

# Illustration

**LUIS PEREYRA**  
(CONTEMPORARY ARGENTINE ARTIST)

Everything in this outside world is cold, indolent, expected to happen over pre-established rules and codes. Far from the spirit, the emotion, the feeling. To exert the act of liberating oneself from the conditions that society imposes with its action contrary to the natural and to the habit of the consciousness implies the risk of being marginalized, merely for violating precepts it has stipulated. To sustain the autonomy of genuine thinking is to be removed from the stage erected by the social mass. Luis Pereyra rebels against a structured world and with his art leads us to doubt, to illusion, to imaginations. He conforms in his drawings or paintings, pluralities that arrive from the universe that surrounds him, because he understands that in each entity the arché, fundamental principle that integrates us to an essence, is sheltered.

With this plurality the artist builds a humanistic world in which he does not disdain any spirituality or matter that delivers his vision of the universe of man. Humanism hopes that the world may walk towards man despite history has transformed it into a utopia. Therefore, only to love hopelessness is left in order to maintain the utopia of humanism. Were this humanism attained, how many things would lose their meaning? For example, the very history of man, who is now delimiting good from evil according to his interests, increasingly intricate. In this election he feels justified at the expense of the illegitimacy of his neighbor. Would he lose with humanism the placidity of the daily struggle? Is this peaceful transformation possible? Or would his possible planning enthrone new powers? Surely man's own ancestral action would invalidate humanistic progress. This brings him closer to an aporia. Man cannot leave his reality, a mixture of instinct and interested reason.

In humanism, freedom would grow by the disappearance of suspicion towards the neighbor. Material accumulation would be meaningless and man would be fuller because he would know "what he can be." He would understand that the power of one man over another in any of its aspects would not excuse him. For that purpose he would have to belong to a fair but above all reliable order. Perhaps this is a utopianism [theory that does not come into action] and will always remain a theory. This humanism would have a stoic ethics almost as a religion without gods. It would involve being a man with another history and a psychic conformation derived from a culture towards the "other." It would



"Sorcerer 2"  
Drawing - Pencil on paper, 35 x 50 cm, 1990

build a human culture without social classes. Here is the question: what is the difference between classes but a fundamental economic-cultural diversity? And does this difference make any sense not only from the point of view of the meaning of existence, but also from the inconsistent use of the neighbor? Then in this analysis we find the insubstantiality of the social classes that end up avoiding humanism to bring the differences to insurmountable limits.

Obviously at the level of economic resources, the distribution, according to the will and capacity of each individual must start from basic needs where the neighbor's dignity and freedom, essential principle of humanism, is respected. This would enable us to achieve the



"Medieval Battle"

Drawing - Ink on paper, 25 x 35 cm, 2009

spiritual development of the human being. There can be no real humanism if man is subject to a dispute over his survival. This position also implies a different state in which the material resolution of the human problem is not enough if a cultural change on the instinctive base of the human being's knowledge is not considered. To find the true conjunction that existence is directly linked to the capacity of consciousness is the fundamental point to model the instinctive impulse [to calm instinct is the supporting step to a worthy possibility of life, constituting the matrix to reach humanism].

To use conventional behavior is to interfere in the vulgar world that relates matter, selfishness, and pride. On the other hand, humanistic thinking does not collide with one's neighbor. Far from anger, it builds the being's intimacy. What we are trying to build has the harmony of walking towards the essence that should define us with our sincere limitations. To certify individual existence, to identify the subject. There is a denaturalization of the human race in relation to understanding the existential situation and exonerating what is salvable from its desperate condition. However, man is marked from the beginning of his validity with fears and premonitions that leave him without knowledge. In order to combat the animal imprint society locates the being in the path of demigods, detaching from the freedom of spirit, although this decision does not reassure the acquisition of a state that dignifies it. It only throws it to degradation. Man disguises the ancestral remnants of flesh corruptibility in order to maintain material force within established social norms and codes. Hypocrisy is its great ally, avoiding him to being sculpted by the norms of spirit and meditation. The formal point of society is to maintain a situation with interests that dilute the individual. Then man does not imagine or dream, because the most genuine acts of his being, utopias, possess highly desirable amounts of unreality. They are only on the lookout of their own conflagration.

We must reach the man that lies in our naked interior, devoid of the conditioning of the external, the hypocrisy of behavior and the egoism of genes. The goal is the spirit, the "self," rusting the rubble of the chronicle that happened to us, ceasing to be a disposable entity

of the universe and thus rising above matter. Climb to the top with the pulse of the heart. Save the individual from mass-society. There is an opaque and oppressive world that in reality houses the miseries of man, which stands on his dispossession avoiding the transparency of being. The hidden man must be reached by tearing off the mask of lie, of deceit. This world that was constituted is an absurd, a chimera, a fraud, and still pretends to be at peace with its fears returning fantasies to the being's essence.

*One has to think how things can be changed. By persuasion or imposition? Imposition by force would be more instinctive, persuasion at this point is still utopianism. In the present circumstances men have become accustomed to living in iniquity. Those who give themselves to others will be devoured by the rest. Not being able to leave this limited consciousness makes humanism an aporia. And this for the moment does not allow us to be in a better world. Today we try to do it by sacrificing our neighbor, because we do not teach the relativity of conscience and greed always turns resources into new disputes albeit they could suffice for all men, at a fair percentage for an ephemeral life. Luis Pereyra understands that materiality alone does not explain man. There is also an essence, an "arché", which he dissects in each of his works trying to get the observer to understand that humanism is to strengthen fervor for the neighbor.*

*Each of Luis Pereyra's works seems to pray: I do not try to analyze the thought of others, I only interfere in mine. In its labyrinth, unraveling the hieroglyphs that haunted me. It was hard to get to this moment with authenticity. Throughout my life I had been afraid of the world that submits with its rigor. This inhibited me and then constituted disobedience and rebellion. My thought rages, confronts the formal when inquiring in its depth. It tries not to be conditioned by reason to approach the essential being. The collision with the contradictions is inevitable, my first companion in this of feeling human. Not to assume them is to surrender to this confused world in which life is embodied from the logic imposed by power.*

**Jorge C. Trainini**