

A.A. Boranbayev¹ , D.N. Nurmanbetova¹ , K.M. Bolysova² *

¹L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan;
²S. Seifullin Kazakh Agrotechnical Research University, Astana, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: boranbayev88.88@mail.ru; jamilya.nurman@gmail.com; kuralai_2702@mail.ru)

Modern concepts of dehumanization of art

The philosophy of art is an important aspect of the study of art and culture, playing a key role in understanding the fundamental concepts and ideas behind various art forms. In this article, we examined the basic concepts of the philosophy of art and their influence on modern culture, as well as explored the humanizing significance of art. The goal of this study is to develop a systematic understanding of the nature of art from a social philosophy perspective, revealing its humanizing role in shaping personality, and analyzing the essential characteristics of “new art” in the context of Ortega y Gasset's teachings. While there are numerous theories of art, it cannot be claimed that its essence, specificity, and social significance are fully comprehended, with debatable issues remaining in its understanding. The complexity and multifaceted nature of art as a phenomenon of human life make it challenging to create a complete and final theory. It is difficult to say that this issue has been sufficiently addressed in our country, as it reflects our society and requires complex philosophical consideration.

Keywords: philosophy of art, humanism in art, dehumanization of art, modern culture, understanding of art, Ortega y Gasset.

Introduction

In the modern era, there have been significant changes in how philosophy, science, and knowledge are viewed. The forms and methods through which science understands nature and society have evolved, as has the relationship between science and other forms of social consciousness. The revolutionary changes in social existence have presented philosophy with numerous problems that require solutions and a reevaluation of traditional questions related to the nature of thinking, the role of the anthropological factor, and the boundaries and dimensions of knowledge.

Art is essential for a complete human life and has been a part of human existence since the Upper Paleolithic era. It has developed alongside humanity and plays a crucial role in human development.

Various sciences consider art as a sphere of spiritual activity. In social philosophy art is viewed as a form of interpersonal communication and dialogue, representing social feelings and serving as a means of socialization and humanization. Artists express their inner emotional worlds through art, and viewers or readers absorb and enrich themselves through these expressions. The essence of art lies in its sensual and figurative nature, conveying human feelings and emotions through images and symbols.

Art functions as a harmonious system with different features interacting with one another. The overarching function of art is to humanize individuals. Through dialogue, art has the capacity to shape and develop personality, fostering a new, humane individual known as homo humanus.

Humanization of education involves appealing not only to the intellect but also to emotions, enriching human experiences with new meanings. Combining developmental teaching technologies with the humanizing aspect of art can help to address various pedagogical and psychological challenges in education. Art itself can be seen as an educational technology, promoting understanding and creating an environment conducive to learning. The teacher's role is to cultivate the ability to comprehend and appreciate art.

Art is a powerful tool for psychotherapeutic influence on individuals, allowing them to express and process their mental and psychological experiences. Through art, individuals can experience catharsis, purifying their sensory world and orienting themselves in a correct way. The philosophical foundation of art therapy lies in the understanding of art as a sensory-figurative dialogue.

Art is a realm of sensory images consciously created by humans through various forms and materials, aimed at bringing beauty, knowledge, pleasure, creativity, imagination, and spirituality into their lives. It humanizes individuals, shaping their personalities and, through the humanization of autonomous

* Corresponding author's e-mail: kuralai_2702@mail.ru

personalities, has the potential to humanize society as a whole. This is the profound purpose and mission of art.

Unlike the concepts of “beauty” and “aesthetics”, the term “beautiful” holds a unique significance. It serves as a descriptor of object utility and moral importance, carrying a societal value judgment. The term “beautiful” encompasses more than just superficial beauty, as it combines form and content to convey the essence of an object. Beauty is always valued, whether it is found in everyday objects or moral actions, and it is inherently social, as individuals align their perception of beauty with societal ideals at a given time.

Art can sometimes trend towards dehumanization, not by eliminating human elements, but by emphasizing the dehumanizing aspect within itself. Dehumanization in art is the process of distancing artwork from representations of humanity, human emotions, and experiences.

Methods

This article is grounded in the fundamental ideas of philosophical classics, drawing from the works of Ortega y Gasset and M. Heidegger to explore the significance of art as a humanizing force. Methodological principles such as historical and philosophical approaches, comparative analysis, and elements of hermeneutic and structural analysis are utilized to theoretically support the discussion.

Discussion

In a market economy society, where works of art become subjects of profit and speculation, the inevitable destruction of art occurs. This leads to the emergence of works that cater to the taste of the bourgeois and the average consumer, resulting in a general decline in the overall level of artistic culture. As a result, aesthetic theories proclaiming the end of art and its unavoidable destruction have surfaced. However, these theories fail to explain the characteristics of modern art, particularly its increasing humanistic orientation [1].

In 1925, Spanish philosopher and sociologist José Ortega y Gasset published his essay titled “The Dehumanization of Art”. This essay serves as a continuation of his critical analysis of the music of French composer Erik Satie, questioning why his music is not popular.

Ortega y Gasset observes that not only Satie's music, but also the “new art” that emerged in the early 20th century, including post-impressionism, cubism, expressionism, fauvism, and symbolism, faces a lack of popularity.

Ortega y Gasset notes how the “new art” divides the public into two groups: a minority that embraces it, and a majority that rejects it. The philosopher identifies the main distinguishing factor as the “dehumanization” aspect of the new art, which involves a departure from realism and human representation. He explores the utilitarian view of art held by modern individuals, who appreciate art that relates to human life and destiny.

Ortega y Gasset describes and explores the truth and facts of art. First, it reveals the modern man's utilitarianism in relation to art: people only like art related to human destiny, human life: “they call art a collection of tools, which, accordingly, are connected with human things of interest”. Ortega y Gasset considers this understanding of art to be natural, since most people do not know any other way of looking at objects than “practical” [2].

However, there is a difference between art for art's sake and the supporters of Ortega y Gasset in relation to bourgeois utilitarianism: the former rejected utilitarianism, a purely divisive approach to art; the other sees it as a “majority”, “mass” attitude, which cannot rise above a primitive, simple practical relationship.

Ortega y Gasset distinguishes between art for art's sake and the utilitarian approach adopted by the majority. He argues that true aesthetic pleasure goes beyond practical considerations and emphasizes that the human element in art does not necessarily correspond to aesthetic enjoyment. For Ortega, art and reality are fundamentally different, with an artistic object being artistic precisely because it is not real.

Therefore, only a person who can truly understand and perceive works of art can see art for what it truly is. “Most people cannot do this, says Ortega y Gasset, because they never experience true aesthetic pleasure because they are immersed in human reality”.

Ortega y Gasset states that most people are unable to do this because they are too caught up in human reality and never truly experience the aesthetic pleasure that art can bring.

However, Ortega y Gasset does not refer to purified art as “pure art”, as he acknowledges that the idea of “art for art's sake” has already been debunked. Instead, he advocates for purifying art by removing negative elements.

The inflation of human values in modern society is a clear phenomenon that thinkers like Ortega y Gasset recognize as essential in all areas of social life.

Ortega y Gasset believes that the core of art lies in its inhumanity. He identifies a new aesthetic feeling emerging in both artists and society, characterized by a desire to eliminate the human element from art. While true art should be devoid of humanity, there needs to be a minimum amount of human touch for the work to resonate with viewers. It consists in the desire to avoid the whole person: “the important thing is that there is a new aesthetic sensibility as an indisputable fact in the world. Trying to find the universal feature of the new artistic product, I found it in the process of dehumanizing art”. Here he refers to a new painting. If earlier painting tried to imagine reality as natural or human, then the new painting tries to remove this human element from art.

But art turns to dehumanization because it gets rid of the human element, but it consists mainly of this dehumanizing action. That is, true art, according to Ortega, should be completely freed from the human element, but in this case it would be unclear whether the work was “freed”. Therefore, the artist must leave the “human” minimum necessary to see what is winning. Thus, José Ortega y Gasset tries to remove two things from art: nature with form and man with feeling. Because nature constantly connects the artist's activity and horizon, and man — the humanity of art brings the artist back to nature, to the “Inorganic body of man”.

He also discusses poetry, emphasizing the need to separate a person from poetry, particularly a hero or an individual, as life and poetry are distinct entities. A person is different from a poet. The Spanish thinker states that abstracting something real is fundamental in true art. Ortega underscores the importance of freeing poets and artists from suffering and personal experience, as art transcends reality, isolating the artist from others.

The author's chosen topic is not arbitrary, as public perception of art evolves over time. Efforts to convey ideas to the public become secondary, with aesthetics losing its dominant role. José Ortega y Gasset is a prominent advocate for innovation and modernism, yet his research is rooted in past and present perspectives. The author's apprehension is derived from nihilism's constraining effect on human thought. Developing alternative viewpoints is crucial to breaking free from worldly constraints.

Art is a complex medium for conveying divine messages that may not be easily understood by others. Throughout history, art has evolved depending on societal changes. Yet, the author believes that despite these shifts, there remains an unchanging essence. José strives to analyze contemporary art trends, expressing doubts about the disconnect between art and inspiration. Comparing art superficially may lead to misconceptions, as understanding the underlying ideas requires perspective.

The author probes the reasons behind the lack of popularity of new art forms, conducting a study on musical trends. By examining traditional and contemporary music, he seeks to unravel this puzzle. The answer cannot be found solely through composer comparisons; instead, societal viewpoints provide a more accurate analysis. Each year introduces new art forms with a common eternal theme, even if motifs and colors vary.

The diversity of art is expanding annually, making it challenging to comprehend and compare the multitude of artistic directions. Referencing Aristotle's teaching on distinguishing things by their similarities and common properties, the author highlights the importance of color in paintings as a unifying characteristic. This shared trait allows for a comprehensive assessment of the vast array of art genres.

The words of the writer are very interesting for aspiring artists and writers, as well as journalists and creative individuals in general. One should not wait for approval, as it signifies modesty. It is important to pursue one's own ideas and plans without conforming to current trends. If one does not possess this quality, José Ortega y Gasset recommends engaging in worldly affairs.

There are various forms of art in the world, and authors should not be afraid to present their creations to the public. Fear stems from a lack of understanding and negative reception. However, a new “aesthetic feeling” has emerged, where art, whether in the form of a painting, book, or article, is analyzed and understood at its source. Ortega y Gasset's work on the dehumanization of art, written in the 19th century, remains relevant today.

Artists like Erik Bulatov and Ivan Ivanovich Shishkin offer contrasting perspectives in art. While Shishkin aims to capture the beauty of nature, Bulatov prioritizes conveying ideas over nature. Their approaches represent different facets of the art world, catering to diverse audiences. Despite evolving trends in realism, art continues to speak to the masses with its encrypted messages and reflection of human experiences. This example is not an indication of the degradation of realism in art. On the contrary, such

works are understandable to the masses. Only as realism grows, the number of people who know something other than “aesthetic” is increasing. This trend is highly commendable because the work is an unsolved cipher. To achieve this, the author deforms reality, destroys the human side. Despite the simplification of aesthetics, the work does not lose its original source — its colors and figures are still there. The main goal is to find a form that reflects a person's thoughts, sadness, home, things he has seen in life. The challenge is to reveal all the encrypted information.

This text fully reflects the reality of life, because works of art always contain the core of “living” reality. The beauty of art is that it doesn't put ideas on a silver platter. Getting to the idea and abstracting from the surface is the genius of art connoisseurs.

Art serves as a reflection of life, with its core embodying reality. It challenges viewers to delve beyond the surface and grasp the underlying ideas. Ortega y Gasset's examination of avant-garde art in the 20th century reveals a deliberate move towards elitism and inaccessibility, leading to the “dehumanization” of art. The disconnect between new art and society stems from a lack of relatability, resulting in its unpopularity among the masses.

In the work “Dehumanization of Art”, he analyzes the defining trends in the artistic avant-garde art of the 20th century and shows that the new art very consciously, in principle, wants to be and remain unpopular, aimed at the elite, not the masses. But in this way he does not feel the need to be generally human and universally understandable. The aesthetic experience it creates does not bring people closer to the elements of everyday life, on the contrary, it takes them away from it. This is the “dehumanization” of new art. José Ortega y Gasset studied art from a sociological perspective and wrote, “Why is novelty in art accompanied by so much failure?” asks the question. He looks for and finds the reason why the new art is so clearly unpopular with the masses. What good is a new art that does not really understand society and recoils? It turns out that the failure of young art is not a coincidence, but a pattern. After all, most of the people who do not know about art (those who insult it, and put it mildly, just people) appreciate its closeness to life in art more than anything else. The more art resembles life, the more familiar and understandable it is, the more complete the happiness of an ordinary person who suddenly feels in an artistic environment so dear to his heart. After all, no matter what the critics say, people who walk around the empty halls of the Central House of Artists and feel uncomfortable still come to the nearest bazaar with white birch trees on the coast to take pictures. Their hearts, and the grass must be green and fluffy, and the sky one hundred percent blue. And new art is still far from the people. What awaits him? Ortega y Gasset's answer: “A new style must go through an incubation period” [3].

In conclusion, art must undergo an incubation period to bridge the gap between innovation and societal acceptance. While new art may seem inaccessible at first, its evolution is crucial for expanding artistic boundaries and engaging diverse audiences.

Does every new style come with failure? No, Ortega y Gasset explains that it is not a threat to art that allows it to deviate from reality. For example, Romanticism was popular because it was a popular style.

Ortega y Gasset wrote at a time when he could observe modernism in art, before the time of postmodernism had arrived. When he spoke about the essence of new art, he saw it categorically. He believed that the root of the present reality was a deep injustice — the wrongly assumed equality of people. He preferred to see art as separate for the masses and the “privileged”. He stated, “New art is not liked by many, but by a few”. The displacement of the masses is based on the opposition to art, an immunity to new art. “New art is characterized by dividing people into two groups — those who understand and those who do not understand”. Since the work was written in 1927, it can be assumed that the ideas of dominating the world were prevalent and permeated everywhere, in politics and social life: “This art is not for the common man, but for a special breed, people who clearly differ from others”.

What is the meaning of new art? Since it is not understood by everyone, it does not stand on a human basis, it has a different foundation. Art revolves around people, their passions, according to Ortega y Gasset. As long as art is playing in them, people understand it, but as soon as it rises above reality, the understanding becomes thin and snaps like a taut string tied to a playful ball. Ortega y Gasset uses a metaphor: the viewer of a work of art seems to be looking through a window pane at the garden, that is, at “people and passions”, and does not notice the glass, that is, the highly artistic medium through which it is realized. Of course, for the uninitiated, complex art is like a clouded glass, through which he tries to see what is interesting to him. If he succeeds, he will feel his selectivity, if not, we will lose him. Ortega y Gasset does not regret such a defeat at all, he is happy that art has returned to normality and has become elite, a narrow “circle of limited people”.

“It will be art for artists, not for the masses, not democratic art, but caste art”. New art arrogantly turns away from the viewer, it is more important to be recognized as a trendsetter in artistic fashion. It is not afraid of the primacy of aesthetics over human images, nor of being misunderstood, because this confirms its innovation and difference from tradition.

Ortega y Gasset believes that it is impossible to focus art on the beauty of art forms or on the “humanity” of perception; such art will be “blind”. Realism and true artistry, in his opinion, are incompatible. You can't connect the glass and garden without damaging one or the other to some degree.

What is the meaning of new art? Ortega y Gasset announced that it will come back into style. The key word is “stylization”. It's stylish, we say, but it is not real style. Stylization is the distortion of reality, its reinterpretation. “Styling involves the abandonment of morality. There is no other way to dehumanize”.

Heidegger's critique of traditional humanism has many layers. Heidegger is not satisfied with man's thoughtless excuses and his imperfect actions. The philosopher challenges the concept of humanism that originated in a specific historical period (the era of the Roman Republic) and has been unquestioningly applied to later times. However, Heidegger believes that all forms of humanism share a common aspect: the understanding of man as a rational being, rationality that distinguishes humans from animals. “This definition of man is not incorrect. But it is influenced by metaphysics [4]. And even the conventional metaphysics as we know it is open to question.

Heidegger is aware of the sensitivity of the subject as he calls for a reevaluation of old humanism and a shift towards a new form of humanism. Criticizing a particular philosophy, he also questions the future of philosophy as a whole.

He maintains that his opposition to “humanism” does not imply a dismissal of morality, and that thought diverging from conventional “values” does not devalue concepts such as culture, art, science, human dignity, world, and God. The essence of his critique and his “turn” towards a new form of “humanism” lies in a reevaluation of thought itself. He suggests that future thought should no longer adhere to traditional philosophy and metaphysics, but instead move closer to the essence of being and wisdom. This new form of thought, closer to an understanding of absolute knowledge, sees language as a direct representation of being. Thought breathes life into language through simple narratives, much like a farmer tilling the field.

Conclusion

The didactic and methodological aspects of establishing the relationship between art and virtue are essential for the development of human culture. The essence of art is artistic creations, that is, studying and absorbing them. The goal is to educate and cultivate individuals with a rich spiritual world. Artistic creations are the essence of art, and the main objective is to uncover the inner nature of the work. The source of cultural and spiritual power in art lies in its inner secrets. Artistic works serve as the foundation for understanding the philosophical laws of art recognition, which address themes such as the meaning of life, beauty, and virtue.

In exploring the question of what art is, different types and historical periods are considered to understand its significance in human life. The Kazakh people are known for their artistry, which is evident in their rich spiritual heritage encompassing legends, epics, songs, and handicrafts. Art has played a crucial role in shaping their worldview, lifestyle, and personal values, serving as a beacon of beauty for the soul. It has been a channel of great art, which has not been forgotten for centuries, and there are legends, epics, songs, and various handicrafts. They didn't just reach it, they reached it by becoming the world view, lifestyle and standard of living of those times, the support of their life, and the educator of the beauty of the soul. Art, which has enlightened our spiritual world to this day, is a testimony of worldly perfect intelligence, and studying its works is probably a field of high thought.

Art is recognized as the oldest means of representation in human existence. This function of art shows the importance of consciousness, but obliges to look at it from the point of view of new requirements. Art is related to the concepts of “making” and “doing” in the cognitive understanding of the Greek people. That is, all products related to artistic activities form the basis.

Explaining the life of nature with its own secrets and laws shows the authenticity of art. Harmony and harmony of nature are closely related to each other. The earth and the sun, the moon and the stars, animals, and plants all reflect the seamless connection of the natural mystical harmony. There are many methods of forming good relationships with art, nature, and people. Art reveals the secrets and laws of nature, demonstrating its authenticity and harmony with the natural world. Establishing good relationships with art, nature,

and fellow human beings is vital for appreciating and valuing artistic creations and meeting emotional and spiritual needs.

Art has been a longstanding form of expression, highlighting the importance of consciousness and meeting new societal demands. It is closely tied to the concepts of “making” and “doing”, encompassing all products connected to artistic activities. In the 21st century, art serves as a reflection of both creativity and production within a technological civilization. While creativity is a fundamental aspect of human existence, production is driven by technological advancements, which can lead to artificiality and the imitation of human nature. The evolution of art and its methods are a reflection of the progress of human existence and purposeful engagement in life's activities.

References

- 1 Долгов К.М. Реконструкция эстетического в западноевропейской и русской культуре / К.М. Долгов. — М.: Прогресс-Традиция, 2004. — 1040 с.
- 2 Ортега-и-Гассет Х. Дегуманизация искусства / Х. Ортега-и-Гассет. — М.: Искусство, 1991. — 218 с.
- 3 Ортега-и-Гассет Х. Время, расстояние и форма в искусстве Пруста / Х. Ортега-и-Гассет. — М.: Радуга, 1991. — 51 с.
- 4 Хайдеггер М. Исток художественного творения / М. Хайдеггер. — М.: Академический проект, 2008. — 136 с.

А.А. Боранбаев, Д.Н. Нурманбетова, Қ.М. Болысова

Өнерді дегуманизациялаудың қазіргі концепциялары

Өнер философиясы өнер мен мәдениетті зерттеудің маңызды аспектілерінің бірі және ол өнердің әртүрлі формаларының астарындағы негізгі ұғымдар мен идеяларды түсінуде шешуші рөл атқарады. Мақалада біз өнер философиясының негізгі ұғымдарын және олардың қазіргі мәдениетке әсерін қарастырдық, сонымен қатар өнердің ізгілендіруші мәнін анықтаймыз. Зерттеудің мақсаты — элеуметтік философия тұрғысынан өнердің табиғатын жүйелі түрде түсінуді дамыту, оның тұлғаны қалыптастырудағы ізгілендіруші рөлін ашу, Х. Ортега-и-Гассет ілімінің контекстінде «жаңа өнердің» мәнін ашу және өзіне тән белгілерін талдау. Өнердің сан алуан теориялары бар, оның мәні, ерекшелігі, элеуметтік мәні түпкілікті түсіндіріледі, алайда толықтай зерттеліп, қарастыратын мәселелер қалмады деп айтуға болмайды. Адам өмірінің бұл құбылысы тым күрделі және көп қырлы болғандықтан, оның толық және түпкілікті теориясын жасау кез келген уақытта мүмкін емес. Тұтастай алғанда, біздің елімізде бұл мәселе жеткілікті түрде қарастырылды деп айту қиын, өйткені ол біздің қоғамның көрінісі болғандықтан, жан-жақты философиялық тұрғыдан қарастыруды қажет етеді.

Кілт сөздер: өнер философиясы, өнер гуманизмі, өнердің дегуманизациясы, заманауи мәдениет, өнерді түсіну, Ортега-и-Гассет.

А.А. Боранбаев, Д.Н. Нурманбетова, К.М. Болысова

Современные концепции дегуманизации искусства

Философия искусства является одним из важных аспектов изучения искусства и культуры и играет ключевую роль в понимании основных концепций и идей, лежащих в основе различных видов искусства. В этой статье мы рассмотрели основные концепции философии искусства и их влияние на современную культуру, а также определили гуманизирующее значение искусства. Цель научного исследования — раскрыть сущность и проанализировать характерные черты «нового искусства» в контексте учения Х. Ортеги-и-Гассета и его гуманизирующей роли в формировании личности. Существует немало различных теорий искусства, но нельзя сказать, что его социальная значимость, сущность, специфика окончательно поняты, что не осталось никаких дискуссионных вопросов в его понимании. Феномен человеческой жизни слишком многогранен и сложен, чтобы можно было в определенный момент создать его окончательную и полную теорию. В целом, сложно сказать, что в нашей стране этот вопрос рассмотрен достаточно широко, поскольку, являясь отражением нашего общества, он требует комплексного философского рассмотрения.

Ключевые слова: философия искусства, гуманизм искусства, дегуманизация искусства, современная культура, понимание искусства, Ортега-и-Гассет.

References

- 1 Dolgov, K.M. (2004). Rekonstruktsiia esteticheskogo v zapadnoevropeiskoi i russkoi kulture [Reconstruction of the aesthetic in Western European and Russian culture]. Moscow: Progress-Traditsiia [in Russian].
- 2 Ortega-i-Gasset, J. (1991). Degumanizatsiia iskusstva [Dehumanization of art]. Moscow: Iskusstvo [in Russian].
- 3 Ortega-i-Gasset, J. (1991). Vremia, rasstoianie i forma v iskusstve Prusta [Time, distance and form in the art of Proust]. Moscow: Raduga [in Russian].
- 4 Khaidegger, M. (2008). Istok khudozhestvennogo tvoreniia [The source of artistic creation]. Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt [in Russian].

Information about the authors

Boranbayev Aidarkhan — PhD student, Department of philosophy, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan; <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4451-1473>

Nurmanbetova Jamilya — Doctor of philosophical sciences, professor, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Academician of the Academy of National Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Astana, Kazakhstan; <http://orcid.org/0009-0003-7194-8587>

Bolysova Kuralay — Candidate of philosophical sciences, Senior Lecturer of the Department of Philosophy, S. Seifullin Kazakh Agrotechnical Research University, Astana, Kazakhstan; <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7505-9187>