Art

Introduction

Art can be considered as that collection of human activities and products of those concerned activities. Art serve diverse needs of human perception of their universe, aesthetically art tends of colour the universe. An art will connect the artist with the world by their art work. Primarily any artist wants the rest of the world (viewer, those who did not take part in the development of art work) have the same mind of dealing with the universe. Artists use art to express their feeling out the world composition, achieving this call for a strong mind to combined critically sorted out ideas and represent them on the relevant platform of art representation ready for their target market. Art comprise of such field like sculpture, painting, photography, printmaking, among other visual media. Considering briefly architecture, falls in the category of visual art since it involves object creation where major concerned is to relate with the practical object (Arnheim, pg. 24).

Art is bound to speak many functions as a bunch, among the functions of art include; express the artist feelings in a more advance philosophical language this can be referred to as expressionism, secondly communicate to those who are viewing the piece of art (communism) of the intended emotions through it mimesis ( i.e. representation of reality) characteristics. Just going high up the notch, within the romantic period art was seen as “special branch of human mind fit to be classified among science and religion.” Although art does not have a clear definition it can be illustrated from the various philosophical agreements that art is that clear description of human imaginative ideas or those technical skills originating from the human agency and creative creation. Making a good art needs proper coordination of many issues, proper control of this ideas matter the most in the final concept created. In the rest of this critic paper our main focus is to criticize the various important aspects of art especially painting (Arnheim, pg. 24).

*Style of painting and simplicity*

Painting style is vital in every art work it gives art work a definite shape. Relativity simplicity is the word. Frank Stella piece is not falling within this movement; it is observed that Stella is moving from the long mastered movement involving great painters like Malevich, who was a constructivist, Mondrian a Neo-Plasticist, and the purists. Relating his work with the abstract expressionism, or the surrealism, in contrast to these virtues of painting his work cut across the simplicity principles (Bruce, Pg. 148) as people tend to face the difficult aspect of painting there would always be somebody who is facing that different direction about painting which is painting with simplicity. Frank consider his art piece are that different from the work which was presented by Mondrian 30 years ago in the New Yorker, the time he was showing for the first time his piece of *Coates*, for him nothing was similar though he was young by that time.

Frank Stella does not have anything common with Mondrian painting especially on the aspect of geometric painting, it seems like he does not drive his motivation from Mondrian work, and from this perspective his work does not follow the European geometry of painting. Comparing Frank’s pieces with those Vasarely, there is something to hold you there for a moment, aspects of illusionism are present in both pieces though the magnitude is what causes some differences for instance the, Vasarely’s work is full of illusionism unlike Frank’s (Bruce, pg. 149)

However, on the same point the work of Vasarely depicts much similarity to the European geometry painting unlike the work of Frank Stella. Though the work seems similar in pattern among other aspects, scale of the art is one of the conspicuous things to take much consideration of. Vasarely’s work make use of a smaller scale and it is composed of greater details and qualities that are contained in the 20’s and 30’s European paintings, he can be regarded as the artist who is in the developmental phase from the early 30’s who did it by himself by that time (Bruce, pg. 149)

Frank’s painting is not *relational* in this sense it is non-relational. Most of the artist would tend to balance the distribution of their piece of art that they are working on for instance the nature of event distribution that is in case one is using a canvas to represent their piece of art they would make sure that all of the space in the canvas is equally utilized, on this concept whatever that is done one corner of the of the painting should also be done on the other corner for equity achievement. The work of Frank Stella does not put much emphasises on the aspects of relational painting, for him what matters is whether the image has been presented on the medium of representation. To achieve symmetry for Frank depends entirely on natural as connection, compared to Ken Noland who could employ use of concentric circles to bring symmetry in his work; this for him would curb problems that might occur as a result of trying to workout symmetry (Bruce, pg. 150).

Since the work of Frank Stella does not consider symmetry just like the contemporary painters in America, their piece of work is bound to be associated with issues dealing with quality work production. In the case when more information is supposed to be represented in the canvas without proper symmetry good work would not be achieved. Frank’s work is a representation of the art work which is more of having the feeling of industrial look due to the over emphasized artist’s presence in the work (Bruce, pg. 150).

Stella tends to reduce many details in his work especially with usage of paint. Painting according to Stella is wastage of resource as the art work would still convey the same information and create the same impression. As mentioned earlier he does not take into consideration of the values bestowed by the Abstract Expressionist. Drawing and painting are two different things that do not converge at any particular instance. Painting would result in creating more illustration of the main feeling or the view you as a painter or artist has on whatever you are bring to the audience to view. More information would be easily visible hence facilitating quick interpretation of you work, from this point of view most his work is lucking clear direction. No artist would want their work go without making an impression to the audience hence painting would help solve this mystery (Bruce, 151).

From a rationalism perspective, Stella’s work fall falls in the category of the reductionist. He is working out all the aspect that people would be looking for in an art work. This can be considered as being egocentric such that you only want people to see you want them to see. Through the reductionist aspect, Stella would get rid of all the things that would get him into trouble and consuming much of his time in process of preparing a piece. Doing a simple piece of art requires an artist to leave out much aspect of doing visual art and inculcating the modern values of doing art (Bruce, pg.163).

In summary Stella is calling out for a radical move in the field of visual art whereby he clearly states that one does not need to follow the strenuous requirements of the past to come up with a piece that would impress the viewer. He advocates for a short move that makes the piece clean and appealing to the viewer.
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