

What is art?

Sol Facondini*

Every single person on Earth is acquainted with *art*. We have all listened to a song, watched a film, or read at least one book during the course of our lives. Said mediums can be regarded as art forms. However, the quarrel behind these forms of expression has been around since the beginning of time- *some* people seem to be unable to rest at night until the age-old question of “what art is” is finally answered.

The easy response would be that good art is in fact the only type of art that should be addressed in such terms. But deeming the value of art depends on one's point of view. For instance, Van Gogh's “Starry Night” is considered good art because of the painter's unique strokes and its use of vibrant colours. But Da Vinci's “Mona Lisa” is said to be a unique piece of art because of its mysterious background and the way in which the painter captured the muse's facial expression. Both paintings are thought to be among the best, but for two very different reasons. Following this train of thought, there is no strict list of attributes one can tick off to decide whether an artwork is good enough to be defined as such.

Then again, it must be considered that some of the most popular and expensive art pieces in the world seem to be generally considered childish work. Who has not heard somebody claim that, for instance, an abstract painting is something their three year old could do? We have previously mentioned how the way *art* can be assessed in terms of technique and what makes it stand out. But what happens with more abstract works? Kazimir Malévich's “The Black Square” is just that: a black square painted on white paper. Picasso's “Las señoritas de la calle de Avinyó” can be considered a bunch of geometric figures thrown around in a way that seems to resemble a group of naked women in a colourful background. They evoke feelings in *some* of its viewers, but for many others, they are just possible covers for money laundering given the high prices these are sold at.

In the end, what even is *art*? The nature of something that started out as a form of expression or as a way to show future generations that we were once here truly is being killed in a futile attempt to define it. The essence of such a delicate concept is being torn apart by the ongoing battle between a group of people who drink overpriced coffee and a troupe of ninety year-olds who have a passion for bickering. For the average person, this fight is pointless, not to mention outrageously pretentious. What these people do not seem to understand is that art is, like all creative notions, subjective. Its only concrete aspect is the fact that there is in fact *good* and *bad* art, and that notion is just as personal. Which art styles are to be considered superior or inferior, however, is a tug o' war in which I have no intention of participating- if snobs are willing to die for their ideals, to each their own. What one should focus on is the fact that *art* exists. Good or bad, anyone can both create it and enjoy it. The nagging disputes that surround the mere existence of *art* ought to be ignored, if one's aim is to appreciate it. After all, can something as unique as *art* be defined in just a few mundane words?

* Mención especial del Concurso Literario USAL en Lengua Inglesa – Categoría ensayo (2021).

