A philosophical and psychological examination of aesthetic choice

Elaine Castiglione

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.rit.edu/theses

Recommended Citation
THESIS PROPOSAL FOR THE MASTER OF FINE ARTS DEGREE

College of Fine and Applied Arts
Rochester Institute of Technology

TITLE: "A Philosophical and Psychological Examination of Aesthetic Choice"

SUBMITTED BY: Elaine M. Castiglione

DATE: October 1, 1974

THESIS COMMITTEE: Dr. Robert Johnston, Co-Chairman
Robert Schmitz, Co-Chairman
Luvon Sheppard
James Thomas

DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL: 1.
2.

GRADUATE CHAIRMAN APPROVAL:

FINAL COMMITTEE DECISION:

[Signature]
5/19/76
A PHILOSOPHICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINATION OF AESTHETIC CHOICE

by
Elaine M. Castiglione
For my brother
INTRODUCTION

"It is necessary for a society in which works of art arise and are supported, to find out whether all that professes to be art is really art, whether all that which is art is good... It may be still more necessary for every conscientious artist to know this that he may be sure that all he does has a valid meaning."¹

It is the object of this paper to show that judgements in art are matters of personal preference and that psychology is the underlying system which governs aesthetic choice.
PART I

Is there an objective basis for judgements in art or is it simply a matter of personal preference? Let us imagine a conversation between an artist and a philosopher so that we can examine arguments from both points of view.
Arthur is a graduate student majoring in sculpture at Rochester Institute of Technology. Philip is a graduate student majoring in philosophy at The University of Rochester. They are roommates; thrown together by chance.

Phil: Why do you think your opinion is better than mine?

Art: Because of the differences in our backgrounds and professions. If we're talking about grounds for credibility of opinion, I really don't see how we can exclude these differences from the argument.

Phil: I agree but we're talking about art—not scientific principles. It all boils down to being simply a matter of taste or perhaps personal preference may be a better way to describe it.

Art: A more informed attitude will recognize four different and distinct reactions to art: two which are visually schooled and two untrained. Let's consider the reactions of the untrained. Among them there is first a level of higher sophistication—for example, a scientist. This level of understanding comes closest to that of the visually trained. The other level is that of the average layman who has a minimal intellectual response. His appreciation is on a surface level because he needs to relate to something which connects to his personal life and
which is complete in itself. That's why this group finds genre paintings so appealing.

Phil: Perhaps the layman's response is, therefore, more valid because it is totally naive and pure reaction, uncontaminated by esoteric jargon.

Art: Well, if you are talking about the emotional response part of the aesthetic experience, then your statement has validity. Everyone does have a gut level reaction to art. On this level I concur with you. If emotional response is the criterion, then each person's reaction is equally as valid. They are not, however, equally as intense or profound.

Phil: Isn't that a value judgement? What is your criterion for determining whose response is more intense... yours or that of the garbage collector?

Art: The artist cannot help but have a more involved and sophisticated reaction because he is alert to visual media. His visual receptors respond to additional stimuli, providing him with more information than an untrained layman would receive. More information yields more response. People in other higher levels of learning can also relate to an art object because they too may be involved in a creative process. Also, there are underlying structural principles or systems of thought which move through areas like science, music, theatre, literature. Therefore, we have common principles of structure
evident in a science vocabulary, a music vocabulary and so on. The educated class has a more valid response in that they can perceive these objective qualities like structure or rhythm in a work of art whereas the others cannot.

Phil: Do you realize what you're saying? If underlying principles can be recognized only by the educated, and, if perception needs an esoteric vocabulary, then art can be perceived only by the elite!

Art: That is true.

Phil: I disagree. If these formal elements are present, then they should be perceived by the viewer, educated or not. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that the educated may recognize specific qualities and label them according to the canons of a specific discipline. He can do this either because he is familiar with them from his own work or because he can associate them with something else in his world. I want to ask you something.

Art: O.K.

Phil: If a scientist responds to a painting by Mondrian because he identifies a certain system of order or structure about it which he associates with the organization of the cells he has been studying under the microscope, would it not also be true that a stock boy in a grocery store could have just as
intense a response to that very same painting because he senses the same order or structure but associates it with the geometrically arranged objects on shelves and displays? If this is so, what evidence do we have that the scientist or any other member of the educated elite is better qualified to recognize these "objective" qualities you speak of in art?

Art: If we think in words, then language becomes the basic vocabulary for our thinking. Obviously, someone with a larger vocabulary can develop and understand concepts more readily than someone with a limited one.

Phil: Yes, that is true. However, because something cannot be described in words doesn't mean that it isn't felt or known. If you acknowledge that response to art is subjective, then isn't it possible for two people to feel the same thing, while only one is skilled enough to put it in words? An inability to verbalize does not preclude feeling.

Art: Agreed but what I'm talking about are concepts, not feelings. Objective standards in art come from an intellectual process. Some art is for all people and some isn't. The art that does not have universal appeal is not readily understood. This is because it requires previous experience to be brought to the work itself. It requires the intellect.
Now, there are those artists who pursue a concept and those who don't. Those who don't make objects for sheer enjoyment. They are not challenging any ideas, they are not pushing into new unexplored areas, they are not examining new approaches, data, or materials. These two groups constitute the visually schooled category that I mentioned earlier. The first consists of artists, who study in the areas of the fine arts, and the other of artisans who study crafts.

Phil: Is this your contention or do others share it?...
Other artists?...The public?...

Art: People who are involved in art are aware of the distinction. As for the public, well, the masses accept tradition... it is more comfortable psychologically. If an artist is pushing into unfamiliar areas in the sense of exploring and understanding concepts, like color or form, then the masses need time to adjust. They reject an artist and his work on the grounds of eccentricity when they really mean incomprehensibility. The artisan, on the other hand, receives almost universal appeal in his time because his work is either traditional or utilitarian or both. The intellect is not challenged by the familiar. So, the masses need time to adjust and to be educated to the concepts that the artist is exploring. This very point is exemplified by the many artists who become famous posthumously. The visual intellect
of most people takes a number of decades to catch up to the visual intellect of the artist.

Phil: You said that the masses accept tradition. I don't understand, then, the reason for the overwhelming reaction to fads. Doesn't it seem that the masses must be bored with tradition for fads to have such an intense impact?

Art: Well, fads are quite separate from artistic concepts. They are on a surface response level...a new gimmick to amuse...a new flavor of ice cream...a momentary thing. Reaction to the visual arts is more profound. Fads are usually characterized by being an object and not a concept. This idea of "utilitarian object vs. concept" is the distinguishing feature between the crafts and fine arts.

Phil: Are you saying that the fine arts have a higher level of importance in the field of art than the crafts?

Art: What I am saying is that each of the areas of the fine arts is more conducive to exploring a concept. When you define a category in the crafts you set a limit at the same time. For example, jewelry—which is limited to body decoration. You cannot explore a concept completely if you have to make considerations for its function.

Phil: Can you give me a clearer example?
Art: Sure, let's use the concept of integrated spacial relationships or geometry. In the crafts you affix geometry to a thing, that is, a preconceived end. For a painter such as Mondrian, the painting evolved out of the geometry. The geometry did not dictate the painting. A concept is not restricted to a certain material. Mondrian could have used clay, plaster, wood, straw, sand or just about any material. In the crafts, the geometry would have to be applied to a function...a utilitarian function. For example, a coffee mug dictates that you use a heat withstanding material, that it be non-porous, that it be a certain size, that it must have a handle which fulfills certain criteria etc. etc. Exploring visual concepts in the fine arts becomes an intellectual pursuit with no consideration given for utilitarian function. It is an objective examination of ideas through principles of visual language.

Phil: Be careful of how you use that word "objective". It really isn't appropriate in discussions of art.

Art: It is from the standpoint of the artist. He is the only one who has the trained eye and sensitivity needed to determine the objective components to be measured in a work of art.

Phil: You are speaking of the artist as having expertise and using that premise as a ground upon which to base credibility. In reality, even the experts
in this area can't agree. So what does artistic expertise prove?

Art: Quality of discrimination and hence, opinion. The fact that an artist commits himself totally to the arts separates him from others. He is constantly in search for underlying systems of thought. He has been trained to question... to analyse... to solve difficult visual problems using creativity and innovation. This results in increased sensory perception and gives him a basis upon which he can validate his initial subjective response by being able to identify the principles in question... the particular relationships which set off that response. Now, I can't see how quality of discrimination can do otherwise than elevate quality of opinion. Artistic taste certainly can be informed or uninformed, sophisticated or naive, highly refined or crude.  

Phil: Wait a minute, Art! I think you have a profound point this time. I finally see it. There really is indeed such a thing as good taste and bad. Good taste means MY taste and includes EVERY person in the world who shares my taste!

Art: Why you feel compelled to reduce yourself to insipid humor is beyond me, Phil.

Phil: Insipid! One thing my humor is not and that's insipid. Why, I attended Yale School of Humor...
spent four years analytically studying underlying principles of the ludicrous...why, I hold a B.A.H. Degree! Any qualified connoisseur of humor will attest to the fact that humor may certainly be "informed or uninformed, sophisticated or naive, highly refined or crude!"

Art: O.K. O.K. I get the message.

Phil: The point is simply that there has to be an independent method which will identify sophisticated taste and indicate that it is superior. I can't think of a way of answering this question in other than arbitrary and dogmatic terms. The self cannot be taken as a standard. Another point: Is there an independent method which will establish as fact that education leads to a refinement of discrimination? Wait! Don't answer that. It's rhetorical. I find it a bit incredulous that artistic training works by substituting subtle and precise sensory discrimination and emotional responses for crude and imprecise ones.

Art: Alright. Let's confine our discussion to the actual objective principles the artist employs to define his statement visually.

Phil: There's that word again.

Art: What word?

Phil: "Objective"
Art: It applies.

Phil: Prove it.

Art: O.K. The vast majority in art create at a level which is satisfying emotionally. That is, their efforts are directed toward either the creation of art objects or the expression of themselves. The artist, conversely, creates at a level which is satisfying intellectually.

Phil: Are you saying that the artist isn't involved in either self-expression or the creation of objects?

Art: The artist's primary concern is not with creating an object nor with expressing himself but the two are logical by-products of his pursuit. His intention is the exploration of visual principles and his purpose is to discover new relationships which will be a contribution to the field of visual awareness.

Phil: What does this have to do with objectivity?

Art: Every visual idea embodies a system of interconnected principles which will enable it to function with maximum efficiency. An artist defines a concept, that is, he sets criteria for the solution of the problem. These become objective components which satisfy the criteria set for the visual concept.
Phil: Would you agree that the word "objective" would refer to only that which exists independent of the perceiver?

Art: Yes. These components are objective and exist independently in that they constitute the necessary criteria for the resolution of the concept.

Phil: Having objectivity is not the same as having measurable physical properties which I think is what you mean. If these components are objective, then any artist working on the same concept will come up with the same solution by using the same "objective" components. Listen, if there were objective criteria in the field of art then all artists would use the same rules. Also, all who were educated aesthetically would have the same aesthetic viewpoint. Children as well as mathematicians agree that 1+1=2. That was true in 400 B.C., is true today and will continue to be valid ad infinitum. The objective premise is true in the U.S.A., China, South America, and even primitive civilizations. If art had objectivity then taste would remain constant and there would not be so many conflicting definitions of beauty. If artists can't agree on a definition of beauty why should we believe that such a thing as beauty even exists? It is irrational to believe in something without grounds to support that belief.
Art: Just because you can't define something, does it necessarily follow that it doesn't exist or that it has to be subjective?

Phil: Or is unknown. Your reasoning is sound.

Art: Can't knowledge exist unproven? If knowledge cannot be proven scientifically or empirically, does that preclude it from existing?

Phil: Yes. Knowledge, by definition, refers to a body of KNOWN facts which are accepted as truths on some grounds.

Art: Isn't there a realm of knowledge which exists, that is, is understood by people yet not statable in a concrete way?

Phil: Knowledge is statable and communal. You must be referring to feelings.


Phil: Abstract ideas do not exist independent of the mind that conceives them. They cannot be perceived.

Art: That's ridiculous! To see something as...well...round, is to see roundness in it. Roundness is an abstract concept. Therefore, perception does indeed consist of grasping abstract ideas!

Phil: True abstract ideas are entirely man made and are not
measurable. Roundness is something which is found in nature. Quite simply, ideas do not exist independent of the mind. If an idea does exist independent of the mind then it is a thing...an external object, not an idea.

Art: Wait a second. Abstracts do not have an existence apart from the real world. They have a translatable value. That is, you can tie the occurrence to a principle or an end.

Phil: Even with this line of reasoning you are going to have trouble pulling off the same trick with beauty. You won't be able to attach it to anything outside of itself or one of its categories.

Art: Just follow my thinking. We'll use justice as an example. Justice is an abstract idea but translatable. We can prove that civilization is dependent on it. We can prove that justice is..., well, equality. I have nine players on my baseball team and you have nine. Anyone, anywhere can understand that. That's objective knowledge though it may not be able to be proven scientifically.

Phil: I want to ask you a question.

Art: O.K.

Phil: Am I correct in saying that you feel the concept of justice is universal?
Art: Yes. In the simplest of terms, if we have 4 apples justice will dictate that I get 2 and you get 2. Everyone will agree.

Phil: O.K. I ask you, "What is justice?", and you show me 2 apples on my side of the table and 2 apples on yours. Next I go to Siberia and ask the chancellor, "What is justice?", same question, right? He says, "What is justice? Why that is easy, I can show you. Come see our very fine concentration camps!" Then, I go to Africa and pose the very same question to a medicine man. "What is justice?" He proceeds to escort me to an area where he has the most exquisite collection of shrunken heads that I have ever seen. Now, the question I want to ask you is this: Are all three concepts of justice identical?

Art: No, of course not. But you did do that Russian accent rather well.

Phil: Thank you. I picked that up in my sophomore year of humor school. To get back to beauty...let's put the concept into a valid syllogism:

- Objective means: only that which exists independent of the perceiver
- Beauty is not independent of the perceiver
- Therefore, beauty cannot be objective.

Art: I will concede that there may be no objective grounds
for beauty outside the perceiver but that still leaves inside!

Phil: What do you mean?

Art: I mean inside the perceiver. Intuition. Not long ago I read a book by Theodore Reik, a psychoanalyst. It was called "Listening With The Third Ear". In this book he advances his thesis that a competent psychoanalyst is born and not made. I happen to feel that the same thing holds true for artists. True artists are born and not made! The whole question ends up in genetics and not in environmental influences, although the latter does have its role.

Phil: You may be correct but there is an important point which shouldn't be overlooked. When you shift your stance to inside the perceiver, you then give up the hope of attaining objectivity. Without that, you can never hope to have a claim to knowledge. "I feel certain" is the best you can hope for and no matter what way you cut it, it still ends up as an evaluative claim which is no more than a highly qualified assertion. "It is certain", on the other hand, is unqualified and therefore a much stronger claim. Quite simply, knowledge claims are strong claims and require strong support. They demand objective certainty which in turn gives them the distinguishing feature of being beyond rational dispute! ³
I have determined that artistic judgements are matters of personal preference.

I am now compelled to ask an additional question: Are these preferences arbitrary or is there some underlying system which influences aesthetic choice? In the following pages I shall present my thoughts which offer an answer to this provocative question.

My formal education did not include a concentration in psychology. I have, therefore, taken great precaution to carefully support the ideas leading to my thesis with quotes and detailed footnotes from works by the two most authoritative figures in psychology--Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung. I ask the reader to bear with this documentation and to make reference to the footnotes with an asterisk as they accompany the text for additional information.

The archaic and no longer accepted way of spelling the word "fantasy" as "phantasy" has been selected out of respect for Sigmund Freud and for consistency with regard to quotes and footnotes.
Freud characterizes the artist as having organic personality defects which affect his ability to adapt and adjust to life's problems, or, in psychological terms, "the reality principle."5 "The artist is...in rudiments an introvert, not far removed from neurosis. He is oppressed by excessively powerful instinctual needs."6 He "is originally a man who turns away from reality because he cannot come to terms with the renunciation of instinctual satisfaction which it at first demands, and who allows his erotic and ambitious wishes full play in the life of phantasy."7

In his own writings, Carl Jung concurs with Freud and explains that the artist's life "...cannot be otherwise than full of conflicts, for two forces are at war within him..."8 He identifies the forces as the desire for ordinary human happiness and the relentless passion for creation. Jung describes the creative drive as an autonomous complex, "...a split off portion of the psyche, which leads a life of its own outside the hierarchy of consciousness."9 Therefore, according to Freud and Jung, the drive functions as an "unconscious imperative"10 and because of its autonomous nature is beyond control of the artist's will. That is, the secret of its origin lies in biology.11* It cannot be learned, and it cannot be dismissed from or recalled to consciousness by the artist himself.12

Paul Klee affirms the existence of this compelling force in his writings. "My hand is entirely the instrument of a more distant sphere. Nor is it my head that functions
in my work; it is something else..."13

In order for human civilization to exist, our instincts must be restricted. Therefore, the human organism must compensate in some way in order to avoid a temperament which otherwise would be in itself devastating. One way the psyche does this is by repressing the denied instinct, withdrawing from the unsatisfactory world of reality and then substituting phantasies in a desperate attempt to compensate for the unsatisfied longing. Art, in the words of Ernest Jones, "constitutes an intermediate territory between the wish-denying reality and the wish-fulfilling world of phantasy."14 It has, therefore, the unique attribute of being able to offer substitute gratification for cultural renunciations.

The artist is able to achieve this substitute gratification through a process called sublimation, which is a way of directing repressed energy to an outlet in another area and thereby hold perverse impulses in check. "...according to the completeness or incompleteness of the sublimation, a characterological analysis of a highly gifted individual, and in particular of one with an artistic disposition, may reveal a mixture, in every proportion, of efficiency, perversion, and neurosis."15

Unsatisfied childhood longings should not be dismissed lightly. They are profound psychological disturbances which continue to haunt the individual. Examples are extensive and include: an identity crisis
resulting from sibling rivalry, a defiance of authority resulting from the Oedipus complex, a self-destructive activity resulting from inadequate parental love.

The disturbances mentioned above are basic human problems and, therefore, universal. They are experienced not just by the artist but by all humans. However, it is important to note that the artist's bio-chemical makeup contains inherent organic weaknesses which distinguish him from others as well as the gift of eye-hand coordination.

I believe that the artist is tormented by a multiplicity of conflicts, but that analysis of his work will reveal a main psychological preoccupation with one deeply rooted problem which left him traumatized in childhood. The analysis should then be able to reveal other symbols which indicate conflicts that can be viewed as logical correlaries of the main disturbance.

Assume a male child six years of age whose biological structure embodies both the artist's psychological makeup and artistic talent. The child is going through the phase of development known as the Oedipus complex. In psychological terms, he competes with his father for the love of his mother, sees his disadvantage, and develops hostility toward his father. Society renounces both incest and hatred towards one's parents. The child's instinctual impulse is unusually intense and a conflict arises between his Id, that is, his instinct to possess his mother, and his Ego, that is, the reality which forbids
him to do so. Due to the inherent defects in his personality the unresolved conflict becomes obsessive and results in trauma. In order to avoid "a disposition which is in itself perilous"\textsuperscript{18}, the psyche represses the conflict and the child takes flight in phantasy as a means of compensating for the inadequacies of reality. The conflict has not been resolved and therefore remains in his subconscious as an undercurrent of anxiety.

The energy for this subconscious turmoil is drawn from the conscious state and "...can drain him of his humanity to such a degree that the personal ego can exist only on a primitive or inferior level and is driven to develop all sorts of defects... These inferiorities are the only means by which it can maintain its vitality and prevent itself from being wholly depleted."\textsuperscript{19} Jung explains that the development of undesirable characteristics is the only defense mechanism children have to protect themselves from the destructive influence of a loveless environment. Negative attention is better than no attention at all. "...such children easily become ruthless and selfish, and later display an invincible egoism by remaining all their lives infantile and helpless or by actively offending against morality and the law."\textsuperscript{20} This "...greater expenditure of energy...must necessarily leave a deficit on some other side of life."\textsuperscript{21}

Thus, a child may grow to maturity with all sorts of personality defects. He will withdraw more and more from the insufficiencies of reality into his own personal
world of phantasy.

At some point in his life he discovers a creative discipline and a mysterious connection is made as his subconscious senses the opportunity to sublimate, or, relieve his anxiety. The field he chooses will be directly influenced by elements from his childhood environment. The child now is provided with an outlet for his phantasies which radiate out of the unresolved Oedipus conflict. He is not, however, at liberty to state his phantasy directly. Not only would he feel shame but society would react in a condemnatory manner if he were to let his subconscious surface and openly state: "When I was a child I wanted to kill my father so I could have my mother's total love." His phantasies, therefore, to be fulfilled, must undergo "...a transformation which softens what is offensive in them" and "conceals their personal origin..."\(^22\)

The child finds "the way back to reality, however, from this world of phantasy by making use of special gifts to mould his phantasies into truths of a new kind, which are valued by men as precious reflections of reality."\(^23\) He links "...so large a yield of pleasure to this representation of his unconscious phantasy that, for the time being at least, repressions are outweighed and lifted by it. If he is able to accomplish all this he makes it possible for other people once more to derive consolation and alleviation from their own sources of pleasure in their unconscious which have become inacces-
sible to them..."24 as they too feel the same dissatisfactions caused by the reality principle. "...he (the artist) earns their gratitude and admiration and he has thus achieved THROUGH his phantasy what he had originally achieved only IN his phantasy..."25 These are: honor, power, and love. In this way the artist liberates his audience and enables them to obtain satisfaction from their own phantasies without feelings of self reproach or shame.26*

The artist is unaware, then, that his creation is a visual representation which symbolizes his phantasy. He fancies himself examining visual principles. The observer believes he is looking for beauty. Both are subconsciously searching for a way to alleviate their suffering "from the same arrested desires."

Freud notes, "This has brought me to recognize the apparently paradoxical fact that precisely some of the grandest and most overwhelming creations of art are still unsolved riddles to our understanding. We admire them, feel overawed by them, but we are unable to say what they represent to us."28

According to Jung, we may be able to identify the symbol "...even though we may not be able to unriddle it's meaning to our entire satisfaction. A symbol remains a perceptual challenge to our thoughts and feelings. That probably explains why a symbolic work is so stimulating, why it grips us so intensely, but also why it seldom affords
us a purely aesthetic enjoyment."\(^{29*}\)

We have learned from Freud and Jung that psychological analysis of a work of art can reveal the underlying conflicts in the artist's personality. Jung shows profound insight in adding that if analysis becomes so intensive that it brings the work into the realm of general human psychology, "It strips the work of art of its shimmering robes and exposes the nakedness...of Homo Sapiens..."\(^{30}\)

To set himself free the artist must express his phantasies in such a way that others may also find liberation. It follows, then, that his role contains a paradox. He must disguise the phantasy so that it will not be offensive yet reveal it sufficiently to have emotional impact on the observer. His search is for the balance between the two. Within this paradox and upon this balance lies the secret to beauty.\(^{31*}\)

Beauty is not a constituent of an object. It is not a measurable physical element. Beauty is born of the ethereal relationship between artist and viewer.

The "beauty" that the artist creates or the observer perceives is, in fact, the visual representation of a psychological kinship between the two.
PART III

My development in the field of art is the result of two thought processes—an intellectual view in the area of aesthetics and an intuitive visual perception. My attitude toward and my approach to clay, therefore, is the result of a total involvement which includes these two processes of reasoning.

The written material in this theses not only presents my thoughts in the area of aesthetics. It documents the transition in my art work form pottery to sculpture.

My search in philosophy and psychology enabled me to accept as valid the non-utilitarian use of clay to create form. It made me cognizant of my own limitations in artistic thinking and hence, my work. It also allowed me to accept the use of materials and the exploration of concepts other than my own. Most importantly, it gave me profound insight into myself and others and elucidated the true and important role of a work of art in human society.

My sculptures were created so I might examine the effects of natural light upon color and its use in volumetric space. The materials employed were: earthenware and stoneware clays, polyester resin, steel, wire. My exploration of color, light, and form through clay and resin demanded additional technical knowledge and skills. I came to learn that the fusing of new materials and ideas leads one to a more sophisticated and involved expertise which enhances the potentials of any material.
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