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Abstract

Beatriz Colomina has characterized the domestic architecture of Le Corbusier as a mechanism for viewing. This mechanism produces a modern subject whose existence is confirmed by his ability to see and be seen. Looks or framed views in the architecture are created for his subjectivized eye. By examining specific views within Le Corbusier’s Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau, this thesis clarifies the interrelationship between the subject vis-à-vis “seeing” and “being seen”. Lacan’s notion of scopic vision provides the structure for understanding this subjectivized viewing. In the Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau, in some instances, the subject becomes an omnipresent eye that objectifies others, and in other cases, the subject is the object of the gaze of the other. By revealing the gaze, the Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau becomes a machine to disturb and arouse through sight.
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1. The eye.

2. The gaze
3. The eye and the gaze.

4. The screen from the point of view of subject.
I. Background

1.1 Preamble

There has been a paradigmatic change in the definition of “seeing”. According to Jonathan Cray, since the Enlightenment, “seeing” has been defined as an objective, physiological function. In the Cartesian separation between mind and body, the eye is the window from which the mind is able to access the world. Seeing becomes divorced from the body. In this separation between vision and the body, there has been the increasing dependence of seeing over our other haptic senses. Vision has become the predominate mode through which we acquire knowledge of the world. As the valorized organ, the autonomous eye is an eye without a body.¹

In contrastsing the development of the modernist eye from Adolf Loos to Le Corbusier, Beatriz Colomina identifies modern architecture as primarily a frame for viewing.² In Loos’ architecture, the visual experience addresses the spatial position of the spectator. This point of view is relative to a physical point looking into space as the subject is cocooned and enveloped by the architecture. On the other hand, the Corbusian views are the reverse of Loos:

*In photographs windows are never covered with curtains, neither is (sic) access to them hampered by objects. On the contrary, everything in these houses seems to be disposed in a way that continuously throws the subject towards the periphery of the house. The look is directed to the exterior in such deliberate manner as to suggest the reading of these houses as frames for view.*³

For Colomina, modern architecture, as a viewing mechanism, produces a subject whose
existence is confirmed by the ability to see and be seen. Exemplified by the architecture of Le Corbusier and Loos, the modern subject is created by the "ownership" of a view, allowing the subject to both objectify others while at the same time being the object of another's eye.4

Following Colomina, this paper examines the modern subject as it is revealed through the architecture of Le Corbusier. Le Corbusier’s architecture manifests the notion of the subject situated in a spectacular world in which "the organizing geometry of architecture slips from the perspectival cone of vision, from the humanist eye, to the camera angle."5 But this disembodied eye is not an objective eye. Rather, the eye entails a desiring look originating from a specified subject. Furthermore, this implies that the looks or framed views in the architecture are created for and/or create particular eyes. A subjectivized eye intertwines notions of seeing, identity and desire. Using the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau as a case study, this paper clarifies the interrelationship between the subject vis-à-vis “seeing” and “being seen”.

1.2  **Historical Context**

*French decadence -- Purism -- The Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau -- Split in the Visual Field*

In late 19th Century France, debate about the decadent nature of society raged in the press and in academia. The loss of the Alsace-Lorraine to Germany, as well as its decline in economic influence among the other industrial nations, was perceived as a symptom of the decaying, corrupt and perverse nature of the French culture. After the First World War, France's cultural decadence became a social crisis in need of immediate redress. Purism, through its journal *l’Esprit Nouveau*, participated in this nationalist, anti-decadence, movement.⁶

Purism attempted to reintroduce a type of classicism into art by constructing an aesthetic based on an ideal vision of the human experience inspired and instructed by order and rationality. It developed a hierarchical system of evolving ideal types based upon numerical ordering as well as an historical progression. Purist theory posited that machine-produced objects, because of their economy, efficiency, order, and precision, had evolved into universal and ideal types. Standardized, machine made objects -- *objet-types* -- embodied a universal order as well as the everyday world. For the Purist, order was the means by which we understand and therefore constructed our world.

In December 1918, the Purist movement launched its first manifesto, *Après le Cubisme.* Painter, Amédée Ozenfant and architect, Charles-Édouard Jeanneret (later to be known as Le Corbusier) hailed Purism as the heir to Cubism and proclaimed it the aesthetic for their
time. Accusing Cubism of having reduced painting to merely a composition of formal elements, Purism sought to define art as a category of knowledge above sensory pleasure. For the Purist, Cubism had undermined any higher meaning in art by successfully detaching painting from perspectival order. From its rediscovery in the Renaissance, perspectival paintings were representations of the human body within a rational, conceptual order. In the perspectival painting, truth and beauty were revealed when the work of art was meaningful and intelligible. Cubism's multiple and fractured viewpoints did not re-present a logical, unitary world. Painting had lost the unity between representation, beauty, and truth. For the Purist, art was to appeal not only to the senses but also to the mind. To emphasize the intelligible, Purism reintroduced perspective spatial elements into painting. For example, (fig. 5) the cup is represented as existing in a specific time and space – perspectival space – in relation to the viewer. The viewer can enter into the painting via his/her spatial relationship to the representation. In other words, the viewer understands the marks upon the painted surface as the representation of cup from his/her singular perspective.

Following their manifesto, Ozenfant and Jeanneret, together with author and poet Paul Dermée, launched the Purist journal, l’Esprit Nouveau in 1920. (fig. 6) Financed by the Swiss banker Raoul La Roche and with advertisements by major French companies, l’Esprit Nouveau, through 28 issues, from 1920 to 1925, brought together the French cultural, technological and economic elites.

Exposition Internationale des Arts Décoratifs et Industrial Modern

As early as 1907, the French government recognized a dire need to stimulate the industrialization of their decorative arts. Although famous for their luxury handicraft goods, France had fallen behind German and American industrialized production methods. In addition, other nations were copying French products and benefiting commercially from their designs. After many failed attempts to organize a decorative arts exhibition with the intention of renewing French industry, the Exposition Internationale des Arts Décoratifs et Industrial Modern finally opened, in the summer of 1925.

Sited along the Seine between the Grand Palais and the Place des Invalides, the location of the exposition was itself controversial. Rather than being an opportunity for permanent urban planning and construction, its location in the center of Paris meant that the exposition had to be ephemeral in nature. (fig.7) As this was a major influence in the design of its pavilions, many of which were constructed out of paper maché, the exposition had a theatrical effect.

Although claiming to be "international", the pavilions were predominately French and attempted to create a modern “Parisian style”. This Parisian style or look was based upon a feminine metaphor emphasizing the sumptuous and ornamental. Many of the pavilions, opulent and ornately decorated, constructed tableaux that appealed to the eye. (fig.8) As a stage for commodities, the majority of pavilions were designed as backdrops to the items being promoted. Indeed, located on the Pont Alexander III, the “Rue des Boutiques”
7a. Perspective view.
8a. Primavera Pavillon
Maîtresse Pavillon,
Exposition Internationale des Arts Décoratifs et Industrial Modern, 1925.

8b. Maîtrese Pavillon, interior
Exposition Internationale des Arts Décoratifs et Industrial Modern, 1925.

provided a picturesque shopping spot. (fig. 9) As Tag Gronberg has demonstrated, this
depiction of Paris further strengthened its reputation of being a city for women – as the place
to shop and the de rigueur city of display.¹¹

Against this feminized conception of modernity was the entry by Le Corbusier and Pierre
Jeanneret, the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau.¹² Encapsulating concerns of mass housing,
urban planning, and industrialization, its program called for the "rejection of decorative art
as such, accompanied by an affirmation that the sphere of architecture embrace every detail
of household furnishing, the street as well as the house, and the wider world still beyond
both".¹³

10a. Back façade, Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau. Although the main façade for the exposition, this
elevation is the "back" of the unit. In the Immeuble Villa, this elevation looking onto a courtyard. See
figure 11.
10b. Side façade.


15. Contemporary City for Three Million Inhabitants.
The hostility of the exhibition organizers was reflected in the Pavillon’s location between the two wings of the Grand Palais on the south façade, far from the main throughway. (fig. 10) In addition, the Pavillon was nearly hidden from view, since the exhibition forbade the cutting or destruction of any trees on the site.  

Totaling 400 square meters, the Pavillon l'Esprit Nouveau consisted of a full-scale mock-up of an individual residential cell and a two-story annex. The residential unit, adapted from a larger scheme for mass produced housing, the *Immeuble-Villa* (1922) (fig. 11), was a two story, 300 square meter model home that included a main living space, dining room, study, covered terrace, kitchen, servant quarters, two washrooms, two bedrooms, boudoir, and an exercise room. (figs. 12, 13) The 100 square meter, two-story annex contained two dioramas, *Une Ville Contemporaine de 3 Million d'Habitant* (1922) and the *Plan Voisin de Paris* (1925), both of which addressed urban planning and renewal with an emphasis on efficiency and order. (figs. 14, 15)

The Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau, applying Purist theory to domestic housing, advocated that the design of objects should originate from their function and the mechanical process by which they are produced. The machine metaphor was used to evoke the economy and efficiency of the modern industrial process and the Purist rational aesthetic. The Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau was filled with industrial fittings and was decorated with industrial objects such as laboratory glasses and prefabricated furnishings. In addition, there were Purist paintings and *objet d’art* with mechanistic themes. (fig. 16)

Jacques Lipchitz, *The Bather* (c. 1924).
The Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau demonstrated the possibilities of standardized design and construction with its use of reinforced concrete for the frame, prefabricated windows, fitted cupboards and storage units, flush-fitting metal doors, and a standard fitting metal staircase. The Pavillon was built from 37 in-situ poured, reinforced concrete vertical supports spaced at three-meter intervals. The wall and flooring was insulated with pre-fabricated standard rectangles of a synthetic material called “solomite” (fig.17) over which cement was sprayed by means of the new Ingersoll-Rand cement gun.15

*The Split in the Visual Field*

*Ozenfant and Jeanneret -- Jeanneret and Le Corbusier – the modern eye*

The culmination of Purism and the journal, *l'Esprit Nouveau* was the construction of the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau at the Exposition Internationale des Arts Décoratifs et Industriels Modernes in July 10, 1925. This event marked the end of the fruitful collaborative efforts between Ozenfant and Jeanneret. For the initial issues of *l'Esprit Nouveau*, Ozenfant and Jeanneret, using various pseudonyms, co-wrote the majority of the articles. By 1923, with Ozenfant's reservations over the glorification of the machine aesthetic, they began to pen separate articles. Jeanneret, using the pen name “Le Corbusier”, authored architectural items, once co-written by Ozenfant and Jeanneret.\(^{16}\) In 1925, rather than publish a special edition of the of *l'Esprit Nouveau* that would have been dedicated to the Pavillon, Jeanneret/Le Corbusier published the material in book form as *Almanach d’architecture moderne*.

Although the end of the *l'Esprit Nouveau* and the building of the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau signaled the near metamorphosis Charles-Edouard Jeanneret into Le Corbusier, there were still cracks and anamorphic distortions upon the new image.\(^{17}\) The Le Corbusier persona was not yet fully realized, as both Jeanneret and Le Corbusier remained visible throughout the project. For the inauguration of the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau, Ch. E. Jeanneret, president of the "Conseil d'Administration de l'Esprit Nouveau", gave the inaugural speech.\(^{18}\) In the invitation to the opening, (fig.18) Le Corbusier was credited as architect and the artworks of Ch. E. Jeanneret were exhibited.
L'ESPRIT NOUVEAU

REVUE INTERNATIONALE DE L'ACTIVITÉ CONTEMPORAINE

LE CONSEIL D'ADMINISTRATION ET LA DIRECTION DE "L'ESPRIT NOUVEAU"
LES "AEROPLANES G. VOISIN" (AUTOMOBILES)
MR. HERBY FRUGÈS, DE BORDEAUX
LES ARCHITECTES LE CORBUSIER ET PIERRE JEANNERET

VOUS PRIES DE LEUR FAIRE L'HOMMAGE D'ASSISTER VENDREDI 10 JUILLET, A SEULE HEURE, A L'INAUGURATION DU PAVILLON DE L'ESPRIT NOUVEAU, SOUS LA PRÉSIDENCE DE MONSIEUR DE MONZIE, MINISTRE DE L'INSTRUCTION PUBLIQUE ET DES BEAUX-ARTS.

LE PAVILLON DE L'ESPRIT NOUVEAU EST CONSACRÉ À LA RÉFORME DE L'HABITATION (TRANSFORMATION DU PLAN, STANDARDISATION ET INDUSTRIALISATION). IL COMporte UNE CELLULE EXTREME DE "L'IMMEUBLE-TILLAS" AVEC JARDIN SUSPENSO ; DES ŒUVRES DE GEORGES BRAQUE, JUAN GRIS, CH. E JEANNERET, Fernand LÉGER, Jacques LIPCHIT, ANGÉLE DEZENFANT, PABLO PICASSO.

L'URBANISME DES GRANDES VILLES SERA EXPOSÉ SOUS FORME DE DIORAMA D'UNE VILLE CONTEMPORAINE DE 3 MILLIONS D'HABITANTS ET PRINCIPALEMENT DU PLAN "VOISIN" DE PARIS (AMÉNAGEMENT DU CENTRE DE PARIS).

LE PAVILLON DE L'ESPRIT NOUVEAU EST SITUÉ DANS LE JARDIN ENTRE LES DEUX AILES DU GRAND PALAIS, CÔTE COURS LA REINE, DERRIÈRE LE PAVILLON DU HAUT COMMISSARIAT.

CE PAVILLON EST LE PLUS CACHÉ DE L'EXPOSITION.

CETTE INVITATION TIENT LIEU DE CARTE D'ENTRÉE DANS L'EXPOSITION PAR LA PORTE D'HÔMMEUR
AVENUE ALEXANDRE III

18. Invitation to Inauguration of Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau, July 10, 1925.
Le Corbusier, Villa Meyer, Pars, 1925 (second project).

19. Seven views, Villa Meyer.
These fissures in the Jeanneret/Le Corbusier identity parallel the inconsistencies and contradictions that characterize the face of modernity.¹⁹ For Baudelaire, the façade of the quintessential modern man -- the dandy

...consists above all in an air of coldness which comes from an unshakeable determination not to be moved; you might call it a latent fire which hints at itself, and which could, but chooses not to burst into flame.²⁰

What is the fire that is present but barely visible? The dangerous and existing potential of emotion appears to lie dormant. Baudelaire is contrasting the two aspects of the modern subject: the “dandy” who has the ability to create his external image and the “viewer” who projects his own feelings upon the dandy’s image. In other words, the modern subject is the compilation of a self-styled projection of himself and, at the same time, he is a projection of the viewer. This relation between the re-presentation of the self and the other manifests as the latent fire – a contradictory state, a split – in the visual field. This split between seeing and being seen in the visual field is revealed in particular views in the Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau.
1.4 Critique of Vision

Sentinal works such as Laura Mulvey’s “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema”, John Berger’s Ways of Seeing, and Jonathan Crary’s Techniques of the Observer, question the transparency and neutrality of vision. Critical of universalizing assumptions of visual experience, these authors discuss vision – “seeing” – in terms of specified subject(s) and, as systems of beliefs existing within a historical social, cultural and economic framework. For these critics, the eye is not a passive, optical receiver of information. Visuality expands beyond the physiological act of seeing to encompass the visual field, the social context that influences and creates what is seen. For example, painting, as a mode of representation, is the remnants or the proof of the social-historical context of a particular way of seeing, of a visual regime.

Beatriz Cololina has developed this discourse on representation into a “critique of vision”. Cololina argues that the humanist subject is displaced with a specified subject – the masculine subject. In discussing Cololina’s critique of vision, I want to focus on two related issues: the redefinition of humanist subject and the creation of a gendered visual regime.

Re-definition of subject in relation to vision

From the Enlightenment, the idea of the individual experience as a transparent vehicle to knowledge of oneself and of one’s world took primacy. Freewill, the ability to choose
based on one's mastery of the world, formed the foundation of the humanist subjectivity. The human subject masters the world through his self-knowledge (consciousness).

During this period, the eye was defined as the passive organ through which the objective truth of the world is revealed. Through the use of geometry, (fig. 1) the subject maps the space of vision. The subject, located at the apex of the diagram, is related by connecting linear points to the object. Indeed as Diderot's *Letter on the Blind for the Use of Those Who See* reminds us, we can reconstruct the geometric space of vision without sight. Seeing, defined as a spatial relationship between the seeing subject and seen object, became a source for objective truth. Through vision, the world can be mastered and controlled.25

The subject can only "see" from his/her eyes and paradoxically claims what s/he see is objective. According to Lacan, the subject resolves this contradiction by imagining him/herself to be outside of his/her body – of his/her own eyes. In effect, the subject positions him/herself as, "I see myself seeing myself".26 The logic is thus:

A. The eye is an objective organ through which I can see the world.(seeing)

B. Through sight, I am conscious (and have knowledge) of the world.

C. Because I am conscious, *cogito ergo sum*, I know that I exist.(being)

D. Therefore, through my eyes (seeing), I know I exist. (being) (i.e. seeing is being and seeing is believing that one has objective truth of the world)

The *cogito ergo sum* verifies existence via consciousness which is proven through the objective world seen through one's eyes. Being is equated to seeing.(Seeing substitutes for being) The subject becomes a disembodied eye.27
According to Colomina, Le Corbusier’s architecture...

"...defines modern subjectivity with its own eye. The traditional subject can only be the visitor, and as such, a temporary part of the viewing mechanism. The humanist subject has been displaced."^{28}

Counter to the traditional notion of an architectural object that addresses the subject via his body, Colomina posits that modern architecture re-defines the subject as one who sees."^{29} For example, Le Corbusier's architecture becomes the creation of views. "It is this domestication of the view that makes the house a house, rather than the provision of a domestic space, a place in the traditional sense"^{30} where the subject looks determines the spatial sequence --how the architectural experience unfolds via the different points of view.

In the drawings of Villa Meyer, for example, the seven views indicate how the visitor would move through the space creating motioned views.(fig.19) Progressing from the entry in the vestibule to the view of the landscape, the visual flow is indicated by the story board layout of the spaces."^{31} Similar to the cinematic experience, the spectator occupies the privileged disembodied eye of the camera. Like the voyeur, the spectator, detached from the action on the screen, has the power of viewing and experiencing outside the unfolding cinematic "reality".

The subject’s relationship to the architecture has “the distance of a visitor, a viewer, a photographer, a tourist."^{32} Colomina’s modern subject, defined as tourist or voyeur, takes ownership of space not in the material sense. S/he has the power of visual objectification. Like Bentham’s Panopticon, vision is one technique in which human subjects are made to be objects of surveillance and hence vision has the power to control individuals."^{33} The subject becomes a subject by the mastery of others.
Although the tourist and the voyeur both share the technique of objectification, the point from which the eye sees has different spatial references. For the tourist, the capturing of views via the camera entails the literal possession of the view. The picture becomes the remnant of the spatial relationship between the subject and the object. The picture itself frames the subject. In modernist representation – in both photographs and paintings, there is a gap between image and the visual experience. In a sense, the viewer is both inside and outside the picture. For example, as outlined by Colomina, in Adolf Loos’ domestic architecture, the subject is both actor and spectator: s/he is framed by the architecture while at the same time, the subject looks upon him/herself from outside the frame.\textsuperscript{34} On the other hand, the voyeuristic look defines the subject in Le Corbusier’s architecture.\textsuperscript{35} In a sketch of \textit{La Ville radieuse}, Le Corbusier’s cell for living, perched upon a tower, inhabits a small human figure and a huge single eye.\textsuperscript{35} (fig. 20) According to Colomina, the huge eye looks out of the apartment. The architecture serves as the frame from which the eye -- divorced from the place/picture, -- looks out into the world.\textsuperscript{36} In other words, the modern eye is a disembodied eye that is always outside of the picture.

For Colomina, citing Sartre, the object of the voyeur’s gaze becomes the subject the moment in which the subject feels him/herself as an object of another look. Independent of an actual person looking, the anxiety is derived from the subject’s \textit{consciousness} of being the object of the gaze. For both the voyeur and the object of the voyeuristic eye, to be the subject entails being conscious of seeing and being the object of the gaze. As Lacan points out, Sartre’s subject -- who realizes his/her own subjectivity at the moment in which s/he feels looked upon -- exceeds his/her vision by imagining that his/her eye is
outside of his/her body looking back at him/herself. The power accorded to the subject remains the illusory power of the Cartesian subject to "see oneself seeing oneself". In "Of the Gaze As Objet Petit a", Lacan compares his voyeur and Sartre's "gaze". For Lacan, it is indeed an exterior eye that issues from outside the subject that causes the anxiety. Contrary to Sartre, anxiety is created by being the object of an external gaze, not from the subject's recognition that s/he is the object of the gaze. The Lacanian subject is defined as looking from a single point of view and, at the same time, being seen by a separate, detached other.  

For Sartre, the gaze of the other exists only so far as it exists from the point of view of the feeling subject. There is no spatial separation between the subject and the other: the other resides within the subject. While Sartre's subject exists within itself, Lacan's subject exists in relation to the other. Lacan places the other as external to the subject. The Lacanian subject and the other, occupying two different spatial realms, are mediated by the social context – a picture. In other words, Sartre's subject exists without a picture while Lacan's subject exists within a picture.

Cololina's thesis that the modern subject exists outside the Corbusian frame is dependent upon the Sartrean subject whose existence is confirmed by his/her own consciousness of seeing and being seen. Contrary to Cololina, my analysis of the Corbusian frame is based upon the Lacanian subject whose existence is dependent upon his/her consciousness of seeing and at the same time, being the object of the other's gaze.
Sketch in *La Ville radieuse*, 1933.

20. Le Corbusier
1.4 Laura Mulvey and the objectifying look

*(T)he house itself is a camera*\textsuperscript{48}

Cololina’s discussion of voyeurism links her to film scholarship. Feminist film theory has been and continues to be an influence for other disciplines that are venturing into the critique of vision. In particular, Laura Mulvey’s seminal essay, “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema”, provides the theoretical background to the development of a theory of vision.\textsuperscript{39}

Mulvey discusses the underlying structure of the pleasures derived from looking at “traditional” Hollywood films.\textsuperscript{40} The mechanisms that produce pleasure in traditional (Hollywood) narrative cinema are twofold: scopophilia and narcissistic self-identification. As outlined by Freud in the *Three Essays on Sexuality*, scopophilia is the pleasure of looking at another as an erotic object and is a “natural” component of sexuality. Simultaneously, there is a narcissistic aspect to the pleasure in which the spectator identifies with images on the screen. The spectator becomes absorbed into the movie through identification with characters within the film. Citing Lacan, Mulvey suggests that this identification with cinematic characters is similar to the process in which a child identifies with his/her mirror image. In the cinematic experience, this temporary loss of passive body to become an active participant on screen is a re-creation of the mirror stage when there is a loss of the sense of one’s body for the image of another.\textsuperscript{41}
A voyeuristic relationship exists between spectator and image. The spectator must embody the eye of the character on the screen in order to obtain pleasure from the traditional narrative cinema. By looking from the point of view of a character in the movie, the spectator must forget not only that s/he is looking from the intervention of the camera, but also that s/he is part of the audience.\textsuperscript{42} This relationship to the specular other is crucial to the cinematic experience. By identifying with the image (viewpoint) on the screen, the spectator can enter the picture and be absorbed into the action all the while remaining outside of the plane of the moving picture. According to Mulvey, "the position of the spectators in the cinema is blatantly one of repression of their exhibitionism and projection of the repressed desire onto the performer".\textsuperscript{43}

In the Hollywood film, traditionally, the look of the desiring gaze of the male character is simultaneously the gaze of the spectator. The point of view of the camera entails that the spectator embodies the male character. In order to attain pleasure, the spectator must assume the “identity” of the male character. For Mulvey, "pleasure in looking has been split between active/male and passive/female".\textsuperscript{44} The power of looking is assigned to the male while the female figure is the passive object of the active male gaze. In classic Hollywood cinema, the male eye is the eye of authority.\textsuperscript{45}

According to Mulvey, Hollywood cinema is a cultural form in which patriarchy reproduces itself. In a patriarchal society, culture is organized around the symbolic authority of the phallus. Defined in relation to the phallus, men and women have
different roles vis-à-vis the attainment of the phallus. Because she is does not have a phallus, woman symbolizes the castration threat/anxiety – the male fear of not being able to assume his position in patriarchy’s hierarchical order. The Freudian castration anxiety is equated literally with the lack or fear of losing the penis. In traditional Hollywood cinema, the male subject projects castration anxiety upon the object of the male gaze, the woman.  

In her reassessment of Mulvey’s position, Kaja Silverman argues that the pleasure derived from the voyeurism is intrinsically tied to narcissism. By projecting his desire onto the person on the screen, the spectator is projecting his lack upon the other person. Silverman posits that while looking is the mechanism and signifier of castration anxiety, it also signifies the lack, the void at the center of subjectivity. The revelation of this void creates not only anxiety but also desire. This desiring look entails the site of (male) insufficiency. (See section 1.6 for clarification of terminology)

*Colomina’s desiring look*

Similar to traditional Hollywood cinema, architecture has the potential to frame a sequence of particular views. For Colomina, Le Corbusier’s architecture functions in this manner and is, conceptually, a camera for viewing. The subject, as part of the viewing mechanism, entails the action of looking upon another as an object of sexual stimulation. Similar to Mulvey’s equation of seeing/male and being seen/female, Colomina assigns a gender specificity to views framed by Le Corbusier’s building. Le Corbusier’s voyeuristic views embody a desiring look that is gender specific.
Charlotte Perriand in the chaise-longue against the wall.
*Salon d'Automne 1929.*

Villa Savoye.
Still from *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui.* "Une maison ce n'est pas une prison: l'aspect change à chaque pas."

22. Pierre Chenal with Le Corbusier,
Still from *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui* (1929).
For example, in both the film *l’Architecture d’aujourd’hui* and in the photo collage of his collaboration with Charlotte Perriand, the female figure is the receptor of another's look. Her back is always presented to the viewer and her face is turned away from the viewer. (figs. 21, 22) According to Colomina, the figure of the woman is the object of the masculine look. The viewer is forced to take the position of the masculine point of view. The architecture produces a gendered subject.\(^{50}\)

It is beyond the scope of this paper to further this discussion of the valuation of the masculine over the feminine or the numerous issues facing the difficulties in separating female and feminine -- sexuality and gender. But by extrapolating Colomina's discussion, it is my opinion, that there is an implicit valuation of the masculine voyeur's look over the object of the look, the female form. The masculine look, as exemplified by the voyeur taking possession through looking, is the active subject, while the feminine is the passive object of the look. To take possession through looking entails having power over the object being viewed.

Colomina suggests that the eye of the disembodied subject is an engendered look and that the Corbusian view is synonymous with the masculine look. It is unclear how Colomina separates the disembodied eye from the masculine eye. That is, the universal disembodied eye necessarily entails a masculine eye. But are all voyeuristic views masculine? Although she provides a general approach to the investigation of the formal configurations that produce gendered subjects, Colomina fails to show how the views are gender specific. Le Corbusier's re-occurring motif of the disembodied single eye (fig. 20)
is the masculine look only in so far as we can accept that the universal disembodied eye
is synonymous with the masculine eye.

Recently, there has been a reconsideration of the equivalency between the Lacanian
"gaze" and the masculine eye. Although Mulvey and Colomina can be accused of
generalizing tendencies, from an historical perspective, considering when their articles
were written and published (early 1970's and 1980's), both authors, nevertheless, have
contributed to the analysis of specific visual orders.
1.5 **Defining visual regimes**

In order to discuss a subjectivized eye and its visual regime, it is necessary to define the subject vis-à-vis seeing. The link between seeing and being seen is revealed through the intertwined relationship between looking, recognition and identity. Psychology connects the relationship between seeing, identity and desire. Lacan’s theories provide a structure for understanding the formation of self-identity in relation to the spectacular nature of our existence. \(^{52}\) “Seeing” moves beyond the Cartesian eye that receives objective facts to include our social, cultural relationships – our visuality.

**The Lacanian Subject**

*Pre-mature bodies -- Lack is at the center of subjectivity -- Spatial concept of mirror stage -- Split in the Visual Field*

**Premature bodies**

Human beings are born biologically “premature”. The newborn is incapable of self-sufficiency and is dependent on others. Lacan sees the child’s body as an aggregate of body parts that function separately, each with its own needs. (According to Lacan, the child is not born with a gender. Since the child has not yet gone through gender differentiation – the resolution of the Oedipus Complex, I will refer to the child as “it”.) Although the child attains mastery over each part gradually, it has no initial sense of a whole body. \(^{53}\)
Lack is at the center of subjectivity

This lack of an autonomous body extends to the child’s psyche. Not able to separate itself from its environment, the child is attached to the maternal figure. It is only during the mirror stage -- from six months to eighteen months of age – that the child begins to differentiate itself from the maternal figure. The recognition of lack or absence of the maternal figure is the beginning of the realization of “self”. This distinction of self from the other involves feeling the loss of the sense of wholeness from the maternal figure. In order to have a sense of other, there must be a sense of loss or “lack”. From this point onward, the child is forever trying to fulfill the lack by identifying itself with images (the imaginary) and through language (the symbolic).\textsuperscript{54}

In the development of “self”, the child has to come to terms with the inherent incompleteness of the body. At this point, although the child is unable to supply itself with all its needs, the mirror stage initiates the development of the subject.\textsuperscript{55} In order to bridge the gap between the actuality of the “lack” of control over its own body and the psychic development of “self” – to master its body, the child identifies with an image of a complete body. The identification can be with the child’s own image in the mirror or with another child. Regardless of what image the child takes as its own image, the identification with the image comes with the alienation of the child’s own body. It is an imaginary identification that involves the separation of image from the physical reality of the child’s premature body.\textsuperscript{56}
Split in the Visual Field

There is a narcissistic pleasure in seeing oneself. The child exhibits a fascination with its specular image. Unlike primates that, once acknowledging their mirror image as an image of themselves, lose interest in the image, the human child maintains a continual fascination with its own image. The fixation with its image forms the dynamic of all subsequent relationships in the imaginary register.  

Although self-identity begins when the subject takes the image of other as him/herself, the subject’s identification with the image is not complete and total. There is a split in the visual field. The physical experience of the child’s fragmented body is at odds with the image of the body. The image of the other is outside the control of the subject. The child’s psyche is oscillating between the joyful identification and the aggression against the alien “self” image. The child oscillates between recognition/mis-recognition of the image.  

Need – Demand – Desire

The child must develop beyond the mother/child unit. Without expanding its relationships to include others, the child will be trapped in an “unhealthy” dependency on the maternal figure. In order for the child to fully participate in society – to include others, it must engage the social, verbal, and economic – the symbolic realm. Initiating the entry of the child as an autonomous self in relation to other people and objects in the world, the stage also marks the development of the child’s desires, motivations and
limits. At the basis of its entry into the symbolic world is the development of the child’s psychic, social and sexual positioning.\(^{50}\)

The child is born in a pre-social and pre-linguistic existence, in what Lacan calls the “Real”. (The “Real” is not reality.) In order to be part of the social condition, the child must be able to understand and derive meaning from imaginary and symbolic representations – to become a meaningful subject.\(^{60}\) The child needs to move from the realm of the “Real” to the “imaginary” and then to the “symbolic” by developing its relationship to others from needing, to demanding, to desiring.\(^{61}\)

The child’s initial relationship to others is predicated on basic needs that are necessary for its own survival. When hungry, tired, discomforted, it cries and there is a response with the bottle, being carried, etc. The child’s crying is for the object(s) that will satisfy its needs. The child learns that crying brings the presence of the maternal figure and identifies its needs with the presence of the maternal figure (the other). Through language, it attempts to control the presence and/or absence of the maternal figure. Occurring at the time of the mirror stage, the child learns that crying carries meaning beyond that of satisfying its need. The cry in carrying meaning becomes a demand. When the child’s cry is for the missing maternal figure rather than for the fulfillment of its needs of food, diaper change, etc., the child enters into a symbolic and linguistic relation with the world.\(^{62}\)
According to Lacan, demand is always formulated in language. It takes the form of, “I want…” or “Give me…” The demand, addressed to and for the other, serves two simultaneous functions: to concretize the child’s need and to bring the need into a social relationship. Formulated in language, the demand becomes a signifier for the love of the other. But even when the object of need is given, the demand remains unfulfilled. Primary to the child is the relationship to the other -- the meaning of the need (what the need stands for) The demand is ultimately a demand for the love of the other.63

Even when the demand results in the need being satisfied by the object, the other part of the demand – the love of the other – can never be proven nor satisfied. That aspect of demand becomes continuous and is unfulfilled. Since demand of love cannot be proven, the object of his/her desire, the love of the other, can never be obtained. This component of the demand gives rise to desire. Desire fills in the gap between need and demand. Desire manifests itself when need is satisfied but the demand is not. Desire is lack or absence of the object of his/her desire. In other words, the subject’s desire is to be desired by the other.64

Desire is not a conscious wish but structured in a language that is revealed in the gaps and fissures of speech. For example, in the Freudian “slips of the tongue”, the flow of speech is interrupted by the subject’s unconscious desire.65 Demand, since it is addressed to others, involves being in a social group in which behavioral norms are established. Desire, on the other hand, because it is unconscious, does not need to conform to behavioral norms. Concerned with satisfying its own processes and pleasures, desire,
using its own logic, can subvert demands and social norms. Desire opens up the subject to other possibilities of signification – other meanings beyond those determined by others. (This is the sense of “I”) Desire marks the entry of the child into the domain of the Other – the domain of the law, law-as-language, the symbolic realm, the hierarchical placement of the child in the social order.⁶⁶

For the child to function within society, the closed relationship between the child and the maternal figure is broken by a symbolic authority, “The-Name-of-The-Father” (the symbolic phallus) that functions as the ordering structure for which and by which the child places him/herself within. The symbolic father, (not necessarily the biological or the familial father) representing laws and social norms, supercedes the authority of the maternal figure. In accepting the phallus as the authority and law, the child realizes that there is a symbolic network that exists outside of the child/maternal relationship. In order to gain identity, the child knowing that the mother does not possess the symbolic phallus, renounces and represses his/her desire for her. (The repression is the basis of the unconscious) The maternal “other” is replaced with the paternal “Other”. The subject’s object – the desire to be desired by the other – is replaced by the desire to be desired by the Other. It is at this point of the Oedipus Complex that sexual differentiation occurs. Girls and boys position themselves in relation to the lack of/acquisition of the phallus.⁶⁷
Drives

*Sexuality is pleasure that is dominated by the lack.*

Drives are not instincts. While instincts are biological necessities for the survival of the individual, drives only refer to the field of sexuality. (Sexuality does not entail only the genital pleasures.) The drive is one of the two mechanisms (the other is cathexis – the fixing upon an object of need) that produce pleasure. Drives are internal impulses that aim the subject toward the attainment of the object of satisfaction.

The child’s first sensual pleasure is when the child seeks the breast even when it is no longer hungry. That is, the sensual pleasure is the object of satisfaction rather than food. As mentioned previously, the child’s sense of self – and its pleasures – is dependent upon its realization that it is separate from the maternal figure. In order for the child to recognize its pleasure, it has to learn lack or absence of the object before it can find sensual pleasure. The maternal breast is the primal lost object of sensual pleasure. The loss of the maternal breast is the undercurrent that underscores all subsequent relations to others. The *objet a* is the reminder of the lack or absence of the other. The object of satisfaction then is the *objet a.*

Since the desire for the Other is unattainable, desire is projected upon the *objet a*, which becomes the substitute for desire. The object of satisfaction, the *objet a*, is also the cause of desire. Through the process of exchange between the *objet a(utre)* (the other object)
and objet A, pleasure is produced. Pleasure arises with the engagement of the objet a.71 Henry Krips suggests the analogy of the suitor, beloved, and the chaperone to illustrate the relationship between the subject, the desired object (objet A), and the objet a. For the suitor, the beloved is the desired object. But it is only through the presence of the chaperone that allows him to access his beloved. The chaperone, the objet a, both impedes and allows the suitor to be with his beloved. In order to pursue his beloved successfully, the suitor strategically bestows more attention onto the chaperone. The chaperone becomes the point of focus of the relationship to such an extent that the suitor finds pleasure attending to the chaperone.72 In other words, the subject’s desire is for the objet A. But it is only via the objet a that the subject can achieve his desire of objet A. That is, the objet a allows access to the subject’s desire of the objet A.73
Subjectivity and vision – scopic vision

The eye and the gaze -- this is for us the split in which the drive is manifested at the level of the scopic field.  

Scopic vision, the desire to see and to be seen, is a drive. For Lacan, after Freud, the scopic drive is one among many drives, from which individuals achieve pleasure. The drive to look and identify with others is an inherent human quality in the formation of the notion of self. Scopic vision is a conjunction of the subject looking and being the object of another's gaze -- a conjunction of seeing and being seen, of the eye and the gaze.

The Eye – figure 1

Initiated in the mirror stage, there is a spatial-corporal dimension to vision. The child who identifies with an imaginary whole body is at the same time creating a psychic map of the body. Limits of the self are tied to a visual conception of the body. For example, in the case of limb amputation, the patient experiences the pain of the lost limb. The patient has an image of his/her whole body that has changed drastically. The psyche has not yet adjusted to the change in body image. In time, the patient will modify his/her body image and the pain will disappear. In other words, the conceptual body determines the “feelings” of the physical body. In other cases, the boundaries of the self and body have become permeable. For the psychotic, who hears voices emanating from body parts, the boundaries of self and his/her body have dissolved.
The mirror image gives an illusion of a whole body that, in turn conditions the relationship of body image to the body itself. Set in a physical environment, the mirror image supplies a source from which the eye can organize the world from a singular point of view. In other words, seeing is defined within a hierarchical spatial order. From the *Four Fundamentals of Psychoanalysis*, Figure 1 illustrates the spatial definition of vision. As with the perspectival model, the human eye is at the apex of the cone of vision. In between the eye and the picture, the world is represented.

*The gaze – figure 2*

What begins as the look from the mother, and further develops with the look of the child in the mirror stage, the gaze is the effect of the subject feeling that he/she is being watched even when there is no one there. In effect, subjectivity is the internalization of the consciousness of being visible in the world. The self is constituted by its acknowledgement by the other. In figure 2, the gaze is looking at the picture in which the subject is the object.

Between the gaze and the subject there is an opaque screen so that the gaze, or the point of light, is not seen. The gaze is not apprehended and the subject is only conscious of being the subject who is able to look upon the object. (fig. 1) The gaze is experienced by the subject, not as a desiring object of an individual eye, but as “the subject-of-consciousness…who arrogate to itself a certain self-presence of substantiality”. The experience of the subject as the eye (fig.1 ) is the illusion that self knowledge comes from
acknowledgement of one's own consciousness. For the ability to be conscious of oneself – to see oneself seeing oneself – is an impossible embodiment and is a false sense of mastery. Indeed, "consciousness, in its illusion of seeing itself seeing itself, finds its basis in the inside-out structure of the gaze".  

Masking – self-identity projected on the screen

In figure 2, in between the gaze and the picture, is an opaque screen on which the "subject maps itself into the constitutive space between the eye and the gaze". And conversely, the image from which identity is constructed can be projected upon the "screen". The subject is able to inscribe him/herself into the picture screen, redoubling his/her image, like a mask. This redoubling of its image is seen in animals, such as chameleons, that can change their skin to mimic their environment. But it is, according to Lacan,

\[\text{(o)only the subject--the human subject, the subject of the desire that is the essence of man--is not, unlike the animal, entirely caught up in this imaginary capture. He maps himself in it. How? In so far as he isolates the function of the screen and plays with it. Man, in effect, knows how to play with the mask as that beyond which there is the gaze. The screen is here the locus of mediation.}\]

Identity plays upon the "screen". (fig.3) From one side of the screen, the play of image is the lure that can be played with and manipulated. From the other side, the subject is captured by the gaze and, like light sensitive photographic paper, is imprinted upon the screen. The screen or picture where our images reside is a conjunction of the view from our eye and the object of the gaze. (RE: the dandy's latent fire.) Figure 3 is the Lacanian
model of scopic vision.  

*Distinction between eye and gaze*

The eye comes from an individual or individuals. The eye can involve the projection of the subject’s longing upon another object – thereby becoming an eye from which issues a desiring look. Only the eye of the subject can have an appetite, becoming a desiring eye. Unlike the eye that issues from one particular individual, the gaze comes from all sides. Figure 4 illustrates, from the point of view of the subject, the inability to see the point of light. Rather than merely the inverse of the perspectival model (fig.2), the gaze can be visualized by the radiance of light that surrounds and encompasses the subject. The gaze does not issue from a subject, but is analogous to the omnipresent eye of God. In other words, the gaze does not come from a desiring eye.

By looking upon the objet a, the subject’s desire can be accessed. As previously stated, to be the recipient of the gaze from the other – to achieve the desire of being the desired object of the other, is impossible to achieve. Since the subject’s desire to be desired by the other (the objet A) cannot be achieved, s/he aims for a replacement. Through an approximation of the object of desire, the objet a (the object cause of desire), the subject sees/accesses his/her desire. Although the subject’s desire can be accessed by the objet a, this desiring look always refers back to the source of its desiring subjectivity, its lack.
Cololina’s desiring look and the gaze

Lacan’s “mirror stage” prefigures Cololina’s central argument that the modern subject has the power to define oneself through vision. The sense of "I" is based upon the premise that the body is incomplete. The self is a construct of one's mis-recognition of one's self image in relation to external references. In the mirror stage, there is pleasure at being looked at by one’s self. But it is predicated upon the illusion that the child sees itself outside of its body. The external image and ones subsequent alienation of the same image is the source of self-image. The image of self is dependent upon one's relationship to an other that is outside of oneself.

But while Lacan’s gaze is an omnipresent eye, Cololina’s voyeuristic gaze issues from a desiring eye. Cololina’s subject is based upon the recognition/non-recognition by other individuals/subjects. The power of the look of others, not other/Other, determines subjectivity. For Cololina, the gaze that the subject feels upon him/her is from a particular point. Although Cololina’s voyeuristic eye, as defined by Sartre, is indeed a disembodied eye in which there need not be an actual eye, the relationship is simply an inverse of the perspectival model in which the subject is the object of another eye. (fig.1)

In this structure, the gaze is equated with the look from an individual eye -- a desiring look. Cololina’s critique is rooted in the recognition by other individual eyes. Since the "being seen" determines identity, the power afforded by the look from a masculine point of view entails looking at the feminine form as an object of the desire.
The gaze revealed in the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau

In "Split Wall: Domestic Voyeurism", Colomina interprets a sketch in *La Ville radieuse*. (fig.20) In this drawing, Le Corbusier's cell for living, perched upon a tower, is inhabited by a small human figure and a huge single eye. Colomina concludes that the eye is looking out of the apartment. The architecture serves as the frame from which the desiring eye, the disembodied omnipresence, looks out into the world. I propose, however, that the eye is looking into the apartment. What Colomina refers to as the "displaced humanist subject" is more akin to the "gaze" of the eye. The gaze brings anxiety by exposing the dependence of the self-identity upon an external gaze of another.

Lacanian theory suggests that visibility is not a dual relationship in which the subject is defined by his/her ability to objectify through vision but rather that it is a tri-part interrelationship. The tension and anxiety arises from seeing that which the eyes do not see -- the scotoma -- in the field of vision. I propose that within the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau, desire is embedded underneath the view by the revelation of the gaze -- the "underside of consciousness". When there is a split between seeing and being seen, between the subject's look and the gaze of another, "the feeling of strangeness begins" and the gaze of constant surveillance is felt. The Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau exposes the illusion of "seeing itself see itself", and reveals the Lacanian gaze. The architecture of the Pavillon manifests this anxiety of self -- this loss of a stable, internally created identity. This uncertainty about self-identity, the lack at the centre of subjectivity, is manifested in the tension between seeing and being seen.
1.6 Interpretive Methodology

Age of Mechanical Reproduction

In the era of mechanical and digital reproduction, notions of originality and authenticity are problematicized. The value of object no longer resides in the object having the "memory" and traces of the creator.\textsuperscript{92} With its reproducibility, the aura of the work of art is destroyed. Walter Benjamin’s notion of "aura" refers to the unique existence of the work of art in a particular time and space. Historically, the aura developed through its association with the use of the work of art in rituals. The work of art contained a transcendent power that was expressed in the cult. Although, through time, the work of art became separated from its original use in rituals, the spiritual power of the work of art, its aura, remained. According to Benjamin, the aura of a work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction, such as the photograph, is destroyed since reproduction replaces the work of art’s unique existence in time and space. The reproducibility and temporal existence of the photographic representation changes the way in which human beings perceive things. With the advent of pictures as the primary representation and filter of the world, rather than seeing what is unique and permanent, things are perceived as one of many. The effect is that things become undifferentiated as equal parts of a reality, so that all things become universally equal. In the age of mechanical reproduction, the work of art’s authenticity then is not a matter of spiritual feeling, but one based on the social and historical valuation of that work of art. Art is defined by and from its relation to the apparatus of power.\textsuperscript{93}
For Colomina, the process of reproduction has transformed modern architecture. Prior to the age of mechanical reproduction, the audience of architecture was the user. The user had a direct relationship to the built object and any significance attached to the building was a result of the experience. Based on the Platonic idea that our world is an approximation of reality in which we see only the representation of the true forms, essential truths can only be grasped through philosophy, music and art. Meaning comes from the power of the object to reveal universal truths and underlying structures. The material object transcends itself by an essential relationship to its universal form. With the advent of architectural reproduction in magazines, exhibitions, panoramas, etc, a new audience emerges separate from the specificity of the architecture’s space and time. The understanding of the audience and the meaning conveyed by the architecture is mediated by representation. Reproducibility changes the nature of architecture because our understanding of architecture is separated from the built object.94

In "Split Wall: Domestic Voyeurism", there is a conspicuous lack references to the actual built form of architecture -- the object of architecture. The purposeful elimination of the architectural object addresses how the reproduction of the image determines the nature of architectural discourse. Analysis itself becomes a product of the mode of production and reproduction. In terms of criticism, if the mode of production determines the architectural discourse relates, then it becomes possible to state that “(t)he perception of space is not what space is but one of its representations; in this sense built space has no more authority than drawings, photographs, or descriptions.”95
The nature of the production process – the mode by which it is produced and received -- determines the discourse that creates the architecture. The understanding of built objects is mediated by representations, by discourse, and as a result, representation and discourse become an integral part of architecture. For Colomina,

...architecture, as distinct from building, is an interpretive, critical act. It has a linguistic condition different from the practical one of building. A building is interpreted when its rhetorical mechanisms and principles are revealed...Interpretation is also integral to the act of projecting.\textsuperscript{96}

Architecture does not only reside within itself but also in a conceptual device outside of the form. For Colomina, rejecting Daedalus, proposes Ariadne, the provider of the thread by which Theseus escapes, as the architect of the labyrinth.\textsuperscript{97} If architecture is the framework for the projection of meaning, the critic, through discourse and interpretation, affects the way in which we see architecture and thereby constructs a “new” architecture.\textsuperscript{98}

With the elimination of the architectural object as material "proof ", Colomina refers to a variety of sources of Le Corbusier's drawings and photographs to substantiate her interpretation. Since her focus is the domestic house of the late 1920's and early 1930's, Colomina's source material dates from approximately the same time. (Although Colomina does cite sources from as late as 1954.) Following Colomina, drawings and photographs will form an integral part of my research.
As others have discussed\(^9\) Le Corbusier's photographs and drawings are intentional and distribution is controlled. With the creation of the Fondation Le Corbusier and the publication of the *Oeuvre Complete*, during his lifetime, Le Corbusier was concerned with the presentation and representation of his work. The Le Corbusier “product” is closely regulated. The representations of the architecture in-and-of-themselves have become the basis of interpretation. His drawings, photographs, monographs, and writings have a particular context. For this reason, the *Almanach d'architecture moderne* is an important source for the study of the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau.

The *Almanach d'architecture moderne* was originally intended to be the 29\(^{\text{th}}\) issue of the Purist journal *l'Esprit Nouveau*. Because of the rift between Ozenfant and Jeanneret, it was never published. Of particular interest for our discussion is the series of photographs depicting the progression of the camera towards the sculpture on the ledge that projects from the boudoir. (figs.23-27) These photographs provide a clue to the meaning of the placement of the sculpture. These photographs, choreographed glimpses in time, provide a possible framework for an interpretation of the entire building.
23. Group V, casier 6, hats and shoes.
24. Sculpture on platform.
25. Group V, casier 1, coiffeuse.
26. Group V, casier 1, coiffeuse mirror.
27. Coiffeuse mirror and sculpture.
Justification and value of the material "proof" cannot be based upon its signification of the author's intent. By not privileging the formal object of architecture, Colomina undermines authorial value. That is, researching the intentions of the author as means to justify the interpretation is only valid if one takes the formalist position of the autonomous object and the primacy of the author. Formalist criticism in modern art and architecture is defined by its autonomy, by the self-referentially of the object itself. In formalist analysis, the artist, who has the ability to represent this deeper reality through his art, becomes the master of composing forms, of the transcendental object. The heroic individual, therefore, must be the sole hand and mind of the design. The creative genius is given the power to reveal universal truths and underlying structures. As creative genius, the modern architect is the master of meaning through the assembling of form. The valuation and criteria of design is based upon the authenticity of object that is dependent upon its relationship to an origin in time and space and/or to an author. The architect has the power to give the 'true' meaning through the composition of 'correct' form.

If we accept Lacan's definition of subject, questions of Le Corbusier's intent become problematic. That is, how can we question the intent of an author when the subject as a unitary, knowing (conscious) subject is called into question. On the invitation of the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau's inauguration, when Le Corbusier and Jeanneret are one in the same person, Le Corbusier is not a subject in the humanist sense. Le Corbusier, initially created by Jeanneret and Ozenfant, is the modern subject whose existence depends upon the acknowledgement of others, and of the architectural discourse
surrounding and creating him.

Psychology

According to Steve Pile, space itself is not merely an objective fact, but it constitutes and is constituted by the subject. The built object is a system of representation that represents the subject in spatial and physical relationships. And conversely, the way the subject perceives him or herself in the world is manifested in the architecture. There is a psychic creation of the spatial reality that includes imagination and illusionary. One's bodily relations to the world (one's experience of space) is a constellation of bodily responses as well as the subject's mental structures. One's experience of space is not a universal experience.\footnote{101}

There is an irresistible lure to look for causes and motivations in Le Corbusier's work. According to Schumacher, Le Corbusier loved to place clues of esoteric meanings in his work. Le Corbusier himself wrote, "In a complete and successful work there are hidden masses of implications, a veritable world which reveals itself to those whom it may concern, which means: to those who deserve it."\footnote{102} Although there may be intended meanings on Le Corbusier's part, my project is not to offer a psychoanalytical interpretation of the architect -- to reach a truth about the nature of his intentions. Nor is this research is statement about the psyche of the architect and his private relationship with women.\footnote{103} Rather, the emphasis is upon how images/text are seen, interpreted, reused, and forgotten by others.
The interpretation of architecture is not based solely upon the self-proclaimed intentions of the designer since his/her views of him/herself do not have a transparent effect on how the architecture is understood by others. On the intentions to be assimilated into acceptable social norms. According to Lacan, the value of a work of art sublimates the artist's desire.\textsuperscript{104} By delving into the Lacanian psychological space, we can interpret the personal fantasy within its social context, thereby enhancing our understanding of the cultural specificity and historical importance of Le Corbusier's architecture.

Motivations shaped by both internal (conscious/unconscious/instinctive) and external conditions are complex. It is beyond the scope of this investigation to attempt to offer a complete structural definition. By isolating a specific aspect/relationship between seeing and being seen as it pertains to the architecture, I am interpreting Le Corbusier's architecture as a machine that disturbs and arouses via the eye.
1.7 Age of Electronic Reproduction -- Le Corbusier and virtual technologies

(Interpretation, critical analysis has a concrete application: to reconstruct by breaking down into parts the architectural narrative in order to recreate it. The attempt at "how to design like Le Corbusier" may not seem as fallacious at a second look. In the production of architecture, the mechanisms and techniques themselves communicate something. Critical questions of how, why and what for arises in the process of recreation.)

Changes in technology, philosophy, and economic circumstances effect the structure and viewpoint of institutions. The information age has dramatically changed the nature of architectural practice from collaborative design teams that span the globe to the possibility of creating and building non-linear, complex forms. According to critics like Paul Virilio, we live in a new electronic paradigm brought about by the computer. Our understanding of the world is mediated through electronic bits so that reality -- fractured into constituted moments -- is uncertain. The age of electronic media has not only changed the practice of architecture, it has challenged the relevance of architecture as a field of practice, as a discipline that speaks of our age.105

Electronic media has changed our experience of time and space, in some ways redefining and breaking the limits of reality. Architecture will respond to this new condition.106 By re-investigating the changes to the definition of architecture as brought about by the mechanical age, we may be able to reveal ways in which we should respond to the new electronic paradigm.

Le Corbusier's architecture responded to what Jonathan Cray considers the modern domination of the visual over our other senses. The perspectival model of vision, with its spatial locating of our vision, has collapsed. Instead, the Renaissance cross-referencing
between two eyes has been replace with the single image from one eye. Seeing becomes
"increasingly a question of equivalent sensations and stimuli that have no relation to a
spatial location."

107 For critics such as Colomina, architecture's modernity lies within this
shift towards this singular disembodied eye.

Furthering this notion of vision without a body, Scott Bukatman suggests that the
fundament of the Machine Age is panoramic perception. In panoramas or dioramas, the
body is reattached to an illusory body within the spectacle.

108 In the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau, both the cell for living and the diorama are seen by means of movement
through the space. That is, the spectacular nature of both the diorama and the living
module are revealed as the visitor moves through the architecture.

In the electronic age, the domination of the visual over the haptic has progressed
further. 109 Three dimensional computer models illustrate the spatial interpretation as it is
related to the visual field of the audience. It attempts to create a disembodied eye that
travels through an illusionary three-dimensional space.

Like panoramic perception, in our current technologies, the body -- the "interactivity" --
is brought back into the screen via the cursor. The relationship between a Corbusian
subject, the view, and architecture is similar to the relationship between the user, cursor
and the virtual 3D walk through. With current technology, there is an enticement into the
picture beyond the frame. With "3D walkthroughs", the cursor becomes the subject in the
screen.
The distance between the spectator to the virtual space is constantly reminded by the cursor. The cursor is the limit of the body so that the closest one can get into the "virtual space" is marked on the plane of the screen. Even though it is located at the center of the perspectival cone of vision, the cursor steadfastly maintains a constant distance from the perspectival space. The cursor itself does not change in size -- it is always on the surface of the screen. The cursor, the blot or stain in the picture, points to the direction and desire in which the user wants to travel.

In the spirit of Le Corbusier's embrace of the new, I have incorporated the cursor into his architecture. I have re-created the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau using Auto-Cad and 3D Studio Max. By creating a three-dimensional computer model of the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau, I am able to illustrate the relationship between "seeing" and "being seen"-- that which the eye does not see but nevertheless desires to see--with a virtual walk-through. Although the technology is predicated/based upon perspectival geometry, the viewer of a three-dimensional walkthrough experiences with only one eye. It is the changes of texture and contrasts -- the differences in light -- that the eye responds to. Pixels, interchangeable and exchangeable, are not tied with spatial location. We are inside and outside of the picture.
II. Scopic vision and the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau

2.1 Framing of views

Architecture provides the context in and from which the subject positions him/herself within the world. As the frame for viewing, architecture borders the picture, constructing the visual field that becomes the social construction in which the subject exists. An architecture shift constitutes a change in the relationship of the viewer to his/her world. For example, as discussed by Colomina and others, in modernity, the viewer’s changing relationship to his/her world is evident in the ascendancy of the horizontal window over the vertical window. The vertical window, analogous to the perspective painting, functions as the frame into which the subject is projected into the space beyond. Situated at the apex of the cone of vision, the eye of the beholder is projected beyond the frame into the two dimensional representation that is understood as a spatial continuation of the three dimensional world. (fig.1) Through the eye, embedded at the vanishing point that organizes perspectival space, the subject is projected outside of one’s body and beyond the picture frame into a virtual three-dimensional realm. The subject “exists” as the invisible point within the picture frame. The vertical window contains the subject’s eye that occupies the vanishing point and addresses the human body. Because of its relation to the ground plane and the sky, the vertical window refers to the dimensions of the human body. In other words, the vertical window contains both the eye and the body within its frame.¹¹⁰
Rather than referencing the human body, the horizontal window addresses only the eye. By engulfing the peripheral view and at the same time limiting the upper and lower edges, the screen plane allows the spectator to enter only by means of the eye. The eye, situated outside the frame, constantly refers to the exteriority of the viewer. For Colomina, Le Corbusier’s architecture serves as a frame for viewing. In the drawing of Le Corbusier’s cell for living (fig. 20), perched upon a tower, a huge, single eye representing the disembodied omnipresence, looks out of the apartment that serves as the frame for viewing.¹¹¹

The architecture, by specifying the relationship of the eye to the external world, defines a visual field. For Colomina, in the visual field framed by Le Corbusier’s architecture, the subject is the disembodied eye positioned outside of the picture frame. Contrary to Colomina, I propose that in the Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau, the subject is both inside and outside the frame. Both the eye and the gaze meet at the picture plane.(fig. 3)
2.2 Simultaneously Inside and Outside the Picture

Veil of light

(As Lacan points out, qualities of light – creating suspense and disjunction – reveal that the subject, constituted within light, is dependent upon the gaze of the other. In order to discuss the experience of light, there has to be reference to the effect of light upon an object. This section illustrates how the quality of light itself changes in modern architecture, i.e. how light can place the viewer/subject simultaneously inside and outside the picture.\textsuperscript{112})

Lacan’s diagram illustrating his notion of scopic vision (fig. 3) is the superimposition of subject’s eye relative to an object (fig. 1) and the subject as the object of the gaze/point of light (fig.2). Figure 1 illustrates a spatial conception of seeing: our eye, at the apex of the cone of vision, looks out onto the world. Through the use of geometry, the subject can map the space of vision by connecting linear points to the object. Indeed as Diderot's Letter on the Blind for the Use of Those Who See reminds us, we can reconstruct the geometric space of vision without sight.\textsuperscript{113} Hence in figure 1, to see then is to situate oneself in space. The eye, however, reacts not only to distance, it sees by light. For Lacan, human beings are creatures of light. Through our retina, we receive light rays from objects. It is through light that the child begins the process of developing into a subject at the moment when it recognizes its mirror image. If light is the medium of vision, then to exist is also to be in the space of light. The essence of the relationship between appearance and being is the source (point) of light.\textsuperscript{114}

The gaze emanates from the source of light. (fig.2) Figure 2 is the other half of the scopic field: the subject becomes the object of the point of light -- the gaze. The subject in figure 2 becomes the picture. But it is not quite the inverse of the perspective. In
between the picture and the point of light is an opaque screen. Although the subject is object of the gaze, s/he cannot see the point of light. Instead, the subject, as object of the gaze, is surrounded in light so that the light seems not to have a source.

Certain qualities of light reveal the gaze. Lacan uses the analogy of the photograph to describe the effect of the gaze as light:

What determines me, at the most profound level, in the visible, is the gaze that is outside. It is through the gaze that I enter light and it is from the gaze that I receive its effect. Hence it comes about that the gaze is the instrument through which light is embodied and through which—if you will allow me to use a word, as I often do, in a fragmented form I am photo-graphed.

The "photo-graph" is evidence of the subject captured by the light and the gaze. To be in the picture, is to be engulfed within the light.

To be captured by light is to experience the suspension of time. This suspense can be seen in the Impressionist surface where many layers of careful, gestured dabs, having quick, sketch-like quality yield a literal impression of painting. (fig.28) Lacan notes that the brushstroke is a gesture that expresses an idea to the viewer who completes the meaning of the mark. Only with the viewer’s experience of the suspension/seam of time does the gesture reaches its end. The experience of the seam that exists between "the time of terminal arrest of the gesture (the moment that the gesture ends)...and the moment of seeing" completes the gesture. For example, in "The Flagellation of Christ", the torturer’s upraised arm is an arrested moment. (fig.30) In the threatening gesture, the
“fascinatory effect” ends the movement and freezes it. Hence, the terminal time of the gaze leads the viewer to complete the meaning of the upraised arm.

In modern painting, there is a dialectical relationship between the fascinatory effect of the light and the structure of the painting. The painting exteriorizes the viewer by addressing the flat surface of the canvas. Without a singular point to inhabit, the viewer is outside the picture frame. At the same time, the picture, exemplified by the Impressionist's capturing of light, addresses perception itself. Encompassing the viewer with light, the quality of suspense is created. Compare the treatment of light in a Baroque painting to an Impressionist painting. (figs. 28, 29) In the Baroque painting, light, originating outside the dark ground, either grey or umber, is added to the surface and creates form by revealing the image from the darkness. In the Impressionist painting, light, diffused over the whole surface, is embedded into the painting with the use of a white ground. Unlike the Baroque painting in which the image is revealed by light, the Impressionist image is constructed with colour. In a sense, the light in the Impressionist painting is modulated by colour. With the tension between the light from the white ground and the modeling of this light with colour, the painting freezes, producing the often-repeated description of Impressionist painting as capturing a momentary impression.

29. Peter Paul Rubens, *Venus with a Mirror* (1567).
30. Piero della Francesca. The Flagellation of Christ (c.1440).
The relationship between the white ground of an Impressionist painting to its colour is similar to the relationship of the Corbusian white and the architectonic elements. The light in white buildings functions in the same manner as the light in Impressionist paintings by modulating the composition of the architectonic elements, creating suspense. In the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau (fig.31) the viewer enters into a single story space. The corridor is narrow, approximately 2 metres wide, and 3 metres high. To the right is an open staircase, and to the left, casier-standards reach almost to the height of the ceiling. The colour and treatment of the walls heightens the volumetric transition from the single story space to the double-height salle. (fig.32) Seen from the entry, the mezzanine cuts off the upper half of the view into the salle so that the viewer sees only the lower half of the double-height window. (fig.33) The mezzanine floor, partially covering the view of the full double height window, creates a glowing, halo effect. The mezzanine floor becomes a frame for the view into the salle. The effect is a flattening out of the image. When the inhabitant moves from under the mezzanine into the salle, a fascinatory effect occurs as one enters into the light. The inhabitant, quite literally, is about to enter into the picture.

The light, modulated through the salle, creates a suspended moment similar to a projected image onto a screen. In the picture taken from the entry, the natural light coming through the lower half of the double height windows, which are covered with sheer curtains, is diffused. (fig.34) The contrast between the light to the dark interior, gives an iridescent quality to this light. Reflected off the upper right white walls, the light makes the upper right wall float as a plane separate from the volume. This effect is due to the dual function of
the surface that defines the volume, the architecture, while at the same time, becoming an expressive element in and of itself, independent of the volume. The skin becomes articulated, becoming an entity separate from its function of articulating volume. In the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau, the skin of the upper right wall is emphasized in order to create a disconnected floating condition. The upper right wall, smooth and white, stands in contrast to the lower half of right wall, which is articulated and distinct from the salle’s walls. The exposed supporting columns frame the lower right wall, which is painted a dark colour -- perhaps sienna. The coloured wall with the exposed supporting columns, in contrast with the upper half of the living space, creates the impression that the upper half of the wall is immaterial – floating.
31. View from entry, Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau

32. View from study, Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau

33. Floating right wall, Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau

34. Double height windows, Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau
35. Exterior stairs to first floor, Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau.

36. Section through sports room and bathroom.
Potential of seeing the improper

Transparency of views allows for a visual flow through the building. In the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau, there are many opportunities for voyeuristic eyes to look upon the inhabitants. On the back façade, there is a large, double story window that looks into the living room, as well as smaller windows from the servant’s room and kitchen looking out onto the hanging garden. On the front façade, a reinforced concrete staircase, leading up to the second floor, crosses two string course windows. (fig.35) The large window not only affords a view of the outside, it allows external views of the inside. As well, the inter-penetration of the volumes creates the ability for the viewer to see into multiple spaces. Upon entry into the building, a view of the salle, the dining room, and the study is combined into a single space. The built-in shelves and cupboards, which serve to partition the space, do not reach the ceiling height thereby allowing different functions to flow into other spaces. Furthermore, there are views out into the hanging garden and into the salle as the viewer goes up the stairs. (fig.37) From the mezzanine level, one can view out into the salle.

The need to be neat and tidy and to further cover oneself from prying/preying eyes is created by the architecture. Dictating “good” behavior, the voyeuristic eye oversees the inhabitant who has a heightened sense of his/her body being watched. Like prisoners who are watched from the “Panopticon” tower, the inhabitant’s self-awareness of an exterior eye looking upon him/herself causes anxiety. At certain moments, the inhabitant becomes acutely conscious of the need to control his/her self-image in the face of another’s gaze. When private spaces are open to public viewing, this feeling of constant surveillance occurs. In the
Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau, rooms for private functions are designed to potentially reveal views of activities that are normally not seen. These rooms are spaces in which rites of purification occur. The potential to view intimate, bodily functions and erotic acts are further enhanced with the elimination of doors. Without doors, the bathroom and the washroom are open for viewing. The activity of bathing is revealed to anyone in the sports room and to any eye beyond the windows that line the sports room.(fig.36) When using the bidet in the room adjacent the master bedroom, the inhabitant is forced to face any potential eyes looking through the double height windows.(fig.13)

To train one’s eyes on the purification of one’s own body suggests that there is a correlation between the boundaries of the body and the image of the self. As Julia Kristeva has pointed out, the need for a “clean and proper body” is symptomatic of abjection. Abjection is the effect of the child's desire to be separate from the mother's body. In order to establish self-sufficiency and subjectivity, the child projects revulsion of an unclean "monstrous" femininity onto the mother's body. Abjection is the horror of not knowing the boundaries that distinguishes "me" from "not me". Conversely, the child has to establish a "clean and proper body" in order to make boundaries and to separate him/herself from the mother. In other words, the child creates clean and proper boundaries in the face of not knowing what the boundaries are.117

The boundary between the seeing subject and the gaze of the other becomes ambiguous. Normally not cognizant of the gaze, the subject by viewing these spaces for purification, as with the apprehension experienced by being the object the voyeur’s eye, feels the
unease of being the object of the gaze. By revealing activities that should not be visible, the architecture creates the anxiety of being watched over.

37. Views from stairs, Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau.
2.3 **Cabinets of desire**

_Erotic spaces of built-in cabinets_

_Casier-standards_ were inspired by office file cabinets and by the _Innovation_ trunks.\textsuperscript{118} (figs.38,39) As an admirer of the Innovation storage system, Le Corbusier designed his _casier-standards_ with the same characteristic flexibility and standardization.\textsuperscript{119} Like the Innovation trunk, these _casier-standards_ are freestanding modular pieces that could be stacked and assembled as desired and, in some cases, articulate spaces, taking the place of walls. For example, to enclose the bedroom, Group V and VI _casier-standards_ create the division between the programmatic spaces.

In addition, _casier-standards_ solved a myriad of functional storage problems:

1. *Fittings to take underclothing, suits and dresses in your bedroom, all of one depth, of a comfortable height and as practical as an "Innovation" trunk;*
2. *In your dining-room fittings to take china, silver and glass, shutting tightly and with a sufficiency of drawers in order that "clearing away" can be done in an instant, and all these fitting "built in" so that round your chairs and table you have room enough to move and that feeling of space which will give you the calm necessary to good digestion;*
3. *In your living-room fittings to hold your books and protect them from dust and to hold your collection of paintings and works of art. And in such a way that the walls of your room are unencumbered. You could then bring out your pictures one at a time when you want them._\textsuperscript{120}

Not merely for storage, the _casier-standards_ are used for the timely display of one’s collection. The prerogative of ownership is the ability to reveal and/or hide the sight of one’s possessions. The _casier-standards_, displacing the boundaries between propriety and
propriectorship, controls the desiring looks upon the objects. In other words, the proper viewing of the object is intertwined with its ownership.

Collecting and spectatorship have a history of sexual associations. The merging of the love of objects with eroticism is evidenced in the development in the 18th century of a "cabinet literature". In these texts, the cabinet was not only a private place but it had the connotation of a sexually forbidden place. In the Victorian era, *bric-a-bracomania*, or the obsessive love of collecting, became a popular past time. Bourgeois interiors, filled with the curios and mementos, were charged with eroticism. Furthermore, the Victorian spatial eroticism of the cabinet was seen in bordellos in which the cabinet metaphor was used in the displaying of prostitutes and peepshows. In recent times, the inhabiting of cabinets, and by extension closets, have sexual connotations. Phases such as, "Coming out of the closet", suggest that cabinets hold and potentially reveal repressed sexuality.

In the drawings of the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau, certain *casier-standards* house erotic items. Located on the mezzanine level, Group V *casier-standards* serves as storage space and room delineator for the three adjacent spaces, the master bedroom, the boudoir, and the hallway.(fig.40) In a Group V sketch tracing (fig.41), three of the ten compartments are inhabited. In *casier 6*, which is closest to the staircase and the master bedroom, men’s and women’s hats and shoes are drawn.(fig.43) In *casier 5*, which faces the hallway, there are men’s suits.(fig.44) Facing the figure on the outcrop and adjacent of the boudoir, *casier 1* holds bottles, feminine in character, which can be read as cosmetics and perfume bottles.(figs.20,42) In all three of the *casiers*, the items are associated with masking and
eroticism: cosmetics, hats and shoes, and the English suit.

40. Group V & VI casier-standards.

41. Group V casier-standards.
42. Group V, casier 1, coiffeuse.

43. Group V, casier 6

44. Group V, casier 5, English suit.
According to Freud, the fetish is a mechanism that displaces a perceived dangerous knowledge by focusing the fetishist upon another object. Not merely a rejection or negation, the fetish is a disavowal, the suspension of knowledge of the woman's "loss" penis in favor of the belief in her maintaining one. In his famous account of the young man who developed an erotic mania for noses, Freud interprets the fetish as a displacement for castration anxiety. Upon the discovery that his mother did not have a penis, the young boy, mistakenly assuming that all human beings are born with a penis, concludes that she had been castrated. The possibility of his own castration was so traumatic that he constructed a substitution, a fetish object, to replace the woman's "missing" penis.123

The fetish is a perpetual oscillation between two logically incompatible beliefs. As the denial, and evidence of the denial, the fetish is powered by repressed knowledge. As the traumatic event becomes more repressed, the more frequently the evidence of the anxiety is revealed. By returning to the fetish, the fetishist's double negative belief is continually maintained.

The fetish object is created from the act of looking. In the case of the young man with the nose fetish, the mother's missing phallus is exchanged with the last thing he sees before he closes off the possibility of his own castration – the nose of the mother. The fetishist replaces the desired object with an image. The representation of the body part constitutes the desired object. It is not the object of desire that the fetishist fixates upon.
The young man does not desire the nose for what it is but as an image of the phallus. In other words, the fetishist’s desiring look is projected upon a substitution – the Lacanian objet a. Since the object of desire cannot be accessed, the fetishist substitutes it with the objet a.

Fetishism blurs the boundary between society's acceptable and deviant erotic pleasures. Considered a “contented abnormal”, the fetishist is not deemed a danger to society. The fetish itself does not inhibit the fetishist’s participation in society. In fact, the fetishist would at times expound on the pleasure derived from his fetish. Remaining within the bounds of the social norms of procuring sexual gratification, the fetishist observes and simultaneously perverts the laws of normal sexual gratification. As Peggy Kamuf suggests, the fetishist conforms to the social, “familial laws” that sanction the obtainment of pleasure through erotic means while at the same time perverting the same law with the fascination of the fetish object.

According to Kamuf,

*Bring eroticism home...is the fundamental component of this perversion of normality. To find sexual fulfillment, the fetishist need never leave the paternal home, or cross the threshold of the law. Rather, the scene of optimal erotic pleasure is within the prohibition which forms the walls of the house. Just on this side of the transgressive act, the fetishist’s pleasure shares its space with things like clothes which define a barrier and hide the contours of a body. In this sense, at least, it is still in the closet.*

The fetish can exist within the home as long as there are spaces that can control the visibility of the fetish object. By limiting the visibility of the fetish object, the *casier-standards* allows the fetishistic perversion to remain in the confines of the home. The Group V *casier-standards*, *casier 6* becomes a "fetishist space of perversion" by housing hats and shoes, typical fetish objects. In the Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau, the fetish objects remain in the closet.
Casier 1 and 5 – the difference between the desiring eye and the gaze (fig. 42, 44)

Through clothing and cosmetics, the play of one’s image upon the body is a condition of modern living. The English suit is the clothing of choice for the modern man. Le Corbusier, following Adolf Loos, extols the advantages of the English suit:

*The English suit we wear had nevertheless succeeded in something important. It had neutralized us. It is useful to show a neutral appearance in the city. The dominant sign is no longer ostrich feathers in the hat, it is in the gaze. That’s enough.** [128]

As described by Baudelaire, the *flaneur*, wearing a black suit and a dispassionate expression displays himself in the uniform of the modern man. The *flaneur*, the incognito spectator in the crowd, is the "*I* with an insatiable appetite for the *non-I*." [129] With the English suit, the modern man displays his individuality with an image of anonymity.

The modern subject is able to project his/her self-image as a thing in itself. The English suit, the "*non-I*", the ability to exhibit oneself, is being displayed. According to Lacan, the subject (dis)plays with his/her image:

*Only the subject—the human subject, the subject of the desire that is the essence of man—is not, unlike the animal, entirely caught up in this imaginary capture. He maps himself in it. How? In so far as he isolates the function of the screen and plays with it. Man, in effect, knows how to play with the mask as that beyond which there is the gaze. The screen is here the locus of mediation.* [130]

The subject’s identity plays upon the "screen" with the redoubling of one’s image, like a mask.
Both men and women play with their self-image: the man’s identity is hidden behind English suit and the woman behind cosmetics. But while the man’s façade creates anxiety, the woman’s image produces pleasure. According to Le Corbusier, the modern woman’s figure produces pleasure to those who look at her and she is beautiful, she seduces us with the charm of her graces of which the designers have admitted taking advantage.” This difference between the pleasure of the woman’s decorated visage versus the anxiety of the man’s form is the difference between the desiring eye and the gaze in the visual field.

The difference between pleasure and anxiety can be illustrated by Lacan’s account of the contest between the two Greek painters, Zeuxis and Parrhasios. In order to settle who was the greater artist, the two painters agreed to test their skill by painting a trompe l’œil. Zeuxis presented his painting of grapes. These grapes were so well painted that birds were lured and attempted to eat the illusion. For his efforts, Parrhasios presented a veil on a wall. Zeuxis asked his fellow painter to remove the veil in order to see Parrhasios’ painting. In his moment of triumph, Parrhasios revealed that the veil was in fact the trompe l’œil. Each painting was successful in deceiving an eye. Zeuxis painted a sign that fooled the birds’ eyes while Parrhasios’ painting deceived the human eye. Zeuxis, lured by the veil, conceded defeat.

The human eye finds pleasure in recognizing the trompe l’œil as an illusion of grapes. The lure produces pleasure when it does not “fool” the eye. The image evokes pleasure because the subject is able to puts his/her viewing outside of him/herself – to see the
sense of one's seeing. For the human eye, the grape *trompe l'œil* representing the triumph of the eye over the gaze, does not function as a lure for the human eye. It is with the painted veil that lures the human eye by deceiving it that the "gaze triumphs over the eye".  

Like the painted grapes, the cosmetics upon the woman’s visage produce an exterior mask by which the eye is not fooled. The pleasure is produced in the recognition that the image is a representation of woman. By “knowing” that it is a mask, the person looking is addressing his/her act of seeing. That is, one is able to see the sense of one's seeing.

On the other hand, the English black suit functions as a veil that fools for the eye into believing that the image is “real”. But this mask is not seamless. Upon the modern subject’s façade, the split between one who sees and one who is seen appears. The construction of identity is visible on the cracks of the façade. This is why Baudelaire’s *flaneur*, exhibiting his subjectivity -- the “I” -- in the anonymity of the black suit, harbours latent fires. The moment that the ability to project one’s imagined self-created identity is revealed to be merely an illusion – when the gaze is revealed -- there is anxiety over the revelation of one’s lack.
45. View of sculpture from the salle, Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau.

46. Umberto Boccioni.

47. First floor plan, detail.
III. The sculpture, the boudoir and the dressing table

In the scopic field...there is the gaze, that is to say, things look at me, and yet I see them. This is how one should understand those words, so strongly stressed, in the Gospel. They have eyes that they might not see. That they might not see what? Precisely, that things are looking at them.¹³⁶

3.1 The boudoir

In the photograph of the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau, a figurative sculpture, sitting on an outcrop, arrests the eye. (fig.45) Reminiscent of Boccioni's Unique Form of Continuity in Space, waves of human movement, articulated by an indeterminate outline, are frozen into a smooth, shiny surface. (fig.46) The anthropomorphic sculpture with its multiple limbs seems to be two intertwined figures.

The location of the sculpture is curious. Projected beyond the plane of the mezzanine level, the figure overlooks the salle. To one side of the sculpture, a ledge of a contrasting material articulates the mezzanine wall, which is lower by approximately 20 centimetres. Behind and to the right of the sculpture, a window can be seen running along the right wall. On the other side of the sculpture are sliding partitions that are partially pulled to the left. The partitions are framed by a light coloured vertical member located immediately to the left to the sculpture and by a dark coloured horizontal member running approximately one meter above the mezzanine wall. Because the vertical frame is located to the left of the platform, and on the right the mezzanine wall is lowered, the space behind the sculpture is delineated. When the sliding partitions are closed, the gap
behind the sculpture is framed.

The placement of the sculpture lures the eye beyond the plane of the mezzanine wall. Viewed from the *salle*, the figure is contrasted against the deep shadow created by the combination of the depth of space of the floor to ceiling height of the mezzanine level and the light from the double height windows that are located behind the photographer's lens. This shadow creates an ominous space just behind the figure. From the gap, someone seems to be looking back at you. Having a feeling of being looked at from the dark space beyond the sliding partitions, there is anticipation that something is about to reveal itself. This gap behind the sculpture functions as a veil that the viewer would like to remove.

From the *salle*, three metres below the mezzanine, it is possible for the viewer to see just beyond the sliding partitions into the room from which we feel looked upon. In addition, through the large double height windows, an outside viewer also could see beyond the sliding partitions into the boudoir. There is the potential for something improper to be seen. (fig.47)
Derived from the French word "to sulk", the boudoir is the special room for the woman of the house. For Le Corbusier, "the modern man is bored to tears in his home; so he goes to his club. The modern woman is bored outside her boudoir; she goes to tea-parties." In *Towards a New Architecture*, he advises that all mothers be given a "Manual of the Dwelling" so that she would know the requirements of the clean and proper house. She will be able to demand the necessary elements for the maintenance of the healthy body: good ventilation, diffused lighting, a sports room, and a separate dressing room adjoining the bedroom. The dressing room becomes an essential space since undressing in the bedroom is "not a clean thing to do and makes the room horribly untidy." In the Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau, the boudoir, the adjoining room to the bedroom, functions as the space for dressing and undressing.

The boudoir goes beyond merely the space for the function of the dressing and undressing. In *l’Esprit Nouveau* (Nov. 1924), the copy that accompanies an advertisement for the Atelier Primavera boudoir furnishings (fig.48) states:

> An artist strongly marks his work with his personality. This one is severe, the other is graceful. A collector in his study orders from the former and his wife’s boudoir from the latter. A studio that includes numerous artists with different sensibilities is able to work with all programs. In its furniture ensembles, L’ATELIER PRIMAVERA in particular has always applied itself to satisfying this psychological intention of the work of decorative art.

The boudoir and the study are semi-private spaces that share similar functions. The man of the house collects works of art and books and stores them in the study where his possessions can be pursued at his pleasure. (fig.39) The study is where the man of the house displays his property.
49. Advertising brochure for La Maîtrise with interior views of La Maîtrise Pavillon, Exposition International des Arts Décoratifs et Industriels Modernes, Paris, 1925. La Maîtrise was the in-house line for the department store Galeries Lafayette. See Troy 177.
50. Measuring the height of the divan, from the axonometric, *Immeuble Villa*.

51. Group VI easier-standards
Partition between boudoir and bedroom.
52. First floor plan
Detail of “divan”
Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau.
53. Group V casier 1 and boudoir.
In an advertising brochure for *La Maîtrise*, the juxtaposition of three domestic rooms of Maîtrise Pavillon at the 1925 *Exposition Internationale des Arts Décoratifs et Industriels Moderns*, suggests that the boudoir is also a room for display. (fig. 49) Dancing, eating, and activities in the boudoir all share similar bodily pleasures. In these spaces, intimate, bodily scaled activities are juxtaposed against the public viewing by others. Sensual activities, multiplied and repeated within the social arena, are exhibited for not only others to see but also for their approval.

What other intimate activities go on in the boudoir? In the plan drawings of the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau published by the Fondation Le Corbusier and by the W. Boesigner & O. Stornorow [14], abutting the Group VI *casier-standards*, a mysterious line, separating the bedroom from the boudoir, suggests an evocative picture. (fig. 13) Surnising from the section and elevation details, it appears that the line is not part of the Group VI *casier-standards*, but represents a freestanding piece of furniture, perhaps a table. In the plans of the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau, this item is an anomaly as no other freestanding furniture is drawn. This piece of furniture seems to have more meaning than other items.

In the drawing of the *Immeuble Villa*, this piece of furniture is included. From the axonometric drawing of the *Immeuble Villa*, we can ascertain the height of this item. By extending the line to the intersection and projecting the lines along the bedroom side of the *casier-standards*, the height of the freestanding furniture stands a quarter of the height of Group VI *casier-standards*, just below the self. (figs. 50, 51) At 37 centimetres, the mysterious freestanding item is not a table but a platform. On closer inspection, it appears
that “divan” is penciled in. (fig.52) In figure 53, the texture of the fabric on the divan is possibly covered with a patchwork of leathers.(fig.53) The mysterious line on the plan drawing represents a daybed signifying that the boudoir is not only for the dressing and undressing.

In the Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau, the boudoir, the intermediary between the private space of the bedroom and the public space of the salle, is where private acts and public viewing are intermingled. The Group VI casier-standards, standing only 1.48 meters high, allows partial views to be exchanged between the bedroom and the boudoir. From the salle, the sliding partitions, like the casier-standards, are free architectural elements that may, at times, reveal and/or cover up “unclean” acts. Both the casier-standards and the sliding partitions create the anticipation of looking. Furthermore potentially private scenes can be viewed through the double height windows that face a courtyard in which multiple units are arranged in the same layout. (fig.54) The boudoir is an ambiguous space where the limits of socially acceptable behavior and viewing are played out.
Vue de face. Le Pavillon est sur pilotis, isolé du sol. Polychrome extérieure ; deux grands murs du jardin suspendus, sont peints en terre de Sienne brûlée foncée ; l'autre mur et le plafond, blancs. Sur les façades, murs gris clair ; les écrans de tôles coulissantes, en gris et orre jaune pale à l'extérieur, en bleu clair à l'intérieur.
(Le trou rond du plafond n'est qu'un incident exceptionnel dû à l'obligation de respecter les arbres.)
55. First floor plan
Detail of platform with "aquarium"
Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau.
3.2 The platform

Although functioning to cover and to reveal, the sliding partitions do not create suspense in-and-of-themselves. The platform is the crucial element that initially directs the eye towards the gap. Situated between the boudoir and the hall, and on the axis with the casier-standards, the platform is projected beyond the plane of the mezzanine wall into the salle. This outcrop extends the boudoir’s domain into the public space of the salle. Indeed, aquarium – fishbowl\textsuperscript{142} – is penciled on the platform in the drawing of the plan (fig.55). The platform, the location where eyes are drawn, plays upon the indeterminate public/private character of the boudoir.

This dialectical play of views is a common feature in Le Corbusier’s architecture. As Thomas Schumacher recounts, Le Corbusier was so fascinated by Piero della Francesca’s *The Flagellation of Christ* (c.1440) that he spent long hours analysing its formal composition. (fig.30) According to Schumacher, the juxtaposition of two perspective systems within the composition of the painting is rendered as the separation of “deep and shallow” views in Le Corbusier’s architecture.\textsuperscript{143}

But more than just a formal composition, the painting creates ambiguity in meaning. *The Flagellation of Christ* has two perspective structures, each occupying roughly half of the painting. In the right side, the three conversing figures are oblivious to the action in the background. On the left side located “behind” the three figures, Christ, tied to a column, is facing the torturer who has his arm raised, and is about to supply the blow. Gathered
around this scene are three additional figures. Each of the two perspectives contains a separate psychological realm. The figures in the foreground are not only separate in spatial orientation to the background, but are impervious to the obscene act behind them. This visual split raises questions about the relationship between the two apparently unconnected scenes: What is the connection between the two realms? What are the three figures in the foreground discussing that would make them oblivious to the action in the background? The disjuncture between the obscene act and the oblivious by-standers creates a tension of uncertainty that provides the impetus for the viewer to search for additional meaning that is not evident within the picture. In other words, the juxtaposition of two scenes creates “meaning” for the viewer by addressing the subject’s relationship of “seeing” to “understanding”.

Similar to the effect of montaging the two perspectival views, the platform in the Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau is the disjuncture itself. The platform allows for the dialectical play of obscene and proper views producing the desire to interpret the action beyond the sliding partitions. It directs the eye to the juxtaposition of the public/private space by the extension of the private space into the public, the indeterminate nature of the sliding partitions, and the gap located behind the sculpture. The platform functions as a support for a lure that directs the eye to the gap. From the dark space behind the platform, the viewer feels him/herself as the recipient of a gaze. S/he feels unease at not being able to see from the point of view of the voyeur. Directing the viewer to feel him/herself looked upon, the platform is part of a system in the creation of a subjectivized view.


57 a. Le Corbusier at Pessac. (1926)  
c. Le Corbusier in his apartment, rue Nungesser et Coli in the 1950’s.
3.3 The sculpture

The "I" in the picture

...in the scopic field, the gaze is outside, I am looked at, that is to say, and I am a picture.\textsuperscript{144}

Approximately 1 meter tall, the sculpture, sitting on the platform, is almost 4 meters from the ground level. Made of stone,\textsuperscript{145} the heaviness of the sculpture is in contrast to its indeterminate outline that suggests a figure caught in suspended motion. (fig.45) The size, composition, and placement of the sculpture make it a prominent object in the salle. Indeed, this frozen human figure arrests the eye.

The relationship of the sculpture to the viewer on the second floor is captured in a series of photographs of a viewer progressively approaching the figure. This series of photographs suggest that the sculpture functions as a lure to the private space above the stairs.(figs.23-27) As the camera moves onto the second floor, it is possible to see the sculpture on the platform through two sets of windows. (fig.36) This view, together with the light from the double height windows beyond the edge of the hallway, draws the camera towards the sculpture.(fig.23) To the left of the viewer, Group V \textit{casier-standards}, standing only 1.48 metres high, is the partition wall between the hall and the boudoir. There is approximately 1.5 metres between the top of the \textit{casier-standards} and the ceiling. Again there is the potential for seeing too much. According to Le Corbusier, "The eye is a tool of registration. It is placed 5 feet 6 inches (165 cm) above the ground".\textsuperscript{146} In the design of architectural views, this height sets the level of the viewer's eye. Group V and VI \textit{casier-}
standards are both 17 centimetres below the Corbusian eye. Upon arrival to the second floor, the viewer, turning the corner, can see the inhabitants in the bedroom and the boudoir, as well as the sculpture on the ledge. Furthermore, once inside the bedroom, the top of the sculpture is always in sight.

As the viewer moves toward the sculpture, the light from the double height window, passing through the sheer curtains, engulfs it. The view, compressed and flattened, (fig.24) is similar to another picture in the Almanach d’architecture moderne. In the account of the Pavillon l’Esprit Nouveau’s inauguration, M. Monzie, Minister of Fine Arts and Jeanneret/Le Corbusier are photographed facing the Plan Voisin de Paris diorama. (fig.56) Shot from the behind, the two are mere silhouettes of themselves. In fact, without the subtitle at the bottom of the picture and the knowledge of the Corbusier trademark profile (fig.57), the identity of two shadowy figures is not self-evident.\textsuperscript{147}

M. Monzie and Le Corbusier’s presence, evidenced as merely blots in the picture, are according to Lacan, how individuals map themselves into the screen located in between the space of the eye and the gaze. (fig. 2) This screen is similar to Alberti’s description of how an artist could get a correct view of a scene by observing it through a thin veil or window from which a “realistic” image can be traced. Instead of being the transparent window, the Lacanian veil is an opaque screen on which the subject’s sense of self is constituted, and where the child first identifies with an external image of itself.\textsuperscript{148}

(figs.2,4) Like a photograph, the subject is projected via a single point of light – the gaze. "...(T)hat which is gaze is always a play of light and opacity. It is always that
gleam of light...which prevents me, at each point, from being a screen, from making the light appear as an iridescence that overflows it. And if I am anything in the picture, it is always in the form of the screen, which I earlier called the stain, the spot." In both of the photographs, Le Corbusier and the backlit sculpture (figs.24, 57), the "I", the subject, appearing as a blot in the picture, who looks upon him/herself (i.e. consciousness), sees only his/her shadow.

*The lure*

The sculpture functions like the anamorphic projection in *The Ambassadors*. (Hans Holbein 1533)(fig.58) In his account of Holbein's painting, Lacan discusses the function of the skull as a mechanism that addresses the viewer. At the bottom of the painting, a ghostly image disturbs the exalted representation of the two ambassadors. This blot is out of place among the other symbols of their achievements -- the fur mantel, the globe, the lute, the books indicating their scholarly pursuits are painted in exacting detail. Just as the blot drives the viewer to search for the imagined, "hidden" meaning of the object, the sculpture creates the same mystery.

The disturbance of the blot provokes the viewer, actively search for a "meaning" in the picture, to become aware that s/he is looking from a particular point of view – from his/her bodily point of view. From the prison of the viewer's eyes, the look for meaning entails the acknowledgement of the inability to understand from his/her limited point of view. The enigmatic sculpture also reveals the limited nature of the viewer's
understanding. It addresses the feeling of loss of the illusion of "seeing" from an objective, disembodied eye. The sculpture, calling attention to the gaze upon the subject, causes the subject to experience the disturbance — the lack — of not being able to see from the point of view of the other.  

The blot confronts the viewer's lack at the center of subjectivity. As previously outlined, the desire to be the desire of the other — to be loved — can never be fulfilled. To ask another to verify their love, one may be given "proof" by way of a list of attributes. But, the demand of love cannot be answered since the other to whom this question is asked is separate from the person posing the question. Ultimately, to "know" would involve being in a state in which the two people are one. Although, this state of wholeness, the "Real", according to Lacan, once existed between the child and the maternal figure, it is superceded when the child learns of its distinctness from its mother and enters into the "symbolic" realm. In other words, the sense of "self" is based upon the separateness — the lack — of the maternal figure. The child's initial sense of self is further developed in the mirror stage where the lack or absence forms the basis of desire.

In the process of becoming a subject, the child, identifying with its mirror image, imagines its "self" in relation to an external image. The child begins to develop the imagined ability to see outside of its own eyes — to be conscious -- to be an objective, disembodied eye. The subject imagines him/herself to be the Cartesian subject, the self, whose existence is affirmed and acknowledged by one's self-consciousness. For Lacan, "In the scopic relation, the object, on which depends the phantasy from which the
subject, is suspended in an essential vacillation is the gaze." This illusion that self-
knowledge comes from acknowledgement of one’s own consciousness is exposed by the
revelation of the gaze.

Residing in the unconscious, the gaze is normally avoided. But at certain moments the
gaze is exposed. According to Lacan,

...the relation between the gaze and what one wishes to see involves a lure. The subject is presented as other than he is, and what one shows him is not what he wishes to see. It is in this way that the eye may function as "objet a", that is to say, at the level of lack."

The skull in Holbein’s painting illustrates the relationship between the desiring eye and the gaze. Seen only from an awry angle, the skull reveals the “hidden” meaning of the painting. The moment the viewer turns away and glances at The Ambassadors, the distorted image appears as a skull. The skull is a memento mori – the reminder of the futility of all the material riches that the ambassadors own. Emerging from the blot, the skull transforms the anxiety of searching for “meaning” into the pleasure of “understanding” the blot. The blot is the revelation of the gaze.

In the Pavillon de l’Esprit, the sculpture, like the skull, addresses the viewer, allowing access to the viewer’s desire. The objet a allows one to get as close as possible to the object of desire. Since the desire can never be fulfilled, the obtainment of a substitute – the objet a -- becomes the “object cause of the desire”. As the revelation of the “object cause of desire” (objet a), the sculpture is the approximation of the desire. Pleasure
comes from the process of attaining one's object of desire rather than actually obtaining it.

According to Lacan, "Modifying the formula I have of desire as unconscious—man's desire is the desire of the Other--I would say that it is a question of a sort of desire on the part of the Other, at the end of which is the showing (le donner-a-voir)." What reveals itself is the projection of the subject’s desire -- desire to be the desire of the Other -- as the desire for the other. In other words, the sculpture is the impetus that allows the viewer to achieve the pleasure from looking upon the dressing/undressing woman (the desire for the other). But the desiring look on the dressing/undressing woman is only the approximation of the subject’s desire.

As Holbein’s anamorphic skull holds hidden meaning, the sculpture is “a partial dimension in the field of the gaze, a dimension that has nothing to do with vision as such--something symbolic of the function of the lack, of the appearance of the phallic ghost.” The subject’s desire shows itself by the desire to be the recipient of the gaze of the Other. Connoting masturbatory practice, the Sailor with Guitar, is the subject’s desire looking back at him/herself. The Sailor with Guitar, (fig. 59, Jacques Lipchitz, c.1919) is literally the phallic ghost that is the desire on the part of the Other.

Naming the sculpture changes the meaning and experience of the view. The revelation of the name destroys the viewer’s illusion of pursuing the object of desire by replacing the sculpture as the objet a, the object cause of desire, with the Sailor with Guitar, the object
of desire. The pleasure of the looking upon the dressing/undressing woman, turns into anxiety as the viewer sees the obscenity of his/her own desire looking back.\textsuperscript{157} This view is perverse not from the possibility of seeing the female body behind the sliding partitions; rather, this view is obscene because the viewer becomes the object of his/her own desire. The viewer's desiring look is conflated with the gaze of the desiring other. This is the improper: to see one's own desire in the picture — the desire that the subject has to be the desire of the other.

60. *The Intimate Toilet*
Anonymous engraving.
Early eighteenth century.

61. Antoine Watteau.
*A Lady at her Toilet*,
(1716-1717).
3.4  The dressing table – the mirror

The eye and the gaze in the mirror

No doubt, in the depths of my eye, the picture is painted. The picture, certainly, is in my eye. But I, I am in the picture.158

The sculpture is the lure for what one wishes to see beyond the sliding partitions and the casier-standards. Standing in the hallway at the top of the stairs, the Corbusian viewer can see over the top of Group V and VI casier-standard.(fig.23) But because of its location next to the exterior wall and its proximity to the floor, the divan can only be seen when the viewer rounds the corner of Group V casier-standard and the coiffeuse.(fig.51)

The coiffeuse, occupying casier I, the end compartment of Group V casier-standard, is a crisis point in the viewer’s drive to see the “unclean” acts of the boudoir. Located one metre from the sliding partitions and adjacent to the boudoir, the coiffeuse is on axis with the platform and the sculpture. The last thing that the Corbusian viewer sees before he looks upon the female form on the divan is the coiffeuse mirror and its reflection.

The coiffeuse or the table de toilette, a French invention between the Regency period (1715-23) and Louis XV159 in the an 18th Century, remains until now a component of erotic tableaux/representations. The coiffeuse prepares or dresses the woman for presentation in order to hide her nakedness so that she is ready for visual consumption as an acceptable erotic spectacle.160 (fig.60) Applying the veil of the desired object upon her
façade, the woman produces pleasure.

According to Donald Posner, although hard-core pornography has always existed, it is only since the beginning of the 18th century that paintings of naked women in domestic settings were considered an acceptable subject matter for fine art. Prior to this period, the female nakedness, considered risqué, had to be justified in the form of a goddess, mythological creature, or historical/biblical character. As Posner points out, Jean-Antoine Watteau’s Lady at Her Toilet (1716-17) was at the borderline of social acceptability.\textsuperscript{161} (fig.61) In these “toilette” paintings, the marks that define the women’s sex are covered up: pubic hair and genital are removed and the surface of the skin is generalized into a soft haze. Unlike pornography in which the brutality and obscenity comes from being too close to the sex, the nude in these paintings appear as veiled form of the viewer’s desire, the objet a, that allows the subject to access his/her desire. By desexualizing the eye, the viewer - seeing the nude via an “objective” eye - can see the “beauty” of the female body in the formal aspects. The viewer imagining him/herself looking outside his/her own point of view, allows the eye to subsume the gaze.

\textit{The returned gaze}

The re-sexualized nude in Manet’s \textit{Olympia} addresses the viewer with weary eyes. (fig.62) As T.J. Clark has pointed out, although the patron is addressed and wanted, he is not necessarily desired. This Olympia returns the gaze of the patron with cynicism. She will pretend to be your Olympia, knowing well that both she and the patron know of the illusion.
In her gaze, the patron’s desire is addressed and turned back upon him. The re-sexualization of the look involves its subjectivization.\textsuperscript{162}

Contrary to the toilette paintings, the photographs of the \textit{coiffeuse}, the sculpture and the boudoir, are taken from the position of the desiring eye. (figs.23-27) In the cropped shot of the \textit{coiffeuse}, the sculpture is reflected in the mirror instead of the camera. (fig.27) With the planning of the mirror, \textit{coiffeuse}, and the platform, the sculpture is visible in the mirror regardless of the position of the sliding partitions.

When using the \textit{coiffeuse}, the sculptural figure is always seen obliquely in the mirror. Although the eye of the viewer can never be seen outside of his/her body, the subject’s own desire is reflected in the mirror. Like Manet’s Olympia, the gaze of the other is returned in the reflection. The gaze and the eye are fused in the mirror so that the desiring eye looks back onto its own gaze. The sculpture in the mirror is the oscillation of the desiring eye of viewer and the gaze of the other. The reflection of only the sculpture in the mirror manifests this anxiety of self -- this loss of a stable, internally created identity. Exposing the gaze, creates the feeling of "strangeness", anxiety of the self identity being dependent upon external images. The revelation of the "gaze" exposes the lack at the center of the self’s desire. The mirror reflection threatens the objective eye with the self’s desire looking back.
V. Conclusion and Further Research: Eyes Which Do Not See

_Le Conscient et l’Inconscient_ (l’Esprit Nouveau (number 21) 8, 1925), written by Rene Allendy and Rene Laforgue, outlines scotomization. According to Carolyn J. Dean, scotomization, the most significant contribution of French psychoanalysis between the two wars, refers to the mechanism by which unconscious desires are blocked out of the subject's view. Derived from the Greek word for darkness or obscurity, scotoma refers to the dark blot that appears in the field of vision.

In the Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau, the scotoma literally appears in the form of the sculpture sitting upon the platform. Lipchitz’s sculpture is the blot that indicates meaning beyond our sight. The blot creates a multitude of possible interpretations from which a “true” interpretation can be derived. These interpretations are dependent on some of the following objective facts:

- The sculpture is a prominent visual focal point. It is located on a platform that is an extension of the mezzanine space in that the sliding partitions never close off the space immediately behind the sculpture.
- The sculpture is always reflected in the mirror of the coiffeuse.
- The sculpture is called Sailor with Guitar.
- There is an historical precedence in the eroticization of women at their toilette.
- The boudoir is the intermediary between the private space of the bedroom and the public space of the salle.
- Group V and VI *easier-standards* are only 1.48 metres high.
- The contents of Group VI *easier-standards* have sexual connotations and associations.

The “correct” interpretation is dependent upon the ability to link the objective facts which in-and-of-themselves form no meaning. In order to provide meaning, a narrative must arrange the facts.\(^\text{165}\) As Pierre-Alain Croset has suggested, ”seeing” is a common theme running throughout Le Corbusier’s work and that reinterpretation and reformulation through the theme of ”seeing” would reveal new insights and consistencies in Le Corbusier’s entire body of work.\(^\text{166}\)

Crucial to any discussion of the experience from seeing is the definition of the subject. Le Corbusier’s architecture creates specifically defined views for particular eyes. *For whose eyes is the architecture designed?* For Cololina, Le Corbusier’s architecture addresses the eye of a modern subject, one who defines oneself by his/her ability to position him/herself as the seeing subject of the object, and by the ability to be conscious of being the object of one’s own eye. The subject is defined by its recognition of its consciousness vis-à-vis seeing. One’s existence is dependent upon the ability to recognize self-consciousness. The other exists in so far as the subject is conscious of the other. Applying this definition of modern subject to modern architecture, the subject then exists outside the Corbusian architectural frame. Contrary to Cololina, the Lacanian subject sees and at the same time, is the object of the other’s gaze. The Lacanian subject has a spatial relationship to the picture – the view incorporates the subject within the
architecture as well as the subject being outside the picture. The Lacanian subject positions him/herself inside and outside the Corbusian frame.

For your eyes only

The framed views in Le Corbusier’s architecture are analogous to the viewpoints created by the cinematic camera. As with the film spectator, the visitor/inhabitant feels him/herself as being outside, exterior to the architectural frame. The Corbusian subject is a disembodied eye that is outside of the picture. In the Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau, the subject controls his/her private bodily functions as if his/her eye is an omnipresent, virtual being. The projection of the subject’s eye as an external part of his/her body is reiterated by housing in the easier-standards items with which the subject can play with his/her image. In order to achieve pleasure, the viewer embodies a desiring look. The spectator, the omnipresent eye, is able to enter the picture by the projection of the masculine, desiring eye. Standing 165 centimetres from the ground, the eye level of the Corbusian subject is from the European, male perspective. The creation of the universal modular human being is based upon the European, male proportions. The views generated by the Sailor with Guitar and the Group V and VI easier-standards are for a masculine viewer. In order for the spectator to access the meaning of the experience of this kind of view, s/he must embody the masculine viewpoint. By looking from the point of view of the desiring eye, the spectator attains pleasure. The power of looking is assigned to the male while the female figure is the passive object of the active masculine eye.
The analogy to cinema is useful in understanding the complexity of many kinds of viewpoints and the different kinds of psychological states that both cinema and architecture try to affect. As with cinema, there is not just pleasure in the act of looking. From certain points of view, there is also anxiety. According to Mulvey and Silverman, the masculine, desiring look is the projection of castration anxiety -- lack -- upon the other person. The act of the desiring look signifies the lack at the centre of subjectivity. The revelation of this void creates not only desire but also anxiety. In the Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau, the views created by the *Sailor with Guitar*, the coiffeuse, and the boudoir evoke both pleasure and anxiety. Although the architecture frames a gendered viewer, the masculine viewpoint can be a critical exercise. In the Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau, the pleasure from the masculine, desiring eye oscillates with the anxiety of the gaze.

*Pleasure and anxiety through seeing -- the desiring eye and the gaze*

The partial covering of the “improper” views is provided by the architectural elements. This theme of veiling -- the tableau of a framed figure behind which is a veil -- is also repeated on the back facade. (fig. 10) The balcony and the double height windows with built-in blinds, repeat the configuration of the sculpture and the sliding partition in the *salle*.

In the Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau, the sliding partitions reveal and/or cover up the boudoir: the cabinet for the woman of the house. The sliding partitions can function either to *hide* the dressing/undressing female body from the voyeuristic eye or to *shield* the
viewer’s eye from dressing/undressing female body. As a cover, the sliding partitions prevent the viewer who wants to see something that would give him/her pleasure. The possibility of possessing the female body, as a displayed object, creates pleasure. In order to find pleasure in this view, one would have to take the specific position of the desiring eye, which involves the embodiment of the masculine eye. If we accept the generalization that one gender is more likely to find the sight of a naked woman titillating, then Le Corbusier’s architecture is designing for a masculine eye.

As a shield, the sliding partitions protect the viewer’s eye from what he does not want to see. This interpretation – the difference between covering and shielding -- is dependent upon the relationship of the sculpture to the sliding partitions. From the salle, the sculpture presents the public aspect of what is behind the sliding partitions. The sculpture, the blot in the view, is ambiguous. Its anthropomorphic shape, suggesting an erotic activity, creates the feeling of uncertainty. This feeling of strangeness is extended to the sliding partitions so that seen in conjunction with the sculpture, the sliding partitions suggest that it is covering something that we should not see.

The sculpture is the lure to what one wishes to see beyond the sliding partitions and the casier-standards: erotic, “unclean” acts that occur in the boudoir. From the Corbusian viewer, standing either in the hallway or the bedroom, there is one point where he cannot see: the divan. Only when the viewer rounds the corner of the dressing table is he able see the divan.
The last thing that the Corbusian viewer sees before he sees the female form on the divan is the reflection of the sculpture in the coiffeuse mirror. It is a recreation of the fetish exchange: the woman’s “missing” phallus is replaced by the *Sailor with Guitar*. The sculpture is a fetish object, “a frozen, arrested, two-dimensional image, a photograph to which one returns repeatedly to exorcise the dangerous consequences of movement, the harmful discoveries that result from exploration.”\(^{169}\) Occupying an idealized space, the carapace within the mirror, the desiring eye is shielded against the impending threat. This shield then is manifested in the attraction and importance of the mirror.

Referring to the (mis)recognition of external images as the source of subjectivity, the mirror functions as a *veil* that simultaneously hides and shields. The viewer, looking upon a euphemistic symbol for his own desire, addresses his/herself own limited viewpoint, from his/her own bodily limits, the “I” – the lack, the omission at the center of the Lacanian subject. Through the veil, the viewer, as the phallic ghost, appears. This is the moment of both pleasure and anxiety, the conflation of the desiring eye and the gaze.

*Further research*

In light of my research, reviewing analysis of other critics may yield new interpretations. For instance, in his exploration into the connection between Purist painting and architecture, Bruno Reichlin points out that the bathroom on the second floor in the Villa Besnus is the controlling factor in the creation of the sequence of views.\(^{170}\) (fig.63) Re-reading Reichlin’s
analysis, we can make an interpretation as to the meaning and psychological effect of having the bathroom as the motivation element between the boudoir and the bedroom. In the Villa Besnus first floor plan, there is a suggestive view of the bidet from the bedroom.

63.

64. Abraham Bosse. *The Remedy* (1633). Inscribed underneath the image: “I have the syringe ready; so be quick, Madame to make the best of this little libation. It will refresh you, for you are all afire, and the tool that I have will enter gently.” Also note the servant with the *chaise percée.*
Surrealism and Purism

According to Walter Benjamin, the spirit of France on the 1920’s was characterized by the figures of André Breton and Le Corbusier. Europe had just endured the war that was to end all wars. The First World War, with its industrial machines of destruction, brought unprecedented levels of misery. Surrealism questioned the rationality of war – the fight for industrial supremacy between Western European nations – by examining the boundaries of rationality with investigations into the roots desire, sexuality and madness. Surrealism celebrated a world out of control. On the other hand, Purism's rationality and calculation was a call for order and mastery in a world faced with the seemingly irrationalities of war.

Although Breton and Le Corbusier represent two seemingly opposite movements in early 20th century Paris, they do not mutually exclude one or the other. Nationalistic fervor and rhetoric, permeating French society, pointed to the sexual degeneracy of the French male as one of the causes for the losses in World War I. Both Surrealism and Purism were a response to the heady mix of death, sex, and industrialization. For the Surrealist, the Marquis de Sade was the hero and victim of modernity. The Sadean eroticism became the vehicle in which human nature could triumph over the moral conformity of contemporary society. In the case of Purism, we can see within Le Corbusier’s “machines for living” the post-war anxiety expressed in fetishistic elements. Purist architecture was a conflation of remoteness and heightened erotic sensuality. In Le Corbusier’s Purist architecture, rational functionality is borne from a repressed eroticism. Through the machine metaphor, the house, as a marriage of the economics of living and industrialization anxiety, becomes both the
rejected and the desired object. Purism is not a revolt, but fetishistic substitution.

The Purist *maison-type* contains the angst of modernism: creation but with fear and horror of the created. The application of Purist theory, derived from mechanical processes, brings the crisis of industrial life together with the transcendence (metaphysics) of art. By adding the mechanical metaphor to the house, the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau combines the house-as-palace with the mechanized world of the worker. The everyday man is able to enjoy the visual display of one's person once reserved for only the sovereign. Indeed, in *Vers une architecture*, the dressing room can be no longer considered a "chaise percée".¹⁷⁴

Furthermore, although derived from the Immeuble Villa, the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau, in my opinion, responds to the specific context of the 1925 International Exposition of Modern Decorative and Industrial Arts. Against the backdrop of an exposition, whose goal was ostensibly the selling of commodities - of fashion and sex, the Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau displays the viewing of the desired object as a perversion.

The Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau was a temporary building, existing for the duration of the 1925 International Exposition of Modern Decorative and Industrial Arts. Destroyed after the exhibition, the building exists only in photographs, drawings, and first hand accounts. The Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau remains a kind of chimera, existing in an imaginary space. We can experience the building only by placing ourselves in an impossible embodiment of the omniscient eye.
Appendix 1

Natural Science & Psychology Articles Published in l'Esprit Nouveau

__________. "La Constitution de la Matiere." E.N. 18, nov. 1923.
__________. "La Conscient et l'inconscient." E.N. 21, mars 1924.
__________. "Hormones et sexualite". E.N. 23, mai 1924.
__________. "Les nevroses". E.N. 24, juin 1924.
__________. "Le reve", E.N. 25, juil 1924.
__________. "Le Complexe d'Oedipe", E.N. 28 janv. 1925, 2376-2383.


Darty, ______. "Lettre a Saturne, E.N. 10, juil. 1921, 1111-1114.
__________. "La similigravure et la trichromie", E.N. 23 mai, 1924.


Jaworski, Helan. "L'interiorisation de l'eau de mer." E.N. 11-12, nov. 1921, 1267-1272.

__________. "La mathematique de la matiere", E.N. 16, mai 1922, 1865-1870.

Luminere, Auguste, "Nouvelles hypothèses dans le domaine de la physiologie et de la medecine". E.N. 10 juil 1921, 1183-1192.

Pouding, G. "L'inquiétude actuelle des sciences physiques", E.N. 20, janv-fev, 1924.

Recht, Paul. "L'origine des petroles". E.N. 6, mars 1921, 719-723.
__________. "Rayones X et lumiere. Tensions et precisions". E.N. 7, avr. 1921, 835-838.
__________. "Les tourbillons et l'orgine dualiste des mondes", E.N. 8, mai 1921, 872-876.
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