

Cherise Gabbidon
COMD 3504-0110

Spring 2021

Assignment 3

(Note to self - Dematerialization
means doing more with less)

I feel that if I read
all three at once before
getting some of my thoughts
down from the first one I
will forget my reactions/thoughts.

So I will write out some
of my thoughts from "Our
Book" first. It was an interesting
read. I can tell that he really
enjoyed writing it. It was
as if I could physically hear/
feel his excitement through
the choice of his words.

When I was reading the
first two paragraphs of
our book I felt as if I
was reading something
current. I felt like his
language was not so foreign.

It felt like I was reading
a work from someone who
was born in a generation
not too far from my own.

I think I thought this was
because the present
day of our society is more
focused than ever on
technological advancements. We
have e-readers like the kindle
and iPad. Electric cars, Flat
Screen television, headphones,
Smart phones/cell phones, etc.
Most things of the past
has improved. Socially,
physically, economically etc for
country's like our own.

Lissitzky spoke of technology
back then in his present
but also in sense spoke
for the present. He understood
where society was heading.
He welcomed it. He spoke
mainly of three things or

4 that all tied into each other in some way or another. Those 4 things were design, technology, the book, and language.

I did not really understand the mentions about the language, the symbols, the sands etc. However, there was one thing that I highlighted that I want to respond to regarding hieroglyphs. He stated that "the hieroglyph book is international (at least, in its potentiality). I do not agree with this statement after the conversations that we had as a class / your thoughts and lecture. Before this class I would have most likely agreed with his statement. I thought most symbols were universal. However, now I know that culture can change ^{the} meaning

of symbols and words.

My last comment regarding the reading "our Book" is about the easel's effectiveness. He says that although great works of art are created from the use of the easel its effectiveness as an item has been lost. I disagree while also agree slightly with this statement. The reason I agree with it is because there are other mediums to create beautiful art now that are effective in the display. For example digital art is one. One can paint a painting that resembles an oil painting. This can be done quicker and effective because you don't have to wait for paint to dry. You don't have to clean up after you are done,

You don't have to spend time mixing paint values. You can "undo" with a click of a ~~button~~ button etc. However, on the other hand I disagree because I believe it did not lose effectiveness as an object. People still use them, personally and professionally. Although a oil painting can be visually copied using digital means it cannot be copied by physical means. The touch/sensation of a traditional painting cannot be mimicked. Digital paintings must be printed. That is what separates them in the wisest way.

In article two, "who we are" it says that we did not create technology. My question is then who did?

I disagree that technology is the mortal enemy of art. I believe they have the ability to work together. I consider I would like to consider myself an artist. However I do not only create in the physical world alone. I create in the digital world as well. I love it. I feel grateful that I have both skills as I am living proof to those people of yesterday that the world needs both and can co-exist in a world together. Lastly a comment. I love that it was written in a poetic format.

In the last reading "The Futurist Manifesto" there was a line that said they would see angels fly and witness the birth of the first

Centaur. I am not sure if this is meant to be hyperbolic or literal. I would assume that it is an expression for the future inventions unknown to ^{the} man of yesterday. I think they are saying that what is to come will be so exciting, something never before seen or even ^{never} expected to ^{be} seen happen. This is probably to peak the public's interest to encourage them to adapt the Futurist society. A society run by technology and innovation.

In conclusion to end here, I want to briefly mention the one thing that all the authors had in common. It was their views on technology. They were excited by it, they believed it would

be a main component that
would advance women societies.
In all this is my response
to Assignment 3.