

Art As Revolution

True art is revolution, everything else is merely imitation. There are three broad based groups of people in this world: 1) those that lead or defend the status quo (15%), those that blindly follow the status quo (80%), and those that reject the status quo (5%). The revolutionaries and visionaries, political and artistic, reside as an even smaller subset of this third group, and what differentiates them is that they see the world NOT as it is, but rather as it could be or should be.

Examples: the radical departure of Da Vinci's "Last Supper" from the stiff painting style of his day, Jefferson's masterful crafting of the U.S. Declaration of Independence, the raw intensity of Beethoven's music, the vibrant wording of the "Communist Manifesto" by Marx and Engels, Van Gogh's radical transformation of the impressionist landscape, the cubism of Braque and Picasso, the exquisite "Nude Descending a Staircase" by Duchamp, the bountiful colors of Matisse and the simplicity of his cutouts, Gandhi's visionary writings on non-violent civil disobedient protest, the drip painting of Pollock, the Objectivist philosophy of Rand in *Atlas Shrugged*, the early silk screens of Warhol, Lennon's soul searching songs as "Imagine" and "Strawberry Fields", Mother Teresa's refusal to allow the destitute of Calcutta to die in the streets, and most recently Gehry's design for the Bilbao Guggenheim Museum. All represented revolutionary departures from the accepted thinking of their day. The defining characteristic of each was a unique ability to tap "emotion", and express it in a physical medium beyond themselves.

For the past 30 years the revolutionary and visionary nature of art has disappointingly been hijacked and submerged by "Shock Artists", "Commercialists", "Politico Correcto's" and "Retros":

Are we now to believe that a painting with cow dung on the Virgin Mary represents revolutionary or visionary thinking? Certainly not, it is art meant to "shock" for attention, much as a two year old will throw a tantrum for attention.

Are we to believe the mass production of paintings of cottages set in Sherwood like forests with lit windows carry a single visionary or revolutionary thought? "Commercialism" for the sake of making money.

Are we to accept the racial and gender segmenting of art today as anything but diversionary? Revolutionary and visionary thinking has little to do with the "politico correcto" take on race, gender or popular belief. It is about individuals, who for unexplainable reasons, gain a unique ability to cross borders of accepted thought and venture "outside the jail cell of society".

Are we to consider the current preoccupation with "Warhol, Picasso and Company" by the mainstay of the art world as anything but looking in the rear view

<http://www.StudioRevolution.com/>

Copyright 2002 StudioRevolution. All Rights Reserved.

mirror? The art world of today disappointingly pre-occupies itself with a "retro-focus" on the already well-known artistic revolutionaries and visionaries of yesterday. The focus should be on finding and fostering the future ones.

The revolutionary and visionary nature of art is far from over, the time has come for us to begin looking for it again. And remember, just because anything can be called art, doesn't mean it should be.