discussion of what Moore and Gillette refer to as Boy Psychology (see pp. 13-42, esp. pp. 16-17). If boys and men have recognized their early childhood traumatization, involving not only their fathers but also their mothers, then they can use the succinct characterizations of Boy Psychology on the chart (pp. 16-17) to outline a profile of themselves as boys – which is a wonderful way for them to be able to view themselves with the help of the useful chart that Moore and Gillette provide.

Moore and Gillette have also published four books detailing each of the four masculine archetypes on maturity in the male psyche (as well as in the female psyche): *The King Within: Accessing the King [Archetype] in the Male Psyche* (1992a), *The Warrior Within: Accessing the Knight [Archetype] in the Male Psyche* (1992b), *The Magician Within: Accessing the Shaman [Archetype] in the Male Psyche* (1993a), and *The Lover Within: Accessing the Lover [Archetype] in the Male Psyche* (1993b).

Robert Moore further elaborated his views archetypal psychodynamics in the male psyche in the revised and expanded second edition of *The King Within: Accessing the King [Archetype] in the Male Psyche* (2007).

Now, in my estimate, Father Ong embodied the optimal and positive form of the masculine Magician/Shaman archetype in the male psyche.

In my estimate, however, Father Ong did not embody the optimal and positive form of the masculine Lover archetype in the male psyche (and in the female psyche as well) – just as Wonder Woman in the television series does not embody the optimal and positive form of the Queen archetype in the female psyche (in the male psyche, the equivalent archetype is the King archetype).

For understandable reasons, Moore and Gillette did not write any books about the four feminine archetypes of maturity that all girls and women and all boys and men have in their psyches. But the late Jungian psychotherapist and theorist Robert Moore of the Chicago Theological Seminary thought that there are also four comparable feminine archetypes of maturity: the Queen, the Warrior/Knight, the Magician/Shaman, and the Lover. I agree with him about this much. But I see these four feminine archetypes of maturity as being in the psyches of all girls and women and of all boys and men.

In addition, I agree with Robert Moore that each archetype of maturity has two bipolar “shadow” forms but only one optimal and positive form. In short, eight archetypes of maturity = sixteen bipolar “shadow” forms.

In the book *The Lover Within: Accessing the Lover [Archetype] in the Male Psyche* by Robert Moore and Douglas Gillette (1993b), they discuss the two “shadow” forms of the masculine Lover archetype (see esp. pp. 159-187). One “shadow” form of both the masculine Lover archetype and the feminine Lover archetype is the Impotent Lover. The other “shadow” form is the Addicted Lover.

As the beautiful and bold young Lynda Carter portrays Wonder Woman in the *Wonder Woman* television series, Wonder Woman/ Diana Prince represents neither “shadow” form of the feminine Lover archetype, but the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype.

Now, Robert Moore and Douglas Gillette discuss masochistic tendencies and sadistic tendencies as the two bipolar “shadow” forms of the masculine Warrior archetype that all boys and men and all girls and women have in the psyches in their book *The Warrior Within: Accessing the Knight [Archetype] in the Male Psyche* (1992a, pp. 121-131 for The Masochist “shadow” form and pp. 132-142 for The Sadist “shadow” form).

BDSM porn videos feature porn actors acting out The Masochist “shadow” form and The Sadist “shadow” form. Because of the law, all the women who appear in BDSM porn videos on the internet are over 18 when they voluntarily consent to appear in them.

In any event, certain pornstars are characterized as goddesses. However, because they engage in exhibitionist sex in the porn videos, I would not equate them here with the beautiful and bold young Lynda Carter in her wonderfully revealing Wonder Woman costume as a wholesome sex goddess – because she is not filmed having sex in the *Wonder Woman* television series – there is not even a hint in the television series that Wonder Woman has sex with anyone, although she is occasionally portrayed as flirtatious.

Nevertheless, it remains for me to spell out here why certain pornstars are characterized as goddesses. No, I do not think that this characterization means that male viewers are projecting archetypes from their psyches onto the pornstars in question. When certain pornstars are described as goddesses, I think that this means simply that they have sexy bodies. In other words, I think that their sex appeal does not involve archetypes or the archetypal level of the viewers’ psyches, but appeals to the viewers’ ego-consciousness.

Now, in Dwight Garner’s review of Jill Lepore’s 2014 400-page book *The Secret History of Wonder Woman* about the comic book character, mentioned above, Garner says, “‘Not a comic book in which [the erotic] Wonder Woman appeared, and hardly a page, lacked a scene of bondage. In [comic-book] episode after episode, Wonder Woman is chained, bound, gagged, lassoed, tied, fettered and manacled.’”

Similarly, in Carla Kaplan’s review of Lepore’s book, also mentioned above, Kaplan says, “‘Wonder Woman appears tied up, chained, bound, manacled, trapped or wrapped on almost every page.’”

But that BDSM theme of Marston’s erotic Wonder Woman in the comic book is somewhat muted in the beautiful and bold young Lynda Carter’s portrayal of Wonder Woman in the television series – but not entirely absent.

In any event, Moore and Gillette say the following about The Masochist “shadow” form of the masculine Warrior archetype: “Impotent men are grieving. They are hurt and in pain. Self-emasculated by their own impotent rage, they have underdeveloped Ego structures and inadequate Ego-archetypal axes. Consequently, they fall under the power of the bipolar archetypal Shadow systems. For the Warrior [archetype], the two poles of the Shadow are the Sadist and the Masochist” (p. 121). “Often after trauma, a psyche fractures into Ego-identified and Shadow-engaged features” (p. 122).

Here are two statements about that “shadow” forms of the Lover archetype from Moore and Gillette’s 1993b book:

(1) “Boys must build a wall between themselves and their mothers in order to get the distance they need to experience themselves as fully masculine. . . . The father plays the crucial role at this juncture. . . . Fathers need to nurture their sons in order to show them that while they do have to separate from their mothers in order to achieve a masculine identity, they do not have to forfeit warm and intimate relationships in the process” (p. 162).

(2) “Emotional paralysis comes from the shock and the fear of having had our psychological boundaries invaded, of having been the recipients of emotional abuse, of having been unable to break the ‘merger’ with the mother. Impotence is its result. If we are raised by a mother who is an ‘inconstant love-object,’ who alternates offerings

of love, nurturing and affirmation with attacks, invasions, and criticisms, we learn to be on alert all the time. We learn to beware of the next 'lightning bolt' which might fall unprovoked out of the sky" (p. 164).

But early childhood traumatization is inescapable – indeed, it is an ineluctable part of life. Now, the single most important book that I know of about psychological healing of our deep traumatic wounds from early childhood is the later John Bradshaw's book *Healing the Shame That Binds You*, expanded and updated second edition (2005; first ed., 1988).

Disclosure: In my early childhood, I am sure that I experienced traumatization involving my mother. As a result of that traumatization, I am sure that I am locked into the "shadow" forms of all four feminine archetypes of maturity in my psyche – and I have not yet learned how to access the four optimal and positive forms of the four feminine archetypes of maturity in my psyche.

But when I characterize the beautiful and bold young Lynda Carter in her role as Wonder Woman as a wholesome sex goddess, I mean to say that she represents the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype. Even though I do not believe that I myself have learned how to access the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype in my psyche, I feel that watching the beautiful and bold young Lynda Carter perform in her wonderfully revealing Wonder Woman costume evokes in me the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype in my psyche.

In addition, I am sure that in my early childhood I also experienced traumatization involving my father as well. As a result of that traumatization, I am sure that I am locked into the "shadow" forms of all four masculine archetypes of maturity in my psyche. Now, because of the deep bond that I formed with Father Ong from the fall semester onward until his death in 2003, I believe that he represented for me the optimal and positive form of the masculine Magician/Shaman archetype in my psyche. I have not formed such a deep bond with any other person in my life. However, I do not believe that I have yet learned how to access the masculine Magician/Shaman archetype in my psyche – or any of the three other masculine archetypes on maturity in my psyche. End of disclosure.

Now, for girls and women, Lynda Carter's portrayal of Wonder Woman most likely registers on them and their psyches as the optimal positive form of the feminine Warrior archetype in their psyches. In other words, she is like the goddess Athena, the goddess of war, in *The Odyssey*.

But girls and women most likely are also able to relate positively to the beautiful and charming Diana Prince, with her beautiful eyes and charming smile – and her well-covered-up body.

Wonder Woman's magical powers symbolically represent the optimal and positive form of the feminine Magician archetype that is in the psyches of all girls and women and of all boys and men. However, I suspect that Wonder Woman's optimal and positive form of the feminine Magician archetype in the psyches of all girls and women and on all boys and men does not register much at all in the psyches of girls and women or in the psyches of boys and men. Her magical powers most likely register on my people's psyches as part of the comic-book fantasy associated with Wonder Woman – not as symbolic expressions of the powers associated with the optimal and positive form of the feminine Magician archetype in the psyches of all girls and women and of all boys and men.

As to the optimal and positive form of the Queen archetype that is in the psyches of all girls and women and of all boys and men, Wonder Woman's mother is the Queen. Wonder Woman herself is a princess. And so the Queen archetype is largely in the background in the television series.

MY FINAL REFLECTION ON YOUNG LYNDA CARTER AS WONDER WOMAN

Duluth, Minnesota (OpEdNews) September 24, 2024: I am writing the present short encore article as a follow-up to, and as a sequel to, three of my recent short *OEN* articles:

- (1) "Young Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman" (dated September 3, 2024);
- (2) "Robert Moore on Optimal Human Psychological Development" (dated September 17, 2024);
- (3) "John A. Desteian on Love Relationships" (dated September 16, 2024).

As I indicated in my *OEN* article "Young Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman," I am discussing here the 1970s *Wonder Woman* television series starring the young Lynda Carter (1976-979; 59 episodes), which is available now in both a DVD version and, as of 2020, in a Blu-Ray version.

Both the DVD version and the Blu-Ray version include the pilot episode, as well as other special features including Lynda Carter's commentary on one episode in which she says that the plotlines in the 1970s *Wonder Woman* television series now seem "corny." Yes, they do. Nevertheless, I am still going to encourage you to watch those episodes as sympathetically -- and as empathetically -- as you can -- that is, I am here encouraging you to view the beautiful young Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman as empathetically as you can.

In the present article, my thesis is that Wonder Woman as portrayed by the beautiful young Lynda Carter in the 1970s *Wonder Woman* television series is an archetypal figure and that when she is viewed empathetically can move the viewer to become infatuated with her and thereby evoke in the viewer himself or herself the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype of maturity in the human psyche.

Now, in my *OEN* article "Robert Moore on Optimal Human Psychological Development," I discuss both the feminine Lover archetype of maturity in the human psyche, and the masculine Lover archetype of maturity in the human psyche.

Each of those two archetypes of maturity is accompanied by two bipolar "shadow" forms:

- (1) The Impotent Lover "shadow" form;
- (2) The Addicted Lover "shadow" form.

In my *OEN* article, I point out that the Roman Catholic Church's moral vision embodies The Impotent Lover "shadow" forms of the masculine Lover archetype of maturity in the human psyche, and of the feminine Lover archetype of maturity in the human psyche.

Now, in real life, are there certain women who are themselves locked into The Addicted Lover "shadow" form of the feminine Lover archetype in their psyches? Yes, indeed there are. All the women who are over 18 and perform legally in porn videos on the internet are mainlining The Addicted Lover "shadow" form of the feminine Lover archetype in their psyches.

Moreover, all the boys and men who watch porn on the internet regularly are locked into The Addicted Lover "shadow" form of the feminine Lover archetype in their psyches.

Because my thesis in the present article is that Wonder Woman as portrayed by the beautiful young Lynda Carter in the 1970s television series is an embodiment of the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype in the human psyche, on the one hand, and, on the other, that viewing her empathetically the girls and women viewers and the boys and men viewers can project the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype in their psyches onto her -- which projection can enable them to learn how to access the optimal and positive form of the feminine lover archetype in their own psyches.

Ah, but there is no guarantee of this! Even though I characterize the beautiful young Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman, as a wholesome sex symbol, because wonder Woman in the television series is not portrayed as being involved in any sexual relationship, I recognize that not all viewers of the beautiful young Lynda Carter in her wonderfully revealing Wonder Woman costume will necessarily view her this way. On the contrary, I recognize that many boys and men may view her as an erotic sex symbol, not as a wholesome sex symbol.

Now, between December 23, 2005, and September 15, 2024, 198 fake nude pics of young Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman have been posted at the CFake.com website. It strikes me as not unreasonable to suggest that the various male creators of those 198 fake nude pics of Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman are infatuated with her as Wonder Woman and that each of them is projecting The Addicted Lover “shadow” form of the feminine Lover archetype in his psyche onto her as he creates his fake nude pic of her and posts it for your other fans to see at the CFake.com website.

Now, I have no idea when the CFake.com website started, no idea of how many celebrities are represented at the CFake.com website, and no idea how many fake nude pics all total have been posted over the years at the CFake.com website.

Now, when it comes to learning how to access the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype in the human psyche, we are all still works in progress – just as we are all still works in progress when it comes to learning how to access the optimal and positive form of the masculine Lover archetype in the human psyche.

This is why in my *OEN* article “Robert Moore on Optimal Human Psychological Development,” I refer to him as present us with a vision of optimal human psychological development.

OK, but is there any way that we, as works in progress, can proceed to learn something further about learning how to access the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype in the human psyche, and of the masculine Lover archetype in the human psyche?

In my *OEN* article “John A. Desteian of Love Relationships,” I call special attention to his extensive discussion of infatuation in his 2021 book *Coming Together – coming Apart: The Play of Opposites in Love Relationships* (Chiron Publications, for specific page references to infatuation, see the entry on it in the “Index” [p. 251]).

As I empathetically watched the beautiful young Lynda Carter perform as Wonder Woman in her wonderfully revealing Wonder Woman costume as I watched the DVD version of the 1970s *Wonder Woman* television series in late August-September 2024, I undoubtedly became infatuated with her!

I have already indicated that the male viewers of the beautiful young Lynda Carter in the 1970s *Wonder Woman* television series who posted those 198 fake nude pics of her at the CFake.com website were infatuated with her – all 198 of which were posted there years after the original broadcast of the 1970s television series.

Now, do viewers of other television series become infatuated with certain actors in them? Yes, I am sure that they do. And when they do become infatuated with certain actors in them, the viewers are projecting archetypes from their psyches into the actors in question.

But I should now add here something further about infatuation that I did not say in my *OEN* article “John A. Desteian on Love Relationships”: infatuation with a certain other person, even a person you know only from viewing her, or him, on a screen involves feeling mildly euphoric. In and of itself, feeling mildly euphoric is a pleasant experience.

Ah, but does the experience of feeling mildly euphoric happen only when we project the optimal and positive form of the feminine Lover archetype in the human psyche onto the other person – or only when we project the optimal and positive form of the masculine Lover archetype in the human psyche onto the other person? The answer is, “No.”

Even when we project The Addicted Lover “shadow” form of the feminine Lover archetype in the human psyche

onto the other person (e.g., the creators of those 198 fake nude pics of Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman posted at the CFake.com website) – or The Addicted Lover “shadow” form of the masculine lover archetype in the human psyche onto the other person, we may feel mildly euphoric as a result of our projection onto the other person, even when the other person is question is only someone we know only from viewing on a screen – such as the girls and women over 18 who perform in porn videos on the internet, as well as girls and women and boys and men of all ages who perform in television shows and movies.

Yes, indeed, certain adults over 18 have been infatuated with certain child actors well under 18 such as Shirley Temple just from viewing them on movie screens. Like other forms of infatuation, adults who were infatuated with Shirley Temple as a child actor in movies projected some feminine archetype from their own psyches onto her. But what did it mean for Shirley Temple as a child to have a feminine archetype projected onto her? She, of course, is but one example of a child actor in movies.

But what does it mean for actors over 18 to have infatuated fans project archetypes from their psyches onto them? To consider these questions, go back to the basic paradigm of personal love relationships between two persons that Desteian discusses in his 2021 book. Have you ever had the experience of having another person fall in love with you and project an archetype for their psyche onto you? If you have had this experience, do you understand now that you were carrying a project of an archetype from the other person’s psyche? How did it make you feel to carry that projection from another person’s psyche? Did it make you feel that you were special to that person? If it did, did feeling that you were special to that person make you feel, in turn, that you had a special relationship with that person that you need to uphold to carry the projection that was being projected onto you?

Now, multiply the number of persons who are projecting archetypes from their psyches onto you as infatuated fans. Yes, this most likely would make you feel that you must be someone special to your fans. So far, so good provided that you are already an adult when you are receiving your infatuated fans’ projections onto you.

But now go back to young Shirley Temple as a child movie star. Yes, as a child in movies, she undoubtedly captivated and infatuated many adult fans. But was she as a child able to carry her infatuated adult fans’ archetypal projections of their infatuation onto her? As for the beautiful young Lynda Carter (born in 1951), she was in her twenties when she starred as Wonder Woman in the 1970s *Wonder Woman* television series. Today, Lynda Carter maintains an email address for her infatuated fans to write to her, and she employs a staff to reply to email messages she receives from her infatuated fans.

The email addresses of certain other celebrities are available on the internet. Evidently, certain celebrities do not mind receiving fan mail from their infatuated fans. In the meantime, what happens to us each time when we become infatuated fans of a certain celebrity we have seen and heard only on a screen but have projected an archetype in our psyche onto the person in question? No doubt many of us can remember becoming an infatuated fan and projecting an archetype in our psyche onto the person. Usually, we also feel an impulse to express ourselves somehow as an infatuated fan. But the certain celebrity with whom we are infatuated is not within our immediate reach. In short, we usually do not want to be an infatuated fan without somehow expressing that we are indeed an infatuated fan of a certain celebrity – preferably to the celebrity in question, but also in other ways closer to our immediate lifeworld, perhaps by email contact, but also by other ways that are meaningful to us as an infatuated fan.

I seriously doubt if most celebrities read all the email messages that they receive from infatuated fans. Once the celebrities recognize that an email message is from a fan, they may just delete it, rather than read it. However, from the standpoint of the infatuated fans, sending an email message to the celebrity they are infatuated with can nevertheless seem like a meaningful form of outreach and contact. However, apart from actual outreach efforts via email messages, infatuated fans usually find other ways to express their infatuation with a certain celebrity, so that their friends know they are indeed infatuated fans of

the celebrity in question. Indeed, each new effort that infatuated fans make to renew for their own benefit but also for the benefit of their friends and acquaintances that they are indeed infatuated fans usually also renews their experience of a mild euphoric feeling.

It really is not much fun to be a secret infatuated fan of a certain celebrity if you have to keep it to yourself that you are an infatuated fan and keep it a secret from the celebrity in question and from your friends and acquaintances. Something about being an infatuated fan of a certain celebrity seems to demand some kind of expression of your being an infatuated fan of that celebrity.

To sum up my final reflections on the young Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman, my reflections here on my three recent *OEN* articles have prompted me to add these further embellishments and elaborations to my earlier reflection in those articles. To round off the present article, I would now like to provide you with links to each of my three recent short *OEN* articles (listed here in chronological order by date of publication):

https://www.opednews.com/articles/Young-Lynda-Carter-as-Wond-Sex_Sex_Sexuality-240903-503.html

https://www.opednews.com/articles/Robert-Moore-on-Optimal-Hu-Catholic_Catholic-Church_Catholicism-Vatican-Pope_Christian-Religion-240917-255.html

<https://www.opednews.com/articles/John-A-Desteian-on-Love-R-Jungian-Psychology-240919-574.html>

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, check out the DVD version of the *Wonder Woman* television show (1976-1979) starring the beautiful and bold young Lynda Carter. In her wonderfully revealing Wonder Woman costume, she is wonderful to watch!

References

- Anonymous. (2024). Diana (mythology). *Wikipedia* link in the above text.
- Anonymous. (2024). *Wonder Woman* (comic book). *Wikipedia* link in the above text.
- Bradshaw, J. (2005). *Healing the shame that binds you*, 2nd ed. Health Communications. (Original work published 1988)
- Desteian, J. A. (2021). *Coming together – coming apart: The play of opposites in love relationships*, 2nd ed. Chiron Publications. (Original work published 1989)
- Farrell, T. J. (1991). Secondary orality and consciousness today. *Media, consciousness, and culture: Explorations of Walter Ong's thought* (pp. 194-209; B. E. Gronbeck, T. J. Farrell, and P. A. Soukup, Eds.) Sage Publishing.
- Farrell, T. J. (2000). *Walter Ong's contributions to cultural studies: The phenomenology of the word and I-thou communication*. Hampton Press.
- Farrell, T. J. (2024, August 23). Emily Wilson on *The Iliad*. www.opednews.com link in the above text.
- Farrell, T. J. (2024, September 3). Young Lynda Carter as Wonder Woman. www.opednews.com link in the above text.
- Farrell, T. J. (2024, September 16). John A. Desteian on love relationships. www.opednews.com link in the above text.
- Farrell, T. J. (2024, September 17). Robert Moore of optimal human psychological development. www.opednews.com link in the above text.
- Garner, D. (2014, October 23). Her past unchained. *The New York Times* link in the above text.
- Houston, J. (1992). *The hero and the goddess: The Odyssey as mystery and initiation*. Ballantine Books.
- Kaplan, C. (2014, December 12). Jill Lepore's "Secret history of Wonder Woman." *The New York Times* link in the above text.
- Lepore, J. (2014). *The secret history of Wonder Woman*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Marston, W. M. (1944). Why 100,000,000 Americans read comics: The creator of Wonder Woman makes the case for superheroes – especially female one. *The American Scholar*, 13(1), pp. 35-44.
- McLuhan, M. (1951). *The mechanical bride: Folklore of industrial man*. Vanguard Press.
- Moore, R., and D. Gillette. (1990). *King, Warrior, Magician, Lover: Rediscovering the archetypes of the mature masculine*. HarperSanFrancisco/ HarperCollins.
- Moore, R., and D. Gillette. (1992a). *The King within: Accessing the King [archetype] in the male psyche*. William Morrow.
- Moore, R., and D. Gillette. (1992b). *The Warrior within: Accessing the Knight [archetype] in the male psyche*. William Morrow.
- Moore, R., and D. Gillette. (1993a). *The Magician within: Accessing the Shaman [archetype] in the male psyche*. William Morrow.
- Moore, R., and D. Gillette. (1993b). *The Lover within: Accessing the Lover [archetype] in the male psyche*. William Morrow.
- Moore, R., and D. Gillette. (2007). *The King within: Accessing the King [archetype] in the male psyche*, revised and expanded second edition. Explorations Press. (Original work published 1992a)
- Neumann, E. (1954). *The origins and history of consciousness* (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.). Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1949)
- Neumann, E. (1955). *The great mother: An analysis of the archetype* (R. Manheim, Trans.). Pantheon Books. (Original work published ???)
- Ong, W. J. (1945, Autumn). The comics and the super state: Glimpses down the back alleys of the mind. *Arizona Quarterly*, 1(3), pp. 34-48.
- Ong, W. J. (1952, February). The mechanical bride: Christen the folklore of industrial man. *Social Order* (Saint Louis University), 2(2), pp. 79-85.
- Ong, W. J. (1958a). *Ramus, method, and the decay of dialogue: From the art of discourse to the art of reason*. Harvard University Press.

- Ong, W. J. (1958b). *Ramus and Talon inventory*. Harvard University Press.
- Ong, W. J. (1971). *Rhetoric, romance, and technology: Studies in the interaction of expression and culture*. Cornell University Press.
- Ong, W. J. (1981). *Fighting for life: Contest, sexuality [gender], and consciousness*. Cornell University Press.
- Walsh, T. M. (2011). Walter J. Ong, S.J.: A bibliography 1929-2006. *Language, culture, and identity: The legacy of Walter j. Ong, S.J.* (pp. 185-245; S. van den Berg and T. M. Walsh, Eds.). Hampton Press.
- Whitmont, E. C. (1982). *Return of the goddess*. Crossroad Publishing.
- Wilson, E., trans. (2018). *The Odyssey*. Norton.
- Wilson, E., trans. (2023). *The Iliad*. Norton.