

CEZANNE PICASSO BRAQUE

Birth of A Language



Jim Blake

CEZANNE
PICASSO
BRAQUE

Birth of A Language

Jim Blake

I'm gettin' tired of drivin' up and down the same old strip."

Brian Wilson

Foreward

During my first semester at the Harvard Graduate School of Design, Professor Werner Seligman made a statement to the effect that Cubism played a key role in the development of Modern architecture. I had been painting for many years prior to graduate school so I was intrigued by the notion that painting had ever had any influence on architecture at all. Up to this point in 1975 I had a passing familiarity with Cubism and decided to embark on a series of paintings in the Cubist manner in an effort to discern, first hand, any connection between painting and architecture. After twenty years of explorations of Cubism as a painter and much study of the literature of Cubism, I have arrived at some insights into Professor Seligman's statement.

The following text is an attempt to distill my understanding of the nature of Cubism and its link to Modern architecture. In order to do this, I have expanded notions I have held about the importance of this connection and its broad sources in European history as well as in contemporary life. My thoughts originate from many station points and from my thirty five years as a painter and twenty years as an architect. I have lectured on the subject of Cubism several times in the past eight years and was recently challenged by Norman Mailer to write this book. The following ideas are exciting ones for me as a painter and as a writer. I hope I am able to communicate my enthusiasm as well as the concepts in a clear manner.

Jim Blake
Palo Alto, California

Chapter One

"Thomas Hobbes argued in *Leviathan* that a high, imposed discipline in language was necessary for social cohesion. Language was for human beings the chief organizing principle and without it, 'There had been amongst men, neither Commonwealth, nor society, nor contract, nor peace...' Any social contract had to be written with terms of exact and universally understood meaning: 'For one man calleth *Wisdom*, and another calleth *Fear*; and one *Cruelty* what another *Justice*; one *Prodigality* what another *Magnanimity*...' " Paul Johnson, *The Birth of the Modern*

As the twentieth century draws to a close it is clear that the word Modernism was hijacked from its source in the esthetic revolution of the nineteenth and early twentieth century and applied to many processes and artifacts with roots in the language of classicism. Classicism was revived during the Renaissance, institutionalized in the French academic tradition, manifest in the machine esthetics of the Bauhaus and propagated in U.S. Architecture schools after World War Two. Until recently, in the world of architecture, it is as though the Modernism with its pedigree in the Cubist revolution never happened.

The collective will of an epoch precipitates into the arts. The rules of linear perspective characterized by a fixed station point symbolize rational, enlightened man at the center of his measurable world. This is the Renaissance paradigm, articulated in the eleventh century by William of Occam who suggested the separation of secular matters from the ecclesiastical. His notions stood in direct opposition to Aristotle who believed that truth could be found by reason alone. "Occam believed that concepts were symbols and had no intrinsic reality, that cognition could only be personal and intuitive and that the attempt to reach God or understand the world by means of abstract reasoning was futile. Man could only understand the world by two distinct paths; either by an act of faith, entailing acceptance of such undemonstrable truths as the existence of God or the immortality of the soul, or by logical deduction applied solely to what could be directly observed in the physical world. Occam declared a division of ways of knowing into two categories; the spiritual and the temporal. His philosophy undermined the traditional role of clergy as intermediaries between man and God. Occam believed that knowledge was gained through observation not through reasoning alone." These notions gained momentum across Europe in centers of learning where manuscripts of the great ancient Greek and Roman authors were translated into Latin and enthusiastically shared by the educated classes.

Linear perspective, (developed from optical theories of the tenth century Arab mathematician Al-Hazen and Florentine mathematicians Biaggio deParma, Toscanino

and the architect Brunelleschi), was an effective tool for examining the great architectural motifs of ancient Greece and Rome. It was a tool that was used to invent new combinations of elements for new building types from an ancient grammar of built form. A new architecture was developed in the fifteenth century by imaginative two dimensional experiments in painting and scenographic works for revivals of ancient dramas. The rules of linear perspective allowed architects to experiment vigorously in two dimensions before committing their ideas to the rigors of gravity and the construction process. Paper architecture was born.

Any work of art on a two dimensional surface has pictorial space of a perceivable depth. The work of the cave painters at Lascaux and that of the ancient Egyptians is flat. The 'working space' (Frank Stella's term for the volume of illusionistic space engaged by a painter) is shallow. As medieval painters learned a few tricks such as overlapping figures and placing smaller figures higher in the picture plane their working space became deeper but it wasn't until the early fifteenth century when Brunelleschi and friends fixed the station point (the implied observer) that pictorial space stretched as far as the eye can see. The paintings of earlier epochs were done with several station points or an unpinned station point. The observer's eye shifted as necessary to create a series of views in a single work.

The act of fixing the station point brought the temporal world into focus. The light of the visible world was gathered in a single point. The world was now measurable.

Alberti's Latin translation of Brunelleschi's rules of linear perspective elevated the crafts of painting and architecture in the world of Renaissance intellectual life to a status they had not previously enjoyed. They were now contenders in the realm of Plato's liberal arts: grammar, rhetoric, mathematics and astronomy. Linear perspective overlaid a mathematics of vision onto painting often obscuring or preventing a more instinctive mathematical balance of the myriad variables manipulated by a trained, passionate sensibility. Because linear perspective conferred status it was included as one of the deep structural elements of the western paradigm for four hundred and fifty years.

During the middle decades of the nineteenth century weaknesses of the Renaissance paradigm were seen in the suffering of millions of people whose lives were spent answering the demands of the great industrial/agricultural engine created by the Renaissance. Cities were noisy and dirty, poverty was rampant and slavery was an active reality or a very recent memory. It was clear that although industrialism and broad emigration of Northern Europeans throughout the world created vast opportunity, a great many suffered to varying degrees from this industrialized intensity. If the French Academy with its official annual salon symbolized the classes benefitting from industrialization, then artists were beginning to undermine its most entrenched values. The French painters Delacroix, Courbet, Manet, Gauguin, Monet and Cezanne dismantled the Renaissance paradigm over the course of the Nineteenth century. These painters defied the academic tradition of drawing, narrative subject matter, slavish brushwork and entrenched studio procedures. A fatal blow came from Cezanne who unpinned the fixed station point. Unpinning the station point was the most definitive act of the Modern epistemology. If a work of art or architecture is conceived with the station point fixed-

u

then the work is Classical/Renaissance or Very Late Renaissance . If a work is conceived with the station point in a state of flux, the work is Modern.

Picasso and Braque codified the essential spatial breakthrough of Cezanne whose signature techniques of passage and facture flattened pictorial space. **passage** (*small zones of paint that have the effect of compressing space - of uniting deep and shallow pictorial space by the obvious painted quality of the patch*) **facture** (*clusters of single brushstrokes that also serve to flatten pictorial space by interrupting vision toward the distant spaces*) Picasso and Braque abstracted and simplified these two techniques into a form that was intelligible, with some intense effort, to painters who wanted to participate in the Modern revolution. They isolated passage and facture out of Cezanne's larger array of painting strategies and used them as the basis for Analytical Cubism. The Modern revolution began in the mid- nineteenth century and reached a fever pitch throughout the capitals of Europe prior to World War One when any young painter with the desire to participate in the avant garde struggled with Analytical Cubism.

The spatial concepts revealed in Cubism were quickly assimilated and developed with intensity in the work of Malevich, Mondrian, Leger, Duchamp, and Jenneret (LeCorbusier). The telling feature of Modernism, the unpinned station point, was much more easily investigated in painting than in architecture.

Picasso and Braque are important to architects because they developed an alternative to the Renaissance paradigm of linear perspective articulated by Brunelleschi and practiced for four hundred fifty years. During the flowering of the humanist epoch linear perspective was useful for the investigation, re-construction and re-invention of the buildings of ancient Greece and Rome, pre-Christian architecture. Linear perspective was a means of introducing mathematics into painting giving it new status. Linear perspective was invented in order to look backward to antiquity for precedent, Cubism was invented to engage the present in all of its multi-cultural fullness. Perspective is precedent, rules, history, models, arrogance; Cubism is searching exploring, experimenting, discovery, and doubt. Perspective is ultimately a tool of archaeologists and historians, Cubism is a tool of inventors.

Perspective was used in varying primitive forms throughout western painting since the time of the ancient Greeks. It was the Italian humanist educators who established rules for creating realistic spatial order on a two dimensional surface. Linear perspective was a tool of Renaissance set designers who used it to create refined vistas of imaginary civic space and form for their theatrical productions.

The term Linear perspective in this text refers to constructed perspective with a single fixed station point, picture plane, horizon line, vanishing point(s) measuring lines, measuring planes, cones of vision and optical axes. This method often uses both a plan and elevation of the building being constructed in a representation of three dimensional space on a two dimensional surface. There are many systems of shortcuts that introduce time saving assumptions. The facts of this method symbolize the Renaissance paradigm.

After 1450 there were rigorous rules for painters. During the final half of the 19th Century those rules were replaced. Picasso and Braque's distilled Cezanne's great breakthrough in seeing. A new graphic system was invented to serve those who found themselves adrift in Victorian Industrialism.

The key difference between the Renaissance paradigm and the Modern is that in the former, the observer is fixed in space and in the latter, the observer is not fixed, so that a single painting or a single building does not imply a static act of looking with hierarchies of formally composed elements. Painting becomes sculptural - a report from many points of view simultaneously. A building becomes a four dimensional experience whose reality is not revealed in a static view or even a prescribed procession but in totality from any number of points.

The masterworks of antiquity were conceived in light and revealed in light and they are monuments to light. Over the centuries when the masterworks of the ancients and Romans were copied the elemental role of light was lost. Perhaps it was the Northern climates. The unpinned station point of Modernism allows a thorough search for light and form and space. Linear perspective allowed a short cut to built form. Rather than conceiving original responses to culture and climate, Linear perspective gave birth to drawn architecture and to a tendency to copy history rather than search for a deeper understanding of history, for study over invention. Linear perspective opened the door for the intellectualization of architecture. This was a trap that exists for every student of design who is intoxicated by drawing. There now exists a vast body of modern looking contemporary architecture that was born of Linear perspective rather than the Modern conception of multiple station points. Perspective is the drug of choice among most architectural designers and it is taught in schools as though it is a very useful tool rather than awkward conceptual training wheels that prevent unobstructed flights of imagination. Perspective is a tool for the creatively disadvantaged that perpetuates stifling mediocrity. Perspective is a quality control device that insures that the quality doesn't get too high. Genuine invention is as rare in architecture as it is in painting or sculpture. A few primal models have served a multitude of practitioners. The pyramids, The Parthenon, The Pantheon, The Roman Baths, The Strozzi Palace, The Robie House, The Barcelona Pavilion, La Tourette, Exeter Library, Boston City Hall.

An annoying, sometimes tragic, flaw of the Renaissance paradigm is that it allows and encourages the way something looks to dominate judgement of intrinsic quality. The Renaissance encouraged seduction by surface, seduction by sight. The Renaissance and Very Late Renaissance (inclusive of the present) has been an age of infatuation with finish. Cubism explores the deeper texture of things seen. Cubism reveals the phantom, the implied, the subconscious, the deep structure. Cubism taunts the surface, violates the surface, the polish, the finish. Cubism demolishes drawing, eye slavery, eye candy, it demolishes the color of things for the structure of color. It avoids the story, the fable, the lesson, and the moral for the reality of the painted or the built object. The Renaissance is of the eye - Cubism is of the eye of the soul and the soul of light.

Linear perspective was integrated into western art to cure an inferiority complex brought about by Plato's failure to include painting among his four primary liberal arts. It overlaid a superficial mathematics of vision onto painting often crowding out the instinctive, intuitive mathematical balance of the myriad variables manipulated by a trained, passionate sensibility.

Picasso and Braque are not just heroes for painters, sculptors and architects but for civilization. They articulated a way of thinking without man at the center, with man free to explore the periphery, the back regions, so he can report a larger truth not just superficial appearances. They bridged the gap between art and science that had been widening since Leonardo.

The term perspective is frequently misused. There were representations of three dimensional space on two dimensional surfaces for thousands of years before Brunelleschi formalized a set of simple rules for accurate perspective construction. The techniques for creating working space of varying depth were not new. There were converging/receding parallel lines in many medieval paintings. There were diminishing figures placed strategically in the image, there was overlapping of figures to represent space. The great conceptual breakthrough of perspective in the Renaissance was to fix the station point and introduce the use of a measuring line to establish accurate vertical measure back within the created pictorial space. This is Linear perspective. Leonardo DaVinci articulated rules of aerial perspective in his notebooks of the late fifteenth century. Aerial perspective is the effect of the atmosphere on hue and value. distant matter becomes lighter in value and greens become blue as the atmosphere filters out yellow light. Distant objects also become blurred. Linear and aerial perspective became the backbone of the Western paradigm in painting for four hundred fifty years. These are the rules born in faddish enthusiasm, wonder and vitality in the patrician salons of Tuscany that became stifling, doctrinaire, and severely limiting in following centuries. These rules were systematically dismantled by French painters of the nineteenth century. Delacroix removed the varnish and line drawing, Courbet removed allegory, Manet flattened space and introduced bold graphic effects as well as shocking subject matter. Cezanne and Gauguin restored the structure of color and the Impressionists restored light.

If the station point wanders in a work of art prior to 1450 we are speaking of the Medieval. If the station point is unpinned and the year is later than 1910 then we are discussing the Modern with a capital M. If we are discussing that great epoch that resulted in the separation of the ecclesiastical from the secular and that produced a flood of rational observation, the scientific method, technology, financial markets we are speaking of the Renaissance/Reformation/Age of Enlightenment - an epoch often referred to as modern that I will henceforth call the **Very Late Renaissance** or the **VLR**. The Renaissance epoch from 1450 until 1815. The VLR began in 1815 and continues today in coexistence with the Modern which reached full stride with the invention of Analytic Cubism in 1910. As the 20th Century draws to a close, the Modern paradigm is just now breaking out of the realm of the arts into the general worlds of science, mathematics, law and commerce. These terms should no longer be confused. The words Renaissance and

modern have been so broadly misused for so long that they have lost all precision. When the word modern is used to describe notions rooted in the fixed station point that took place in the twentieth century, only confusion results. White Educated Man at the center(women and minorities oppressed) - station point fixed (under threat of death) - Renaissance or VLR. Man off center, sharing world view with women, men and children from around the world as well as all other living things, station point is unpinned, station point is in motion, Modern with a capital M. Picasso and Braque not only codified this multi-valent point of view but also opened the door for images from the third world as well as from every day artifacts. The White Educated Male at the fixed center paradigm created the industrial miseries of the Victorian age that culminated in the vast carnage of World War One. By 1920 it was clear to all thinking, feeling individuals in the Western world that something was wrong with their picture.

The great battles of nineteenth century art to pry loose the station point from western consciousness should not be in vain. This idea must be released from its imprisonment on the third floor of the Museum of Modern Art in New York in the form of Picasso's *LeDemoselles D'Avignon* and brought to the forefront of every contemporary life. Modern isn't just art, it is a way of viewing the world. When we are able to make the distinction between VLR and Modern we will be able to make decisions about all aspects of our culture that will enrich rather than destroy.

Revolutions in art have always been the residue of revolutions in social thinking. The invention of Linear perspective was an outgrowth of the secularization of late medieval power, power moving from the church to the aristocracy, a shift from blind faith to knowledge gained from observation of the temporal world. A minor blow to the Renaissance paradigm was struck by the Romantic movement in the first three decades of the Nineteenth Century. The dissolution of the Renaissance paradigm in painting coincided with Einstein's discovery of a physics of uncertainty and relativity.

The innovations of Turner, Delacroix, Courbet, Manet, Cezanne and Picasso amounted to the dismantling of the carcass of the perspective dominated Renaissance epistemology. They carried away the bones of a beast undone by technology, leaving a new primitivism, an irrational, potentially hermetic way of seeing. They invented a new religion with new dogma and new social status and temples of worship - museums of Modern Art. Painting that once illustrated religious themes has *become* a religion, the painting itself is the icon. Picasso and Braque reversed the relationship between religion and art. The new priesthood is educated in the cult atmosphere of contemporary university graduate programs. Gris, Leger, Duchamp, Mondrian, Malevich - the apostles. Cubism is more than a new way of seeing it is the core doctrine of a vital twentieth century religion - Modern Art.

The lesson of Cubism for architects is that a building may have a logic that defies comprehension from a single station point or a single axis of procession. It takes great discipline and will to un-pin the station point. Architecture conceived with multiple

After 1450 there were rigorous rules for painters. During the final half of the 19th Century those rules were replaced. Picasso and Braque's distilled Cezanne's great breakthrough in seeing. A new graphic system was invented to serve those who found themselves adrift in Victorian Industrialism.

The key difference between the Renaissance paradigm and the Modern is that in the former, the observer is fixed in space and in the latter, the observer is not fixed, so that a single painting or a single building does not imply a static act of looking with hierarchies of formally composed elements. Painting becomes sculptural - a report from many points of view simultaneously. A building becomes a four dimensional experience whose reality is not revealed in a static view or even a prescribed procession but in totality from any number of points.

The masterworks of antiquity were conceived in light and revealed in light and they are monuments to light. Over the centuries when the masterworks of the ancients and Romans were copied the elemental role of light was lost. Perhaps it was the Northern climates. The unpinned station point of Modernism allows a thorough search for light and form and space. Linear perspective allowed a short cut to built form. Rather than conceiving original responses to culture and climate, Linear perspective gave birth to drawn architecture and to a tendency to copy history rather than search for a deeper understanding of history, for study over invention. Linear perspective opened the door for the intellectualization of architecture. This was a trap that exists for every student of design who is intoxicated by drawing. There now exists a vast body of modern looking contemporary architecture that was born of Linear perspective rather than the Modern conception of multiple station points. Perspective is the drug of choice among most architectural designers and it is taught in schools as though it is a very useful tool rather than awkward conceptual training wheels that prevent unobstructed flights of imagination. Perspective is a tool for the creatively disadvantaged that perpetuates stifling mediocrity. Perspective is a quality control device that insures that the quality doesn't get too high. Genuine invention is as rare in architecture as it is in painting or sculpture. A few primal models have served a multitude of practitioners. The pyramids, The Parthenon, The Pantheon, The Roman Baths, The Strozzi Palace, The Robie House, The Barcelona Pavilion, La Tourette, Exeter Library, Boston City Hall.

An annoying, sometimes tragic, flaw of the Renaissance paradigm is that it allows and encourages the way something looks to dominate judgement of intrinsic quality. The Renaissance encouraged seduction by surface, seduction by sight. The Renaissance and Very Late Renaissance (inclusive of the present) has been an age of infatuation with finish. Cubism explores the deeper texture of things seen. Cubism reveals the phantom, the implied, the subconscious, the deep structure. Cubism taunts the surface, violates the surface, the polish, the finish. Cubism demolishes drawing, eye slavery, eye candy, it demolishes the color of things for the structure of color. It avoids the story, the fable, the lesson, and the moral for the reality of the painted or the built object. The Renaissance is of the eye - Cubism is of the eye of the soul and the soul of light.

station points is an architecture of anticipation. The whole cannot be perceived from a single place. The viewer is always tantalized by a part of the whole. The perception of the whole exists in memory only, not from a single station point as it does for Renaissance/VLR architecture.

De-construct the subject to create an object - the implied goal of Cubism. When this idea is applied to architecture it means the abandonment of traditional formal grammar. A building is free to be understood on immediate terms as a play of light on form in space and time rather than as a referent to prototypes or historical or contemporary models. By abandoning history one is forced to enter a vital realm of form-giving process.

Economic success gave new independence to the educated classes of quattrocento Florence, Venice and Milan and Rome. Investigation of Classical thought was a means of rebellion from intellectually oppressive church dogma. Latin translations of ancient Greek texts were assembled from all over Europe in the great libraries and learning centers of Northern Italy. Mathematics, Poetry, Drama, Philosophy, Geography from the ancients became a system of thought used to establish intellectual freedom from the church. Linear perspective was one of the tools that allowed artists and architects to participate in the resurrection of ancient ideas. Linear perspective was not only associated with this very fashionable way of thinking by virtue of its mathematical characteristics but it was a useful tool in the recreation of ancient architectural models for the production of scenery for stage productions. It was in scenographic works that much formal experimentation took place that later found its way into the built form of palazzos and public buildings of the Renaissance.

*

In the Australian film "Ballroom Dancing" the mean-spirited antagonist said there were "No new steps!" just learn the tradition and don't rock the boat and you will have the best chance at success. The question is shall we rock the boat, sink the boat, design a new boat, expand services to steerage, throw the captain overboard, build a fleet of boats and bank the lease commissions then buy an airplane or stay on shore.

Classicism has been revived four times in the past five hundred years. First in the Quattrocento as an antidote to oppressive religious dogma and politics, second during the reign of Napoleon in the late Eighteenth Century as a rebellion from the values of the French aristocracy, a third time in the late Nineteenth Century in the United States as a style for an ambitious nation and a fourth time by the VLR Americans who called it the International Style or modernism which it wasn't. Perhaps Classicism has never really gone away after being revived the first time during the Renaissance. It has assumed a variety of disguises in the Twentieth Century..

Each architect might engage his/her own Renaissance experience taking lessons from all periods of history searching for guiding ethos, not necessarily formal solutions.

When Walter Gropius assumed the deanship at the Harvard Graduate School of Design he ordered all of the history books removed from the library. Why would he do such a thing? Some think it was his effort to keep young minds from being polluted by history but it may have been an effort to prevent them from seeing how close his Bauhaus design esthetic resembled that of the Renaissance and the ancients.

Cubism is not just another academic filtering mechanism like calculus to baffle and discourage potential players.

Knowledge of the history of the picture plane is important in the comprehension of Cubist notions.

Brunelleschi's Linear perspective focussed the receding lines that had existed in western painting for a thousand years.

. The tradition of Linear perspective virtually guaranteed that there would be a hazy band of pigment on the upper third or fourth of each landscape painting . It was as if police tape had been placed on the top third of each blank canvas saying "No bright colors here" "No distinctly bold forms here" "Everything in this zone will be dim, blue and small, or, if the sun was setting, dim, pink and small."

Does understanding Cubism help to synthesize new ideas or is it just another of the analogys?

Clipper ship - Form follows function

Gastronomic - A building is like a fine meal

Industrial - A house is a machine for living etc.

Sexual - spatial sequence is like foreplay, orgasm, the cigarette

Molluscan - buildings are like seashells

Linguistic - building as sentence

Cubist collage - building looks like three dimensional collage

*

The Renaissance was the re-birth of science and the last word on the plastic arts. Painting, sculpture and architecture have never surpassed work done before the year 1600. The great paradigm shift of the Renaissance away from faith into the secular realm removed the soul from the fine arts, it reduced the great sources of creative energy: faith, belief and aspiration and replaced them with measurement and commerce. Alberti and Leonardo killed painting with their rules. The Renaissance painters were the final generation to have a link to the great spiritual sources of Medieval Christianity. This spiritual source combined with a profound awareness of nature as well as notions of classical perfection combined to produce works of depth and resonance.

Painting has become anemic in scope. Today it is flopping about in the mudflats of contemporary art theory gasping for spiritual oxygen. We have killed faith, killed the heart for the mind, science rules - science kills. The great gift of the Renaissance was not painting, certainly not architecture, it was science. Every man is his own observer.

*

Devil's Advocacy:

Cubism is a dead end, so what if it summarizes Cezanne? Cezanne is worshipped because he brought a cranky, hermetic socially inept acuteness of observation to painting. Cezanne was a spiritual son of the Tuscan humanists - A Leonardo without the drawing skill or distractions of an excessively fertile imagination. We love Cezanne because for him plodding reaped a golden harvest. Just as we love Louis Kahn who proved that architectural life begins at fifty. A million plodding dreamers have Lou Kahn and Paul Cezanne yoked to their shrivelling hopes for discovery. Who would even dare to paint or practice painting or architecture past the age of forty who didn't harbor visions of his own primacy?

Art has become religion without the fear or the power. We have temples, is David Salle our savior? Contemporary art museums are desolate dens of a small belief that there is an alternative to the oppressive rationalism that is destroying our earthly habitat.

Cubism inspires formal exploration on hermetic terms that negate more naturally inspired sources for the shapes of buildings.

Malevich's black square was the last rational painting, after that there can be poetry or nothing - all dreck has been spoken.

Leonardo's dictum to finish a painting to the Nth degree gave rise to an epoch of turd polishing. This age was dismantled by Manet, Courbet, Monet, Gauguin, Van Gogh, Cezanne.

Is the computer initiating a new Renaissance? A paradigm shift like that from the age of faith to the age of reason? Perhaps not. Things are just getting faster. The quality of life for most is degenerating. The industrial world is destroying the environment. Societies are fragmenting, polarizing intensely, getting meaner, faster. Gunfights at the grocery store, cyber relationships, voice mail. All measure is silent and deadly. The codes for belonging are getting very arcane.

Cubism - dead end or path to enlightenment. How many station points can fit on the head of a pin?

The power of faith meeting science - Gothic cathedrals

Why are artistic aspirations so small today? Is it embarrassing to be an artist?

Culture as vapor - nothing has meaning or measurable gravity until at least eight thousand i.e. battalion strength are engaged as believers.

The picture plane in history is a bellows: flat, deep, flat

George Bellows was a great American Very Late Renaissance master.

As above - So Below

The widespread application of small aggregate in intercity road surfaces had more to do with the revolution in Nineteenth Century painting than compressible lead paint tubes.

'Each age is characterized by its own notion of how time passes. This conception is the underlying shared epistemological element that most governs the manifest characteristics of an age, of a culture.' - James Burke

We have entered a new era with a new conception of time generated by the oscillating clock in a microchip marking nano and femtoseconds (1/30,000,000th). All decisions are split microsecond decisions and not to be rescinded by one man. The coming generation is being raised on a bath of tens of thousands of hours immersed in video games where fates are played out a dozen times a minute at warp speed. This generation, the oldest are ten in 1996, will edit itself into the haves and have nots based on game scores and video game trivia. Just as one cannot get hired in the U.S. workplace without computer skills today, in twenty years the means of evaluating will get much more specialized, quicker, meaner - new time will spawn new attitudes, new recreations, new language, new art.

We live in the age of fine art as kvetch. Piss Christ, oppressed minorities, angstvission. This generation is over. - next! When it became clear that the Romantic era had supplanted the neo-classical world of Napoleon and David the director of the French Academy and chief apologist for the classical, Louis Auger, committed suicide.

Picasso painted three Cubist paintings per week, Jan Van Eyck painted one picture every two years. Who was creating paintings as objects and who was framing the residue of Modern impatience?

Jan Van Eyck created images of space and things his work possessed great object quality - as much as a Cezanne, a Malevich, or a Pollock.

The dogma of twentieth century painting styles is as divorced from reality and as saturated with doctrine, faith, ritual, half-truths, shibboleths as any Christian cult of the darker middle ages. Picasso and Braque shattered the Renaissance paradigm or at least those aspects of it rooted in empiricism for a cloistered, cultish, ritual based art that has become religion itself. Picasso is the savior, Gertrude Stein, the reincarnation of

Germaine DeStael, is the high priestess, Alfred Barr the Pope, Clement Greenberg, Harold Rosenberg, Leo Steinberg, the cardinals.

A church needs its relics, its Rothko, Frankenthaler, Pollock, Louis, Still, Moore, Smith, Judd, Irwin, Schnabel, Johns, Rauschenberg. The savvy creators worked at a scale befitting the resting place of their creations.

People go to the art museum on Sunday led about by the docents reciting the liturgy of Modernism.

There is vastly more to Cubism than its multiple station points. To ascribe the power and resonance of Cubism to a single technical feature would be like saying the computer revolution happened because silicon is a semiconductor. Cubism is large and important because it has been used, much to the amazement of its once humble inventors as the basis of this cloistered religion called Modern art.

Building had axes and prime loci for viewing long before the rules of linear perspective were articulated, to propose that linear perspective created a new type of building is an exaggeration. It created a new way of designing, in elevation, on paper.

To focus on a single fact is to make it disappear. Ten thousand pictures make a tradition. A lifetime of absorbed attitudes create a painting or a building. Cubism is a tool for studying unrealized form just as linear perspective was a means of studying historical building form for the stage sets of Serlio's Italian Renaissance drama. The painted perspective stage set of the Renaissance was a rich source of ideas for the architects of the time just as the pages of today's architecture magazines are sources of ideas. Neither is exploring primary sources.

Q. How can I (an architect trained in the perspective tradition) become Modern? How can I integrate Cubism into my design process? Are there specific rules? Do I need to master painting, as did Picasso and Braque, before these rules become clear?

Q. Were the rules of Cubism meant to remain hermetic, mysterious, impenetrable?

Most of the 'Cubists' Gris, Metzinger, Gleizes, Fauconnier, Leger, just made pictures of Cubism, they weren't engaged in Cubism itself. Even Picasso only painted a handful of genuinely Cubist pieces.

The new religion of the next century will not be centered on the arts, especially not painting. Communication technology has become our new religion especially with its ameliorating qualities of chaos, string theory and fractals softening the edges of strict rationality. To be an oil painter harboring any thoughts dreams or desires to be the focus of any significant cultural energy in our time is to suffer the delusions of a New Guinea Cargo Cultist waiting for manna from heaven.

Tasks

Overlay and analyze/ diagram twenty Cubist paintings - ten analytic and ten synthetic. If there are multiple station points manifest then identify pictorial section with numbered station point in order to prove the multiple station point assertion. Does one really move around the objects represented in an Analytical Cubist painting? If so, how far around? Does one see the back of a head in a portrait? Do the pieces of objects - the hints, the cues, imply multiple station points? Is it possible that Analytical Cubist paintings imply only one station point and a fractured picture plane? Is there a difference or would there be a difference.

Q. What is the "Democratization" of the picture plane?

A. This is the abolition of that upper band of pale minimal information that riddled western paintings like a birth defect. Note the solidity and variety of Cezanne's skies at Bibemus Quarry and Mont Saint Victoire.

The essence of Cezanne's contribution:

1. Form rendered with color
2. composition with color
3. freedom from line - drawing
4. freedom from finish - varnish
5. Capture essence - move on
6. omit the narrative, the storyline
7. new avenues to the transcendent

Cezanne's quest - his devotion to his art in the face of ridicule and rejection, indifference. He was striving toward a lofty goal in isolation - a prototypical Nietzschean superman, a quiet, humble superman. Cezanne never diluted his art, his vision for the marketplace or the tastes of the public. Cezanne had great unyielding, undiluted faith in the power and transcendence of nature. If he served nature he would prevail. He had no ulterior social motive. He had simple, grand aims.

The essence of Picasso's contribution? He tired of Puvis DeChavannes, he had to confront Matisse. He armed himself with the magic of primitive icons to do battle with his sublimely courageous contemporary.

Passage/ facture - defying Leonardo's dictum to make the hand of the artist disappear.

When the viewer sees patches of blue brushwork in the sky around Cezanne's Mont Sainte Victoire, there is a schizoid resonance at work. The obvious brushmarks, patches of paint, give substance/reality to the surface of the canvas. The blue/white color of the paint creates implied/perceived recession. This area is simultaneously forward and back. The branches of the pine trees and the clusters of pine needles are the forms closest to the top of the picture. Renaissance pictorial logic would infer that these were the most

distant objects in the scene but they are the closest. The distant mountain is the largest single rendered form. The lowest foreground is articulated into many small patches of farmland thus reversing one's expectation that forms recede in scale in the distance. This is a subtle variation on the "Moon Illusion", a phenomenon wherein the vast scale of distant objects is made real by their adjacency to large earthbound landscape features diminished by perspective. Cezanne's obvious filling in of blue and white distant sky pigment around very close pine tree branches and needle clusters further exaggerates this close/distant schism. Traditionally, the elements of a foreground feature would be carefully rendered to maintain complete isolation from the very distant background. To use white pigment representing clouds to outline the pine boughs is outrageously bold in terms of traditional technique but this method creates powerful rhythms and stark contrast in a zone of the picture plane that is traditionally a great bore. The "Zone of Boredom" has become a vital participant in the creation of a dynamic surface from top to bottom and side to side.

Cezanne's willful dismantling of the rules of the Renaissance paradigm was his way of disembowelling an even more oppressive authority figure - his father. Cezanne transferred his internalized construct from an authority he could not confront to one he could penetrate, manipulate and eventually dismantle. Cezanne methodically deconstructed a four hundred fifty year old tradition and replaced it with a more direct and powerful way of representing nature on canvas.

Leonardo could not have invented Cezanne's way of seeing, his color theory, his composition, his use of the picture plane to create content. To Leonardo, the picture plane was totally transparent - one looks through it out onto the vast poetry of form and space in the landscape. With Cezanne, you are reminded with every brushstroke of the picture plane itself.

The generating idea of the Renaissance as formulated by William of Occam is the search for empirical truth. That Cezanne discovered painting techniques that revealed those truths better than Leonardo, Titian, Pouissin is evidence that Cezanne was the greatest of all painters in the spirit of the Renaissance.

Occam encouraged men to unveil the mysteries of the physical world by reasoning from their experience. "Occamism consists, above all, in the rigid segregation of the sacred and profane. The former is the province of the heart and should be under the spiritual direction of a purified church. The latter belongs to the intellect and must be exempt from priestly interference. This doctrine not only secularizes knowledge but frees it from all metaphysics, especially from Aristotle and his philosophy. Parisian scholar Nicolas d'Autrecourt asserted "There is a degree of certainty that men can attain if they apply their minds, not to the philosopher or the commentator, but to the study of things. The new approach was immensely stimulating when it led to all strange phenomena being observed directly, critically and without reference to any preconceived system. It resulted in their being portrayed as they really were, in all their diversity, and

in the replacement of the abstract, conceptual symbol by the true image of this or that creature. In this way Occamism gave an impetus towards realistic art." Georges Duby

*

The laws of physics change once you penetrate the shell of an atom and laws of human behavior change once you enter the ring of two individuals and an entirely different set of laws governing the behavior of a single person. An individual acts within a locus of behavior as do two people, three, four, twelve, one hundred, ten thousand. Place fifteen hundred people in one place and they will behave in predictable ways. Certain types of music are very successful in groups up to one hundred fifty that tend to fail with audiences over five thousand. When more than three adult male humans gather in one place other living things suffer. The intellectual friction that generates verbal energy for the popular press comes from taking the normal patterns associated with a specific size group and pointing out their incongruence with the values of a larger or a smaller group. The teachings of Christ for the guidance of the individual break down when applied to larger groups. The type of character that can dominate a group is not a character who likely manifests the qualities that successfully guide an individual. The political network is anathema to the individual.

Cezanne: The penetrating thoroughness of a single passionate explorer

Picasso/Braque: The acute distillation of a shared language - Cubism as pig latin -

Cubism is a language invented by Picasso and Braque so they could speak to each other about Cezanne.

The Cubists: Gris, Leger, Fauconnier, Gliezes, Metzinger, Duchamp - a movement, a desperate gang who barely comprehended Cubism - a bandwagon on a dangerously cobbled road, a need for manifestoes, a leader, exhibitions. This group created art that looked like Cubism, it had earmarks, it was not the nucleus, it was an outer shell of orbiting minor electrons that interacted with other atoms(units, cadres of impressionable young artists) setting off a chain reaction throughout European and American centers of culture, Vienna, Berlin, Moscow, London, Prague, New York.

Once every several generations there is an individual who returns to nature for inspiration, for principles, for energy. One who can penetrate the shells of various orbits of group-think to develop a deep response to some aspect of the natural world. One who sees with fresh eyes, like the contemporary artists Robert Irwin, Andy Goldsworthy and Vito Acconci. This individual is one who has no link to an established order and more than a few good reasons for destroying that order.

Codes are invented to separate, isolate, to reject, to elevate one group and negate another. If one knows the use of codes and is versed in the grammar and syntax of a few, it is easier to see these exclusionary systems and attach one's self with foresight as well as insight.

The Renaissance Code: visual order

The Modern Code: manipulations of station point

A recent Code: politics

"It is not just what you see but how you see it that will establish your reputation in the world of contemporary art" What is your lens doing. How small can you paint and still have an impact on the international level? Can there be a contemporary masterpiece that is only 5"x7"?

Look Ma! - No Fingers

A group of seven young men and women all in their early twenties live in an empty brewery vat near the Southern Pacific railroad tracks. They write a manifesto about art and sacrifice. They unroll seven large canvasses six by twelve feet each. They stand by the railroad tracks waiting for the freight express to thunder by at fifty five miles per hour. They lay their fingertips across the tracks, seven fingertips are severed in three seconds by the speeding train. They begin to paint and scream simultaneously in a dervish nightmare of blood and panic and passion using their spewing digits to swirl and drip across the expanse of canvas. They fall back from their work in agony leaving seven large canvasses painted in what could be called the 'action' style. Each of the seven works has a distinct style - a language of horror and passion. Each of the paintings was purchased by a major American or European art museum for amounts in the high three figures. The group entered the history books which was their collective goal. Most painters self-destruct more slowly from alcohol, drugs, cigarettes, sour adrenalin. The "stump seven" as they came to be known were the most written about group of painters in history with every academic discipline holding forth on the significance of such a strange pact. Is painting a record of beauty, truth etc. or just a ticket to a restricted clique or remote clinic? Graffiti artists risk their freedom by painting on boxcars in patrolled trainyards, the 'Stump Seven' laid their fingers on the line for Art in a gesture with broadly conceptual as well as graphically rich overtones.

*

The Renaissance Ideal

That the tools and techniques are sometimes mistaken for the spirit of truth is unfortunate. When the truth gets formulized and perverted to be used as a binding agent for political, academic cliques, cadres and communities, the truth suffers. Brunelleschi, Leonardo, Durer, Turner, and Cezanne were searching for, and discovering and communicating new ideas they are all "Renaissance" men. The gift of the Renaissance is that it is not a crime to think! To observe carefully and to record and to share observations. Prior to the Fifteenth Century it was a crime to think in public. It was a crime to think an unsponsored thought. Thinking was evidence of being isolated from the village and isolation was evidence of madness. Ideas came from the Church, the Pope, Bishops, the friars, not from individuals.

What did Cezanne see and how did he see it? How did he prove that which he saw? The concept of the painter's mind as a capacitor receiving and storing stimuli from the landscape then every twenty or thirty minutes he responds with a release of energy informed by processed data in the form of a mixing of colors on the palette, a final glance at the detail in the landscape, a quick summary of work on the canvas, then - a new brushstroke that further completes the puzzle. the two dimensional reality. One of Cezanne's brushstrokes had at least a double function of recording the hue and form of the represented object and placing the paint to enhance the overall structure, composition, and balance of his entire image.

Cezanne's technique, as executed over twenty years was a relentless drip of acid onto the academic, illusionistic paradigm not unlike those elbows that wore away the travertine from the windowsill in Eliot's 'Wasteland'. Eventually the edifice crumbles. Cezanne, the lonesome termite, single handedly eroding the dominant structure by his incessant, penetrating observation and synthesis.

If we examine the painting process of five great painters we can more clearly understand Cezanne's unique contribution. Michaelangelo had a narrative/spiritual motive. The medium must tell a big story. Big client, big ego equals big art. Michaelangelo painted from memory. The Sistine Chapel ceiling is not about learning from nature or seeing the world anew each day. Michaelangelo worked with a set of figural prototypes in a set color range. His reputation as a painter rests on willpower, scale and imagination. He looked only long enough to translate his vision. Leonardo was a careful observer who painted in his studio from memories of past observations and elaborate notes, a technical master, he understood the potential of the oil painting medium. David, another storyteller, was seduced by drawing, composition and technique. He worked in his studio referring to memories of nature in the service of Napoleon. Monet worked outdoors from nature but cared little for pictorial structure, the overall relationships of pictorial elements. His paintings had the casual beauty of the snapshot superbly timed. His brush was on auto-pilot taking continuous cues from nature not burdening himself with a more ambitious compositional agenda. Cezanne's stated goal was to do impressionism with the structure of Poussin and this he achieved. Cezanne rarely resorted to auto-pilot he was engaged in active dialogue with his subject at all times.

It was an assumption of the French academic tradition that a young painter would study nature for later use in his studio while working on large narrative pieces whose purpose was to illustrate classical scenes, myths, significant historical events not to glorify rocks, weeds, farmland, minor peaks, fruit, flowers or relatives or small animals. It was this isolation from nature, from direct observation, from the process of seeing, from the processes of painting itself that sealed the academic tradition from the infusion of fresh technical ideas. Academic art became hermetic and predictable, an easy target in a rapidly changing society.

The only idea that academic painting shared with the Renaissance ideal is the notion of linear/aerial perspective. These procedures were not employed to explore the natural world but to create fantasies in a closed studio environment.

In Medieval times, to separate yourself from the group meant you had lost your mind. In Renaissance/Modern times to not separate yourself from the group means you have lost (or not yet found your mind). In contemporary times all artifacts and behaviors that isolate an individual from the group are good, all behaviors that would cement a community are not good. In poor communities, a spirit of sharing is called "Identity Diffusion" and it's bad. In wealthy communities a spirit of sharing is called "Community Participation" and it is good. The poor are a mob - the wealthy are a community. The poor deal with the blood.

If, in Medieval times, to be separate was to be thought mad and in contemporary times to be bonded to a group means you are mad, does this mean that modern man is, by definition, schizophrenic? To improperly manage one's schizophrenia is to be mad. Modern man is an astute manager by definition. Strong individuals who lived during the cusp of the Medieval/Renaissance paradigm looked mad to their peers and they would appear to embody our most respected notions of individuation. To fail to hide your schizm is to be uncool. The gracious winner is a quintessential VLR man.

In Medieval as well as contemporary primitive societies the notion of being in any way isolated from the group either by excellence or by crime is alien behavior. Behavior that would have been grounds for institutionalization in 1150 propel one to success in the VLR era.

"The law of nature had been invoked by Medieval writers as a normal restraint upon economic self interest. By the seventeenth century, a significant revolution had taken place. "Nature" had come to connote, not divine ordinance, but human appetites and natural rights were invoked by the individualism of the age as a reason why self-interest should be given free play."

"When mankind is faced with the choice between exhilarating activities and piety imprisoned in a shrivelled mass of discarded formulae, it will choose the former, though the energy be brutal and the intelligence narrow."

"The official church, to which independence of thought among the lower orders was but little less abhorrent when it related to their temporal well-being than when it was concerned with their eternal salvation, frowned upon these dangerous speculations, and sometimes crushed them with a ferocity as relentless as the most savage of the white terrors of modern history has shown to the most formidable insurrections."

Cezanne was an intellectual gleaner with a feudal attitude. He was a humble servant of nature.

Greed gave birth to the re-birth. Capitalism is the mother of the Renaissance. F. Scott Fitzgerald: 'Culture follows money'. The arts were only a footnote to the Renaissance. The growth of the free cities, the reformation of the Catholic church, trade with Asia and the Middle East. The concept of interest on loaned money changed the underlying perception of time. Concepts of change were transformed. In 1200 the signal events of a life were played out against a rigid, static social order. During the Renaissance there began a growth in the social strata from the top down of a class of merchants who invested, borrowed money in speculative trade deals financing journeys for silks and spices.

Return to Cezanne's capacitor snapping brushwork, the loaded mind - the loaded brush. Why is Cezanne so widely loved? His humility is a great attractor. His late work is such a dense concentration of information, it's like the moisture absorbent gel in a baby diaper that absorbs 1,000 times its own weight. Cezanne's art is richly packed with fresh ideas about the technics of painting. These ideas were a great attractor for curious, knowing, ambitious young artists. If academic illusionism had become hermetic and impenetrable in its high gloss narrative, then Cezanne was the antidote. His clumsy draughtsmanship and bent perspective lured observers to his work where they were astonished by his powers of observation and invention with color for subtly complex compositional goals. One never tires of looking at a great Cezanne still life or landscape, they ooze secrets like a Pinkham Ryder oozes cadmium oil paint one hundred years after the final brushstroke was laid to canvas.

Cezanne is intriguing in the way Forrest Gump is intriguing. There is something wholly non-threatening thus accessible to the spirit then there is this great pay-off of super morality, extra conscience, honesty, integrity. The man who didn't have to sell out. People forgive the fact that Cezanne was supported by a stipend from his father until his father died when Cezanne was in his early forties. Cezanne then inherited wealth and a large country estate. Cezanne was the patrician country gentleman who didn't have to work for someone else a day in his life. He always had the luxury of nurturing his crabbed, intensely anti-social personality. Cezanne was a Medieval spirit in a Modern world with all of the inherent fascination of the 'fish out of water'. He worked out of doors in the countryside when imperialistic Victorian industrial world was being crammed into noisy, dirty, crowded cities.

Cezanne excised the narrative imperative from western painting and replaced it with a spirit of invention that animates the object without the baggage of storytelling, a task better left to film makers. Perhaps in the next century people will tire of the mind numbingly predictable narratives they are getting from movies and television and will return to painting for the stories and myths of their lives - don't count on it! Cezanne a giant killer? The Renaissance tradition was long exhausted before Cezanne's contributions.

Cezanne was the quintessential student. He did not sense, until very late in life a feeling of having 'arrived'. The sooner you arrive - the sooner you depart. One is advised not to

spend one's fuel too soon but on the other hand don't let its corrosive vapors eat away your soul without presenting your case for existence to your society. Send thank you letters to the multitudes who rejected your efforts during the early and middle years, they allowed you to develop in tranquility.

Faceless families face forces of civilization. The populace has a will of its own and it is not politically correct. It is a toxic vapor from which the laws and values of a generation condense to form fields of desolate dew; books, movies, laws, music, dance, consumer products, public personalities, legal disputes, wars. If you wish to speak to your generation with your droplets of creativity then inhale deeply of the toxins of the moment. You must take a new breath, remove yourself from the iron lung of history suppling the culture with ineffectual form and content.

Have there been any great acts of artistic willpower in recent memory? Willpower is not cool, every act must look effortless, seamless, machine made. The soul has been removed from the touch. Feathering paint, modelling with paint, apply a daub of color then brush it around for ten or fifteen minutes on the canvas trying to make a tree trunk look round while the sun is moving overhead and the light is changing on the tree. Cezanne did not waste his time modelling with brushstrokes. The time and effort other painters spent modelling, Cezanne spent looking. He had his own way of creating volume that used small dabs of color placed upon the canvas with one stroke for each, they were left unmodelled. They may have been overlapped by a more appropriate dab but these small patches of paint were not brushed at in order to blend them into other wet paint of a lighter or darker value in order to create roundness (chiaroscuro) Cezanne's roundness was created by the color itself: warm colors in front, cool colors as you move around the form. Warm colors in front, cool colors to the rear. Some warm colors in the background resonate with warm colors up front. Cezanne created resonating rooms of space on his two dimensional surface. These surfaces are living things. The eye is alive when looking at a fine Cezanne. There are lazy Cezannes but he had a very high batting average. Cezanne's great attraction is that he stayed out of the arena for so long then entered a hero. He toiled in isolation the way any artist must but he toiled for so long alone. The lesson here: If you are pedalling dreck then hire a press agent and spend your money on advertising. It takes economic clout to get the public to buy the ordinary. If you are bringing something of quality into the cultural arena, if you have guided your truth from its earliest, most nebulous beginnings to its conclusive, articulated form then you can walk and speak softly and you can come late to the party and your great and honest idea will resonate across your epoch and for years to follow. Warning, don't try to come to the party late with something that a million dollar promotional effort couldn't foist onto the public. If you're going to show up late you'll want to have the goods or you'll be down on skid road begging for change.

If someone ever suggested to Michelangelo that he was 'expressing himself' he surely would have chuckled. The concept of self expression has eroded the arts. Modern music is pale and wan. painting is scribbling, sculpture is dead animal carcasses. Self

expression was never a stated component of Renaissance art. Self expression when seen as a goal, short circuits the creative process. Self expression was a concept invented by Byron and Shelley as an excuse to prolong the sensual indulgence and physical excesses of their adolescence. The Romantic movement, besides being an overt rebellion from Napoleonic Classicism was one of a few major attempts to swerve from the evils of industrialism and urban growth that characterized the Renaissance paradigm. The Romantic movement was shortly overwhelmed by the narrowness of its inherent duplicities. The Romantics wished to change the world, to re-instate nature and the passions without damaging the central governing reality of the Renaissance which was the concept of the white male fixed at his station point.

Cezanne's goal was not self expression. He strove to communicate a deep feeling for nature. No one can work for long without revealing one's self. No matter what your implied or expressed artistic aims - your self will be expressed, sad as this is in most cases. Self expression is the natural residue of working not an end in itself. Self expression is a stupid goal. Don't ever say it out loud, it is a broad term used by adolescents who haven't learned the value or meaning of work. Any time the term self expression is used by anyone over nineteen, you're in the presence of a problem child, a slacker, a parasite, a naif. Cezanne's reverence for nature gave birth to his array of technical inventions. It is interesting that the Renaissance was much more about finance than about art and Cezanne's father was a banker whom he spent his adult life dismantling through the medium of his art. Cezanne, the artist/son did not have the courage to ever confront or reject the financier/father directly but chose to sublimate his strong feelings of rebellion, perhaps to maintain the stipend and the inheritance. Modern man does not have the luxury of sublimating his rejection of Renaissance values. Art will be a tool in the pitched physical confrontations to come as we enter the chaos that always exists along the seam between two distinct paradigms. Modern is more than art as Renaissance was not really art at all.

Underlying grammar allows one to perceive the world in a certain way. Adults living in Paris in 1880 did not possess a grammar with which to understand Cezanne's paintings. Grammar is formed in one's early childhood, visual grammar perhaps a little later. A forty year old adult in 1880 would have had a fully functional visual grammar, deep structure established by 1850 when the work of Eugene Delacroix was considered dramatically innovative, unusual, unexpected, fresh in its painterly extravagance, in its abandonment of drawing, in its Romantic demonstration of passion. There is always an invisible thirty year lag between the immediate present and the governing intellectual matrices of the adult population. Cezanne was trying to say something about nature that the prevailing illusionistic grammar did not allow. He struggled for thirty years to invent a new way of communicating with paint. Cezanne's new grammar was codified by Picasso and Braque who used this new language to celebrate their quiet little commonplaces.

A child has a powerful predisposition to learn a language. Most painting is about painting not about nature. Cubism was about Cezanne and was it about anything else?

Cubism was about great friendship, working together. It is interesting that the production of these foundation artifacts of a great epochal paradigm shift away from the individual fixed at the center involved two young men unwilling to even sign their paintings, whose work was indistinguishable one from the other. Cezanne found a better way to say apple, orange, mountain, tree, stone. Did Picasso or Braque understand Cezanne's deep grammar?

They understood his structural grammar of space that concerned the rules of linear perspective, their use and abandonment. Neither Picasso nor Braque ever demonstrated any painted evidence that they understood Cezanne's revolutionary use of color to create space.

Cezanne's manipulations of traditional perspective were relatively simple to understand and to re-create, to manipulate but Cezanne's use of color was the stuff of transcendent genius with its roots in a profound understanding of nature as well as of the paint itself and of light. Picasso and Braque knew they would be in deep waters if they elected to speak to Cezanne's color so they intelligently elected to limit their palette to a few shades of brown, black, gray and ochre for the most part while exploring the most transferrable of Cezanne's ideas.

The general population is as removed from the principles of Modern visual grammar as ever. What value is the grammar of Cubism? Just as the fixed station point of linear perspective symbolizes the man centered, rational world view of the Renaissance/modern, the unpinned station point of Cubism with its implications of multivalent, non-linear, inclusive points of view is a metaphor representing a way of seeing the world in its entirety, in its scientific as well as spiritual richness. The Modern way of seeing includes the highest ideals of Medieval faith along with science and technology. The Modern epistemology does not exclude everything that does not fall within the cone of vision as does the Renaissance/VLR paradigm. It is continually repositioning the cone of vision to include all ideas that may be important for our survival. Cubism isn't important just because the pictures themselves have a subtle, austere beauty or just because they issued forth from the brush of Pablo Picasso. It is important because it contains and describes this vast metaphor that has meaning for every human being. All cultural artifacts are weighed by history in relation to their meaning in a particular historical context.

Analytical Cubism carries a great deal of significance because it clearly represents both a summary of the crumbling Renaissance paradigm in art as well as an articulated demonstration of a new way of seeing. Analytical Cubist paintings simultaneously close the door on the Renaissance and open the door for the Modern. Post- Analytical Cubism, the collages and papier colles, have a much narrower scope than the work of 1910-1911 in that this later work is essentially about art specifically, without the broad implications for all of culture.

There are two distinct styles of art making that both have the name Cubism. There is Analytic Cubism practiced by Picasso and Braque as a direct response to the spatial inventions of Cezanne, developed between 1909 through 1911 then there are the collages and papier colles, or Synthetic Cubism which should not be labelled Cubism at all for all this style has to do with concepts of single paintings produced in a framework of an unpinned station point. The Synthetic Cubist works are as different from the Analytic

works as the Analytic work is different from the late work of Cezanne. Synthetic Cubism is about the use of material and the incorporation of text into a work of art whereas Analytic Cubism is about representations of pictorial space.

The Renaissance began when someone put a price on money and changed forever conceptions of time in western society. Anyone paying a mortgage or a credit card debt is a Renaissance man.

"The culture does not exist which an alien cannot perceive as barbaric" Thomas Greene

Cezanne's composition "The Kitchen Table" (1888-90) is a demonstration of the geography of color, of triangulation. Note the red pears, one in the lower left quadrant, one in the basket in the upper right quadrant and the right front table leg that is more red than the left. The green pears form another inner triangle. The ellipse of the blue-gray pot is a tertiary cluster orbiting with its anti-counterparts, the white elliptical lid of the ceramic teapot and the larger, white elliptical domelike form on the white glazed jar to the left. The floor tilts at an angle greater than forty-five degrees as it rises behind the table whose left and right edges recede, non-parallel to a horizon well below that of the tilting floor. The table in the upper left corner is on a third plane with a third horizon implied. Note the scale of the large image of the yellow apple printed on the wallpaper that forms a triangle with two other similarly colored round forms, one in the basket, (an apple), and one in the center of the table, (an apple or an onion). The dissonance created by the over-scaled apple printed on the wallpaper has a compressive effect on the pictorial space. Many of the forms serve more than one compositional function. The local triangular/arrow shapes of the opening in the folded cloth at the lower left center, the top of the large green pears to the left and right, the opposing triangles of the clay pot wicker holder. The negative space arrows pointing to the dynamic center formed by the intersection of the white ceramic lid and the clay pot, the clay pot and the left cloth in the basket, the dark void beneath the cloth at the upper right of the basket. Note the opposition of the over-arching basket handle and the under-arching wicker ring around the upper third of the blue gray clay pot on the left. The curve of the white cloth above the lower left rim of the basket creates an elliptical triumvirate with the two ceramic lids while the two lids create a resonance with the dark elliptical opening in the clay pot. The little yellow/orange pear in the basket below the apple is pointing to the apple in the wallpaper thus serving a harmonic color function as well as a linear compositional function. Note the three handles; that of the teapot (leaning to center), that of the clay pot (leaning into the center of the picture) and the basket handle whose apex is tangent to the intersection of the back wall and the floor, thus collapsing and condensing the illusion of space between them. There are several layers of unifying background color. The "L" shape at the left edge and top (darkest), the "L" shape of the inner top and lower right, next darkest and colored in a receding blue gray. The blue gray of this floor in its two parts is joined by the blue green gray of the cloth shadow in the same value range. The sophistication of establishing a compositional triumvirate with one of the thirds, a different element (mixing apples and oranges, so to speak) i.e. two gray elements of floor with one gray element of cloth or two solid white ellipses with a void of black ellipse.

Two brown flexible handles with one solid white handle, two pieces of first degree illusionistic fruit (on the table) with one piece of second degree illusionistic fruit (in the wallpaper). This use of painted fruit and images of painted fruit is the source of Picasso and Braque's witty experiments with varying levels of illusion in their collages. The transition from solid to transparent using the same color, solid table to wicker grid along the basket edge.

This painting has two major 'movements'. The composition on the table with all of the objects separated by a generous range of space and the group in the basket - more densely packed and sitting on a high contrast, staccato foundation of the small, vibrant patches of white tablecloth seen through the wicker grid. The basket is an unusual family of imaginatively aligned ellipses. The lowest rim of the basket, (tilting up forming an implied ellipse at the upper rim below the diagonal checked grid) is horizontal except at the ends then the ring of wicker, diagonal weave is at full tilt - even greater than the base, thus reversing the order of diminishing curvature expected in a legitimate Renaissance linear perspective. Cezanne has taken bold liberties with traditional perspective to serve his compositional ends. He has created a larger cohesion of the overall picture by sacrificing the logical cohesion of rules of perspective. No element floats away in this Cezanne still life. Each object is bound by multiple devices to the intense centripetal energy at work here. The entire surface is enlisted in the battle for the viewer's attention.

The background in this painting is not simply a flat expanse of graded color in the manner of Whistler, Puvis DeChavannes or to use a contemporary example, Russell Chatham, but an extremely active, albeit subdued zone of importance. Note the alternating directionality as we move from left to right in the upper left quadrant/triangle, the horizontal table top with deep edges, bisecting a vertical screen (with apple wallpaper) then a vertical bookshelf side panel, then horizontal shelves, three, vertical panel, horizontal chair seat and leg brace, vertical leg, horizontal seat and two horizontal braces, another vertical leg followed by the extended horizontal base of the wall, extending to the right edge of the picture. What a rhythmic section! Where the key subjects - the fruit and the containers are an interlocking arabesque of curves. The background is composed of straight lines except that apple image. Analytic Cubist works such as "The Clarinet Player", "The Architect's Table", "Portrait of Fanny Tellier" carry concepts stated in this painting to one higher level of abstraction. In these paintings the edges dominate the image. In "The Kitchen Table" the image is served by the always subordinate edges.

Cezanne's most audacious affront to Leonardo's rules and regulations of linear/aerial perspective is that in this painting the smallest things are the closest to the picture plane and the largest are the most distant! Note the tiny delicate flower painted on the teapot and its bizarre contrast to the massive apples and leaves on the distant wallpaper. It is as if a fundamental rule of perception had been reversed - both painted images of painted images. The three visible corners of the table top form arrows pointing outward away from the center creating a great compositional tug of war. We are looking at a decisive moment in a great battle frozen for eternity with the outcome unknown. This painting will engage forever with its delicious suspense. This is a classic example of a painting that one could live with for a lifetime, seeing new relationships with each viewing. This

painting resonates with immortality. It demolishes the static predictability that dooms most paintings to rapid comprehension, comfort and boredom. There is great beauty and great tension at work here. Although it is tightly composed this painting is not still. Most traditional still lifes achieve repose - Cezanne achieves immortal resonance. This painting ranks with the masterpieces of Rubens and Chardin for compositional complexity and cohesion. It is a symphony of form and color, counterpoint and dissonance every element plays a vital role.

This work contains all of the classic Cezannian syntactical dissonances that spawned Analytical Cubism. Picasso and Braque, after a close reading of this painting and many more like it, displayed in Vollard's gallery and at the Salon D'Automne 1895-1907, developed their language of Cubism containing the following features: 1. Humble, non-narrative still life subjects 2. Pictorial space flattened by linear, aerial and logical perspective distortions 3. Short directional lines formed by edges where tone and color contrast (passage) 4. Interlocking pictorial elements, objects and their surrounding space given equal weight no part of the canvas is simply paint, no zone can be read as represented object or space alone but each square inch serves at least a dual function of being something illusionistic as well as being a piece of the mosaic being constructed on the two dimensional surface. Cezanne and Picasso/Braque put every part of the picture to work. Each stroke carries multiple meanings.

Note the edges in "The Kitchen Table" Those that are orthogonal as well as elliptical reveal distorted linear perspective. It is this distorted geometry that connotes multiple points of view, i.e. multiple station points. Picasso and Braque have exaggerated the multiple station point concept by giving primacy to the edges in their Analytical Cubist work. They have elected to avoid Cezanne's great array of color invention to focus on that aspect of Cezanne's work that most clearly swerves from the Renaissance paradigm. By unpinning the station point Picasso and Braque have removed the observer from his center at the fixed point and introduced such notions of Twentieth Century thought as uncertainty as manifest in quantum physics and the state of doubt rather than confident assurance, doubt that has characterized the masterworks of Modern literature in Beckett, Eliot, Hesse, Joyce, Sartre, and Camus. In the Modern paradigm the observer is not welcome at the center because his very presence violates the processes he wishes to reveal.

Once the observer was removed from the center and sent wandering, it wasn't long before the rapid evolution of concepts that removed the individual altogether with multi-directional expanses of meaning (Pollock) and boxes whose dimensions were telephoned in to the fabricator (Judd).

What about Cezanne's color? It was Picasso's removal of color harmony in an effort to create a shallower 'working space' that forced him to rely so heavily upon his multitude of edges, the facets, the passage itself. He abandoned the most powerful and inventive element of his great precursor. He succeeded too fast and an immensely instructive system of color harmony was lost. Who was left to respond to Cezanne's color? It is the

immensely inventive use of color that creates the great resonance of these late works. It is with color that Cezanne so forcefully establishes his pictorial arena, not by passage or facture alone but by the hue of the passage and its interaction with a family of objects and spaces. Facture (those little brush-sized clusters of contrasting patches of paint usually occurring on a flat color) certainly played a dominant role in forcing the issue of the reality of the surface by removing depth from the illusion but it is color that creates the vibration between Cezanne's deep and shallow space. Cezanne has harnessed the natural vibrations of complimentary colors with his green and red pears, his oranges and blue backgrounds. His color creates form and space.

Our culture has deified Picasso and Braque for their inventions although both failed to demonstrate an understanding of Cezanne's vastly sophisticated and powerfully inventive use of color for compositional ends. This is not surprising because deep understanding is the reward for a lifetime of dedicated study - Cezanne was a profoundly wise scientist of color interaction. Picasso and Braque wisely avoided it altogether in their drive to clarify and codify an easier although more culturally resonant topic, that of perspective.

No painter in the Twentieth century has attempted or achieved such bold uses of color for compositional ends as those demonstrated by Cezanne. Perhaps the next century will be one in which we pick up where we left off when we ignored Cezanne's color for his perspective.

Why are some paintings a perpetual feast for the eyes as well as the mind? What qualities set a work resonating life, cohesion, depth, and poetry? Why is "The Kitchen Table" Cezanne's greatest work? It is balanced. It possesses the colors of life and soul. It is happy and sad, sweet and sour, light and dark, above - below, hard, soft, animate, inanimate, organic, as well as man-made. This painting is charged with oppositions, from its fundamental, deep structural rebellion against the active paradigm of the previous four hundred fifty years with its unpinned perspectives to the opposition of a sweet pear and a sour lemon. This painting is overflowing with restrained conflict, with imminent violence. It took World War One to vent the cosmically concentrated violence of this work. Picasso and Braque pulled the pin with their little experiments then BLAM! Painting and society have yet to fully recover.

This painting captures the essence of Cezanne's lifelong struggle to prove himself independent, not only of his father but the French Academy which was steeped in the illusionistic strategies of the Renaissance. While he could never confront his father in the forty eight years they shared the Earth, he could transfer his fear of an inaccessible authority figure (father) to an authoritative, dominant institution (The French Academy) and over the course of his twenty five year pitched battle in the fields of Aix-en-Provence, he dissolved the archaic, stifling lens of a world view that he knew in his heart was no longer adequate to express his deep reverence for God in nature. Cezanne's art was ecclesiastical. He put religion into color. He was a one man reformation of the way artists interact with nature. William of Occam, Martin Luther, Paul Cezanne - not just a great painter but a great thinker.

"Truth is a mobile army of metaphors, metonymies, anthropomorphisms, a sum, in short, of human relationships which rhetorically and poetically intensified, ornamented, transformed, come to be thought of, after long usage by a people, as fixed, binding and canonical. Truths are illusions which we have forgotten are illusions, worn out metaphors now impotent to stir the senses, coins which have lost their faces and are considered now as metal rather than currency." Frederick Nietzsche

"Our primitive mode of contact with the world is essentially as artists, as more or less unwitting makers of images and metaphors, transforming rather than reproducing our experiences, themselves transformations and not duplications of their causes and objects." "An acknowledged true idea is but one that is enshrined in the conceptual columbarium that is the 'Cemetery of Metaphors' a 'false' idea is an unenshrined or 'live' metaphor - a deviant image." F.N.

"Today's scientific orthodoxy and common sense being yesterday's metaphor, cooled, so to speak, and hardened into fact." F.N.

"Our linguistic scheme has been worked out to accomodate routine experiences - this almost guarantees that expressions of deviant experiences will border on unintelligibility." F.N.

"Rationality is the destiny of any institution that survives, and intuition is the source of any rationality that prevails." F.N.

"Nietzsche saw art not so much in terms of providing truths but as enabling us to bear the truths we experience." A.Danto

Re: "Solid Space in Cezanne" Modern Painters - Spring Issue, 1996

Dear Mr. Heron,

Thank You for your fine article on Cezanne. It is among the more articulate explanations of those characteristics of Cezanne's painting that make it meaningful in the evolution of the Western painting tradition. Your focus on 'multi-directional perspective' and 'The abandonment of that single perspective' is the essence of Cezanne's great paradigm shift.

You state: "It resulted in the final abandonment of that boring Renaissance perspectival system which drew all receding lines toward a single vanishing point on the horizon. Instead, the moving eyes *projected their own vanishing points* (my italics) wherever they focussed, so that when, for instance, your eye dives off to the left of this blue vase, it projects or creates its own perspectival system, its own little avenue between objects which is slightly at variance with the avenues it finds to the right of the blue vase. *It is as*

if the eye of the spectator itself projects separate avenues leading to separate vanishing points wherever it focusses, (my italics) to the right and to the left and above and below all the objects in a composition and it is one of the by-products of this roving eye which projects so many variants of a perspectival system into various parts of a Cezanne painting that it upends planes everywhere into positions which are more approximately parallel to the picture surface. These multiple planes, which face the spectator frontally everywhere in Cezanne, were the brilliantly novel means for generating an entirely new pictorial space - Cezannian space!"

You have identified the essence of Modernism in this paragraph but your optics are exactly reversed. The points I will make are not always obvious. Your initial erroneous assumption and it is one shared by a battalion of art historians and theorists is that the 'boring Renaissance perspectival system' often referred to as 'One Point Perspective' (the system referred to in scholarly texts as 'Perspectiva Legittima' as refined by Brunelleschi and Alberti and practiced for four hundred fifty years by Western painters) typically possesses a single vanishing point. Not so, the 'one point' that contemporary misinformed scholars refer to is the Station Point, not a single vanishing point. I'll try to clarify this by citing some principles of the Renaissance paradigm:

1. Lines that are parallel to each other vanish to the same vanishing point.
2. Lines (edges) that are parallel to a horizontal ground plane will vanish on the horizon line (established by the height above the ground plane of the single eye of the observer whose eye location is called the 'Station Point')
3. Lines (edges) that are not parallel to the ground plane will not vanish on the horizon line, they will vanish above it or below it.
4. Lines (edges) and planes that are parallel to the picture plane *will not vanish* which means they will not recede. Rectangles and squares will remain rectangles and squares, they will not become trapezoids.

Note: There is a type of constructed perspective called 'One Point Perspective' This one point is a single **Vanishing point** not the **Station Point!!** The 'One Point Perspective' is a simple type of perspective construction wherein the principal plane of the object (usually a building or an interior space or a public plaza.) is parallel to the picture plane and since it is usually rectangular, the receding edges vanish to a single vanishing point, usually in the center of the image. If this traditional Renaissance view had any edges that were not either parallel to the picture plane or parallel to those dominant edges receding to the dominant Vanishing Point, it would then be a **Two -Point Perspective** or a **Three-Point Perspective** or one of many types of multi-vanishing point perspective constructions. A Three-Point perspective is one in which the optical axis is tilted from the horizontal, thus leaving no planes in the image at ninety degrees to the picture plane.

An area of confusion is the mis-use of the term **One-Point Perspective**. The renaissance perspective system should simply be called **Linear Perspective** or **Station Point Perspective** not 'one point perspective' which is only a sub-category of the system of Linear Perspective.

You stated "It is as if the eye of the spectator itself projects separate avenues..." The eye projects 'separate avenues' in any classical Renaissance image that happened to contain a volume that is skewed in plan. This cannot be the phenomenon that makes Cezanne's way of seeing unique. There are definitely 'separate avenues' (paths of photons between object and eye) in a Cezanne painting and it is this feature that Picasso and Braque formalized in Analytic Cubism but it is *the station point that is moving* thus establishing new families of vanishing points with each new position of the station point. It is this un-pinned, un-fixed, unpredictable station point that is the cause of the distortions in Cezanne/Picasso/Braque. The eye is not roving, the entire body is roving thus providing views from above and below and around the subjects. The eye roves in a linear perspective context as you can see in diagram 1, the eye moves left, right, up or down to establish vanishing points for each and all sets of parallel edges.

note: The rectilinear forms seen in plan in diagram 1 may have sloping roofs - planes not parallel to the ground. These planes would have their own new horizon lines, one for each set.

Imagine Duchamp's nude looking back through her picture plane at a Cezannian still life motif and you will have a model of the un-pinned station point, i.e. you get a facetting of the image when either the subject (the nude) or the observer is shifting. This would mean that neither "Nude Descending A Staircase" nor the futuristic work of Balla, Boccioni are Modern, Cubist inspired works but variants of the Renaissance paradigm in which moving objects are observed from a fixed station point.

Thank you for the stimulating article.

Sincerely,

Jim Blake

*

What are the social phenomena that launched Modernism?

1. The deconstruction of the moralizing, duplicitous, racist, Victorian dowager.
2. Primitive chic.
3. The Nietzschean cult of the individual
4. The flat East
5. The decline of the Beaux Arts tradition
6. Mass production, the rise of the bourgeoisie
7. The spread of Pragmatism, the great civil works.
8. The exhaustion of the Romantic ideal - too exclusive

The influence of the concepts of linear perspective had a much greater influence on the architecture of the 15th and 16th century than Cubism has had on the architecture of the 20th century. Perspective was used as an archaeological tool to retrieve and revive the ideals and forms of Classical antiquity. Cubism hasn't begun to be used as an exploratory tool of form except in the architectural design classes of Michael Lehrer at the University of Southern California. Where the public was accustomed to the classical models being re-invented by Renaissance architects in the 15th and 16th centuries, the contemporary public is mystified by Cubism and concepts of Modernism in general. When the station point is not fixed, the public gets confused. The Modern paradigm in the arts has not yet taken root. The work looks jarring, and confusing. Perhaps the concept of multiple station points is a violation of Occam's premise - Occam's Razor. The simplest explanation that fits the facts is the best, most likely to be correct. If the culture of the West were to subscribe to a visual system that deviates from this fundamental notion of Western thought, this would indeed be a paradigm shift of far-reaching consequences - it is illogical, non-scientific, instinctive, non-linear, potentially chaotic.

Modernism is, in its essence, primitive. Would architects be banging their heads against the wall, leading the public down a garden path to subscribe wholesale to the concept of the unpinned station point and all of the formal innovation that entails or is this primitive, non Occamian, anti-Renaissance, unscientific concept at the root of a genuinely new order? An epistemology that includes the important values of the primitive society's integration with nature along with the marvels of the industrial/information age. Perhaps a widespread subscription by architects to the principles of Modernism/Cubism with its roots in the unpinned station point would be a gesture toward the notion of civilization in tune with nature, with the primitive as well as the scientific. As we have jettisoned the stylistic fripperies of the Victorian era, we would release the confining, Renaissance based way of seeing and designing as determined by the mechanistic fixed station point, freeing designers and the public from the stale, timeworn, exhausted bag of tricks of the Renaissance tradition. There have been generations of architects in the 20th century who have called themselves Modern who were Renaissance traditionalists in disguise. It takes a greater leap than that involved in editing out the victoriana and containing it in edited, ironic classicism to be Modern.

The practice of Modernism is more complex than using the great tool of the Renaissance, linear perspective (and its techno-doppelganger, the camera) to cadge the look. Real Modernism is rooted in a process of seeing, of seeing entities, entire systems not just facades and their associated prescribed processions. By considering the whole thing, solid and void, form and space, light and that which is revealed by light. We are paying service to the possibility that we have examined our project in its total relation to the environment, that we have examined the whole spectrum of environmental costs, that we have removed those blinders that have been proscribed by the Western, man-centered

fixed station point tradition that are characterized by environmental exploitation/destruction, the sacrifice of the individual in a community to the demands of the marketplace.

Learning a new language as an adult is very difficult. It is painful and frustrating. The thought of having to learn a new language generates apprehension, anxiety and fear. It has taken thirty years for me to learn the language of Renaissance-modernism and I have only practiced it sparsely why burden myself with a new language of form? Architects can be leaders. Symbolic acts are the most resonant acts. Architects can be the symbolic torch bearers of an order in which we can survive as a species. A global order that embraces the primitive as well as the technically sophisticated. Will a global outlook produce an architecture of sameness? No, just the opposite. A new architecture will create diversity.

We have not yet examined or mined Modernism. It is time to look at it closely and learn a few of its secrets. Embrace the conceptual opportunities presented by the dynamic unpinned station point. Reject the static, gridded, man-centered, narrowly scientific, empirical, financial notions of the dying VLR.

In looking at Modernism more closely, one sees very few real practitioners. There have been battalions who have used the name without the underlying principal, who did not understand the fundamental first moves, either the spiritual or the technical first moves, the spiritual seeds.

Schools of architecture spawn and propagate cults at the expense of fundamental processes or they, with good intentions bombard students with a theoretical soup of VLR and Modern seeming ideas without making important distinctions. Students are left without the working knowledge of a cohesive language with which to address design challenges. Without a language of form both students and practitioners will resort to perspective, to the camera and to precedent rather than their dynamic reality.

The dilemma is that the audience expects tradition- a language with which they are familiar.

Cubism with its theoretical assumptions is symbolic of a new integration. Imagine that stripped classicism, photo modernism, post modernism, photo de-construction, neo- neo classical revival (Chicago Public Library) can be distinguished from all Modernism, i.e. that style would be divided among the thinkers and the non-thinkers, the co-opters, the short circuit club. Imagine that the general public as well as the informed client can tell the difference between a think and a non-think design. What if you could not fool any of the people anytime? Architects would have an unavoidable opportunity to learn a new language of design.

Q. How does this new design order affect me?

High school student: Count me in! train me, I'm receptive.

Undergraduate: Yes! A new religion

Grad student: I'm paying too much not to fit in - What's my milieu? If this is going to be it - it's worth a try.

Apprentice: I just work here - trying to keep a job with my ignorance and my transcendent disconnected wisdom

Mid-career professional: Hey! get real buddy, this dreamy stuff goes straight to video.

Corporate: We'll run it up the flagpole. We will have to educate our clients, they will not pay for idealism per se, it has got to be cost effective. The pro-forma is not elastic

Medieval Europe was infinitely more receptive to all of the ideas of the Renaissance than our contemporary culture would be to the real implications of Modern design.

Modernism has been diluted, perverted, misunderstood and abused by painters and architects. To copy the outward appearances of Modernism is simple, to understand its essence takes some effort, it takes more than intelligence. It can't be intellectualized. There is more to Modernism than Corbu's Modulor or Rudolph's dynamic balance. Our scientific, rational, time dominated thought processes and values are at odds with understanding Modernism. They are two distinct world views.

Modernism has a large primitive element manifest in first principles, not just overt, superficial signs like Gauguin's Tahitian subjects or Picasso's bold abstractions of 1908 inspired by Equatorial African sculpture. Modernism is a celebration of community, the tribal context with the advantages of the industrial/information age.

If artists are the bellweathers of cultural shift, they began to swerve en-masse from the VLR during the 1920's. They were inspired by Picasso, Braque, Nietzsche, Joyce, Freud and Einstein. The shift continued to materialize from the 1930's through the 1970's. During the 1980's, sensing the lack of momentum toward a discernable new paradigm and a total co-opting of Modern values by the VLR artists have either stopped work altogether, reverted to social commentary or reverted to the Renaissance paradigm with a pathetic irony. Our canaries in the coal mine have died and no one noticed.

The Modern epoch, as opposed to the VLR has its roots in Cezanne and Picasso who attacked the beating heart of the Renaissance Paradigm, the symbolic center of the entire epistemology, **linear perspective**, with its single station point with man at the center of the world. The concept of linear perspective, the art technique, as developed by Brunelleschi and Alberti plays a very small part in the vast commercial engine that is the Renaissance and Very Late Renaissance way of life but it symbolizes perfectly man's right to locate himself at the center of the world. It is the enabling diagram, the declaration of independence from all living things that are not white, upper class males.

In their attacks on this key component of drawing and painting, the Modernists were assaulting the conceptual center of the Renaissance world view. The efforts of the Modern movement to dissolve this fundamental precept of the Renaissance are just

beginning as the wonders of science, technology, industrialization and communications are embraced by Asia, and Eastern Europe. Realities that are passe' to Americans and Europeans are fresh and exciting to others. We are in the midst of a great global value discrepancy. Americans and Europeans have become enlightened recyclers while their goods are manufactured by polluting aspirants to the Renaissance ideal. This destructive epistemology has wings. It is a Gorgon's head.

As the millenium nears Modern artists are waiting for the world to catch up, to exhaust their thrall with technology. Modernists never clearly defined themselves. There has never been a viable, articulate Modern agenda for all factions of culture to embrace. Modernism has been seen as the province of the precious, something to be entombed and eviscerated by museums. The components of a healthy, coherent, functioning Modernism are present in our society just as the ideas of separation of church and state, the primacy of the individual, interest on money and commerce were present in the middle ages. The essential notions of Modernism have yet to find their Medicis and Strozis, people who harnessed an idea for profit. Profit in Modern terms must embrace the concept of total costs to the environment.

It was painful to watch the boomer generation get excited about the possibility of fundamental changerising to the call of its most insightful artists that 'the times they are a changin' then fall into the roles prescribed by the forces of the dominant VLR world view. In the late twentieth century our revolutionary artists have been embalmed in Renaissance piles. The anarchists have been transformed into deities in an effort to co-opt the message. That Cezanne enjoys vast support from the most entrenched voices of the VLR is massively ironic.

*

Within the VLR paradigm, basic human tendency usually meant dire news for mother earth, in the Modern paradigm the basic human tendencies will result in good news for mother earth. If we can use our vast technological will to damage and destroy the natural environment we can certainly establish a system, and with new communication technologies, a global system, to preserve and conserve the environment. Until an industrial facility has found ways to recycle its wastes and to mitigate its total cost to the environment, it will lose out in competition with those that can, both for employees and for customers. Ambitious entrepreneurs will investigate ways that this reverse switch will manifest itself in products. There will be a million variations on the measurement device. Great social forces will be at work to reduce the use of the automobile, not air pollution but green card deficits - status pollution!

*

Cultural dissonance resulting from simultaneous active paradigms - The Primitive, VLR and the Modern. Every man woman and child lives with this dissonance in their own hearts creating the unease that forms the core of the 'Age of Anxiety'. Modernism means the unification, re-unification of the primitive, myth centered world with the most advanced technologies at our disposal for the enhancement of quality of life, family and community for a sustainable coexistence with all animate and inanimate global systems.

Forgiveness, absolution of mother nature for her severity, harshness, unforgiving qualities. We must live in grace with natural power that can and will destroy us.

Picasso's great Cubist painting "Les Femmes d'Alger (O. J.)", is one in which he boldly demonstrates his rejection of the Renaissance paradigm of illusionism for a deeper symbolism, one that villifies the Victorian matron and her brutally duplicitous values that gave rise to bourgeois fooleries of a violent age and ignored the costs of urbanism and colonialism. Picasso was intensely aware of the social costs of urban industrialism. He catalogued the human detritus, the poverty stricken men and women isolated from both the comforts of a place in the village and the material benefits of a connected urban life. Modernism is the integration of the primitive forces of individuation and community with the techno-opportunities of VLR rationalism.

Some individuals are inherently primitive, some are inherently rational, few are inherently Modern. Modernism must be learned. In the words of Bob Haft of Crown Books the Very Late Renaissance "costs too much". Civilization can no longer afford it. It is now excluding the former middle classes of the United States. It has become far too exclusionary. The VLR demands a small part of the brain for a short amount of time then it is time for the trash heap. It excludes the young who have become fodder for third world manufacturing, the middle aged are under such unnatural pressure they need an ark of drugs to navigate the impossible labyrinths of the contemporary working world at the very least, large doses of caffeine and refined sugar.

As industrialism, fueled by empirical discoveries, accelerates in the late Nineteenth Century, concepts of integrating the primitive are taking root. Picasso gives form to a notion that had been stewing in Paris for thirty years. His primitive expressive language of the female figure in *Les Femmes d'Alger* opened the door for the validation of tribal icons as fine art. Their appearance in a painting of academic salon scale gave the concept credence. This painting served a dual function in servicing the Modern paradigm, it admitted the non-rational, non-empirical, mythic, ritualistic yet secular and it de-constructed the exhausted grammar of illusionism and narrative iconography. By ignoring linear perspective and violating notions of the female figure in western painting. Women like these had never been painted before. During the fin de siècle the model of the Victorian dowager was widespread. Women held little institutional political power but held enormous sway over concepts of ethics and morality. Picasso punctured this stuffy morality and the pretensions it spawned.

*

It takes twenty years of 'education', brainwashing to transform a child into a cog in the machine who buys into the VLR system and its empirical, materialistic system with its hyper-competitive exclusions and destructions. The theory of 'Distance from the Screams'

The low classes do the killing - of animals in slaughterhouses and of other people in the streets and in declared wars. Education insulates, nothing new here. There is a perpetual

war in lower class communities. There is an edge of demarcation between the killers and those insulated from the killing. This edge is shifting now to include large numbers of the formerly middle class.

*

The struggle between left and right brains, left and right political wings, the rational/ the mythic, Appolonian/Dionysian, the Romantic/ Classical is not one of the former prevailing and the latter withering, it is a matter of proportion. There have always been rational men, there have always been intuitive men. Different cultures express different degrees of each. Tribal societies have rational men. Fortune five hundred companies have their myth mongers. Society is a vapor, a noxious cloud that changes from mauve to dusty rose and back again depending on the force of the collective memory - the gravity of the group. A single grain of sand possesses gravity just as the sun has its gravity. A grain of sand can stop a watch or spoil a bite of food or crash a hard drive. A grain of sand has its powers. We live in an epoch called the Very Late Renaissance. Perhaps our techno-scientific rampage against the Earth will last for another thousand years, burying the Modern, placing 1997 in the Middle Renaissance.

Once again we must define our terms. Some scholars have modernism beginning in the early fifteenth century, replacing the word Renaissance altogether. Some scholars claim that the Renaissance began in the Twelfth Century, the Medieval era to most. Was William of Occam the first scholar to suggest the separation of the secular and the ecclesiastical? Probably not, he had the best press agent. There were many Renaissances. That for architecture began with Brunelleschi, in the world of scholarship it began with Eleventh Century monks, in painting with Leonardo. The gridded perspective paving symbolizes the Renaissance in all things. The term modern also means many different time periods to different scholars. Some claim that modernism began in the fifteenth century during the period identified by others as the Renaissance. Some scholars argue that the modern world began in the second decade of the Nineteenth century with the improved system of public roads in Britain, the steamship, the railroad, and the arrival of the self-infatuated artist. Still others look to the inventions of Manet in the 1860's as the beginning of modernism.

*

There has always been Modernism. There have always been forces of Modernism in human society since our Australopithecine romps across the African veldt five million years ago. It is frustrating and foolish to use the broad, categorical terms modern or Renaissance for specific segments of history. These terms embody types of cultural expressions not specific styles. This mis-naming accounts for a thick cloud of confusion and endless opportunity for scholars. We have a small pond of vocabulary and everyone is swimming around peeing in the pool. We establish benchmarks to support our prejudices. There were thousands of marvelous paintings completed between 1860 and 1914 that have received little attention because they don't reinforce a wholly synthetic notion of the 'flow of history' Agenda, who has the agenda? Picasso had his entire Blue

Period in a single roll of canvas in his closet without the foggiest dream that those paintings had any external value. They were tapped by history as was "LeDernoiselles D'Avignon" a painting that also did a decade long tour in Picasso's closet.

*

If you have no audience do you have the will to speak? Imagine Picasso's audacity and courage to speak the unspeakable in a language undecipherable - the best for disturbing messages.

Foundation myths of VLR architecture: Form follows function, Use determines form, the structure shall be expressed, honesty in materials.

Cubist papier collés are a formal source for Frank Gehry. Gehry has projected the paper collages into three dimensions just as LeCorbusier projected Picasso's guitar into the zone of human occupation thus creating the Corb component of the omnipresent Corbaalto curve. Corbu abandoned the station point thus establishing his Modern credentials.

*

The flesh-eating bacteria paradigm. Human life is a vast, flat organism that has an active outer edge surrounding an inner expanse of dead matter. This edge, if observed closely is an intensely violent swarm of activity digesting its way into the future. It is composed of the working population from Medieval scholars to our machinists of sugar refining equipment, scientists of all stripes, astronauts, doctors and shoe salesmen. As members of the colony mature they are educated and funnelled toward this violently moiling edge where they consume resources at an alarming rate and exhaust other living matter leaving behind not only used members of the organism but a dead surface.

*

The History of the Station Point is the history of the picture plane is the history of Western Art.

Working space is like a bellows that, throughout the course of history, has expanded and contracted from the shallow scenes on the walls of Altamira to the continental vistas of Albrecht Altdorfer back into the shallowing space of Manet and the impressionists and shallower still with the flattened space of Cézanne. Picasso and Braque gave specific structure to a shallow space using the Cézannian techniques of passage and facture and the generation weaned on Cubism, Malevich, Mondrian, Corbu, Klee made flatness a deep grammatical reality of Modern painting.

1. Diagram the perspective set up: Station point, vanishing point, horizon line etc.
2. Examples: Lascaux, Egyptian, Greek, Roman, Irish, Medieval, Giotto, Della Francesca, Cimabue, Brunelleschi, Leonardo,
3. Discuss Occam, Medieval Christianity, the Latin revival

4. Perspective developed as a tool for looking backward toward the fashionable Greek and Roman prototypes
5. Leonardo and Vasari: Rules of painting
6. The paradigm is fixed by government: The French Academy, the Romantic swerve
7. 19th Century rebellion: The birth of Modernism; Delacroix, Gericault, Courbet, Manet, Monet, Gauguin, Cezanne
8. New techniques for representing light and form, the dismantling of Chiaroscuro by Monet and Cezanne - Monet/light, Cezanne/color.
9. Fracture and Passage; the manifestation in paint of the unpinned station point in Cezanne's late work.
10. Cezanne's impact on the new generation of painters in Paris - Picasso and Braque dissect the master.
11. Building technology dismantles the Beaux Arts.
12. The Bauhaus fails to grasp the nature of the unpinned station point and fixes upon superficial aspects of the avant garde, the social and industrial, rather than the technical realities of Cubist painting and true Modernism.
13. The Americans through Gropius and Mies create a stripped classical vernacular they call modernism. Phillip Johnson and Alfred Barr never did understand the unpinned station point, the relationship of the Cubist revolution to architecture.
14. It is ironic that LeCorbusier's purist painting lacks any evidence of pictorial space constructed using the multi-positioned observer but his architecture is infused with it.
15. Contemporary architects; Frank Israel, Rob Quigley, Frank Gehry, Zaha Hadid, Wolf Prix, Peter Eisenman and Daniel Libeskind among many others, have grasped the concept of the unpinned station point in architectural space thus creating a body of genuinely Modern architecture.

The effect of the station point on any work of architecture is fundamental. One era's hybrid is a purebred for the next. Listen to language. The generation that knows the sources, that saw the new when it arrived will disparage it. To a new generation everything is fresh. New information ages at a steady rate. The student of a new language doesn't learn the history of that language simultaneously with its grammar. To my generation rock and roll was whole cloth. Most did not know its roots in Rhythm and Blues or Delta Blues. The Beatles were not an amalgam of U.S. top forty and Liverpoolian working class sentiment, they were something totally new.

Did perspective really mean anything to Quattrocento Florentine architects? Could they have done as well without it? Gothic cathedrals didn't rely upon perspective for their conception or realization. One doesn't have to know perspective to understand the physics of an arch.

What was the extent of the influence of the warmed over Renaissance architecture of Enlightenment France on Thomas Jefferson? What did he see? What did he remember? Why continue an orthogonal grid into a building? What is the correlation of the Renaissance grid to the layout of American farmland as seen at twenty thousand feet. Are we farming a fad grown stale. Brunelleschi's grid created the dustbowl. Question for

term paper topic in Western Civilization course: What was the relationship between Brunelleschi and John Steinbeck?

Linear perspective was a very popular fad, Cubism was a fad, Orthographic projection was a fad during the 1970's. Will computer technologies influence the invention of form? Will there be a CADD style? Fads reveal truths about a culture. Fads are of the essence.

Task for graduate students: Diagram overlays of every Analytical Cubist painting produced by Picasso and Braque. Label with numbers each separate facet and assign a letter to each edge of every facet. One scholar per painting until 2010, then one scholar per quadrant, then one scholar per facet, then in 2050, one scholar per edge. Let them propose theories of interaction between various edges and families of edges. Treat these paintings as geographical entities to be mapped, like great valleys or mountain ranges. Let them propose patterns of station point motion for a single painting and speculate on distances between painted objects, the picture plane and station point. Then when they are finished analyzing Picasso and Braque proceed on to every Cubist wannabe in twentieth century painting.

*

My analytical painting "Runway 210" is large for a Cubist painting at 5'x7' (see cover). It maintains the limited Cubist color palette using shades of gray for the most part. The Cubist fabric is established in the charcoal drawing on primed canvas. The main figure is fractured to establish the delicate balance between the reading of the figure and the reading of the ground as coherent pictorial space. If the figure is too literal it cannot engage the surrounding space with the balance required to create the democratic working space that is characteristic of this style, the proper depth. If the figure is too vague, the reference to nude human is lost. The interplay between abstraction and illusion loses its tension. The artist is constantly making decisions regarding the amount of figural information to include. Knowledge of anatomy is crucial in order to create incisive, consistent abstraction of the woman's form. A consistent level of abstraction must be maintained although in LeDemoiselles Picasso violates this rule. The theme of consistency occurs at many levels including brush energy, paint thickness, degree of resolution of shading. Modern painters from Delacroix to Rivera broke many rules but there are some deep matrices that have rarely been violated without risking basic credibility. Consistent execution is a quality that is present in Cezanne's early passionate narrative daubings (where the limbs of the pale figures look like sausage links) as it is present in Frank Stella's aluminum honeycomb wall structures. This is a rule that, if violated, is violated with consistency as in the work of David Salle. It is one quality that underlies most conceptual esthetic principles. The figure in "Runway 210" is fractured, tied into the overall pictorial space. The details of the head and hands and feet must be carefully considered so that their smaller size does not interfere with the pattern of interlinking passage elements both solid and void. All edges of the entire canvas must be considered just as in a classical composition. This consideration is rarely forgotten. The edges must resonate with the interior forms avoiding a framing effect. This aspect was

not handled well in Picasso and Braque's work. They seldom achieved that democratization of the entire surface that was so consistently achieved by Cezanne. He used a variety of bold spatial conceptions such as close objects placed high in the picture. He filled in gaps between foliage with obvious strokes of sky blue that follow the contour of the branches. He places unexpected warm colors in an otherwise blue sky - yellow, ochres, violet and green tints, these warm colors bringing the distant sky forward to participate in the rhythmic dance of compositional cues scattered about the painting surface uniting it into a cohesive objectness. The balance of light and dark must be established as in a traditional work. Not many rules are actually being broken here, just a few, just enough to subtly disturb an educated observer and to totally baffle those uninitiated in the key battles of Modernism. Gold is only one electron away from lead. "Runway 210" is a history painting intended to assume a specific position in the progression of nineteenth and twentieth century development. It falls around 1912. It is a figurative Cubist work that contains a broad narrative subtext for those initiates who can see that it is commenting on Picasso and Braque in a dialogue through history. You can see that the painter knows Duchamp for the fracturing buttock and thigh and calf and foot all of which refer to an unpinned station point. The tension is engrossing. It draws the viewer into an act of resolution. This image has been constructed like a labyrinth. There is no ultimate solution. The painting vibrates with the tension of an unanswerable question. It is a test of courage. How long can you live with uncertainty? Cubism is a test of courage. If you hunger for the static, for resolution then Cubism is not for you. This entire work is left complete in its incompleteness. It is statically dynamic. The viewer closes the equation with the courage of resonant uncertainty. No high gloss here, no gloss at all. The surface is reflectively flat and the space represented is shallow though there are abundant references to deep space. Picasso and Braque were astounded by LeBourget's flight around Paris in the Wright Brother's airplane in 1909 and they incorporated the image of those multi-directional wires and spars in the edges of their facets. "Runway 210" has the 747 on approach, the nacelle openings caught as if by strobe five hundred feet and closing fast "Mon Cher Wilbur".

*

The work Frank Lloyd Wright contains Cubism's lesson. The Robie House and Picasso's "Man With a Clarinet" are both expressions of an internal, organic logic unlike the static creations of the ancient Greeks and Romans.

The intensely observed organic nature of the Arts and Crafts movement influenced Frank Lloyd Wright. The denial of industrialism, the direct investigation of natural forms for inspiration. The asymmetrical grandeur of leaves on a vine, branches on a tree, the rejection of mass production and a return to sources. The Renaissance was a retrieval of antique models that represented three thousand years of refinement of Greek and Roman buildings. William Morris, John Ruskin and Charles Rennie Macintosh as well as Frank Lloyd Wright under the influence of Louis Sullivan and Walt Whitman returned to ground zero. These men and their followers possessed a deep spiritual link to the powerful forces of nature. They were beyond precedent. Nature was their precedent not the ancient Greeks or the Romans. Wright's mentor, Louis Sullivan, integrated

contemporary industrial technology with his direct, powerful and original vocabulary with its sources in organic forms. Sullivan possessed the spirit of the ancient Corinthians in his distillation of a very personal language of detail.

Picasso and Wright were driven to deny the formulaic, confining rigors of the fixed station point. A Prairie House was designed to be experienced spatially. Its logic becomes clear upon experiencing movement through the structure from the approach, entry and movement throughout the house. It was not of the static, station point driven logic of the ancient models or their Renaissance counterparts. Wright's Robie house is an integration of form and space. It is a dynamically balanced composition that violates antique tectonics so prized by Kahn, to manifest a total form logical from any vantage point inside and out. It is a complex and coherent play of light and space that breaks the shackles of Renaissance epistemology just as surely as the Analytical Cubist paintings of Picasso and Braque. This was a simultaneous invention/expression of a new way of seeing. Not since Leibniz and Newton co-discovered calculus or Darwin and Wallace's co-discovery of the principles of natural selection. Louis Sullivan was to Wright what Cezanne was to Picasso and Braque; a powerfully intuitive precursor whose instincts and great powers of invention and sheer orneryness created a new way of seeing. Cezanne and Louis Sullivan were both deeply involved in matters of structure; Cezanne dealing with his search for a more direct, powerful structure for the picture plane and Sullivan with the great challenge of honestly expressing the nature of an entirely new building type - the highrise office building. He expressed the essence of this new form in an organic way, one that spoke to first principles rather than to tradition. There was no tradition for the highrise.

*

Sullivan and Cezanne returned to the source, to the immense bounty of nature, to a forceful, primal organic spirit. LeCorbusier was enthralled by the Cubists. He was two steps removed from nature. Wright's guiding energy was once removed. Wright was a vitally Modern architect and an inspiration to the young European architects of the 1920s who absorbed the best of Sullivan through Wright and the best of Cezanne through Picasso and Braque and created four of the defining masterpieces of 20th Century architecture; Villa Savoye(modern), Ronchamp(modern), The Barcelona Pavilion(VLR) and the Seagram Building(VLR). The other two are Wright's Robie House and Fallingwater. Fallingwater is the apotheosis of the unpinned station point although, ironically, like any great Renaissance building, it photographs to best advantage from a single point as though it were conceived from this location.(The owner of Fallingwater, Edgar Kaufman never had a peaceful night's sleep in the house for fear that the vast, creaking cantilevers would collapse - Modernism breeds anxiety.) As the 20th Century closes, it appears that, barring a late surge from Peter Eisenman, Frank Lloyd Wright is the greatest architect of the century. The one most representative of the Century's salient contribution to the development of Western thought. For the record and Phillip Johnson, Frank Furness is the greatest architect of the nineteenth century.

The radically original architects of the VLR (1830-present) have drawn deeply from organic sources. Gustave Eiffel, Louis Sullivan, Frank Lloyd Wright. LeCorbusier was vastly creative, inventive and influential but he was not radically original. Richard Meier, Charles Gwathmey, John Hejduk, et al have tapped Corbu as if he were a primal force of nature. Frank Gehry has transformed the Cubist papier colles into a three dimensional grammar of assemblage. Gehry is a great bricoleur, as assembler of form but he and the aforementioned contemporary architects have avoided that terrifying source, nature itself. It is an immense task to filter original ideas from a connection with fundamental life forces. Perhaps it is too much to ask of an architect not raised on a farm to have a very deep connection to organic, generative forms and processes.

No architect has ever become transcendent without returning to nature for inspiration.

Postmodernism should have been called premodernism. It was born of rebellion from the oppressive dogma of the true believers, the second generation VLR architects, students of Mies and Gropius. Postmodernism is a reaction to the academic cruelties of mid-century American provincials trying to ape the external syntax of Renaissance rationalism. Robert Venturi and Charles Moore were rejecting the strong arm tactics of dogmatic intellectual bullies, the crew cut academic and corporate scenery chewers Gordon Bunshaft, Paul Rudolph, Richard Neutra, Pietro Belluschi and Eero Saarinen. Postmodernism was an effective brushfire that cleared the field of architecture of VLR dogma. There is now a viable worldwide intellectual climate for the growth of Modernism.

The work of the so called de-constructivists Eisenman, Hadid, Liebskind, Prix, and Pran is the realization of Modernism's essential idea that architecture is not conceived from a single point or along a single axis. These designers are the generators of raw syntactical invention. Modern talent is emerging at the close of the century. Sullivan and Cezanne tapped forces of nature that generate form and through force of imagination and willpower they developed new dialects. A new generation of designers will look beyond form into energy itself and tap organic processes. A building will not simply refer to the organic, it will be an organic object.

*

Modern Architecture Education

"The effectiveness of the cult depends on a common structure by which the group attempts to counteract the person's demoralization. This common structure includes the following: 1) A special supportive, empathic and confiding relationship between adherent and cult. 2) A special setting imbued with powerful symbols of expertise, help, hope and healing (ignorance is a disease) 3) A special rationale, ideology or indisputable myth that explains health, illness, normality and that renders sensible the person's self. Preoccupations and inexplicable feelings within a logically tight framework; and 4) A special set of rituals and practices that confirms the person's assumptive world and insures that within that context a constellation of

new learning experiences and successful outcomes" James T. Richardson, Ph.D., J.D.

"If you want to express yourself - go do it in your basement! Architecture is a public art." Professor George Anselevicius to first year Harvard student.

"After three years in this place, I've finally figured it out! Architecture is about lining things up. If I line things up I stay out of trouble." Third year graduate student at the Harvard Graduate School of Design. The Renaissance paradigm is about lining things up, the Modern paradigm is about dynamic internal cohesion with perhaps nothing lining up.

"Drawing got you into this school but it won't get you out." Professor Tom Stifter to second year student at the Harvard Graduate School of Design. Professor Stifter's subtext of rebellion against the Harvard VLR tradition of drawn architecture.

Talent is a mysterious phenomenon. It is envied and feared. Its possessor is a chosen one, a messenger, a messiah perhaps. Talent is a warning, a predictor of achievement. We expect significance from the talented among us. We give the talented a wider berth, we give them money and time. Hurry and develop your talent and bring us closer to the truth. Oh! you have disappointed us, you had so much talent. You are not Christ after all, not even Raphael.

*

The Modern notion of the locus of uncertainty, the unfixed center, the unpinned station point is manifest in music. Modern music is without a tonal center, Schoenberg, Crumb, Cage, Ligetti, Ice-T, Bartok, Geist. Twelve tone music has no keynote. It is unpredictable, full of dissonant surprises. We learn grammars of sound at an early age. Rap is Modern. It is simple in ways similar to Cubism. There is no melodic color in rap just as there are only gray, brown and ochre in Picasso and Braque's Cubist paintings. Rap is black, Cubism has strong roots in African tribal sculpture. Rap is broadly expressive and culturally effective using a limited palette of musical means. Cubism sent a shock wave through the Western illusionistic paradigm.

*

Architecture students arrive at the point of being forced to learn a language of architecture at an excruciatingly late date in the life of their brains. The human cortex acquires language skills with brilliant ease until the age of four, after that it takes conscious effort, after the age of twenty any language acquisition is a matter of embarrassingly painful effort for most. Frank Lloyd Wright was learning the language of form while still in the womb. His mother surrounded his crib with images of great buildings. Her dreams for him were present in her amniotic fluid and in her breast milk. She gave him Froebel blocks while he was a toddler. Frank Lloyd Wright learned the deep grammar of organic architecture at a very early age. He was a fluent, natural talent with a great capacity for learning and invention in his language of architecture. Mies, Gropius and Corbu were Johnny come lately in the context of language acquisition.

By the time a student is in his/her early twenties alas! the brain cells have ossified to the point where the possibility of being a 'natural' is long gone. At an age when those with primal talent are doing their life's finest conceptualizing, these students are learning their ABCs. But architecture eats its young by the bushel. Architects will say that it is an old man's profession then tell stories about Lou Kahn, who essentially began his career in his mid fifties.

If this society values imaginative, creative architects, it must re-think the point at which training begins in earnest. Fat chance, we already graduate more architects each year than have designed a public building in the history of Western civilization. The profession is crowded, graduate no more until we use the ones we already have who are dying on the vine from under utilization. Schools of architecture must remain the cruel filters that separate the wheat from the chaff, organic education, the agricultural analogy. Only one graduate per program, send the rest to schools of professional practice so they can become executives and execute ninety nine out of the one hundred who graduate in the new regime. The new graduate must not only have talent galore but also must demonstrate Cezannian and Sullivanian originality. We must graduate the potential paradigm shifters restoring meaning to the term Master's Degree. Our schools of architecture must become filters not centers of education. They must assume the new function of cleansing society of potential mediocracies. The schools must recruit widely from the countryside, the small towns and the cities all who aspire to create architecture and gather this enthusiastic lot that is so full of dreams and potential and over the course of five years the professors must simultaneously encourage (to maintain tuition cash flow) and criticize at ever intensifying levels until, by the end of five years it is clear to all who the 'chosen' will be. The primary task in this new institution will not be to educate the class but to identify the single chosen one, the one with talent. The one with perceptions so frighteningly deep he or she could teach the teachers, the one who needs little attention but gets it in spades, the genius! Send this chosen one on to a graduate school on the East coast and the fifty nine others to purgatory. In graduate school the process is repeated - admit sixty, glorify one. At the graduate school level the fifty nine remain in the profession as a unified cult that protects its genius like soldier ants protecting a queen. All sixty know the language well enough to serve as knights, well enough to fight for their queen, (prince). This new graduate school will have all of the salient features of a religious cult. The chosen sixty will be away from their homes and their loved ones, their diet restricted as well as their sleep, there will be a 'godhead' they all study worship, there will be initiated lieutenants who guide them when their faith wavers. They will be isolated from the outside world for weeks and months at a time. They will be subjected to physical rigors, alternating hot and cold temperatures. They will have no financial resources. They will have indoctrination sessions where they are taught the wisdom of the godheads. They will be taught by retired knights of the paradigm who have fought brave battles and had the results printed in Domus or Record. At the end of three years in the east there will be one knight chosen from each sect of the cult, excuse me, graduate school to be the one 'of grace'. This knight must then go into the world to prove his or her new swerve on the paradigm. If he is bloodied by others from competing cults he will return to the house of the cult ...er school and teach the aspirants. If this knight is of true Sullivanian mettle, he

will build for America and the world. He will join the round table with its twelve tone musical chairs and practice architecture until he is either exhausted by jet lag or elected to godhood. Even then only time will tell if he ever really shifted a paradigm. Remember the fate of once vastly popular now virtually forgotten Bourgeois.

We have, of course, already met this future. Current graduate level education is cult mongering. How do we educate not eliminate during the undergraduate years? Must we redefine talent? or re-evaluate its significance? Preposterous! The knights can always draw like angels. No draw - no talent. This drawing fetish symbolizes the Renaissance paradigm from which we are shifting. That architecture is drawable is a quintessential Renaissance idea. Schools of architecture today display the badges of VLR sham Modernism with a deep affection for those who can draw. Students with this talent become skilled con men by the time they graduate. They can look at any book or magazine and crib at will just as the Renaissance scenarists for Serlio's theatrical productions lifted from antique structures for their stage set fantasies. With a modicum of imagination, drawing skills and a light grasp of contemporary idioms they will win the day at their final review and be insulated forever from the agonies and ecstasies of original spatial invention.

Schools might develop systems for encouraging thought rather than the parroting of images or shorthand recipes for program organization and expression. Louis Kahn was not much of a draughtsman. He did not draw like an angel. Kahn had the wisdom to skip back beyond the Renaissance into the resonant core of ancient building practices.

*

I propose a graduate architecture program of three years that uses only cardboard models and no drawing whatsoever, none, nada, nil, zip, zero. No drawing but fifty levels of model making from the chipboard/gluegun sketch model to the basswood/pewter presentation productions. Return the three dimensional blood to the architectural education process. Imagine how quickly this class could give tangible form to their ideas. Drawing is for lazy, shortcutting, primadonnas. Who is going to make a model of a insincere idea? It would require too much effort.

What would be an effective method of dealing with the difficulty of acquiring new language skills at age nineteen. No student who struggles with a language of form during their early twenties will ever possess the fluency of Frank Lloyd Wright. Very few who learn english as a second language develop a seamless fluency but this can work to the student's advantage as was the case with Joseph Conrad and Vladimir Nabokov who learned English late in life and wrote great fiction in their adopted tongue. Natural talents like Wright and Eero Saarinen have a tendency to get too fluent for the good of their art. Late Wright work is often excessively and superficially detailed. Saarinen's taste for drama precluded developing a recognizable style at all, this flaw being explained by his apologists as his search for unique formal solutions to each commission. Achieving greatness in architecture is as difficult as attempting to thread a needle by throwing thread across a room at the eye in the dark with a fan on. It is such an unpredictable, mercurial

enterprise that those that claim to have no architecture can be masterful practitioners, African tribesmen and mediterranean village craftsmen.

Architecture graduates remember the fear of failure in architecture school where design strategies were learned with the reptilian brain fighting for psychic survival. A graduate architect tends to hold these hard won realizations dear. Things must line up, the structure should be expressed, the program must be divided into the served and the servant spaces, the scrambled egg scheme, the peanut brittle scheme, the salami strategy, popcorn suburbia, the food analogies coined by Syracuse University professor Werner Seligman who spent some hungry childhood years in a Nazi concentration camp during World War II.

If Frank Lloyd Wright had been burdened with more humility his imagination may have become static enough to participate in the VLR rationalism that was fashionable during most of his productive years.

Louis Kahn, perhaps the greatest architect since Bernini but certainly too retro to compete with Wright for Twentieth Century honors. Kahn wasn't of this century, he was for all time, an individual who transcends the very concept of the paradigm. He was his own paradigm, a true knight. One would have to return to the Pantheon in Rome completed circa 50 A.D. to find a more profound building than the Exeter Library. Neither of these buildings compares to the Parthenon or the Temple of Aphaeia on the island of Aegina near Athens. These two temples are the product of three thousand years of development. Ictinus and Callicrates, architects of the Parthenon, were shepherds of tradition. They designed the greatest building of all time yet they were not great architects - why not? They were standing on the shoulders of a giant tradition.

"The Renaissance was the setting sun all Europe mistook for dawn." Victor Hugo
It was sunrise for science and sunset for the plastic arts.

Is Kahn's Exeter Library in New Hampshire a greater work of architecture than Chartres Cathedral?, the Bridge at Poli-Khaju?, or the Biblioteque St. Genievieve in Paris? Yes, yes and yes. A poem is a higher art form than the novel.

Cezanne was a great tryer. He made no excuses. Every day in a thousand small ways he tried to be honest to an idea that was larger than his prejudices. Even Wright eventually stopped searching. Perhaps the disciplines of painting and architecture would benefit from regulations of the U.S Air Force. After five years, when a pilot is beginning to get comfortable with his fifteen million dollar mechanical marvel, he is grounded. The theory being that if you are no longer afraid, you are dangerous. Assumptions kill. Cezanne flew until his final breath. He never lost his fear and respect for nature or for the mysteries of painting.

*

"The combination of healing and salvation rituals as a kind of rite of passage is probably what makes religious conversion or induction such a powerful socializer of human behavior. Renunciation, expiation, and cleansing manifest themselves in such contexts. Individuals successfully inducted into most of the new religions emerge in a metaphorically transformed sense as individuals re-socialized into a new psychological or social world. The 'rite of passage' nature of such healing and salvation rituals in new religions (cults) typically involves three stages: separation (physical and psychological); transition (learning the new role and world view); and incorporation (adopting the standards of the system and living by them), moreover, they effectively impress upon the initiate: 1) how a change in one's self is sequentially managed within a particular structure with the assistance and guidance of a particular person or group; and 2) how the outcomes can be ultimately attributed to one's own efforts."

"Richardson and Kilbourne have recently applied the above reasoning in a comparison of the use of brainwashing - thought reform models of the 1950s with their contemporary application to new religions. They believe that the four major models of 'brainwashing' - the Neo-Freudian, the Physiologic, the Pavlovian / Psychoanalytic, and the Cognitive/Social psychological can be similarly conceptualized in terms of a three stage 'rite of passage' ritual to explicate the resocialization process."

Common characteristics:

1) belief system 2) belonging 3) leadership 4) meeting places 5) rules and regulations 6) members 7) money 8) language 9) pay-off

Cults and New Religious Movements. A report of the American Psychiatric Association, Edited by Marc Galanter, M.D.

The Cult Experience. John J. Collins, Ph.D.

LeCorbusier was and remains a powerful 'cult' figure among contemporary architects. If graduate school is a cult experience, and it appears to fit the description, then Corbu's buildings and texts were a large part of the ideological aspects of membership in the broadly influential cults of the Ivy League graduate schools of architecture in recent decades. One of LeCorbusier's most dramatic proposals for urban development involved the erection of a grid of high rises in the center of the city (Paris is his model) and the destruction of all other buildings between this cluster of towers and the city limits. This interstitial wasteland to be called a 'park'. Although this prototype is laughably extreme, it inspired the vast destructions and dislocations in American cities during the 'Urban Renewal' frenzy of the 1950s and 1960s. A classic example of the horror of this notion of contemporary architecture 'cult think' was the destruction of the thriving black business district at South Hill in Philadelphia for a new arena and required access roads and parking. Another example is Robert Moses' wholesale devouring of entire ethnic enclaves in New York City and environs, destruction that had its theoretical enabling epistemology in the Corbusian ideal. Cruel ironies abound. The texts of modern dogma are riddled with notions of 'social purpose' of architecture as a mechanism for social change. The dogmatic, narrow minded teachings of the cult of VLR architecture have

been responsible for a great deal of insensitive, ill-considered, destructive intervention into neighborhoods throughout the United States. It is unfortunate that generations of architects educated at the finest public and private universities failed to understand the Modernism they were so viciously committed to.

*

Modernism is manifest in landscape architecture:

The pastoral designs of Capability Brown, inspired by the grand landscape paintings of Claude Lorrain that were brought back to England by the sons of the landed gentry from their grand tours of Italy, contain the signal feature of the Renaissance approach, the fixed station point. Brown's landscapes, with their Claudian foreground, middleground with pond, architectural folly/ruin and background of gently rolling land with bosques of trees closing the view. The features of Brown's designs were 'natural' and all elements were arranged in a 'natural' manner they were, in fact, as rigorously proscribed as the scenery in a Florentine drama.

Calvert Vaux, designer for the renowned American landscape entrepreneur Frederick Law Olmstead was Modern in spirit. His parks were designed to be fully comprehensible from any one of countless vantage points - a thoroughly democratic experience for the visitor, glens and dells and sinuous paths, streams, lakes, clearings, all surrounded by flowering shrubs and trees of a range of scale forming a free flowing, non-prescriptive experience. Vaux/Olmstead have more in common with Cezanne and the Cubists therefore with the principles of Modernism than such rigorous corporate/civic geometers as Peter Walker, George Hargreaves and Martha Schwartz whose use of color and gridded pattern suggest a very specific and prescriptive spatial experience, a VLR not a Modern approach. It is interesting to compare the work of LeNotre at Versille with that of Capability Brown in the English countryside, they are identical in concept but poles apart in their execution. The landscape philosophy of Ian McHarg, its notion of preservation and sustainability, of working with the earth, listening to the earth rather than violating it with industrial waste, is more essentially Modern than the work of Dan Kiley who is often referred to as a great 'modern' landscape architect. A thoroughly Modern landscape architecture has not yet been synthesized. McHarg has detailed the philosophical concepts that would suggest a state of co-existence with the natural order, Walker et al have the hermetic formal passion for linear perspective generated invention that characterizes the VLR, Calvert Vaux demonstrated a firm grasp of organic Modernism. Landscape architecture is ripe for a great synthesizer who can combine these three currently isolated attitudes into a powerful means toward Modern form.

*

Modern architectural space and structure can be distinguished from that of VLR space and structure with the understanding of a few basic features. Countless buildings and public spaces have been called Modern that, although built in the modern era and sporting the sheep's clothing of modernism are not Modern in principle. Modernism has been a difficult language to learn after growing up in a Jeffersonian gridded world. It is much

easier to identify a Modern painting than a Modern building. There have been very few Modern buildings constructed in the United States. Much of Frank Lloyd Wright's work, Corbu's Carpenter Center for the Visual Arts at Harvard, Paul Rudolph's Yale Art and Architecture building, the work of Peter Eisenman, Frank Gehry, Richard Meier and a spawn of their imitators. It may be that Modernism is unlearnable after the age of twelve. Frank Lloyd Wright and LeCorbusier were intensely aware of natural forms and processes as boys. Their brains, still malleable, made a connection between nature and design processes. Given the evidence accumulated in our cities since the World War II, Modernism is baffling, impenetrable, mysterious and mythical.

The spatial education of architects must begin much earlier than it does now. By default, living in ultra-gridded American cities, worshipping time, money and machine, every American child is initiated into the VLR paradigm that separates the empirical from instinctive, intuitive access to organic, fundamental processes of myth, faith, and respect for nature. To learn Modernism, with its multi-valent locus of the individual and the immense array of possibility and responsibility that this world view encompasses, the instruction should begin early. We ask twenty one year old graduate students to learn Modernism in the course of a three, five or even a seven year program of architectural studies while cramming them with the latest technologies of the industrial west on a cultishly intense schedule. We are continuing to create a professional order of schizophrenics. Our schools of design might first identify Modernism and place it in the context of the bifurcation of the Western mind that occurred in Medieval Europe and flowered in Quattrocento Italy reaching warp speed in the 1830's. We must develop clear definitions for the words Renaissance and Modern. Education must begin with definitions and distinctions. Epochs of history coincide with passages in a human life. A means of clarifying the distinctions between the Modern and the Renaissance epistemology can be found in all of the arts and science. The notions of Renaissance and Modern coincide with tendencies of each half of the human brain: The Renaissance hemisphere (counterintuitively) would be the left with its logical linearity, empirical rigor and rationality and the Modern hemisphere, the right side with its direct wiring to the reptilian brain and instinct driven emotion and lateral thinking.

Human life span was brief in the Middle Ages. The Medieval culture manifest notions characteristic of the young - fear, faith, hope, aspiration, striving, becoming hence - Gothic forms. When the plagues and general miseries of the Middle Ages passed and the average age became greater, the sum effect on the culture was the reason that begins to manifest itself in one's 30s and 40s. During the 20th Century, the miracles of medicine extended the average life span to include concerns that are chiefly political. What is more political than the ossifying brain of a middle aged person who has spent thirty years carving out a strategy for survival in the world. We are in an epoch that prizes property - gridded, mortgaged and subdivided at the expense of spontaneity, romance, dreams. The age of Chivalry expressed the primacy of the rules of engagement for the sexes. The mean age at this time was 21. What if not romance and sex fill the heart and mind of a teenager? The 20th Century has been overwhelmed by politics, by the selfish, greedy, destructive dominance of temporal pragmatism over all other tendencies of the human

soul. The VLR culture crushes youth into submission to the 40-60 hour work week, the twenty five year career, to material comfort. The faceless horrors of spiritual submission to the insane race of time, a pattern that excludes most and exhausts the rest and imprisons all whom it cannot crush.

*

The human brain is the boundless universe that will internalize the realities of this blue jawbreaker we live on. Each brain evolves through its own epochs, the primitive, Medieval, Romantic, Rational and Modern. Perhaps people who favor the right hemisphere experience one five-part sequence and those who favor the left experience a quite different series. Each society on Earth favors a particular pattern of development. The rational epoch of the left-brained is the dominant paradigm for the industrial nations. To be a Modern mind in this VLR world is to be out of phase. Schools now reward children with VLR tendencies and edit away most of the programs that would provide a context for a Modern child. These Modern children must either get in the VLR line or fail. This editing of the contexts in which our potential saviors will be nurtured is a burgeoning crime.

That congealed demographic bolus, the baby boomers has entered its narrowly self serving political phase, romance is a distant memory, myth ended with the last chapter of Lord of the Rings and ritual with the hazing of college or basic training. These lives are now ruled by the rational exigencies of mortgage payments, children's college tuition, caring for aging parents and incarcerated, institutionalized siblings and other marginalized relatives. Our civilization has never been dominated by people over fifty and we are about to discover the nature of an era of the aged.

Artists have served their function during the 20th Century. They have warned us and shown us a way. From 1880 to the present, artists have suggested that we remove ourselves from the station point, from the center of the picture, from the stationary. They have suggested that we address our primitive, mythical selves, our romantic, sensual selves as we intensify our empirical understanding of nature. The message of Modernism is integration of the epochs of individual development into a cohesive, vibrant, curious, creative energetic being - full actualization is the ideal state of Modern man. The computer will allow the minimizing of the drudgery of rational activity so we can seek and find the mythical.

*

The awareness of an esthetically oriented individual evolves throughout a life. There is a primitive phase that is dominated by symbol and crude representation. There is a transformation phase in which people divide themselves into those who can and cannot draw in an illusionistic manner. There is a phase when Victorian clutter seems imaginative and inspired, an age when one is fully susceptible to the full Apollonian palette of axiality, procession, symmetry, hierarchy structure and finish and then there is an age when the nature of Modernism strikes a sympathetic chord in the soul with its informality, dynamic composition and inclusions of the mythically primitive, a point

where allegory and illusion are subsumed by abstract objectness. One flaw of contemporary architectural education is that it has, for the most part, excised the central stages of esthetic development in denying all tendencies toward Victorian exuberance or literal classicism. It has force-fed a denatured VLR dogma while heaping ridicule upon any germinating tendencies toward a full multi-phase development. The natural esthetic language acquisition sequence is cauterized not unlike a tribal genital mutilation to prohibit the student from ever feeling the pleasures of the direct practice of the rich profusion of historical styles that are the Western architectural heritage. If an architecture student between 1950 and the present developed a serious design solution with a dense layer of decoration he or she would be considered beyond teaching. Development through the paradigms may be independent of one's chronological age. The more attuned to historical developments, the sooner a student evolves a fashionably contemporary habit of generating form. Academic/peer pressure is a great accelerator of ideas. Because of the immense contextual submersion in the built residue of the Renaissance paradigm it takes will power and courage to experiment with Modernism i.e., the unpinned station point. The issue is that design educators are force-feeding dogma, oppressing natural expression and evolution. Instead of addressing the ages of esthetics with studio exercises that remove the shame of classicizing or gingerbreading or the ever-present Frank Lloyd Wright cribber, they train by oppression, ridicule and coercion, a broad spectrum of brainwashing strategies. If only they were brainwashing, they are in fact brainsailing. There are few things more pathetic than a 'liberated' mid-career professional reverting to a long suppressed adolescent tendency that was never allowed its timely expression, exhaustion and transcendence. The post-modern movement was a legitimization of natural classicizing tendencies that had been thoroughly suppressed by Gropian VLR believers not any sort of logical evolution from Modernism. Postmodernism had absolutely nothing to do with Modernism. The station point is always fixed in this very drawn architecture. It takes intense courage for one who has spent a lifetime driving around on an orthogonal grid to the rhythms of the atomic clock to even experiment with Modernism long enough to sense the liberating effects of the unpinned station point and the democratized picture plane. Until Modern design theory reaches the elementary, middle and high school level, the employment of Modern design strategies by architecture students will be difficult. Modern design theory is not an external paradigm generated by totalitarian designers imported from Europe, it is an acknowledgement of our own link to esthetic, spiritual sources in nature. Modern design education is much more a process of not killing what already exists in all people than bending them to the artificial rigors of a stifling transitory idiom.

*

The Renaissance was a conflation of political violence, commerce, chivalry, religion, science. It was a time when Christianity replaced painting and sculpture with the printed word to communicate its message.

The phenomenon of linear perspective is dramatically demonstrated in a view from the tenth floor of a building on a grid in a large city. It can be seen from this vantage point how pervasive the Roman grid is in our lives. The rules of linear perspective were

formulated to re-create the power of this Roman planning tradition, that of generating a *Cardo* and *Decamanus* which would in turn generate a regular rectangular grid for the town become city. Major cities that were laid out without benefit of Roman town planning strategies are quite unique in their irregularity, this includes Rome itself and London, Istanbul, Tokyo and Paris - vast modern cities whose streets are paved cow paths - Medieval in spirit, pre-Roman, non Renaissance, not at all conducive to dramatic demonstrations of the rules of linear perspective. It is interesting that the great bearers of Modernism in our epoch; Cezanne, Picasso and Braque were closely connected to Paris, a city whose geometry possesses the organic spirit of Medieval pathways as well as the broad axial boulevards inspired by ancient Roman planners and re-addressed by planners inspired by Renaissance station point axiality. Paris is a vast thriving example of the richness and viability of the inclusive Modern paradigm. It is not surprising that Paris was the adopted home of so many Modern artists; Picasso, Satie, Apollinaire, Corbu, Diaghilev, and Hemingway to name a few of hundreds. The geometry of Paris gives rise to an all inclusive thought process that unites the power of the primitive and Medieval with the clarity of expressive reason.

It is a challenge to take an American student who was born and raised in a pervasively gridded environment whose poignant adolescent memories may have been cruising for two or three miles up a straight avenue, turning right or left ninety degrees and cruising back down the avenue absorbing, at the level of deep grammatical spatial structure, the rigors of Renaissance epistemology, and re-awaken them to their organic, non-linear potential. It is especially difficult when this task of deep transformation is assigned to architecture professors who received their mongrel "modernism" thrice digested by Wright, Bauhaus/Corbu and first and second generation dogmatic VLR modernists or the rebels from that slant, the Venturian post-modernists Charles Moore, Michael Graves, and innumerable contemporary practitioners who welcomed their release from the diet of mean-spirited conceptual gruel that American VLR modernism had become.

The opportunities for educators at every level to clarify the architectural learning process are numerous. In order for these opportunities to flourish, there must be a clear definition of the vocabulary of discourse. At present, there are too many confusing definitions for the terms Renaissance and Modern. There is little agreement in the world of the fine arts and architecture and even less between the arts and history, sociology and anthropology. Design education alone uses many pidgen esthetic dialects that take bits and pieces from many secondary and tertiary sources, mixes them in a confusing soup of gut instinct, prejudice, and inspiration and uses them to intimidate, brow-beat, baffle and dishearten new recruits each school year. A good starting point would be the simple distinction between left and right. If you can tell your left from your right you have begun the process. The left brain is rational, the right brain is intuitive and the Modern brain is the unification of the two halves. The ancient Greeks celebrated a bipolar division of human nature into the Apollonian and the Dionysian that corresponds to the rational and intuitive. The Renaissance was a re-birth of the rational. Linear perspective with its fixed station point is a *synechdoche* of all artistic, literary and scientific manifestations of the humanist, man-centered paradigm. Man is at the center, wherever he moves his grid

follows to guide his visual rays in a measurable world. Medieval thought is centered on God and the afterlife. Reality was misery for the most part giving rise to aspiration, faith, belief, preparation for the afterlife.

Each hemisphere of the brain has enjoyed an epoch in Western civilization in which it alone was the dominant model. Each of these epochs had a characteristic art and architecture. There are many signs that, rather than entering an age of unity of the hemispheres we are re-entering an age of intellectual feudalism a possibility noted recently by Carl Sagan. With Paris, the city of light as our inspiration we must unite our divided selves and continue to build upon the grammar of unity developed by Cezanne, Picasso and Braque. Just as linear perspective is an intellectual construct representing not only an epoch but a physical geography of the brain, let us recognize Cubism as a code representing the integration of ourselves that will enable us to integrate reverence for nature into our lives.

Western Civilization is still in the early stages of Modernism. It is young in relation to VLR and at risk of dissipating completely as an interesting anomaly in human history. The great breakthroughs of Cezanne, Picasso and Braque have yet to be translated into a manageable curriculum. The intellectual nest that has hatched the paradigm shifting ideas of Modernism was invaded by the Bower Bird of Bauhaus Brutalism, with teutonic imperiousness disguised as self-effacing humility, Walter Gropius planted his thick-shelled eggs of machine rationalism in the Modern nest crowding out the intuitive, inclusive, nature centered way of seeing the world.

The name Modernism belongs to the soldiers of 19th century esthetics who risked their careers to invent it. to Turner, Delacroix, Courbet, Manet, Monet, Cezanne, Gauguin, Sullivan, and to the 20th century innovators who translated those hard won battles into a language of form, Wright, Picasso, and Braque. The artists of the West have been trying to tell us something important for the past one hundred fifty years. We must clarify our language so our culture can proceed in a coherent, life affirming direction.

*

Change is gradual, it condenses from the vast vapors of a billion minds. A million minds sense a lack of fit with their culture and their traditional language does not explain or prepare them for their world. The existing language becomes archaic. Single minds act as lightning rods that collect the energy at loose in the social atmosphere. Those minds give form to a new way of seeing the world. Change is slow. Look at Christianity after one hundred fifty years. It was fragile but potent.

*

Contemporary architects are trained to take a Rosie Ruiz approach to their educations. Rosie, you may recall, was the Boston Marathon runner who entered the race at the twenty fourth mile and "won" her division. Today's students skip all of that training at the foot of nature where they would observe and feel natural processes. Experiences that Wright and Corbu had as children and teenagers. If the cult doesn't get 'em before they're

nineteen there is little hope of producing anything other than facile technicians when civilization is begging for thinkers.

*

Modern architecture assumes an un-pinned station point. There are many systems, sequences and patterns of movement. Cezanne's station point was random within a restricted 'shot pattern' as was that of Picasso and Braque. When the picture plane becomes an object as in the work of Pollock and Rothko there is an implied pattern of station point locii like a single electron that revolves so quickly around the nucleus of its atom that it forms a uniform shell. This shell is then another single point at a larger scale.

If you examine a single station point you actually have the cyclopean world of a single eyeball with ten thousand single points in the form of rods and cones. The station point is not a point after all but a screen that is struck at ten thousand points by photons filtered through the lens of the eye.

The vanishing point and the station point have an integral relationship with each other. The vanishing point is on the opposite tip of the ray of light from the station point. Follow a ray of light between the vanishing point and the station point. One extends out to an infinite horizon in the physical world and the other reaches the infinite horizon within the brain which unscrambles an upside down image and fixes it in a fragile reality.

Would the development of systematic, rational paths and patterns for the un-pinned station point in a painting or a building design be a violation of the spirit of Modernism? Forget your eyeball - design with your heart. Design as if there were no station point at all fixed or unfixed. No seeing, only touching, smelling, hearing, tasting. Hot, cold, hard, soft.

*

The quality of a civilization will be expressed in its architecture and urban design. Are we decay? Our cities look like tooth decay from satellite photos. Can anything good happen in a place that looks as if it is devoid of organic content. Perhaps the differences between VLR and Modern are minute and insignificant from any over-arching vantage point.

Why glorify the primitive? Primitive people, though they live their lives in close association with nature are often brutal. Could it be that it is far too late to incorporate any useful organic principles into a system that has such terrible momentum and vast powers of enculturation? Has rationalism stripped the Japanese of their spiritual essence? Are rationalism and faith mutually exclusive? Are too many people genetically wired to be exclusively rational? Can they be trained? brainwashed? Is it too late to formulate a new paradigm or will the human race be forced to discover one from the devastation.

*

"Nothing originates in a spot where there is no sentient, vegetable, and rational life; feathers grow upon birds and are changed every year; hairs grow upon animals and are changed every year... the grass grows in the fields, and the leaves on the trees, and every year they are, in great part, renewed so that we might say that the Earth has a spirit of growth; that its flesh is the soil, its bones, the arrangement and connection of the rocks of which the mountains are composed, its cartilage, the tufa, and its blood, the springs of water. The pool of blood which lies round the heart is the ocean, and its breathing and the increase and decrease of the blood in the pulse is represented in the Earth by the flow and ebb of the sea." Leonardo DaVinci

"Leonardo has taken that branch of human knowledge of the human body to express his sense of tragedy - and what was this tragedy? It was the failure of human knowledge in the face of the forces of nature; and for Leonardo the symbol of this failure was precisely that flux, that continuum to which all his researches had led him." K.C.

"Leonardo regarded painting as the final goal for the efforts of a universal mind. To paint was an operation that demanded every form of knowledge and almost all the scientific disciplines; geometry, dynamics, geology, physiology." Paul Valery

"The intellectual who has been spoiled by his own good training, ought to examine evidence, analyse, compare, test hypotheses, and support theories with logically ordered arguments, is victimized by the advantages of systematic thought. For him, Leonardo daVinci must remain an enigma or a failure because no matter how he looks at 'The Fascination' in the hope of interpreting Leonardo's life's work systematically, there is no system, no simple unity bringing together the variety of what he left behind." Morris Phillipson

"The cultural value of Leonardo rests in how the image of his personality functions for us, not merely in what he did. In effect, Leonardo is infinitely more significant as a myth than as a man. From the time that the myth first began to be elaborated by the nineteenth century Romantics, Leonardo has gained increasing importance; he has gone from being the essence of free, creative spirit to standing as the existential model for everyman." M.P.

"Leonardo's image functions as an occasion to consider what it is for a life's activities to have 'intrinsic value' as opposed to significance for any man." M.P.

"The fascination of Leonardo's personality rests on this fact: that the essence of self-enjoyment is directly related to the interest one takes in the attractions of the rest of the world - in nature as well as in one's own spirit, in matter as in ideas, in the actual as in the possible, in the past and present as in the future." M.P.

"Each epoch gets the discoveries it needs." Sir Kenneth Clark

"In Bertrand Russell's Wisdom of the West, one comes upon two superbly chosen illustrations on facing pages, on the left, Marie Curie stands erect in her austere laboratory waiting to resume work with her electrical equipment. On the right Sarah Bernhart poses amid the bric-a-brac of her histrionic sensibility, her handsome head tilted in an expression of infinite longing and infinite boredom. We chuckle over the neatness of the juxtaposition and comprehend the opposition it represents of two sensibilities, two ways of reckoning with life. The history of this split has not yet been written. Saint Paul, Saint Augustine and Saint Thomas Aquinas all distinguish three orders of being: body, mind, and spirit. Descartes reduces the three to two: body and mind, in almost total separation. It was Pascal who re-opened the subtle fissure in the midst of thought by distinguishing between l'esprit de geometrie and l'esprit de finesse - an untranslatable distinction not at all clear in his work but long remembered nevertheless." Roger Shattuck

The Eighteenth Century sailed along seemingly unperturbed by the fact that things might be coming apart, and the Nineteenth Century seriously took up the task of dividing the human mind into opposing faculties, Cartesian rationalism congealed into positivist theory with its idea of science and history as a growing collection of facts that would reveal their own significance in the shape of law and order. Professor Henry Morganau makes the point about positivism in a lucid article 'The New Style of Science' "Science, then, according to this pristine understanding, is an aggregate of facts, often of trivia, put together with a suffusion of majesty about their mere factualness." Next to this idea of scientific fact, Romanticism spawned a tradition that declared the only true values are feelings - the passions and inner responses that tell us what and how and why we are. Out of this conviction Madame de Stael could write in *De l'Allemagne*: 'In effect, when we abandon ourselves completely to reflections, images and desires that surpass the limits of our experience, then only do we begin to breathe freely.' The old conflict between faith and reason gives way to a new conflict about the very faculty with which we should encounter experience: reason or instinct, thought or feeling, intelligence or sensibility. The opposition is attributed shakily to Rousseau, affirmed by Mathew Arnold and Rimbaud and the decadents and D.H. Lawrence and given social status in the purported alienation of the artist from the bourgeois values of the era." Roger Shattuck

*

There must have been great rationalists among the Neandethals, as there must be among the Australian Aborigine and Native Americans. Because a culture doesn't manifest a particular half of the brain doesn't mean it is absent. Perhaps it was the more rational and scientific prehistoric tribes that survived. They were the ones that remembered paths of animal migration, they could predict the seasons for planting, they could remember formulas for metals. Perhaps all of human evolution has been driven by the rational mind.

Remove man from the center of rational procedures. Those processes don't become necessarily emotional, instinctive and feeling based i.e. products of the right brain but they do embrace a greater realm of possibility. The 'braining' of humans into camps of left and right is misleading and counterproductive. It is of the nineteenth century

tendency to separate that has fractured the profession of architecture into two professions; structural engineering and design architecture - the rational and the intuitive.

"It was the co-existence of the two inter-acting basic aims of Italian art in the Renaissance - that of copying nature and that of transcending it - that accounts for, or at least connects with, its two most extra-artistic manifestations - the passions for science and for antiquity." Cecil Gould - The Grand Manner

*

"Plato had established four liberal arts - arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music - which were the basis of all true knowledge. This number was afterwards increased to seven by the addition of grammar, logic and rhetoric; and in the middle ages this list was the subject of various glosses and expansions but none of these included painting among the liberal arts. This had much distressed the painters of the Renaissance, partly for reasons of prestige, and partly because they were convinced by Plato's arguments and thought that some mathematical or harmonic basis really was necessary if painting were to be a branch of true knowledge: hence the purely mathematical approach of early books on art such as Alberti's Della Pittura, and Piero della Francesca's Prospettiva Pingendi. Leonardo also wished to raise the status of painting from a manual to an intellectual art. A large part of his Treatise on Painting is devoted to this end, especially the comparison of the arts, the so called Paragone; and it was therefore an historical necessity that his study of the science of painting should be built on mathematics... for Leonardo the universe was a mathematical reality overlaid by appearances." Sir Kenneth Clark

"If you despise painting, which is the sole means of reproducing all the known works of nature, you despise an invention which, with subtle and philosophic speculation, considers all the qualities of forms: seas, plants, animals, grasses, flowers, all of which are encircled in light and shadow... by his creative power, the mind of the painter is transformed into the likeness of the mind of God and this is only achieved by intimate understanding of all that he creates. He must consider all of the qualities of forms - animal, vegetable or mineral." Leonardo daVinci

*

Renaissance architecture was a creative interpretation of classic models. There is a limited number of solutions to the problem of spanning with stone. Painting embraced the quasi-mathematical rigors of linear perspective out of a sense of inferiority at having been omitted from Plato's list of the liberal arts. Plato ran out of ink or had to break for dinner and he changed the history of western painting.

*

Leonardo daVinci could be considered more a mascot for the Renaissance than its guiding spirit. His broad integration of the arts and sciences, of the rational as well as the intuitive make him much more a Modern than Renaissance man. That he identified the spirit of the Renaissance so well with his drawing of the universal man and his articulation of the rules of painting in perspective signals us that his mind was broader

than the Renaissance. At this point we can at least clarify our language to the point where we can take full advantage of the richness of the Renaissance tradition while adding to it the radiance of the three dimensional, fully functioning self that makes full use of our hard won conceptual mobility.

*

Then tell 'em what you told 'em

We must clearly define the concepts and nomenclature of the Renaissance paradigm and the Modern paradigm. They are often confused in contemporary discourse. The difference lies in the relationship of man to his world and this in turn is represented in paintings and architecture. The Renaissance paradigm has man fixed at the center, making rational observations and judgements about the natural world. The Modern paradigm has man assuming a variety of peripheral positions that allow him a fuller understanding of his own nature in relation to the external world. This Modern condition is codified in twentieth century painting by the unpinning of the station point. The Cubist paintings of Picasso and Braque were the first works of art to represent a transferrable language of form that takes into account man's maneuverability in the face of nature, not unlike a football quarterback who can not only throw effectively from the pocket but can also scramble. The absence of clear definitions of the Renaissance paradigm and the Modern paradigm has caused well intentioned but narrow minded architects to mis-read powerful opportunities for the design of our cities. There was a mis-naming that transpired in the architecture community during the first decades of this century and propagated in the fifties and sixties, that has blighted us all. This text is a challenge to architects to come to grips with the difference between the Classical/Renaissance/Very Late Renaissance paradigm and the Modern Paradigm. If this distinction is not understood and communicated to students we will, as a culture, continue to suffer from the narrowness of a "man at the center of the universe" world view. This is an exhausted paradigm whose narrow luxuries we can no longer afford.

Cezanne dislodges Western man from the inviolate smugness of his fixed station point. With the unpinned station point as the new reality of the dominant paradigm there is room for women and majorities to stand firm and let their view of the world register. If each epoch has its characteristic vapor and resulting condensate then that of the Renaissance focused most of the wealth down that narrow cone of vision back into the lives of the educated white males who commanded the fix, ruled the point. If the station point was fixed during the five hundred years of the Renaissance epoch it was fixed with violence. Its stasis was protected by the suffering of millions. Cezanne unpinned the station point, Picasso and Braque codified Cezanne's great conceptual achievement in their Cubism and Cubism has rocked the world of Twentieth Century thought. As the century closes we are just beginning to feel the effects of the freedom and inclusiveness of the unpinned station point. Until now the freedoms and responsibilities of the unpinned station point were confined to the realm of art from which they originated but the resonant power of Cezanne's idea is now spreading throughout the culture.