

TR 77-36
RHODES UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

Cl. No. TR 77-36
Acc. No. 80/58
128013

ART AND POWER

An investigation into the effect Politics,
the Church and Economics have had on the
content of a work of art and the develop-
ment of art in general.

FOR: THE MASTER OF FINE ARTS DEGREE

By
ALBERT B HEYDENRYCH

NOT TO BE TAKEN AWAY
FROM THE LIBRARY

RHODES UNIVERSITY 1976

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	Page 1
1. THE RUSSIAN VENTURE	Page 4
2. THE ARTIST AS BUSINESSMAN	Page 20
3. THE SOUTH AFRICAN WRITER AND CENSORSHIP	Page 28
4. RELIGION AND THE ARTS	Page 37
APPENDIX A:	
MUSIC UNDER KHRUSKCHEV: THE DECREE OF 28 MAY 1958	Page 43
CONCLUSION	Page 45
BIBLIOGRAPHY	Page 48

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Financial assistance of the Human Sciences Research Council towards the costs of this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed or conclusions reached are those of the author and are not to be regarded as a reflection of the opinions and conclusions of the Human Sciences Research Council.

The author wishes to thank Miss D. Holderness who so kindly consented to type this essay.

The author wishes to hereby acknowledge the supervision of the research for this essay by Prof. Brian Bradshaw of the Fine Arts Department of Rhodes University.

INTRODUCTION

Society, being made up of different groups, is a varied and intricate system of relationships forming an environment in which these groups operate. No one group reacts or relates to this environment in the same way, which accounts thus for differences in their psychological states and in their aesthetic needs and desires. Therefore, within a specific environment we will find groups existing side-by-side making demands on the artist which are quite different in character. The situation is further complicated in that these groups can be sub-divided into classes, these, as we all know, occupying a place of superiority within the group according to their level of education, occupation and wealth.

Cultural life is determined by this society and the artist can thus only create within the milieu provided by society. Generally the artist belongs to a different social group or 'class' from his 'patron' and thus does not necessarily share the same views, needs or commitments as his patron. However, whether the artist accepts the dominant cultural values of his age or is aware of the contradictions within that culture, his work is shaped by those forces in control of society at the time.

Too often the arts is approached purely as a means of providing pleasure with no, or very little, attention being paid to the social significance of the work of art or the intricate relationship that exists between the artist and his audience or the society that determines the basic conditions of communication. This criticism not only holds for the general mass, but can be applied also to the majority of critics and numerous artists themselves. In the Western world especially, very little attention has been paid to those constraints placed upon the artist that have played a major role in determining the contents of a work of art, the direction art has taken in the past and even now.

During the course of this essay I will show how the dominant groups in society exercised their power as regards the above mentioned. I will further define these groups as being the State, Church and those

on a high economic level. As I have already stated, different groups have different psychological needs, tastes and desires. Thus there exist the question of how the psychic states of these patron groups affect the creative act and so also general artistic developement. I would suggest that this happens in at least three basic ways: these being stipulation, attraction and selection.

Stipulation I define as the placing of orders with the artist that has to be carried out according to the specifications of the patron. Although patronage is more the exception than the rule today, it still exists in one form or another. It is definately very much operative as regards 'commercial' art, portraiture, architecture and the composition of music for films and television, and less so as regards novels, easel painting, the theatre and sculpture.

Under stipulation I will also include the State and Church in as far as they stipulate by way of direct legislation or decree .

Attraction speaks really for itself in that it implies the following or adherence to a certain ideology or approach at your own free will. Here I thus mean the ability of the group to attract the artist to its point of view via a sympathetic moral or intelluctual climate or else becasue of, or with the support of, economic support. Attraction played a leading role during the beginnings of the Christain era, the deeply religious eleventh and twelfth centuries and the initial years before and after the Bolshevik revolution in Russia. It is often very influential during periods of social change or revolution. Attraction also manifest itself in the sphere of the arts in another way, in that it can lend strength to movements and styles. After a work of art has gained recognition and finds support with the dominant group within a society and proves thus to be economically safe, other artists are often attracted or indused to follow the new style or movement.

Selection is also fairly simple to comprehend in that it indicates the choosing of works of art for specific reasons or purposes. People on all levels give preference to a specific form of art, but it is only those at the top economic levels that patronize the 'major' arts and thus exercise an influence on the arts in this manner. This influence

often extends to the lower classes or economic levels. The artist who achieves fame because of his acceptance by this group, is bound to attract a following of artists more interested in the economic reward than artistic development. In this way then styles can also be created. I must point out here that attraction and selection are actually very closely related in practice.

The reader will realize that it is rather difficult to deal with art through all its developments as regards the premise as out-lined above within the limited space of this essay. I shall thus proceed to elucidate my premise by way of discussion and illustration of a few periods from the vast world of art which will suffice, I am sure, to make my point quite clear.

What I will thus ultimately illustrate during the course of this essay is, that culture is not politically neutral; and that it is as impossible for it to be so as it is impossible for any other form of human labour to detach itself from its conditions of production and reception. I will show further that the notion of art-for-art's-sake, that is, that art is justified by its very existence and should not or does not serve any social function overtly; that it does not elude to anything outside itself; is a fallacy. In fact, art-for-art's-sake is primarily the response of producers of art for a market in the same way as producers of other commodities. I will therefore show that all artists are in one way or another subjected to the ideologies, views and systems created by those already in control of or aspiring for control of society.

THE RUSSIAN VENTURE

From March to November 1917 Russia was ruled by a revolutionary "provisional government". This regime made tentative attempts at establishing a political democracy, but was actually unable to bring about any effective social reform. By November 1917 it was a body totally divided, totally in-effective and with no popular support. It was thus a very easy task for the Bolsheviks to overthrow the Provisional Government and assume power.

Their most outstanding leader was Vladimir Ulganov (1870 - 1924), popularly known as N. Lenin. His most able lieutenants were Leon Trotsky and Joseph Stalin, both who were destined to play a leading role in the later leadership of Communist Russia.

As mentioned, the Bolsheviks seized power in November 1917, and Lenin proclaimed that his dictatorship "is the dictatorship of the proletariat." In the ensuing months and years we witness the take-over of all private property; placing of the management, production, purchase and sale of the factories in the hands of worker committees and peasant communities. In 1917 Lenin issued a "Declaration of the Rights of Peoples" in which the cultural and national self-determination of the peoples of Russia was promised; a promise which was never to be kept in full. At this stage the Bolsheviks were still very much in the minority; but a very determined minority: in 1918 Bolshevik soldiers broke up the Constituent Assembly sitting in Moscow, denouncing it as "an agency of reaction", while throughout the country Bolshevik soviets terrorized the majority into submitting to the Communist ideal.

The Bolsheviks were intent on bringing about a thorough social revolution and any "reactionaries" were harshly treated. Capitalists, nobles, army officers and bureaucrats of the old regime were executed. In 1918 the Orthodox Church was disestablished by decree and steps were being taken against Christian clergymen.

All this did not happen without any opposition from the general public. Various groups throughout the country; including the Anarchists who were initially very much in favour of the revolution; with the help of certain Western powers rose against the new regime. But, as can be seen today, the Bolshevik revolution was a revolution to stay and to entrench a new power.

By 1921 the authority of the Bolshevik government was firmly established. In 1922 Germany recognised the Communist regime, soon to be followed by the Allies till also the United States recognised them in 1934. The Russian dictatorship was firmly established ; a one party state under the leadership of Lenin. The Communist Party, as late as 1935, still consisted of only two-and-a-half-million people of which urban workers comprised by far the largest number.

In 1924, on the death of Lenin, Stalin assumed power, Trotsky was dismissed from the Commissariat of War; in 1927 he was expelled from the Party and in 1929 he had to flee the country in fear of his life.

This then is the state of Russia by 1929. The ideals of the party were continuously propagated via the theatre, music and the fine arts. Russian society, instead of comprising of a minority of wealthy idlers and a majority of poverty-stricken workers, would consist of a single class, all of whom would enjoy the fruits of their labor. Simultaneously, under social ownership, the latest and best machinery would be introduced into Russian factories and onto the farms, increasing their yeild, raising the general standard of living and endowing all the people with ever increasing material benefits.

KHRUSHCHEV: AGE OF LIBERALISM

In the arts and literature Khrushchev followed largely the ideals of the Stalinist old-guard. His frequent utterances of disgust at tendencies outside the official lines were echoed and reinforced by official warnings. Writers, as well as other artists, who took the liberty of criticizing the past or present found themselves officially attacked. This, more than often, landed them in a rather dis-advantages position, and a great many of them found their usefulness confined to a lunatic asylum.

Social responsibility reigned supreme and spontaneity was absolutely not permitted. But, changes were becoming more and more the order of the day, and it was here that the writers and artists of the Soviet Union played a leading role. It was left to them to challenge officialdom; of stimulating or forcing the State to state its case . During the Khrushchev era then, writers and artists found it more and more possible to question the Party attitude to the arts.

So we find on occasions that Khrushchev is directly challenged by one of these rebellious individuals. One such instance occurred in November 1962: the rebel -- Ernst Neizvestny. An exhibition had been organised by the Moscow Union of Artists consisting of works executed by its members during the previous thirty years. Neizvestny was invited to participate, but, because other experimental artists were not called upon to share in this exhibition, he declined. However, by some means or other, a man called Bilyutin managed to organise such an exhibition under the auspices of the Moscow city council. The venture caused a sensation and was widely visited by the Moscow public till it was officially closed down by the government. The artists were ordered to hang their works in the Manege building for official inspection.

On seeing the works Khrushchev exclaimed: " Dog shit! Filth! Disgrace! Who is responsible for this? Who is the leader?"

The man to step forward was Ernst Neizvestny. Again Khrushchev started shouting, but Neizvestny boomed back with equal force: " You may be Premier and Chairman, but not here in front of my works. Here I am premier and we shall discuss as equals!"

An argument ensued that lasted a considerable moment, but on leaving Khrushchev turned round and said: " You are the kind of man I like. But there's an angel and devil in you. If the angel wins, we can get along together; If it's the devil who wins, we shall destroy you!"

But Neizvestny and his contemporaries were not the first to rebel. Already as early as the 1930's we find a number of artists who refused to accept the official line, deciding to work more or less independently. Although in opposition to the official doctrine, they never openly voiced their grievances, preferring a passive revolt through non-participation; having as little as possible to do with the official Academy or Union, the Union being the more 'liberal' of the two.

After the death of Stalin it became more possible and safe to challenge the Academy and its adherents. The general mood against Stalinism that prevailed at the time certainly had a hand in this. Here I would like to quote Isaac Deutscher in explaining this new situation.

".... Stalinism, he said, drove barbarism out of Russia by barbarous

means. We should now add that it could not go on doing so indefinitely. In Stalin's last years the progressive impact of his regime was increasingly nullified by the means he employed. In order to go on civilizing herself, Russia now had to drive out Stalinism. Nothing made this more urgent than the interference of Stalinist dogma with - biology, chemistry, physics, linguistics, philosophy, literature and the arts - an interference reminiscent of the days when the Inquisition decided for the whole Christian world which were the right and wrong ideas about God, the Universe, and Man.....Such intrusion of the theological or bureaucratic dogma on the working of the scientific mind belongs essentially to a pre-industrial epoch . In mid-century Russia, it amounted to a sabotage of science, technology and national defence. Not even the narrowest sectional interest was served by that sabotage; and all educated people were eager to break it! "

But, let us cast our nets a little wider and make an assesment of the developement of the arts till the time of Khrushchev; and what better place to start than with that man Peter the Great. It was he who, finding it desirable to open the Russian front door to the world, established the Russian Academy; and this he did by decree. Modelled on the French Academy, as soon as it was established it controlled virtually all artistic activity in Russia. However, what use is the Academy without a public to cater for, and I mean a public interested in the arts?

We find that Russian art until the eighteenth century is essentially Byzantine in style and most certainly Medieval in spirit. Apart from traditional folk-art the country was devoid of any secular art. Religious art was seen purely as an aid to devotion. Ikons were the most common works available with the attention in this art form restricted in as far as it was a religious object conforming to definate regulations, thus placing severe restriction on any imaginative approach to it.

I am by no means trying to say that these had no artistic merit. Russian Ikons can be classified as some of the most least contradictory religious pictures ever painted containing in themselves a profound expression of certain aspects of the national character. But, they are static and devoid of expressing any definate experience; but then, is this not the function

of a religious relic? They are in essence images of holy figures intended to be seen in the light of a heaven in which the people believe so as to make the visible world around them credible. These ikons, as are most ikons, are thus impersonal. In them time nor space exist. They are intended to address the eye which then shuts in prayer so that the image becomes isolated and entirely spiritualized. This then is the state in which Russian art found itself until Peter the Great decreed his academy and this academy was instructed to cater for the fame of Peter above all else.

Different from the academies in the Western states, the academy in Russia developed and promoted artistic values in a very favourable climate. First of all there was no tradition of realistic art. The power of the Academy, and therefore its influence on the masses, was further secured in the absence of any patronage except for that of the Academy, a situation that persisted till late in the nineteenth-century. The Academy thus created an art public from scratch, instilling in it its own formalised and conventional ideas. This ensured an art public that was conformist and largely ignorant of any outside artistic developments. The Academy was thus able to conventionalize, inhibit and virtually destroy any potential talent for four or five generations.

Emphasis was vested in theory rather than practice. Concentration on this eventually reached the point of turning theory into a religion rather than a guide. Most artists of the nineteenth-century knew how they were going to paint something before they knew what they were going to paint. The subject was smothered in technique, with the result that everything was life-less, static and conventional. The subject is never revealed; for, how can it be if the artist paints theory instead of life, if he does not adapt his procedure to the demands of the moment.

A MINOR REVOLUTION

The first revolt against the constraints placed upon the artist by the Academy came in 1863. A number of students voiced their objection to the subject chosen as the theme for that year's Gold Medal Award, demanding instead a Slav theme.

Though minor in itself we have here the first inkling of tendencies to come: national aspiration and the Socialist Realism of the twentieth century.

Having been expelled from the Academy for their rebellious behaviour, they formed themselves into a group called The Wanderers. The name derived largely from their organizing travelling exhibitions in order to reach a wider public. The aim of these travelling exhibitions was also to introduce into the artistic sphere the urban uneducated workers and the illiterate populace of the country. They saw in their work thus the possibility of art as a medium of instruction. Perhaps the first really significant work of these painters is a work painted by the artist Tchernichevsky in 1865 entitled Essay on the Relation between Beautiful and the Real.

Apart from a different emphasis on subject matter there is very little change in style or technique from that of the Academy in their works. As regards subject matter and themes, an emphasis is now placed on the more socially 'relevant'; the working classes and suffering of the oppressed.

In Yaroshenko's Everywhere there is Life we see convicts in a prison van on their way to Siberia. From behind the iron bars of this vehicle of imprisonment they are throwing breadcrumbs to the birds outside. All in all, this picture conveys a feeling of the innocents dragged off to some desolate outpost where they will have to undergo the suffering of enslavement despite their human innocence. Most certainly a work that will touch the heart and emotions of those shackled to the yoke of the tsar.

The Wanderer made an attempt at eradicating Romanticism and replacing it with a more objective Naturalism which accounts for the energy, at times even brutal energy, in some of their works. They made a definite attempt at offering to the masses works of art catering to popular tastes and desires. It is thus no wonder that their works were hailed as the prototypes of revolutionary art by Stalin and his comrades.

We look for instance at Nicholas Gay's work entitled Apotheosis of War (1871). In this painting reality is transcribed with an almost brutal simplicity, and the lesson contained in the pyramid of severed heads transmit a very definite message - WAR KILLS ! The work itself was inspired by his own experiences as a war correspondent in Turkestan, and intended as a plea for peace.

Perhaps the most radical of all these painters was Ilya Repin. Drawing his inspiration from the Russian peasant, he managed to impart to his works a strength not found in that of most of his contemporaries. His absolute sincere devotion to reality was accompanied by a sense of commitment which gives his work a higher and wider effectiveness. Amongst his best works we count works such as Bargemen of the Volga showing a group of struggling, shabbily dressed peasants straining at ropes attached to a barge which is not shown in the painting. Others were inspired by political events: Return from Siberia and The Propagandist's Arrest.

It is only at the end of the nineteenth century and after the beginning of the twentieth century that Russian art is exposed to the influence of the European tradition. After the liberation of the serfs in 1861 we find the emergence of a proletariat which made the development of a capitalist industry possible. Although development was still kept in check by the social conditions, a new class of wealthy industrialists was emerging. Capital was still mainly in the hands of the absolutist state and the landlords. Large industrial enterprises relied near exclusively on orders from the state - either for the army or railways. However, from this new class did come a number of eager patrons of the arts, many of whom eventually housed impressive private collections. Perhaps the most exceptional collection belonged to Sergei Shchakin. By 1914 he was the owner of over two hundred paintings including works by Degas, Van Gogh, Cezanne, Gauguin, Matisse and Picasso. Shchakin regularly opened his collection to the public and artists, thus introducing them to some of the most important contemporary European art.

Artists were now also in a position to choose their patrons, thus escaping to some extent from the tyranny of the academy. The absolutist power of the tsar was thus in effect broken in art before it was broken in politics. Outside the field of art the power of the State still reigned supreme, with the bourgeoisie remaining strangely passive and un-committed. The British art critic John Berger accounts for this in a very lucid manner. He states: "The fact that a few unusually intelligent individuals patronized the arts on such a scale and in such a remarkably far-sighted way may be connected with the weakness and lack of vision of the bourgeoisie as a whole; had they been members of a class in which they could believe as a force, they might well have directed their vision and energy into political and financial organisation."

LENIN: DAWN OF A NEW ERA :

The real revolution in both the arts and socially started with the 1905 uprisings that finally culminated in the revolution of 1917. In both of these the anarchists played a major and very active role. "The urge to destroy is also a creative urge", wrote Micheal Bakunin the father of Russian anarchism in 1842, and his disciples yearned ever after for a social revolution that would destroy the tsarist regime and usher in the stateless millenium. Gaining inspiration from such minds as Nietzsche and Max Sterner, the Anarcho-Individualists exalted the ego over any collective entities, drawing to them a large following of artists and intellectuals. In other areas the Anarcho-Syndicalists exercised a definate influence on the working proletariat which had formed themselves into one of the most militant and revolutionary forces in Europe. Already in the 1905 disturbances we have an indication that the workers' revolutionary force was forming into a mighty power that will have to be reckoned with. Had the upper classes been perceptive enough they might have been able to prevent this force to come to fruition; but, as history has shown us, this was not done. Thus, in 1917, this power came into its full right. No longer prepared to be submerged in their own backwardness, they strived to create a future, a future for which the conditions were indeed most favourable. The people were willing to follow and the leaders were available and willing to lead. Indeed, the future they would seize, would be far in advance of the rest of Europe. They saw in the Western Capitalist concept the danger of a bourgeoisie devoid of any humanity, a condition all too much reminessant of the tsarist era. Furthermore, we must keep in mind that the capitalist endeavour, as they had so experienced in Russia, was still very much of an oppressive nature. Finding strength in organizations and groups such as the Bolsheviks and anarchists, they were soon to rally together and establish a firm footing for the revolution from which to operate.

Russian artists also became heavily involved in the political and spiritual aspects of society. Being of the intelligentsia they recognised and supported the need for change, with the most farsighted of them envisaging the ultimate to be a Russia adhering to the Socialist ideal. They realised that the autocracy had to go and were also repelled by the concept of Western capitalism; regarding it as ruthless and without soul.

With the overthrow of the autocracy the academy and all its prophets were also destroyed. The immediate result is that we now find a vitallity of

vision and commitment amongst the artists that never existed before. Thus, with political freedom we see the liberation of the artist. Cubism, seen as the symbol of the destruction of established modes in art, soon acquired a following. Yet there was no uncontrolled urge or clamouring to destroy, but instead they revealed a belief in the profound role that art had in the lives of individuals and social development as a whole. Extremes most certainly existed, but they were all linked by this common realisation.

At the one end we had Vassily Kandinsky (1886 - 1944) who believed strongly in the validity of art only in as far as it served an inner necessity. As Kandinsky himself wrote in his book, Glimpses of the Past: "I felt more and more strongly that it is the inner desire of the subject which determines its form.....The separation between the domain of art and the domain of nature grew wider in me....." and he concludes, "I knew then that objects harmed my painting." Thus between 1910 and 1920 he produced works characterised by disordered, violent lines and very bright colours. Gradually chaos gave way to order in response to "an inner necessity". All in all, the whole venture was an attempt at expressing cosmic forces which transcend the powers of the individual. In, Das Kunstblatt XIV of 1930, he wrote of his feelings while working in Germany in 1910: "The corruptive separation of one art from another and furthermore of 'art' from folk art and children's art,.....the firmly established walls between which I considered to be related or even identical manifestations in a word, the synthetic relationships, gave me no peace. Today, it may seem strange that for a long time I could find no helpers, no means, simply not enough interest for this idea."

After the revolution he occupied several important posts at the Commissariat for Popular Culture and at the State Studios. Later he became Vice-President of the Academy of Artistic Sciences of which he was actually the founder. A few years later he, and others like him, fell into disrepute with the Soviet Government with the adoption of Socialist Realism as the official art form.

At the other end of the scale are people such as Tatlin who denied the difference between art and any other productive activity.

Thus, for a few years after 1917 we see the Russian artist operating with relative freedom; serving the State on their own initiative.

However, it would not be long before the cultural apparatus would be transformed, re-organised and subjected to political control. Socialist Realism was established as the new academic formula. The State maintained that ideologies have no independent histories. Thus, the form of social organisation of each period merely reflects this development, including art. It is thus not possible for art not to support an ideology. Art as a neutral occupation was rejected as non-social. Art to the Bolsheviks was no more than an instrument of propaganda to serve the future as prescribed by the Party. Therefore the emphasis was placed solely on the content of the work of art. Form served only to illustrate the content as clearly as possible and make it easy for all to understand. The function of art, as defined by the Bolsheviks, was to glorify the Party, its leaders and achievements of the State.

In 1932 painting and sculpture were put under the centralized control of the Union of Artists. The Academy was re-established under the direction of Isaak Brodsky. This new onslaught on the artist was very much in keeping with the second industrial revolution which began in 1928.

THE NEW THRUST:

The new thrust was to transform Russia completely and give the Soviet Union its modern image. Up to now there had been a clear distinction between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world; but soon these distinction would be hard to perceive except in party ideology. The emphasis was now on production. People became capitalists or representatives of such interests by edict, because Stalin and the State desired them to be so. Ranks were re-introduced into the army with all the prestige and status that went with it. The whole industrial process brought about a re-organization of the social and cultural aspect of society. Discrepancies were deliberately introduced in the pricing of goods to stress the priorities of the government. A system of remuneration according to production also replaced the concept of wage levelling for workers. With this dawned the era of Stakhanovism - so called after a coal-miner who, with the help of two assistants, succeeded in producing 102 tons of anthracite in a normal working shift - with continuous pressure to over fulfill work norms.... In return the workers were rewarded with material benefits and public esteem or punished with public condemnation if they failed.

It is only natural that this attitude should penetrate every sphere of life. This then even affected the stand taken towards the arts. Instead of mere debate, as was the case up to and during the 1920's definite directions were now handed down from above as to how Party ideals should be presented

in literature.

The first Union of Writers to be established after the 1917 revolution was the Russian Association of Proletariat Writers (R.A.P.P.). They preached, somewhat along the lines of Prokovsky, the discarding of all culture except the proletarian. This lasted till 1932 when this largely nihilistic group was disbanded by the government who then proceeded to organize all writers into the Union of Soviet Writers. On these writers was imposed the new official doctrine which was to become known as Socialist Realism. Thus guided by what was officially regarded as the 'correct principles' Soviet writers were to participate fully and prominently in the building of socialism as, to quote Stalin, "engineers of human souls." Socialist Realism thus became synonymous with literature in Soviet Russia, all other movements having been outlawed.

This new official doctrine was outlined by Karl Radek at the first All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers in 1934. He defined the writer's position as follows:

"The search of Soviet art for its own creative methods has been a long one, for it has had to overcome the old traditions in art and to explore a new trail, leading to a portrayal of our life as it is. This trail has been found. The methods of soviet art has been found and they are commensurate with the tasks which revolutionary literature sets itself....Realism means giving a picture not only of the decay of capitalism, and the withering away of its culture, but also of the birth of that class, of that force, which is capable of creating a new society and a new culture. Realism does not mean the embellishment or arbitrary selection of revolutionary phenomena; it means reflection of reality, as it is, in all its complexity, in all its contrariety, and not only capitalist reality, but also that other, new reality - the reality of socialism."

He continues his exposition, and now the ideology of the Bolsheviks comes clearly to the fore: "Socialist Realism is not only knowing reality as it is, but knowing whither it is moving. It is moving towards socialism, it is moving towards the victory of the international proletariat. And a work of art created by a socialist realist is one which shows whither that conflict of contradictions is leading which the artist has seen in life and reflected in his work", and in a later passage he states: "We do not photograph life. In the totality of phenomena we seek out the main

phenomion. Giving everything without descrimination is not realism..... Realism means that we make a selection from the point of view of what is essential, from the point of view of guiding principles; "these of course being the principles of Socialism;" And as for what is essential - the very name of Socialism tells us this....."

The main social ideal behind this doctrine is thus that the artist, via his work, should show how Socialism is growing, growing in battle, in hard toil, in sweat; in other words, how its growing in deeds, in human beings.

This then is the Socialist Realism as sponsored by Stalin and the Politburo. Perhaps a very admirable doctrine in a way, but because the Party had its own view of life, based predominantly on Marxist views misapplied to Russian reality, Socialist Realism became no more than crude and lifeless propanganda. The long struggle of socialism was the beginning and the end. Writers were forced to depict the achievements of the five-year plans and other 'significant' subjects; else they had to console themselves with the writing of realistic historical novels. The manner in which this was to be done was already prescribed. Pessimism was a dirty word. Only the glorious and heroic was to be depicted. The Soviet hero must be essentially a paragon of virtue, with no deep rooted inner conflicts or psychological ambiguities. Things had to be depicted as they should and would appear in the future. The grim world around them had to be ignored.

It is thus small wonder that the developement of Russian literature, with the exception of Maxim Gorky, Tolstoy and Micheal Sholokhov, was and still is somewhat retarded.

The works of a writer like Boris Polevoi is very much in keeping with the lines as laid down by the Party. His book, in the Deep Rear, abounds in positive characters. All the figures are devoted to the fatherland and the cause. They are all good communists capable of the greatest self-sacrifice and self-denial; the old military surgeon who dies of a heart attack brought on by sheer physical exhaustion. Fine and touching is the portrayal of Genia Muller who crosses the enemy lines into a German occupied city to execute a Russian quisling and who, on her way back, gets killed by a German bullet. The only negative figures are the loathsome quisling, The faithless husband of Anna who abandones her for a cheap hospital nurse, and the press photographer whose vulgar advances are rejected by little Galka, a textile worker. Symbolic of the worker, and thus of the State, is the near destroyed textile mill; chief scene of this novel.

Definitely not a profound piece of writing. One would look in vain for any subtle psychology or refined literary traits. But, with its unsophisticated story, which makes for easy reading by the less literate, it makes for good reading and the 'positive' characters are all loveable and profoundly edifying people.

Thus the State seized control of the arts on the assumption that the artist himself needs to be educated and at the same time serve the interests of the new era. Artists, scientists and even architects had their tasks minutely allocated. Literature had to be solid and concern itself with objective problems of socialist construction rather than 'idealistic' speculation about human nature. The painter also had to be content with painting endless canvasses of happy people working on building sights, on farms or in factories.

An all-out attempt was thus made to model and incorporate intellectual activity into the Stalinist version of an industrial society. This, however, not only affected the immediately expressive arts, but was extended to incorporate fields such as the sciences and writing of history itself. Everything was analysed and classified according to the Marxist Socialist approach. Even mathematics was analysed according to the 'right' critical analysis and ideological content.

It is thus clear that the political strait-jacket was laced tight in the fields of the arts and sciences. None of these has recovered from this even today. A greater degree of freedom has been granted, but is still subject to certain political constraints.

After 1930 then we have a re-imposition of the sterile academicism originally fostered by Peter the Great. Not only did this stunt the development of the arts, but also blocked the development of the very public it created for art. The only positive result from this is the fact that the Soviet people were made aware and proud of the fact that the visual arts could enter and play a role in their lives. Because of the violence of modern Russian history, the rate of development and the scale of the country, the masses approved of an art in which an apparently unchanging Russian identity could be confirmed. At the same time such art served the conservative nationalism which necessarily accompanied the

Stalinist ideal of centralization. He also made the masses aware of their right to art and at the same time proud of the privilege of art. Despite this there was no meaningful development in the arts, not only because of the restrictions placed on it, but due also to the fact that a naturalistic art - whose style had no popular roots, being essentially the style of the 19th Century middle class in Western Europe - was disseminated to a vast, culturally backward, public by a centralized government.

Thus despite its popularity, there was an unnatural vacuum between spectator and work and even between the artist and his subject. In 1944 Stalin called in a number of writers and said to them: "I don't know what's the matter with you people; when I read Dostoevsky, it makes me think about it at night; when I read the stuff you people write it leaves absolutely no impression." This then was the state of affairs until the outbreak of the Second World War.

POST WAR RUSSIA :

During the immediate post war era it was Andrei Zhdanov who reigned supreme when it came to matters concerning culture. The war had been a means for Soviet writers to express their strongest feelings in an honest, and yet acceptable, manner. In fact, instead of an even sterner line taken towards the arts, there seem to have been a slight relaxation of norms during this period. Zhdanov, being the arch anti-intellectual, would do his best to enforce total orthodoxy and destroy even this tiny attempt at a new mode of expression. Already as early as 1945 Ilya Ehrenburg, a Jewish journalist and relatively cosmopolitan, was publicly attacked for failing to distinguish between Hitler and his henchmen and the essentially democratic and peace-loving German people. Zhdanov now imposed new and hitherto unthought of standards of dullness and conformity on the writers and artists of the Soviet Union. This was a return to Socialist Realism with a vengeance; with masses of dreary stories of realizing production norms, devoted collective farmers threshing wheat, and above all, fanatical praise of Stalin as the godlike genius of Marxism-Leninism.

It was especially the Jews who suffered under the new ice-age imposed by Zhdanov on the Russian culture. One of the first purges of 1947 more or less closed down the activities of writers and actors who used Yiddish as their medium of expression. Among them was Mikhoels, a senior Bolshevik and famous actor, who was liquidated in 1949. Zhdanov died in 1949, but the policies he inaugurated persisted for years to come.

On the 5th of March 1953, Stalin died of a haemorrhage of the brain. With the passing of Stalin, what would become of Russia and the policies instigated by him? The Western World had by now almost come to expect the Stalinist phases of the Soviet Union as permanent. In the Soviet Union itself there was shock and respectful mourning. On both sides of the Iron Curtain it was difficult to picture Russia without the man who had so firmly imprinted his image and ideas on his country, who had so totally changed the entire nature and culture of a people.

From 1953 to 1957 a period of political instability seem to have existed in Russia and her satellites. The main figure during this period, up to 1955, was Malenkov, soon to be succeeded by Khrushchev. Khrushchev set about consolidating his position as the most powerful man in Russia with zeal. By June 1957, he had successfully taken over the leadership of the Party. The hitherto subdued attacks on the more baroque aspects of Stalinism now gave way to a formal and full denunciation of Stalinism as a system -though this took place more in the form of an attack on Stalin as an individual and on the personality cult. From now on a great many changes would take place in the country which would make for greater changes to come on a cultural and social level.

A definite change came about in the arts during the 'reign' of Nikita Khrushchev. There was a definite move away from the stereotype writings of Socialist Realism and far more experimentation in the fine arts. The official line was, and still is, Socialist Realism, but it was not as rigidly enforced as in the past. Literature continued to be a 'big industry'. In his report to the Third Writers Congress in May 1959, Alexei Surkov, the President of the Writers Union, announced that membership of the Union had increased from 3,695 to 4,801 in the preceding four years.

Khrushchev himself made various statements as regards the arts and literature. In 1957, he stated that: "What our people need is works of literature, art and music, properly rendering the pathos of labour, and understandable to the people.The Party is waging a relentless struggle against the penetration of alien ideologies into our art and literature, and against hostile attacks on socialist culture....."

He also made several attacks on the so-called 'revisionists', those who did not adhere to official lines. By 1959 he was satisfied that 'revisionism' had been stamped out and took a far more lenient line towards these artists. He stated that the 'rather violent battle' against these people was now over and should, if not forgotten, then at least forgiven. On the whole, Russian literature today is a far more complex phenomena than would appear to meet the

eye. Russian writers have stopped being 'epigones of Russian nineteenth-century literature.'

Many books touch on what were once taboo subjects - Pavel Nilin's Cruelty, for instance, deals with the tortuous psychology of an NKVD man; while Panferoo's Meditation deals with the injustice and mismanagement inside collective farms in the Stalin days.

During the past five to six years, however, there seem to be a tightening of the screw again. One is rather amazed that people such as Alexander Solzhenitsyn and a number of poets, who were tolerated, if not accepted, under Khrushchev, should suddenly be persecuted or driven out of the country. With the general opening up of Russia to foreign artists and performers it is rather strange that the stand as regards local talent should appear to be as rigid as in the days of Stalin.

THE ARTIST AS BUSINESSMAN

In this section of my essay I will limit myself to the artist in the modern western world. I will attempt to explain his position within this society as regards his social status, financial support and the means he employs to attain this position.

The reader will, I am sure, not blame me for not going into any detail as regards the above mentioned, when I refer to the arts before the twentieth century. The conditions under which these artists worked are clearly illustrated in other sections of this essay and Russia itself has been dealt with extensively as regards the twentieth century.

Today the successful artists have magnificent studios and comfortable lives. In the United States the artist belongs to a social category as desirable and enviable as that of the university professor or president of a corporation.

The artist has ceased to be an outcast, struggling to earn a living or fighting against the whims of patrons or the prevailing social order, instead he has become a slave to society. Nowadays, the revolutionary manifestations in art provoke no scandals, nor do they irritate. Young artists have immediate success, especially if they launch some newfangled invention or merely take up the reigning fashions. 'Art' has gained a vast following. In the last decade or so, this interest has been demonstrated by the drastic increase in the number of collectors, commercial and other galleries and the overwhelming interest shown by magazines, the radio, etc. Museums, private showrooms and foundations are all interested in art and its development; even governments give it official support.

The only explanation for this, is that there has been a fundamental change in the attitude towards art, thus the changed situation of the artist, formerly a creator of a work of art, has now become a manufacturer of consumer goods.

Thus the artist is no longer the alienated misfit of the past, but has become incorporated into the mass society as a normal member. This mass society is characterized by a vast, passive, and indifferent

population whose fundamental function is to consume. On this passive and willing force a power, made up of an active group of manufacturers of articles and creators of artificial needs, is exerting itself. The artist has incorporated himself into this group. The artist has thus opted to gain power by becoming a follower rather than to establish himself and his power by acting as an individual or creative leader.

Perhaps it is as well to give some explanation of how the power impulse manifest itself in society. There are essentially two ways in which the power impulse manifest itself: explicit in leaders, and implicit in their followers. When men willingly follow a leader, the politician, industrialist or church, they do so with a view to gaining a part of the power acquired by the group, feeling that the triumph of the leader is also a triumph for his followers. Most men do not feel themselves competent enough to lead a group and therefore seeks out a 'captain' who appears to possess the courage and determination necessary for the achievement of supremacy.

This then is what the modern western artist seem to have done. Caught in a predominantly capitalist enviroment where the only, or else by far the most, affluent members of society are those in control of the economy, he has opted to become part of that group that directly benefits from them.

The artist has thus become, or has been forced to become, a willful slave of the society he lives in. He concentrates on producing works that are intended primaraly to please and be saleable; and he always takes into account where he is most likely to get his sales and makes sure that his work is in keeping with the taste of that group. The nature of these articles does not so much depend on the consumer's needs, but is determined by the manufacturer, critic or agent, and imposed on the public through advertising or constant propaganda.

Thus an egalitarian level is created, not only in the basic products, but also in entertainment and cultural products. The cultural product of the mass is something that is imposed from outside, artificially manufactured, and , as a consequence, directed at the lowest levels. Thus, these articles do not have to correspond to man's inner

necessaries, the need having been artificially created. As these works are intended to cause effect they are not intended to vary with their surroundings. It is thus inevitable that in such an environment a great number of works are produced, not because of any inner need of the painter or artist, but merely to make capital gain from. Works are thus brought forth by the demands of the market and artists with the characteristics more of a dealer than a creator come to the fore. They are no more than manufacturers with stupendous skill in publicity and an easy feel for self promotion. These are the people who inhabit the private galleries and collections with their abortions. These are the people talked about in magazines, art columns and screened on television; and for this they are the ones that receive the honours and official support. There is no doubt that mediocrity is not the exclusive property of the present era, but it is most certainly reaching alarming proportions.

In Scope magazine of August 13th, 1976 we read the following passage:

"Warhol, 'referring here to Andy Warhol,' shot to fame with his pop art paintings of Campbell's soup cans and line drawings of Marilyn Monroe. He has always been bizarre, living in his 'factory' with his 'thingfriend', a humanoid of undetermined sex named Silva Thins.

.....Perhaps his visits to the White House as a guest of Jack Ford have served to drag his mind out of a fantasy world and back into reality. Who knows?

What remains is that his art form is beginning to resemble the socially acceptable norm.

His favourite subject now is the black homosexual....."

It is also ironical to note that homosexuality has also become the 'in thing' among the globe trotting wealthy, rich industrialists and the more intellectual members of society. Other artists who have taken an interest in the homosexual as subject matter are eminent painters such as Francis Bacon and David Hockney.

The commercial characteristics and value of a work of art remind us more of the trade characteristics that distinguish large industrial organizations. As Warhol stated in an interview, "The best art is commerce. Every artist produces only one good work in a life-time. The rest is to fill his pockets with money..... I am my own best manager....." How the term, 'a genuine Picasso', remind us of some company trying to promote the sales of its

electric appliances with the phrase, '.....approved by the South African Bureau of Standards.'

Up to a few decades ago, perhaps one can site the end of the nineteenth century, the value of a work of art depended mainly on its expressive or representative power. Of course the content was to a large extent determined by the patrons, but the commercial value was of a much lesser importance than it is today. The emotional, documentary and expressive qualities were primary.

Today this criteria has by and large changed. No longer is it what the picture says that is of importance, but what it is; in other words, it is the rarity of the work, in the case of the old masters, or else its technical ingenuity that determines its uniqueness. Thus the meaning of the original work lies not in what it uniquely states, but what it uniquely is. In present culture the value of a Lautrec thus depends on its rarity.

This value is affirmed and gauged by the price it fetches on the art market. Speculation, as on the stock exchange, is now of more importance than the true value of the work of art. This art market exists mainly through the activities of dealers who are usually those in charge of galleries or other similar agencies. The success with which these have been operating can be judged according to the number of commercial galleries that have appeared all over the world in the last few years; and let us not forget the number of so called 'art critics'.

But, let us be fair and stress that the appearance of these galleries and salons is basically the culmination of an inevitable trend which evolved from the patronage of the church, state, political leaders and organizations, the nobility and rich traders.

Before the invention of the camera the only way to record visually the possessions of the nobleman or upper-class was to have a painting made of the desired item. John Berger states in his book Ways of Seeing :
"To have a thing painted and put on canvas is not unlike buying it and putting it in your house." It is therefore quite justified to say that the nobleman of the seventeenth century was more a patron of the arts because he could ensure that the power he possesses or would like to possess will be portrayed in the painting, than out of a true interest or love of art. Paintings were thus intended to express the status and wealth of the owner, to impress the spectator with the might and power of its owner and to serve as consolation to the owner.

John Berger states, when talking of oil painting; " Works of art in the earlier traditions celebrated wealth. But wealth was then a symbol of a fixed social or divine order. Oil painting celebrates a new kind of wealth which was dynamic and found its only sanction in the supreme buying power of money. Thus painting had to be able to demonstrate the desirability of what money can buy," and this still holds true to a large extent today, the only real difference being that the work of art must now also create a market on which to sell itself.

Those with money surround themselves with works of art. Private galleries have been in existence as early as the sixteenth century. Here I can mention the galleries of Leopold Wilhelm and Cardinal Valenti Gonzaga. A painting of Gonzaga's gallery by Panini shows it as a vast barrel vaulted hall, lavishly decorated in the popular style and hung with paintings from floor to ceiling. A work that leaves us in no doubt as to the vast amount of money that must have gone into the purchase of these works. It also serves as a testimonial to the wealth of its owner.

The French Salon was also to some extent responsible for the appearance of commercial galleries. The annual Salon was seen as an important event by both the public and artist. In fact, it was here that an artist could achieve fame or lose out completely. Strict control was exercised as to what will or will not be hung at this show. Many painters therefore would produce works which would obviously please the selectors just to gain a place in the show.

All this then led to the establishment of the modern galleries and art market. Most of these started out as promoters and publicists of new tendencies, but today very few adhere to this. Most of them have taken on a commercial character and appear to be extremely sensitive to market values. Many of them seem to prosper by putting under contract artists who appear to be rising. Run by wealthy businessmen, they have the capital to offset the initial expense of launching these artists on an impressive scale. Artists themselves are eager to secure contracts as this entails a shortcut to the consumer and the chance of regular sales; and above all a definite income. On a personal level it has become virtually impossible to come into contact with the artist except through his gallery. In this the galleries thus usurp the function of the earlier patrons by being both financier and promoter. Once again there is one distinction; where the patron acquired a work of art for his own gratification, the gallery does this with an eye on the commercial market. Thus the court painter of

the past has now become the regular supplier of the art market. The galleries, in their contract, often demand a certain number of paintings per month at a set level of remuneration and often even specify the style in which they are to be done. The artist can now rightfully call himself a one-man-factory, MADE TO ORDER.

The emphasis on the commercial nature of the arts has had a profound affect on the developement of art and artistic tendencies. Movements rise and fall at such a rate that any artist who manages to produce significant work for a decade these days earns his old-master status.

A major tendency in the twentieth-century is the mode to create elaborate theories to explain tendencies, this going hand in hand with a move towards extreme simplicity; the latter revealing a trend in society at large and the first as part of the sales talk necessary to sell the art work. As paintings have become more simple the theories have become more elaborate. This reached a point in the 60's where the works themselves were in danger of being regarded as mere illustrations of the critic's theory.

By the middle of the decade artists began to realize that it could not be left to critics and philosophers to provide explanations for their creations and began to annex the role of the critic in making explicit the theoretical basis of their work. In the 1970's the artist has assumed total responsibility for explaining the theory underlying his work. It is, however, ironical that, instead of moving away from art forms that rely on theoretical expositions, they have merely assumed the role of theoretician themselves. It is perhaps not so ironic that the critics soon started announcing that painting is in a crisis, that it is exhausted and, ultimately, that art is dead.

When stylistic diversity exist to such an unprecedented extent it is extremely difficult to trace the causes in most cases. It is however, possible to site a few general causes; during the nineteenth-century we see the political triumph of the bourgeoisie which was responsible for a general climate of revolt, freedom and individualism. With this we have a decline in the prestige of tradition that accompanied the over-throw of the old order, the separation of church and state, and a great many discoveries and experiments in many fields throughout society.

The artist was thus encouraged to reject existing modes and seek inspiration outside the classical Western tradition. They were in fact encouraged to experiment freely with the new toys provided by technology.

The arts and sciences have never been so closely linked as now. Some regard this free experimentation, unrelated to societal conditions, as the raising of self-expression to its highest level of importance. However, as has been proved over and over again, art for art's sake is shortlived if there is no harmonious relationship between the artist and his environment.

There has always been a connection between the artist and society and commercial appeal has always played a part in this. Thus Baudelaire declared, when he was encouraged by the revolutionaries during the 1884 revolt, that art should serve a definite social purpose, but soon reverted back to art for art's sake after the counter-revolution. The artist has always scorned commercialism, but these days, though they may deny it, they are only too willing to adhere to the demands of the businessman, in other words, the dealer.

The dealer encourages and demands experimentation in styles. One can here draw a definite link between the dealer and modern commercial economics. In nearly all fields experimentation is encouraged in order to produce new or improved products. These products are then gotten rid of via the intricate and elaborate system of advertising and sales methods that create a market for these goods. The same applies to the arts.

In most catalogues the description of the painting is not so much an evaluation of the content of the work, but a carefully researched testimonial as to the authenticity of the work, its age, previous owner and status of the artist; and above all a glorification of the technical skill that went into the making of the work. All this is intended to promote the artist and lend status to the painting. The whole thing amounts to little more than good advertising and excellent sales talk, that justifies its economic value.

Works of art and artists are thus primarily selected on the basis of their potential for promotional purposes rather than the satisfaction of deep-lying psychological needs.

Dealers, and artists, however take great care that these works are not too readily assimilated into society. In 1964, for instance, Op Art made a dramatic appearance; discovered by Time Magazine. By 1965 a series of exhibitions of work in this new style consolidated its position. Also

in the same year Vasarely won first prize at the Sao Paulo Biennale . Pop Art gained near immediate popularity with mass society and it was not long before it was ruthlessly exploited by the fashion, textile and advertising industry. For once the critics were actually behind, instead of ahead, of public taste and condemned it, naturally, as 'mindless'. It was thus not long before Op Art, as an art style, disappeared. The fact that it lent itself to instant assimilation by commerce and the intense publicity given to it by non-art magazines can definately be sited as reasons for its rapid decline as an art style.

I would like to conclude this section by summing up with the following statement; stylistic developement is brought about by the artistically creative members of society, but the survival of such styles or further developement of artistic traits is dependent on the artistically non-productive members of society. In the production of his art the artist thus gives a prime consideration to the potential market, clients and patrons; as a good businessman would do in any other sphere of commercialism.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN WRITER AND CENSORSHIP

When one tackles the question of censorship in any country it is necessary that one should give at least a basic outline of the purpose of censorship as it is applied in general by most states; and that censorship is there for the benefit of the State or church no one can deny. Thus, all censorship is political in nature. It is there to ensure that nothing threatens the dominant ideology or moral concepts. This is often, if not always used in conjunction with other legislation, organisations and codes that form a very effective barrier against any threat to the established order. One can argue that this is indeed necessary to ensure that there is stability and purity within the society concerned, but, unfortunately, more than often it leads to cultural stagnation and general artistic decline; I have already cited the example of Soviet Russia where censorship combined with legislation has had a profound effect on the culture of Russia.

Censorship is a means that is employed extensively by most regimes with absolutist tendencies; Soviet Russia, Cuba, Chile, China and the Nationalist government of South Africa. Works challenging prevailing concepts and conditions are tolerated only if they are so vague that they can be mistaken for something else or actually manipulated and used by the government to convey a liberal and humane image of the regime. However, as soon as such works directly challenge or threatens the status quo, censorship is employed to get rid of it.

Amongst the many security, group areas and other laws and acts the South African government also has at its disposal an elaborate and comprehensive set of laws to prevent the printing, and distribution of 'undesired' publications.

Although a measure of censorship has been in existence since 1892, the first definite and comprehensive set of laws were introduced in 1963. Act 26 of 1963 provided for a censorboard consisting of nine people, six of whom had to be experts in the field of art, languages, literature or law, who were to be appointed by the Minister of the Interior. This board, called the Publications Control Board, was empowered to investigate and declare 'undesirable' any publication it felt itself called upon to do so. Furthermore, any individual had the right to request the board to investigate and cast a verdict on any publication. It is worth

mentioning here that one of the organisations to make use of this provision extensively was the Dutch Reformed Church which, we are all aware, has very close ties with the Nationalist Party. Other religious and ethnic groups to make use of this were the Afrikaanse Christelike Vroue Federasie and the Herstigte Nasionale Party, an extreme right-wing political party in South Africa.

Although the conditions and penalties contained in the act were rather severe, it did provide for the right to appeal to a court of law against any of its decisions. The exception here concerns films. In the event of an appeal in this instance the case would be referred directly to the Minister of the Interior and not the courts.

Act 26 itself contained an elaborate and embracing definition of what can be regarded as an offensive publication. Here I would like to quote A.H. van Wyk writing in Standpunte 114 of August 1974 who in turn quotes from Act 26.

He writes:

"'n Publikasie of voorwerp word geag ongewens te wees indien dit of 'n deel daarvan - (my verkruising)

a) onbetaamlik of onweloweglik is of vir die openbare sedes aanstootlik of skadelik is;

b) godslasterlik is of vir die godsdienstige oortuigings of gevoelens van enige bevolkingsdeel van die Republiek aanstootlik is;

c) enige bevolkingsdeel van die Republiek belaglik of veragtelik maak;

d) vir die betrekkinge tussen enige bevolkingsdele van die Republiek skadelik is;

e) vir die veiligheid van die Staat, die algemene welsyn of vrede en goeie orde nadelig is.....' "

In a later passage he again quotes from the Act:

i) "'n Publikasie is "onbetaamlik of onweloweglik" "indien dit na die oordeel van die hof die strekking het om die gedagtes van persone wat waarskynlik aan die uitwerking of invloed daarvan blootgestel sal word, te verderf of te laat ontaard".

ii) "n Publikasie is " vir die openbare sedes aanstootlik" ,, indien dit na die oordeel van die hof waarskynlik skokkend of walglik sal wees vir persone wat dit waarskynlik sal lees of sien".

iii) : Publikasie is,, vir die openbare sedes skadelik" " indien dit na die oordeel van die hof op onbetaamlike wyse handel" '.

Under the last clause A.H. van Wyk mentions some of the subjects listed under this clause as what can be regarded as harmful to public morals. The following were included in the list : murder, death, gangsters, sexual intercourse, slavetrading with white females, passionate lovescenes, nudity, nightlife and infidellity.

From this it becomes quite clear that the writer and the artist therefore had to be very careful as to what he wrote or painted or how he wrote or painted. Of greater importance to the writer is the fact that his work could be banned because of one single word or paragraph that the censors did not agree with. From what I have shown in these paragraphs one can deduce the far-reaching implications the Act had for South African writers and artists of all kinds. The State had at its disposal every means to control the content of the work of art. It was therefore also in the position to, through the application of Act 26, indirectly control the developement of literature and the fine arts. However, as I will show later on in this section, this control was to be further expanded until they had absolute control over the artist by 1976. From 1967 to 1972, the board considered 7,091 publications and objects; 4,025 were banned.

FURTHER LEGISLATION:

Stemming from recommendations made to parliament by the Secretary for Internal Affairs in March 1972, a select committee was established to investigate the effectiveness of the present act and make recommendations on ways to broaden the powers of the Publications Control Board. It started functioning on the 8th May, 1973, and was then turned into a commission.

One is immediatly confronted with the question: why should this board have more power to decide on the fate of a publication and what makes this neccessary? The answer is given by the Commision itself in its report that we tabled early in 1974. It states, and I quote Mr. van Wyk: "In die

meerderheids verslag word gesê dat daar, sedert vroeg in die sestigerjare.... 'n gees van permissiwiteit en ontaarding oor die wêreld vaardig geword (het), en dat optrede nodig was ter bekamping hiervan.....Volgens die meerderheid word die kondisionering van die volk, vervlakking van sy moraliteitsgevoel, afbreking van sy geestelike weerbaarheid en ondermyning van die goeie sedes en gewoontes van die bevolking gesien as 'bevordelik vir die doelstellings van die kommunisme en as 'n poging deur die kommunisme om die gees van die volk te onderwerp' ". The reasons given leads one to the conclusion that the wider powers accorded the Publications Control Board would be aimed at the suppression of Communism primarily , but I would venture to say that this was not the only, if the real, reason, and I will make this statement clear when I discuss the rise of the Sestiger movement later on.

Be that as it may, the Publications Control Board was now restructured and replaced by a Directorate of Publications with an unspecified number of committees serving under it. The right to ban or censor is now placed in the hands of these committees with the Directorate acting more as an administrative body. Another change is in the composition of the Directorate and its committees.

The Directorate is now appointed by the Minister of the Interior, but , no specific qualification is needed except that the minister must deem the person or persons fit to perform their duties on the Directorate. The committees, each consisting of not less than three people, are appointed by the Directorate from a list submitted to it by the minister in question. The implications are quite clear; the minister reserves the right to appoint the Directorate and indirectly also its committee, and as I have stated at the beginning of this section, do not forget that censorship is essentially political in nature. The minister is thus in a position to ensure that the 'right' people serve on this board of control.

Perhaps the most controversial part of the new act is the powers granted the Publications Control Board in terms of the following:

- a) any committee can declare illegal the possession of a banned publication after ratification of this decision by the appeal board,
- b) any person, with the permission of the minister (of Interior), can enter any premise and confiscate any publication,



- c) the right to appeal to a court of law against a banning is withdrawn, and,
- d) refusal to comply with a decision of the appeal board (this is a body within the controlling body) shall be deemed an offence.

The sum total of this is, that the Publications Control Board and its appeal board now have the status of a court of law with the same powers and protection.

The implications for the writer and his art are grave. He is placed in a position where he must choose between his own conscience and the dictates of the State. Should he decide to adhere to his own conscience and ideology, which may well be in conflict with that of the State, chances are that most of his work will be banned. Should he decide to operate within the limitations provided by the State he might well become very popular with the masses, make a lot of money, be acclaimed as a 'volksskrywer' and, lose his own identity which means ultimately a retrogression of his art.

Literature is by its very nature something for public consumption, it is the vehicle through which the writer conveys to the masses specific ideas and values that are of importance to him and which he feels should be read and considered by others. No novel is ever written with the intention that it should after completion, be locked away in one's bottom drawer. With the threat of censorship, the artist is thus placed in an awkward position, for, should his works be banned, chances are that firstly, publishers will be reluctant to handle his manuscripts in future, and secondly, chances are that the public will be reluctant to buy his books. With the added possibility that possession of a banned book may now also be declared illegal this danger becomes even greater. I should mention here that previously the possession of a banned publication was not illegal if the publication was bought before it was banned.

The artist must thus be extremely careful in what he depicts or writes. I can cite a few examples to illustrate the adverse effect the threat of censorship can have on writers and publishers alike. Om te Vlieg, a novel by Breyten Breytenbach, was accepted by no less than two publishers in succession. The book itself was highly praised by those who read the manuscript, including two professors of Afrikaans. However, the first publisher had to cancel publication because pressure was exerted from above (there were a few members of the Cabinet on the Board of Directors),

while the second publisher could not find anyone willing to print it because the printers feared prosecution. Various other writers had their manuscripts turned down after the publishers had sought legal opinion. Others after certain paragraphs and phrases have been suitably altered. A novel written by Andre P. Brink, *Kennis van die Aand*, published in 1973, was banned soon after it appeared on the local market. The book deals extensively with the relationship between a Coloured man and a white woman, the man's encounters with the Security Police and the position of the Coloured people in South African society.

Both Breytenbach and Brink were leading figures of the Sestiger movement of the 1960's: a movement that challenged existing modes in Afrikaans literature and generally gave new life to it. Up to this time Afrikaans literature adhered to a predominantly ethnic parochial line, the kind of framework advocated by people such as the late Prime Minister, Dr. Hendrik Verwoerd: Our literature and art must only depict that which is good of our people, their fight and suffering to attain freedom and their deeply religious convictions. In its initial stages the Sestiger movement offered an energetic challenge to several cultural taboos of Afrikanerdom. The new generation paid more attention to those religious concepts regarded as taboo by the Afrikaner; they advocated and formulated new moralities and challenged old ones, and, above all, they showed a keen interest in experimentation with literary form.

It is however, sad that this initial zeal should have, or appear to have, died so rapidly. In fact, I would say that Afrikaans literature has reached a new point of stagnation. To even try and account for this would be rather presumptuous, but one can safely say that censorship and the climate created by censorship is a very important element in any possible answer.

Initially the Sestigers personified the revolt against the traditional in South African literature, in other words, they heralded a move away from the 'typically South African' and the attempt to explore the more universal or 'human'. They thus rejected the age old stories of poor whites, droughts, the Boer Wars and innocence, to concentrate more on the philosophical aspects of life. Later they wanted to employ their newly acquired techniques and philosophical and ethical insights to explore the specifically South African word. It is thus inevitable that some of this work would have political implications; South Africa being after all a country where people are judged not according to ability as such, but more according to skin colour and the language they speak. It is here then that censorship stepped in, gradually 'purified' our literature and now act as the ever alert watchdog of the State.

I have dealt exclusively with the Afrikaans writer, because, generally he is in a far more secure position than any other artist in this country. Because the Afrikaans writer is part of the dominant political and language structure, he has obviously been treated with some leniency. However, as I have shown during the course of this section, even they are severely restricted by censorship. As regards our English and Black writers, the position is definitely not as 'rosy'. It seems to be much easier for the government to ban the products of Black writers or a couple of English novels for the chances of it's ever reaching the press or anyone kicking up a fuss are much less than with the Afrikaans novelist. The case of Kennis van die Aand is a prime example. The press, magazines and literary journals gave extensive coverage to its banning, while that of a Nadine Gordimer will hardly be mentioned, except perhaps in the Government Gazette, and then only to proclaim that it is banned.

This then is the position in which the South African writer finds himself.
✓ He must be carefull, extremely careful, about what he writes and how he writes it, what he attacks and whom he attacks. One phrase, no, one single word, can mean the end of what might have been a 'good' piece of literature.

RELIGION AND THE ARTS

In this section of my essay I will deal with the effects the rise of Christianity had on the artist. To this I will add the periods of religious upheaval, namely the Reformation, Counter Reformation and the period of iconoclasm.

THE RISE OF CHRISTIANITY:

Christianity in its earliest manifestations was essentially apolitical in nature. Attention was given, not to the conscious acquirement of power, but to a sincere and honest attempt to establish the new religion amongst the masses.

The rise of Christianity can roughly be pinpointed to the third century A.D. At this stage we find the Roman Empire in a state of virtual collapse. It was a period of unrest and instability that penetrated the leadership, the army and population alike. During this period we find the rise of the 'mystery religions' in the cities in the east of the Empire; amongst them, Christianity. Having established itself in the towns it soon spread to the country where it attracted a great many followers and acquired a toughness that protected it against persecution.

Various reasons for its popularity amongst the peasants can be put forward, but the most important factor, something bound to have found favour with the obstinate puritan peasantry, is the fact that it preached a belief in one omnipotent, heavenly God to whom all stood in the relationship of creature to Creator. Furthermore, they believed in an afterlife, something that was bound to appeal to the over-taxed peasant, and also generated a sense of belonging, of solidarity, to an intimate community of faithful.

Their art in its initial beginnings, and mainly in technique, resembled that of contemporary pagan artists. The main difference lies in the content of their work which was obviously dictated by the Christian philosophy. Artifacts only had value in as far as they revealed some aspect of the divine and eternal world, thus it was held that the visible world was only worthy of attention if it revealed some aspect of the divine. For the Christian the goal of life on earth was God, and everything had to reflect this attitude.

The spirit of Early Christian art was symbolic and allusive. Its prime function was to instruct and edify the believer, rather than to act as mere decoration. The emphasis was thus on simplicity. What is easier than, for a poor and uneducated person to look at an uncomplicated symbol and be led to accept complex Christian truths? To them these signs were confirmation of the concept that all men are brothers, united by faith, hope and charity - the three things that stressed the transitory nature of life on earth and the certitude of life after death.

The Christian artist was thus more a teacher than a creative individual; the purpose of his art being to instruct, to clarify and to preach. For them art was restricted to as far as what it revealed or represented and any overt attention to style was considered unimportant. Thus they were quite happy to employ the techniques of their pagan colleagues. They shunned realism in favour of the symbolic and allegoric, restricting themselves to themes such as: the Cross (symbol of the sacrifice of Christ), the Palm (martyrdom), the Anchor (salvation), and the Fish. The letters of the Greek word for 'fish' signify 'Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour'. After this followed depictions of the dove, peacock or stag, all of which are representative of the desire for the cleansing waters of baptism.

As a rule paintings were executed in bright colours with plenty of highlights. From the Catacombs of S. Callixtus in Rome comes a painting of fish with a basket of bread. The stilllife is very simply presented with no attention to detail. The objects are clearly outlined and painted in bright greens, reds and browns. The whole is placed against the stark whitish surface of the wall, thus isolating it from its surroundings. This virtual isolation of the stilllife, its simplicity and vivid colours makes it easy to read and understand the allegorical meaning of it.

Representation of Holy figures were frowned upon and regarded as blasphemous. To attempt to present a Holy figure in material shape could lead to its being worshipped, not for what it represents, but for its own sake, and the worship of any kind of image would be idolatrous, as is stated in the Bible,: 'Thou shalt not make the likeness of anything that is in heaven, or in the earth beneath'. When figures were employed they are only of allegorical significance - ie. the Good Shepherd.

The Greek Church permitted the use of figures in a realistic fashion only as symbols. They were painted not to establish a fact of vision, but to convey an idea.. By decree they were painted in an hierarchical order: Christ the tallest, then Mary and the devotees the smallest. Because of this prescribed order and poses in which Holy figures had to be rendered, their art assumed a formalist character.

The developement of Christianity was greatly enhanced by the recognition of the new religion through the Edict of Milan in 313 A.D. and its acknowledgement as the State Religion in 380 A.D. Thus, under Constantine, we find the merger of State and Church, a merger which was to last until the religious upheavels of the Renaissance.

During this period Christian art reached a point of quality equal to the finest works produced in Alexandria or Antioch. Church building flourished. They were lavishly decorated on the interiors with mosaics, favoured for their durabillity and brilliance of colour that made them suitable for enhancing the preaching of the Word and entrance the spectator. Gold was now also used extensively in the backgrounds of paintings.

The Christian believes that the spiritual and not the material is of importance. This view is reflected also in their architecture. The exteriors are plain and unadorned, while the interiors are lavishly decorated. It is here that the soul as it were, wafted to the heavens above. Thus restrictions were not only placed upon the painters of the time, but also on the Christian architects. Sculpture was virtually non-existent.

During this period we find the conception of a new out-look on life and the start of a new iconcgraphical system. With the blessing of the Church, this was to continue with little change, despite the iconoclastic interval, till the end of the Byzantine era.

ICONOCLASM

In 726, Leo III had the image of Christ removed from the Bronze Gate of the Imperial Palace and replaced by a cross. This marks the start of the era of Iconoclasim which was to last for a hundred years, till 843. Already in 721, the edict of Yazid II had resulted in the destruction of images, including Christian symbols in the Christian churches of Palestine.

During this period we thus notice a move back to the old notion of art serving purely as a medium of instruction and making use only of symbols. The Iconoclasts abhorred the use of images and regarded them as 'drawing the spirit of man from the lofty adoration of God to the low and material adoration of the creature'. As Dr. James Martin states in his book , A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy,: 'they conceived of idolatry as an attitude of mind which led the worshipper to substitute the created thing for its Creator'. All holy images, and often simple symbols, were thus destroyed during the reigns of the Iconoclastic emperors.

In 843 ,the supporters of the image finally triumphed. This was the work of Empress Theodora acting on behalf of her son, Michael III. The return of the image was marked by the restoration of the image of Christ on the palace gates. The official texts of the Iconoclastic emperors, as well as those works of art that had been produced according to iconoclastic principles during the crisis, were destroyed.

THE REFORMATION

I will not dwell on the conditions and events that gave rise to the Reformation, nor on the events and wars during this period of religious upheaval, for they, in themselves, provide more than enough material to fill several volumes, let alone an essay.

The reformation served a double purpose. On the one hand it weakened the church because of its opposition to the authority of the Pope, while, on the other hand, it strengthened the State, for it was on the secular governments of the time that Luther and his comrades relied on their fight against the international Catholic order. The Reformation marks the last major religious upheaval; I include the Counter Reformation in this, the final separation of Church and State, and the rise to power of the common masses. It was a revolution that not only affected the theology, but also had lasting effects on music, ethics, ritual and art.

Whereas, Catholic liturgy was aristocratic in nature, standing above the people in all spheres, including music, the Reformation heralded the participation of every soul in the service. The singing of song during mass in the Catholic church was the soul privilege of the priest and a male choir set apart from the worshippers. In the Protestant churches a change

came about that was to affect not only the manner in which songs were to be sung, but also in their very content.' The language used was to be the vernacular of the people with the participation of the whole congregation in the singing of the songs, in fact, they would eventually take a leading role in it.

Luther loved music and would do much to create religious music 'that would move the people by its fusion of faith with song'. He wrote in 1558, : 'When natural music is sharpened and polished by art, then one begins to see with amazement the perfect wisdom of God in His wonderful work of music.....' In the Protestant hymnes we now find a fusion of folk song, Catholic hymn and a great deal of original composition. Music now sought to follow and interpret the sermon. From the music composed by Luther and his aides flowed the noble Protestant church music of the eighteenth century, culminating in the oratorios of Handel and the Masses, oratorios and chorales of Johann Sebastian Bach.

Other reformers were not as favourable to music as Luther. Zwingli forbade music from church services entirely, while Calvin forbade it except in the form of unisocal singing by the congregation.

As a result of the Reformation, religious music penetrated the very houses the Protestants lived in and became a part of their daily life. In fact, one can say that, the democratization of religious music marked the lands of the Reformation and 'covered the darkness of the creed with the releasing joy of song', for with the other arts it did not go so well.

The Reformation resembles, in its attitude to art, the iconoclastic revolt of 726 A.D., where the Catholic church was renowned for its patronage of the arts, even to the extent of heavy taxation in order to obtain the necessary finances, the Reformation meant the destruction of many a work of art and eventually, an entirely new direction in the arts.

None of the Protestant leaders cared much for either painting or sculpture. Calvin considered them pagan and immoral, but tolerated both to some extent: 'I am not so scrupulous as to judge that no images should be endured.....but seeing that the art of painting and carving..... cometh from God, I require that the practice of art should be kept pure and lawful. Therefore men sould not paint nor carve anything but such as can be seen with the eye,' while Luther had this to say of

painting: ' I do not hold that the Gospel should destroy all the artsI would fain to see all arts.....serving Him.....The law of Moses forbade only the image of God.'

Other outlawed religious painting and sculpture altogether and cleared their churches of all ornament. To this day we find that Protestant churches, on the whole, are unadorned with decoration of any form.

In Germany, heart of the Reformation, church architecture virtually disappeared. Many churches remained unfinished while others were destroyed and their stones used for other purposes. At the same time the Protestant churches adhered to a stern simplicity, while Catholic churches indulged in over decoration to the point of vulgarity.

With the split that came between Church and State, civic and palace architecture replaced church building as the main architectural enterprise. Thus the most pretentious architecture of this and the next age took the form of immense castles, lavishly decorated and furnished, for the territorial princes. In fact, the princes now replaced the Roman Catholic church in taxing their subjects in order to finance their ventures. The nobility and State thus replaced the Church as the main patrons of the arts. The palace of Duke Christopher at Stuttgart was so lavishly furnished and decorated that the city magistrates warned him that the luxury of his court was scandalously in contrast with the poverty of his people.

In the other arts excellence prevailed, but, as was the case with architecture, now in the service of princes, nobles, merchants and financiers. Though the old technical skill is still there, we do notice a move away from the old tastes and forms in favour of complexity of ornament. This new development was definitely a result of the puritan movements of the age. Even amongst the reform Popes of the Catholic Counter Reformation this was evident. They tried to encourage an art compatible with religious dogma, but instead aesthetic standards took a severe knock. Painting became sentimental and one is aware of an overriding undertone of insincerity, while architecture became grandios and ostentatious. Most of the architectural creations of the age lack the charm and originality of the Gothic cathedrals of the Middle ages.

For the first time German artists began to paint glass with enamel colours; in this way vessels and windows took on crude, but rich, designs, and the prosperous bourgeois could have his likeness fused into the windowpanes of his home. Yet, the glory of German art continued to be in painting. A certain amount of religious paintings were still produced, but the subject matter changed completely in that the themes are now mainly allegorical in content. Thus the reformation is again responsible for a new tendency in the arts, because of its opposition to Holy images. Again, as was the case with most arts, the tendency is to cater for the rich elite. A fair trade developed in portraiture. At the same time the works of Albrecht Altdorfer heralded the beginnings of the landscape tradition. Works such as The Battle of Arbelá, Rest on the Flight from Egypt, and his St. George, are amongst the first true landscapes of modern painting.

Despite the regulations as regards the nude, issued by the Council of Trent, it became a favourite subject of German painting of the time. As a result of the regulations of the Council of Trent, a virtually unknown artist named Daniel de Volterra was appointed to paint breeches on all the naked figures of Michelangelo's Last Judgement and other similar works in Italy. The Germans took note of this and resultingly we notice the use of various objects to obscure possible offending parts, thus rendering them safe from puritan condemnation. Lucas Cranach the Elder, held so high in esteem by the leaders of the Reformation, painted nudes to his hearts delight, using objects such as hats, beads, bodkins and leaves to stay within the limits of decency. His nudes are voluptuous, tantalising and provocative. He paints them with an Italian clarity of line and stresses their sensuality by showing them as slim, naughty females, thus going counter to the traditional concept of the 'Frau'. Nudes began to play a leading role, and even in religious painting, painters used themes such as Suzanna and the Elders, Potiphar's wife tempting Joseph, or Bathsheba in her bath. With the death of Lucas Cranach the Elder, German art 'receded in the backwash of theology and war'. What saved German painting from vulgarity now is the impish humour in them. The German humour enlivened the traditional by making fun of safely dead gods.

The Reformation thus meant the virtual death of religious painting and an entirely new direction in religious architecture. On the other hand it marks an increase in the production of portraits and the development of

the landscape into a genre in its own right.

With the rise of the Reformation we also see the rise of Capitalism and the State. Nobles and princes replaced the Church as patrons of the arts and artists themselves became more aware of the commercial value of their work. As Preserved Smith writes in his book, The Social background of the Reformation : "Even when the Reformation was not consciously opposed to art, it shoved it aside as a distraction from the real business of life. Thus it has come about in Protestant lands that the public regards art as either a 'business' or an 'education' ".

The end result of the Reformation and Catholic Counter Reformation was that, painting was sentimentalized and moralized. Architecture adopted the gaudy, insincere style of the Baroque with painting following suit. Churches were turned into 'christmas trees' stuffed with podgy angels and 'tinsel', while marble was replaced by painted plaster and 'saintliness by sickliness.'

APPENDIX A

MUSIC UNDER KHRUSHCHEV: THE DECREE OF 28 MAY 1958

' The Central Committee of the CPSU notes that the Decree of February 10 1948, concerning Muradell's Opera, the Great Friendship, played, on the whole, a positive role in the subsequent developement of Soviet musical art. This decree defined the aims of musical art based on the principles of Socialist Realism, and stressed the importance of the links between art and the life of the Soviet people, the best democratic traditions of the classic and folk music. The formalist tendencies in music were rightly condemned, as well as those alleged 'innovations' which created a gulf between art and the people, and turned music into something that could interest only a narrow circle of 'arty' gourmets. The developement of music in the last few years confirmed the rightness and timeliness of these instructions.

At the same time the assesment of the work of certain composers was in several cases unfounded and unjust. There were faults in Muradell's opera which deserved sober criticism, but which did not justify its being denounced as a formalist work. Gifted composers, such as Shostakovich, Prokofiev, Khachaturian and G. Popov and others, whose works sometimes revealed the wrong tendencies, were simply denounced as the representatives of a formalist, anti-people tendency.... Certain wrong appreciations in the Decree reflected a subjective attitude to certian works of art by J.V. Stalin personally.'

The 1958 decree also states:

'While the Decree of February 10, 1948, directed correctly the developement of Soviet music..... it contained, at the same time, many unjust and undeservedly sharp criticisms of the work of many highly gifted Soviet composers; such a negative attitude was characteristic of the personality cult period.'

It then gives the following instructions:

- a)' The editorial of Pravda (editor, Comrade Satyukov) should, on the strength of the present Decree, publish a leading article containing an all-round and profound analysis of the main problems concerning the developement of Soviet musical art.
- b) The Regional Committees, the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the various Soviet Republics, and the Ministry of Culture of the

USSR should conduct the necessary explanatory work in artistic unions, art schools etc. in connection with the present Decree, bearing in mind the necessity of raising still further the artistic and ideological level of Soviet musical art and the further consolidation, amongst creative intellectuals, of the Communist ideology and of the bonds uniting art and the life of the people'.

In keeping with the prevailing mode of using Stalin as the scape-goat for attacks on the old system, the decree made him responsible for attacks on certain other composers and for certain Pravda editorials that appeared in 1951 'on his instructions'. The Decree actually states: 'As we know a very adverse influence was exercised on Stalin in these matters by Molotov, Malenkov and Beira.....'

CONCLUSION

The artist is a human being prone to the weaknesses of such a being and subject to the conditions and demands laid down and made by that group of beings which he forms a part of. Therefore, his very mode of existence and manner of reaction is largely determined by the society he lives in. Thus it is that the works produced by the artist are also subject to the same conditions and demands. It is impossible to separate the imagination from the general influences active at the time when the work of art was created; in short, it is as impossible to detach the imagination from social reality as it is to attempt to detach our daily existence from that self same reality. Every human being ultimately forms part of a group and the works created by the individual are ultimately rooted in the group experience. The individual cannot react to something if there is nothing to provide the catalyst for such reaction, thus, through contact with the group the individual develops a certain opinion or emotional relationship that stimulates him into reaction.

Although the works produced by the artist do not necessarily comment favourably on his society, that society largely determines the basic format of the work of art, in other words, the subject matter and symbols or objects used in the construction of the work of art are influenced by society at large, and those forces in control of society. The fact that the only guarantee that any artist has of success depends on the extent to which he can make a group of people believe in him and respond to his work bear this out. No artist, if only to ensure his continued survival, can afford to be indifferent to the values of the group.

In the introduction to this essay I stated the three major ways in which the group or dominant force exerts its influence on the artist, these being stipulation, attraction and selection. I also defined the State, Church and Economics as being the three major forces to determine the direction in which art will and has developed as well as the content of the work of art. I then proceeded to illustrate this by way of four situations, or periods, as we find them in the world of art. Let us then relate these to the premise as I outlined it in my introduction.

Economics has always played a major role in the development of society. He who controls the economy is in a position to effectively dictate policy on a wide level, be it politics or religion.

In the 20th century the economic aspect has developed into a force in its own right, as regards art in any case, in the Western world, hence the large number of commercial galleries, art magazines and agents. The art marketeer rely exclusively on the principle of selection and attraction to establish his market. In any art movement we will find the figurehead, the one whose works are held up and publicised as the cream of a movement. Others are encouraged to follow his style and technique. Thus a person and his work are selected as the epitamy of the group. This, together with the artist's financial position, are then widely publicised which in turn attract others to the movement. In this way then movements and styles can be created in order to cater for the commercial art market.

In its very beginnings Christianity also relied on attraction to draw artist to the new religion to be used to propagate Christianity. Artists, finding the new religion compatable with their own views, thus joined it and willingly allowed themselves to be employed as instruments of instruction, adhering to the laws of Christianity. However, as soon as Christianity had acquired sufficient power, it started to stipulate by way of definate decrees what may and may not be painted by the artist, thus effectively regulating the developement of art. The objection to the rendering of Holy images and the overall puritan emphasis of the Reformation were decisive factors that determined the further developement of religious art. The Reformation, because of its puritan outlook on life, was responsible for the rise of the landscape as a genre and a significant increase in portraiture during the 16th century, and the period immediatly after. In fact, it was largely due to the Reformation that the artist became more aware of the commercial value of his art as he was forced to concentrate on areas such as portraiture to ensure the survival of his art. Thus one can say that Luther and his compatriates were responsible for commercialism replacing spirituality in the arts.

In the same way the Socialists in Russia brought about the imposition of Socialist Realism as the only exceptable art form on the Russian artist; while in South Africa the use of censorship by the Nationalist government has had wide ranging concequences for the healthy developement of literature in particular.

Finally then, I think I can safely say that the State, Church and Economics

have had a drastic and overwhelming effect on the general developement of art in all spheres, whether directly or indirectly, for they are ultimately also responsible for the beliefs, customs and attitudes of the societies they dominate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Here follows a list of the more readily available literature on those subjects discussed in this essay.

THE RUSSIAN VENTURE

- J. Berger: Art and Revolution. Pelican - 1969
R. Williams: Culture and Society. Pelican - 1958
A. Werth: Russia under Khrushchev. Crest - 1962
C.J.H. Hayes: A Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe. Macmillan - 1939
N.V. Riasanovsky: A History of Russia, Oxford - 1969
L. Schapiro: The Government and Politics of the Soviet Union. Random House Inc - 1965
I. Deutscher: Stalin. Perquin - 1966
J.P. Nettle: The Soviet Achievement. Thames and Hudson - 1967
C. Gray: The Great Experiment. Russian Art 1863 - 1922. Thames and Hudson - 1962

THE ARTIST AS BUSINESSMAN

- J.A. Walker: Art Since Pop. Thames and Hudson - 1975
L.R. Lippard: Pop Art. Thames and Hudson - 1974

THE SOUTH AFRICAN WRITER AND CENSORSHIP

- A.H. van Wyk: Die Wetsontwerp op Publikasies en Vermaaklikhede van 1974.
Standpunte 114, Volume 27(6) August 1974
W.E.G. Louw: Probleme i.v.m. die beheer van Publikasies, Standpunte 120, Volume 28
(6). August 1975

RELIGION AND THE ARTS

- A. Martindale: Gothic Art. Thames and Hudson - 1967
G. Pischel: The Golden History of Art. Hamlyn - 1968
J. Lassus: The Early Christian and Byzantine Church. Hamlyn - 1966
E.J. Martin: A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy. London - 1930
Larousse Encyclopedia of Renaissance and Baroque Art. Gen. Ed. R. Hugghe.
Hamlyn - 1964
D.T. Rice: Art of the Byzantine Era. Thames and Hudson. - 1963
V.H.H. Green: Renaissance and Reformation. Edward Arnold - 1964
G.G. Coulton Art and the Reformation. Basil Blackwell - 1928
W. Durant: The Reformation - A History of European Civilization from Wycliffe to
Calvin: 1300-1564. New York - 1957
P. Smith: The Social Background of the Reformation. Collier - 1962

