

It's ironic that at the time of a suggested "New Objectivity" in this Post-Modern, and Post Structuralist period the same old original Objectivity is at this point still largely accepted by the majority of the populace.

\*

This essay roughly follows a line of artistic thinking which from its origin seems to have been subtly, misunderstood. It starts in works of art made by - among others - Streminski, Rosanova, Mallevitch, Rodchenko, and Mondrian, the precursors of the Minimalist reductivism which followed their lead.

In specific works of theirs one can speak of a certain type of reductivism. It is one generously constituted of both the Philosophic-Phenomenological and Ontological ideals of Being and Consciousness and the direct and concrete means of an awareness and use of perception, the works, in fact to a large degree being justified through these just as much as has been suggested their involvement in a Modernist Avante Garde or Political or Economic ideals.

Philosophy and Perception are wide ranging fields of study and reductivist art is very specific in its use of them, this use has not been given much time and less yet has been given to the theoretical climate surrounding the artists while they made their initial strides.

This essay also wishes to explore how these devices have been subsequently exploited throughout art continuing on up to the present day where it seems to have culminated in the "send-up" of reductivist art by positing ciphers for the obligatory "content" art obliges as in the work of Allen McCollum.

It is my belief that these pioneering reductivists used in a very different way, artistic cognition, Ontology, and faith of perception than we commonly think they did. At the time of their pioneering works new understandings into the natures of the brain and perception had firmly been undertaken. Its crude yet concrete physiological structure substantiated a new "Objectivity" yet it was being linked with the influences of both the subjective and the contextual.

Existentialism, postulates for the existence of a fourth dimension, relativity, the uncovering of the sub-conscious mind all helped contribute to a view of the artist as one who draws from the wellspring of his subjective "Nature" free to express himself in the materials at his disposal. It is my belief that the modernist dictum of "subjectivity" has wrongly been cast backward (projected) onto these early reductivists, assuming that they entrusted the same subjective artistic devices that their non-reductivist peers held firmly to. Yet when we examine closely the writings and artworks themselves we are struck by the direct and transparent concreteness conveyed straight away with a minimum of means, also what amounts to an enthusiastic rejection of the formalisms and idealistic "creativities" prevalent at the time.

With perceptuality as a main component of the early reductivists artistic device there can be several assessments. Of these, two basic understandings explored and pitted here against each other are: of the belief in an empirical perceptual cognition - as in a trope of the camera and camera obscura - of that which we are in witness of; and the other assessment being a "corporealistic" view based in the physical

construction of our perceptual apparatus, and, the contexts and bias' with which we make our visual assessments - our seeing.

Within views toward a "corporeal" perception I would like to try and show a useful comparison which can be made between what I call Sympathetic Perception and that of Empathetic Perception.

By my use of "Sympathetic perception" I mean a faith in a perception that hinges on psychological "projections" onto the objects of our perceptual interaction, to a large part it can be seen to be comprised in the viewers bias, socialization, and contextual learning, all seen as separate from the object.

Use of what I term Empathetic Perception being antithetical to Sympathetic view is also subjective in its nature though it denotes a direct, a physical, subjectivity, not one being mainly comprised of bias and interpretation; In Empathetic perception the percepts are in part formed through the virtue of the similar physical structure in the cerebrums perceptual field, or "maps," to that of the object of perception. This view had at first only been hinted at by theoreticians and early Gestalt Psychiatry, though now can be deduced more justly in recent strides made in the still nascent field of the Physiology of Perception. Especially in the work of Robert Edelman.

It is assumed here that the reader is aware of the commonality of dualistic theories of perception, where the mind is seen as something not physical in its nature much apart from the secular workings of the body.