

Process of "seeing" and creating the structure.

Nili Portugali

June 1980

Instructor: Proff, C.Alexander.



## Introduction.

In this paper I will try to clarify three major things:

1. What are the virtues which underlines the profound whole nature of a thing, and thus can act as criteria of judging the profoundness of a thing, and help to generate our acts? (the virtues is the motivation which guides the process)
2. How can we describe the inner-nature of the existing, which we want to illuminate?  
What is the mirror which reflects the true nature of something, which we have to follow?
3. What is the right process which enable the profound inner-nature of a thing to be revealed to us?

These three issues are closely related to each other, and although will be described as separate as possible will still be topics of one argument.

\*\*\*\*\*

1. The profound nature of a thing is "what it wants to be" at any given moment. It's the shared desire behind the parts which can't be described in a form of parts but in the form of the whole. Grasping the nature of something, is grasping its whole. The whole is always a manifestation of all the properties inherent in the thing. The color, form, and the function, which constitute the reality of the thing, and can't be "seen" separately. The crucial question is what underlines the reality of all things at any given moment? As I said before the reality of something is what it wants to be at any given moment. Now, the assumption is, that when a thing is reaching this state of "itself", and has the character of a "being-nature", it is relaxed, it is calm and satisfied. It looks humble because it relies upon natural type of laws which govern its existence, rather than on personal willful statements from outside its nature. The human being is governed by the same laws of nature which governs the profound self of an object. These things which have the spirit of that the human being has, become part of us and their surrounding because they are all mirrors of the self. One can become a mirror of the self only if it is guided by the universal laws of nature.

Something which is true to its inner-nature, its parts are united in a friendly way, and the same heart is beating in all its parts.

What we see if we look directly to its insight, from our insight, is not the physical



2  
form but the rules which created this form. And what we have to follow are those rules. These rules tell you at each moment to create something which is relaxed, they tell you to make sense to its function. Not only in the practical level, but that we will feel alive when we use the object or look at it. They tell you to create a feeling of harmony among all parts, and with its surrounding. They tell you to follow the nature of the materials it is made of. It tells you to enhance the feeling of the structure which is due to the configuration of the whole and not to the individual components.

These rules are the characteristics of a structure which is true to its inner-nature, and that is the reason why they are the ones to guide the process. If we look at a stone wall of a house, and we want to draw it on paper, what is that we have to grasp from it? We know it is not the physical particular appearance, which happened to be a result of certain reality, when it was born. The wall is actually the harmonious feeling which we want to put on the paper. It is the way the flowers are falling on it, it is the feeling of the different colors which match each other, it is the openings which are just in the right place etc. It is the feeling of that particular wall we have to grasp. And it can be done with completely different colors or shapes, just to match that feeling. So basically we follow the same rules mentioned above, in order to accomplish that feeling. The feeling of the thing is inevitably reflecting the nature of the thing. (not good or bad). These rules are capable of generating a process, because they are free enough to illuminate the self of the thing. And because of that, these rules can act as a criteria to judge if what we did was the right thing to do.

These fundamentals which describe the profound self of a structure and thus can also generate it, are the manifestation of all the i4 properties. The difference is, while the i4 properties can only describe the end product in parts and thus are abstract, the rules mentioned above, which are versions of some properties (calm, centers, not separateness) are to do with the concrete feeling of the thing which is reflecting the whole, and thus able to guide the process. A process which is capable of illuminating the nature of the thing. As I will say later in part 3, only the intuition is capable of grasping this feeling of the whole.

Someone who is motivated by the virtues which underlines a "being-nature", and let them guide the process, gives the way to the structure to be what it wants to be.

When this is happening the true quality of the thing is felt.



2. When a structure is reaching "itself", we can say that, the relationship among the different parts of the structure are so, that enable the essence of the structure to be revealed. The virtues of such a structure as mentioned in part i ~~are~~ can be described in the form of some properties. Calmness, Not-separateness, Centers. These properties are the ones which reflect the concrete feeling of the thing. This concrete feeling is reflecting the whole as oposed to the other properties which reflect the parts, although are manifested in the structure.

The question now is, what is the mirror which reflects those underlying properties of the inner-nature of a structure?, a mirror that we can respond to while we deal with a structure? which we have to follow.

In the structure there is always one thing that we grasp and enhance. In the colors there was the Inner-light which represented for us the constitution of the essence which we wanted to illuminate. The Inner-light represented for us the feeling of the color, and as the feeling of the color is the part which represents the whole, it was the part which could generate our act. The feeling is a product ~~among~~ <sup>OF</sup> the properties of the color (hue, amount, tone), but those properties are not capable of illuminating the concrete whole while we deal with them separately. And the mirror which reflected for us the color was the inner-light.

In a structure, space, object or whatever, we have to refer to the place which can get us hold the most with the feeling of the whole. I did call it the Virtual center of the configuration of the whole structure at any given moment. Unfortunately one might think that it is associated with the geometrical appearance of the structure. That is not what I mean. It is nothing to do with a physical map of a center which is fixed, because at each moment the configuration of the whole which is there can project a different feeling, and thus it is not the configuration we had two minutes ago. On the other hand it is what the structure wants to be at each moment. If we are consistent to that desire, it will always lead to the true, and not necessarily what was there when we started.

I have the feeling that the Inner-light of a color and the Place which is reflecting the most the feeling of the structure, are the one's which will survive up to the last moment....when a structure at a particular moment will vanish.

When we design something "new", or improve something which is existing, we look for a



4

configuration that will produce good feeling. The good feeling has to do with how much the structure, space etc, is true to its use, to its surrounding, etc. If the configuration is right to its natural forces, there will always be a place or places that represent the feeling of the configuration. But what we have in our mind when we design is not the configuration of the parts which will be generated, but those places (virtual centers) which are induced by already what was there. For example: if we want to place a house on a site, there is already a feeling at that place which is induced by the trees, road wind etc. We grasp that feeling from that place where it is felt most, and we enhance that feeling. And that is what we have in mind. We don't have in mind the separate trees, road etc. In other words at each moment we see those places with our intuition, and we enhance the feeling they represent, not the places themselves.

There is always the larger configuration which determines the feeling of a place. It can do with the surrounding or with the way one is using an object.

I would like to refer to a specific example of re-designing the balcony, which will clarify what I have just said. (description of the process is enclosed at the end).

There was a certain configuration which produced a certain feeling, which one expected to find in the balcony, but was not there. It had to do with the way one wanted to reach the garden in front of the balcony, the way one felt connected to the house while sitting in the balcony, etc. The balcony had to be the place where this natural feeling had to be reflected. At this moment there was not such a coherent place (center) where one could feel it, I don't name it good or bad, but rather say that the balcony had no relation to what it really wanted to be in reference to the larger configuration. Each act along the process had to satisfy the particular concrete feeling which was presented within the larger configuration. So, in this case and in the case of the door in the class, there was not yet any place (center) where one can grasp the feeling of the real thing, but nevertheless, there was a potential center in the back, due to the dominant coherent things, which were related to each other, and they called for an infill that will eventually bring the whole space to a space where you can feel the essence in a concrete place (center).

This is the state that we called Zero. It is this state when the structure is true to its own nature. A structure of this kind will always have a focal point which will

5



reflect the field strength. This focal place can only be received by our feeling, and that is why this focal place is real. Anything which is perceived by the intellect is just the part of the story, and thus only by accident can generate an act which will preserve the feeling of the whole. (this will be discussed in the next part).

Let me distinguish between two things: 1. What do we actually follow in the actual process? and 2. Our understanding what is going on behind the process.

In the color phenomena the Inner-light was the constitution of a color. The properties were the relationship between these constitutions. When we concentrate on the Inner-light of a color, we are on the way to produce it—enhance it. In this case the inner-light is the configuration of the hue, amount and tone of the color. The properties which are the relationship between these elements are directly responsible of the illumination of the color. So, in this case we both know what is guiding the process, and how it is related to the actual process. (considering just the colors).

In the case of the structure, my analogy to the Inner-light is what I call the feeling of the structure, which is as well the direct reflection of the constitution of the structure. (mentioned above). The place where this feeling is presented is what I called the virtual center. The properties are the relationship between the constitutions of the structure. And thus the feeling of the structure can be described in terms of the properties. (some of them in particular). ~~I am quite clear what is guiding the actual process, but what is going on behind the process. The reason for that is, that I am not yet able to define the structure in those terms which are directly responsible for creating the feeling of the structure. The given is sufficiently defined to guide the process but not sufficiently defined to understand the cause for or the reflected. (separate parts). But as I said before, as far as the actual process is concerned, we are interested in the mirror which reflects the whole and not the reflected parts.~~

Although in the colors it was more obvious how the color can be defined in the terms of the properties, in the structure as well it is clear that this is the only way a structure can be described. We can understand the parts in terms of the different properties, and we can feel the whole in terms of some properties. The different properties



are to take care that a coherent feeling of the one will be established. When this is happening we can define the structure in terms of other properties, which are underlying the profound nature of the self. (discussed before) Those properties which define the whole, are the ones which guide the actual process. The other ones are directly responsible of illuminating the structure.

\* This part, <sup>which is</sup> to do with the definition of the structure in terms of the properties is yet to be more investigated. This part to me is important to be clear about, and the reasons for that are: 1. It will lead us to know how consciously, why in what circumstances we reach the quality of the profound nature of the structure, which we already can feel? (in the colors we know what are the conditions necessary for the inner-light)

In the "structure", we can define vaguely the structure, and we can clearly feel when it reaches "itself", but we are not clear about the connection of the two. 2. When we are stuck we will be able to analyse what is there and refer to it, and be guided by it.

I don't believe this is the right process one should take as a general rule, but it can certainly improve the situation in the cases where we can't get hold of the reality by the intuition. 3. Once we understand consciously and more specifically the cause for the quality, it becomes part of our inner-knowledge which then operates through our intuition, and this is the most important reason for knowing more. So it is not to do directly with the actual process, but rather what is behind the process, - this is what we have to be clear about.

In the last chapter I will deal with the different aspects of the actual process which takes place.

3. If we want to produce something which has got feeling in it, we have to get in touch with a kind of process that will allow the power beneath the surface to act. This power which is inherited in us by nature, is the power which tells us what it is that a structure wants to be. In other words, if we want to preserve the feeling of the structure, we have to direct our insight to its nature. The self nature is inherited in all beings, and an object which reveals its nature of a being is an object which reflects each one of us. The kind of process we are looking for, is the one which will allow this natural-power in us to see the truth and reflect it on our "consciousness" and bring it to actualization.



The nature of the structure is not a static map of definit parts which is relied on our preknown abstract knowledge, but rather a process of infinit possibilities guided by the reality of the whole. The only mean to get hold of this reality of the whole is the intuition. The intuitive process is the immediat and total awareness to the inward natural laws which guides the self of the structure. The intelectual part of us can draw a map of a structure, but this map is never completed, because it is based on our predetermined knowledge, i.e it is what we are looking for and not what we find. The intuitive part of us (which is constituted of knowledge and feeling) "see" a structure directly, seeing -feeling the concrete ~~whole~~ nature of the whole.

What is the nature of a structure? I did say before, that it is what it wants to be at each moment. And when it is fullfilled it reveals a peacefull feeling. There is no good or bad structure, ~~it~~ is already a concept. There is the structure. We can not bring forward the self of a thing by, accidental manner or by concious efforts..

The actualization of the self is the outcome of a free mind, which lets the inavitable to guide us, and that is determined in the process itself. The free mind is the intuition.

Any thing which is guided by the laws of nature, and is a sequence of such a process evokes our feeling, because the nature of the human being is guided by the same laws.

But it evokes our feeling only if we look at it in the direct way.

As long that we are in a state of "nothing", i.e, not looking for the abstract to guide us we can than say that what is there already is the emptiness. This emptiness is the nothings (which is something), it is the infinit potential which will generate the next act we do.

It is not a matter of good or bad, but it is to do with our nonconceptual vision of the structure. The structure will always be "empty", as long as it is created by its own nature which is percieved by us, and not by artificial will of us. If So again, the structure of nothing is, our free state of mind which is capable of recieving anything and enhance it. If we aply our abstract knowledge (based on past experience), before we grasp the whole, we are not any more in the structure of nothing, which is the concrete reality of the thing. So the only supreme rule behind the process is the one which is capable to tell us if the inner-structure is reflected or not. This rule is to do with the feeling of the whole and not with the parts. Our task than is to find a definition of this criteria which can tell us when a structure is in its natural state. (this has been discused in part i).



The profound structure of "nothing" has the character of being dynamic and open ended, as opposed to a predetermined structure which is a definite complete ended statement, governed by the unreal, or by part of the reality.

If we approach a process in this way, it is clear why making wholes which heals, is the same as respecting what is there. A whole which is perceived by our intuition, is by definition the reality of the thing, rather than the sum of the parts.

The reality of the thing is its inner-nature. So when we make something a whole by our intuition, it always refers to the original nature of the thing we are dealing with. And that act is to infill the part which is missing in order to bring what is there to the peaceful state it wants to be. We can't bring a thing to a state of calm if we don't perceive first its nature, which is what it wants to be. Its nature is not its appearance, or its individual properties, it is the essence of the whole, it is the version underlines its properties, it is beyond the forms.

In my previous papers written during the seminar I went into description of some processes, which repeats what I have said above, 1. designing the walls of the exhibition. 2. redesigning the balcony. 3. the paper on the virtual center. which is to do with the creation of the whole by the next step, and the creation of the larger whole by paying attention to the hierarchy of wholes. So I did not repeat all these arguments again.

For summing up all that have been said above one is clearly aware of the following:

1. The authentic process which enable us to get in touch with the nature of a structure, is: the intuitive process.
2. The virtues which underlines a structure which is true to itself, is our motivation which guides the process of creation. (part 1)
3. We get in touch with the feeling of the real configuration which exists. If it feels good, we enhance it until it feels just great. We do it at each moment and in all levels of scale. If it does not feel good, we know that it did not yet reach the state it wants naturally to be in. So something is wrong with its configuration. (not the abstract formal configuration, <sup>but it is</sup> which can tell us what to do, but the intuition which is translating the feeling to a the critical problem within this configuration). We keep going, always having in mind those properties which underlines the good feeling (calm, not separated, coherent feeling)



this is under our control. At each moment there is the critical thing which has to be done. Unless we grasp it at the right moment and do it, we don't really follow the right process. The order of what are the crucial things one has to do at each moment, is determined by the real situation of the natural process itself. If one does not follow the order which is determined at each moment, one does not actually solve the problem. At any moment there is the problem which has to be solved, and all the other things are relatively minor. If we start dealing with the minor things, it means we are not enough concentrating on the whole, and thus occupied with secondary things.

If I take as an example the re-designing of the balcony (enclosed) there were three things which came to my mind at the very beginning. 1. it was too narrow. 2. the railing was too high. 3. there was no protection, in terms of roof or trellis etc.

Out of the three the most crucial one which my instinct told me to deal with was: that it was too narrow. That was the problem at that particular moment. The other two accomplished the balcony much later. If let's say I would ignore that problem and start dealing with the secondary problems, I would quite certainly not solve the real problem at that moment, and quite likely come back to those minor problems after the main problem of the balcony has been solved. It is not likely that the size of the balcony will be determined by the trellis or the railing, but rather the opposite. Not because of the physical scale of it, but because there was a much more dominant configuration which determined its size at that particular case. If it was not so, my feeling would not tell me to do that first. In other words that was simply the problem, and until that is solved whatever we do hasn't the capacity that the larger configuration imposes us to do. The larger configuration is the one which happens to have the most impact on the structure. (Physically it can be very small). A lemon tree can have the great impact which tells us to put a branch under it. And if we place a building near by it still does not solve the problem.

Nili Portugali