

## **We Are All Taught**

We are all taught into day's modern society what color is, what are the different colors; how color is filtered through light and carried with partials within the visible spectrum. How we perceive it through our light sensitive neurons and how many forms of light that cannot be seen. But the one thing that we are not taught is what colors mean or even what they are saying to us.

How we perceive color varies from person to person and is much as part of nature as it is nurture. We perceive colors through a verity of factors within the modern world, a few of which are, primal instincts, contrary of origin, current pop culture, advertisement and even DNA. As ones eye color has been linked to ones visual receptors and how one might find certain colors appealing while others disgusting; although this also could all be linked to natural selection.

Two artists who were massively exploring the theory of color were, Gerhard Richard and Josef Albers. It is thanks to them that we know as much as we do about colors today. Gerhard used complex algorithms to create concise and exact imagery, in the form of digital code in the form of colored squares. The idea brought modern mathematics and mechanics together with color, primal colors and pop culture to create a series of bombarding pleasant imagery at the same time contrasting and battling mathematical color palate.

While Gerhard work is like randomness derived from a methodical pattern or a conundrum that justifies itself by being beautiful; Josef work is filled with depth derived from equality through the slight variations complementing colors. We see depth in his paintings in the same way that we would see depth in the form of shading. A complex format requires a high degree of self-awareness to fully comprehend. This format is used within many toddlers' toys, using shape and color to create a puzzle that will amuse them by expanding their visual and special awareness. This habit can also be seen in developing kittens, suggesting that this kind of artwork can only be appreciated by developing one knowledge; nurture over nature.

Anyone that looks at Jackson Pollock work and says that it is meaningless is either to young or to undereducated to understand philosophical ideas. When I look at Jackson's work, I see anger and a passion a feel of longing and unease. I wish to believe that he had set out to prove two things:

One is that ones emotions can be embedded within the canvas

Two was to prove that he existed, that he could define his life and I wish to believe that he was able to make something of himself.

A form of modern satirical Irony and psychological emotional depth marks Andy Warhol's work. His most famous image of Marilyn Monroe gained the public's attention due to its deafening and original characteristics.

The main attraction to this photograph is caused by pareidolia and defamiliarization. By using contrasting colors and tones in a complementing way and using Monroe's faces as a form of template, he was able to capture the primal fascination we have with facial recognition; this not only works on an emotional level but also on a primitive level. However, one of the main reasons this photograph went viral was due to pop-culture and celebrity influence. Now the uneducated viewer, what is kind of depressing when you think about it, can think of this kind of work as a cliché.

Kandinsky's and Mondrian's work is most likely the derivative of synesthesia and an intellectual fascination with color. Kandinsky's art will truly never be deciphered, for that reason will be profound, and grab the interests of historians and physiologists for centuries to come. When looking at his work I don't try to understand it, I just try to bask in it, to try to take away a thought provided by it, inspired by the vivid color and depth within nothing; the corundum of philosophy and the pomposity of reality. I wish to believe that this was his design. Mondrian's prospection is easier to muster a response to; he used mathematics and theories of grandeur to allow him to self show and play with depth and illusion created by man's intuition, greed to decipher and patterns to try to find answers that are not there; the golden number is an example of this. Some people find this within his work; I disbelieve in the golden number and believe it to be a product of apophenia. However, I cannot ignore the fact that it is there and that it might have played a role within his work. This feels a bit like agnosticism within art! Still his work is profound to me due to its simple and psychoanalytical nature as his images can affect someone's mind on the level of the butterfly effect.