



Realism in Art and the Artist's Truth

ABSTRACT

Realism in a work of art has been a subject of ongoing debates concerning truth, reality, and fact for millennia. These discussions, predominantly led by philosophers and individuals with external interests in art, have sought to classify art and artists based on objective external criteria and *scientific* principles. However, the intricate nature of art has proven to be an impediment to its comprehension through such classifications. Scientific methodologies and non-artistic reasoning have often marginalized the artist, resulting in an incomplete understanding or interpretation of the artwork's reality within the artist's subjective relationship to it. Against the backdrop of unresolved notions of truth, reality, and fact, the question of whether there exists a reality to be represented and whether such representation yields realism remains a topic of contentious debate.

From the standpoint of artists, it becomes apparent that reality and realism encompass far more profound connotations than mere formal and representational issues. The indiscriminate assessment of artworks, which arise from entirely subjective processes, using the same criteria for description and categorization, poses a significant hindrance to understanding, or at the very least perceiving, the reality of art, particularly its realism. Examination of the expressions and manifestos of artists who have embraced diverse periods, worldviews, and styles reveals that their common ground lies in the pursuit of truth in their art and their endeavors to convey this truth through their works. The prevalence of regarding the artwork itself as a manifestation of reality among artists underscores the necessity to reevaluate scientific studies and interpretations concerning the realm of art.

Keywords: Artist, Realism, Truth, Art History, Artist Manifestos

INTRODUCTION

The issue of realism in art is often accompanied by a trite and ambiguous definition that seldom receives profound contemplation: "An approach in the realms of painting and sculpture that seeks to directly reference the realities encountered in the non-artistic realm through the motifs that constitute the artwork." (Sözen ve Tanyeli, 2016: 115).

This definition inevitably prompts the query, "what constitutes reality?" The response to the question of reality hinges upon the question of "what is considered real?" The intricate interplay between reality, realness, and the mediating subject complicates this line of thought. Furthermore, when delving into the concept of truth, it becomes infeasible to proceed without scrutinizing the notion of fact. The mere mention of these fundamental concepts engenders profound philosophical debates that have persisted for millennia.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Fact, Reality, and Truth

The process of comprehending and grasping the boundaries of human perception, wherein external data is interpreted and transformed into knowledge, encompasses the notion of truth (accuracy). The presence of a phenomenon that exists independently of human presence and consciousness does not necessitate a conscious entity to perceive it. Nonetheless, our consciousness remains indispensable in acknowledging the existence of said phenomenon. While this may initially appear paradoxical, the true paradox lies in questioning the reality of the phenomenon. According to Plato (423-347 BC), "only the Ideas themselves are inherently and absolutely real, while perceptible things and objects are merely transient copies of the Ideas." (Hançerlioğlu, 1995: 47). On the other hand, David Hume (1711-1776) posited that "experience and sensation provide not the objective reality, but only its impressions. Our understanding forms ideas based on these impressions. Objective reality can never be known." (Hançerlioğlu, 1995: 140)

With the increasing influence of quantum physics in popular culture, the understanding of reality and the nature of objects has become even more enigmatic.

The palpable becomes impalpable, the visible becomes invisible, behind the reality perceived by the senses there is a vast reality that escapes the imagination and can only be expressed by mathematical formulae. Vigorous, forceful reality with all its shapes and colours -the nature Goethe saw as a scientist as well as a poet- has become an immense abstraction. Ordinary men no longer feel at home in such a world. The icy breath of the incomprehensible chills them. A world that can only be understood by scientists is a world from which they are alienated. (E. Fischer, 1953: 86).

The incongruity between subatomic existence and the universe perceived through classical physics and human senses has led to significant existential turmoil for individuals, questioning the very essence of meaning.

Huri Kiriş Büyükgüner¹

How to Cite This Article

Büyükgüner, B. K. (2023). "Realism in Art and the Artist's Truth", Journal of Social, Humanities and Administrative Sciences, 9(66):3104-3111. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/JOSHAS.71134>

Arrival: 17 April 2023
Published: 31 July 2023

International Journal of Social, Humanities and Administrative Sciences is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

This journal is an open access, peer-reviewed international journal.

¹ Inst. Dr., Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Faculty of Fine Arts, Painting Department, İstanbul, Türkiye

Disregarding these inquiries and adopting a cultural standpoint towards reality, truth, and perception does not provide a remedy to the predicament at hand. Drawing upon insights from cultural history and the metaphysical dimension of supposedly rational human beings, it can be deduced that humanity has long sought to construct a truth based on belief systems. In this regard, if we were to assert that the relationship between humans and reality is questionable, even this proposition presupposes the existence of a timeless and spaceless truth, while simultaneously critiquing historical processes that deviate from this assumption. In essence, let us proceed with the recognition that the concept of reality is a multifaceted and intricate subject matter.

Having established a reasonable response to the question “What is truth?”, we are then faced with the inquiry of “What constitutes reality?”. “Reality is concerned with everything that exists. We should not confuse reality with truth. Truth manifests itself in judgment and is related to the validation of reality at the conceptual or mental level. Reality is perceived, that is, it is perceived or directly contemplated.” (Timuçin, 2004: 230). Recognizing that reality encompasses all that is deemed real, we come to realize that truth or accuracy is generated therein. Ultimately, the consciousness that perceives the accepted ‘thing’ as real must derive truth from it.

Reality and truth are often used interchangeably. While the nature of reality (the totality of facts) does not necessitate our existence, we rely on generating truth within our minds. Henri Delacroix (1873-1937) asserts: “The world of reality is not the world of truth; the world of reality is nothing but a condition for the world of truth. Truth is a functional position of thought that gradually assimilates itself to reality. Human spiritual activity surpasses what does not exist and opens up to the realm of possibility.” (M. Fischer, 2010: 27). This process, heavily reliant on the cognitive abilities and cultural accumulation of the individual, promises us access to the ‘thing’ we refer to as truth and convinces us of the genuine existence of knowledge. It is important to bear in mind that throughout the course of human history, all religious beliefs have laid claim to revealing the truth.

Even if we accept that the phenomenon existing independently of humans is synonymous with the concept of reality, the interpretation of truth cannot occur without human involvement. When the issue of truth is set aside, the remaining concept of objectivity is not compatible with the notion of realism, which we will briefly define as the representation of reality. If reality, for humans, is the understanding of factual information, then realism cannot be confined to a mere depiction of the sum of facts.

Thus far, we have posed more questions than provided answers concerning the subjects of facts, reality, and truth, which are typically philosophical in nature. However, the thought processes of the postmodern era have liberated knowledge from its central position and relinquished truth to the subjective perspective. In light of this, there is no harm in illustrating how artists approach the concepts of truth, reality, and realism without resorting to broad generalizations.

Art and Realism

Realism in art has been a fundamental and enduring issue since the emergence of artistic expression. Particularly within the realm of visual arts, cave paintings serve as the earliest source dating back to approximately 40,000 years ago. In considering cave paintings, we are compelled to reflect upon the relationship between the depicted images and reality, as well as the role of art in this context. “Primitive cultures do not have a separate reality for art; the only distinct separation could be between ‘usefulness’ and ‘religious ceremony’.” (Glaser, 2008: 9). This proposition is subject to debate, as its opposite holds equal validity. Even as we move closer to more recent times, the complexity of this topic remains intact, and the meaning of realism becomes uncertain: “The concept of realism in art is, unfortunately, elastic and vague. Sometimes realism is defined as an attitude, as the recognition of an objective reality, sometimes as a style or a method. Often the dividing line between the two becomes blurred.” (E. Fischer, 1953: 105).

The writing of art history and art criticism often involves categorizing past historical processes that have concluded, diminished in impact, or even been forgotten, with the aim of providing a coherent narrative. It may be posited that realism originated from Plato’s cave or that it emerged as a phenomenon during the Renaissance. While it is acknowledged that it is impossible to measure the accuracy of sociological predictions made for prehistoric eras, the validity of analyses conducted for more recent periods is being called into question. In our current experience, we frequently encounter errors in the investigation and categorization of seemingly simple problems that we assume to be straightforward. This can be observed readily in any social media platform accessible to users, where many individuals question, “What is truth? What is the truth behind this? What is being concealed from us?” Naturally, amid such chaos, the erosion of trust in knowledge, its producers, and the concept of truth itself leaves retrospective explanations hanging in the balance. Are the cave paintings products of reality or fantasy? Does the Renaissance truly depict a secular world in its relationship with reality? Has art emerged as a means for fiction to transform into a convincing truth, or does truth exist independently and art merely represents it? If the same Christian belief defended

the same truth in both the Renaissance and Baroque periods, has the representation of truth detached itself from reality? Countless examples can be provided.

At this juncture, a general assessment can be made regarding the role of realism in the acceptance and assimilation of artworks from the perspective of an art historian. In Western art, realism is inherently linked to optical precision. Optical realism stands as a distinctive characteristic of Western art. The symbolic approach observed in ancient Egyptian art evolves into mimetic naturalism as we approach Greek and Roman art, i.e., the Western tradition. During the Middle Ages, optical realism wanes, and the idea that nature serves as the source or indicator of knowledge is abandoned. In the flattened and hierarchically structured compositions of Gothic and Byzantine art, optical sharpness gives way to clarity and symbolic narrative structure. This departure from optical realism should not be viewed as a deficiency but rather as a manifestation of a new and distinct understanding of realism. Subsequently, with the revival of Greek philosophy, classical art, and references to science, optical realism experiences a resurgence during the Renaissance. However, due to its shaping by socioeconomic and political forces, Renaissance realism falls short of attaining the alleged transparency or objectivity associated with realism, despite its naturalistic appearance. The claim to realism in this context serves as an aesthetically ideological tool designed to stimulate the senses, deceive the mind, attract attention, and arouse curiosity. This realism, to some extent overlapping with optics, functions as more of a façade. Nevertheless, in the 19th century, realism evolves into a more complex form of artistic expression. The sense of reality, initially employed to please the eye, transforms into a vehicle laden with political values. With the invention of photography in 1826 and the introduction of the daguerreotype to the market in 1839, reality assumes an entirely new content. Photography, by assuming the responsibility of reflecting, describing, and particularly optically reproducing the prevailing realism in representational painting, becomes an instrument for the expansion of representation. The invention of photography plays a significant role in the crisis of representation, the abandonment of abstraction, and the aesthetic landscape as a whole.

Artist's Perception of Truth, Reality, Fact, and Realism

Ernst Gombrich (1909-2001) initiates his book, "The Story of Art," with the assertion that "There really is no such thing as Art. There are only artists." (Gombrich, 1951: 5). Indeed, in the act of creating artwork, the sole presence is that of the artist; without the artist, there can be no artwork. However, when we delve into discussions regarding art, we observe that it is the philosophers, art historians, art dealers, art brokers, and even newspaper editors who predominantly express their perspectives, rather than the artists themselves. Harold Rosenberg's (1906-1978) viewpoint on this matter is worth considering:

The painter gets away from Art through his act of painting; the critic can't get away from it. The critic who goes on judging in terms of schools, styles, form, as if the painter were still concerned with producing a certain kind of object (the work of art), instead of living on the canvas, is bound to seem a stranger." (Rosenberg, 1952: 23).

Throughout history, numerous artists have either remained silent or their viewpoints have not reached us. Today, rather than discussing a collective group of artists, we find ourselves speaking of isolated and disconnected individuals who engage in artistic creation. However, particularly in the first half of the 20th century, known as the "age of manifestos," artists actively made their voices heard. Successive art movements, written treatises on art, and texts crafted by the artists themselves have formed an extensive body of work. As we examine these sources alongside the written records left by a select few artists from earlier periods, we encounter diverse definitions of art. Despite these varying perspectives, delving into the concepts of truth, reality, and fact mentioned in the text offers us an opportunity to comprehend the extent to which these concepts pose challenges for artists and how they are perceived in a manner that deviates from our accustomed usage.

What the Artist Sees

When Gustave Courbet (1819-1877) declares, "I paint what I see with my own eyes!" (Baillods, 2008: 18) and responds to someone who asks why he doesn't paint goddesses with, "Well, come on! Have you ever seen a goddess before?" (Baillods, 2008: 48), he unequivocally signifies that he does not perceive realism as mere semblance. This is because "objects presented in a realistic appearance in the visual field create the illusion that the context is also real" (Kuş, 2019: 117). The mere naturalistic representation of form alone does not suffice to make it realistic.

The act of "looking" constitutes both the initial and final stages of visual arts, particularly painting. This act of gazing does not determine what will be seen; the artist looks first, then sees. In fact, isn't the viewer also, in a sense, seeking to experience what the artist sees? While Courbet paints what his eyes perceive, other artists engage in a similar process. They also look first, then see: Paul Cézanne (1839-1906) states, "I progress very slowly... for nature reveals herself to me in very complex ways; and the progress is endless. One must look at the model and feel very exactly." (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 46), and his action is not fundamentally different from Courbet's. Cézanne shares a

relationship with nature in which he looks at it, and it reveals itself to him. Nevertheless, the artist arrives at his expression through the act of feeling.

If we are to regard the recognition of an objectively given reality as the nature of realism in art, we must not reduce that reality to a purely exterior world existing independently from our consciousness. What exists independently from our consciousness is matter. But reality includes all the immense variety of interactions in which man, with his capacity for experience and comprehension, can be involved. (E. Fischer, 1953: 105).

Both Courbet, as the pioneer of the realism movement, and Cézanne, who pursues a formally distinct trajectory, seek truth through their gaze, but they do not perceive realism as merely a formal expression. “Consequently, in everyday language, the visual expression or verbal narration that we describe as real or realistic often conveys not the reality of the phenomenon but merely a frozen image of what is being told.” (Kuş, 2019: 116). It becomes evident that this image is neither sufficient nor profoundly significant for the artist.

Hermann Bahr (1863-1934) encapsulates his thoughts on the subject of vision and art by asserting, “The history of painting is nothing but the history of vision-or seeing.” (Bahr, 1925: 37). He also delves into the technical aspect by stating “Technique changes only when the mode of seeing has changed; it only changes because the method of seeing has changed. A man views the world according to his attitude towards it.” (Bahr, 1925: 37).

The act of looking may seem straightforward and universal, but the process of seeing carries a personal and subjective quality. It becomes evident that artists’ interpretation of what they see extends beyond a mere retinal experience. The concept of “seeing” in the realm of art extends beyond mere visual perception, encompassing the artist’s construction of truth upon the objectively perceived world. This notion is eloquently expressed by Georges Braque (1882-1963), who asserts, “The senses distort form, the mind shapes it. Strive to perfect the mind. There is no certainty outside of what the mind grasps.” (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 242). Braque’s statement implies an underlying complexity within the artist’s engagement with the act of seeing. Moreover, when he suggests that “The painter thinks with form and colors” (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 242) it becomes evident that the artist’s cognitive processes diverge from conventional modes of thinking. For the artist, the conceptual dimension finds its manifestation through the interplay of color and shape.

Henri Matisse (1869-1954) asserts,

But the thought of a painter must not be considered as separate from his pictorial means, for the thought is worth no more than its expression by the means, which must be more complete (and by complete I do not mean complicated) the deeper is his thought. I am unable to distinguish between the feeling I have about life and my way of translating it (Flam, 1978: 35-36),

and it is not surprising that the rationality mentioned by Braque holds true on an emotional level as well. August Macke (1887-1914) goes even further, stating, “Human life is expressed through forms. Every art form is an expression of its inner life. The exterior of art form is its interior” (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 119), establishing an identity between the artwork and the artist. Matisse also echoes similar sentiments: “I am fully aware that a painter’s best spokesman is his work.” (Flam, 1978: 9).

Jackson Pollock (1912-1956) articulates his connection with painting in the following manner: “When I am in my painting, I am not aware of what I’m doing... It is only after a sort of ‘get acquainted’ period that I see what I have been about. I have no fears about making changes, destroying the image, etc., because the painting has a life of its own. I try to let it come through.” (Buhmann, 2012: 11). He acknowledges that painting possesses its own reality and that the act of painting entails immersing oneself into this reality. While nature reveals itself to Cézanne, painting beckons Pollock inward.

On the other hand, Max Ernst (1871-1976) describes Surrealism as “... the borderland between the internal and external worlds which are still unfamiliar though physically and psychologically quite real (‘sur-real’), registering what they see and experience there, and intervening where their revolutionary instincts advise them to do so.” (Lippard, 1970: 136). He suggests the existence of another internal dimension of the world that we refer to as reality, and that reality encompasses a broader perspective than the objective world.

Formally, ranging from the most realistic to the most abstract, including the surrealists, we observe that artists do not perceive realism solely as a technique or method. Regardless of the forms employed and their worldview, we notice that the process, which commences with seeing, continues with perception, and artists, in fact, scarcely interpret these data. They surrender themselves to this perception without extensive interpretation. Reality exists, and it manifests itself onto the canvas in a manner that is not heavily mediated by the artist’s interpretation.

The Truth of the Artwork

Jean Dubuffet (1901-1985) differentiates the world and functioning of art from the broader intellectual realm by asserting, “Ideas and the algebra of ideas can be a level of knowledge, but art is a different means of knowledge; its levels are entirely different: they belong to vision.” (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 665). Pablo Picasso (1881-1973), on the other hand, when he states, “We all know that Art is not truth. Art is a lie that makes us realize truth, at least the truth that is given us to understand.” (*Art Humanities Masterpieces of Western Art: Primary Source Reader*, 1997.:321), clearly expresses that the reality of art is distinct from the external world, as evidenced by his remark, “Nature and art, being two different things, cannot be the same thing.” (*Art Humanities Masterpieces of Western Art: Primary Source Reader*, 1997: 321); perhaps even this comparison itself lacks meaning.

In light of this, it becomes imperative to reevaluate the nature and reality of art itself. Naturally, artists hold their own perspectives on this matter. For instance, Fernand Léger (1881-1955) declares, “The realistic value of a work of art is entirely independent of any imitative quality.” (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 229), and further adds “In my opinion, I would say that pictorial realism is the simultaneous arrangement of three major plastic components: Lines, Shapes, and Colors.” (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 229). Although these terms may sound familiar to us, it is crucial to recognize that the external world is not comprised of lines, shapes, and colors; it consists of objects. Describing the world in this manner does not imply that we perceive it in that way. While artists perceive lines, shapes, and colors, a non-artist perceives a glass, a cloud, a table. Léger refers to this as ‘perceptual reality.’

On the other hand, Hans (Jean) Arp (1887-1966) asserts “Representation is imitation, display, acrobatics... But art is reality, and the reality we share must reveal itself beyond all singularities.” (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 310), thereby alluding to the representation of objects. Art transcends the reality we conventionally perceive; for Arp, it may even constitute the very essence of reality. Robert Delaunay (1885-1941), who states, “Realism is the eternal quality in art; without it, there can be no permanent beauty because it is the very essence of beauty.” (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 199), demonstrates through his paintings that the realism he refers to diverges significantly from the discussions in art history.

Macke also articulates, “Man expresses his life in forms. Each form of art is an expression of his inner life. The exterior of the form of art is its interior” (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 119). He further emphasizes, “The scent of a flower, the joyful leaping of a dog, a dancer, the donning of jewelry, a temple, a painting, a style, the life of a nation, of an era.” (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 119). It is not surprising to encounter the concept of essence in these statements. Artists appear to concur that truth surpasses mere appearances.

Man Ray (1890-1977) summarizes the process of creating artwork as an act, stating,

The creative force and the expressiveness of painting reside materially in the color and texture of pigment, in the possibilities of form invention and organization, and in the flat plane on which these elements are brought to play... He uncovers the pure plane of expression that has so long been hidden by the glazings of nature imitation, anecdote and the other popular subjects. (*The Forum Exhibition of Modern American Painters*, 1916).

Ray seems to believe that imitations of nature conceal true reality.

Osip Brik (1888-1945) contends, “... we the painters make pictures in which nature is not the subject but merely an initial impetus for ideas. The painter not only has the right to change reality, it is virtually his duty to do so; otherwise he is not a painter but a bad copyist photographer.” (Elliott, 1979: 90). We witness a departure from nature in painting, but this does not imply that the painting no longer holds any connection to reality. Brik asserts, “The painter’s task certainly does not consist in showing an object as it is but rather in recreating it in a painting according to different, purely painterly laws.” (Elliott, 1979: 90). The painter operates within their own set of laws, which correspond to the reality of painting. Roger Hilton (1911-1975) also touches upon a similar point, albeit in a different manner: the absence of a suitable image. He states,

But I think that the figurative parts of paintings are not really what the painting is about. It becomes apparent that technique is constructed not so much as a means of representing the visible world, but as an instrument capable of embodying people’s profound truths. Abstraction has arisen not from positive things but from the absence of a valid image. (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 816).

Hans Hofmann (1880-1966) also explores the notion of a subjective reality for the artist, stating “The artist condenses his concepts, focuses his experience into a complete spiritual reality within himself, and thus creates a new reality from the medium’s perspective. Therefore, an artwork is a world within itself, but it reflects the sensory and emotional world of the artist.” (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 419).

Kazimir Malevich (1878-1835) asserts that art possesses its own truth, particularly when describing the Square as aligning with nature itself. He remarks,

... there is no longer the longing for those small escapades where art betrays its own truth. The Square is not a subconscious form, but the creation of instinctive reason. The face of the new art. The Square is a living and noble child. The first step of pure creativity in art. Everything before it is merely naive disruptions and copies of nature. (Danchev, 2017: 138)

“The artist’s perceptions undergo a transformation into the reality of the painting: “The realization of our perceptions of the world in the forms of space and time is the sole aim of our pictorial and plastic art.” (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 333). “Art (...) like all our activities, is an autonomous activity influenced by the material conditions of existence; as a form of knowledge, it has its own truth and its own consequences as its own form.” (Baynes, 2008: 31).

The Truth of the Era

Léger asserts, “Every art era has its own realism: it invents it in connection with more or less earlier eras.” (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 540). This statement is not without merit. Even if we assume that what we perceive as reality is universal and fixed, the passage of time allows for the emergence of new forms of truth. E. Fischer elaborates on this, stating

He (the artist) is not merely the accessory of a sensory organ apprehending the outside world, he is also a man who belongs to a particular age, class, and nation, he possesses a particular temperament and character, and all these things play a part in determining the manner in which he sees, experiences, and depicts the landscape... The whole of reality is the sum of all relationships between subject and object, not only past but also future, not only events but also subjective experiences, dreams, forebodings, emotions, fantasies. (E. Fischer, 1953: 105-6).

Jean Metzinger (1883-1957) echoes this sentiment, asserting, “Reality is deeper and at the same time more complex than academic formulas.” (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 221).

Adolph Gottlieb (1903-1974) suggests that the role of the artist is that of an image-maker, adapting to the demands of different times. He states, “The role of the artist, of course, has always been that of image-maker. Different times require different images... To my mind, certain so-called abstraction is not abstraction at all. On the contrary, it is the realism of our time” (“Tigers Eye”, 1947), highlighting the influence of time on the artist’s relationship with reality. Carlo Carrà (1881-1966), while discussing this change, emphasizes that the essence of art remains unchanged: “We do not want to bring any claims for the future because art, just like history, goes through successive stages, but this does not change its profound essence and it carries that future within itself.” (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 265).

Richard Huelsenbeck (1892-1974), referring to Dada, points to a new reality: the reality of the era. He states,

The word Dada symbolizes the most primitive relation to the reality of the environment; with Dadaism, a new reality comes into its own. Life appears as a simultaneous muddle of noises, colors, and spiritual rhythms, which is taken unmodified into Dadaist art, with all the sensational screams and fevers of its reckless everyday psyche and with all its brutal reality. (Huelsenbeck, 1920: 244).

Gerhard Richter (1932-) describes a shift in the representation of reality with a new discovery: “The invention of the ready-made appears to me as the invention of reality, in other words, a radical discovery that the only important thing about reality, which contradicts the view of the world image, is reality (that it produces itself). Since then, painting no longer represents reality, but reality itself (the reality it produces).” (Harrison ve Wood, 2011: 1212). Naum Gabo (1890-1977) seemingly concludes the discourse on reality in art by stating,

In the light of the Constructive idea, the purely philosophical wondering about real and unreal is idle. Even more idle is the intention to divide the real into super-real and sub-real, into conscious reality and sub-conscious reality. The Constructive idea knows only one reality. Nothing is unreal in Art. Whatever is touched by Art becomes reality. (Gabo, 1971: 9).

CONCLUSION

Art holds a collective ownership within humanity, transcending the confines of individual ownership. Cave paintings and renowned masterpieces like the Mona Lisa are not possessed by a single individual. Instead, art is an integral part of our existence, serving as a transformative force that has elevated us from mere animals throughout the course of our extensive history. This sense of belonging within the realm of art grants every individual the right to engage in discussions about it. As humans strive to comprehend the world around them and satisfy their innate desire for understanding, they embark on a quest for explanations that leaves no mystery unexplored. While humanity rapidly progresses in unraveling the mysteries of the external world, the enigmatic depths of our inner selves remain

perpetually elusive. Consciousness, in particular, stands as one of the most intricate subjects, defying complete comprehension.

Among individuals, it is the artist who occupies the most mysterious position in the interconnected chain of consciousness, interpretation, understanding, and creation. The emergence of artistic forms defies complete explanation in terms of their causes and processes. Philosophers and art historians have long undertaken the task of elucidating this phenomenon. However, when artists themselves express their perspectives, the definitional efforts of others often prove futile. The concepts devised for the purpose of dividing and categorizing art as a scientific method for enhanced comprehension ultimately fall short in capturing the essence of what is truly real, failing to establish a canon that holds intrinsic value for the artists themselves.

For the artist, every aspect pertaining to essence, including truth, reality, and authenticity, coalesces within the artwork itself. The artwork becomes the embodiment of truth, reality, and authenticity. From this perspective, all artists, as they create the reality embedded within their artwork, can be considered realists. Debates that extend beyond this fundamental point serve as intellectual exercises that hold little relevance to the artist and the realm of art.

In the contemporary post-humanist era, our interaction with reality assumes a heightened significance. Whereas in the past, a tangible reality could still be contemplated, with an awareness of something existing beyond its confines, the predominant focus of our present age revolves around virtual reality. We are now confronted with an intangible realm, apprehended through devices and distilled into cryptographic codes utilizing blockchain technology. Concurrently, as art immerses itself within the domain of virtual media, the artwork undergoes a transformation, to some extent, morphing into an image subservient to the capriciousness of pixels materializing on the screen. In delving into the nexus between art and reality, it becomes conceivable that we are gradually relinquishing our grasp on reality itself. The concept that simulation, in its very essence, supplants reality, emerges as a central concern delineating the future trajectory of artistic expression.

REFERENCES

- Art Humanities Masterpieces of Western Art: Primary Source Reader*. (1997). 3. bs. New York: Columbia University, Department of Art History and Archaeology.
- Bahr, H. (1925). *Expressionism*. Çev. R. T. Gribble. London: Frank Henderson.
- Baillods, J. (2008). *Courbet Yaşıyor*. Çev. Yalçın Karayağız. Portreler Dizisi 10. İstanbul: Chiviyazıları.
- Baynes, K. (2008). *Toplumda Sanat*. Çev. Yusuf Atılgan. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Buhmann, S. (2012). "Pollock: Signs & Symbols Allover". İçinde *Jackson Pollock, A Centennial Exhibition*, 9-11. New York: Jason Mccoy Gallery.
- Danchev, Alex, ed. (2017). *Fütürüstlerden Stuckistlere 100 Sanatçı Manifestosu*. Çev. Emir USLU. İstanbul.
- Elliott, D. ed. (1979). *Alexander Rodchenko*. Oxford: Museum of Modern Art, Oxford.
- Fischer, Ernst. (1953). *The Necessity of Art: A Marxist Approach*. London: Penguin Books.
- Fischer, M. (2010). *Kapitalist Gerçekçilik, Başka Alternatif Yok mu?* Çev. Gül Çağlalı Güven. İstanbul: Habitus Kitap.
- Flam, J, ed. (1978). *Matisse on Art*. New York: E. P. Dutton.
- Gabo, N. (1971). "The Constructive Idea In Art". İçinde *Circle - International Survey of Constructive Art*, 1-10. New York: Praeger.
- Glaser, M. (2008). "Önsöz". İçinde *Toplumda Sanat*, çev. Yusuf Atılgan, 9-11. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Gombrich, E. (1951). *The Story of Art*. New York: Phaidon Publishers.
- Haçerlioğlu, O. (1995). *Dört Bin Yıllık Düşünce, Sanat ve Bilim Tarihinin Klasik Yapıtları Üzerine Eleştirel İnceleme*. 6. Basım. Büyük Fikir Kitapları Dizisi 8. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Harrison, Charles ve Paul Wood, ed. 2011. *Sanat ve Kuram 1900-2000 Değişen Fikirler Antolojisi*. Çev. Sabri Gürses. 1. bs. İstanbul: Küre Yayınları.
- Huelsenbeck, R. (1920). "Collective Dada Manifesto". İçinde *The Dada Painters and Poets: An Anthology*, 242-46. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

- Kuş, M. (2019). “20. yy. Resim Sanatında Gerçekçilik Arayışları”. *IBAD Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, sy 1 (Aralık): 114-20. <https://doi.org/10.21733/ibad.603874>.
- Lippard, L, ed. (1970). *Surrealists on art*. New Jersey: A Spectrum Book.
- Rosenberg, H. (1952). “The American Action Paintings”. *ART News*, 1952.
- Sözen, M. ve Tanyeli U. (2016). *Sanat Sözlüğü: Kavram ve Terimleri: Resim-Heykel-Mimarlık Geleneksel Türk Sanatları Uygulamalı Sanatlar ve Genel Sanat Kavramları*. 16. bs. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- The Forum Exhibition of Modern American Painters*. (1916). New York: M. Kennerley.
- “Tigers Eye”. (1947). Adolph & Esther Gottlieb Foundation. <https://www.gottliebfoundation.org/tigers-eye-12-1947>.
- Timuçin, A. (2004). *Felsefe Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Bulut Yayınları.