**THE BASIC STARTING POINT OF MY WORK IS LOVE AND ADMIRATION FOR REALITY**

Both for nature, perceived by our senses, and also for relationships created by man and which we understand through knowledge.

We often read in the writings of certain contemporary art theorists that this or that painter does not “describe” reality but “expresses” it, using the pejorative “describe” instead of the classical “depict”. It is the difference between the objective “depiction” and the subjective “expression” that is essentially the difference between the classical and the modern. It is a dual and mutually exclusive approach to reality. Of course, there is a piece of expression in every depiction and some depiction in every expression – because everything “depicting” is also a subject and everything “expressing” is part of an objective reality.

For me, this modern, subjective “expression” of reality is completely distant and alien. I cannot and nor do I want to identify with a subjective, distinctly individualistic approach to reality. Reality, whether historical or contemporary, seems in itself so interesting, attractive, exciting and beautiful to me that I do not feel any need to select something out of it or add something to it, much less evaluate it myself. Of course, I cannot capture the whole reality even in its partial manifestations, but I feel my personal opinion, given by my possibilities, to be a limitation rather than an advantage.

In my opinion, artistry is necessarily contained in reality itself – seen and recognised – so that I would be perfectly satisfied if I managed to objectively depict this reality, but perhaps also describe or illustrate it. I see nothing wrong for myself if I am able to complement the magnificence of reality with at least a somewhat adequate picture or illustration.

Of course, I include in the reality around me and in the reality of the contemporary world the opinions, attitudes, learning and points of view of people, especially those I know and who are close to me. I also try to draw on their thinking, knowledge and work. I have no desire and therefore probably also no ability to see in life and in everything around me something that no one else can see, and then to reveal this “knowledge” to people. On the contrary, I want to paint things as I believe they are seen or could or should be seen by most of those people who are close to me in their attitude to the world.

I would like to see the new and fast changing world through the eyes of those who are closely connected to its changes. I would like to incorporate my paintings into the collective efforts of people striving specifically for a fusion of humanism and the scientific and technological revolution and for new victorious knowledge and action.

I am equally fond of and close to the past and the present, the humanist and the technical, everything – or almost everything – from Egypt and antiquity, through the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, the Baroque to the nineteenth century and the current state-of-the-art technology. Whether it be cybernetic robots, space rockets or controlled thermonuclear reactions, art forms or technical forms.

Anything that allows one to look at a certain period or a certain subject from multiple sides and allows for multiple narratives seems to me to be an interesting idea for a huge series of paintings. The literariness that modern art does not foster is close to me and I would like my paintings to be “narrative”. This is also why, unlike modern art, subject matter is important and often essential to me. Many of my paintings also come into being because painting allows me – and often even forces me – to examine in more detail many of the themes that interest me.

Having painted more than thirty paintings by painters close to me, I have naturally got to know their works, their way of working and their approaches to reality in more detail than if I had just leafed through reproductions of their works.

It is possible that my love for reality is somewhat naïve, that it lacks critical thought and often leads to idealisation, but this is probably due to my temperament. Perhaps it is also a reaction to a not insignificant section of modern art that finds artistry in ugliness, depression and the distortion of reality. Hopefully it is not such a great and unforgivable offence to prefer beauty in life and in paintings to ugliness.

If almost every historical subject seems to me to be interesting and artistic in itself, I also find it extremely contemporary. After all, we also see history today, precisely thanks to new, extraordinarily scientific knowledge, new, more truthful and more complex than ever in the past. Compare, for example, the range and quality of information that a Renaissance artist had about antiquity with our current ways of learning about the ancient world. Remember how French art explored Africa; think of the Baroque depiction of Biblical themes or the historical paintings of the Romantics. These and other examples allow us to compare and see what a huge amount of concrete historical knowledge is now being combined with the new appreciation made possible by science and technology. Like no other time in history, the entire past of humanity is also becoming the subject of contemporary interest.

That is why, for me, old and new civilisations, periods and events are absolutely present and alive. Here too, my views are contrary to modern art, which has systematically sought to rid man and art of the “sediment of old civilisations”. After all, in art the twentieth century turned away completely from the Greek-Latin tradition, in which reality and rationality were the two fundamental pillars. For me, it is this tradition, along with the ancient fusion of the rational and the sensual, that is the fundamental basis and standard by which I evaluate my personal experience.

Like the past, modern art also negates the possibility of knowing objective reality, focusing rather on irrationality, instincts and, at best, human emotions.

Of course, if we are talking about modern art, we must bear in mind that it has existed for a hundred years and not forget the enormous diversity of opinion and the changes that it has undergone. After all, there is incomparably less difference between Velázquez and Manet or between Rembrandt and van Gogh than, for example, between Monet and Kandinsky or Matisse and Pollock. It is precisely during the most recent decades that modern art has programmatically distanced itself from reality.

But to me, the tangible world around us, the world of new things, new forms and new knowledge seems incredibly interesting and exciting “in itself”. It is precisely through new thinking that it begins to be knowable again, even with all its transformations, with all its speed of development.

This knowability of the world, along with the possibilities of its transformations, gives unsuspected possibilities to the realistic representation. Realism is the representation of the typical under typical circumstances, and the scientific and technical revolution makes it possible both to grasp the typical and at the same time constantly change the typical circumstances.

On the one hand, it returns reason, logic and knowledge to life and to art and creates the conditions for realism; on the other hand, it changes its possible forms through its movement. Nineteenth-century realism grew out of philosophical materialism and the emergence of the natural sciences. It saw reality objectively, but as given and essentially unchanging. Today, both dialectical thinking and the huge development of science and technology are changing perfect static ideas of reality. What possibilities the new dynamics give for the representation of reality!

It seems to me as if today’s world is beginning to achieve again, on a higher level, a unity that makes synthesis possible and thus gives possibilities for a new period of style.

Understandably, if the world seems to me to be more and more unified and knowable, this leads to an effort to find a way of working that would allow me to paint this whole world, as I am able to know it, with essentially the same means of painting. To paint everything that can be painted and that interests me – from a child’s portrait to paintings with such abstract themes as cybernetics and genetic engineering. I look for forms that allow me to combine both my loves – history and the present as well as historical art forms and technology – organically in a painting.

I would also like to combine what is close to me in modern art. Especially, the colour and morphology of non-figurative art with an objective “classical” approach to reality. I would like to bring together what I see in nature and in life with what I know about people and things.

I like Velázquez just as much as Miró. To me, Manet and Picasso are just as current as Formula One drivers. I admire Homer as much as Einstein, ancient art as much as electronics. I would like my paintings with a historical theme to have something contemporary in them and my paintings with modern technology to have something classical.

I would be pleased if my paintings were accepted as an expression of love for objective reality and if they were at least a little closer to the revolutionary goals of the present – the combination of a qualitatively new humanism with the most advance science and technology.

**IVAN SEDLISKÝ**