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1. ARTIST’S REALITY.

The approach of the artist to his creation differs from age to age. The artists of the Byzantine period or the Ajanta and Ellora caves used to believe that art was an instrument to please gods. They created out of an ideal and borrowed images mostly from the human world, sometimes suppressing what automatically emerged from their personal tastes. Their geniuses were patronized by their rulers and even if there is no distinct trace of any suppression as such, the scopes of such suppressions were not altogether distant from the minds of the artists who had to abide by certain dictates of the political authority. The artists of the primitive days on the contrary painted with images over which they had no conscious grip. The artists of the late nineteenth century, again, painted with absolutely personal ideas. Cezanne for example, used colours on the canvas in a way that defied detailing and that was not representational in nature in comparison with his predecessors. Van Gogh followed him and changed the sowing field into a carpet of red and yellow dots with a pale blue tree and a paler blue sower. A painting of Picasso or Juan Gris is representative of a conscious attempt of the artist to connect himself and his viewer with a world of art that is neither his own world nor the cognizable objective world.

The above references stand as a challenge to any particular conception of the artist’s reality. What an artist of this last part of twentieth century shall call real when he would sit to translate his aesthetic ideas? The discoveries in the field of human psychology are opening up before the artist many new vistas that lead him to a state of puzzle and it becomes difficult for the modern artist to grapple with the situation beginning in enquiries and ending in experiences that were never faced by the predecessors.

* We know well the story of Michael-Angelo’s mental depression in the face of the objection raised by his masters at the apparently nudist and thus ‘obscene and blasphemous’ drawings which he readied for the Sistine Chapel.*
The artist of the nineteenth century, for example, had no scope to believe that his aim was to express his own mental undulations at the face of trying circumstances of the objective life. The greatest of the post-Impressionist group of painters, Paul Gauguin, even when he lived a life of utter exile in Tahiti, did not sit to picturise the frustrations of mind in direct forms. On the contrary, his Tahiti canvases are like tapestries and are full of purely decorative effects. In them the artist never tried to represent that third dimension of his own personality which was haunted by too many idealised and unfulfilled dreams. But as the artist's knowledge of the world, his medium and his own mental workings grew, there began to appear persons like Odilon Redon (1840 - 1916) who was utterly dissatisfied with the approach of the post-Impressionists and began to omit colours from his canvases. Odilon took his subjects from literature, embodied the visions that haunted his imagination and conjured up fantastic creatures and strangely unreal scenes. He insisted on monochromic illustrations mostly in black and white and in a majority of cases on charcoal drawings. At the last phase of life he took up colours and painted flowers and it may be said that the dislike for colour was only a matter of personal choice. But noteworthy is the continuance of the spirit of defiance in the matter of traditional subject selection among the artists of the entire span of the present century. By the time of the arrival of Picasso in the scene the meaning of aesthetic exercise itself was changed altogether and art has come to be a mirror of the artist's reactions to the undulating social disturbances and similar other objective situations.

In the early Eastern Art the issue of reality was tackled in somewhat different manner. Religious consciousness used to govern the societies to which artists and artisans of Konark, Khajuraho and the temples of southern and eastern India belonged. The artists of ancient India were personally aroused by a deep sense of humble subservience to a universal spirit that, they used to believe, was omnipresent and omnipotent. ...
Their audience and their patrons also lived under the spell of religion. To give expression to a personal conception of a universal muse of aesthetics through holy themes and sobri pictorial (if not photographic) detailing, was the only reality of the Old Indian artist. In ancient Chinese art too a strong spirit of religion oriented either by Buddhism or Taoism is palpable. Briefing Chinese Art in his book The Meaning of Art Mr. Herbert Read says, 'Throughout its history, Chinese art conceives nature as animated by an immanent force, and the object of the artists is to put themselves in common with this force. This may be partly due to the highly philosophical nature of the Chinese religions.'

A complaint is raised about the dictations put over Chinese art by Buddhism and Confucianism and attempts are made to prove that religion spoilt the intellectual independence of the artists. But Chinese art stands the wear and tear of time inspite of limitations and it maintained a remarkable vitality, reaching an apex in the Sung period. A national religious sense played significant role in every Indian and Chinese (to speak to the most important countries) artist-mind of the past. The artist worked as an individual, but his individuality was built by the objective concept of a supreme power. Hence the need for taking the artist out of the frame of his national history and culture was never felt. The artist worked considering his object from a personal level but there was no chance to differentiate between the artist's selfhood and his social or religious obligations. To portray things not as they are, but as they should be, was the early artist's only reality, only objective. The aesthetic urge to systematise his expression and to harmonise opposing elements was personal in an impersonal sense of submission to the demands of an authority which was in all cases religious. This sense of submission is not directly found in prechristian art of the West. But art as a separate aesthetic expression was cultivated in a broad scale only after Jesus Christ had appeared and the human conception of a supreme governing power was idolised. From the first century A.D. religion began to influence the artist and his patron.
If a line is drawn from the earliest Christian paintings, found in the catacombs, through Byzantine art till the art of the Renaissance onwards, a general spirit of religion is palpable in the temperament of the artists. However different and anti-religious the present situation is in the world of Western aesthetics, the early history of the Western art (till 18th century) was replete with a gnostic spirit which was present in a stronger way in the art of the East as well. At both sites the artist’s world was his own, but a submission to the authority of God lay at the root of the personality of the artist. The artist knew his own morality or religiously developed mind as his only reality and traces are yet to be met as to whether there lay in the deeper stage of his personality any sense that rebelled against religious spirit or didactic note but could not cross the lips out of a fear for losing the social footing. The Western attitude of life began to differ from the Oriental attitude for a number of sociological, political and economic reasons. The drift grew huge at the end of the eighteenth century with the rise of a tremendous intellectual curiosity in the Western mind and a few vital scientific discoveries which drew the attention of men to the utterly materialist prospects of life. The artists of the early days of civilization used to work out of an inner urge for expression. Whatever was categorically real and what was not, was not the primitive artist’s concern. The only reality of an art object was its visual appeal. The artist was keen on organising in lines and forms what was interesting to his sight. Herbert Read has precisely analysed the features of all primitive arts taking from the prehistoric phase (from 30,000 to 10,000 B.C.) the best examples of which have been found at Altamira in Spain to the much more recent specimens found in the art of the Bushmen of Southern Rhodesia and South East Africa. In all these works "the purpose is rather to represent the most expressive aspect of each element in an object, the side view of the foot, for example, being combined with the front view of the eyes."
The primitive artists' stress on visuality was so deep that an almost invariable abandonment of detail also is noticeable in the above specimens. Particularly the art of Bushman represents a velocity which was associated within the artist's assumption that he can secure the actual occurrence of the event, portrayed in his art. The running of animals and the hunting scene are rendered extra-ordinarily alive by the power of the artists' imagination which endows him with a power to catch hold of the spirit of the painted scene. These paintings convey the artist's attraction for the movement and sometimes the ignorance of the artist relating to the aesthetic logicality of the movement outside sheer visual impressiveness. The primitive man was so engrossed in life that he accepted artistic activity as an escape from the arbitrariness of life. Read says: 'He lived from day to day, and from hand to mouth in the exact meaning of the phrases. There was no permanency in his life, no sense of duration. ....... He does not reason beyond the immediate situation ....... There is no reason to find in the art of early men any other reality than an immediate apprehension of coherence in forms and shapes. To put it other way, art to him was a reproduction of the events that took place around his day to day life, including the mobility of objects. This reproduction resulted a contentment and as Mr. Read puts it, there lay a sense of escape from the chronicity of existence behind this contentment.

To the primitive artist, reality was an unknown term. The life itself was majorly materialistic and the struggle for existence was so tremendous that there was no scope for the mind to concentrate upon anything other than the maintenance of life. Habit of painting was indulged as a sheer pastime, a relaxation, and escape so to say from the arbitrariness of life. The need to relax was as real as the need to eat and to protect oneself from vicissitudes evoked by the objective conditions of living. There was no need to focus extra attention upon aesthetic exercises. But the situation changed with the advance of civilisation. The more man found himself assured and superior beside other animals, the greater was the growth of an urge to enquire and particularize. .......

---

No. 6.

......
Human mind discovered many strange regions within its own jurisdiction which began to strengthen its working capacities. The real was gradually divided into two parts, one subjective, the other objective. The artist's urge to work was coloured by a growing universal conception and consciousness of the two-fold reality. The mind of the artist has its own channel to flow. His body is a reciprocal element of it. There is a second channel that is the world of objective forces. The mind has no control over it. The early man discovered that even if he does not want, there comes rain, the scorch of the sun, the thunder, the cold spell and that there is a system in Nature. He grew a fear for the objective world and this fear was rationalised into the form of religion in due course. The art work carried the human urge to surrender to the uncontrollable objective forces of the world. It also carried the individual, the subjective feelings of strangeness and later beauty to the objective and universal aesthetic concepts. The concept of artist's reality was formed out of a gradual growth of the consciousness of the artist-mind. This consciousness was but a distinct notion of the artist about his own ideas and the ideas that are born as a sequel to his mental intercourses with the ideas that are not his. Art has liberated itself from the dictatorial authority of the personal fancies and personal contentments. In the modern period 'art is a searching of values - values that conduct our life in general and in particular ....... it does not set criteria of right or wrong ......' The artist, in short, is the subject matter of his own work.' All our interior world is reality and that perhaps more so than our apparent world.' The intensive probing into the interior world has resulted in an awareness of the artist about the workings of his own mind. The modern artist's reality is his direct contact with two sides of the world in two ways. He has to consider the world as it is and as it is accepted. He has to consider his own personal ideas of the world and the ideas of others about it. ....

* The Challenge of Modern Art, Allen Lappa.
He has to accord well with the interior and the exterior. The world of art is a representation of the man and the world. The artist has to explore it from a fourth perspective. It is the perspective of objectified subjectivity and subjectified objectivity.
The mind of the artist is the birthplace of art. The artist's consciousness of an aesthetic emotion in his own mind is translated into an outward shape under the supervision of the mind. The artist mind is the source of the two divisions that make complete an artwork. These divisions, as we all know, are the conception or the imagination and the application. The artist has a higher type of sensibility which helps him enter deep into different situations and systems of the objective world. It is this higher sensibility that helps the artist ideate and translate the ideas into a particular type of symbol that is an object of beauty and pleasure. A major section of art lovers and art historians hold the opinion that artistic activity is an absolutely personal business and that artist mind is obviously the source of aesthetic symbols whatever is their similarity with the other general symbols of life. The supporters of the opinion also believe that the formal similarity of an art work with an object of real life (like the similarity of the head of Mona Lisa with a woman of the real world) was an utterly insignificant aspect in any consideration and appreciation of art. The artist's mind is a grinding machine. The material is poured into it from without. And it is a sheer belief that the material remains same after it comes out of the mind being grinded by the machineries of fancy idealism and personal convictions. The spirit that the material had does not necessarily remain with the symbolic aesthetic expression. Even if it remains, it is coincidental. The artist has no responsibility about the cognizability of the material after it is used as an element of his creation. In case of absolutely imaginary contents like the last supper of Jesus by Leonardo da Vinci the question of cognizability does not arise at all and the artist had no chance to find an objective correlative of the type of expressions he had used in the faces of the disciples of Jesus. The situation is cognizable as a real ceremonial dinner.

* Say, convictions concerning morality, sex, religion, social behaviour and so on of the artist's own mind.
The artist has soaked every detail of it within his knowledge of real dinner parties. But the development of abstract symbols and forms has proved that even if he had not used his direct knowledge of the real dinners, there would have been a 'Last Supper'. The modern 'Last Supper' like the modern artist's adumbrated human figures would then have no trouble with the world in respect of cognizability. That which counts is the communication. The early artists could communicate with the help of known symbols. But this is no longer true. Picasso, Klee and Kandinsky had a world wide fame even when they painted absolutely absurd canvases. 'We all know that art is not truth. Art is a lie that makes us realize truth, at least the truth that is given us to understand.' This conviction of Picasso stands as a sound defence of those who believe that art has its birth place in the artist's (conscious or unconscious) mind.

Mr. Herbert Read in his book 'The Origins of Form in Art' has raised a novel point concerning the originality of the artist. In the controversy about the exact origin of art, Mr. Read's hypotheses relating to originality in aesthetic realms may supply a few relevant arguments. The chapter on Originality starts with a quotation from Max Raphael. 'Originality is not the urge to be different from others, to produce the brand new, it is to grasp (in the etymological sense) the origin, the roots of both ourselves and things'. An unconscious desire for novelty is one of the strongest impulses in the average man. The artist's hypersensibility makes his conscious about the necessity of renovations and Mr. Read has given us scopes to question whether in a fast changing world (where change of situations is an inescapable reality) the flair for renovations is at all anything desirable. But the process of Read's argument is interesting. Originality is not an urge of mind upon which the mind has a control. The mind is the medium through which a spirit of nameless (which is in tune with the flux of time) embodies itself.
Read has referred to a couple of metaphors, one from Lu Chi, a fourth century Chinese poet, another from Paul Klee, the great modern Swiss painter.

Lu Chi in a poem dealt with the art of letters. Towards the end of the poem comes the problem of inspiration: 'a pattern emblazoned to fill the eye, a music remote yet flooding the ear'. The poet brings out a two-fold image, an ebb and flow over whose alternation the poet or the painter has no control.

'The source is underground', comments Mr. Read, 'in the unconscious, and the flow is released not by the will, but by Nature that is to say, by the attainment of a certain degree of readiness, attention or maturity'. 'There is a treatise on the Japanese art of archery', continues Mr. Read, 'which goes into this point in great detail, maintaining that the most difficult achievement in shooting with the bow is just this waiting for the natural release of the string; a moment that comes with serenity and detachment, with an utter absence of striving. The flow of inspiration begins in exactly the same way, and brings with it, as Lu Chi says, a fountain of words, which the poet suddenly finds in the teeth and the lips. 'The wind of thought comes forth from the breast, a fountain of words is in the teeth and lips ......' ......'. Paul Klee in a treatise has compared the creation of work of art with the growth of a tree, which has its roots in the earth, its crown in the air. Klee has an additional idea of transformation - the idea that art is not a mirrored reflection of a given reality, but the transformation of one element (in the unconscious) into another element (made conscious). The artist is merely the channel whose only function is to transmit the forces of nature into the forms of art. Mr. Read's conclusion is rather arbitrary. He has not denied the point hidden in the two metaphors about the insignificance of originality or change in the realm of art (as also in life). But, to quote his words, 'I think that both Lu Chi and Klee assume that what comes out of the unconscious has never been seen before, and in that sense is original ...... But in modern usage originality is regarded as a unique gift, a capacity possessed by a very special kind of person'. Mr. Read has dwelt upon the modern usage of the word originality inviting ........
the views of some great modern intellectuals. He has no agreement with notions like that the unconscious is a source of originality or that spontaneity is a guarantee of originality.

'The poem which is absolutely original is absolutely bad; it is, in the bad sense, subjective', with no relation to the world to which it appeals... originality, in other words, is by no means a simple idea in the criticism of poetry. True originality is merely development, and if right development it may appear in the end so inevitable that we almost come to the point of view of denying all 'original' virtue to the poet.'

The above quotation is from T.S. Eliot's introduction to the selected poems of Ezra Pound. Eliot has been emphatic about the inclusion of the objective forces into the framework of any art. His interest in this infusion of the exterior into the interior reached an apex in his inculcation of the theory of the objective correlative. Leaving aside the controversy that may arise from a poet's zeal to theorise on the basis of abstract assumptions, we can hail T.S. Eliot for his magnificent observations relating to the double-natured origin of art. He perhaps had been the first major intellectual to contradict the notion that art is born in that inner realm of the artist mind where the artist himself cannot go. To indulge in this notion is certainly not to attempt a dig at the artist's world of personality. The mind of the artist is unready for expressing anything before it gets a green signal from its own nature. But what if mind if it is not a unit that is set up for receiving outer experiences? The biologist will say how the capacity to receive outer experiences grow in human mind as it develops in age. A little boy cannot receive a beautiful scene with the same strength of mind as a grown up man does. Similarly a grown up man cannot withdraw his mind from an attractive objective experience like that sight of a running computer; but a child does. The existence of mind itself is justified by its capacity to receive and respond. By personality should be meant this capacity only. .......

No. 12.
Hence behind any creation even if it is the creation of a human child the objective knowledge is a vital factor.

In connection with his observations about originality Mr. Reas then refers to Mr. André Malraux's book 'The Psychology of Art'. In the second volume of the book Malraux has developed the thesis that art is not an imitation of nature, but of art - art is, as it were, an independent species, mating and sprawling in isolation from other species of human activity. To explain the concept Malraux proceeds, "The fact that it is not some supremely beautiful face which launches the painter on his career, but the sight of a beautiful painting, does not lessen the emotion this experience gives him, and like all deep emotion, the emotion which springs from art has a craving to perpetuate itself." He names that man artist who creates forms, be he an ambassador like Rubens, an imagemaker like Gilbert of Autun, an ignotus like Master of Chartres, an illuminator of manuscripts like Limbourg, a court official like Velasquez, rentier like Cézanne, a man possessed like Van Gogh or a vagabond like Gauguin... Painters and sculptors, whenever they were great, transfigured the forms they had inherited...

The essence of Malraux's thesis lies in its stress on two elements - on the form and the values. Malraux, in his definition of art has proved that forms are normally imitated and handed down from generation to generation by craftsmen, but values depend upon the particular vision of the world, the peculiar individual way of seeing the world. Generally the values lead to modification of terms. Malraux goes to the extent of proving that 'originality is a matter of personality and that personality is superior to creation.

Mr. Read clarified the point further by bringing in the issue of the artists' sensibility into separate discussion. 'Intelligence has little role to play even in artists like Michaelangelo or Goethe..."
There is no intelligence without sensibility. Basically all arts have the same aesthetic laws, they differ in the nature of their materials and in the kind of sensibility required for formal exploitation of the material. Personality is a servant of sensibility and it is sensibility that prepares the artist to receive and respond. Mr. Read quotes Scherchen's words on Bach's last composition to defend the position held by sensibility in the creation of art: 'The test of greatness in a work of art is that it transports us; lifts us out of our temporal existence and holds us suspended in time-less attention.

A work of art is an organisation of sensation rather than a mode of representation. The understanding of art begins and ends with that realisation. By this act of transport, this reaching after an order higher than the unreasoning existence of nature, men does not deny life. Art is not an escapist activity. On the contrary, it is the means by which we achieve what Wordsworth called 'the widening of the sphere of human sensibility'.

Read calls sensibility the only synonym of originality. In a splendidly written paragraph the chapter on originality is closed. To quote a few lines from the paragraph shall hardly be an exaggeration.

'Reality... is something we achieve through the organs of perception and sensation...... The first order introduced into man's conception of the world was an aesthetic order - the order of ritual and myth. Later the intellect gradually made a selection of the totality - the part it can describe and measure and gave it a more or less coherent unity, and called it science. The map is constantly enlarged: new details are filled in, but vast territories of space and time must still be marked 'terra incognita'. The sensibility plays like lightning over these dark abysses......' the brief glimpse that is the artist's intuition and which he then strives to communicate to us by the symbols he invents. That is the moment of originality - the moment in which we are made to realize the ethereal shimmering texture of music, the shapes that haunt thoughts......
'wildernesses' in poetry, the beauty wrought out from within upon the flash of a painting. Poetry, painting, music—all these are arts or skills for raising the senses to that condition of insight, in which the world is not transfigured, but in which for the first time some aspect of it is revealed, is given a form, and thereby, for human eyes, newly created, newly communicated.

The world outside the senses is the mirror upon which sense itself sees its own reflection and realizes its own worth. The connection between the mind and the world is set up through a process which is inexplicable, which, rather, is dependent upon nature. But the question of setting up connection occurs much later than the formation of the symbol in the artist's mind. The formation of an aesthetic symbol in the mind would never have been possible without the contact between mind and matter. No artist would have painted a single canvas without a sound knowledge of the colour and the form that are spread around his senses. This is why the artist even at the deepest moment of concentration does not forget to pick up the right colour from the palette or to use his vocal chord upon the right note. Deep concentration leads to the revelation of a sphere of truth underlying the concerning musical note or the subject painted. The truth is the artist's awareness of a spirit of unity in forms created or the note displayed.

In listening to ... music, one is aware of stimuli far beyond human realization'.

'A picture came to me from miles away, who is to say how far away I sensed it, saw it, painted it, and yet the next day I can't see what I have done myself ...' Picasso, in a statement made in 1935 (quoted from Herbert Read's book 'A letter to a young painter') acknowledged the existence of an objective source of his arts. There is no essential difference between Scherchen's realization of a superhuman sphere to which music transports him and Picasso's acknowledgement of a third world of art which is his inspiration. 

* Scherchen on Bach as quoted by Herbert Read.
The artist-mind is responsive to this third world. If it is inactive about response, the image will never mature into art. This is why the artist has to suffer. Yeats once said 'passive suffering is not a theme for poetry'. Greek tragedies dealt meticulously with themes of acutest human suffering. The suffering of the modern poet has been so great that he often tries desperately to change his medium of expression (even when the medium is poetry) just as Ruskin, Baudelaire, Pater and others did by turning to painting. But what else is suffering if not a direct contact with the insufficiencies of the world revealed before senses? The artist-mind is the birth place of art inasmuch as its function is conscious expression. Originality is relative to the individual artist's power to grow and maintain contact with the world of senses. Biological differences transform one man into many. The artist, in respect of spirits, is one. It is he who works alone with ingredients collected from the world without. The temperament of the artist is moulded by his knowledge of the world. The difference of expression is conditioned by the difference of the knowledge of the world. Expression simply follows the direction of mind. But what lies in the mind is an aggregate of various external impressions internalised.
There are two facets of an artist mind. We have so long been dealing with the point of consciousness in a general way. But only consciousness is not enough for the creation of an art work. The artist mind follows the dictates of a few codes of conduct when it prepares to take up an aesthetic exercise. These codes are termed in one word as concentration. There is an inner level in the artist-mind that keeps a record of limits and of the difference between the desirable and undesirable. This level is unapproachable unless the responsive nature of the artist-mind in general is approved. The concentration of the artist is built also upon the artist's awareness of the effects of absentmindedness or desultariness upon his art. When a child artist paints, he uses his brush haphazardly and shows interest in forms that are not well organized and approved by the common codes of aesthetics. Child art thus is always a chance availed without care to the consequential lapses. Sometimes the child's painting is spoiled. Sometimes it is sublimated into a superb quality of aesthetic exercise. As the child artist grows there arises in him the power to concentrate. The maturity of an artist is nothing other than his power to fix his attention upon the verifiability and the logicality of the presence of the forms and symbols used upon the canvas. A particular subject, or a particular way of representation or even a particular symbol is relevant only when the artist uses it by framing it out of his knowledge and experience of life in general. The mind plays a major role in shaping his knowledge and experience, but the role is secondary insofar as it develops the power to concentrate through the growth of the knowledge and experience of the objective kind. Had there been no knowledge of objectivity, the mind would have failed to proceed towards any aesthetic order. The opponent may at this point raise an argument to the effect that there is an instinctual flair for order and proportion in an artist mind and this instinctuality helps....
..... even the child artist to drop from his palette the wrong colour and to destroy in his canvas the wrong line by washing it off. But the question of unpredictability of course is not dropped and there always is a chance for the instinct to commit to a rapturous overstatement. The mature artist on the other hand has no such possibility for he has a conscious control over his own instinct. His sense of proportion and balance is invariably stimulated by a power to concentrate. Concentration is that which he achieves from his experience of the damaging effects of disproportion and his instinctive power to integrate objective experiences into a coherent aesthetic form and shape. The instinctual power, if there at all is any, is subject to modification. The artist's conscious connections with the external world where there always is a cross current of balance and imbalance, proportion and disorderliness, lies at the core of his power to modify. Artistic knowledge is achieved by a dialectical process of acceptance and rejection. Concentration grows in the interaction. The instinct of the artist assists him in choosing what is essential for his own survival that is in calling the elements that are beneficial and pleasant for mankind. The treasure before him is huge. The artist learns to concentrate by way of exploration like Robinson Crusoe he has to mind every step. The absence of concentration and alertness would have rendered Crusoe's life on that desolate island more miserable. Same is the artist's case.

Romain Rolland has pointed at the deep level of concentration in the artist mind in his book on Beethoven (Beethoven the creator). An artist can elevate himself to Beethoven's height only when he is a mediator. Referring to Michaelangelo, Kalidasa and Shakespeare a critic of Rollandi's book has remarked that their meditation and absorption are in no way lesser in degree than those who practice yoga. Rollandi too has indentified the artist with the yogi on the ground that both of them develop through deep concentration. 'Music develops in its own self that power of concentration on an idea, that form of yoga, that is purely European ....
... For music is an edition in notion, all the parts of which have to be sensed simultaneously. It demands in the soul the vertiginous movement in the immobile, the eye clear, the will taut, that spirit flying high and flee over the whole field of dreams. Beethoven's 'perpetual congestion of thought never ceased its concentration'. According to Rolland, Beethoven's passionate pursuit, this multiplication of the idea that has been seized upon, bent to his will, subdued, produces on simple and sincere natures that yield themselves up to it an effect of hypnosis, a yoga. Even a casual glance at his book on Vivekananda will reveal a number of startling statements about the supposed similarity in the concentration of thought required for yogic practices, on the one hand, and artistic creation, on the other. The heights of contemplation that Vivekananda could attain was 'by sudden flights amid tempests which remind me over and over again of Beethoven', Rolland goes so far as to say that in all countries and at all times thinkers and artists have unconsciously practiced intense meditation, and again cites Beethoven as example, who 'in complete ignorance of Raja Yoga in the strict sense of the word achieved it and thereby wrecked his physical organism to such an extent that it brought about the final tragedy of deafness. As in Indian yoga, one who attains this power of concentration carries it about with one everywhere, when walking, talking, working in every act of the daily life. Deep concentration, Rolland observes, leads to a total blackout of all physical movements and when such concentration is long and endless, nature takes her revenge. Such a thing, in the opinion of Rolland, happened to Beethoven. Rolland's diagnosis of Beethoven's deafness was supported by Dr. Morace. He wrote to him: 'your comparison with Indian yoga appears to me to be very exact.'

Before we accept Rolland's analogy, a bird's eye view should be cast upon the purpose of yoga in the oriental sense. The purpose of yoga as a whole, according to late Hiriyana, the noted modern thinker, is to assist men in the ascent from ...
..... the narrow personal view congenital to him to the larger vision which brings freedom with it. (The Essential of Indian philosophy). Art, likewise helps man to take a detached view of life and thus realize freedom through sensuous representation. The appreciator is led to a world of freedom and beauty. If art is regarded as objectification of subjective feelings, it necessarily implies detachment and broadness of vision. The keyword to this stage of discipline of yoga is impersonality. Man must overcome the egoistic impulses in him which are the source of so much evil in the world. As in yoga, so also in the creation of work of art, the subject does not identify itself with the object. The object of art is to separate the subject from the empirical self or the ego. Such a separation is also characteristic of the meditation or yoga as conceived in the Sāṁkhya-Yoga system. There is a contrary view in the Upanisadic concept of yoga. In the Upanisads we find that the individual self unites with or merges in the absolute self by means of yoga. Yoga which means union in a deep sense, is virtually a disunion or viyoga in the Sāṁkhya yoga system. Concentration however is a criterion for all yoga systems. It offers the person concerned an awareness about the presence of a unity between the universe and the self. Rolland has not done justice to the concept of concentration by pointing at its paralysing effect upon the physical being of man. True that yogis too become physically insensitive at one point. But the yogic insensitivity is not desirable in the artist's case. The artist's modus operandi is dissimilar to that of the yogi. He can never be callous about sense. His task is to discipline his will to create through constant communion with the bodily urges. It is a misreading of Beethoven's genius to generalise him as representative of all great artists who achieve the height of maturity through concentration as a corollary to yoga. Beethoven's physical incapacity was compensated by a deep connection of his subjective creativity with the universe. ......
There is no denying the fact that Beethoven stands as a splendid exception in the whole hoard of artists. Nobody would accept Matisse or Rembrandt without a hand or Rabindranath without the voice to sing. Matisse's name reminds one of his last collages. He was old and incapacitated to move from bed. But the painter in him was still burning for expression. Matisse then ordered for the canvas and some papers and began to dictate to somebody else the arrangement of the coloured paper pieces upon the canvas. These collages are wonderful, but they do not represent the same skill that the master Impressionist had shown in his earlier canvases filled in tonal complexities. There is an artist in Bengal, Mr. Binod Behari Mukhopadhay by name. He turned blind when his genius was at its peak. But he still works in full swing. After his blindness one night he was found standing at the open window of his room. On enquiry his maid came to know that he was feeling the blanch of the moon upon his hand. The artist's face was lit in gay abandon as he expressed this. Matisse's collages were simplified and statementary in character and the argument may go to the extent that his physical debility had robbed the creator of his power of expression in natural course. The recent paintings of Binod Behari (those murals upon the outer wall of the canteen of Kala Bhawan, Santiniketan) too seem little less organised (when compared to his works upon the inner walls of Hindi Bhawan, Santiniketan), which is most possibly due to the incapacity to make use of the sense of sight. But unmistakable are the creative urges and the harmonious representation of the urges in the works. The case of Beethoven cannot be placed beside the above cases because these artists were able to utilise their sense organs for collecting materials from the external world during long periods of their lives. By the time they were incapacitated the creative power established itself in the depth of their mental life and they were linked with the creative stream of consciousness.
An artist's concentration sometimes leads to a total blackout of all physical movements, but it does not disintegrate the artist's will to create from his ability to create. Physical paralysis occurs from the natural incapacity of the body to work as a machine. The mind should respond to the incapacity and the lack of response too may lead to a loss of sensitivity. Great artists who work or at least try to work after the attack of paralysis, make use of their previous experiences of the objective world. Concentration is not the force that helps the artist eliminate his experiences of the external world. It is a force that renders the artist's instinct with discipline by way of setting up a bond between the artist's subjectivity and the universal flow of various objective forces. Beethoven's case may be defended by that branch of philosophy which rejects all possible realities of response between the subject and the object. Leibniz, the great German thinker, embellished philosophical thought with the thesis that man is composed of some monads and that the character of each group of monads is separate from the other. He says that the groups of monads lie in absolute independence from each other. No man has any scope to set up direct connection with the external world and what is most important is that there is no external world at all outside the existence of a diametrically opposing group of monads each of which tries to form an external world according to respective independence. Applying the theory of Leibniz one may conclude that the artist has no need to make use of the senses for collecting data from the outer world and like as he is the maker of his own world so also he is the maker of his own art. Groce too speaks of the function of the artist as a petty translator for he believes that art originates in an absolutely subjective level of the artist's mind and it is complete as soon as it forms in the artist's mind. The expression of the artist is not the original art. It is the formal symbol of the art. In that respect every artist is a Beethoven and every artlover is an artist because each is creating a world of his own in course of responding to the concerning art object. 

* In Indian philosophy also the school of Naiyajis characterises man as constituted by a group of atoms.
But the shoe pinches somewhere else. What about the bond that unites the artist's passions with the art lover's passions? Where lies the clue to the resemblance between the forms that the artist chooses and the forms that are not his? How a work of art is able to stand the wear and tear of time and is acclaimed by men and not man alone? How Beethoven could know the science of preparing notations unless he had committed to the universal objective concept of the octaves? If he was an individual imprisoned into his own individuality there could have been no chance for him to communicate. Hence by concentration is meant a training of the individual self to adopt itself to the objective conditions of existence. Even if the artist is a translator, he has to accept some recognized forms and shapes to play his role as a translator. These forms and shapes are not created by him and these could have existed outside his range and these could have been made use of by anybody else in any way. Eliot's London is not Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's London. Both paint it according to their subjective incommunicable selves. But London as a city however different in description has an independent existence which has acquired a reality of its own in course of being described. Even if its name is changed by a new generation of men in future and it is called Paris or Leningrad or by any other name as such, there will be a situation, a city, if not a city, a village, a geographical territory, for certain period of time. Nature may destroy it in due course, but that destruction of course will not depend upon any human will. Many cities have been destroyed by wars and man's memory conceives them as things of the past. The opponent may say that these cities are unreal outside human memory. But should nature speak, it would as well have described these cities without any human interference. 'God said let there be light and there was light'—this dictum is invalid in an age of science. Science has already proved that there was is and will be light as a natural radio-active discharge from the sun even if god does not ask it to appear. It is the very error of the man to believe that he is the creator of the world and there is no objectivity. ....
The world is a creation independent of man. To define the exterior world as an outsidedness of the subjective interior world is to display a narrowness of vision. Leibniz has agreed to accept a god as a monad of all monads. He too has ultimately approved of an existent pervading force independent of human individuality. Beethoven's mind was able to respond to this pervading independent force. He had no sensuous communications with this force, but his artist mind was in contact with it. Had he senses, he would have offered a greater stock of notations to the posterity. His power of concentration substituted the absence of the sense of hearing. His vision or his sense of touch may as well have supplied him the power to concentrate. What is most notable about his art is the infusion of his private consciousness into the universal consciousness of life.

Concentration is always coupled with consciousness in the artist's case. Freud's researches in the realm of psychoanalysis and his discovery of the origin of art in the deeper strata of sexuality have opened up newer vistas of thought to be explored by the later scientists. The concept of consciousness has to stand the wear and tear of all marvelous explorations of the modern age. Aesthetic consciousness is a vague term for there is, in this term, an outrageous attempt to foreshorten the area of human consciousness in accordance with the needs of a particular class of human beings called artists. The consciousness of the artist is his awareness of the existence of an order and semblance in all things. The artist is provoked under certain circumstances to translate awareness into colourful canvases, or written words or into other plastic media. The artist's consciousness is different only in the above zeal of the artist to reproduce what has been produced in him. The artist is otherwise same as his fellow human beings. An average man also is aware of a system in life as a whole. This awareness can be described as an awareness of the objective world or life. The mind, when a peculiar will is produced inside it, drops the same into the objective category and grows a connexion with it taking for granted a sort of difference between the will and the self. Say for example I have a will to wear a red shawl.
This will is produced in me from the interaction of many things like my idea of a red shawl, my experience of others wearing it and so on. How when I am aware that I want a red shawl, I become conscious of it. But the awareness was born from a will. The will was a part of the objective state insofar as it was born as a concrete, formal idea of the red shawl. Consciousness is the name of the process that connects our mind with the objective forces. Following this process the old rishis of India connected their mind and soul with the greater power they called god. Following the same process the modern psychoanalyst is spreading his knowledge towards a world of inconceivable hypotheses. The artist also follows the same process. He connects himself with a world of hypotheses and goes ahead. Any explanation of the character of this process is bound to be superfluous for this process justifies itself by its being a transportation of the objective to the subjective.

Freud, however, has supplied a few rigid arguments concerning the necessity of the psychanalytic studies of aesthetic values. Freud has rejected the probability of the transportation of aesthetic ideas from the state of the unconscious to consciousness. His arguments explain the part played by consciousness in the formation of art in a typical Freudian way. He has always been tentative in his approach to aesthetic problems though, Sir Herbert Read in his book 'Forms of things unknown' has devoted a chapter on psychoanalysis and aesthetic value, the aim of which is to analyse the pros and cons of the modern psychoanalytic approach to aesthetic values. While discussing Freud, Mr. Read quotes a few words from Otto Rank's essay Der Kunstler (first published in 1907). Rank: 'art was a given basis in sexuality, in the manifestations of the psyche the work of art found a place somewhere between pen-sexuality and hysteria'. 'Art develops from the infantile dreams to the neurosis and attains its peak in times of greater psychic need when the people are enabled by means of their artists to balance over the abyss of hysteria with the virtuosity of a sleepwalker'. Otto Rank proceeds in this way towards a novel solution. ......
‘Art, he suggests, is an irrational language for the expression of what cannot be expressed in rational language. In their extremely conscious effort to reproduce what they call the unconscious, modern painters and writers have followed modern psychology in attempting the impossible, namely to rationalize the irrational’. In a paper ‘Formulations regarding the two principles in mental functioning’, published in 1911, Freud gave support to his colleague Otto Rank in the following manner: ‘The artist is originally a man who turns from reality because he cannot come to terms with the demand for renunciation of instinctual satisfaction as it is made, and who then in phantasy life allows full play to his erotic and ambitious wishes. But he finds a way of return from this world of phantom, back to reality; with his special gifts he moulds his phantasies into a new kind of reality, and then conceals them. Thus by a certain path he becomes the hero without pursuing the circuitous path of creating real alterations in the outer world. The artist cannot deny his mind. He lives in a world of phantoms. It is his reality. But the world in reality is quite different from this world of phantoms. The artist’s capacity and tendency to ideate is sharp. He goes ahead to subjectify everything that occurs in his mind. He is conscious about all his ideas. But as Freud’s opinion runs, this consciousness has little or no objective value for it represents itself in the work of the artist without any chance of its being a film of cognizable objective reality. Art thus is but an exercise that evokes ‘intellectual bewilderment.’

While referring to the Muse of Michelangelo, Freud has used this phrase and continued, ‘I realize that it cannot be merely a matter of intellectual comprehension; what he (the artist) aims at is to awaken in us the same emotional attitude, the same mental constellation as that which in him produced the impetus to create’. The artist’s job thus is to represent his subjectivity, his own reality. He knows how to elaborate his day-dreams so that they lose that personal note which grates upon strange ears and becomes enjoyable to others.’
Further, the artist possesses the 'mysterious ability' to mould his material into a state where the repressions are outbalanced and dispelled. The object of this ability is to win honour, power and the love of women. The discovery of such a personal object is fatal to any fresh thinking regarding a psychology of art. Freud has committed to the fallacy of identification. He has identified the artist's world with the world as a whole. He has seen art as an obsession, a state between pansexuality and hysteria. He has confused sexuality with the general emotional attitude of man. His aim was to interpret aesthetic consciousness as a part of sexconsciousness. Some of his followers elaborated his thesis to dangerous extents. Daniel E. Schneider for example has remarked: 'That the pleasure derived from art form is in part very close to sexual pleasure cannot be denied by one, otherwise we should all prefer to listen to spiritual lectures, and Broadway would become a Mecca for other purposes than its present ones'. Dr. Schneider accepts the logic that the work of art is a form made objective by the artist. He refers to the 'master-hypothesis' of art which recoils from the task of making itself 'a thing of joy to others'. In the process the dream (that is the condensed form of dream) is deprived of its basic sexuality, but it 'stimulates and discharges psychic tensions'. The work of art serves as a buffer between impossible impulses and reality. To this extent it can be called a process that transports the subjective to the objective and the vice versa. What Freud and his party have termed as 'dream' is nothing but 'idea'. The idea of something is formed in the mind and the artist hastens to translate it into this and that shape. Sex may be one of the ideas and Freud may have been just to point out that the method of operation followed by the artist is same as is followed in a sexact (beginning from the formation of sexual emotion to the climatic discharge of the emotion). But he has directed his arguments towards a dogmatic, if not an obsessive hypothesis that the origins of aesthetic emotion and sex emotion are same. ....
...... Such a hypothesis will never help an observer to frame plausible notion about aesthetic consciousness. If a particular idea is the general basis of so important an emotion vis-à-vis aesthetic emotion, the scope for understanding the dialectical advancement of subjective and objective forces towards the formation of the aesthetic reality, is nil. Freudians acknowledge the feelings of beauty as a part of our consciousness and they agree that though the unconscious sexual symbolism is the basis material of art, this crude material is elaborated to the degree of dissimilation, by our conscious feelings of beauty. ‘Our need for beauty springs from our wish to find in art evidence of the triumph of life over death’. Mr. Read quotes the above and similar other lines from later psychoanalysts like Henri Focillon and Dr. Rickman towards the end of his discussion. He is of opinion that it is better to prefer the evolutionary myth that artistic exercise is an expansion of consciousness. ‘Consciousness, particularly self consciousness, and the ethical sense that comes with it, is an evolutionary acquisition of man. As a phenomenon, it has never, as far as I know, been satisfactorily explained in terms of the survival of the fittest, or the triumph of life over death’. Read continues: the psychoanalytical school reduces art to a functional activity of the brain cells, but does not explain what induces these cells to behave in such a peculiar way. Echoing what Mr. Read has suggested we can say that the reality of an art work lies in its being a projection of the self through its knowledge of the objective. The artist is induced to behave in a particular way by his self but the behaviour would have been insane and inconsistent if he would not have projected his idea through those objective forms which an onlooker has right to interpret in accordance with his own temperament. This last point requires special mention. The artist has to objectify his idea unto an extreme extent where he himself, with all his subjective feelings, can no longer reach. The reality of artistic consciousness lies in the artist’s awareness of this idea of objectification. .......
His idea of an art object which the Freudians call impossible impulse or dream, is real when it objectifies itself upon the canvas. Artist's consciousness is an evolutionary force. The more the artist sees the world, the greater is his chance to ideate and the larger is his scope to form a reality named as painting, poetry, sculpture and so on out of those ideations. A painting is real for we can acknowledge its existence in our senses. It is real for we can extend ourselves through it to an ideal world of beauty and harmony. It is real also because the maker of it has intended to serve the physical and mental life of his own and the rest of the world. Art is not a representation of appearances only. A psychoanalytic study of art is relevant from the perspective that it unearths many new levels in our understanding of the exact nature of relationship between the world of personality and the world beyond it. Freudians make us aware of a possible chance of confusion between personal emotional attitudes and the general norms of art. By focusing particular attention to sex, Freudians have saved us from misunderstanding art as a mere subjective propaganda. The failure of Freudians to give any satisfactory explanation of the mysterious ability of the artist to work points to the immanent truth that art has a deeper level of significance. Art has an independent power or force to establish itself upon the world of human emotions. The artist is always conscious about this force. Even when he is not at work he responds to this consciousness. There is a general complain against the artist that he often becomes careless about the material side of life and the protagonist will say that it is concentration that renders the artist callous about the time of his dinner or the right maintenance of his own apartment. But the fact is stranger than arguments. The artist lives amid a stream of consciousness. He delves deep into the stream at one point, comes out of the depth at another point. Debiprosad Roychowdury, one of the most eminent painters of India of the present era, once told in an interview that he exchanges words of his soul with his creations. His house was packed with paintings and sculptures. ....
When he was asked by the interviewer if he had any extra fascination for a particular exhibit, the septuagenarian artist, a couple of years before his death, said with a smile, 'This is my harem. I am interested in all of them; I cannot single out any that way.' The artist hinted at the contact he had with a stream of consciousness. He had a direct concern with every piece at the same time because they all belonged to the evolutionary state of consciousness. Absence of this consciousness is inconceivable in any appreciation of aesthetics. The artist is thoroughly conscious about all the particulars of the object of his work. His constant attempts at introducing to his instincts for knowledge the elements of the objective world is the only function of his consciousness.

Consciousness should be identified with these attempts. This consciousness lies at the root of the artist's deep involvement with his work. When the artist sits to paint there runs a will in him to unite the content with the form and to objectify the emotion that has matured in his mind. The will to express is developed in the artist's mind due to its constant communion with the spirit of unity that exists in the experience of the artist.

Rabindranath Tagore has analysed the nature and function of art in many ways. His analysis invites our attention not only because he was the chief architect of modern Indian art but also because in his was found an artist who for the first time in the history of modern Indian art traced the root of aesthetic joy in the communication that is set up between the artist and his appreciator. He asked the question, why that which originates in the artist's personal self evokes the interest and joy of others? The answer followed that a work of art brings into shape that which the artist collects from a universal soul. In his opinion a universal soul exists in the artist too. The artist gathers his materials or his inspiration from this soul and expresses it in his own way. The poet has magnified the role of personality in the perspective of its being a medium of communication between the personal and the universal. Rabindranath has divided the artist's mind into two parts, the one that works as a universal power, the other that expresses the power in a personal way. ....
..... The division is made with attention to the impression of an artwork. If the artist's personal way of expression would reveal his subjective emotions in a subjective way only, the audience would not necessarily feel delighted by the art. The function of the artist's subjective self is to mediate. He spreads to others what encourages others to find greater interest in life, what helps others to overcome their personal prejudices and get joyed without any personal interest. Professor Hiramoy Banerjee in his book 'Rabindra Silpatatva' (Aesthetics of Rabindranath) has categorized the poet's aesthetics into a few parts. The first part is concerning the poet's enquiries into the nature of art. The nature of art was, according to the poet, to give to the people that which has no material value. The second one has been discussed above in a nutshell. The third one is about the difference between art and intellectual. Science and philosophy supply us information about the universe. We enrich our store of knowledge by them. But art is classless. It does not supply us any information. Its identity lies in itself. Sciences classify truth, philosophy defines truth. But art transforms truth into creation. Rabindranath has advanced further and tried to find the origin of the joy that we get from an object of art. Beauty is not the origin and cause of our joy. Beauty makes us happy, but happiness is not joy in any case. Aesthetic joy is often fetched from things absolutely unhappy in essence like the misunderstanding that led Othello to strangle Desdemona to death or the king Oedipus's discovery that he had married his own mother etc. Aesthetic joy is different from happiness in its freedom from any aim. Rabindranath has found at the core of aesthetic joy (ananda) a universal consistency and unity. He has compared aesthetic joy with human love. Ideal love builds up a contradiction-free coherence between two human beings. Comparing the beautiful with the truth, Rabindranath has also said that both are same in nature for both are complete in being consistent. ......
Finally Rabindranath has termed art as the greatest reality. Art is the most personal possession of man. In the world of matter man is an organizer, an innovator. He collects knowledge from the objective world and justifies his own existence. But in the world of art man is the maker. Here he is not apart of the creation. He is the creator himself. The universe is created by the artist for the rest of humanity on the basis of his personal contact with the underlying creative force of the universe itself. The artist identifies the force and presents it to others. His way of approach is known by his sense of consistency in representing the consistent creative force that pervades the living world. The artist is a creator in so far as he is a discoverer of the underlying creativity and he is a narrator of this creativity in coherent ways. Art, according to Rabindranath, mingle matter with imagination. An object of art is the representation of this mingling. Matter should never be banished from the world of art. The artist brings matter into imagination and applies his own sense of proportion into the mixture. His personality is equipped by a sense of proportion as it has seen the objective world and the permeating force that unites diversities and embellishes the history of life by an intense urge of man to live in defiance of death.
CREATIVE FORCE.

Herbert Read has compiled some important opinions on creative impulses and the concept of creativity in his book Forms of Things Unknown (ch. Limitations of Scientific Philosophy). Hans Reichenbach, the famous logical empiricist (the book, The Rise of Scientific Philosophy) for example, writes of the creative impulse driving a man to write a book or to make his own fence for his garden as individualistic activities. Mr. Read supports his view and adds that the creative impulse finds an outlet not only in the context of other human beings.

"The artist does not act according to the established rules as one tells him what kind of picture to paint. There are no a priori aesthetic values which the artist strives to incorporate in his pictures, the values declare themselves in the coherence of the picture when it is completed, in the relations established between the desire to create and the result attained." (Read). The next reference is from Max Scheler. The history of art must be conceived, as Max Scheler says, "as a series of expeditions against the intuitable world, within and without, to subdue it for our comprehension which no science could ever provide". The mission of all true art is not to reproduce what is already given, but to press forward into the whole of the external world and the soul, to see and communicate those objective realities within it which rule and convention have hitherto concealed.

Mr. Read proceeds to amend the words of Scheler in the following way: "seeing is creating, and creation is communication. The objective realities come into existence in the act of creation". Read then quotes Andre Malraux. "..... The widest claim that can be made for science is that it is the history of nature. The widest claim that can be made for art is that it is the creation of nature - that it brings into existence an entirely autonomous world." Read modifies the French aesthete's view and says, "for my part I am content to claim that it extends the existing world, enlarges it with new facts, with elements that give continuity to the human experience."
Read's manner of expression is sometimes inimitable. He draws the issue of relatedness between science and art towards the ideals of our technological age and raises the puzzle that was accosted by the earliest Greek philosophers, by Pythagoras and Heraclitus, Zeno and Parmenides, Thales and Empedocles. It is the puzzle relating to the answer of the question why does anything exist? What elements in existence justify the absurdity of continuing to live? To these vital questions Read has added a finale: Is it possible that life acquires meaning only to the extent that man is creative?

Creative impulse of man is a subjective state of the universal creativity. The artist is wondered to meet this world of creativity within himself. He expresses his wonder in his art by asking aloud, 'Is it possible, he should know what he is, be that he is?' (All's Well that ends Well). The disclosure of the identity of the self to self is the greatest act of creation. The artist knows himself by coming in touch with the stream of creative consciousness. He creates a fresh meaning of the consciousness in his art. In connexion with an analysis of the relation between beauty and ugliness in his book The Origin of Form in Art, Herbert Read has pointed out that an immanent creative force and not any concept of beauty of and ugliness lies at the core/arts that are ugly yet sublime. He refers to the arts of the remote past in particular. Mesopotamian Art, Egyptian Art, Cycladic Art, Chinese Art, Gothic Art, Renaissance Art (and why not to some extent Indian Art, mainly sculpture,) are depictions of natural ugliness and wilful deformations of natural objects. At the head of all the above arts lies the art of the savage primitive people. The ugly palaeolithic Venus which were symbolic of pregnant palaeolithic women, exemplify the proneness of the early artists towards a deliberate deformation. These arts are treated as valued art treasures even by the modern intellectual spectators. World of art is now divided into the two parts - the primitive and the modern. The former world of art is dominated by terror and fear, and every work of art is 'sublimely ugly'.

.....
•••«• Head trace? the origin of the human interest towards ugliness in the human recognition of a creative force. 'In African philosophy, all beings, all essence, in whatever form it is conceived, is conceived not as substance but as force. Man is a force, all things are forces and the 'modalities' are forces. Man and woman, dog and stone, east and yesterday, beauty and laughter are forces and as such are related to one another'. 'The artist is the man who can control these forces and give them formal existence. The work of art is magical because it is an embodiment of the sublime forces that determine all being. 'A belief in these forces inspires the whole complex of primitive art'. The modern art-critics and aestheticians have acknowledged the existence of this force behind the artist's will to portray ugliness sometimes at its grossest form. Edmund Burke for example mentioned it in his discussion beauty and ugliness. * Burke: 'But though ugliness be the opposite to beauty, it is not the opposite to proportion and fitness'. By equating ugliness with sublimity in the manner of the Greek and Teutonic philosophers and artists, Burke has made his document fascinating. 'Sublime' itself is a reconciling word, and is an ambiguous rendering of Longinus's Greek word 'hypēs' which means no more than height or elevation. But Burke, according to Read, 'invests the concept of the sublime with qualities that were far from the mind of Longinus'. He has deliberately emphasized the fact that the sublime goes side by side with the horrible. Burke’s argument cuts a new way in our understanding of the underlying creative force as he describes the nature of relationship between beauty and ugliness in the following way. '... vicarious ideas of pain, sickness and death fill the mind with strong emotions of horror: they intensify our awareness of life, whereas normal life and health by simple enjoyment, make no such impression ... '

* Read collects the reference of African philosophy from a research work 'Muntu, an outline of Neo-African culture' by Janhein Jahn.

* Enquiry into the Origin of our ideas of the sublime and Beautiful: Edmund Burke.
Read has recalled Aristotle's theory of catharsis here and says that modern psychology has not advanced much beyond Aristotle. "It is very natural that an artist may take an object that is inherently ugly or disgusting—the flayed carcasses of an ox, the guillotined head of a criminal, the tortured body of a martyred saint, a crippled idiot or a loath-some reptile, and by painting these subjects with loving care, by giving them aesthetic values of colour and composition, he creates a 'distance' between the reality and our perception which in effect transforms the ugly object into a beautiful work of art'. That which counts is the modality of expression. In Aristotle such modalities are called 'Poetic Diction'. In continuation of his observations, Mr. Read proceeds to the psychological proneness of the modern artists to depict ugliness in its crudest form. 'Art', said Picasso, the greatest modern artist, 'is not the application of a canon of beauty but what the instinct and the brain can conceive beyond any cannon'. The tendency of the modern artist is to penetrate deep into the problems of existence aroused by the material elements of life. The issue is now greater than a mere choice between the good looking and bad looking. At the centre of the modern artist's rapport with the ugly there lies no conscious aim to cling to any sublimity. But his ugliness does not jeopardise his social existence either. The gap that has grown between the artist and his public is a consequence of the loss of mutual love and sentience. In the third chapter of the dissertation the point shall be raised for further enquiries. For the present the conclusion can be drawn with a renewed acknowledgement of the creative force, the force that pervades all acts and that insures the artist's instinctual togetherness with the ugly and the inartistic objects as worth. Even when a psychology of art has been created by the empirical sciences of modern times, and an object refusal of abstract and perfect idealism is solicited in the perspective of massive material growth in all possible fronts of existence, the force is accepted as the only impetus for the artist. .....
Burke has spoken of the all pervasive sublime forces in nature and said that these forces are always associated with a sense of vastness and infinity, of fear and astonishment. Artists: catch hold of the spirit of these forces. There is an inevitable historical influence of African sculpture on Picasso and Henry Moore which the artists have acknowledged themselves. This creative force does away with the barrier between the god and the devil. It denies history. The force can be well realised from the impact of permanent pleasure that ugly objects like the primitive art or the horrible Hellenic stories of Aeschylus and Sophocles render to the art lovers of all times.

The object of art is the subject objectified. The artist detaches himself from the stream of objectivity accepting in the process the universal creative force as the only reality. He learns, as he works and extends his knowledge, that the truth of his own existence lies in his becoming a party in the developing creative process of life as a whole. Whether he wanted it or not, there is the abiding force everywhere in the world outside. The necessities of proportion, consistency and coherence are justified by the continuous existence of the world itself. The artist discovers quicker than his fellowman that he is but a part of the whole and that his major aim should be to portray the universe as it is. The personality of the artist is composed of two elements. The first is his contacts with various diversities of the world (inclusive of the physical). The second is his power of depiction which is simply consequential to the contacts.

In course of his assessment of Beethoven's genius Romain Rolland lay emphasis on the dualism in the creator's soul, his passionate striving for self expression, and the necessity he finds himself in 'to subdue the form to his Will'. Rolland was largely influenced by Nietzsche. His evaluation of Beethoven reminds us again and again of Nietzsche's conception of a superman who perishes because he wants more from life than the mediocrity of self-satisfaction. .....
Holland like Nietzsche saw in the lives of great artists the very incarnation of a super human conflict. Holland says: 'had destiny descended only upon some weakling or on an imitation great man, and bent his back under his burden, there would have been no tragedy in it, only an everyday affair. But here destiny meets one of its own stature, who raises it by the throat, who is at savage grips with it all the night till the dawn - the last dawn of all - and who, dead at last, lies with his two shoulders touching the earth, but in his death he is carried victorious on his shield, one who out of his wretchedness has created a richness, out of his infirmity the magic wand that opens the rock.'

Holland pointed at the intense suffering that the artist has to undertake. At the root of the suffering lies the artist's contacts with an ideal, a larger than life creative force. The permanence of the force haunts the artist. He realises that his personality has no identity beyond the reality of its search for this permanent and consistent force. For a negotiation with this force the artist gropes in the darkness and sees a gradual awakening of the spirit in the great solitude of feverish and exhausting labour. Beethoven's sufferings, according to Holland, were due to a death struggle between the ego and the universe, one trying to subdue the other; it was also the tragedy of his deafness, which Rolland always considered to be the result of his super human struggle for self realisation. The zeal to struggle originates in the artist's contacts with the creative force on an absolutely abstract ideal plane. An ordinary man has no chance to possess such a lofty ideal.

The reference of Beethoven is relevant in any discussion on the function of the objective forces in the making of art. An 'art of the real' is constituted by a synthesis of the objective forces with the subjective power of the artist. The student of art hesitates to accept this synthesis as valid on the basis of his experience of the great artist's personal life and temperament. He says that art is above an expression of the personality of whatever elements of the objective world it is composed.
He also says that the personality of the artist is dependent upon a mysterious ability to express things in extraordinary ways and the artist is born and not made. Few among us are artists with an exceptional quality to find order in disorder, harmony in chaos and life beyond and above death. The philosopher stands beside him when he tries to find a justification of the hypothesis that art is a matter of personality only and when he defends his hypothesis by the logic that the arts of two artists differ in identity just as their makers differ in look and nature, nay, in personality. The 'art of the real' is an acknowledgement of the synthesis with particular approval of the role of the reality of the objective kind. To accept the synthesis for him, is to appreciate this role of the reality of the objective kind in the shaping of art. Such an appreciation is a negative of the argument in favour of the greater hold of the artist's subjective power in the making of an art. The antagonist will find at home to put Beethoven's case as a rebuttal of the 'art of the real'. Beethoven was shut to the working of sound in the objective world, but he dealt with sound and produced gigantic symphonies. How can Beethoven be justified as a master artist? The answer to such a baffling argument is simple. The purpose of producing a new definition of art, viz. the 'art of the real' is not to include all artists of all times into its jurisdiction. The 'art of the real' is a gradual rising of a process that becomes complete only in the present century. The dramatic development of things of the objective, particularly material kind in the perspective of the growth of a new matter-oriented civilization, has necessitated this new description of art. The tendency to probe into the psychological level of the artistic creation has developed with new discoveries in the realm of psychological science. That Beethoven was deaf is not an excuse for assailing him as an artist, immune to be objectively inspired. Inspiration is a matter of contact. The artist, even when he is not in direct contact with the objective forces, can set up a relation with the underlying creative force of the ...
...... universe. He may well grow conscious of this force. That Beethoven was ignorant of the effects that his music had created upon others' ears is yet another false statement because he always had an ideal audience of whose reactions he had a fair conception. The ideal was Beethoven's reality. The ideal was composed of an urge to depict the experience and the knowledge that he gathered from his contact with the essence of the harmony lying in the deep of the very concept of music. Carlyle once said, 'all deep things are songs'. Greek philosophy has stated philosophy to be the highest music. Schopenhauer said that all arts aspire to the condition of music, 'Only a composer of music is perfectly free to create a work of art out of his own consciousness'. Music takes us to that state of the artist's experience which is the perfect symbol of consistency and order. Whether the artist collects his experience from the objective universe is not the question. The question is whether the artist's representation of the experience is symbolic of an ideal state of consistency and order that the ordinary men cannot realize. The artist can represent the ideal if he is in touch with it. The route that is followed by him to set up the link is his reciprocity and concentration. It is the growth of his consciousness about an ideal of values.

Joad's metaphysics teaches us that there is a world of value, nonhuman, nonmaterial, nonmental, but yet real, which is somewhere there, waiting to be discovered independently of our seeking. The artist's pilgrimage is to this land of values, and his creation is a mere act of discovery. In Joad's opinion, the artist is a Columbus and not a Copernicus. The creator's glory is withheld, and the artist is invested with the honor of a chance-seeker. Here we will do well to recall the poignant lines offered by Stephen Spender.* 'If a little bird is paralysed with the conviction that in ten minutes' time a very nice serpent which has just looked his way is going to eat him, there ought to be one minute centre of the bird's consciousness that is aware of a million other......

* The Destructive Element. Stephen Spender.
possibilities, and that centre is the artistic consciousness'. The artist's only reality is this awareness of other possibilities the number of which is immaterial. The reality exists in the artist's conception of the universe. The artist possesses this conception if he is sensitive and poised. Beethoven was one such artist. He cannot be rejected by the theory of the 'art of the real' on the ground that he was deaf to the sounds of the material kind. The 'artist of the real' is he who has been able to enjoy the reality of the creative force of life by way of portraying it in objective forms (just as Beethoven did through his sonatas and some theories of physics). But the 'art of the real' has gathered a new dimension in the hands of the artists of the latter days when the emphasis is laid upon the material elements of life. Beethoven to an is an exception among the artists who elevated themselves eagle's height. The great artists are generally not physically insensate. They make use of their senses to establish the contact that they grow with the creative force of life. They are open to all objective elements and these objective elements strengthen their power to objectify their knowledge of the permeating force. Who can really deny that Beethoven himself would have reached a still higher level had he been able to utilise his own audibility? The artists face the world in all its varieties and feel the reality of the force deeply in their mind. They also feel the dialectics that intensify the force. They see that a huge anti-creativity also exists besides the creativity of life and that in the tussle the said force intensifies itself. The artist's knowledge is justified by his contact with the 'idea' and 'anti idea' in a compact form. The artist of modern time has to apply himself to the problem of good and evil, right and wrong, idealism and anti-idealism because he lives in a world which is too full of contradictions, too empty of unity.

Towards his realisation of the creative force there lies impediments of innumerable types. ......
In our discussion on the ideal and the anti-aesthetic and anti-ideational forces we have tried to explain how the artist has to face multifarious anti-artistic and thus anti-life forces. An aesthetic knowledge is an artist’s direct contact with the positive and the negative. The aesthetic knowledge of the past was also same but in a restricted sense. Michaelangelo perhaps had to work with simpler challenges. He was criticized by the nobility for his detailing of human situations as in the case of the flying clothpiece that covered little of Adam’s bosom in the ceiling of Sistine Chapel. But he had no trouble with the conception of pure aesthetic joy. He drew and painted as he imagined and the imagination was not alloyed by any neurosis like that he was incompetent for the society or that he was lacking in social security and so on.* We, on the contrary, live in an age when poetry has lost its force. It exists like a submerged stream and those who are thirsty for it can occasionally tap it.* The advancement of science towards the inner mental life of man has posed a dangerous obstacle between the artist and his knowledge. A pyramid of science is under construction. The ambition of the builders is eventually to cover all things, mental and physical, human and natural, animate and inanimate, by a few rules. The pyramid will look sharp enough at the peak, but towards the base it will vanish inevitably in a fog of stimulating ignorance like one of those mountains that dissolve in the emptiness of untouched silk in Chinese brush paintings. For as the base broadens to encompass an ever greater refinement of species, those few study rules will intertwine in endless complexity and form patterns so intricate as to appear untouchable by reason.*

The above lines from the introduction of the book ‘Towards a Psychology of Art’ by Rudolf Arnheim, best express the jeopardy that the advancement of science and the interest of men in it have created. No Florentine painter of the seventeenth century had ever faced this situation. The challenge is faced by the modern artist in unique way. He would be ready to surrender his abstract ideal and his knowledge of the Universe ……

* His chronic obsession to become a decent nobleman and an intellectual should not be treated as a negative force – like the modern artist’s sense of estrangement.

* A Letter to A Young Painter – Herbert Reed.
as and when necessary. He would be ready to surrender his abstract ideal and his knowledge of the universe to the matter of fact and conflicting causes of life. By aesthetic knowledge is now meant an awareness of the immanent forces of creativity by coupling it with the forces of the physical level in general. When the call of the physical life is so great, the artist's knowledge cannot be divorced from it.
AESTHETIC DISCIPLINES

In connexion with the artist's use of the objective materials a few words are necessary about the aesthetic discipline of the artist. The creative force is too great for any human conception. It lies everywhere, from an atom to the mind of the stoutest mammal, from one corner of the universe to another of it. The artist's consciousness mingle with it and the reaction of the artist is one of wonder and sometimes awe. But what is most mentionable is the artist's loss of mental balance. The artists are often said to be eccentrics. They do not import normal behaviour to the society. At the core of the artist's eccentricity lies his communications with the creative force. The microcosmic creative impulse in him is stirred the more it finds a reciprocation in the macrocosmic force. The will to express is inflamed by its communication with a universal expression. But it is difficult to accommodate the universe in the small frame of one single mind. The result is an apparent inconsistency on the physical level. The artist's eccentricity is often dubbed as a danger signal for his creative impulse. But this is a wrong assumption. There is nothing dangerous about it all insofar as the artist is disorderly only on the physical level. The mind of the artist can never suffer from the loss of order. An inherent aesthetic discipline is always existent in the artist's mind which the artist acquires from the experience of the interaction of his own creative impulse and the universal creativity. The artist's connections with the objective creativity of life endows him with a sense of proportion and coherence. This sense is the artist's nearest reality and sans this sense the artist is destined to meet a sad end. Instances from the art of modern cinema can be cited to establish how the dearth of the sense deals a fatal blow to the act of creation and the artist alike. Cinema is a complex art for it includes many forms of art like music, fiction, drama, acting, painting and so on. .......

The maker of cinema has to unite all these forms into a harmonious whole. He has to be alert about the nature of these forms. His task is difficult for in course of synthesizing many arts he has to create an art that is independent and irrespective of either of them. His creative impulse requires discipline much more than any other practitioner of art and there is a greater chance in him to commit to disproportion. Same is happening to a majority of modern films. A recent Japanese film, by a noted maker of modern Japanese cinema has depicted an adolescent boy's accidental contacts with a young whore. The boy could not sleep with the whore out of an adolescent awe and an embarrassing nervous excitement at the rapturous sex appeal of the woman. He visited the whore-house on another occasion and acting as a peeping Tom experienced a series of ugly masochistic and lesbian behaviour of a number of lascivious young women who were forced to pose likewise by professional photographers. The experience haunted him to such a degree that he began to apply sexual emotion to a female child. At a final day he decided to go to the whore and comply to her provocations. An abrupt road accident brought an end to the young boy's life when he was at a stone's throw from the woman's dwelling. The curtain drops at this point. The subject instigates the maker to exaggerate his narration by sort of pansexuality which does not, in contradiction to what Freud have formulated, apply any colour to art due to an impending chance of mental indiscipline let loose both among persons in the auditorium and the person who creates it. The use of sex is successful whenever it can be duly stimulating for the see's eyes. But a stimulation as such has a tendency to increase in volume and such an increase is symptomatic of anticreativity. The ambitions and desires of the subjective state are always colliding with the objective states. Any chance offered to the instincts to intrude with authority into art is outrageous for art. .......
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The use of sex has dragged the maker of the above film to an abysmal disproportion and this is why the young boy’s repressed sex urges were allowed an outlet in the pretty kid regardless of the possible irrelevance of the pointless inclusion of the kid in the plot. The young boy is killed in a road accident as an ineffectual device of the maker for reaching an arbitrarily human finale which was, by way of sex expositions, already anti-artistic and thus anti-human in nature. The problem perhaps was a young boy’s astonishment at the experience of the mysterious attractions of sex through a professional woman. But the conflict of the boy’s mind should never have been portrayed through a repetition of details of perverse sex acts. This had issued forth due to the director’s lack of aesthetic discipline. Same is the case with many a film of United States of America and this lack of discipline has instigated even the film makers of socialist countries like Cuba to produce films that are representative of capitalistic exploitations including those relating to sex. Examples of indiscipline are rampant in films because the makers of films can not manage to accommodate the claims of speed and staticism, music and ordinary sound, tragedy and comedy, protagonist and antagonist, science and arts below the same canopy. Whenever filmmaking artist rushes into the business headlong, there arises as a result, an inevitable difference between himself and his materials, between his own instincts and the state of things beyond him. The artists of modern times live too much as social beings; they have to return to themselves at the slightest provocation. The society is always provoking the artist to remain self-centered and instinct governed. When the artist sits to paint or holds his camera he cannot help expressing his subjective choices of things. His tenacity to stick to his own instinct grows rapid as he sees that a wall has been built up between his own ideas of the world and the world itself. The filmmakers, the story teller, the musician and even the painter, all try to shift to a small world of their own imagination which is not necessarily artistic...
The impulses like sex in above case impede the growth of an aesthetic perfection because they are not artistic. The artistic impulse is an impulse of coherence order and discipline. Much importance to the subjectivity of the artist is fatal for the growth of the aesthetic discipline. The user does not want to see the artist more than his art during an aesthetic enjoyment. The tendency of the modern artist is to show more of himself. Hence the necessity of an aesthetic discipline. The artist is conscious about the inherent order through his experiences of disorder at every sphere of life. But he must know how to express his consciousness at the face of the negative experiences.

There however is no specific way to learn the discipline. The artist has to believe that the disharmony of his personal experience is not the reality. He has to adopt his imagination to the objective condition which he collects from the experience of the disharmony. This adoption is nothing to be imposed from without. The imagination has the power to adopt itself to the elements that nourish it. The interrelatedness of imagination and objective disharmony will bring in the desired result of discipline in the artist's mind. The trouble with the modern artist is that he cannot adopt himself to the disharmonies of the world. He suffers from a paralysis of imagination. He does not believe that the disharmony is not the only reality. He sits to paint or to film with anger because of his conviction that he will not be able to depict reality if he objectifies himself.

The trouble with him is that there is no communication between his will to create a harmonious whole and the inherent harmony of the apparently disorderly shape of things. The material ambitions of life have encompassed the artist so hugely that he does not find a way out of matter. Harmony on the other hand is a matter of that level of mind which is responsive to a sort of spiritually higher idealism. There is little or no ideal in an average modern artist's mind except an ideal of maintaining a safe material life. ....
Those who can ignore this ideal still have the ability to unite their imagination with the inner system of existence. The ancient artists took refuge to religious theme and they had a religious minded audience. They had no problem of aesthetic discipline. But for Picasso or George Braque the purpose of an aesthetic exercise is to cut a way of joy out of the interaction of various material forces. Such a joy is inevitably oriented by the limitations of materialism and is supposed to be unknown or less known to the state beyond material limits. The recognition of the objective world of materialism is a must for the artist but the danger of this recognition is great, so great as it may disunite the artist from his ideal. Religious sentiment is representative of the artist's adherence to an abstract idealism. But this sad old world of us is competent enough to progress without utopian ideals of religion. The world of artist too is not governed by religion anymore. Science governs it. The artist does not want to sublimate his imagination to the state of idealism. The artist cares least to bother about an aesthetic discipline. To accept the objectivity of the material (or may be mental) level, the artist has to discipline his aesthetics. He has to respond to the ideal universal order by way of controlling personal passions relating to sex, violence, social services and so on. An aesthetic discipline is the need of the hour because the hour is dark and pregnant with the virus of indiscipline.
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