

## POP ART EXTENDED

*“Some critic called me the Nothingness Himself and that didn’t help my sense of existence any. Then I realized that existence itself is nothing and I felt better. But I’m still obsessed with the idea of looking into the mirror and seeing no one, nothing”.*

**Andy Warhol**

The post modernism in the history of art, like all historical events, could be understood as the whole of conflicts at a chaotic level. Millions of cultural production, in which a good many activity and interpretation are blended; too many of them remaining from the actions and reactions, sometimes are printed but returned, which also haven’t entirely come out (and will never come out) from the darkness of the history. In this respect, It means that it gains its legitimacy as the remaining and continues its “de facto” existence in the history of art and deserves to be understood in more depth. Interpretations beyond this are mostly ideological.

The identity of artist in this movement, which was elevated all along of enlightenment, was established as a privileged area in where the art, which was the last refuge of the truth as attributed by Adorn’s a rather conflicting comment, was considered to be a superior culture. This privileged area determined the main codes of today’s art, with being dethroned by a revolutionary coup of two main movements, which coincided with the mid of the past century. Whilst avantgarde movements, under the leadership of Duchamp, showed tendency to understand every marked object as an art, as for The Pop Art artists, especially Andy Warhol, walked straight to the area to be avoided and wrote afresh all the rules of the game by taking all consumption culture at the level of iconography.

The tendency of taking Pop Art lightly as a sort of movement of fun and games, no fewer than art, a reaction against the noble art, didn’t last long and Pop Art continued to increase its strength, especially in America, as a strong movement, which expresses the spirit of its age. Arthur Danto the art ideologue sums it up in a quite obvious way as the following: “In my opinion the reason for change [in art], in a sense titled unfortunately and to my mind, was the emergence of pop art, which has been the most vital art movement” (2010: 155). Its creation of such a strong effect and the continuation of its determinant influence on today’s art obviously cannot be explained as a coincidence.

Therefore Andy Warhol as an artist was the personage, who was quite suitable for the new circumstance and achieved to be attuned to the demands of the period with his instincts. Warhol was acting in an exact opposite direction of altering the trueness and the motivation of transforming singly to original work, which was suitable for great acclaim. In this respect an art shows itself using repeatedly the bombardment of the image in consumption culture, the indicators ultimately winning victory over the illustrated (Kahraman, 1991: 84). This; is not an art of which is facing the opposition of main movement culture, of the love

gravitating towards a reality or of having the aim to being monumental. As Baudrillard said: "Warhol is the first person who added the fetishism, which was is commonplace image and devoid of wish of an existence, into modern fetishism" (1998: 96). Everything is artificial in Warhol: an object is artificial because it is merely related with the wish of the object, not with subject. Here an image is artificial because it is only related with the wish of the image, not with an aesthetic request (Baudrillard, 1998: 96).

Then at this very point it shows itself why Warhol was the subject of such a big artistic success. On the one hand as Warhol was agreeing with all codifications under his reign to the extent of reaching up to a capitalist nihilism and describing himself as a machine, and on the other hand [he] was making the existing codification visible and revealing it in a striking way. According to Foster this is the revelation of traumatic fact: the repetitions which are fixated on the traumatic fact, staging a traumatic fact or producing a traumatic fact (Foster: 2009: 173). In order to do this you only have to be Warhol "I have never broken into pieces; because at no time I was a whole" (Warhol, 2011). In this regard the effect of Warhol's artistic halo is bidirectional: On the one hand all the allure of money, fame and earthly the popular culture, on the other hand the feeling of nothingness at full steam, which is felt deeply by everybody at its extreme point. Donald Kuspit's critical text writes this in his book titled "The end of The Art" as; "Warhol's genius, was originating from him being a genie placed in objects which belonged to him – this power surpassed all his other qualities" (Kuspit, 2006: 92).

Warhol died in 1987. But the time of the movement, which he made to reach to its height, to expand into wider areas started to reach to its real strength in those dates. Whilst The Eastern Bloc was collapsing totally, a new circumstance showed itself where the contemporary art were being influential in many centres, and Americanism and globalization starting to show its effects in full flood all over the world. In this respect the late capitalism, into which Andy Warhol was born, set the world's determinant cultural foundation with its whole inclusiveness. Thus Pop Art provides a forefront context for the period's artistic paradigm. This is the process in which Pop Art is being realized sometimes stylistically and sometimes on its keynote level. Pop Art makes a lasting suggestion in consumer societies' (un)realities, which are based on simulation: Can you go up to the end? So at this point, the art we thought that we had lost will resurge and shows its strength again where it touches the human being.

So at the time of such an age, to describe the existing period is both easy, and also even if it is not precise, trying to understand relations and common cultural implications may lead to productive results. Most of the young contemporary artists cannot produce with a certain group of people or in a shared platform. On the other hand they don't develop risk, on the scale of their production's genuineness and self-confidence, in their relations and distances with current movements like Pop Art, on the subject of taking part in a joint exhibition. Does it not fundamentally correspond to the very thing that Pop Art caused them to gain? An Art,

which is not escaping from the existing relation, not being outside but being inside; relying on its strength of converting the codification rather than being lost by being codified!

We might say that the exhibition of POP ART EXTENDED is an initiative to understand their artistic levels afresh under a light of paradigm, while the Istanbul based young contemporary artists encounter with Andy Warhol. The dimensions of the distance inbetween them and what the established dialogue gives voice remains to be understood by each of the viewer's own experiences.

**Efe Korkut Kurt**

### **Sources**

Adorno, T., W., (2007), The Culture Industry, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.

Baudrillard, J., (1998), Le crime parfait, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul.

Danto, A., C., (2010), After the End of Art - Boundary Lines of Contemporary Art and the history, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul.

Foster, H., (2009), Return of the Real, The Avante- Garde at the end of the century. Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul.

Kahraman, H., B., (1991), Reality as a New Image, Contemporary Thought and Art, UPSD Yayın Dizisi, İstanbul.

Kuspit, D., (2006), The End of Art, Metis Yayınları, İstanbul.

Lynton, N., (1991), The Story of Modern Art, Remzi Kitabevi Yayınları, İstanbul.

Şahiner, R., (2008), Refraction of postmodern art, vintage or modern construction, Yeni İnsan Yayınevi, İstanbul.

Warhol, A., (2011), Philosophy of Andy Warhol, Sel Yayıncılık, İstanbul.