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I. Abstract

Mankind’s fascination with natural form is undeniably long-lived. From collecting and preserving specimens for evolutionary research, to documenting and expressing natural form through artistic practice, Mankind continues to embrace for scientific and aesthetic benefit that which surrounds us. I believe that botany, marine biology, and environmental phenomena—all areas of influence and study from my childhood—are sources that illustrate perfection in form and utility. The sheer beauty evident in these scientific forms continues to inspire me, and I will celebrate them and explore my relationship with them through an experimental making process in wood.

Carved objects, form studies, and functional furniture is the format for my thesis. By selecting specific examples from my past involvement with the sciences, I will seek to convey a sense of pure wonder with my interpretation of natural form. These forms will be explored through the use of specific unique wood samples that I myself have collected, with the intention of establishing a conversation between the design and the material. For me, wood is not just a building material; it is the means of connection between Mankind and the natural world. I respond to its tactility, its preciousness, its origin, and its identity, and I feel a responsibility to honor the medium. Honoring wood is an all-encompassing process that begins with the search for material. I will use material from personally-milled logs that are selected for their naturally grown curves and gesture with the intent of unifying the inherent gesture of the material with natural forms found within.

Rather than reproduce life forms, I will apply my particular knowledge of and fascination with the natural world to explore the process of designing and making objects and furniture in wood. Form exploration and experimentation will be of utmost importance through my research, not utility, although I will use the context of furniture to help ground me in my development. Ultimately, I hope to establish a working process that feels seamless and fluid between the material, the inspiration, and my hand.
II. Discussion of Sources and Research

Growing up in a household with parents who are marine biologists instilled in my siblings and me an inherent reverence for the natural world. In particular, we learned about the strength and fragility of ecosystems and the importance of an investigative process in the environmental sciences. Dinnertime conversations about sampling water on the Chesapeake Bay, Sunday afternoons at Horn Point Laboratory exploring the oyster hatchery, and stray laboratory instruments around the house simply felt customary. At many times, I felt compelled to pursue the sciences, but never did it fully satisfy the urge to work with my hands. As I began my studies in design and furniture making, the language that surrounded me as a boy persisted, both linguistically and visually. There is a purity to the botanical, and a fluidity to the biological that drew me in. It took me nearly six years of exploring strictly furniture and architectural forms to begin to unearth my grounding in the natural. I now feel compelled to refer to natural form as source material—knowing it refers to my family heritage, as well as the fact that natural specimens are objects of form, fully justified for their utility through history.

Research for this body of work seemingly began before I even knew I would attend the School for American Crafts. It was the cold January day that I first milled a log into lumber under the guidance of my mentor Vicco von Voss that my mindset on material changed. I had previously been sourcing lumber and raw materials for my furniture from old millwork shops and lumberyards—anywhere that would give me their scraps. My search for free material began with strictly economic reasons, and it yielded material that was sufficient to begin a student’s career, but was certainly not top-shelf. What captured my attention was the process of seeing a log, selected purposefully for its naturally grown curves and characteristics, turn into planks that were alive with color and gesture. Before I knew it, I was making any connection I could to obtain logs of my own.

My first jackpot harvest was when I was offered the remains of a nearly 300 year-old soft maple tree in my hometown of Easton, Maryland. While most of the six foot diameter trunk was hollow from rot, I hand selected the best portions I could, 5 logs in
total, and eagerly awaited their turn at my mentor’s sawmill. After a day at the sawmill, the biggest challenge was waiting the two years for the lumber to properly air dry, one year per inch of thickness. These were the planks from which I knew I would create a body of work. *When? About what?* These were still unknown. In October of my second year at the School for American Craft, I was once again humbled by this material; I had witnessed that very maple tree standing 70 feet tall, and had fostered the material to its second life as an object, permanent in existence. That piece is *Pteria*.

![Pteria, Soft Maple, 32” x 30” x 16”](image1)

![Pteria, Surface Detail](image2)

The exploration of the natural began during my apprenticeship under Vicco von Voss in Chestertown, MD. I aided him in shaping large timbers into sweeping curves and cross-sections for large furniture pieces, learning to read the wood grain to select the perfect piece for each component. As he referred to it, it was about “listening to the wood” and recognizing what each plank wants to become. This process struck a chord
in me—with this material, new forms of the natural were possible and I would no longer be confined to the “scrap wood” I had collected prior.

Throughout the research that paralleled my first few pieces, I discovered a long history of documenting and recording natural forms. While the most obvious source of information would be documentation for scientific and environmental advancements, I was more concerned with how other visual artists were interpreting the formal characteristics of botanical and marine subjects in relation to design and visual art. The prominent question to consider became “why are these artists recording or reinterpreting nature when it already is perfect?” What I discovered was that artists had a common urge to share and present a feeling of pure wonder in natural form. Active in the 1860’s, German biologist and naturalist Ernst Haeckel, author of Art Forms in Nature, created expressive illustrations of species, both botanical and aquatic. His work was described as representing the connection between Man and nature; “Through human beings, nature, in a sense, becomes conscious of itself for the first time” (Eibl-Eibesfeldt, 25). While Haeckel took liberties in expressing his illustrations of specimens to increase awareness of Darwinian theory by the general public, I similarly was striving to make people conscious of and curious about forms that nature fruitfully created.

Haeckel was not alone in documenting nature by way of visual art. German professor, sculptor, and amateur photographer Karl Blossfeldt set out to study the plant world through photography to uncover their structure, organic configuration, and “lofty artistic form” (Mattenklot 1). His images were of hand-selected plant specimens, photographed in a frontal and centered composition revealing a clarity of plant form and structure. The collection of images was about the objective presentation, displaying clearly the formal characteristics of each plant species. Blossfeldt in many ways was working as a steward for future artists, designers and architects providing a glossary of forms, structures and textures as reference material. He argued a direct tie between the forms found in nature and in the arts,

The objects necessary for artistic use can always be reduced to a number of typical forms, as it were… As for the vegetable kingdom, those forms must be represented
more fully which exhibit the criteria for translation into artistic forms in the most visible and explicable fashion. (Mattenklot 8)

His documentation of the plant world was unaltered, raw, and informative, yet his interpretation and concept as an artist resided in the composition and craftsmanship of the work. Ultimately, Blossfeldt was providing source material through his own visual research and provided to me the confidence to present my carved specimens simply as formal objects in space for others to study.

Swedish surgeon Bertel Bager may not be categorized as an artist in this niche of documenting natural form, but he certainly holds a dominant role as an explorer of sorts. Bager has long been associated with the study of design and nature, as for many years he collected thousands of specimens from the plant world, namely seedpods and fruits, and documented them through rudimentary photography. His greyscale images are not as tightly composed as Blossfeldt’s, but they excel as clear, concise imagery of form, detail, and structure of plants. Bager posed numerous questions to guide his photographic research, many of which concern the designer or craftsperson, including,

- Is there any system in [a flower’s] color? Is everything purposeful, according to plan? Is it reasonable to think that all beauty confronting us exists solely for its own sake and to give us pleasure? What is the fundamental reason for their presence? (Bager 9)

Bager did not claim to be an artist, but he posed many questions about the implied perfection evident in naturally occurring seed and fruit forms. He was assisting others, aiding their questioning and providing another glossary of forms for designer and artists alike to explore. What resonated with me was his argument that man and nature convene most effectively beyond imitation. He argues, “Nature in her design and man in his art meet somewhere beyond the limits of imitation—in something universally common to both…Deviations from ideal shapes give rise to variation in form in both art and nature” (Bager 8). It is with these questions, I began exploring the carved “specimen” simply as a form study as a way to inform larger pieces in a furniture-context. These larger pieces
would later exude aspects of botanical and marine form, but leave room for viewer 
interpretation of specie and utility.

III. Critical Analysis

This body of work provided an opportunity for a fundamental change in the way I 
engage in the act of making furniture. In previous work, a fascination with existing 
furniture forms, efficiency in methods and ergonomics steered my work toward limited production. I prioritized the opinion of the masses through my handmade objects, subsequently revealing less personality in the work. Throughout my graduate research, I 
began seeking an inward mode of thought. I needed to discover a studio practice and 
direction that first and foremost satisfied my own aesthetic rather than that of the 
customer. What that aesthetic was exactly, I was not quite sure.

By the fall of 2013, I had completed three lengthy apprenticeships in furniture 
making and metal working, all with mentors who balance their work between utility and 
sculpture. I had developed a certain skill set under my mentors and was starting to 
recognize a visual direction that I liked. I felt compelled to explore a new language of 
objects as a holistic compilation of my education. Extracting themes and methods of my 
own from past experiences opened up a freedom to use furniture as a vehicle for form and 
sculptural expression rather than as means to a utilitarian or economic end. My mentors 
encouraged me through the making of their own work to maintain a priority of form 
exploration. Ultimately, this work allowed me to develop my own approach to making 
by merging my skill-based experiences with a context from family.

Upon returning to academia, no longer was I driven toward using flat stock; I was 
now drawing curves, particularly long *fair* curves, with broad convex and concave 
surfaces. These lines were coming from a combination of leaf, floral, and aquatic 
inspiration: all of the aspects of my life that were resurfacing. I had been encouraged to 
embrace more complex curved cross-sections, achieving them through a series of flat 
facets during the shaping process. I realized that wood need not be flat; it was now a
blank canvas for me to explore. I began to take pride in the precision of shaping intersections of curved surfaces, revealing both a continuation and separation of surfaces. The ridge or peak created by two intersecting concave or convex surfaces, called an *arris*, became integral to the forms and cross-sections I would later create. I think of that *arris* as line-work, adding definition and complexity to the composition of a form, and guiding the viewer’s eye throughout the piece.

Getting to this point had been convoluted. While I was beginning to incorporate that line-work through early pieces, it was *Specimen 1: Samara* where I myself began to listen to the wood, as Vicco had taught me. Although I did not mill the material myself for this piece, I saw within that specific plank of mahogany a swirling grain pattern, reminiscent of the form of a maple seedling. The material was telling *me* what it should be, not the other way around. The urge to simply begin carving an interpretation of a maple seedling was new territory for me; I had no particular function in mind, and certainly no formal design on paper. I began to draw on the wood itself, doing my best to follow the flow and gesture of the wood grain to suggest contours. I felt compelled by this urge to make, to uncover, and experiment and bring into the world an object of curiosity and wonder. Ironically, when the form was complete, a thin undulating leaf with a bulbous seedpod, the wood grain I had intended to accentuate was disguised. It was no longer about the wood grain but entirely about the form.

*Specimen 1: Samara*, Mahogany, Milk Paint, Steel, 45” x 17” x 5.5”

*Specimen 1: Samara*, Detail
This moment presented the first of many uncomfortable intersections. My stomach dropped as I faced questions of intent. Do I leave the piece natural, knowing that the original intent is lost? How do I resolve the surface treatment to enhance the form? The act of painting a piece never crossed my mind before; I was always partial to revealing the wood. But, this crossroads made me realize that leaving wood natural had always been the safe route for me. The act of painting Specimen 1: Samara in a solid cream-white tone taught me an invaluable lesson: solid tones reveal a purity of form undisturbed by the patterns of wood grain. Presenting this carved form as a specimen isolated and prioritized the formal characteristics I would later explore through this body of work: form, line, color, and texture.

Completing Specimen 1: Samara prior to my thesis year encouraged me to simply begin making, and let the first objects reveal themselves and help direct the projection of this body of work. What became critical in my investigation of material and form was being fundamentally experimental. All my pieces were experiments in their own right—I began with very little knowledge of what the final object would be or how I would get there, but I did know what specific material I was working with. David Pye mentioned in The Nature and Art of Workmanship this separation between the objective and subjective,

The truth is that what we want to do is, not to express the properties of materials, but to express their qualities. The properties of materials are objective and measurable. They are out there. The qualities on the other hand are subjective: they are in here: in our heads. They are ideas of ours…They are part of that private view of the world which artists each have within them. (Pye 88)

By selecting specific planks from my collection from which to begin, I was committing to revealing the qualities of each plank. There was only one of each plank, and each was irreplaceable. I therefore was able to skip mock-ups and samples, as they would be irrelevant and misrepresent that plank. The curves, knots, and inclusions all played a role in the conversation I directed between my pencil and the board, thus committing me to finished objects as experiments. I embraced the intuitive, with a taste of the impulsive.
While the majority of the wood I was using was maple—often a less valuable wood than most—I treated the flitches as specimens themselves, jewels of the natural world that I was to foster. My material philosophy was shifting and settling. Now, when I think of the idea of a tree, I envision the volume it consumes in space with the canopy full of gestural branches. When most individuals envision the material that comes from that very same tree, they think of a straight plank. Here lies the disconnect. By the nature of industrial processes, we devalue the most gestural part of the tree as it is difficult and time consuming to process into lumber, thus we are left with what I argue is a lifeless starting material. *How can we create gestural or expressive objects with material that is stripped of its potential before it is in the hands of makers?* With this realization, I made it a priority to do my best in maintaining the inherent gestural qualities of the wood from the very beginning when I select log sections from a tree, through the milling process, and into the design stage.

The first series of pieces I completed for this body of work were inspired initially by oyster shells from the Chesapeake Bay and the South Pacific Islands. As objects that persisted in the background of my studies and childhood, I felt it was important to revisit the idea of the oyster as content for the work. The interiors of both species of shells intrigued me. The smooth pearlescent interior that undulates to accommodate the anatomy on a thin canvas of a shell was fascinating. Before I got started, a few questions surfaced. *How could I combine my shaping and carved line-work with such visually demanding wood planks? Should I be active or passive? How can I be a steward for the material and still satisfy my visual goals?* With my first pair of wall-mounted vessels inspired by these oyster forms, I landed at either end of the spectrum. *Pteria* was about embracing what the planks had to offer—a wide crotch section for the top with swirling grain and a thin horizontal extension of wood that helped reference the hinge mechanism on the winged oyster, from the genus *Pteria*. 
Arris was not such an easy feat; I had designed the form prior to picking out material, and simply fit the templates of components on the most appropriate sections of wood. While I thought I was using the curves of the grain to my advantage, I was not collaborating with wood. After shaping the form for Arris, I was left with a slew of wormholes on the surface which nearly deemed the piece unusable. I was at that painful crossroads yet again. Shaping Arris from the cherry planks I had selected left me no better off than making it from commercial lumber. The piece sat for nearly 4 months unfinished before recognizing that what I was originally revealing was a simple form, with line-work produced by the convergence of the upper and lower surfaces. I returned to my realization about painted surfaces with Specimen 1: Samara and committed to a monotone charcoal milk painted surface, with a hint of the cherry showing through along the rim.

Working on these two pieces in tandem, and later finishing them natural and painted was the beginning of a tension that resonated through the remainder of the body
of work. That tension arose from different surface treatments. I was giving such priority to the natural color and figure of the wood in some pieces, while painting and obscuring it in others. Ironically, this body of work began with material at the forefront, yet unexpectedly I made more pieces with the grain obscured or hidden than natural. Priorities had shifted throughout my research as the search for form took front seat. This shift pained me during the process to a degree, but as a body of work, the tension that arose between the natural surfaces and those obscured by paint or dye became a healthy element, allowing the viewer to sway between material integrity and form.

Working with this special air-dried material commanded a certain attention. I realized that I should not fight it, but rather embrace all of the qualities that the flitches had. No longer would I be nervous of checks, inclusions, or wormholes—these were just elements that would later help direct the making process. Before I let go of the wall-mounted series, I was compelled to finish that chapter with a third piece, one that built upon the collaborative process I was developing with the flitches that surrounded me in

Nascent, Soft Maple, 52” x 15” x 8”

Nascent, Detail
my studio. I began flipping through the wood as if pages in a book, picking out grain patterns and defects which captured my attention. I officially put down my sketchbook, and strictly drew directly on the wood. This was a surefire way to explore ideas and forms that were integral to the wood from which it is made. *Nascent* was born from a challenge to make one piece from one plank with no additional components; all I could do was derive a gesture, cut apart components, rearrange them, and shape them. I began by sawing away rot, then grinding away soft areas with wormholes, and the remaining material began to develop into a form. It was the areas that were intact and solid where I could collaborate with the wood, sketching lines along the grain until a vague gestural drawing appeared. It was the beginning of a language of what I refer to as tendrils that later appeared in the bench *Incrementum.*

![Incrementum, Soft Maple, Limestone, 72” x 15” x 13”](image)

The idea of the tendril persisted. It became a sinuous, gestural line in and of itself, with which I aimed to bring life to a piece. My cues for this tendril motif are multilevel, ranging from the visual language of my mentors Peter Dudley, Vicco von Voss, and Sam Castner, to the idea of new growth in a plant sprout. While *Nascent* is anamorphic with its carved wispy tail that returns upon itself in front of the viewer, the
tendril that *Incrementum* consists of was much less “natural” looking, kinking at the location of the joinery and accommodating to the limited material dimensions. It appears otherworldly to me, and lacks a distinct reference to the natural world, and because of that is much less successful.

At this point in my research, my process was a fundamentally reactive design process. My material had already made decisions for me, such as overall scale and mass, but I was responsible to respond to the wood grain, determining a context, and creating a form from its clues. Karl Blossfeldt mentioned this sensitive process within his own work; “The sentimental to-and-fro between nature and art vacillates between stressing the artistic in nature and the vegetal in art” (Mattenklot 8). This back-and-forth working style finally felt natural to me. It was experimental; it had no easy answer; it did not and could not tell you what the end result would be. It was a fully focused engagement with a single specimen of wood until the very end of the project. The result was a seamless combination of the natural form with the natural material; in places like the lower leg of *Pteria*, the combination of curl in the wood and the curve in the form give the illusion that the component was bent, not carved. This was one of the earliest details I shaped, and remains one of my favorites.

What remained instrumental in my research was allowing utility to take a backseat. Prior to this graduate work, I was making furniture that kept utility and refined ergonomics in design paramount. I was exploring sculpture as a student as well, and while intrigued by the idea of form exploration, I never had a comfortable platform on which to pursue it. This body of work gave me that platform as I was creating these naturally shaped objects within a furniture context. Utilizing the common furniture forms such as shelves, tables, and benches grounded my research because I insisted on making these items with the furniture related skills I had worked hard to develop. I took pride in how well things were made, and hinted at construction methods for the viewer, as seen in the scarf joint pinned with Ebony on *Nascent*, or the shaped finger joints present on *Incrementum*. David Pye reinforced the idea that workmanship in and of itself is an art; he stated, “Unless workmanship comes to be understood and appreciated for the art it is,
our environment will lose much of the quality it still retains” (Pye 19). Contrarily, while a piece like Arris, having been sealed, painted, and sanded thoroughly, may disguise all signs of furniture related workmanship, it still retains a high level of finesse that I think Pye would support.

The back-and-forth design process between the material and me was quite parallel to the back-and-forth between carving specimens and making these furniture-related objects in multiple materials. I gave lower priority to the material from which I carved the initial specimens as I saw them as studies, and eventually as patterns from which to take a mold and cast in other materials. Painting and dying these studies to be solid tones, as seen in Specimen 2: Cycad and Specimen 3: Crassostrea began to dematerialize the objects and provide an opportunity to see them strictly as examples of form, texture, and line. It was not about disguising the fact that they were made from wood, but rather to encourage the viewer to question the idea of how I went about interpreting specimens. The specimens were intentionally made not to be botanically or anatomically correct—
they were my rendition of the forms that sparked my own curiosity. I was creating a contour map of the objects for my own research. Iron and glass castings of these same objects proved successful in further separating the viewer from the original pattern, yet left more questions for me as I stepped nearer to the daunting realm of pure sculpture, as can be seen in *Sofa Table 1: Crassostrea*. Ultimately, embracing multiple processes of carving, casting, and painting helped me maintain a prolific workflow until every piece could be seen together as a body of work.

![Sofa Table 1: Crassostrea](image)

*Sofa Table 1: Crassostrea, Cast Glass, Sipo, Holly, 30” x 12” x 36”*

**IV. Conclusion**

Wonderment and fascination with the natural was the impetus for this body of work. It was about getting closer to objects and subjects particularly dear to my parents who surrounded us with reverence for the environment. I spent time investigating specimens, and extracted the themes I believed to be most prominent for objects and interpretive furniture. As I walked the line between sculpture and utilitarian objects, the question of *why* remained prominent. I carved and meticulously painted or textured a
collection of specimen forms that were not accurate enough to be reference material for other botanists, nor abstract enough as pure sculpture, but suggestive of an essence or gesture that I saw in the specimen. I did not intend for them to be considered sculpture, but rather as form studies that put sculptural cues to work. As objects they command attention and pose questions for the viewer: *What is it made from? What does it represent? Is it carved?* While these questions are fitting for the context of craft media, as I near the world of sculpture moving forward, not only will I have to rearrange, if not let go of some of the craftsmanship-based priorities, but I will have to consider more pressing questions concerning content and concept. As a fundamentally experimental process, this body of work lacked a clarity of intent, fostering a freedom of making that allowed me to work through a collection of different ideas. While it worked for now, I recognize that will need to prioritize this clarity at the onset of new projects, whether in a furniture or sculpture context.

I was once told by a former teacher and director of the Center for Furniture Craftsmanship, Peter Korn, that we as makers, sculptors, craftspeople make things not because the world needs another chair, table, or sculpture, but rather because we have an undeniable urge to see our ideas manifested in real life with real materials. Korn states in *Why We Make Things and Why it Matters*:

> Craft is especially fulfilling because its materiality anchors the craftsman’s understanding—the stories, ideas, and beliefs through which he structures his identity organizes experience, and makes decisions—in reality…When his work is concluded, the fruit of his labor stands there, unambiguously. (Korn 55)

Within this body of work, I never had to justify why I was making something—it was simply because I felt compelled to bring it into the world as an object of beauty.

Using the sciences, primarily botany and marine biology, as source material kept me close to the world of discovery. I did not keep to a rigid scientific method, but as seen in many of the titles of the work, I felt it imperative to retain the scientific nomenclature as a nod to my family references, and also to aid the viewer in their initial
response to the work. Staying close to these sciences, but not fully engulfed satisfied that urge to reconnect. It also allowed me to uncover forms of my own making, forms from my botanical vocabulary.

Developing this language that consists of tendrils, flowing line-work, and broad dished surfaces provided a stimulating result when seen them as a body of work. The collection of objects revealed that I was working sculpturally, but also offering the viewer occasional moments of utility. Perhaps a moment of visual rest, a moment that one can relate to as furniture. The work may not command the conceptual content that one could find in a body of pure sculpture, but rather invites the viewer to explore both the visual and tactile. The sculptural was integral to the ideas of utility because it directed the tactility and exploration of form and surface. Similarly, the utilitarian was integral to the sculptural for it grounded the forms in a context and allowed the forms themselves to become the structure.

As individual pieces, they have strengths and weaknesses, and none of them were made without faults. Whether it was overcoming the material flaws in Arris prior to painting, the awkward or “unnatural” looking tendril in Incrementum, or the flatness in the front view of Nascent, each piece resulted with certain characteristics that were not
ideal. Regardless, the body as a whole speaks to the nature of experimentalism through the making process, and to the impulsiveness of diving into the material that I considered precious. At the outset of my research I was unclear what I would actually make, and as I worked through the numerous pieces, I could feel as though I was chipping away at questions I had, slowly arriving at answers, but never attaining one complete. New questions arose, and more ideas came—I had discovered there is a career’s worth of exploration ahead of me.

As I move forward into a realm that feels comfortably as my own, the questions I pose for myself will gravitate toward the where and away from the why of making. I seemingly arrived at multiple directions within this body of work, one being carved sculptural specimens that operate solely for exploring objective characteristics, another being the furniture related objects left natural to accentuate the coexistence between form and wood, and lastly the painted, cast, or “disguised” furniture forms. This body of work established for me a wide spectrum of types of work along which I will explore in the future. I feel confident that this will widen my viewpoint for new bodies of work and give me the confidence yet again to explore uncharted territories.
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