

Propaganda of Art for Art's sake Movement Through Media

Dr. Yasmeen Sultana Farooqui

Assistant Professor

Dpt.of media studies

SMIU

Dr.Javed Akhter

Department of English Literature

University of Balochistan.Quetta

E-mail: sangatjavedakhtar@gmail.com

Abstract

The aim of this research paper is to trace the origin and development of Art for art's sake movement from Marxist perspective. The origin of Art for art's movement can be traced back to the late Romanticists who felt themselves misfit in the post-revolutionary bourgeois world of business, profit and industrialisation of the Patriarchal countryside of Europe. Therefore, an insoluble contradiction occurred between the aims of the late Romanticist artists and writers and the conditions of the Post-revolutionary bourgeois capitalist world. However, they became hostile to it, but failed to see any hope of changing it.

The employment of Marxist literary hermeneutics in analysing Art for art's sake movement yields the result that the apostles of this movement express their disharmony with the bourgeois capitalist social formation. They refuse to be commodity producer in the bourgeois publishing industry, in which an author is a labourer or commodity producer for those consumers whom he does not see. However, the apostles of this movement failed to introduce new modes of literary production as well as to change the bourgeois social formation. The present research study highlights the purpose, rise and fall of Art for art's sake movement in an innovative Marxist perspective.

Key Terms: absolute autonomy of art, useful art, idealism, bourgeois publishing industry, modes of literary production

Introduction

Romanticism developed into ‘L’ art pour l’ art’ or Art for art’s sake movement in the Post-revolutionary bourgeois world side by side with realism whose chief target was to explore and criticise the bourgeois social formation. In fact, Art for art’s sake movement was an attitude adopted by the literary writers, poets and the artists, which was also a protest against the vulgarization of values, dirty core of profit and business, commonplace utilitarianism of everything. It protested against philistine materialism and the bourgeois ‘Religion of Progress’ (Valery, P., 1938, Pp. 79-98), roughness of the stereotyped world of reality, “orthodoxy of philosophical systems, fixed points of view, and dreary business and commercial pre-occupations of the smug world of the bourgeoisie. It was also a reaction of literary men and the artists against the old-styled didacticism of the new liberal and socialist pre-requisite, according to which, art and literature should serve morality, progress and utopia, and to instruct many officials and economic management. The protest of the artists, and literary men in the form of Art for art’s sake movement reflected their disharmony with the bourgeois capitalist social formation; they expressed their denial to be commodity producers in the bourgeois publishing industry, selling their heartfelt masterpieces of art as saleable commodities in the bourgeois capitalist market. In the bourgeois capitalist world, everyman turned into commodity producer and everything saleable commodity.

Therefore, the socio-economic conditions of capitalism reflected a growing apprehension and hostility of an alienated minority of the artists and writers towards the bourgeois capitalism accompanying the rise of the petti-bourgeoisie and the spread of democracy. The rise of the sentiment towards freedom of expressions and protest against the monarchy and the bourgeois class approached at its zenith in the middle of 19th century in Europe. The masses of the common people started demanding their own choice of expression and liberty of freedom from the traditional doctrine. The freedom of expression became the foundation stone for the period. French Revolution gave birth to the new bourgeois social relations, bourgeois publishing industry along with the various bourgeois literary modes of production. In short, the development of capitalism as one of the modes of production, dominating all of the social formation makes human pursuit, the social relations unbearably abstract, unsensuous, and incapable of being shaped into art. Capitalism’s social division of labour, the dominance of the exchange relationship over all the aspects of human life, and the fetishism of all life forms that necessarily follows surrounds the

artist with an environment to which he cannot relate in a naïve-immediate way, delighting in his world and producing his art joyously. “The tragedy of the artist in bourgeois society-from which tragedy the whole of the 19th century art movement stems-lies in the fact that precisely this relation of immediacy, the bases of the artistic attitude towards reality, is disturbed, indeed made impossible” (Bewes, T and Timothy H., 2011, p. 159). In this way, capitalism replaced the feudal modes of literary production with the new bourgeois modes of literary production reducing the status of an artist to a labourer in the bourgeois publishing industry. This situation gave birth to Art for Art’s Sake movement, which became the fountainhead of the new style, thoughts and sentiments, leading to the influence in every field of fine arts, including the field of design. James McNeill Whistler wrote that “a new class who discovered the cheap, and foresaw the fact of sham” (Whistler, J. M., 2012, pp. 135-59).

For the aesthete, beauty is an escape and refuge from reality while he claims this he was prompting an indulgence in the decadent archaic and the morbid. Friedrich Nietzsche proclaimed “The Death of God”, turning the apostles of Art for art’s sake movement towards the occult and the transcended to make a thoroughly spiritualized and idealised art substitute for the old belief. In this respect, the aesthetes defined and defended the paramount value, self-sufficiency, independence and autonomy of art and literature. This idea of independence of art and literature was, of course, far from new. Usually it has been traced back to the English Romantics to De Quincy, Herbert Spencer, John Keats and Walter Pater to the Germans to Arthur Schopenhauer, Immanuel Kant, and Friedrich Schiller. Herbert Spencer in his book “Principles of Psychology” tried to adopt Friedrich Schiller’s idea of play impulse (Spencer. H, 1855, Chapter XI), which he derived from Immanuel Kant because Friedrich Schiller’s such ideas as play impulse, sense impulse and form impulse are based upon neo-Kantianism. De Quincy’s essay “On Murder Considered as One of the Fine Arts” (1827) and John Keats’ following lines are early aesthetic points of view:

“Beauty is truth, truth beauty, ’---that is all”

Ye know on earth and all ye need to know” (Keats, J., 1990, lines 49-50, p. 289).

In addition, the traces of this movement may be found in the works of the English Romanticist poets St. Coleridge, Swinburne, the members of Yellow Book Group, the German Goethe, Schiller, Winckelmann and Otto Ludwig, the French, Gustave Flaubert, Theodor de Banvilli, Leconte de Lisle and Paul Valéry, and the Russian Alexander Pushkin and Ostrovsky.

Literature Review

The early traces of Art for art's sake movement may be found in the late romantic poets and writers such as Herbert Spencer, John Keats, De Quincy, Walter Pater, Arthur Schopenhauer, Immanuel Kant, and Friedrich Schiller. The Art for art's sake movement was based on Immanuel Kant's idealism. This movement spread throughout Europe. The book on the subject, which is worth mentioning, is Rose R. Egan's book entitled "The Genesis of the Theory of Art for Art's Sake Movement in Germany and England" (Northampton, 1921). This is the full-length study of the movement and very important in many respects.

In addition, the Marxist literary critics felt it contrary to Marxist theory of aesthetics. Georgi Plekhanov, the most eminent Russian Marxist philosopher and literary critic analysed it from Marxist point of view in "On 'Art for Art's Sake' in his book entitled "Unaddressed Letters and Art and Social Life" (Moscow, 1957). Ernest Fischer, the most famous Austrian Marxist leader and literary critic also do so in "L' art pour l' art" in his book entitled "The Necessity of Art" (London: Penguin Books, 1984). These pieces on the movement under discussion are very thought provoking example of the Marxist analysis of the movement. The focus on Art for Art's sake movement, the works of research in the area of his literary output such as, the study of the Emergence Art for Art's Sake movement from Marxist Perspective have been very scant. In order to fill this gap, the present study proposes to take up an evaluative Marxist critical study of Art for Art's Sake movement.

Discussion

The doctrine of Art-for-Art's-sake movement which, sprung in France at the middle of the nineteenth-century, promulgated in the writings of Theophile Gautier (1811 - 1872), Theodor de Banvilli (1823-91) and Leconte de Lisle (1818-94). It was transplanted to Germany by Goethe, Schiller, Winckelmann and Otto Ludwig, to England by James McNeill Wistler, Walter Pater, Oscar Wilde and the members of the Yellow Book Group, and to Russia by Alexander Pushkin, Mikhail Lermontov and Ostrovsky refused the moral, political, social and utilitarian functions of art and literature. In their view art and literature are neither influenced by the society nor do influence it. They are self-autonomous, independent and self-sufficient and their function is only to provide aesthetic pleasure. The idealism of Immanuel Kant provided philosophical and ideological bases to the doctrine of the movement. His claim of the disinterestedness of the intuitions or the imagination (Kant, I., 1982, Pp. 42-43) is kept on further by Arthur Schopenhauer.

He was of the opinion that ‘an absolute’ art keeps the mind off from despicable life and get it from its bondage to the will. Since, music is a spiritual or immaterial art as well as independent of the spatial-temporal material world. In his book “The World as a Will and Idea”, he proclaimed that, “In song, desire and perception of surroundings presented are wonderfully mingled with each other the subjective disposition, the affection of will parts its own hues to contemplated surroundings communicate the reflex of their colour to will” (Schopenhauer, A., 1909, p. 323). He further said that, “to become like music is the aspiration of all arts” (Schopenhauer, A., 1909, p. 323). This is echoed by Friedrich Nietzsche in “The Birth of Tragedy from the Spirit of Music” and by Walter Pater in his remarks, “All arts are constantly aspire towards the condition of music” (Pater, W., 1873).

Benjamin Constant used the phrase “art for, and without purpose” in his diary in 1804, while reporting in Weimar with Henry Crabb Robinson, who told him about the aesthetic view point of Immanuel Kant. However, the Germans never involved of course, into the illusion of surrendering social, moral, and metaphysical claims of art and literature by the self-sufficiency and autonomy of them. They did not mean anything like the “uselessness” flaunted by Theophile Gautier, Walter Pater and James McNeill Whistler. They, no doubt, had known these theories in general terms since they were popularised in France in various versions by M. Victor Cousin (1792-1867), and Theodore Jouffroy (1796-1842). In a lecture first given in 1818 (printed in 1836) M. Victor apparently stressed the need of “religion for the sake of religion”, of “morals for the sake of morals” and of “art for the sake of art”. This is taken up and carried further by Walter Pater, whose most famous phrase “the love of art for its own sake” has served the aesthetes as a slogan implying the rejection of “heresy of instruction”. James McNeill Wistler wrote in his “Ten O’ Clock Lecture” (1885) that, “Art is selfishly occupied with her own perfection only” and has “no desire to teach”. (Whistler, J. M., 2012, Pp. 135-59). Oscar Wilde was also of the same opinion, remarking that, “They have passed into the sphere of art and science, and neither art nor science knows anything of moral approval or disapproval” (Wilde, O., 1971 a, p. 1008). Similarly, Nikolay Gogol, the most famous Russian novelist in his famous story “The Nose” (1836) poked fun at the idea of morality improving literature. Therefore, the story ended without a moral, but with the narrator sputtering into silence as he attempted to elaborate what meaning there could possibly be in an incidence about Major Kovalyov’s lost nose reincarnated as a senior civil servant.

The phrase Art for art's sake reminds us the counterpart of science for science's sake that Karl Marx quoted in his book "Capital", the principle established by the bourgeois capitalist economists such as Adam Smith "production for production's sake. In every case, either the case of science for science's sake or production for production's sake or art for art's sake the bourgeois market is lurking in the background. We find in Art for art's sake movement the antagonist contradiction of the illusory attempt of fighting single-handed against the bourgeois capitalist system yet at the same time tending to confine its principle of production for production's sake. Theodore Jouffroy in his lecture course on aesthetics given privately before a small class, including Sainte Beuve, in 1828 (but printed in 1843), tried to distinguish the beautiful from the useful. M. Victor Cousins' theory of abstract beauty, which harks back to Plato and Winckelmann or humanitarian aesthetic feelings of Theodore Jouffroy that derives from the Scottish Common-Sense School, are totally different from Theophile Gautier's sense of sensual, corporeal, even sexual beauty.

Theophile Gautier found himself out of harmony with the bourgeois social formation of his time. He abused the bourgeois utilitarian critics, as impotent, envious, and fools who confused author with work. He wrote that, "No you fools no, you goitrous cretins, a book cannot be turned into gelatine soup, nor a novel into a pair of seamless boots, a sonnet an automatic syringe, a drama is not a railway,— all of which things are essentially civilising and carry mankind along the road of progress. By the intestines of all the Popes future, past and present: No, and a thousand times no...." (Gautier, T., 1980, p. 77). Theophile Gautier believed that art and literature neither influence social formation nor are influenced by it. For him the beautiful phenomenon is superfluous. Like, Theodore Jouffroy, he believed in the distinction between the beautiful and the useful. In this way, Theophile Gautier believed in the absolute autonomy self-sufficiency and independence of art. In a biographical note on Charles Baudelaire, Theophile Gautier highly admired the author of "the Fleurs du mal", for having maintained "the absolute autonomy of art and for not admitting that poetry had any aim but itself, or any mission but to excite in the soul of the reader the sensation of beauty, in the absolute sense of the term" (Gautier, T., 2013, Pp. 17-126).

In fact, Theophile Gautier believed in the absolute autonomy, independence and self-sufficiency of art because he loved the aesthetic surface proportion, the colour, the outward form of pictures and painting: even to the infusion of sensual or sexual attraction or mere luxury with

aesthetic gratification. He himself recognized “the lust of the eyes is my sin”. He further said, “What is the use of beauty in woman? Provided a woman is physically well made and capable of bearing children, she will always be good enough in the opinion of economists. What is the use of music? — of painting? Who would be fool enough nowadays to prefer Mozart to Carrel, Michael Angelo to the inventor of white mustard? There is nothing really beautiful save what is of no possible use. Everything useful is ugly, for it expresses a need, and man's needs are low and disgusting, like his own poor, wretched nature. The most useful place in a house is the water-closet. For my part, saving these gentry's presence, I am of those to whom superfluities are necessities, and I am fond of things and people in inverse ratio to the service they render me. I prefer a Chinese vase with its mandarins and dragons, which is perfectly useless to me, to a utensil, which I do use, and the particular talent of mine, which I set most store by, is that which enables me not to guess logogriffs and charades. I would very willingly renounce my rights as a Frenchman and a citizen for the sight of an undoubted painting by Raphael, or of a beautiful nude woman, — Princess Borghese, for instance, when she posed for Canova, or Julia Grisi when she is entering her bath.” (Gautier, T., 1980, .Pp. 82-83).

Theophile Gautier also believed that art is liberty, luxury, and extravagance. It is the flowering of the soul in idleness. Yet all the Parnassians agreed with Theophile Gautier's theory of the absolute autonomy, independence and self-sufficiency of art and literature, reflecting hopelessly their disharmony with the bourgeois world. Theophile Gautier flaunted the disharmony of the French Romantics with their socio-economic environment. He wrote that, “The parterre before, which Chatterton declaimed, was filled with pallid, long-haired youths, who firmly believed that there was no dignified occupation save writing poems or painting pictures---and who looked on “the bourgeois” with contempt hardly equalled by that which the Fuchses of Heidelberg and Jena entertain for the philistine” (Gautier, T., 1981, Pp. 153-154). For Theophile Gautier the contemptible bourgeois class consisted of the bankers, brokers, lawyers, merchants, and shopkeepers.

Similarly, in a sonnet, Theodore de Banville, one of the famous French Romanticist poets also expressed the same ideas that he too had been afflicted with the hatred of the bourgeois class. In a word, to the romanticists, the bourgeois means a person whose only god was the five franc piece, who had no ideal but saving his own skin, and who in poetry, loved sentimental romance,

and in the plastic arts and lithography. For this reason, Theodore de Banville in his “Odes funambulesques” branded those people as unmitigated scoundrels who led a bourgeois mode of life and did not worship romantic geniuses. The new art with which the romanticists were infatuated so strongly was for them a refuge and escape from the sordidness, tedium and vulgarity of the bourgeois world. Theophile Gautier not only mocked the utilitarians but also laughed at the utopians, for example at Fourier and the foolish belief in progress. For him progress has not achieved anything humanly and morally significant. He remarked that, “Has a single additional mortal sin been invented? Unfortunately, the number of them is still seven, as of yore, the number of a just man's falls in one day —pretty small. I do not even believe that after a century of progress at the present rate, there is a single amorous man capable of repeating the thirteenth labour of Hercules. Can one make things pleasanter for one's goddess than in Solomon's time?” (Gautier, T., 1980, .p. 87).

The life of art or art of life is a form of purified ecstasy that is produced in a dreamland, which is far from the harsh realities of the social formation and the world. After the failure of the 1848 Revolution, Theophile Gautier, Gustave Flaubert, Theodore de Banville and Charles Baudelaire embraced the doctrine of art for art's sake in their writings. The intense distaste of the devotees of art for art's movement for the bourgeoisie's rising power led them to withdraw from social formation rather than try to change it because they sought refuge in the transcendence of beauty in art. In the latter years of the Restoration and the first half of the reign of Louis Philippe, art for art's movement was at its zenith. The young romanticists devotees of art for art's sake movement felt difficult to fit themselves in the sordid, prosaic and tedious life style of bourgeoisdom. In the period of the terrible storms of the Great Revolution and the Napoleonic era, they negated the bourgeois mode of life and bourgeois modes of literary production introduced by the bourgeois publishing industry.

Therefore, romanticists expressed their negation in their art as well as in their own external appearances. We have already read from Theophile Gautier that the young men who filled the parterre at the first performance of Chatterton wore long hair. Theophile Gautier also had long hair and used to wear red waistcoat, which made decent people shiver with horror. He wrote, “The red waistcoat! It is more than forty years since I wore it, yet people still speak of it, and will go on speaking of it in days to come, so deep did that flash of colour penetrate the public's eye. If the

name of Theophile Gautier happens to be spoken in the presence of a Philistine, even of one who has never read a line of prose or verse of mine, he knows me at least by the red waistcoat I wore at the first performance of "Hernani," and he says, with the self-satisfied look of the man who knows what he is talking about: "Oh, yes. You mean the young fellow with the red waistcoat and the long hair." And that is the way I shall go down to posterity. My books, my verse, my articles, my travels will be forgotten, but men will remember my red waist-coat" (Gautier, T., 1981, .p. 127).

This Byronic romantic fashion was followed and popularised in Russia by Mikhail Lermontov. For this reason, Mikhail Lermontov was regarded as a Byronic poet and novelist in Russia. However, long hair and pale face meant to young romanticist devotees of art for art's sake movement of the whole Europe, to protest against the bourgeoisie and way to distinguish themselves from the bourgeoisie. Theophile Gautier said that, "At that time it was the prevailing fashion, in the Romanticist school, for a man to be wan, livid, greenish, and somewhat cadaverous, if possible, for thus did one attain the fateful, Byronic, Giaour look of one devoured by passion and remorse. Tender-hearted women thought such a one interesting, and, feeling grieved at his approaching fate, abridged the time of waiting for the consummation of happiness in order that he might taste it while still in this world. But rosy health illumined his sweet and lovely face. It is not every one who can have the mien of a Ruthven" (Gautier, T., 1981, Pp. 49-50).

The Romanticists did not even forgive Victor Hugo, the leading and acknowledge romanticist for his respectable appearance. Theophile Gautier told us about this, "His dress consisted of a black frock-coat, gray trousers, and a turned-down shirt-collar, a get-up at once most simple and correct. Indeed no one would have suspected this thorough gentleman of being the leader of the hairy, bearded bands that were the terror of the smooth-chinned bourgeois" (Gautier, T., 1981, p. 29). The romanticists protested against the idea of useful art that was for them tantamount to serve the bourgeoisie whom they detested so profoundly. The vehement sallies of the romanticists against the preachers of useful art may be found in their writings. Alexander Pushkin, the most eminent Russian romanticist and contemporary of Theophile Gautier did so in his poetry:

"Begone, ye Pharisees! What cares

The peaceful poet for your fate?"

Art for art's sake movement is a strong reaction against all the theories of social, moral and political function of art. The romanticists, Parnassians and aesthetes of the whole Europe neither expected nor desired a change in the bourgeois social formation of their time. They did not see any hope of changing the social formation, so they became quite hopeless. Alexander Pushkin and Ostrovsky no longer wished for any change in the period of Nicolas and the tone of their art was similarly tinged with pessimism in this era. That is why; the ardent believers and devotees of art for art's sake movement turned their backs to social formation in which they lived, retreating into subjective idealism and aestheticism. Walter Pater, the most eminent English aesthete and acknowledged philosopher of the movement wrote that, "For just in proportion as the writer's aim consciously or unconsciously comes to be the transcribing, not of the world, not of mere fact but of sense of it, he becomes an artist and his work fine art" (Pater, W., 1944, p.6).

In this respect, the advocates of Art for art's sake movement held supra-social notions and norms of the absolute autonomy, self-sufficiency and independence of art and literature. In fact, they tried to isolate art and literature from the other forms of social consciousness and signifying ideological practices of the social formation such as morality, politics and others. In this respect, they isolated everything from the other things of the universe and from its social and natural relations. For instance, Gustave Flaubert advised his most intimate disciple Maupassant that he should observe a tree until he discovered the traits, which distinguished it from all other trees and then seek for the words that adequately express this unique quality of the particular tree. In fact, Gustave Flaubert's task is to isolate the tree from nature as a whole and from its relationship with human beings. Oscar Wilde wrote in "The Decay of Lying: An Observation" as follows:

"Art never expresses anything but itself. That is the principle of my new aesthetics; and it is this, more than that vital connection between form and substance, on which Mr. Pater dwells, that makes music the type of all the arts. Of course, nations and individuals, with that healthy, natural vanity which is the secret of existence, are always under the impression that it is of them that the Muses are talking, always trying to find in the calm dignity of imaginative art some mirror of their own turbid passions, always forgetting that the singer of Life is not Apollo, but Marsyas. Remote from reality and with her eyes turned away from the shadows of the cave, Art reveals her own perfection, and the wondering crowd that watches the opening of the marvellous, many-petalled rose fancies that it is its own history that is being told to it, its own spirit that is finding expression in a new form. But it is not so. The highest art rejects the burden of the human spirit, and gains

more from a new medium or a fresh material than she does from any enthusiasm for art, or from any lofty passion, or from any great awakening of the human consciousness. She develops purely on her own lines” (Wilde, O., 1971 b, p. 987).

The artists and writers associated with the moment stressed the form of art and neglected the content of it. For this reason, their art became ambiguous and difficult to understand for the masses of people and was confined to a selected circle of readers. They consider that obscurity and unpopularity of writings are the criteria of excellent art and literature and the popularity of writings is the writer's artistic and intellectual inferiority. Leconte de Lisle opines that the popularity of a writer was proof of his intellectual inferiority. Besides, Walter Pater, Oscar Wilde, James McNeill Wistler, the names of the members of the pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, Swinburne, Arther Symons, Ernst Dowson, Lionel Johnson, Andrew Lang, William Sharp, John Addington Symonds and the early Yeats are commonly associated with the movement. Aubrey Beardsley and James McNeill Wistler are ardent believers of the theory of Art for art's sake movement. The aesthetes refused to produce commercial art and literature. Charles Baudelaire, the most acknowledged French lyric poet strongly protested against vulgar commercialism of the bourgeoisie. Walter Benjamin, the most eminent German Marxist literary theorist wrote something different from the original interpretation of Charles Baudelaire's poetry. He wrote that, “Baudelaire's behaviour on the literary market: Baudelaire's thorough understanding of the nature of commodities enabled or obliged him to recognize the market as an objective test-----Baudelaire wanted to find a place for his works and so he had to elbow others out-----His poems were full of special devices intended to put all other poets into the shade” (cited in Fischer, E., 1984, p. 68). On the contrary, Ernest Fischer, the most eminent Austrian Marxist literary critic begs something differ from Walter Benjamin's interpretation of Charles Baudelaire. He wrote as follows:

“Baudelaire set up the sacred effigy of beauty in opposition to the smug world of the bourgeoisie. For the vulgar hypocrite and the anaemic aesthetic, beauty is an escape from reality, a cloying holy picture, a cheap seductive: but the beauty, which rises out of Charles Baudelaire's poetry, is a stone colossus, a stern and inexorable goddess of destiny. It is like the angel of wrath holding the flaming sword. Its eye strips and condemns a world in which the ugly, the banal, and the inhuman are triumphant. Dressed-up poverty, hidden disease, and secret vice lie revealed before its radiant nakedness. It is so though capitalist civilization had been brought before a kind

of revolutionary tribunal: beauty holds judgement and pronounces its verdict in lines of tempered steel” (Fischer, E., 1984, Pp. 68-69).

Walter Benjamin, however, came to the development of his analysis. He wrote as follows:

“The decisive element in the picture we have of Baudelaire is that he was the first to realize- and this realization had immense consequences-that the bourgeoisie was in the process of withdrawing its commission from the artist. What steady social commission could take its place? No class was likely to supply it; the likeliest place from which a living could be earned was the investment market; It was not the obvious, short-term demand that occupied Baudelaire but the latent long-term one....But the nature of the market, where this demand was to be discovered was such that it imposed a manner of production, as well as a way of life very different from those of earlier poets. Baudelaire was obliged to claim a poet’s dignity in a society, which had no more dignity of any kind to give away” (Fischer, E., 1984, Pp. 68-69).

The bourgeois world in fact, was unable to commission Charles Baudelaire’s works in a direct sense. He produced his most heartfelt masterpieces of poetic art for a non-existent and anonymous market-hence, arts for art’s sake -----but that he was doing so in the great expectation of some eventual, unknown public or clients. Many trends in his poetry prove and sport the above-mentioned interpretations of both Walter Benjamin and Ernst Fischer: His Poetry reflects his arrogant dismissal and repulsion for the bourgeois readers and listeners; yet at the same time, his fascination by the startling shock effects of the bourgeois world. He showed his disgust with socio-economic ethos of the bourgeois world and at the same time, his ‘aristocratic pleasure of displeasing’. The former trend of his poetry, is, in fact, a withdrawal into ‘art’s sake, refuge and escape from reality whereas, the latter one, is a desire to terrorise the despised and contemptible bourgeois mind by a dreadful beauty, and by glittering tools of torture. However, he refused to be producer of art and literature in the bourgeois publishing industry for the bourgeois buyer, and determined not to sell his masterpiece of work of art and literature in the bourgeois market and yet he expected and produced his work for an anonymous literary market, for some unknown consumer as the final test. In this manner, he reflected a hostile attitude towards the bourgeois world of capitalism in the form of Romanticist protest and the sharp edge of accusation of the capitalist bourgeois world, bourgeois publishing industry and bourgeois modes of literary production and at the same time a confirmation for its principle of ‘production for production’s sake’.

When the refreshing storm of the February Revolution of 1848 took place, many of the artists who had believed in the doctrine of art for art's sake emphatically rejected it. Even, Charles Baudelaire, who was subsequently cited by the apostles of the theory of art for art's sake as the model and ideal specimen instance of an artist, who believed in flexibly in the absolute autonomy, self-sufficiency and independence of art and literature, began at once to put off a revolutionary journal, "Le Salut Public". However, its publication did not regularly keep on. In 1852, Charles Baudelaire in his forward to "Pirre Dupont's Chansons" opined the doctrine of art-for-art's sake movement as an infantile, proclaiming that art must possess a social purpose in it. Leconte de Lisle reflected the psychological significance of this reversion and psychological secret of the theory of 'art for-art's sake movement'. He reflected them very distinctly in the preface to his "Poems antiques" (1852), remarking that, poetry would no longer stimulate social virtues, because now, as in all periods of literary decadence, its sacred languages could express only petty personal emotions and was no longer capable of instructing. Addressing the poets, he said that the human race, whose teachers they had once been, had now, outgrown them. Now, in the words of the future 'Parnassus', the task of poetry was "to give an ideal life" to those who had no "real life" (cited in Fischer, E., 1984, p. 69).

Similarly, Nikolay Gogol revised and developed his idea of art a decade after the publication of his story "The Nose" in a very different notion of the writer's vocation. In his treatise entitled "Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends" (1847), he claimed that Alexander Pushkin the only reader of "Dead Souls" to understand the high moral purpose of the novel. He wrote, "A Writer's duty is not only to provide pleasant amusement for the mind and the taste; he will pay clearly if his works do not disseminate something of use to the soul and if they convey no moral instruction to their readers" (Gogol, N., 1847, p.142). The element of Romantic protest, rebellion, the sharp edge accusation and criticism is also to be found in Charles Baudelaire's work and ideas, which Novalis sketched out in his theories of art and literature. Mallarme, one of the most ardent and constant apostles of art for art's sake movement applied in his poems what Novalis had formulated as a principle of Romanticism---only melodious and full of beautiful words---a few verses comprehensible, no more---Hugo Friedrich in his book entitled "The Structure of Modern Lyric Poetry", subtly analyses Mallarme's poetry, sum up as, "Mallarme's lyric poetry is the embodiment of total loneliness. It wants none of the Christian, the humanist, or the literary tradition. It denies itself any intervention in the present. It keeps the reader at arm's length and will

not allow itself to be human” (cited in Fischer, E., 1984, p. 70). However, Mallarme tried to escape from the ‘flood of banality’ as Hugo Friedrich opined that, “In the eyes of others my work is what clouds are in the twilight, and the stars: useless---expunge reality from your song, for it is common---The only thing the poet has to do is to work mysteriously with his eye turned upon Never” (cited in Fischer, E., 1984, p. 70).

In Mallarme’s poetry, there is a desire of escaping from all palpable reality, there is nothing left of Romantic revolt and rebellion of Baudelaire. At last, Romantic protest turned to silent retreat and hopelessness. Baudelaire’s call for death, the ‘old captain’ and leap into nothingness still bear a sense of plunging into new strange and unknown are to be found in Mallarme’s poetry. Therefore, we find a sense of pure nothingness thinly encased in ghostly, supernatural veils, attire and magic arabesques in Mallarme’s poetry. We do not come across even the faery land in which Novalis believed he could find himself, but a world so ice cold that even faery and Ariel creatures could not exist in it. In this way, art for art’s sake movement leads into hopelessness, nothingness and vacuum. Therefore, such type of negative elements prevails as time goes on. Art for art’s sake movement reached its height in Mallarme’s expiring melodies, tenuous lyricism of Heredia, the poems of Swinburne and finally in the aristocratic displeasing of Stephan George, who escaped and sought refuge from social reality of his era, retreating into a confined circle of disciples and glorified the elect personality against the common masses. That is why Art for art’s sake movement reflected the certain signs of despair of a class with regard to its own existence, to the possibility of producing meaningful and humane conditions of life within framework of the underlying socio-economic structure of the social formation and the corresponding forms and contents of it. Responding to the attacks of bourgeois criticism on his novel “The Jungle”, Upton Sinclair acknowledges that, “The Jungle” marks the beginning of a proletarian literature in America” and insisted that the “proletarian writer is a writer with purpose” who refused to produce “art for art’s sake” (Sinclair, U., 1906, p. 594). “My main concern had been for the fate of the workers, and I realised with bitterness that I had been made a ‘celebrity’, not because the public cared anything about the sufferings of these workers, but simply because the public did not want to eat tubercular beef” (Sinclair, U., 1920, p. 47). He concluded the discussion that, “All art is propaganda” (Sinclair, U., 1925, p. 9).

To sum this discussion up, let us quote the following words of the Russian Marxist philosopher and literary theorist, Georgi Plekhanov: “Art for art’s sake movement develops when artists feel

a hopeless contradiction between their aims and the aims of the society to which they belong. Artists must be very hostile to their society and they must see no hope of changing it” (Plekhanov, G., 1957, Pp. 43-63).

Conclusion

The present research paper attempted to concentrate on how Art for art's sake movement develop in the Post-revolutionary bourgeois world of capitalism as a Romantic revolt against the bourgeois modes of literary production, bourgeois publishing industry and bourgeois market. When capitalism entered into its Post-revolutionary phase, there occurred a contradiction between the interests of artists and the aims of the bourgeois publishing industry. Therefore, artists protested against the vulgar utilitarianism and dreary business occupations of the bourgeoisie. In doing so, they refused to be producers in the bourgeois publishing industry as well as they rejected every utilitarian, social or political function of art except the entertaining one. The noticeable point of this research study is that in fact, the apostles of Art for art's sake movement rejected the bourgeois social relations and bourgeois modes of literary production yet at the same time they confirmed the bourgeois principle of production for production's sake. In this way, they failed to introduce even suggest the new socialist social relations and socialist modes of literary production. No doubt, they protested against the bourgeois world of exploitation but did not struggle to change it, so they failed to change the existing bourgeois world of capitalism.

References

- 1) Bewes, T and Timothy H. (2011). Georg Lukacs: The Fundamental Dissonance of Existence. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- 2) Egan, R. R. (1921). The Genesis of the Theory of Art for Art's Sake Movement in Germany and England. Northampton.
- 3) Fischer, E. (1984). Necessity of Art. Translated. Anna Bostock. London: Penguin Books.
- 4) Gautier, T. (1980). "Preface to Mademoiselle De Maupin". In: The Works of Theophile Gautier. Translated and edited by Professor S. C. De Sumichrast. Vol. I. Parts I. and II. London: The Athen/Eum Press.
- 5) Gautier, T. (1981). "A History of Romanticism". In: The Works of Theophile Gautier. Vol. 16. Translated and Edited by Professor F. C. De Sumichrast. London: The Athen/Eum Press.

- 6) Gautier, T. (2013). "Art and Criticism, The Magic Hat". In: The Works of Theophile Gautier. Vol. 23. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 7) Gogol, N. (1969). Selected Passage from Correspondence with Friends. Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press.
- 8) Kant, I. (1982). The Critique of Judgement. Translated, J. Meredith. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 9) Keats, J. (1990). "Ode on a Grecian Urn". In: John Keats. Ed. Elizabeth Cook. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 10) Nietzsche, F. (1999). The Birth of Tragedy and Other Writings. Eds. Raymond Geuss and Ronald Speirs. Translated. Ronald Speirs. Cambridge: Cambridge University of Birmingham.
- 11) Pater, W. (1873). Renaissance. London.
- 12) Pater, W. (1944). Appreciation. London: MacMillan and Co Limited St. Marlin's Street.
- 13) Plekhanov, G. V. (1957). Unaddressed Letters and Art and Social Life. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- 14) Schiller, F, Elizabeth M. W and L. A. Willoughby. (1982). On the Aesthetic Education of Man, in a Series of Letters. Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press.
- 15) Schopenhauer, A. (1909). The World as a Will and Idea. Translated From The German by R. B. Haldane, M.A. and J. Kemp, M.A. Vol. I. Containing Four Books. Seventh Edition, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.
- 16) Sinclair, U. (1906). "What Art means to Me". In: Cosmopolitan 41. October 1906. Magazine 41. October 1906. Sinclair, U. (1920). The Brass Check: A Study in American Journalism. Pasadena, California: Published by the Author. Pp. 591-594.
- 17) Sinclair, U. (1925). Mammonart: An Essay in Economic Interpretation. Pasadena, California: Published by the Author.
- 18) Spenser, H. (1855). Principle of Psychology. London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans.
- 19) Valery, P. (1938). On Baudelaire's Art. New York: Second series.
- 20) Whistler, J. M. (2012). The Gentle Art of Making Enemies and of Remarking Aestheticism. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- 21) Wilde, O. (1971 a). "Pen, Pencil and Poison". In: Complete Works of Oscar Wilde. Ed. Vyvyan Holland. London and Glasgow: Collins. Pp.993-1008
- 22) Wilde, O. (1971 b). "The Decay of Lying". In: Complete Works of Oscar Wilde. Ed. Vyvyan Holland. London and Glasgow: Collins. Pp. 970-992.

IJSER