

## **Georges Braque: „Art upsets, science reassures”. Analyze and evaluate.**

Georges Braque (1882-1963), a French artist, lived in very special times, times of uncertainty and fear that were expressed in art, but also in times of blooming of science and great inventions that influenced the course of history. Also then artist created new sectors of art using new technology such as photography, cinematography. Moreover, by using new paints, they could paint in totally new way. Braque himself was trying to deal with problem of painting solids what I would call involving science in the art. But what did he mean by saying: Art upsets, science reassures? And can we still agree?

Firstly I should explain what I understand by upset and reassure. So upset means that something introduces anxiety, but here it can also mean causing certain emotions to occur in the receiver. We can contradict it to reassure, that means to introduce comfort, provide some reasonable explanations in order to make the receiver feel secure. Also nouns that are used in this phrase are contradicting whit each other. Art is using skills to produce beautiful things; a creation of different reality and science (here I thinking only about natural science) is a study and knowledge about physical world and natural laws by observing facts and testing ideas with experiments.

The problem here is in what way the art upsets us? For me art is expressing personal, subjective emotions and knowledge about world. It does not have to stick to natural laws. Usually it is connected with human sciences, as it can be connected to history, psychology. In my opinion it is the world or life itself that upsets us all, but only small group of people have the ability to express their fears and translate the emotions into a form of art. Maybe this is just the way to get rid of their anxieties but it can also be the way to wake feelings in other people, to point out something that they do not (want to) notice. This is a form of dialogue, but we can have some problems with understanding. Here cultural interaction is very important. Firstly, we have to be aware of the history, traditions of the region that the artist is from and also artist's life to fully understand his message. The other barrier is the language as many written pieces ate considered to be the art not only because of the massage they contain but the way of expressing the thoughts. The best examples here are comedies or poetry. It is very hard to translate them without loosing this.

There are also two kinds of art: realistic and non-realistic. That second one does not have to stick to any rules, usually contain absurdity and many symbols. Here even grater knowledge is expected from the receiver and in my opinion especially this kind of art upsets, even forces us to think. We have to search for the hidden meaning and for the reason for hiding it.

Another problem is how to perceive science? For many people science is the truth. Its laws are based on thousands of experiments and exceptions only confirm the rule. But science only states laws, it receives nature as it is and tries to describe it. We take so many of its laws for granted when in fact it is enough to change one condition to make it untrue. People tend to think that science is so predictable and everlasting and that makes them feel secure, reassured

and comfortable. We also seem to forget how hard it was to find those natural laws, to create the science as it is nowadays. But here I have to say that for me science is not reassuring. It also upsets me but in a different way that art does. For example people for centuries were thinking that Earth is flat so how can we be so sure that whole knowledge we possess now is a true. Also some aspects of our world are still a mystery as our thoughts and feeling. Moreover, new discovery only causes scientists to wonder more, to ask new questions and investigate furthermore.

Now I come back to the question from the beginning- can we still agree? No. I think That Braque could say that science reassures because firstly, he was not a scientist and because of the times he lived in. Then science was much more simpler than nowadays, and not well known. Only a bit of it was enough for majority to believe not ask more and feel secure. Nowadays, when science is practically tested in every aspect of the world it is difficult for one person to know whole of it. In Poland we learn a bit of it until half of secondary school and for most of us it is enough. For me science is so wide and needing so many assumptions that we really should not be so sure about it. Also art has changed a lot. Now it has become more universal. Also new sector of art has developed. Films, that firstly were (in most cases) simple entertainment, are becoming a real art. And they are very good example, as well as photography, of a synthesis between art and science.

To sum up, for me both science and art upset, but we have to remember that art is an act of creation, expressing your reaction for the world, while science is examining the world what, some might say, is much more easier. But here every answer creates new question. It also gives those answers that is why it can reassure, when art usually only gives questions. And maybe this is the sense of Braque's quotation.