

1

Consciousness and Judgement lie not in the stomach as was thought by many pre-industrial Chinese, but in the mind, where as we know the brain has come to be located.

The eye, which truthfully can be thought of as the outermost part of the brain (an appropriate metaphor for this collection of essays) having its implicit role in our sense of sight is given an almost sublime faith, authority, and power - words we probably wouldn't use to describe our sense of touch, taste, or hearing. This precedence is unwarranted when one thinks about its specific physical design and functions - the direct translation of sensation data which in it is limited as in all of our senses. Relative to the other sense organs science knows little about the eye and its pathways with the brain, but this makes sense in that it is the most complex and specific sense organ the body has. Taken for granted regarding its role in the perception of art, it is still generally assumed that the eye operates as a camera does, efficiently gathering optical information which becomes directly conveyed to us like the pictures we get back from the darkroom.

In actuality the eye has limited capacities to distinguish color, value, and delineation. It can have stubborn memory, it can fatigue and send us the reverse information of what it "witnesses," it gets bored, cagey, and can produce confusing shapes on its own. The cones and rods of the retina have neural hookups which differ at the center of the retina from that of the periphery, thus shapes projected on our retina are received by the neurons over short periods of time, accounting for our perception of gesture, motion, and "time" in certain motionless shapes.

It is now known that delineation (drastic changes in light texture which we perceive as "shape") has a completely different routing through the brain from the neural information that comes through color.

On a few occasions science has been able to witness the approach of seeing. When in a person who has always been blind is given an operation which regains their sight, they at first can only see a blurry light of color temperature when in fact their eye is witnessing exactly what is in front of it. Distinguishable pictures - aperceptions - will not form until a gradual visio-learning process has undergone.

With evidence and accounts such as these what quickly becomes evident is that the eye is only as good as its construction and participation within the limitations of the brain and its consciousness.

So thereby understanding the crudenesses of seeing allows us that, directly or indirectly, perception likewise has inherent crudenesses and limitations.

In the cerebrum locus of the brain where the largest amount of visual processing takes place in the temporal lobes and visual cortex a great battle rages. While perceiving a work of art for instance, in order for us to be able to make any visual judgement of what is in front of us the brain must contend with many things. Our Concepts, percepts, and judgements in all that we have seen, care about, fear, etc., the compound influences brought about by the context surrounding what we are being exposed to, our moods, personality, all have their input and influence. From these we acquire visual tendencies, attitudes of the eye, tastes, and bias.

Perception is a congeries made - more equally than we might admit - of both influences such as these, and physical components - i.e. cones, rods, neural fibers, group-synapses (mapping) etc..

* Perception Paradigm *

Before going any further into a re-investigation of perception we should bring to mind a working definition of it.

Since the beginning of the study of Philosophy questions of what we regard as; reality, being, and consciousness, have been investigated. Agreement as to what specifically our mind consists of, and what we may call, thought, has changed throughout the years. So too, has opinion of what we term Perception.

We could say perception doesn't really exist in and of itself; for the simple reason that it rides somewhere between pure sensation and straight thought. To describe it more accurately we should say it only exists in a process that in the brain; the sensations or instances mapped variously in the perceptual field (cerebrum and temporal lobes of the brain) which as a result of the excitation of neural fibers due to light etc. are assessed by the mind and added to that which cognition supplies from itself. "Percepts" are neither just sensations of light, as our example of the man who regains sight shows us, or, are they pure cognition which without an optical basis would lose its source in the physical world we witness through light. So

Percepts can be described as an ongoing mental evaluation between these two extremes, and that what we commonly consider to be a constant unified device is in actuality an ongoing assesment of the mind an assesment which draws from its own visual -conceptual resources just as equally as it evaluates this comparison.

This system - device of the mind - as we could call it, has a structure of recipricality, interestingly, a "Self-Consciousness." And perhaps coincidentally, after one considers the most striking feature of the "Reductivist" art we cite here being that, of course its very Reduction, distillation or Absolutism - Malevich's "Economy" and "Desert," Newman's "Pure Idea," or Smithson's "Consciousness of the Vapid and Dull," etc.- is the fact of its very Self-Consciousness.

This reciprocal device which forms what we call an aperception is quite similar to the form Phenomenologists use to define any "thing," as we could know it to exist, as in the study of Ontology - the study of "Being."

Long before any artist made works which adressed the Ontological and the Self-Conscious George Friedrich Hegel a Philosopher born in Stuttgart Germany in 1770 came to a resourceful, though quite complex, definition of self-consciousness in terms of Ontology. His Philosophies were later to prefigure the Philosophies and Political ideologies of: Pragmatism, Marxism, Existentialism, Gestalt theory, and Structuralism. In "The Phenomenology of the Spirit" of 1807, he states: "Self-consciousness exists in itself and for itself, in that, and by the fact that it exists for another self-consciousness; that is to say, it is only by being acknowledged or "recognized." The conception of this, its unity in its duplication, of infinitude realizing itself in self-consciousness, has many sides to it and encloses within it elements of varied significance. Thus its moments must on the one hand be strictly kept apart in detailed distinctiveness, and, on the other, in this distinction must, at the same time, also be taken as not distinguished, or must always be accepted and understood in their opposite sense. This double meaning of what is distinguished lies in the nature of self-consciousness: of its being infinite, or directly the opposite of the determinateness in which it is fixed.

When viewing for instance -"Suprematist Painting," by Kazimir Malevich, or -"Color Construction, Green on White," by Olga Rozanova, we come to the surface and Material for its own sake and sence from it its regard for itself in and of itself just as readily as we come to the proportional relations of the forms displayed, through the differences in hue, value, texture, or variations in sheen.

It is my feeling that the dialogue surrounding early Reductivist art has failed to adress this crucial Self-Conscious aspect of the work (and the beginnings of a forced reading that it effects to be adressed shortly) a side which apart from the obvious scenerio of a Platonist removal from the "Subject of the Real" to that of the Subjective of the Artist, and finally in, that of William Worringers' notions of the "abstract" as in his 1906 dissertation "On Abstraction and Empathy" (influential to cubists and abstract painters alike) where he relates abstraction as an equally acceptable art manifest variously throughout the history of man, a kind of refuge from the irrationality of nature in rationally devised forms, as well as that, Geometric abstraction is implicit in man and "derived from the conditions of the human organism," without need of his exposure to it in nature.

Considering "Self-Consciousness" as how it here dwells in an Autonomous Materiality it becomes obvious that it holds suit with the pervasive climate of the times surrounding the making of these artworks. A time which uncovered the sub-conscious as well as primitive archetypes of the mind, the collapse of Newtonian views of the world, and subsequent rise of Marxist and Existential ideologies.

This climate is interesting because when viewing these works not only are Materiality and Self-Consciousness very secular and "Existential" in their nature but the way in which we seem forced to read the paintings is also, by virtue of how we read the work we must go again through the device of recipricality, though this time through it can result variously in shifting perceptual reading and emotive effects of this such as those of a feeling of stultification or lack.

This shifting perceptual reading I will call Reflexivity and I would like to show its development. It more or less is comprised of the two readings available from certain early reductivist artworks the main difference here being that in artworks consisting of Reflexivity there is a deliberate use of it.

The art which subsequently followed these early works where - the Reductive is combined with the Self-Consciousness of Materiality - continued to specifically apply its devices more efficiently.

* Piece of Mind or Prologue for Visceral
Perception *

Could percepts act in the ways that physical things act? And if so, is it unreasonable to assume that then part of our perceptual empathies and feelings could be a direct result of the physical manifestations of our percepts as opposed to an indirect, associative process of perceptual feelings.

"Science" has accepted that sensations can bypass the conscious mind and cause moods or physical responses from our organs and muscles but seems sheepish when the question is asked, just how physical is the mind and might not the manifestations within it being physical, either consciously or subconsciously help bring to bear an artists visual judgements, trigger perceptual memories, artistic bias, or result in empathetic responses with any consisting in the world of things.

In 1901 a book published by the Theosophical Society which no doubt had been read by those artists studying it: Mondrian, Kandinski, Franz Marc, Max Wertheim (author of *Abstraction and Empathy* an influential book to the cubists), and Ivan Dabrowsky. In "Thought Forms" not a scientific book by any stretch of the imagination it says: "The Western scientist, commencing the anatomy and physiology of the brain, endeavours to make these the basis for a sound psychology. Dr. Baraduc of Paris has nearly crossed the barrier and is on the way towards photographing astro-mental images, to obtaining pictures of what results from vibrations in the grey matter of the brain. He says that the creation of an object is the passing out of an image from the mind and its subsequent materialization..."

On May 7th 1915 Ludwig Wittgenstein speaks of "minima sensibilia" as comprising our visual field, when one perceives for instance, a uniform color, and that "A spatial complexity" is at the same time a "logical complexity" - Notebooks, If a logical complexity is corresponding physically to the spacial complexity wouldn't it be corporeally manifested rather than externally?

In the 1920's the school of thought known as Gestalt Psychology started to think of perception on very physiological terms, thus corresponding to a climate arising in the areas of fine art, Psychology, Philosophy, Physics, and Literature.

..."Gestalt theory explains this by pointing out that the brain processes on which vision is based, being physical, are subject to the laws of the physical world. If a boat moving through water produces a wedge-shaped wake, might not a wedge-shaped stimulus in that brain field produce, inversely, the kind of dynamics experienced as 'movement?' - Arnheim, *Toward a Psychology of Art*.

The influential art theoretician Henri Focillon in 1934 states, "These forms that live in space and in matter live first in the mind. Indeed, is it not that they live truly, as it were, uniquely, in the mind, and that their external activity is but the projection of some inner process?" - *Vie des Formes*.

In 46' Ludwig Wittgenstein links the word to the previously mentioned understandings of a physiological perception, and the structure of self-consciousness.

A meditation on his seeing goes, "What I really see must surely be what is produced in me by the influence of the object - then what is produced in me is a sort of copy, something that in its turn can be looked at, can be before one; almost something like a materialization." - *Tractatus* of the blue and brown books.

Why when asked to impersonate someone are we able to do so without looking in a mirror? There must be some sort of established standards for us to know the emotions associated with each expression, yet this basis must be comprised within us because we are not seeing the expressions we are making.

A later argument for the existence of this materialized perception is brought about by the perceptual theoretician Rudolf Arnheim who in 1966 writes, "A drawing of a rectangle, at which the observer is looking - when projected on the pertinent brain field, will arouse in that field a corresponding pattern of physiological forces. Thus the static stimulus pattern will be translated into a dynamic process... the resulting tensions in the physiological field will have their counterpart in visual experience as in the rest of the physical world. - *Toward a Psychology of art*."

In the mid 70's Gerald Edelman a Nobel Prize winner put forward his theories of Neural Darwinism and in them a picture of the brain as structured through flexible units built up of individual synapsing brain cells grouped in large numbers into what he termed strands and these strands forming "sheets" upon which variously different "maps" formed the use and function of each. Some working together to solve problems, some forming others, some only for temporary use etc.

If this is the case it is safe to argue that these perceptual manifestations "maps,"

4

in the brain operate in ways that could be called empathetic or analagous. We may encounter an object with the empathy of our opinions developed from other similar characterized objects mapped in our perceptual field. We may have two types of interpretation: one operating on a rational level and one operating on a physical level with various standards and "vested intrests" for both. These physiological manifestations could be called a new corporeality, a physical objectivity, an empiricism of the physicaly subjective.

* John G *

After moving to New York from Paris in the 20's and changing his name to John Graham Ivan Dabrowsky (Ivan being a Russian had known Naum Gabo, El Lizzitzky, and Vladimir Tatlin) curated painting shows and exhibitions of African, Pre-Columbian, and Occidental art at such Galleries as McMillen and Betty Parsons. He championed the work of Barnett Newman, Pollock, De Kooning, David Smith, Stuart Davis and Arshile Gorky, among many others. At McMillen he gave Jackson Pollock his first group show, and had previously introduced Julian Levy gallery to the work of Arshile Gorky which subsequently was shown there.

Graham's Book, System & Dialectics of Art, begun in 1926, consisted of his theories and advice sometimes influenced by the Theosophists, Neo-Plastic writings of Theo Van Doesburg and Mondrian, Malevich's 1916 manifestos of "Suprematism", and the advanced theories of the Unists, a Polish arts group. Graham exposed Barnett Newman to African art, Pollock to the book "The Life of Forms in Art" by Henri Focillon : which is written, "Accident defines its own shape in the chances of matter, and as the hand exploits this disaster, the mind in its own turn awakens. This re-ordering of a chaotic world achieves its most suprising effects in media apparently un-suited to art, in improvised implements, debris, and rubbish whose deterioration offer countless possibilities... Such alchemy does not merely develop the stereotyped form of an invention; it constructs the vision itself, gives it body..." And tells of a Hokusai story where he tried to paint without the use of his hands by "unrolling his scroll of paper on the floor before a Shogun he poured over it a pot of blue paint, then dipping the claws of a rooster in a pot of red paint, he made the bird run across the scroll leaving his tracks upon it."

He probably had been the first painter of what he termed Minimalism in 1929, (unlike by Gregory Battcock in his Minimal Art, A Critical Anthology-68'). At the Dudensing gallery the catalogue by David Burliuk stated that Graham's painting "appeals to us through pure medium of form and color and texture... [his] latest period, "Minimalism is an important discovery that opens unlimited potentialities such as the new pure pictorial, and a new aesthetic signalization... Minimalism derives its name from the minimum of operating means... it is purely realistic - the subject being the painting itself." - David Burliuk, 1929.

Dorothy Dehner recounts the paintings which Graham had left to be lost, as, "Composition non-objective, consisting of rectangles and squares divided by thin vertical and horizontal lines. The colors were muted -soft browns, tans, whites, grays, pinks, and blacks, The ones he called "Minimalist" had dark brown backgrounds, across the background were a few black lines, sometimes broken, other lines less prominent were in white, broken by occasional flakes of white on the dark background. The lines were not mechanical but very hand made, they had varying thicknesses and soft edges. Sensation was heightened by texture, and the quality of the edge was important to him he stressed the necessity of keeping the paint 'alive.'"

Materialism

In 1929 Georges Bataille calls for a new secular meaning for the term Materialism. Previously it was associated with the profane implications of the Philosophic materialism of the same name. He suggests in Documents 3, "When the word materialism is used, it is time to designate the direct interpretation, excluding all idealism, of raw phenomena, and not a system founded on the fragmentary elements of an ideological analysis," and continues, "Dead matter, the pure idea, and God in fact answer a question in the same way (in other words perfectly, and as flatly as the docile student in a classroom) - a question that can only be posed by philosophers, the question of the essence of things," "the idea by which things become intelligible."

* DrUaCbKbit *

The Aztecs devoted themselves to art & torture simultaneously, treating human sacrifice and flower arrangement with similar reverence- Ken Heyman, They Became What They Beheld, 1970.

A by now classic example of "aspect seeing"- first shown in the humorous German weekly Die Fliegenden Blatter- the picture of the rabbit & duck impossible to see as both simultaneously, led Wittgenstein to say, "We see, not change of aspect, but change of interpretation," and, "The flashing of an aspect on us seems half visual experience, half thought." ibid.

This is interesting here because this "aspect seeing" has a structure identical to both the Ontological Self-consciousness, and what we mean by the word Perception, namely, that of the awareness of its vacillating system, in this instance the awareness of only being able to see each aspect independently and yet knowing we are exposed to the form as autonomous form. Visual devices which give this vacillation in perception have had much attention in the field of Philosophy and Perceptual studies, though not comparably so in how its structure has been used in the Visual Arts. The artists mentioned earlier on and the ones that will come to be mentioned shortly have in various ways taken these devices and used them in their work as both "subject" and "object." Right at Wittgensteins point of half-perceiving and half-thinking there manifests a perceptual conundrum, used by artists it can cause what I call un-requested perception.

In the work of Barnett Newman, Ad Reinhardt, Rothko, Lucio Fontana, Wladaslav Stremenski, Milton Resnick, and Myron Stout use of this "aspect seeing" principal becomes firmly instilled, minimalizing the inherent -record of making - in their works these artists moved on from the initiatives of the Suprematists, Unists, and Neo Plastic artists. Though here such a material form as comprises the work calls little attention to itself by virtue of its reduction of artifice, it clears the way for the un-reflexive and material reading, and meanwhile sets the stage for our perceptual vacillation between this un-reflexive material form and a reflexive/self-consciousness reading.

A subsequently more distilled version of these methods takes place in the generation of artists which were to follow, Aparent in the works of the arch "Minimalists" Sol Lewitt, Judd, Serra, Morris and Tony Smith, and the "Color Field Painters," Poons and Olitski, and relatedly, Luciano Fontana. While the "Minimalists" were completely removing artifice from their work, the artists Robert Rauchenburg, Jasper Johns, Robert Ryman, Brice Marden, Milton Resnick, and Myran Stout, had been putting the - record of making - of their painting into quotaton marks.

Simultaneously Johns, Rauchenburg, Yves Klein, Nauman, Joseph Bouys, Paul Theck, were taking issue with the Body. The Body not soley as Self-Conscious Other, but also as cipher for content and a tool to exploit physiological expectations, uses which first came about through the indisputable work of Duchamp, and during a time when Duchamp unbeknownst to them was creating his most remarkable piece regarding just these concepts -Ettone Donne'.

* Deflation ± Est *
Resusitation

The structure of aspect seeing with Duchamp, took a turn in the type of evocation it results in, becoming one which is "body" based, meanwhile its extending use by abstract painters continued on its course, eventually yielding such unexpected likenesses as the work of Milton Resnick with the work of Jules Olitski.

In Duchamps' exploitative use of our erotic/physiological anticipations, he opened up a field in art which came to bare a wide range of body/perception "issues". In his tableau known as Ettone Donne' he effected denatured erotics simultaneously with un-requested perception and reflexive equivocality.

Three dimensional, body/perception based works, by Duchamp and those who have followed: Johns, Nauman, Bouys, Morris, and Gober, Paul Theck, David Ireland, Yves Klein. can surround the viewer with a sence of the bodies exploitation, incarceration (in lack of a better word for the apposing subject of freedom (I am not content with the word "power" in this context)), erotic let down, paradox, perceptual deflation, are some other common effects of the work, in which, physiological metaphore is everywhere

6.

to be found.

Art which as a device offers an otiose cipher as a stand in for subject; the decoy to be taken by a viewer who still hasn't gotten it, that art doesn't have to be about anything at all.

These works touch is maintained to day in a group of artists who are indebted to the "Color Field Painters", and to the denatured cipher devices of Duchamp Yves Klein, Myron Stout, Rauchenburg, and Johns. Precedents in Yves Klein, Arp, Fontana, Olitski, Ryman, where this intention is exclusive in the work....

* Inflatable Edifice *

Allan McCollum

Resuscitation

The Drop/great deflaters/est Write about the new guys.

Breakdown of what characteristics this work shares. Outline? Concomittant/composit etc., self conscious-(thingness)... The two. Dialogue projected/ implied from how we think in dialogue. decision making narrative Ryman.

The Drop, EST, Pulling the rug out, Dropping the edifice, Duchamp?, other examples. Strong sence of loss, deflation, anti-climax while at the same time a distinct sence of place and event.

A. Very specific usage; in painting, abstract 2-d visual "punning", Much as the diologue in a play, text, painting w/script, visualdiologue is set by painter, though all abstract and structured through perceptual readings. flip flopping, Perceptually door shutting, drawer sliding, flap directed perception, infolding, mold making, turning the mold inside out, shell gaming, perceptual thought musceling/flexing/gaming. The two; dialogue projected from the way we think may relate to this. In order to arrive at a meaningful mundane, resolute place.

When absence in consummated, Dirth, the Lack. E. Kovacks. I think Ernie Kovacks was only half kidding when he did a spoof where an Avant Gard Poet starts with the Lines: Dirth, the Lack. He himself was a great defamer and deflater.

B. Which artists work operates succesfully in this way.

a. Which in its most distilled manifestation could be a specific light cast upon some unique form and material. b. Ryman, David Ireland, early Brice Marden, (get essays from Gagorian Marden show) Barnett Newman, (get essays from Pace show), Late Reindhart, Morris' Felts, Just Painters? Nauman/Gober/ Merrit Oppenheim though different focus.

C. What work relies upon this presumption and function to justify it but ultimately falls flat, Zinzer, Ostendarp, woman dot painter at Good. although this flat is passed off as part of the idea.

5.

The Two.

A.

How we think in diologue, how this has effected this work. How this effects the viewer and his expectation-(s) and anticipations of the viewers perceiving mind when "reading" the work. How this is exploited by the artists, and sets a stage and precedent to rebound from and make the coup.

Outline for introduction

1 hesitations due to theory surfeit.

2 lineage fr Newtonian/Cartesian to Relativity/Contextualist/Subjective not only- Existentialism, Working mans knowl still @ old Objectivity, Semiotics, bolstered these ops in USA.

3 New Objectivity

4 Subjects adressed

A. Limited Visceral comprised of the now thouyght to be one organ - the eye brain.

B. The reflexive lineage in Painting and ultimitly in Sculpture.

1. intro. Malleovich through to shift with John and Rauchenburg, Minimalis, now to Glib & Otiose Cipher art. Arp as precursor.

2. Theosophy - Mondrian, Existentialism, relativity and contextuality ignored, realization of a new Objectivity, the subjectivity was perfunctory to these guys. Materialism/Phenominology.

3. Reflexive as Self-Conscious
4. Reflexive/Un-Reflexive - Equivocality.
 - A. as Relativity & Contextualism
 - B. Role of Aspect Seeing - Perception, Thinking.
 - C. Break into Duchamp
5. Current work, Johns drawer pieces, Rauchenburg Erased DeKooning, Olitski, till now, Allan McCollum

*Newton
Oppenheim*

I hesitate to write this essay because of my concern in adding to the rapidly increasing quantities of art theorywritings. I have always believed that its not the artists job to justify his work.

Sometime in the sixties critical writing really took off along with the art world. At this point, theoretical writing itself has in a sense become an end in itself, its own discipline. I saw an attempt at better establishing this fact, in the museum display of a cataloge written by two curators who specialize in verbal heavy justifications for the shows they assemble.

This paper assembles ideas which have haunted me for years.

At some point I realized that I had for years been assembling source materials for the thoughts brought up here, then found myself in a situation where I had the time and peace of mind to write it.

It seems to make sence to get started with a sketch of the grounds to be covered here. Namely Perception in regards to Art.

The problems occur when adressing this topic because

Assuming the average reader has an idea of the vast changes that have occured in our models for our "world views" since the "rennaissance", I must start by making the bold statement that one objective here is to make a claim for a new Objectivity.

The average working man may still have the old Objectivity and view of things, this may be true.

My meaning for objectivity here is both a material and physiological

The processes of visuality are no longer comprised soely of a system of subjectivity and influence.

physical replacements for this subjectivity.

Objectivity is justified in its resuscitation. an Objectivity based in corporeality to replace that of the subjective and the Cartesian objective.

It has been generally accepted that we see "subjectively", countless art related books have been written on the subject, what we wish to focus on here are the implications of the physical nature of perception, while not attempting to deny its "subjective" aspects, to open up investigation to the fact that even "subjectivity" is ultimately physical.

The idea that there is only so much matter in the universe is far reaching, and the notion that we along with everything else are comprised merely of this matter has never stopped western science and philosophy to effect models of perception based on "reality" or "subjectivity". The distance between these predictable egocentric (whats the word for this I centered existence).

takes on our reality and what we know comprises the universe is just getting smaller. This is neither a predictable nihilism, or the interest here lies in how consciousness, and subsequently, reflexive self-consciousness, "Ontologies," as well as, equivocality as expressed in the vanguard art tradition of the west, is founded in the corporeal nature of perception (here refering to the eye and the perceptual field itself being made up of common visceral matter & subject to our interpretive bias) and,

It is my belief that Man and Society take revolutionary advances in understanding as strong metaphores to apply to the world around them.

But the interpretation of these new "philosophies" is open to each mans interpretation.

Such interpretations varied at around the period when Modernism in the visual arts began. As the Newtonian and Cartesian views of reality were changing into those of Einsteins quantum theory, Psychologies separation of the conscious and subconscious mind, Philosophies suggestions of Gestalt and Existential views, and Economics Philosophies of Capitalism and Marxism various interpretaions resulted. My aim is not to adress

I think we are still trying to sort this out.

It We should more fully come to accept that perception is physically based. It seems then, that we would more fully make use of its strongly - but at the moment tacitly-

8

exploited: marketing, evocating, identifying, eroticizing, so
metaphoric role-model everywhere in the world around us, a wor
physical self that pours its various individual psychological
& bias all over it.

Bibliography:

Roland Barth, Camera Lucida, The responsibility of forms.

When did Gestalt theory start? Did Hegel help it along? The way
by the time of Mallewich. When did Existentialism start?
When did concept of Self Consciousness start? Freud?, Jung? La
The concept of the Other. Other as link bet. Psychiatry and Se
only this was of interest to these artists, not "Subconscious"
were more intrested in the concept of the Other in with Gestal
or "Relativity." Zen, Hokusai quote - Graham read - showed to
Materialist views first get manifested in the artists mentione
views are contrary to conventional views of Relativity, Subjec
Subconscious as a justification of Subjectivity.

We've got justifications for abstraction, forms themselves, at
Graham invented Minimalism - not known or acknowledged - he wa
abtract painter or Minimalist, did Newman see these? Cite the o
paintings in Sys&Dial.

Graham hooked up these views to certain Americans, Arch Pollac
Reindhart picked up these possib. independently. Mondrian was
have known of Thought forms, Fontana? Dubuffets materialist we
Resnick.

Why do Nigerians worship the incarnate spirit in pile of cobal
of wood?