Visions Unfolding questions the deeply rooted ideas of traditional architecture and provides opportunity to see architecture differently. Eisenman questions the fact that since the second world war, there has been a shift from the mechanical paradigm to electronics, which has not had an affect on architecture. The electronic paradigm brought reproduction techniques such as photography in which the human still maintains a level of control and the fax which removes control from the human (556). These developments produce an ambiguity of how and what we see which is different to that way traditional architecture can be seen. Vision and perspective have been explored since Brunelleschi’s projection system was developed and has had an affect on architecture. In recent times, perspective ideas have been challenged in other fields such as painting and sculpture with cubism and has been attempted with the international style albeit the premise of traditional architecture still remains the core of these buildings. Eisenman argues “as long as architecture refuses to take up the problem of vision, it will remain within a Renaissance or Classical view of its discourse” (558). Vision can be defined as a way to organize space and the elements within but Eisenman suggests looking back “to allow the subject to have a vision of space that no longer can be put together in the normalizing, classicizing or traditional construct of vision; an other space, where in fact the space looks back at the subject” (559), much like the idea of the mobius strip. Deleuze’s concept of the fold is then discussed as one potential way to develop spaces that no longer fall under traditional architecture ideals.

While folds challenge the way that buildings occur, is this something that is necessary or rather to keep architecture from becoming stagnant? Does architecture require the same sort of thought process as the issues that painters and sculptors deal with?