

Is it Art?

A question that became philosophical after the “Die Blau Reiter” and Dadaism.
An issue that engaged Andre Breton a lifetime.
And after him many others.

Since the beginning of the 20th century it had obtained a total different load as what had happened everything before that date.
The many “isms”, art styles, are proof of that.

Is decorative painting an art form?

Well, painting structures and reproducing of such is nowadays certainly not recognized as Art.

Reproduction is no Art.

But when the reproduction is done with a certain soul to it, a swing in the composition, and in combination of other structures and forms it might give the observer an emotional feel and influencing his mental state to either a good mood up to a possible non comforting atmosphere.

So in case we are influenced mentally we then can concenter decorative painting as a vehicle to express or even influence a mood and mental state.

It might sound degenerating calling decorative painting as being no Art.

It deals a lot with techniques, craftsmanship and self discipline.

But when that quintessential sparkle of thinking comes along with it, so to say the animation, something has been added to the decorative painting.

Just mechanically reproducing a structure for the sake of the intricate technique is than a showcase of abilities.

Still, many could be moved by its perfection of the sample itself and in that manner it belongs suddenly to the section of Art.

The real destiny of decorative painting is to serve an environment.

The end result of that in the total architectural scheme of the surroundings can be uplifting if executed in the proper manner.

Now, isolating a piece of decorative painting on a canvas or board is some other experience.

Either it is meant to be a sample to sell from, so a commercially purpose, or a showcase of what an Artisan can produce to a certain level of quality.

When any object, read form and structure and color, is imitated on a separately and moveable background it might just be considered as Art suddenly.

For, with that we propose and throw to the observer a question.

Whether he gets it or not is from than on already Art.

A painting on canvas is considered more likely as a “product” as when the same picture is done on a wall

But as well respected Salon member Patrick Kirwin says: “One day all Art will end up to be just a mere picture in a museum”.

With that he implies the relativity of the load and meaning of an artist and his or her works.

The value of the meaning and importance of any painting will alter with the times. The picture remains and the true value will stand.

So it is a time related object of discussion.

Maybe the only real Art are properly the emotional malfunctions and frustrations from the deepest inner soul of the artist towards the reaction of the observer. The observers’ reaction than is only a result of its’own personal history.

Even a hideous painting or display, badly painted with an awfull concept is then Art. Because it will arouse one in negative (or positive) sense. Now, there is interaction. It is in other words the creation of communication between two persons.

Is all communication to be called Art?

If my name is Bill Gates: Yes it is!!

Communication about emotions is nowadays Art.

And any decorative painting that causes a reaction or an emotion by its’observer is therefore to be called Art.

But mind you, beauty is not always to be called Art!

In contrary to the statement: Art for Art sake.

Art is a search without knowing what you are looking for.

Decorative “Art” is an inspired giftness to fulfill virtuality towards expectation.

A re creation of reality assured by given rules and laws.

Its’succes is bound by the proper use of virtuosity and initiative.

Only the latter can have the quitessential function as The Sparkle to name a work “Art”.

Picasso was sitting in a café. A woman comes up and asks the man to draw something on a napkin. And so he does. The woman thanks the man and walks away.

But she returns with a bit of guilt and questions him what she owns the man.

He replies:”30.0000, pounds” . As she answer:”But my child of three can produce such as well”

Picasso then says:”But it took me thirty years to come this far”.

Was he relating to his craftsmanship or vision?

The panel painted during the Salon 2003 in Brugge is a collaboration of J.Berghuis and the sublime calligraphist (and decorative painter) from Scotland Ron Gordon. They painted it as a joke and to shake the meaning of decorative painting. All aspects within the panel are surely imitations of materials and the trompe l'œil effect of the metal board hanging on the cushion like fabric. The high contrast of the colors make sure as well we can differ the one from the other and it shows clearly the contrast of the hard, cold metal against the fluffy stuffed material. The sign says "Art is not what you see but what you are about to see" A question to look further than only what we see so obviously. Vision so to say. In this case, we try to look further than only the given information: but there is none. Or is it? The joke is that the metal board is ABOUT to fall off from its nail. A typical Trompe l'œil trick, the message is not far away to discover because we sometimes tend to look too far. Or is it a symbol that Art in general is falling? The panel was done in a spontaneously mood and with a limited space. In a small corridor in the exhibition area the panel was quickly mounted and together with all needed painting materials next to it they both went off in a hurry. There was not enough time to finish it off before the Salon would end. Next to that, people walked by and a crowd of British admirers were opposite of them. Obviously with a lot of fun and relaxed atmosphere.

The panel is completely done in oils and with traditional techniques to express a modern concept.

The atmosphere was hot, as well as the weather was.

A joyful momentum!

J.Berghuis January 2004 excerpt from the book "The Quintessential Academy"

