CHAPTER THREE

THE ARTIST & APPRECIATION.

a) INSPIRATION & EXPRESSION.

b) ART AS ImitATION.

c) SOCIAL ValidITY OF ART.
A) INSPIRATION & EXPRESSION.

The world is unreal without a shape. The shape is the identity. Because of a shape we can call a table a table and differentiate a table from a chair. Imagination deprived of objectivity is unreal and those who take pride in saying that they enjoy a fluid state of shapeless imagination and that they are happy when they do not give shape to their imagination simply hide themselves from a universal truth. The definition of imagination is the formation of some formal images (however obscurely) in the mind. The extent of imagination depends upon the knowledge of forms and the power to form an image, the latter being a subject to the former.

The opponent will contradict the above opinion by saying that the forms of imagination originate in the individual mind with distinctions. And, this distinctiveness is the proof that an image is a creation of personality and is independent of any reference to the objective world. The outside observer that the image has, is the result of the individual person's will to objectify the image. The will differs from man to man. When they are similar, the similarity is only incidental. Fittest answer to the contradiction is the question how then the image is so identical to the images that existed independent of the particular person's imagination? Say an artist imagines and paints an angel with wings and horns at the same time. Others do not have an idea as such. Still they appreciate it as a work of art; what in such a case is the point of agreement between the artist and the appreciator? Is it not the experience of an objective shape, however peculiar it may be, that bring them close to each other? The objectivity of the subjective image or idea is the factor that sets up bond between the two parties. The appreciator must have been satisfied to meet the artist's personal image at a point that the artist has created by transforming the image into a symbol or shape. •••••
The modern art-critic will arouse a controversial issue here. He will say that the images of the artist are not streamlined by any common objectivity and this is why the appreciator today is in difficulty to enter into the specific aesthetic symbol of the artist. But such an issue should not arise in the present context. The appreciator has an equally important role to play. The communication gap has its roots at the deeper level of the conceptual difference of the objectivity itself. The artist and his audience fail to meet each other because they are unknown to the common aesthetic spirit or the aesthetic idea that corresponds to a universal creative force. When the artist catches hold of the spirit, the audience does not. The audience of the modern times is susceptible to so many things of the material level that he gets little or no scope to correspond to any kind of spirituality that way. Many factors contribute to his failure. The artist is suffering immensurably from the dictation of matter. He cannot objectify his personal instinctual reactions evoked by the material world to the extent of an aesthetic transformation of his inspiration. The artist does not reach the aesthetic status which has an eternal objective significance. The audience too cannot reach the same status. All are covered by a heavy barrier or subjective.

Ancient Indian aesthetics supplies the student a few very valuable clues to the understanding of the audience-artist rapport. If an art is approached from, according to Indian rhetoricians, the artist's side, there arises two distinct aspects. The first is the artist's inspiration, the second is the artist's expression. The inspiration develops in the artist's mind. It is termed as bhawa. The expression is the objectively palpable form and shape of that inspiration. It is termed as rasa. The former is content, the latter is form. Both are originally the artist's possession. But the artist is concerned with the bhawa with which the connoisseur never communicates. The bhawa of mind, whether it is of the artist or not, shows itself through signals like the physical movements, actions, spoken words etc.
That we have an inner inspiration, an inner idea, is felt only through our expression of it through different physical movements. The artist too chooses different movements for an expression of the bhawa. The pantomime artist will move his body to express himself. The singer will use his voice and so on. This natural release of the bhawa through physical movements is the basic cause of the formation of two parties centering an artistic creation. Unless the bhawa is expressed rather objectified there is no chance for the rasika (the appreciator) to reach it. The artist expresses bhawa through two instruments anubhava and bibhawa. The tendency of bhawa is towards expression. The tendency of ras is towards pleasure. Bharat, the great ancient art theoretician in his aesthetic analysis of dramatic art (Bharatnatyam) has discussed the two instruments. What helps to make prominent the bhawa is bibhawa and what ways the artist follows to express the bhawa is anubhava. Biswanath Kaviraj, another noted Indian aesthetician of the by gone times, has further clarified bibhawa in two ways. Say sex. It is a bhawa. In the matter of sexual love the notable aspects shall be the characters, beauties and other qualities as such of the spouses. Sheltering these qualities the love will develop. These are called classen bibhawa. The second point is the situation, the atmosphere so to say, like the season of spring or the rainy night time. These also are the factors behind the development of love. When thus the bibhawa is rendered explicit, the time to express it comes. Anubhava is active from this point. The actions that the artist takes resort to for an expression of the bhawa which has formed from different bibhawas are termed as anubhava. Both the authors named above have accepted the causes that inspire the bhawa as bibhawa and the actions that bring into existence the bhawa as anubhava.

Although the ancient aesthetic theories dealt with poetry and drama in particular, the analysis these theories had done is applicable to all forms of art. The summan of the cycle thus is the rise of a bhawa in the mind, inflammation of the same by the bibhawa and expression of it by anubhava.
To this extent there is the artist. The creation is over and then comes the appreciator. The Indian aestheticians have agreed to accept the completion of creation as the starting point for appreciation. For a success of the creation a competent rasika (appreciator) is needed. Bharat has shown that the analysis of the bhava itself bears the proof that rasa is a consequential development from bhava. *Driyate hi bhavabhya rasanabhipravittit* Biswanath Kaviraj also has accepted rasa as the natural result of bhava. There are many types of bhava in classical Indian aesthetics. Each bhava has a subsequent rasa with it. There are ten bhavas viz sex, sorrow, anger etc. There are ten similar rasas too.

About the function of the appreciator too much has been instructed in ancient texts. The appreciator has to be compassionate and sympathetic. Rhetorician Ananda vardhana says, *rasagnata esa sahridayatva*. To be competent to enjoy is the symptom of compassion. Abhinabogupta, a noted narrator of the great text of aesthetics *Dharmaloka* has explained sahridayatva as a quality of heart (hridaya) to expand to and adjust with the objectivity of art.

Prof. Hiramoy Bandopadhaya has, in connexion with his analysis of the aesthetics of Rabindranath Tagore, summarised ancient texts of aesthetic theories in a fitting way by comparing them with Western aesthetic theories.* His reference to Berkeley invites our attention. Berkeley in a different context had put the instance of dreaming an elephant. I dream that an elephant has entered into my room. The elephant is not seen by others of my family because he came in my personal dream. But when I see a cow in the walking state, there is chance for others also to see it. Berkeley’s explanation is that the former exists in my mind and it belongs to my subjective self and the latter exists in the universe that is the mind of universal god. Prof. Bandopadhaya has rectified the philosopher’s opinion. He says the cow is not necessarily a part of the thought process of the artist as an individual where as the elephant is. .....
Idke as the artist is a separate entity, so are the objects of the external world. Rabindranath has, as noted in an earlier occasion classified the soul into two names, one is the personal, the other universal. He has discovered the reason of a common pleasure that an art evokes, in the universal consistency and harmony represented in the artwork. This universal harmony is independent of human mind. Many a western art critic and philosopher has tried to draw a rigid line of distinction between art as inspiration and art as expression. We will do well to recall some modern philosophical observations about the exact nature of relationship between individualism and universalism. The scientific philosophers' assessment in this regard will probably help us to enter into the problem of inspiration and expression more accurately. Hans Reichenbach writes of the creative impulse driving a man to write a book or to make his own fence for his garden as individualistic activity. Herbert Read in his book 'The Limitations of a Scientific Philosophy' has tried to criticise the German empiricist's view in a fitting manner. 'The creative impulse that is surely an individualistic activity finds an outlet not only in the context of a physical world, but also in the context of other human beings. Every choice, moral or aesthetic, is, as Sartre has so well demonstrated, an act which involves the whole human race. Man finds himself in a specific situation, the social situation of his time and must everyday exercise his responsibility. He marries or does not marry, has children or does not have children, whatever he does, it is impossible to evade the problem of responsibility which is also the problem of creative action'. 'The artist does not act according to the established rules. No 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 relations established between the desire to create and the result attained'. 'It then takes its place among the rest of the artist's works, than we discover that it has form, style, beauty-values which are not arbitrary but constructive'. ......
Art starts from nowhere but it has a certain identity. The identity discloses itself through the artist's choice of form and his performance of various responsibilities. William James had pointed out long ago that consciousness does not exist apart from the object we are conscious of. We can induce consciousness by seeking a correlative for feeling (say, emotion, mood, idea and intuition). The object the artist creates, corresponds to his state of consciousness; it is his consciousness of that object. It was not present in consciousness and then expelled like an egg; it grew into consciousness as it germinated, as it was plastically formed. It was matured by an awareness of a context, of a situation, of a matrix. With reference to James, Mr. Head has advanced his proposition to a definition of reality. "Reality in my own sense of the term, is what is in this way created, the object that grew into consciousness and remain there in all their concreteness." "Truth is a predicate of statements"..., says the scientific philosopher. The modern artist says that truth is a predicate of the creation of specific symbolic objects. "The artist," as Read says, "knows that his sense organs are quite incapable of encompassing empirically any external reality; but he knows that he is a part of the universal process, a biological entity engaged in the adventure of existence; and by knowing this, by becoming aware of the growing point that he is in this universal process, he is able to manufacture some grains of the real just as the photogenic cells of a plant manufacture certain real substance from the air or the ether or the cosmic rays."

Mr. Read has been discussing the primacy of over science. He argues with the aim of showing that scientific philosophy and art are analogous and that science is no way of greater necessity than art in the modern age of science. "... the work of art is real in the sense that an atom of nitrogen is real." Art as an object is real in the sense that it has a palpable harmony and proportion. ....
What constitutes the value of a work of art is not the expression or affirmation of desire or the choice of goals, but the fact that there exists a real object, something snatched from the flux of feeling and made to exist, objectively. Its existence, its persistence is its reality. The mission of all true art is not to reproduce what it already given (which would be superfluous), nor to create something in the pure play of subjective fancy (which can be only transitory and must necessarily be a matter of complete indifference to other people) 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 has quoted the above lines from Max Scheler and added that seeing is creating, and creation is communication; the objective realities come into existence in the act of creation.

Benedetto Croce in his famous aesthetic theories has tried to interpret expression as an initiation of inspiration. He has accepted the two parts of an aesthetic experience. There are, according to him, the inspiration and the expression, the artist and his art, the content and the form. But the existence of the artist is the only reality for Croce. He has tried to prove that an artwork is concerned only with the content. A fine poem is somehow born in the artist mind. The artist imagines the context of the poem within himself. The sooner the imagination is complete the poem is created. The artist sits to choose words and cadence for an expression of the poem much later. By that time the poem was complete and what the artist does is an act of translation. The artist translates into an objective form his content. The real art is the content. The artist is at a remove from reality. The aesthetic process behind the formation of an art object is but the development and transformation of the impression that has already established itself in the artist mind. The original aesthetic feeling is absent in the artist's following of the process of development.

* Benedetto Croce - Aesthetic (Intuitions and Arts).
The philosopher has not denied the reality of an objective aspect of any art work. But such a reality is secondary. It has a relatively lesser necessity for the making of art. The student of Croce may easily draw his own conclusion from what he has said. A point may be raised relating to Croce's rejection of the audience from art. If the artist's expression itself is of smaller significance what is the significance of art appreciation? Suppose an artist conceives a nice flower with a serpent under it. He does not express it. In case there is no representation, there is no problem of art appreciation as well. Croce wanted to show that a form also is created with the creation of the context. And this is why whether a second form is supplied by the artist or not, is immaterial. Croce agreed to accept the form, but the form according to him is not as important as the inner working of the artist's mind.

Inspiration is an unreality in the world of art unless it is coupled with expression. There are two phases of expression. The first phase is complete within the artist's mind. The artist frames a form within the subjective level of consciousness which helps the inspiration to achieve an identity which again separates a particular inspiration from other inspirations like the inspiration relating to the artist's sense of friendliness, sense of sorrow, joy, sex, love and so on. This form is the artist's personal possession and this has no connection with the artist's tendency to objectify feelings. This is possessed by the subjective objectivity of the artist's mind. The subjective objectivity is an outlet, an inner working of the mind that expresses the feeling to the mind only and that has no necessity to come to the contact of the objective realities beyond the artist's mind. This objectivity can be called dream or perception. This is manifested by the artist's inward relationship with the spirit of life, his contacts with the universal life force through a single biological identity. This first phase of expression is automatically lead to a second phase of outward objectification.
That which has been formed in the artist's mind as a result of the contact between the artist's personal biological life and the universal life force, always searches a way out of the artist's soul. The sooner the artist is in the know of a form, the urge to objectify it to the plane beyond his own soul crops up in him. This happens because the form which the artist discovered within himself has a universal identity beyond its identity as a part of the artist's inspiration. The inspiration of the artist itself has a personal aspect and a nonpersonal aspect. The artist is inspired to conceive by an existent elan vital that pervades the universe, that circulates through every living object, that inspires living objects to create a new generation even after the knowledge of death as an impending reality beside creation. This is why the artist gets ahead to accept a second phase of formality or expression. Had the first phase sufficed, the artist would never have painted. He would just have dreamt and slept which most other human beings do. The artist learns from his biological life, his way of inhaling oxygen and exhaling carbon, his opening of eyes, his voice that carries him out of himself, the rules of a universal life, a common life beyond himself. This knowledge he makes use of by parting with the form that has come into existence within the small sphere of his personality. The form when brought to light requires orientation and a cognizable identity for others. It also requires to be in tune with other forms. The harmony of an art object is its correlation with other things of life, its justifiable existence in the public place. A nice little flowery municipal park is an artwork in the sense that it is synchronous of the environment, of the temperaments of the people who use it or stay around it. If the world fails to adjust itself with it, the art is dead. It is no art at all. The artist does not have to either. What is a must for him is an awareness of the ways which lead to place his own idea (or content as we may lend the word from Croce) upon the canvas in a consistent and credible manner. This awareness of the artist takes him near his audience. ....
This awareness is manifested in the expression of the artist. This is a part of the inspiration. No inspiration is valid without this. An exclusively subjective and independent inspiration is sure to turn into the expression of such things as are not coextensive of life and thus are not interesting for the users of life in general. The history of art has no evidence of such an inspiration. Inspiration is integrally linked with expression, whether we want it or not. Any act of inspiration is made known to the world by the help of expression. The world therefore does not belong to the artist only. It is of those too who enjoy. The inspiration turned into expression creates the artist's audience. Without the audience the artist oneself is useless whatever be the source of inspiration or of whatever type the inspiration is.

continued b) Art as Imitation.
b) ART AS ImitATION.

Before we enter directly into the problem of artist-audience relationship which will help us to say the final word about the theory of the 'art of the real', a few words are necessary about imitiveness as the essence of art. Indian aestheticians of the ancient days have been very vocal about the quality of imitiveness and they approve of an art that does not imitate. Imitation is a synonym of art. There is an acknowledgement of the adoption of material reality in art in ancient Indian aesthetic theories. 'Yatha Kriya Tatha Trailkyanukrti Smrita' - as in dance so also in other forms of art, there is an imitation of the universe. This dictum has been justified by the Indian aesthete. He wants to analyse the cause of such an imitation by showing that the artist collects the spirit of art from the universe and transfers this spirit to the universe of others via his own ideas and beliefs. The audience of a drama will never find any interest in what the author says unless the way of communication is known to them to some extent. The will to enjoy occurs in the artlover only when he sees that a cognizable world is revealed. There is an ape in every man and the instinctual inclination of the individual man towards apeing provokes him to appreciate an imitation of his own behaviour by others as well. When an artist imitates him or his race in some way or the other, that imitation serves as a stimulus. An immediate response is an inevitable consequence of the whole operation. But for calling art an imitation one has to be sure about the object that is imitated by art. Does art imitate nature? Does it imitate the objective world? Or, is art an imitation of the human personality? The aim of intellect is to collect data from the universe and make the mind content. The aim of art on the contrary is to create an image and make the mind pleasant. The intellect has to be realistic in the material way. Art does not have to be realistic because the reality of art, as we have seen in an earlier occasion, ......
depends upon its power to create. There of course is a role of reality even in art. The artist has to move his limbs to dance or borrow the actor's voice to speak. And to this extent he has to be alert about the nature of material or physical reality. He has also to be alert about the necessity of imitation. For an expression of joy for example the artist draws a man with hands stretched upwards. This action is borrowed by the artist from the objective world. But as we look deep into the purpose of art and compare art with intellect we see that art serves a man as a stimulant, an object that refreshes the mind with pleasure and that necessarily without a purpose. Matisse has described art as an armchair. This description is fitting in the above perspective. Art is not a medium of instruction of any kind. Its business with the reality of the material world is limited in the sense that it imparts to the seeking mind something classless. The task of the artist is tougher than that of the scientist because the artist has to present what others will not need for any practical purpose and which has no identity and the necessity for which differs from person to person. The artist presents truth in a broad and generous way. The scientist or the intellectual person presents it as a speciality and in most cases as a consequence of a particular class of hypotheses. The artist imitates everything beyond his but there lies a strong sense of transformation in his thought process because his aim is to declass the world from all scientific variations for the sake of a change towards all that is good and perfect and pleasant. The audience wants this change and the artist wants to communicate to the audience by way of providing them this change. The whole process of communication however takes place on the mental level. The artist transports the spirits of goodness and pleasantness through some forms and shapes, some words or musical tunes. His medium is an imitation of the world of (objective) physical reality. There are arguments in favour of ignoring musical notes as a physical reality.
But the physical side of a musical note is the quality of its audibleness and voice exercise. The voice of the singer or the finger of the instrumentalist is the physical part of the musical reality. The musical artist imitates a few accepted norms to create a sound of his voice or of his tambourine and he does not do anything that is not already accepted as music. In Indian classical music there are ragas. These ragas are nothing other than an arrangement of physical expression through accepted and established norms. The criterion behind the setting up of these norms most of which have evolved by artists practicing music for a longtime, is a change of the mind towards an organic pleasantness through these norms. The masters of modern Indian music are creating ragas and these ragas are, as we understand, nothing but a few rearrangements of the few old orders. The mind of the modern man is pregnant with a penchant for clinging to new arrangements on all levels. The musicians have every right to improve the old notes and attract our attention. The same had been the case with the age of Akbar to which belonged the great composer Tansen. The artist is an imitator of some established values. Referring to the musician one may say here that Ravisankar may imitate the arrangements of his predecessor Tansen when he plays composed dorbari kanara; but Tansen imitated whom when he composed this raga? This is a pertinent point of objection against the assumption that art is imitation. In the original arrangement the imitation was of different kind. Tansen's affiliations with the world of music rewarded him with a sense of proportion and consistency. His artist's mind was ready to objectify any impulse of creation making conscious use of this sense because this sense was infused in his aesthetic consciousness. The voice that expresses the music or the hand that plays upon the strings are not independent of the consciousness and we have already discussed elsewhere how the body and the consciousness are integrally related to each other. The artist's recognition of proportion and organic unity is a feeder to his creative urges.
Behind this recognition lies his association with music and his earthly existence woven by various objective experiences subjectively realized. The world that lay stretched before the beauty-hungry soul of Tansen was replete with an organic and calm. The historian will contradict the statement by saying that the age of Akbar was full of various social and political upheavals as well, which was not favourable for a Tansen to search an ideal aesthetic order. But this argument belongs to superficial level. The artist of Akbar's time had enough of ingredients to find in the age. The emperor was a great patron of art. In his court there was no less a litterateur than Abul Fazl. The temperament of Tansen was nurtured by an aesthetic atmosphere which also directed him towards a state of concentration. And, we have seen how creation follows concentration by way of the realization of an inherent consistency and order. The first composer's contacts with this order inspired him to portray the same in the creation. He used his voice and felt that an automatic discharge of correct new tunes were possible. The tunes fell in the seven strings of the octave but there appeared new arrangements as a spontaneous consequence of the mental support with some consistency and system that was mingled with the entire consciousness of the artist. Same is true of the painting artist too. The original painters of prehistoric days were ignorant of many things of the universe. But they grew an urge to draw. This urge might have gone in vain had they not corresponded with a consistent order that existed within the frame of their mind originating from the continuous exposition of their personalities to the objective situations of the world. In his description of the hunter peoples of the primitive days, Andreas Lommel, Director of the Museum of Ethnology, Munich, says: 'Hunting in the earliest times, when man was still weaker than the game he sought, must have required the maximum physical and mental concentration of which man was capable. ****

* Landmarks of the World's Art - Paul Hamlyn.
This concentration, and man's relative position in the natural environment, produced a specific mental attitude. Comparing the prehistoric hunters with the farmers of that phase the author adds, 'The hunter feels himself at one with nature. His vision of world is of a spiritual and material entity. Only very gradually does he come to oppose himself to his environment, and so obtain an awareness of himself as an individual being, distinct from the world of nature...' The order underwent a complete change as the light of civilization has spread itself. The modern hunter's superiority over nature makes him separate from nature. The organic order of life is now realised by intellectual powers. The way Tansen conceived and composed a raga has undergone a refinement in the case of Revisekbar or Ali Akber. But in both the states of creation lies a definite realisation of the personal and instinctual responses to the workings of nature which has an objective identity. These responses are matured into creation under the influence of a synthetic order and harmony set up between the individual and the universe. The individual man, when he sits to paint or sing, tries to marry his aesthetic consciousness to this harmony and in this way he is an imitator.

In their theories of aesthetics the great Greek masters too acknowledged imitation as a necessary element of all arts. Aristotle was the first western aesthetician to point out the element of imitation in art. Epic, tragedy, comedy and the different types of expression in the play of flutes and lyres, according to Aristotle, are imitative. The quality of imitation differs in the above forms of dramatic art and music. Harold Osborne while appreciating Aristotle's views on imitation, has commented that art, according to the Greek master, is a complete imitation of the reality of life like photography. Aristotle however discussed imitation in connection with his search for a distinction between fine arts and useful arts. ...
He said that the artist creates an imitation of the reality and the ordinary craftsman creates a useful thing. This is why architecture is not art for it creates a house to serve man's practical purpose of dwelling. Aristotle has also said that man feels happy to see that the realities of his own cognizable world have been successfully imitated in art. Imitation or apeing is a primary instinct in man. This is why he finds happiness in imitation. His interest for art gathers momentum when he feels that his inner liking for imitation is most effectively manifested in art. True that we create a world of our own by stretching our imagination to an extent that thoroughly defies cognizable reality. But can we deny that the roads and houses, the birds and beasts, the gods and demons that exist in our imaginary world look much like those existent in the real world? Should we not describe imagination itself as an imitation of reality? From an approval of this interrogation the artlover accepts the idea of self pretension at the time of appreciation. Coleridge's theory of the willing suspension of disbelief as a must for the enjoyment of supernatural poetry, is applicable to all arts insofar as art is a deliberate copying of reality and not the reality itself. There is a suppressed consciousness of imitation in the artist's mind when he exercises his will to create. This consciousness is nurtured by the artist's growing knowledge of the objective world. Art is not a prototype of the real. The artist, as Rabindranath himself has shown threadbare in his works, has to improvise and remake the real in accordance with the knowledge of the object. But taken elementally the artist is an intendent of the object that he imitates. Minus an object to imitate there is no chance to create. Even if we return to the observations supplied a few lines above in connexion with the problems of musical creation, and affirm that there is no objectivity in the human realisation of the organic unity of the world which the artist depicts, the case of art as imitation cannot be dismissed. The...
The artist's correlation with the pattern of the universal existence pushes him forward to the creation of a prototype of the pattern. This correlation is established through the artist's rapport with the universe. Unless the primitiveman had seen the mating of a couple of bisons, there would have been no depiction of the same by the Kagdalenian artist of 20,000-10,000 B.C.* Similarly, without a thorough intercourse with the harmony of a universal existence which finds expression in the artist's deep concentration and his enquiry into the mysteries of the octaves through constant practices, there could be no violinist, Nohmuin by name, no vocal singer, Paul Robson by name, and the like.

There cannot be a conclusion to the discussion of art as imitation without some final words about the spirit of organic unity that, as mentioned umpteen times in this dissertation, exists in the artist's percept and that the artist gets from a conception of the world around him.

Viswanath Kaviraj, the noted Indian aesthete of the ancient age, in his book 'Sahityadarpanam' has suggested that the joy that one gets from an artwork seems to the person as an indivisible part of his own mental make up. This impression is like the tasting of the spirit of Brahma. Aesthetic joy may make the lower forget about all other things. Professor Bandopadhyay (see below) in his discussion on the organic unity of the universe which the artist seeks to imbibe, has thrown some valuable lights on the source of aesthetic joy and has tried to single out aesthetic joy from all sorts of physical joys and sorrows. The reality of the rasa of an artwork lies in its strength to draw the rasikas (connoisseurs) near it. Bharat, the dramaturgist says - 'Harshasingingchedhigachhati' - (The connoisseur gets elated to see a dramatic performance).  

* Black & white print in landmarks of the World's Art Paul Hamhyn, (plate no. 3).  
* Requoted from Prof. Hiranmoy Bandopadhyay's book 'Rabindra Silpatatva.'
This elation is not joy in the material sense. The Upanishads have identified aesthetic pleasure with divine pleasure. The significance of such an identification lies in the acceptance of art as an integral spirit of the universal existence because god or the Brahma is a universal spirit. Croce, the Western philosopher too has described the pleasure derived from an aesthetic experience as a divine joy. Aristotle (in his Poetics) says that a general consistency must remain in the parts of a beautiful object whether that object is made of many parts or it is a whole in itself. The necessity of such a consistency that lies in the volume and the arrangement of parts is to create the beauty of the object. Leo Tolstoy (in his book What is Art) has emphasised the same point. The parts, according to him, should be organised in such a way that their independent existences should seem inevitable and that the removal of any of these parts should seem anachronous. They are like the different limbs of the human body. The noted English philosopher McTaggart in his book 'Nature of Existence', has named this spirit of wholeness as 'organic unity'. Harold Osborne has called it 'configuration theory'. Rabindranath has expressed his confirmation of this unity in diversity in his works and we should note in this connexion that his conception of the uniformity of things was formed by his religion. In Brahma religion the god is ornamented with the qualities of truth, benignity and beauty. Rabindranath has agreed to accept these three elements as different in proportion and aim from each other. And he has not confused the aim of art which is to achieve aimless ananda with these elements. But there is no denial in his aesthetics of a synchronous nature of coherence and coordination between these elements which, according to the poet, contribute greatly to the forming of an aesthetic based upon an unity of the three spirits viz. the truth, the benignity and the beauty. ....

Anandrupam amritam yadbibhati - (Mandukopanisad) This ananda is something immortal i.e. amritam. A submission to the divine too gave the ancient man similar ananda. Ananda is joy in an exclusively oriental sense which is without any existence. Art gave such a calm joy and inspiration.
All our ideas and experiences follow each other and help us to realise that the true is benign and thus beautiful. The artist deciphers the course of the development of his experiences of the world through his communication with an inherent coordinating state of uniformity existent between his ideas of truth, benignity and beauty. Beauty thus is not joy. The purpose of art is not to find joy only. A realisation of the whole pattern inspires the artist to work. What thus is created is an experience, a new experience of satisfaction and no aesthetic experience should be accepted as a single independent symbol of truth or benignity of beauty. There would have been no tragedy in the world had the artist cared for making beauty or truth only. The story of Oedipus Rex does not apparently suggest anything benign. The history of all arts records the truth that there lies an aesthetic principle behind every creation. The Paleolithic people used to create and worship images that are anything but beautiful. Their Vensuses, (similar to these Vensuses may be found among the women of primitive tribes in Australia or Africa of the present day) resemble deformed Paleolithic pregnant women. Researches in this field have revealed that the distortions and choice of such subjects as objects or symbols of worship took place to strike horror or awe into the beholder. The Greek conception of ugliness too was based on the point that it has a quality of grotesqueness, of something misshaped, defective, but not necessarily unsatisfactory. Edmund Burke has acknowledged the fact that though 'ugliness be the opposite to beauty, it is not the opposite to proportion and fitness'. Although Burke has not accepted ugliness as a sublime idea, he wanted to crown it with such qualities as excite a strong horror. The horrible forces us to submit and this submission is a satisfaction. The tendency of the artists of the Greek age to objectify horror may be equated with the primitives's choice of a horrific symbol even when used this symbol as an object of divine worship. The modern artist cannot avoid taking to the description of ghastly scenes of war and death (Picasso's Guernica for example).
.... All these spring from the artist's inclinations towards the formation of a link between his own personality and the coherent world of truth, beauty and goodness that lies beyond him. The case of those artists who do not want to please with sweet soft words and colours should be considered as very valuable in our understanding of the purpose of art. Art goes to the extent of ghastliness just as religion does. The purpose is to set up the connection between order and disorder. The message of Oedipus Rex is that life has a cycle of its own and that man cannot be the master of this cycle. Sophocles wanted to draw human faith to the organic universal order the identity of which is revealed in the gross mistakes that is imposed upon man by a third power as a lesson and awaken. The artist of the Greek age like his counterparts in all other ages wanted to give expression to the feeling/universality that he had from a constant contact with experiences of various particular kinds. He was an imitator in the sense that his expression was oriented by a will to produce the like feeling through materials that so long lay beyond the range of his own or anybody else's experience. The artist objectifies an idea. The turning of a subject into an object must necessarily be made possible through a process of imitation. An object is the imitation of a subject and this is why the former is so much like the latter. The existence of the artist's personality finds justification in the artist's art. The artist's human qualities, his power of probing his sentiments, his passions and penchant, are exposed to others through his art. Behind the artist's communication with the world outside lies his capacity and will to present to the world things that fall into the range of others' knowledge. The modern artist does not care for the direct knowledge of his connoisseur in this respect. The forms of Henry Moore are strange to his first visitors; but the visitor has to decipher the rhythmic value of these forms from his own personal knowledge of the rhythm of visual forms in communicate to visitor's capacity to the message of the artist. The communication would never have the been possible without quality of imitativenss that the art possesses. .......

No. 20.
The viewer wants to find in the artist an imitator. The whole flow of
allegation against the modern artist's stiff complexity of expression originates
in the viewer's disappointment of not having seen a replica of the intelligible world
of his own in simple diction. The artist is always bullied to imitate or
mimic some such experiences that shall be common to both himself and his
audience. He competently imitates his experience of the universal order and
channels his impulse of imitation through this and that particular form and
shape. The modern artist's lack of communication with the audience should be
traced in his unwillingness to imitate which follows from an element of
bitterness and rage provoked by certain unmanageable circumstances of temporal
life.
c) SOCIAL VALIDITY OF ART.

The issue of a social validity of art springs from the modern artist's failure to portray the image that arouses public enthusiasm and that satiates his urge for creation. The artist has to be concerned about the proper communication between his own reality and the appreciator's reality. He has to create an art that has a social relevance. He has to find specific means to inspire his audience, by moulding his personal notion of the universal order of life into a palatable and believable object of common human interest.

Many great thinkers of the world have dwelt upon the social relevance of art and the question of socialising art has occurred many times in the aesthetic world. Catholics have opposed the issue of accepting art as a social service by saying that such a possibility is a threatening to the entire existence of good art. The protestants have opposed the issue of rejecting art as a social service with the argument that the purpose of art is to delight man and man no longer live as individuals in separate orbits. They live and thus grow into perfection as human beings in course of their deep involvement with a social system. The artist and the artlover are human beings and how can they escape the involvement? How can they produce an object that has no social relevance, no social character?

The history of art has been swinging between two poles of opinion from time immemorial. The weight at the side of the opinion in favour of art as a social project is heavier in the present age because man is living too much of social life. Man now 'is lived and he does not live' and his supervisor is science. At the beginning of civilisation there was little or no science. Man's instinct for knowledge and earthly perfection gave birth to his science. In course of progress man found that science helps him to secure a better position on earth...
..... It provides his happiness of the physical kind the need of which is always tremendous insofar as the body is an immediate truth and reality and it is the vehicle for the understanding of mind. Science stands as an antidotal force in human life and it is the machine that grinds abstract ideas of existence into a concrete palpable utility. The need to stick to science became urgent when human society began to enlarge itself to new horizons and the world's population began to grow fast leaving ample scopes between individuals to misread each other's personal ideas and values. The flourish of human rationality was followed by a slow devaluation of the emotive contents of human mind. An average man of the age of Renaissance could no longer brandish his sword before his contender on a flimsy plea like that the latter had cast a meaningful look upon life in public. An Englishman of the Victorian age could not appreciate by any stretch of imagination all that the royal mandate of the country had conveyed. The will to criticize the authority and to get rid of the bad issued from the human capacity to rationalize the basic emotions of life. Science served man in full glow during the entire course of his development towards the climax of existence. The time has come when Science is being served by man. The Americans are content to expose themselves to the service of science by taking up major social duties in terms of science. The computer is now putting marks on the answer script of the student and judging his merit. It is economizing time like anything. Why should an America allow his personality to supersede the machine? Where a culture of intellect makes life easier and worthliving, the possibility of cultivating emotionalism by pondering over much/love affection piety and mutual understanding should be set aside as chimeras. The society is now ready to retrench the artist who gazes at the Balkan and pushes the brush through the visual mystery that surrounds that huge hill. There is no time at all to paint a picture in the manner of Raphael or Rembrandt. The essential qualities of an aesthetic exercise are to be sought after and plastically retained by scientific means. The printing machine is a very valuable medium of creation...
The electric chisel helps to cut the rock or the wood according to necessity in a much, mechanised and thus perfect way. The labour is economised. The time is saved. The flourish of psychological science too has widened the area of human knowledge to some such extents from where the cause of a particular thought of mind too can be focussed and valued. The course of a modern man's aesthetic appetite, as Freud says, lies in the ambition of man to achieve social honour and (perhaps) the love of women. Whether such hypotheses are valid or not is not the point. One must appreciate the tendency to analyse and judge.

In our discussion on the social validity of art, we are to turn our eyes towards this growth of rationality and the spirit of analysis. If the mind of the artist is so directed towards the achievement of a safe social position when he sits (whether we call it social honour or not) to paint, he has to look after the conditions that his society places upon him and above all the reaction that his society has about his creation.

But what is most important is the question whether the artist is doing justice to himself by committing to social obligations and whether again the society has any authority to be a direct party to the process of his creation. The history of art bears testimony to the truth that the artist is a creation of the society.

In the prehistoric days the seeds of the history of art were sown. At the beginning of mankind there were tool using people. The technique of the making of tools began to change with the advance of time. But the purpose of the manufacture was same for a longtime. It was to combat with animals. The man of early stone age used his tools on games like hippopotamus, wild bear, wild sheep (in Africa), elephant, rhinoceros (in Spain) etc. The paintings found in the cave drawings of places like northern Spain show an assembly of irregular lines developed into the outlines of animals and so into wall paintings and modelled relief. These works date back to thirty or forty thousand years ago. The animals suggest that the....

*Br.L.S., Lensky, the British anthropologist, has already pushed the dawn of the human race back - 1,800,000 years. In Olduvi George in northern Tanzania, he has excavated the fossil remains of a tool using individual (whom he calls 'homehahiggi') who must have been more intelligent & noble than the already known Homo sapienthropus, who lived in Africa some 1,750,000 years ago...* - Andreas Lommel's introduction to the book Prehistoric & Primitive Man. (Paul Hamlyn).
.... development of human species was associated with an awareness of animals either as preys or adversaries. In the portrayal of these animals the early hunter found a cathartic contentment. Speculations regarding the will of man to paint are often avoided by student's of prehistory. But the drawings, the speeding lines, the subjects which were all animals, bear the proof that the early hunting man was depicting his knowledge of the world to which he belonged. The hunter people represented a nature culture and their existence was marked by a vivid motto of progress along with time. The hunter used to feel himself at one with nature. "His vision of the world is as of a spiritual and material entity. Only very gradually does he come to oppose himself to his environment, and so obtain an awareness of himself as an individual being, distinct from the world of nature. He gradually expresses this feeling of distinctness in his art, while remaining closely involved in nature". Just as he progresses from tillage to homestead and village so also he began to draw a distinct animal upon the wet claywalls of his surrounding. An awareness of his own existence as an adversary of nature gradually cropped up in human mind. "The hunter's entire mode of thought, as well as his art, is dominated by animals, which he sees as equal or even superior to himself". "In his art, human beings appear as animals, and later frequently as hybrid beings, such as occur later in Egyptian art and even in classical times". "The Eskimos of Alaska are well known for their marks representing part human, part animal creatures, ...." But the hunter's effort to subordinate himself to his natural environment is disturbed by the need to kill. "This is the first serious step in the dissociation of man from his environment. The hunter kills animals in order to live, but this necessary slaying weighs more and more heavily upon his mind. It seems as though one of early man's major intellectual achievements is the attempt to become free from this burden. ....

He finds a way of thinking death out of existence, and invents the concept of immortal soul and of eternal life. The early hunter persuades himself that he is not really killing the animals themselves but only their bodies and that they can come to life again if their bones are looked after and treated with the correct magic.

'This attitude leads men to reproduce animals through art .... The pictures themselves are intended to capture and contain the imagined powers of the animals concerned and are conceived of as a magical means of ensuring the supply of game .... Prehistoric man tried to comprehend his environment analogically, in parables, and to integrate himself into the life about him by the performance of symbolic actions.' Primitive art was a symbol of the actions of hunting with particular stress upon the actions of the animals hunted. Mr. Herbert Read in his book 'The Meaning of Art' has dealt precisely with the art of the primitive man. The main aim of the author was to reveal the inner lifeforce that found expression through different abstract and semiabstract symbols in the art of the prehistoric days. With reference to the art of the Bushmen of Southern Rhodesia and South West Africa, Mr. Read says a few very valuable words: 'The representations (usually drawings on the walls of caves) show no attempt at perspective; 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 .... Read has referred to the remarks of Dr. Kuhn; the eminent researcher of Bushman art to assume that the most prominent feature 'of the art of Bushmen is the naturalistic and sensory character of its informing spirit.' 'To him (the Bushmen) the object is reality, not symbolism or essential meaning.' 'Most of the paintings represent running animals or hunting scenes', visually replete with a strong movement and life. ....

* Ibid.
Primitive life was one of action. Primitive art was of the action of life. Read continues: 'By the symbolical representation of an event, primitive man thinks he can secure the actual occurrence of the event. The desire for progeny, for the death of an enemy, for survival after death or for the exorcism or propitiation of an evil spirit, is the motive for the creation of an adequate symbol.' While referring to the organic and geometric qualities of primitive art, Mr. Read says that the primitive art 'adopts the organic curve, enhances its liveliness. It is the art of temperate shores and fruitful lands. It is the art of joy in living, of confidence in the world'. The forms are depicted in such a way that Read has gone to the extent of evaluating these works as a departure from exact imitation. They represent so vigorous a life that one may certainly say that these paintings transcended the spirit of visual imitation of things. They imitated rather the whole spirit of their living in their creation.

The art of primitive man was definitely oriented by his environment and the problems of his existence. Herbert Read has pointed out the main purpose of the primitive creation as an escape from the arbitrariness of life. Read: '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. Even today, among races in touch with civilization, it is impossible to get a native to understand the meaning of a promise. He does not reason beyond the immediate situation, but acts instinctively at every turn of events.' This is a major proof of the artist's direct contact with his environment which imposes upon him the desire to escape. Art served as a strong medium of expressing the reactions of the mind against the shape of things whether we call it arbitrariness or not.

As civilization advanced the artist's obligations to his surroundings increased, ...
Artistic activities flourished to the height of incandescence during later times. We will do well to recall here the name of Jacopo Robusti Tintoretto of Venice (lived in the sixteenth century) as a representative example of the artist's constant awareness of the social situation. Jean Paul Sartre in one of his most brilliantly written selection of essays on aesthetics has discussed this Venetian artist with particular reference to his ardent will to live a secured social life through artistic creations and to mould his aesthetic ambitions in accordance with his ambition to enjoy an absolute social superiority. Tintoretto was a dyer's son. He had little scope in his early life to cultivate his individual talent under the pervading personality of his teacher, Titian Tiziano Vecellio. The teacher dismissed him within a short period having discovered his genius and the artist who was now only twelve years old was exposed to the city of Venice almost as a blacklisted child. What attracted the solitary youngster most was the competitive character of the market where he had to place himself as an artisan. Tintoretto saw that a huge number of persons belonging to his class was reigning in Venice and it was a real challenge to pass through the varied tastes of the buyers on a competitive basis. Venetian Republic was no longer the mistress of the seas. The aristocracy began to decline, failures multiply, the number of poor noblemen increases, the others lose their spirit of enterprise. The sons of the merchant princes buy land and live on their income. Soon ordinary 'citizens' replace them in certain functions; ships eventually come under the control of men from the bourgeoisie. But the bourgeoisie is still not ready by any stretch of imagination to consider itself the rising class. It even harbors the notion that it may one day insure the resurgence of the fallen nobility; we should say rather that an obscure agitation took hold of it, making its condition less tolerable and resignation to it more difficult. To cut a long story short, the most ambitious commons in Venice are then members of the petty bourgeoisie: 

* Essays in Aesthetics - translated by Wade Baskin.
Another important feature of the time Tintoretto belonged to, was the gradual decline of spiritualism. A long evolution has begun - an evolution which will substitute everywhere the profane for the sacred. Gold, glittering, racy, the diverse branches of human activity emerge one after the other from mellow divine promiscuity. The artist has to grapple with the incorrigible situation, perhaps for the first time in the history of the world, by turning to the Florentine banker: with the ridiculous notion of using frescoes to beautify his house, replacing his old approachable clientele among the clergymen. With the gradual decay of the authoritarian grandeur of the Republic, the biggest and most significant of its kind in the entire history of the past, the human faith and confidence in the Omnipotent had to withdraw itself from its old exalted position. Heaven failed to heed the urge of men to assert his own independent identity. The dictates of the Church were no longer honoured. God had gone out leaving the artist in a state of darkness and solitude. The artist was at a loss regarding the choice of subject. The object of art is still the world, that Absolute, but Reality steals away, reversing the relation between the finite and the infinite. 'The Infinite is emptiness, darkness, inside and outside the creature; the Absolute is absence, it is God sequestered in human souls'. In the tussle between spirituality and almost material resurgence of humanism all over the West the creator had to breathe with great difficulty. 'Genius - a new word in Europe, a conflict between the Relative and the Absolute, between a finite presence and an infinite absence'. This period of history invites our extreme attention because of the loss of God from the heart of man under the pressure of existential limitations. Tintoretto 'the Little Dyer' had to thrash about in the pit of vipers having been infected with the moral neurosis which Henri Jeanne so aptly named as 'the frightening moral robustness of the ambitions'.
The name of this Little Dyer should be remembered with deepest regards in any discussion of the shaping of an artist's personality through the machination of the objective situations. Michaelangelo died obsessed with his ambition to become a noble man, an intellectual. Titian lived a pretty long life by soothing princes, reassuring them through his canvases that everything is for the best of this best of all possible worlds in a blantly escapist manner. His sky-high popularity rendered him free from the challenges of circumstances. But Tintoretto had never been popular that way. Most remarkable is the fact that he had to guard his own possibilities in the face of a ghastly flow of imported artistes. The shattering of the Republican glory in the seas and the rise of a new bourgeoisie replacing the old authoritarian set up through the growth of a working class formed a unique front of connoisseurs. The authors of the state when they found that the widening of their horizon was a must for a worthy survival, began to import artists. This is the time when the Republic of Venice, checked at sea and threatened by coalitions on the continent, turns to the hinterlands and tries through conquests to assert her might. Most of the new immigrants are from annexed territories. Painting is like all the other crafts in that the patriciate is responsible for facilitating the immigration of good artisans and - to prove what might be called their cosmopolitan chauvinism - for making the Republic of Doges into a melting pot. In the eyes of this distrustful and jealous aristocracy foreigners make the best Venetians. Tintoretto is charged with the guilt of having cared more for money and social security than for art. He is dubbed as a crazy 'Venetian pariah' who ran after commissions, sometimes by way of deception and imbecile cunning. Satre has scrutinised the facts of his life and showed that he was largely in the habit of stealing orders and was so bent upon making money that there was no respite in his life. 'To refuse a commission is to hand it over to my colleagues', He said, 'He has to produce at any cost, here the will of a men and that of a city coalesce.'
Tintoretto's painting first and foremost a passionate love affair between a man and a city. 'In the senseless romance the city is apparently even more foolish than the man.' But the man could not assess the betraying city. He neither could desert it for such a rejection would tantamount to a betrayal of his own evolving artist-self. Tintoretto felt the impulse of self exposition before an (national) audience evoked by a social security as he was born to a century when the old edifice of religious and royal art was blasted under pressure of challenging material circumstances. The Republic of Venice is hungry for prestige. Her ships have long accounted for her glory; tired and threatened with decline, she flaunts an artist. It was Titian. In the description of a fake royal grandeur made by Titian in his art the Republic pretended to recognise her own glory. A spirit of godlessness was creeping like a cankerworm to jaundice the heart of the city below the level of apparent consolation that the nobility of Venice was enjoying in the art of the aged master Titian. The greatest jeopardy that the artist had to face was that the centre of his business was the city as the entire bulk of buyers were citybred. 'The most telling argument is that no one at that time could work for himself. Today paintings are in demand; then painters were for sale. They lined the market place .... in the southern towns; buyers came, examined all of them, singled out one and took him to their church ...' 'Artists had to make themselves available, to advertise themselves ...' 'Everything was under contract; the subject, number, quality and sometimes even the attitude of the figures, and the dimensions of the canvas; these were complemented by the restrictions imposed by traditions relating to religion and to taste ... Intemperance, rejections of compromise, the superb choice of misery were out of the question since the artist had to provide for his family and keep his studio in operation ... In sum he had to renounce painting or to paint according to instructions. No one can blame Tintoretto for wishing to become rich ....
This utilitarian artist followed the principle that nothing is done for nothing — that painting would be a mere pastime unless it produced some income. He liked money, of course, but in the American way, and if he wanted to earn profusely, the psychology behind was to keep life going at the best speed. A decent social status, a stomach full of food for the family and a good stock of materials in the studio — these did not mean that the artist had to hoard money and rank himself as a representative of the petty bourgeoisie. The drive for making money definitely crowned Tintoretto with a lot of pretensions. He accepted commissions at the cost of his personal ideas of creativity. He depicted the fears of his neighbours who were always alert and somewhat suspicious of outsiders, pointed out the hopes that are permitted and those that are prohibited. Satre has assessed the artist by fittingly pointing out the affair below the level of compromise and deception. ... behind the sumptuous and banal facade of the realization, he pushes forward his experimentation. Each of his great works has a double meaning; its strict utilitarianism disguises an unending quest. Fitting his research into the frame of the paid commission, he is obliged to revolutionize painting even while respecting the stipulation of his client. The religious decadence which took place as a consequence of the rising confidence in human superiority over his environment could have affected the soul of the Christian 'pariah'. But he moulded his ambition to work in accordance with the need of the time in his own inimitable way. He did not run like Titian or other imported artists for a depiction of the clichés. He made his own personal life an epitome of staunch Christian faith by becoming extremely involved into his own family. He had many daughters and two sons. He established the studio the close of his life with daughters, sons and sons-in-laws just to give whole business a domestic colour. He also remained Christian by finding the mark of divine favour in the material success of his undertaking. In this respect he was stubborn & antitime. 

* Satre has titled the first essay as 'The Venetian Pariah'. 

---
Venice was not feeling the influence of the reformed religion and Satre is of opinion that the Republic rather reformed itself. The Venetian merchants for example owed their living to credit, ‘they cannot accept the sentence pronounced by the church on those whom it insists on labeling usurers, and they scorn Roman obscurantism in favour of science, especially when practical. The State has always affirmed the domination of civil authority and will not change its basic doctrine. The State has the upperhand over its clergy .... Furthermore the government has many reasons for considering the Holy See a temporal and military power rather than a spiritual power’. Beneath all these there lived a catholic who was to portray the rising protestant spirit in art but to remain faithful to his work as well as his own folks as a mark of service to the Divine. Tintoretto never disliked the people of Venice although he was constantly calling State into question. He painted on the walls of Scuola San Rocco, a poor country parish, ‘The middle class men formed the Brotherhood of this church. He regarded them as true public, the only public he loved.’ The history of Western art stands dazed before the magnificence displayed by Tintoretto the little dyer as he built an art of his own which was to become an art of the future by dint of the artist’s perseverance, diligence, love and a human aesthesis. He could have posed to be noble like Michelangelo. But he hated to be unfaithful to the spirit of freedom from the cliches that was engulfing Venice day by day. He never forgot that he was born in a troubled town; Venice was beginning to fear that would sink her into the sire of her lagoons; imagining that she would find salvation through Beauty, the supreme levity, she makes a pretense of transforming her palaces and canvases into buoys and floats’. When Tintoretto brought into painting the typical Venetian uneasiness almost unwittingly the age refused to accept him. The art of Tintoretto was filled with the absence of God and embellished by an exposition of the bourgeois reservations. Tintoretto was an idealist per excellence. ....
He was radical in approach and was thus a rebel against the norms of applied life around him. Whereas people wanted smooth, finished work, especially the impersonal element, the artist worked too fast and infused the spirit of the national personality in his works. Sartre has regrettably recalled how this great artist of a new age that was ushered by the new ways of materialism, commerce and humanism, had been taken amiss by his time by carrying the reader to the uncered grave of him. Tintoretto's works are not found in the best galleries of the world but the reality of his ardent zeal to objectify art in accordance with the changing nature of objective life is a pointer to truth that the artist has a duty to the time he belongs to. To put it in other words the artist is very much a creature of social situations and a critic of life in the true sense. There is no reason to call into question the relevance of an analysis of the genius of a backdated artist by an existentialist philosopher of the modern age. Sartre's theory of 'Being and Nothingness' which searches out the existence of an 'Other' power in all things of the world applies fittingly to his aesthetic enquiries. He has paid particular attention to the facts that contribute to the making of an artist as a social being tracing the centrifugal position of any Other power in the philosophical development of ideas in the artist's mind. 'No one paint or writes without a mandate, would anyone dare if I were not the Other?' Sartre has quoted from Justus Stirrer's 'To Freedom Condemned' a few lines at the footnote, 'The other is not only the one whom I see but the one who sees me and makes it possible for me to recognize that, I am as he sees me.... Sartre's existentialist philosophy has enlarged the scope of evaluating the artist in the perspective of the world he exists. His analysis of Tintoretto adds a good deal to our understanding of 'an art of the real.'

The history of art began as a means of communication between the artist and his environment. The art of the primitive man was as fast as the life that the early....
The art of the Renaissance was marked by a sumptuous sense of wonder awe and godliness. The art of the Mughals was an embodiment of the royal spirit because the artist was a member of the king's court and he had little or no scope to go beyond the walls of the king's palace in search of a subject. The art of late nineteenth and early twentieth century Bengal which was adequately pioneered by ace artists like Abanindranath Tagore, Gaganendranath Tagore, Rabindranath Tagore and others was thoroughly outlined by a spirit of escape from the gross realities of the world of matter. The artist of the nineteenth century Bengal had no scope to portray the tortuous reality of the social existence of himself because that would tantamount to a sort of treason against the viceregal authority of the state he belonged to. That would also give rise to a resultant disfavour of the rulers leaving the artist at bay at all fronts of social life. Why should Abanindra commit to the miseries of his master's mind or paint the bloodred eye of the British viceroy and stake his social security?

The spirit of Indian life has been marked by an utter subordination to a higher spiritual authority. Indians had been living under alien rulers for hundreds of years without much protest. At the core of Indian life lay a heritage of culture that once taught the world to reconcile to the vicissitudes of life by means of peace, poise and subordination renouncing malice, adamance and belligerence of all sorts. Indian artists of the ancient days (say the exponents of Maurya of Gandhara art) were concerned with spiritual decorations and delineations of their religious thoughts and ideas. A tradition of faith in the divine had remained embedded in the lap of history through fair and foul weather. There never was an art that did not represent the religious national culture. The artist had to face a very rough weather when the last of the rulers, the Britishman, came to impose an alien culture upon the Indian mind with a view to destroying the foundation of Indian culture to achieve a sheer colonialist supremacy over the masses.
The art of India would have swooned to death without an intelligent way of escape from the realities of subjugation and forcible adoption of imperial demigods as the saviour of the masses. When the political upsurges under the nationalist revolutionaries (who were to a large extent extremists) were reaching a climax at the beginning of the twentieth century the artist did not find any difficulty in expressing an escapist note by clinging doggedly to the traditional artistic temper of poise and sobriety. The theme of the paintings of the Bengal school of artists was in general, Nature or the human beings wearing a spirit of perfection and unearthliness. The root of the choice of such themes lay in the artist's awareness of the limits of material conditions in a land that had always tried to transcend materialism through a staunch faith in a superpower. The idealism flowed in the reversal process from the material and social insufficiencies. Escapism is a deliberate denial of situations. Indian art of the early twentieth century was not a denial. It was a refusal to accept the social subordination. It was an art of life, an art of the real in the sense that it gathered ingredients for the aesthetic idea to develop from the limitations of real life. Tintoretto suffered a great deal and was neglected as a pervert socialist, but he did not remove his feet from the scaffolding. His aim was successful as he reached the last state of integration set up between himself and his age, his city. The Indian artist, say Abanindranath never suffered from any mental lapse because he was tied to the spirit of Indianness that flowed from the distant ancient days having been marked by holiness, universal love and faith in the existence of the universe as a designed whole. There was an utter objectivity in Indian art of all times in its being a representation of the organic permanence of life through death and decay. The tree, the sky, the moon, the bird the beast and above all the human form attracted the Indian artist's attention as they all are pitted against a universal current of life. .......

No. 36.
A particular period of history with its particular inclinations to materialism and mutual exploitation had no lasting effect on art in general because Indian art never surrendered to the limits of time. It was marked by a perennial search for the timeless. There is no scope to deny the geographical difference of the Indian and Western temper which left an indelible mark of difference in the aesthetic attitude of the people of the Orient and the West.

Having acknowledged the difference one must search out the basic similarity of approach of the artists of both the sectors. The Indian artist of the last century or of the rear part of the present century was keen on inhibing the trend of universal piety, love and tenderness. This trend was present in the objective life of the country. This had embellished the country’s history. The apparent prosaic realities of material existence could easily be transformed if not transcended by the long poetry that was being written down time immemorial in the heart of the godblessed artist. Poetry is a matter of heart but the heart would have failed to feel its presence without following a process of desubjectification. The feeling of sweetness and light is poetry only when there is a form in it. I see the rivulet flow. The poetry is written only when I can draw my imagination to the inner beauty and rhythm that the rivulet has. My idea of the rivulet is formed only when I see it. The sensedatum which is termed as objective correlative by T.S. Eliot is the most important factor behind the formation of any feeling of the heart. For a student of art the dictates of Groce about the illogocality of any formal expression of aesthetic feeling are fallacious. Whether we call artistic exercise a translation or not is not the point. Most important is the exercise, the formation of something that can be felt with the help of the bodily senses. The Indian mind was reciprocal to the inner music of existence. It was so engrossed in the music that there was no trouble in outdoing the impact of material strifes on political or other social fronts.
The art of India is significant in the perspective of the rising material and antiartistic forces all over the world. The Indian artist had never been callous about the social validity of his creation. He wanted to ideate upon the traditional channels of a universal understanding of particular things. By art one means an approach to a being of beauty and joy. If an artist wants to reach it keeping himself in tune with the temperament of his native audience, no one can deter him. Neither can anyone tell him that he is not representing the social condition. An artistic exercise does not fall into the category of explaining or criticising the social situations. When the general tendency of the audience is towards a larger-than-life ideal, the artist has every right to depict it. When similarly the general tendency of the audience is towards the material reality the artist may depict it with equal importance. What matters is the artist's direct participation in the social condition, the temperament of the masses, the ambitions and frustrations of them. 'The artist of the real' is not the man who cuts his ideas according to the size of his demand. He is a translator of others' ideas as well as his own ideas. This gives rise to a social validity of art as in the case of Indian artist and the Venetian artist. The differences of century do not acquire any remarkable dimension. What is worth noting is the artist's awareness of a world outside him and the entry of this world with all its lights and darkness into the artist's own world. Art of the Real does not abandon the possibility of a thorough moulding of the external world in the artist's hand. But the mould must necessarily have an objective correlative. Sometimes the artist may not include the objective element, but the artwork will bear an objective relevance. A serious affinity of the artist with the events around him, the temperament of the people around him, and the problem that are faced by persons around him independent of his existence, makes possible an 'art of the real'. An 'art of the real' is a system, an approach towards the concept of aesthetic creation in consideration of the accepted universal system by a particular man.
For each an acceptance, the man concerned, that is the artist has to transform his own concept with an eye to catering to the needs of his audience. The artists have been trying to do the same since the beginning of art. The philosophers have been inflaming the artists' will to transform by growing a material fibre around the whole system of human thought.

But before any conclusive remark is made about the matter, an enquiry into the possible devaluation of aesthetic qualities under the impact of objectification should be made for once. Romain Rolland has thrown some valuable lights upon the relation between artist and his social responsibilities drawing us nearer the danger of considering art as a social service and an utility-oriented social or moral work.

Romain Rolland's preoccupation with the idea of social unity, and its acceptance as the summa bonum in the context of human society, largely determined his aesthetic ideas. Aesthetic value was pragmatically determined by him for he was a humanist at the first instance and then an artist. He was largely influenced by Count Leo Tolstoy, and his outlook on life and art bears testimony to such influence. An artist, according to Rolland, having nothing to do with other people's welfare is no artist worth the name. The aesthetics of Rolland was founded upon a concept of universality that binds different human animals into a broad human race and that unites different phases of the history of world into a monumental record of the eternity of life through time. Like Indian seers who say Bhuma Sukaam, naive sukhamasti - 'The Infinite alone is blissful, there is no happiness in the finite'; he wanted to evince a dogmatic faith upon the human ambition to identify the mind with the Infinite. His zeal for the Absolute was almost a religion. The timeless is his true world. Among latter day Frenchmen, none but Victor Hugo and Balzac have had this glorious fervour for the monumental, among the Germans, none has had it since Richard Wagner, among contemporary Englishmen, none perhaps, but Thomas Hardy.
It was easily possible for Rolland to cast his faith upon a social validity of art because of his ardent desire to look through the mirror as a moralist. He was desirous of reforming his society by harnessing art as a social service. Rolland was opposite of Plato in the sense that while Plato wanted to reject the business of art as unnecessary for the society, he wanted art to be treated as a social necessity. Tolstoy was Rolland’s ideal in his notion of the good. ‘Well, if the champions of Science and of Art have the good of humanity as their object, they should not ignore it, and if they do not ignore it, they should cultivate only those arts and sciences which lead to the fulfilment of that object’. (vide Tolstoy’s letter to Rolland) Tolstoy identified art with science considering the aim of the both as same. The criterion for him was to accept art as a medium of unity between men. He was a humanist at the first instance. The peculiarity of Rolland was that he at first accepted Tolstoy unquestioningly and altogether rejected the very concept of art as a social service at the mature age. Aesthetic experience leaves us more suited to our practical life through a process of catharsis, and this was the Greek legacy. Rolland thought of introducing ‘People’s Theatres’ with a view to tutoring public mind and initiating them in the higher standards of public morals. Plato abandoned amusement art from ideal Republic for saving the Greek people from moral bankruptcy. Tolstoy too found in his contemporary art a sort of sectarianism which he treated as fatal to the progress of art. But as Rolland advanced in age he was not totally convinced of such an office of art as was assigned to it by Tolstoy. He wrote to Tolstoy on one occasion. ‘I believed to have understood that you condemn Art because you detect there the selfish desire of subtle enjoyments which make our selfishness more coarse by the hyperexcitability of our senses. But is not art something else, something more?’ In his magnumopus John Christopher, Rolland had expressed this doubt in many ways although this book is not wholly free from its author’s idea of investing art with a thoroughly didactic fervour. ‘But, above all, if you were musicians, you would make pure music, music which has no definite meaning, music which has no definite use, save only to give warmth, air and life.’
Tolstoy had been keen on freeing humanity from the heaviness of selfish desires through aesthetic exercises which broadened the scope of human knowledge and made men's minds a seat of generosity embedded upon a moral standard of judgement. But the artist in Holland was not fully convinced of such a conscious purpose of the artist. He was certain about the reaction of art on the society in a way that may lead to its betterment. The progress of Rolland's thought was marked by an awareness of a basic spiritual unity existent in the universe of diversified functions. Croce has justified the spiritual unity in the following manner. He says: 'Though art is neither the slave nor the handmaid of morality or philosophy, it is always buried with both, for its business is that of the spiritual unity which comes to its own as a necessary and unique manifestation'. Art is a source of constant energy for mankind. It is not harnessed by the inactive and idle mind. Drama, for example, should urge people to act, for 'the happiness of simple and healthy men is never complete without some sort of action. Let the theatre be an arena of action'. An artwork is the representation of an organic structure that harmonizes the conflicting forces within. If we are to accept, according to Rolland, art as a booster of social welfare it lies in the catering of this harmonizing and organic structure. If art is a business of feeling and empathy, Rolland is ready to ascribe to it a social colour and he is not opposed to moral bias of it as well. In his introduction to 'The People's Theatre', Rolland then gives rise to another argument in favour of a social character of art. He says that art to be living should have a constant communion with the life around; when art ceases to commune with life, it is dead. The first requisite to a normal healthy existence of man is that art shall continually evolve together with life itself. By shunning classical art as 'embalmed mummies of the past', Rolland has tried to evince the dictum that nothing is good except in its place and time. This is a direct refutation of the universality, the eternal immutable element in all true art. Rolland's idea of a People's Theatre was intensified by his almost fashionable refutation of the universal element in art...
He asked the theatre maker to mould the public taste by inserting into his art his own personal ideas and not strictly by committing to the ideas of the public. He gave a clarion call to the dramatists to become 'Napoleons of public taste'. "It was the artist's business to lead the public, but not the public to the artist". (John Christopher). One critic of Rolland has categorically pointed out the apparent contradiction that became prominent in the aesthetics of this dignified Frenchman particularly in the early phase of his life. The artist, Rolland says, will have to give something new, something unique in character to his people without which art becomes stagnant and lifeless. Because artists are free to present new things, we have progressed so much in the realm of art. Now, if the artist leads mankind from one age to the other by creating for them new ways of seeing and appreciating things, there automatically arises a question of universality in art. If the artist caters to the public taste by way of putting before the public an ideal and not by way of committing to what they want, the chance for liberating art from the shackles of time is naturally available. Why then refute classics including Beethoven and Shakespeare? Rolland's attitude towards these great artists was equal to that of Tolstoy. But fortunately Rolland did not entrap himself in this contradiction. In our assessment of a social validity of art, Rolland's recognition of an elan vital (i.e., lifeforce) in all things carries a great deal. He wanted dynamism in art. For the sake of dynamism he was sometimes too much overzealous about the insignificance of classics. Dynamism in artist for him is a perennial source of joy, and this joy is born of spiritual activity which is the essence of artistic creation. Due to the existence of a lifeforce and an acknowledgement of it by the artist, an artwork can adapt itself even to sorrow. 'To live is to live too much... A man who does not feel within himself this intoxication of strength, this jubilation in living - even in the depths of misery is not the artist. That is the touchstone. True greatness is shown in the power/rejoicing through joy and sorrow (John Christopher)
Holland's arguments seem to be quite consistent when he says that the flow of life affects changes in the level of art. The life of the Renaissance left a stamping impression upon the art of Tintoretto, Michaelangelo, Raphael, Leonardo da Vinci and so on. Religion was the essential ingredient for the shaping of an ideal mental climate in all standards of life. A new concept of humanism was given prime importance and it was gradually believed that the seat of religion lies in the heart of the man by whose belief and worship God has become a god and Satan has been rendered an eternal assailant. The artists of the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries could not think of taking themselves out of the fabric of social life. But they were not bogged in social maladies for their tremendous life-force. To trace a social validity of art one has to accept as a foremost duty the artist's conscious involvement with an immanent force of life that is present in the universe independent of the artist. The formation of an 'art of the real' is possible only when art is treated as a consequence of the artist's direct encounter with an objective state of life. Holland had been obsessed by a utility lore at the initial phase of his career. But his John Christopher rectified many of his misconceptions. He soon shifted from an inordinate acceptance of art as social service to the secret of an existent life-force that impregnates the artist and. We could profitably recall what Croce has said in this context.

"Art is health, not disease, and is not decadent, for it is a cause of life and of greater humanity..." De Sanctis, in refuting certain romantic anticipations of our modern pure art, wrote that the bird sings for song's sake but in singing expresses all its life, all its being, every instinct and every need, its whole nature. So a man if he is to sing, must be a man as well as an artist. (My Philosophy)

Similar comment has been made by Goethe too. "They try to make you believe that the fine arts arise from our supposed inclination to beautify the world around us. That is not true. Art is formative long before it is beautiful and yet it is then true and great art, very often true and greater than beautiful art itself."
For man has in him a formative nature, which display itself in activity as soon as his existence is secure. The wholeness of life includes its rough visibility; and art, reflecting this wholeness, necessarily reflects this seamy side of life as well. Health means the propulsion which takes us through, and this 'Health' is abundantly reflected in our art activity. The artist has to reflect this health. Such a reflection is the only reality for the artist. The artist cannot reflect unless he is conscious about its presence within the mind. The mind is to a large extent operated by the conditions of the body. But the health that is the life exists in the body most permanently. The artist has to turn towards it for it reflects itself upon the path of his vision in the deepest possible manner. This reflection has made possible a Gulliver's arrival in literature despite its maker's chronic dispepsia, this has inspired a consumptive Keats or a morbid, Strindberg and an utterly neurotic Eliot to offer to the world bouquets of best flowers of prose and poetry. The artist has nothing to do except to keep his senses open for communication. If he was the creator and conductor of this life-force there would have no trouble with matters like the artist's adoptability to his time, his expressiveness and the like. He would then have turned towards sorrow, death and other human miseries without entering into the inward tussle that remains constant between life and death. The artist's search for an absolute state of enlightenment bears testimony to his approval of a state beyond his personality. If you do not have something to discover why you search? The urge to discover is a reality for the artist's mind insofar as the mind has a natural responsiveness. Without a response the element of responsiveness would cease or turn into a subjective sort of suffering equal to that of the suffering of a lover whose love remains unrequitted. Such lovers generally turn cynical and spiritless exiling themselves into a state of anticreativity. The artist experiences the stream of life in the form of pervading force.
It is a force, "... a comet sweeping through the infinite." Rolland believed in the universality of art and his John Christopher identified this force of life with a lightning darted from heaven. He had evidently moved far away from the initial position that art must always be relative to the time, place, and circumstances and that it is no art unless it reflects the spirit of the time. Rolland's utility lore was gradually revalued in the light of the truth that there was something of permanent and lasting value in art. But Rolland did not stop here. He explained his own stand threadbare by making an assessment of the artist-audience relationship. He was never in a position to admit of any valuable participation of the audience in an artistic process. He called the common multitude the 'herd.' In his discussion on Beethoven, Rolland had categorically pointed to the link that the artist has with the rest of humanity. The link might be one of antagonism and conflict. Great artists, say Johann Sebastian Bach, Handel, Mozart, and Beethoven all of them composed or wrote for an audience and were linked in some way or other to the entire temperament of the audience. It is good for humanity, Rolland tells us (John Christopher) 'to remind genius every now and then.' The callousness of the people leaves the genius in a state of spiritual unrest, and the constant discrepancy between the genius's sensibility and the people's complacency leads to a deepening of the artist's awareness. Aronson in his book on Rolland describes this relation in the following manner: 'The relation between the genius and the people is always one and the same; as in a love relationship the tension between two human beings leads to a deepening of affections.' Rolland has brilliantly jumped at the conclusion that when the artist expresses, he not only expresses his subjective emotions and feelings, but those of the people of his time. Through constant action and reaction, the contemporary society and her people contribute largely towards the making of the artist's mind and, when the artist desubjectifies the subjective reactions, they are no more of any particular individual, but they belong to all. ...

* He opined in the same vein about Oriental music accepting thereby the genealogy of true art in the core of the past and approving the element of timelessness in art.
But this hypothesis of Holland seems to be overdrawn and there may be an opposite argument to the following effect. Although the stimulus offered to the artist evokes the artistic creation but it cannot be considered as representing the subjective reaction of the people of a whole society under similar circumstances. This is the starting point of an 'art of the real'. The modern age has accepted the challenge of science in an humble way and the growth of intellect has posed a veritable baffie for the emotion to develop in its own accord. The artist of the present era has to face an audience that does not want to desubjectify subjective reactions during the intercourse with the artist through an art work. The artist too does not want to move away from his personal reactions to an aesthetic emotion of his own mind and what he paints or sculptes is a formal expression of his personality only. The artist's argument is same as his audience. He says that his subjective reactions should be portrayed in his art and there is an element of catharsis in his expression of the complex and sometimes grotesque forms which are prototypes of the mental complexity and the complexity of his approach towards life at large. The audience is split into individuals and there arises a claim for the representation of personal reactions to the thing portrayed on individual grounds. The same element of catharsis is the determining factor in the latter case too.

When a gentleman sits through a film say on the life of the Eskimos of Alaska he adopts his subjective convictions to the events of the celluloid and this adoption is to a large extent independent of the impression that is possessed by his wife who is sitting just beside him and interrupting his concentration by pointing to this and that significance of the film as per her own personal choice and mood. If there are one thousand men and women in an auditorium there shall be one thousand Othellos and one thousand Shakespeares in consequence. Same was the case with other ages. But the trouble with the present age is that the world of personality has imposed a short of stubbornness upon the whole approach. The factors that determine the course of such an approach may easily traced in the modern man's knowledge of world, his sense of impersoneness, his selfdetermination, his mental heaviness due to a huge existential insecurity and the like. All these have cropped up from the complexity of relationship that a man has with the rest of the entire existence.
The reaction that I will have at the sight of a painting shall automatically relate itself with the relationship that I have with the entire existence. If my relationship with the existence is trained by many negative forces I shall naturally try to smear my approach with negativity. When a spirit is negative the tendency to express it is greater because the deprived soul finds a shelter in the cathartic expression of the negativity that he has to experience under certain circumstances. The irritated Calcuttan who has to reach the artgellery by an overcrowded bus in a state of suffocation will find the exhibit less impressive. The tire of the body is a veritable impediment for a smooth appreciation. The visitor may have a sensitive heart, he may have an ample appetite for things of beauty, but he has to surrender to the circumstances. The Renaissance buyer's way of surrendering was marked by sobriety and there was no apparent contradiction in the acceptance of the different trends (like the religious trend) that were adopted in art. There was little complexity in the aesthetic expositions and the directness of an artist's approach flowed from the artist's direct affiliations of relations with the run of life at large. But the case is different with the modern artist. Then, the artwork was sold. The artists had to stand in a queue in the market place. Now, the artist is sold. You buy a painting more because it is signed by Matisse or Picasso. The person, the artist is our point of attraction. He has been suffering from various mental depressions because of the excessive individuality that has been imposed upon him. He is accommodating his personal experiences as an individual. The audience too is an individual and it does not fail to create his own world as he sees an art. This world is in most cases negative in the modern age. The same suffering due to an excessive individuality lies at the audience side. Both the parties are related to their personal problems and both are instinctually cathartic of the problems with a penchant for solution. Art is jeopardised in the tug of war. The issue is no longer of a social constructiveness.
Rolland's discovery of an elan vital in art like Bergson was not a solution from the problem of self-regardness. To settle up the problem that has possibly posed an obstacle between his conception of art and its audience, Rolland brought the issue of humanism in art. The sincere feeling for others is a condition precedent to all due artistic creation. The 'other-regardlessness', to borrow a word from Croce, is the sine qua non of Rolland's conception of art and in this regard he did not reject Tolstoy's assessment of art even when he contradicted Tolstoy on many other points and finally opined that Tolstoy had been rendered immortal not by his social sense but by his aesthetics in general.

In this connexion we may refer to his earlier observations regarding popular art. Rolland once wrote to Dilip Kumar Roy (Among the Great: D.K.Roy), 'There was a time you know, when I was not very well-off, when I could afford only the galleries how tho faces of those hard worked poor people about leapt to life whenever the music or the acting caught fire? What Rolland meant was simple. A single symphony of Beethoven surpasses in moral effect half a dozen social reforms. The more downtrodden the community, the greater is its spiritual need for art. Being inspired with such a concept Rolland applied upon the artist a few social responsibilities and gave an abstract explanation of the artist's stand. Our society is full of mental injustice and inequity. The artist's greatest virtue is his awareness and realisation of an inner universal unity in apparent diversity. He searches this unity being inspired by an inner instinctual creative impulse.

Even if the artist is not directly a social reformer, he is occupied by the mission of offering to the humanity the truth of integration and in this respect he is no less than a philosopher. Rolland's search for a true nature of art was prompted by his discovery of a final basis of all aesthetic understanding. 'Now my whole life has taught me this, that the first and paramount duty of the artist and the intellectual is to be true to his inner call and urge sleeplessly....
...... he must above all keep the lamp burning in the shrine of inner perceptions and must create when his daemon prompts him'. Rolland in the ultimate analysis believed in the theory of 'art for art's sake' and agreed to the concept that no aesthetic pleasure is in the least ephemeral. Without a didactic note a poem or a novel can be quite bracing and alleviating. In course of his talks with Mr. D.K. Roy he once referred to a lady named Malinda von Myresberg who was his friend. This lady was highly cultured. In her reminiscences she wrote that once in a great crisis of her life she witnessed a performance of Othello, which gave her a clue to the meaning of life, so much so, that she recaptured the thrill of life, and colour where there had been only a grey waste of lifelessness. Othello is not full of morals. If a lady extracts a moral cream from it we should try to appreciate her by categorizing her stand as accidental. The same Othello may be irritating to another, flatly pleasing to somebody else. Rolland has rightly assessed the true nature of art by declassing it. 'Art is like the sun whence it is sprung. The sun is neither moral nor immoral. It is amoral. It is that which is. It lightens the darkness of space. And so does Art.' (John Christopher).

Romain Rolland's observations are useful in our understanding of an 'art of the real'. An 'art of the real' is a conception based upon the problem of expression that haunts the whole bulk of modern artists and artlovers. The feeling of a universal unity which is phrased as organic unity in an earlier occasion is suppressed in the artist's mind due to a heavy pressure of existential problems. The artist of the modern age is more interested to express than to voice a particular say. When he sees a discord or an anachronism, he is possessed by an urge to depict the discord as it is. The expression robs him of his inner aesthetic will to right the wrong. The result is utter complexity and mysteriousness. The artist's objectivity lies in the imposition of his ideal self upon his real instinctual self. ......
He does not paint what exactly flows from his mind. He idealises the flow internally of an ideal accord. In the process he serves the visitor by placing an inkling of the ideal that maintains balance between discords. He is possessed by an ideal that is common and universal to all who belong to his class. The sense of proportion that the artists like Michaelangelo maintained is seen in Giaconetti or Lapoujade. The criterion is same for all. What is different is the expression. The expression is conditioned by the artist's knowledge of the world and most pertinently the demands of his time. The life in modern age is not bound by any common norm. Each entity has its own world, own norm, own spectacle to see things and there is myopia in every pair of eyes. The lack of proper understanding of the pervading organic unity issues from our ways of seeing things which are mostly determined by the smallness of our range. Rolland's stress on the presence of a universal harmony in the artist's consciousness of things requires a revaluation in the present perspective and it is urgent for the modern man to consider the artist as an important member of the society for this power of the artist. Art is no longer for art's sake. It is for the life's sake. By life is meant the social life in particular. The tendency of the modern man is towards a subjectification of all things. The will to express which has crowned man with the honour of the best of creations, has been subjectified to such an extent that the expression appears to be utterly imposing, unwilling and thus anti-artistic. The artist has to rectify his expression by allowing the objective elements a bonafide entry into the realm of his creation. He has to be 'an artist of the real'. His reality shall be an intense and conscious effort to express things in the light of a universal understanding of things. An 'art of the real' is a way out of the complexity that the art of the recent times suffers in the hands of the subjectively provoked artist. The development of art from the prehistoric days to the modern era is one of a continuous striving of the artists for objectification of their subjective feelings. .......
...... But the subjective state of the artist's mind has always been the actual
maker. There has been misunderstanding between the artist and his audience
regarding the visual symmetry and intelligibility of a work of art of the bygone
times. The problem arose with the emphasis on the physical elements of life in
general the root of which may be traced in the artist's rapport with the applied
earthly life and his particular attention to a comfortable social existence as an
individual free from the guidance of any authority. Freedom of expression which
is a boon to mankind and which is a result of the liberation of the human soul
from various authoritarian bondages, has let loose an anarchy of approach. The
best example of it may be found in the Surrealist art movements in the major
art centres of Europe. The artists of the war ridden Europe planned to project
their personal imaginations which generally occur in the state of dream and which
are in most cases beyond the ken of intelligible reality. They did it because
their creative urges were thoroughly numbed by the experiences of macabre death,
harrowing social insecurity and fear for an impending loss of moral. If there was
an ideal institution to control their activities, the post war artists would never
have committed to such peculiar sorts of expressions as jeopardise the abstract
and motiveless aesthetic enjoyments. The artist himself was his own institution.
Whatever he thought he chalked out, expressed to a few friends and formed a party.
When we study the history of art of the last two hundred years we are amazed to
learn that an almost infinite number of movements were launched and rejected all
over Europe. The restless nature of history bears testimony to the fact that the
artist was no longer holding an ideal. He was making and unmaking values for a
mental order and peace to achieve and this he did absolutely on a personal level.
Another important point is the supremacy of the European culture over the world
of art in general. The wars and the sumptuous growth of materialistic impulses in
mind of man were taking the artist down to the level of a reality that was never
on land or sea. ....
The mind of man was content to be governed by matter so much so that a
greater importance was paid to the western part of the globe and even eastern
mind; particularly the Indian mind, also began to run after westernisation of all
sorts, taking its own heritage of abstract idealism. India could not give rise
to any art movement of universal significance whereas the oriental artists easily
cought hold of the spirit of almost all major art movements of the West and in a
majority of cases virtually imitated the spirit. The exponents of Existentialist
movement in literature viz. Albert Camus, Sartre, Kafka, of Dadaism, Surrealism
and Cubism in painting viz. Dalí, Braque and Picasso became the idols of eastern
artists. To cut a long story short, the modern movements of art suffer from an
innate complexity due to the pressure of opposing circumstances. The complexity
began with the end of the Impressionist movement. The early Dadaists who came
after the Impressionists expressed the dynamics of the modern age directly by
violently dismembering natural objects, creating new images and sensations
and expressing the new age of sound, noise, automobiles and radios. At the same
time Futurism in Italy issued manifestos concerning the dynamics of movement
and portrayed the new age by showing several positions of an object simultaneously.
A sort of structural constructivism followed through the use of new materials
like glass, metal, plastic and so on. But the essence of materialising art lay
in the artist’s conscious endeavour to subjectify matter which was in most
cases fatal for true art. Paralleling the above art movements and interacting with
them was the work of Pablo Picasso (born 1881), Georges Braque (born 1881), Juan
Gris, Joan Miró, Marc Chagall, Paul Klee, to mention only a few. Too much concern
over forms led to the development of new art forms (as in Picasso’s case) through
the breaking down of realistic objects to the emotionally integrated lines, planes,
colours and textures. .....

* Ibid.
* Ibid.
The result was the appearance of abstract art. 'Strongly influenced by Impressionistic work of the Fauvists, of whom Matisse was the leader and by the automatic expression of African Negro sculpture, Picasso began to paint his subject matter in strong simple forms and then to dismember it into numerous and violently contrasted shapes.* Cubism left open the scope to use the subject matter as a means to understand the relation of three-dimensional space and perceptual form to the two-dimensional flat surface. 'In seeking the roots of creative experience in painting, Picasso began to eliminate realistic space and rejected preconceived systems of design. The new art form suited Picasso and his associates best. The Cubists said that 'since a painting is dependent upon its abstract structure, the artist may wish to work only with this structure'.

'This does not mean the modern artist is unable to use realism (the superb realistic works of Picasso, for example) but rather that he often chooses not to use it'. The wish of the artist as and when it went to the extent of formalising the content and pouring in objective element in its raw form into the subject matter, was necessarily tempered by the complex nature of circumstances. Why otherwise the artist was gradually freeing himself/the depiction of simple forms in simple manner? Why he was running after the structural complexity of simple things like a reclining female or a bird or a street scene? The artist of the Cubic period painted in so indirect a manner that his touch with the greater section of the public was often lost. Without least remorse the artist progressed and there began a general contact between himself and his seers. The artist is liked by his seers for the newness of approach and (may be) for the identification of his seer's complex attitude to things with his solitude. An attempt was made to set up a common criterion of indirectness which, peculiarly enough, was a method of experimenting with objective elements and distorting the objective world in accordance with the critical condition of the artist's mental health. ....

* Ibid.
Where the criterion is not accepted there is the inevitable cleavage into the dark of which art is buried. In a majority of cases however there is a reciprocation.

Surrealism may be placed as an instance in point. Surrealism had its early roots in the work of the Dadaists. It may be defined as the combination of irrational images or subjects not ordinarily associated. The sources of its imagery are dreams, uncensored imagery, imagination and other psychological phenomena. The Surrealist stresses the difference between the inner world of imagery and the outer world of perception. He sees with his inner eye, and attempts to project many of the images that occur... The fact that man does not thoroughly understand himself and the functioning of his mind - that he lives partly in dreamlike unconscious world - gives reality to Surrealist expression. But the expression must be substantially related to conscious creative experience and not because a substitute for the reality of it... The Surrealist artist seeks to include psychological factors which have existence in his creative experience.* The result of it all is the juxtaposition of thoroughly contradictory elements in art. The seer of such an art often catches the psychological factor in his own way and finds delight in it. The description of the unconscious in a conscious manner bears a peculiar (sometimes queer) result as in the case of the lady's head mentioned above. The seer is satisfied to see the queer upon the canvas because it is an almost uncensored description of the artist's mental state and it is symptomatic of a fellow humanbeing's mental unrest. It is instinctual in man to find solace in a replica of himself particularly when the mind is restive and in need of a solace. The modern seer is glad to learn that the artist is trying to portray his own mental images without pretending to be deceit and sober. The social behaviour of man is so pretentious that such a confessional portrayal is a sort of relief, a release of tension.

* Ibid.
The hunger for an identification surpasses the appetite for sweetness and light. Where the latter is strong the chance for the progress of modern art is absolutely absent. The artist where he fails to impress is definitely trying to treat as ideal what is real. The 'art of the real' does not claim to deprive the artist of his subjectivity (that is the fusion of his psychological factors with his creative experience). What it tries to add is a layer of sensibility that will respond to the truth that art is for himself and for others as well who may or may not get any impetus from seeing the enactment of what they see in their respective personal ways. The 'art of the real' is a suggestion to the artist to grow audience-conscious and to believe that the audience wants anything but a sheer identification. The 'art of the real' is the quest for a reality of the artist who is convinced about the essential incisedness of things. It is a reminder to the truth that the world of the artist is one of illusion. The artist if he forgets it and becomes despairis about painting what he seen in reality with no modification through a method of personal scrutiny, has to remake the very illusion of existence; Such a remake will foreshorten the scope to see beyond the border. Unless the urge and sight to seen beyond is there, unless a feeling of depth is attached to the surface of appreciation, there is no need of art. In the present context of things in particular, the above scopes are extremely necessary for the affairs within the border are but the reenacting of a Frankenstein myth. The urge to analyse and realise makes human mind much committed to the material aspects. Thescape instinct which has been man's one of the oldest possessions is crushed under the yoke of matter. Human idealism has a close affinity to a sort of escapism. To dissociate human mind from escapism is to hurt a blow to the very essence of life. Such a blow is constantly hurled by science and technology with strong empiricistic impulses all around. If the artist too commits to 'analysis and realisation' process, there is chance for a further lowering down of the level of values.
The artist has to respond to the urges of his audience to run, for a few minutes at least, from the arbitrariness of life, instead of giving him a drug that benumbs his consciousness for the Other. Susanne Langer has discussed the relationship of the artist with his audience in a novel way in her book Feeling and Form (The work and the public; Chapter 21). She agrees that in one sense the artist makes each piece for himself, for his own satisfaction. This is called 'the studio standpoint'. But in another sense the artist makes it for the people as well. '... that is one of the differences between art and reveries'. A work of art has a public - at least a hypothetical public and its social intent which is essential to it, sets its standard of significance. Even a person who produces a work so unfamiliar, so difficult and original that he has no hope of meeting with intuitive understanding from his fellows, works, with the conviction that when they have contemplated it long enough the intuition of its import will come. Such a person also thinks that 'consequently the most serious and competent judges will contemplate it long enough to transcend its shocking character and find it lucid'. 'The public function of the art symbol imposes on it a standard of complete objectivity.' The artist should never frame an idea of the kind of public for his particular art. 'He works for an ideal audience. Even when he paints a mural, knowing what public will use the building that houses his work, he paints for his idealization of the public, or he paints badly.' 'The ideal beholder' on the other hand, 'is the measure of a work's objectivity'. Susanne Langer has cut a novel way of approaching art appreciation by rejecting the theory of art as communication. 'The artist is not saying anything, not even about the nature of feeling; he is showing. He is showing us the appearance of feeling, in a perceptible symbolic projection; but he does not refer to a public object, such as a generally known sort of feeling, outside his work. Only in so far as the work is objective, the feeling it exhibits becomes public; it is always bound to its symbol.'
The effect of this symbolisation is to offer the beholder a way of concerning emotion, and that is something more elementary than making judgements about it. The art lover responds to the feeling of the artist as would to a natural symbol. And this feeling is not 'communicated', but 'revealed'. The author has tried to enter into this emotional fabric which according to her is the original basis of all arts. An aesthetic emotion is a psychological effect of the artist's artistic activity. The aesthetic emotion is really a pervasive feeling of exhilaration, directly inspired by the perception of good art. It is the pleasure that art is supposed to give. The direct perception of such an emotion may occur when we look at nature with the painter's 'eye'. (that is, when anything strikes us as beautiful whether we are artists or ordinary men). The credit of the artist lies in his tackling of the natural objects as expressive through forms. Expressiveness is the means through which the perception or the aesthetic emotion is introduced to us. 'Beauty is not identical with the normal, and certainly not with charm and sense appeal, though all properties may go to the making of it. Beauty is expressive form'. 'The entire qualification one must have for understanding art is responsiveness.' This quality of responsiveness does not depend upon intellectual exercise. A work of art 'clarifies and organises intuition itself. That is why it has the force of a revelation, and inspires a feeling of deep intellectual satisfaction, though it elicits no conscious intellectual work'. 'In art, it is the impact of the whole, the immediate revelation of a vital import, that acts as the psychological urge to long contemplation.' The reading or experiencing of a work of appreciable length like novel, dance music etc. thus should begin with the introduction of the reader to the whole of it. In case of a drama, 'Every playgoer has been made aware now and then of the existence in the theatre of a supreme unity, a mysterious power, a transcendent and urgent illusion, which, so to speak, floats above the stage action and above the spectator, endowing him with a vision, a sense of translation and ecstasy, alien to his common knowledge of himself.'
Langer has referred to Charles Morgan's book *The Nature of Dramatic Illusion* in this connexion and the above lines are from Morgan. Furthering her arguments, Langer says 'art penetrates deep into personal life because in giving form to the world, it articulates human nature: sensibility, energy, passion and morality. More than anything else in experience, the arts mold our actual life of feeling. This creative influence is a more important relation between art and contemporary life than the fact that motifs are derived from the artist's environment.' The artist's training therefore is the education of feeling, as our usual schooling in factual subjects, and logical skills such as mathematical figuring or simple argumentation is the education of thought. But any survey of the present context of things reveals how the very conception of art is gradually disintegrated from feeling. Art now is a science and the tendency of the artist is to treat art as a special branch of knowledge. The artlover also is contemplating over the aspect of knowledge in any aesthetic experience. The more he wants to learn the greater is the gap between the artist and himself. 'People who are so concerned for their children's scientific enlightenment that they keep Grimm out of the library and Santa Claus out of the chimney...' If the rank and file of the youth grow up in emotional cowardice and confusion, sociologists look into economic conditions or family relations for the cause of this deplorable 'human weakness', but not to the ubiquitous influence of corrupt art, which steeps the average mind in shallow sentimentalism that ruins the germ of true feeling....'. In this regard there is reason, according to Langer, to compare art with religion. In the early part of the history, art was governed by religion. But 'the arts became liberated, as the saying is, from religion, they simply have exhausted the religious consciousness, and draw upon other sources'. The gap began to grow as a sequel to the above. The artist hastened to express anything in the past without least care to place before his hypothetical public a rigid ideal to which the public is supposed to respond and from which the aesthetic pleasure is supposed to be derived.
The public on the other hand failed to appreciate the expressiveness of the symbols and forms supplied. The author then has referred to Shakespeare and Ibsen. There is, according to him, in works of these authors, an engagement of individual existence as a whole, and of its complete development to the limits of action and passion. 'This engagement ... is a necessity to people who have attained a mature self-consciousness;... once the sense of tragedy dawns in us, we are haunted by it, and crave to see it clarified and composed'. Few people know why tragedy is a source of deep satisfaction; they invent all sorts of psychological explanations, from emotional catharsis to a sense of superiority because the hero's misfortunes are not one's own. But the real source is the joy of revelation, the vision of a world wholly significant, of life spending itself and death the signature of its completion. In one sense the artist is definitely a principal beneficiary of his genius. 'Every successful work it is primarily his problem that he has solved, his mind that he has enlightened. But he does not rest in his creations, as the lay public does: his formulations and revelations are an end product in him. His reward is the image, not the use of it, for while other people contemplate and enjoy it and incorporate his vision in their lives, he is already in pursuit of another'. Had the artist been content with the image he would never have projected it through newer forms, nor would he reject one image and run for the other. The artist is the hero but the performance is not a one-man show. There are others too. The imagination of the artist and the consequent symbols that categorised the imagination as productive would have been a cry in the wilderness without an audience. A phase came in the history of art that was replete with the artist's attempt to scatter his imagination beyond the reach of the public. That the artist was deliberate in his behaviour; his passion for playing with personal forms, his running after hitherto undescribed of form and above all his desire to add a special psychological value to the created form, gave rise to an art that was automatically beyond the public reach.
Alberto Giacometti (1901-1966), the Swiss artist for example transformed his art into a projection of the vacuum that exists everywhere between every two subject or form. The figures of men that he sculpted seem to remain at a distance from us and there is a vacuum. His intention was, as Sartre has disclosed in his Essays in Aesthetics, to fill the vacuum by way of making us aware of it. 'His figurines are solitary, but when placed together, no matter how, they are united by their solitude and transformed into a small magical society.' 'One of Giacometti's scenes is a crowd. He has sculptured men crossing a public square without seeing each other; they pass, hopelessly alone and yet together, they will be forever lost from each other, yet would never lose each other if they had sought each other.' Sartre quotes the painter's opinion about his crowd. They are like 'a part of a forest observed during the course of many years ... a forest in which trees with barren, slender trunks seemed like people who had stopped in their tracks and were speaking to each other.' Giacometti was captivated by the legs of a chair; they, according to him, were not touching the floor filling the vacuum. 'Between things, between men lies broken bridges; the vacuum infiltrates everything; each creature creates its own vacuum (Sartre). Giacometti's obsession with emptiness is a glaring instance of the artist's dissociation from his public. The public does not generally enter into the problem of distance when they stand inside an artgallery. The artist of the modern age wants to instill into the public mind a few delicate feelings of his own and the attempt is altogether one-sided. The public in Giacometti's case was captivated by the formal consistency and he was ultimately accepted as an outgrown surrealist and a votary of the doctrine that art is 'an absurd activity'. His elongated figures expressing nihilism and despair, terror and doom bear a unity of their own and the public is ultimately agreeable to their controversial existence. Sartre however has concluded that Giacometti too was conscious about a public and even if the inner psychological layers of his works are not unearthed, there is no difficulty in realizing his objectivity of mind. ....

*The Paintings of Giacometti.*
Sartre: "Giacometti's art is similar to that of the illusionist. We are his dupes and his accomplices. Without our avidity, our gullibility, the traditional deceitfulness of the senses and contradiction in perceptions, he would never make his portraits live. He is inspired not only by what he sees but also and especially by what he thinks we will see. But the shoe pinches somewhere else. If the artist wants the public there may not be a reply to the effect that the public also wants the artist. The people of Giacometti's time were aware of the origin of human loneliness sufficiently. They were naturally stimulated to learn about the separatedness that exists between men due to several chronic obsessions of individual character (grown as an impact of social insecurity, loss of mutual trust and disbelief in any authority beyond the self). In a majority of cases, as in Giacometti's case, the people were fond of identifying their own problems with arts as well. But the essential bond that is supposed to be formed between the artist and his public in terms of mutual responsiveness and, to quote Langer's words, a 'wholeness' that is termed as beauty and that elevates the woes of life, is not set up. The response may be there. But the result is a mutual alienation. The artist is content to have his illusion. The audience too is content to decipher the illusion without suspending the disbelief of mind regarding the falsity of the illusion by any stretch of his will. Bertolt Brecht's theory of alienation was based upon the idea that during a performance the dramatic personage can never involve themselves deeply into the fabric of the plot. They must on the contrary, consciously avoid personal commitment to the development of the story. Such a commitment is injurious to the dramatic effect. Brecht has shown that the plot of a drama and the characters of the plot unless they are dissociated from the player, may fall short of mark. The player becomes the hero. When one has to accept Lawrence Oliver as Lear, the agony of Lear is destined to be jeopardized in the hand of the image of that great stage actor of all times. ...
..... Such things happen in a majority of cases and the audience, particularly of drama and cinema suffer from an illusion within the illusion and renders the final impression into a matter of exclusively personal choice. When the hero is not Richard Burton, the character of Anthony is not loved because the audience has a subjective choice for Burton. Brecht's theory alienated the actor from the character and deliberately tried to suggest that what happened on the stage was something that was not correspondent to the actor's personality. Brecht's major contention against the modern actors is that they cast a hypnosis which affects the meaning of drama. This is why he has turned every plot of his work into a procession of beggars, thieves, whores and bourgeois, and he wants his dramas to be treated after an opera pattern. Our argument relating to the stubbornness of the modern audience not to come out of the personal beliefs at the time of enjoyment, finds a compliment in Brecht's 'a effect' or the theory of alienation. What Brecht thought of was an impending sentimentalisation of the aesthetic contents from which the art of drama has to be freed. In the field of all other arts a growing tendency to sentimentalism was marked and the result is an absolute loss of contact. The objective of Giacometti is put to question because in his case the mor is sentimental about his own standpoint. The sculptor too is sure of what he has done. His nihilism has been expressed in his delicate tackling of space. All the modern artists are sailing in the same boat. Sartre has named another. Robert Lapoujade (born 1921). This Frenchman is selfmade and is possessed with a new problem of presence in painting. Sartre: 'Lapoujade has evolved his own style while painting and has finally created presences that are an integral part of each composition and yet transcend them all'. Sartre supports this painter; so the caption reads 'The Unprivileged Painter: Lapoujade'. Sartre analyses the argument of the presence of something that is the essence of an artistic creation and he has tried to show that this painter although he has not been able to impress the public, has this direct and conscious affiliations with objectivity in the true sense. ....
The audience does not want to overlook the bond between creativity and beauty. "Beauty is not the object of art but its flesh and blood, its being". In case of abstract art too, the fundamental link between creativity and beauty is to be revealed in its pristine purity. "Attempts to depict acts of violence, mutilated corpses and living bodies racked, tortured and burned have been sterile. By falling back upon visual conventions, artists have shown us a moving side of reality and have conditioned us to react as we normally would - with horror, anger and especially with the silent flood of sympathy that makes every man experience the wounds of other men as so many teeth in his own flesh. This unbearable spectacle puts the spectator to flight. A painting may evidence ingenious composition, correct proportions and harmony, but everything is wasted if the spectator flees and fails to return. The painter, on the other hand, may eliminate torture from the canvas by following a dictation of the person who has commissioned him and by turning a scene of massacre into a ballet. But such a process of deducing beauty by way of idealising reality is an escapist device. Sartre has assailed Titian Tizian Vecello as a traitor because he painted vile murderers dressed in rich garment. "Through him Beauty betrayed man and consorted with kings. For a self-willed man in a room with windows overlooking a concentration camp to paint a compote is not serious; his sin is one of negligence. The real crime would be in painting the concentration camp as if it were a compote in the same spirit of research and experimentation". Sartre has nicely placed Picasso's Guernica beside Titian's works and said "Guernica is different... Unforgettable revulsion, commemoration of a massacre, the painting seems nevertheless to have... resulted solely from the quest for Beauty; furthermore the quest was successful. It will always be a bitter accusation, but this does not disturb its calm plastic Beauty... The Spanish Civil War a crucial moment in the period preceding World War II, broke out when this painter's life and this type of painting were approaching their decisive moment".
Mr. Allan Lepea too has assessed Guernica in his book in a separate chapter. Lepea's A vicious circle is represented, the solution is not through human kindness, but through enlightenment. The individual is so highly propagandised that he does not know what is good for him, and will continue to be a victim of destructive forces until he liberates himself. Most notable is the artist's conscious attachment to the objectifying process which stems from an inner trunk of Beauty and which grows to become consistent and transcendental. Lepea has rightly pointed at the cartoon-like quality of Guernica. 'A cartoon serves to present a forceful message, and its forms represent persons and ideas, and are often distorted; it is quite often symbolic and its message is direct and simple'. Picasso did not go to exaggerate his bull and his horse in the painting in accordance with an objective type of beautification as Titian did. The contrast that he created between the horrors of war and the agonising emotional impact of it upon his mind, was tactlessly manifested by his genuine urge to represent the horror as it is in essence and not as it is in outward exposition. The task was unquestionably tough. Picasso's success may lead us to the conclusion that the modern artists represent the elements of the objective world as they are without any direct modification of their essence. What they do instead is an act of indirectness and applied to the gross directness of the objective world. This indirectness is, in case of late moderns, exposed through an avoidance of figures in art. Lapoujade belongs to this generation of builders. 'After what he himself calls the 'disintegration of figurative art' by Picasso, Braque and a whole generation of analysts, all that remained for the newcomers was a medley of colours and rhythms, of crumbled remnants'. The artist's focus upon the inner essence and his will, (according to Sartre) to depict the presence of the essence upon the canvas gave birth to nonfigurative art and the essence of such an art lay on an emphasis of normal variety. ......

* The challenge of Modern Art.
Sartre wants us to believe that the unification which the painter and the viewer seeks can be achieved only through the permanent recomposition of a certain presence. 'And this presence, in turn, can communicate to us its indecomposable unity only through the medium of Art, and only in conjunction with our efforts and the painter's efforts to constitute or reconstitute the beauty of a whole'. This last comment is vital to our understanding of an 'art of the real'. The presence of the essence that is the wholeness must be felt by the artist and the seer alike. The artist must represent this presence in a way that the seer is able to feel it. An 'art of the real' is a device that operates the seer's feeling by giving him forms that fall within the boundary of his cognizable world. The artist's abstraction must be the seer's abstraction through the former's conscious choice of those elements which do not lose cognizability by abstraction which rather are the transformed states of the very concreteness within which the seer lives and moves. The artist should regulate his choice leaving aside his own penchant for analysis and orientation of the wholeness as revealed within his psychology. The urge to give expression to things as they occur may be genuine in mind and there is no scope to regulate its flow. But when there is the actual expression the artist must follow a process of compromise. He must regard the personal likes and dislikes of the hypothetical audience to delight whom his whole business is dedicated. The audience is not sensitive to the degree to which he is sensitive. Responsiveness to an object of delight depends upon the artist's capacity to stimulate the same. The issue is not at all concerned with social unity of any kind except that art creates a union of minds, a bond of mutual responsiveness. The artist's conscious endeavour and initiative lie at the root of the bond.

The present situation is posing a barricade before the two camps. .......

No. 65.
The artist is busy with an authentic delineation of his mental reaction to the situation to which he belongs. His almost obsessive approach deprives him of the privilege to become a friend of his fellowmen. Such a friendship is urgently solicited because the world of himself and that of his connoisseur are equally affected by an existential insecurity and deep selfhood. All human beings are groupings for a relief from the burden that is imposed upon mind by intense intellectual curiosity, materialistic impulses and the competition between desires and refusals on all levels of physical and mental life. Art had previously been a solace, a shelter for the mind that is disturbed by the haunting insufficiencies of achievements. Art has never been without an objective, the elemental objective of discovering the other through a stipulated space or volume. The artist's business has been to recreate the action of life through his experiencing the Other—the action that is absent in real life. The modern artist too wants to recreate the action that will lead him to the Other. He approaches the problem in the following manner. Suppose he paints a nude. A nude, in short, involves two people. Even if the only real presence is a woman, the presence of a man is suggested by the movement of colors, and this gives to the canvas its presence. This presence is often misread for which the audience should not be blamed. If the incarnation of this presence is not valid and in accordance with the temper and receiving capacity of the audience, a total failure awaits the artist. Sartre, while referring to Lapoujade as a successful delineator of the above 'presence' in painting, suggests that 'Abstract art which seemed at first to impose limitations, actually extends the painter's freedom and assigns to him new functions.' He now has a greater scope to transport his feeling to others and to build up a stronger solidarity with them...

"The Other' occupies a central position in the existential world. 'The Other' is not only the one whom I see but the one who sees me and makes it possible for me to 'recognize that I am' as he sees me..." Quoted by Sartre in his book (chs The Puritans of the Rialto from Justus Scretter's book 'To Freedom Condemned')
The painter has only what they have, Sartre has focused particular attention to the crowd of Lapoujade and appreciated the artist's humanization of his canvases which he believed, was not by depicting men as appeared in the days of princes and prelates, but by their joint presence. The process of this rediscovery is conditioned by an act of refinement and a conscious correspondence of the artist with the idea of a universal unity and perfection, if not beauty in the conventional sense. The artist does no longer add wings to his angels. The blurred portraits and the slender bodies of his fellowmen are now depicted and the claim is laid that these men are his angels. The essence of Abstract art rests in the artist's avoidance of deliberate beautification of objects. The need for a form also is in a majority of cases not felt. Thomas Beckatt's dramas via Waiting for Godot or even Brecht's operas have plots but in fragmentary way. The poetry of T.S. Eliot and the later French school under Valere, Malaumes and their associates has been a rebellion against conventional form. When one reads The Waste Land one does not on the first hand follow any chain of thought. But the suggestion is implicit that the poet is fascinated by the contagion of human fear, mutual loss of faith, and war and he is trying to depict his fascination through the presentation of some incidents and some stories. Same is the artist's case. 'The ideological capacity of man to penetrate earthly and supernatural spaces at random - in contrast to his physical prostration - is the origin of human tragedy. This combat between power and prostration implies the whole discord of human existence. Half winged, half imprisoned - that is man ....' says Paul Klee. There is no scope to accept Klee the painter as a philosopher. Klee has spoken in the voice of an 'artist of the real'. The artist should believe that he is a man and he is obviously half imprisoned just as he is half winged. The world of material reality, the world and life as a whole exists around the artist like a prison wall. He can never avoid it. Neither can he remain oblivious of the wings which promise him an elevation up to the sky. ...
The desire of early modern to set an exemplary ideal world of unity and human correlation is reflected in the choice of colours, of strange forms and of the dramatization of techniques. The artist progresses through a negative way. He wants like Keats to idealise his agonised existence by landing his own ears to the song of an absurd nightingale. The song of the distant bird floods his ear and coagulates his life-blood to a cathartic extent. He too, like Keats, may be plunged ultimately in a state of disillusionment. The music flies away with the bird at one final moment. But just as at the end of the 3rd the poet's approach is not thoroughly negative and there is ample scope to believe that the bird's flight seems to have cast a spiritual effect upon the poet's mind, so is the artist's case. The artist's idea of perfection makes headway at one point. His involvement into the worldly woes comes to the forefront at other point. The audience will accept whatever is offered to him provided he sees a reproduction of his own cognisable world in the creation. The audience is not supposed to be objective. The artist has to be by dint of his sincere assessment of the real within the ideal and the vice versa. The art may non figurative like that of Lapoujade, may be humanised by like that of Giacometti, may also be sickening like those of the Surrealists or geometrical like that of the Cubist. The artist does not sit in his studio with tongue in his cheek and flirt with his own fantastic imaginations. He is not bedevilled by the ghost of the obstinate emperors or the bony headed priests. He is to work in an office. He is to sell his creation for the sake of sustenance. The artist has to make a name in the society. The ideas that are formed in his mind are shaped by his direct knowledge of the objective world. Art is idea. The artist of the bygone days had to commit to the dictates of the buyers and to the people in general. Many of them tried to give incentive to the people for a better understanding of their own humanity. Many has escaped by tactful compromise with the utopic idealism of the people's mind instead of attempting to bridge the gap that exists between desires and limits. ....
The artist of the present era is thoroughly committed to the objective environment. He cannot supply the viewer a copybook ideal. He ideates upon the knowledge that he collects from the world without. His idea should be far less plunged into personal hopes and scruples. The way to avoid such a possibility is to allow objects in their original form entry into the fabric of art. The extent of this allowance shall be judged by the artist’s selection of subject and his method of treatment. He should behave in his work in such a way that the seer may at once be stimulated to respond to the creation. Both the parties are armed with absolutely personal beliefs and experiences. The ‘art of the real’ does not rob personality of its own treasures. What it does make is an act of communication. It adds an element of other-regardness, an objectification to say. The artist must be absolutely possessed with his own creative process. But the very process shall be inclusive of an awareness of the Other in the most material sense. The artist is a spiritualist, says Aurobindo, the noted Indian philosopher. Of the three stages of the human understanding of the Divine, art is the first. Aurobindo has, in the vein of Hegel showed that the journey of man to the Divine starts from the utterly sensuous level. Artistic activity falls on that level. The question of deifying the artist’s personality and his business is significant in our understanding of the ‘art of the real’. The confusion may arise regarding the interpretation of art as a matter-and-environment-oriented activity and one may say that if art is created out of the encounter of the artist with the world how can the artist himself cross the material limits and let others cross it? This is the crux of the whole problem. The ‘art of the real’ reveals to the objectively aroused mind the same possibilities which art in the ordinary sense reveals. It is essentially meant for an enlargement of the mind, an elaboration of values. Artists who will never care it shall as well be no less effective in their expression of the possibilities. .....
What it adds is an awareness in the mind of the artist about the aesthetic truth that exists independently outside the artist's own mental frame. It is nothing specifically novel and the preceding discussions on the developing aesthetic philosophy of the world have justified the fact that the aesthetic conception of a man has always been strengthened by such an awareness. The necessity of its separate understanding lies in the present context of art movements which are marked by the shrinkage of the artist's territory due to an acute disorder imposed upon the artist's mind by conflicting situations. The root of these conflicts lies in the racy growth of antidevelopmental and antiartistic forces in the human society. The artist's single-handed attempt to stop the growth is absurd. His inner zeal to remain within himself too is not desirable for he is basically inclined towards an objectification of his personal feelings the causes of which have already been discussed in the second chapter of this dissertation. The argument may occur that the artist's will to objectify feelings in an impersonal way is conditioned by his knowledge and understanding of the objective situations. But the way the artist adopts indirectness and abstraction upon his canvas gives the impression that his personal likes and dislikes play a supreme role in the formation of his aesthetics and if there is any impact that the objective tensions create upon his mind it is exposed in the form of subjective reflections only. The artist learns that his fellowmen fight with an eye to denying the essential values of mutual understanding and social cooperation. His knowledge frightens him and in the fear of an impending loss of his own values he sits inside the studio and draws fantastic lines depicting his fear. This fear sometimes is coupled with a hope for the development of situations but the hope is simply idealistic. The nature of it is so abstract that it requires the seer's attention. The idealism which supported the artists of the past is not resorted to because the artist is already bogged within himself, within his personal reactions to the situations.
Any attempt to objectify his personal fear and subsequent complexities of approach (which also, like fear, stems from his contact with the world without) renders him imprisoned within the reaction itself. He runs in a quicker pace towards an exhibition of the personal reaction than the expression of any ideal. Art of the modern times is a war between the ideal and the real. The artist unfortunately is a sort of bridge. His illusion is pregnant with beliefs and dogmas which he has earned in accordance with his own temper and not as they were. The man in the artist is selfish. He is like all other types of human beings a thoroughbred individual. He is obviously so. No human mind can cross the personal level. But when he is an artist he should try to resist selfishness. He should be influenced by the situations to which he will place his creation, from which he will collect materials. The artist sticks to an ideal. How can he stick to an ideal unless he is submissive to the independent spirit of the ideal? He must realize that the ideal is not his. It is a common link between the ordinariness and the extraordinary, between what we have and what we should have. He should feel that an ideal is not the representation of a few good and beautiful values. It is on the contrary a way to liberation from the heaviness of the Real. Allen Leepa says, 'Abstract work ... deals with deep and mature creative experiencing in and through a medium'. The artist realizes what the layman has experienced but cannot express. The artist frees original fantasies, aims, desires, and emotions, and expresses them through his medium. But the medium has limitations of its own. There are feelings that can or cannot be translated effectively into a particular medium. In considering these limitations, the artist must realize how he changes the material and also in what ways the material changes his expression and his conceptions. The artist forgets the simple truth that all interactions between the individual and his environment is subject to the limitations of natural laws.
It is in the conflict between limitations of the outside world (or the medium in art) on the one hand, and the demands of the individual himself that art is found. Mr. Loepa continues: "Sometimes it is necessary to compromise or even abandon the original ideas with which the artist begins his painting for those arising out of the creative process, that is, as he works. The direction is taken from the painting process itself. 'The solution is not in passive compromise but in reaching a creative adjustment. The artist has to be conscious about the possibility of such an adjustment. His consciousness must be bathed deep in the events outside him. He must believe that the sun and moon that the paints are his insofar as he sees them. They are not his when he does not see them. But the sun and the moon belong to the universe and there is no relativity about it. The universe has its own aesthetics. To live decently man has to cope with the creative process. The medium of expression whether it is old as sculpture or new as cinema must be governed by the artist's awareness of the above natural law. The blue of a springtime sky is an object of art. No one can subjectify it to the extent of turning it bloodred. That shall be a violation of nature. The artist has to portray the inner essence of the colour. He has right to transform his expression to any extent for the sake of the service that he is destined to render to his creative self and no one sense to the entire creative process of life. But he must never dwell upon fantasies that are not modified by human conceptions. He must not ideate in such an abstract manner as may reject the reality of the common human existence of the physical level. The aim of art is to elevate people towards a broader and perhaps better understanding of the earthly existence. Aurobindo has rightly picked up art as his subject and included art into the evolving process of divine realisations. All artists and all philosophers believe income way or other that art is a journey from land to the deep of the ocean. But this present era is cruelly cutting out art by way of materialising it. The artist's are getting adampt at this juncture."
They probe the depth of their own individual souls in strange personal ways. The influence of matter is sinister upon the world of idea in the sense that it minimises the range of idea unto a destructive level. The artist is so disturbed by his environment and its material possibilities that he wants to withdraw from it. The artist who used to serve a religious cause was in comparison much well placed because he had no risk of spoiling an unspoiled abstract ideal. The artist who has no cause to serve except a release of tension and a desire to live constantly and decently under the guidance of certain feelings, is always risking his idealism. The impact of certain situations like war is so tremendous that the artist is more interested to objectify his own position at the face of it instead of entering into its root and cutting a possible way out of it in aesthetic terms. The concept of Ernst regarding 'presence' of the essence of the object in painting is laudable but for its tendency to propagate a personal philosophy of artistic expression. Not that the artist has to communicate, Susanne Langer has been very right, in her words. We may repeat what she says: 'The word message itself is inapplicable in any art appreciation for a message is something communicated and the art insofar as it is a symbol does not communicate at all. The artist is not saying anything, not even about the nature of feeling; he is showing. He is showing us the appearance of feeling, in a perceptible symbolic projection.' She proceeds to conclude that on the analogy of language, one naturally expects communication, which I think is a misleading notion. 'But there is something that may, without danger of too much literalness, be called 'communication through art, namely the report which the arts make of an age or nation to the people of another.' Most important thing that the artist has to do is to see beyond his own ideas, to mould his own ideas about the object according to the spirit of universality inherent in every object. He should realise that the ideas which are called his own too are originally built up in collaboration with and moulded by the influence of the world beyond him.

* Feeling and Form (The work and its public)
* Ibid.
The modern artist is in the know of this influence. He is unwilling to, rather reluctant about the approval of an objectivity of things. His greatest problem is that he is numbed by the objective influence in a negative way and in a majority of cases their reaction to such influence is not complimentary to the course which supplies them this influence. The artists forget that they are the makers of the user’s tastes. It is up to them to mould public mind. Their personal aberrations or inhibitions are not supposed to lead the audience to the discovery of an ideal. The proper duty of an artist is to create a responsiveness in the public mind which is greater than communication. The public is not sensitive like him. It will accept him only when it finds a compromised portrayal of its own known world of hopes and fears, the world that falls within the area of his area of his reality and his ideal at the same breath. He wants to see the world of his head and heart, his own imagination and intellect, his entire reality of existence.

There is no need to differentiate public particularly modern public into two groups, viz. educated and uneducated. Education add culture and discipline to the public mind. But discipline does not mean lack of responsiveness. The uneducated mind may be termed as vulgar. But vulgarity too does not rob human mind of its responsiveness. The urge to see his own world reflected does not depend upon the human frame of mind. The educated mind wants to see it in a disciplined way. The vulgar mind in an indisciplined way. The way of approach is immaterial insofar as the issue is of the elemental reaction of mind to an art object. The division is also unnecessary because the artist’s desire to unfold his creative self does not depend upon what kind of public wants to see him. A claim is often raised by the artist to the effect that he will not be able to cater to the demands of the vulgar public who has no refinement of mind. ....
But the result of such a claim is sad. This is something of a deliberate bid on
on the artist's part to divide the very conception of art-appreciation into watertight
compartments. The division is socially existent. But the artist's urge to create
should not submit to it. The creation itself will create the division. The honest
effort of the artist to create will break the division. The uneducated mind does
not enter into the complexity of Shakespeare's characters, but it loves Othello
sincerely and is haunted by the horror of Hamlet's loneliness. The educated mind
on the other hand will enjoy Shakespeare in a different way. Both the ways are real
and the artist must approve the both. He actually does so by avoiding any
compartmentalization of his aesthetic urges. An 'artist of the real' is he who takes
the objective world as a whole without caring to any division of the standards of
intelligence and education.

The artist's sensitive mind may refine the elements of life and transform the objective
world in accordance with the reactions of mind. It may reprint the inner complexity
of things and so to picturise even the vacuum-existent between two objects. But what
is a vacuum without the presence of two objects? The objects placed together aware
us of a vacuum. The earth and the sun - these two objects make us aware of a state
of vacuum between the sun and the earth.

No one can say that the artist does not have to bother for the masses. The age
belongs to the people, to men and not man. The artist is paid by those who fall
into the category of the people and no longer to that of the Rajah who was an
individual. There is the artist like Picasso for whom the public has a fascination.
A thousand others are left unaspected. The general interest for aesthetic exercises
is often blunted by an opinion that modern art is abstract and is obscured by the
artist's personal reflections. .....
The artist in that case must believe that the public has no apparent standard for art appreciation. It rejects him more because the creation is dominated absolutely by the creator and not by those who see and enjoy it. The artist has to tame such a public by giving them a representation of the environment, the society and the life as a whole if necessary. He is influenced deeply by the social malaises which hurt his idealism. The 'artist of the real' has to include within his realism even the malaise of life. He has to trace the essence of the personal idealism in the world outside. His search shall not go in vain because the entire background of art history and aesthetic philosophy is lending him support. The artist has to keep pace with the demands of the public and work in cognizance of the fact that the public has a queer standard of appreciation. He has to abide by the truth that the audience is essentially subjective and that his existence is justified by a collective subjectivism which to him is an objective reality. The projection of malaise is often a matter of distaste for the collective subjectivism of the audience. The artist has to cut a new way out of this distaste by explaining to audience through his work the presence of a cosmos within the chaos, by giving them a reformatory ideal in the form of motiveless or motive-oriented delight. The criterion before the artist is one. He is to make his art socially valid and acceptable without staking his own delight and idealism. The method he will follow may anything. The artist takes his camera to a gallery, shoots the visitors along with the articles displayed, shows the movie and calls it 'an art of the real'. His desire is to create a new art adding the visitor to the frame. The movie camera gives him the desired result. In an exhibition arranged by the United States Information Service, Calcutta some years back, such an attempt had been made. The girl in red maxi gown was looking at the stone sculpture. She is photographed along with the object and the composition inclusive of all the movements of the visitor beside the static stone, gives the rear of the film a combine impression. They called it 'art of the real.'
The definition was based utterly upon a physical standard. The colour, the light and above all the camera which arrest the movement are all parts of the Physical. But there was an inner psychological value of such an attempt. Such an exhibition in the celluloid, is an allegory of the artist's attempt to add the world as it is into the genre of his art. In such a case the sculpture on show may be devalued. The visitor with a red gown may seem to harm the aesthetic quality of the sculpture. The artists of the modern times have to constantly accost these problems. The art and the appreciation are set at poles apart from each other if the artists are unable to place the audience rightly upon the canvas. The artist's world is no longer of Alice's or Crusoe's. He has to grapple with the problems of fellow man even in his art. The audience, say the girl mentioned above is not supposed to behave as the cameraman wants. She is in the dark about her inclusion into the frame. She will not lose her personal standpoint. The photographer has to use her personality in a manner so that his entire process adjusts her.

The 'artist of the real' is a rebel against the propagation of unqualified inwardness. The objective world should qualify the inside of the artist's mind by pouring in materials. The artist's task is difficult because in course of his creation there shall always be a chance to get struck by the superficial physical aspect of things which may induce the seer to appreciate the face value only. The artist will ignore such a possibility on the plea that he is fusing his inner consciousness with the outside and such a fusion will not give an outward impression that taxes only to be superficial. The 'art of the real' is a two way traffic. It allows the creator's reality pass into the appreciator's reality and collect data. It allows the appreciator's reality an entry into the creator's reality and refine itself. .......
To erase the incongruities represented by modern art in connection with the formation of a bond between the artist and the public, a permission may be allowed to the concept of the 'art of the real' to establish itself within the already burdened shell of the artist's brain. The conception will not find itself comfortable in its new shelter at the beginning. But it is a matter of continuance. There cannot be any formula for solving problems of the aesthetic front. One has to grow up to the new standard, consciously or unconsciously. The initiation is vital.

The final chapter shall be devoted to the life and works of Rabindranath Tagore, the artist for an exemplification of the concept of the 'art of the real'. If this great poetic soul of Bengal is accepted as an 'artist of the real', there is chance for rejecting him as an exception. Exception certainly does not make a rule. But it does make us aware of thousand possibilities for making a rule in the long run.

Rabindranath is not treated as a model 'artist of the real'. All right. Can we therefore say that his instance is unaccountable? We should never forget before we enter into the world of Rabindranath Tagore the artist, that he was the beginner in this new process of aesthetic thinking. His role is one of champion. His paintings which number beyond two thousand five hundred are marked as acts of a pervert sentimentalist and lauded reversely as the creation of a spiritually charged artist who could transliterate his thoughts by the strength of the mental maturity. But one sees in them the inner awareness of an idealist's mind about the vigorous reality of physical existence. How can a lyric poet paint a demon in loud colours like scarlet or ivory black? Why he paints at all after traversing no less longer a life of chequered experiences than sixty years? Why again he felt like rejecting almost all the old aesthetic values one after another after a certain period of life and began to make many a restatement? Let him be an exception. Let him dramatise all his views at the old age. Can we deny the presence of an awareness of the reality beyond himself in the final phase of his life? ....
Can we deny a gradual growth of this awareness in his incessant affiliations with the world without? Can we overlook his liberal attitude in this respect? His paintings make him an 'artist of the real'. It shall be unjust to assess his painting in however concise form we want to speak about them, cutting them out of the entire process of his long life. A fresh chapter has thus become necessary before drawing the conclusion. This chapter should be treated exclusively as an appendix and it is to be reviewed as an example of all what has been said in the preceding chapters.
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