

Tugas[kan] Seniman

Azhar Ibrahim Alwee
Institut Pendidikan Nasional

"Art is an organic part of the culture of such a society, performing a highly important cultural function. It is not divorced from other fundamental social values, be that truth and goodness, patriotic and civic virtue, or eternal beauty itself. But when art becomes... separated from the public, acquiring complete freedom from control exercised by other values, the situation presents distinct dangers. Instead of springing from the soil of social culture, such an art is rooted solely in the erratic fancy of the individual artist. This soil is much more shallow, uncertain and arid..."

Pitirim Sorokin

Seni boleh ditakrifkan sebagai sesuatu upaya manusia yang "mengandungi dan mengungkapkan pelbagai pengalaman manusia, emosi, kepercayaan dan idea dalam bentuk estetik, yang menarik minat pancaindera kita dan merangsang respons emosi dan intelektual dalam benak manusia"¹ Georgi V Plekhanov, seorang pemikir Marxis pernah berkata: "Fungsi seni itu adalah untuk membantu kesedaran manusia, untuk memperbaiki sistem sosial."² Sesungguhnya persolan seni susah sekali mudah diperentengkan, mentelah lagi "tiada suatupun penghasilan seni yang tiada terkandung sama sekali idea di dalamnya. Malah hasil seni, betapapun hanya dititikberatkan bentuknya daripada isinya, ianya akan menyampaikan sesuatu idea dalam satu segi, mahupun yang lain."³

Di saat suasana pemikiran yang cenderung melihat seni sebagai suatu taman untuk dinikmati keindahan berseni-senian dan bersastra-satraan, terpanggil kita untuk mempertegas bahawa keindahan bentuk mahupun isi hanya akan boleh diperakui sekiranya pengisian itu

¹ James H Barnett, "The Sociology of Art," in *Sociology Today*, Vol. 1. (eds.) Robert K Merton *et. al.*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1959), h.197

² Plekhanov, *Art and Social Life* (London: Lawrence & Wishart Ltd., 1953), h. 5

³ Ibid., h 23 ; Lantas ini mengingatkan kita akan pesan Belinsky: "The idea is the content of the work of art and is general. Form is a particular manifestation of idea. Without having grasped the idea one can neither understand nor appreciate the form. ..Poetry is thought expressed in images, and hence when the idea which the form expresses lacks concreteness, or is false and hollow, then the form necessarily fails to be artistic." Dipetik dlm. Herbert E Bowman, *Vissarion Belinski: A Study in the Origins of Social Criticism in Russia*. (New York , Russell & Russell, 1969), p. 108

berasaskan sendi moral-etika dan intelek. Sesuatu yang berseni itu hanya boleh diiktiraf sekiranya ia sempurna bentuk dan isinya yang diungkap secara konkrit dan isinya pun memperihalkan kemanusiaan secara konkrit.⁴ Soalnya sekarang bukanlah manifesto seni yang kita perlukan tetapi harus kita selalu bertanya apakah seni yang berlangsungan di sekeliling kita hari ini. Apa yang pernah dikemukakan Vissarion Belinsky sayugia menjadi ikhtibar:

“What is the art of our times? – A judgment, an analysis of society: consequently, criticism. The thinking element has now merged even with the artistic—and for our times a work of art is lifeless if it depicts life only in order to depict it, without a mighty, subjective urge that springs from the prevailing thought of the epoch if it not a cry of suffering, or a dithyramb of rupture, if it is not a question, or an answer to a question.”⁵

Pertanggungjawaban ini terletak bukan saja di bahu sang pencipta (seniman), tetapi juga khalayak umum, termasuk juga pengamat dan pengkritik seni. Betapapun kita mahu memisahkan domain seni dengan moralitas sebagai domain yang berautonomi, kita tidak boleh pula memisahkan antara keduanya

[I]t is true that Art and Morality are two autonomous worlds, each sovereign in its own sphere, but they cannot ignore or disregard one another, for man belongs in these two autonomous worlds, both as intellectual maker and as moral agent, doer of actions which engage his own destiny. And because an artist is a man before being an artist, the autonomous world of morality is simply superior to (and more inclusive than) the autonomous world of art. There is no law against the law on which the destiny of man depends. In other words Art is indirectly and extrinsically subordinate to morality.”⁶

Tegasnya bagi Belinsky, “untuk menafikan haknya seni untuk berbakti kepada kepentingan awam/khalayak bererti kita tidak memperendahkannya, tidak mengangkatnya, lantas menafikan adanya kuasa vital yang ia miliki, yaitu idea, menjadikan ia pula objek untuk kesukaan, permainan bagi yang suka bermalas-malasan.”⁷ Pengiktirafan pada potensi dan

⁴ Rujuk Adonis, (Ali Ahmed Said) *An Introduction to Arab Poetics* (London: Saqi Books, 1990)

⁵ V.I. Belinsky, *Selected philosophical works* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Pub. House, 1948), h. xlvi

⁶ Jacques Maritain, *The Responsibility of the Artist* (New York: Gordian Press, 1972), h. 41

⁷ Belinsky, *Selected Philosophical Works*, h. xliv ; M Yovchuk menyaring idea Belinsky, “Art is the reproduction of reality, the world created anew, as it were. Literature and art.....are powerful instruments for the cognition of reality – as much so as science. While it is a reflection of reality, art must not confine itself to simply copying it. The artists must not rest content with merely giving a truthful reproduction of the phenomena of reality; his

tugas seni dan seniman sendiri haruslah diperkuuh dan difahami sebetulnya kerana seniman biasa memainkan peranan positif; seni itu sendiri, menurut Howard Zinn, seorang sejarawan dan pengamat kebudayaan,

“art has the capacity of taking ideas that otherwise would be kind and dry and unappealing and infusing those ideas with a kind of passion that music, poetry, fiction, the theatre, and painting can convey. Art, therefore, because it has that power, the special power of enhancing the strength of an idea with emotion, is an attempt to equalize a situation in which most of the material power, the military power, the economic powers rests in the hands of establishment. Therefore the people without power.....have the great need to mobilize people, to inspire people and to do what mere words on paper, mere pamphlets and books, cannot do by themselves.”⁸

Tantangan Dehumanisasi Seni

Dehumanisasi seni terjadi apabila (a) kepedulian dan keprihatinan terhadap manusia telah dikosongkan atau dipinggiran dalam seni itu sendiri⁹; (b) seni yang telah digunakan dengan tujuan propaganda sehingga terjadi *distortion* berkenaan manusia dan kehidupan ini, dan (c) *hyperinstitutionalization of art*, sehingga meminggirkan khalayak yang mendapat kesukaran akses pada seni itu sendiri kerana ianya telah diinstitusikan, dikomersilkan, mahupun dipamerkan di galeri-galeri yang hanya dikunjungi oleh golongan menengah atau borjuis.¹⁰

Lain-lain segi dehumanisasi yang terjadi harus juga diperkirakan: (a) jurang pendapatan dan keselesaan hidup; (b) kebergantayangan kuasa lelaki terhadap wanita; (c)

mission is to interpret and assess these phenomena. Art ...must not be limited to the passive role of providing an indifferent, mirror-like reflection of life and nature, there must be living personal thought in its depictions, thought lending them an object and meaning. In reproducing the relationship of contemporary society in an artistic form the artist and poem must, like the economist or sociologist, cultivate either respect for or hatred of this society.” Ibid., h. xlivi-xliv

⁸ Howard Zinn with Donaldo Macedo, *Howard Zinn on Democratic Education* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers 2005), h. 128-9

⁹ Rujuk Ortega y Gasset, *The Dehumanization of Art and Notes on the Novel*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948)

¹⁰ Paul Willis, “Art or Culture? An Inquiry,” dlm Henry A. Giroux & Roger I. Simon, (eds.), *Popular Culture, Schooling and Everyday Life*. (New York: Bervin & Garvey, 1989)

kualiti kehidupan di bandaran yang semakin teruk; (d) pemaksaan kanak-kanak pada pekerjaan dengan upah minimum; (e) kemiskinan luarbandar sehingga adanya krisis kebuluran; (f) berleluasa buta huruf dan akses pada pendidikan yang mengecil dan sebagainya.¹¹

Tegasnya, seniman yang berani untuk menyanggah dan menepis dehumanisasi yang kian berlangsungan dalam masyarakat harus juga mempunyai daya kritis menyanggah apa jua yang melumpuhkan kemanusiaan. Daya dan visi kreatif mereka pula harus digunakan untuk, mengutip perkataan Carol Becker, seorang pengamat seni: “*to construct art, and to construct a new society, because these goals each depend on bringing into creation that which does not as yet exist.*”¹² Para seniman seharusnya bukan saja menolak persengkokolan dengan kuasa yang dominan, malah juga terpanggil menolak peminggiran yang dikenakan ke atas mereka. Sebagaimana yang disimpulkan oleh Carol Becker juga:

“It is now time for artists..... to refuse the place of isolation and marginality they have been given and which they themselves romantically have often confused with freedom. It is time for artists to challenge that with which they cannot live, and to bring into view that which they refuse to live without. This task of confronting contradictions in all forms, at all levels, of crossing beyond parameters of the art world to do so, is not the work of all artists will have the inclination to choose. It need not be understood so much as a “responsibility” – anymore than we all must assume for securing the survival of this planet – but rather as a possibility, which I personally hope many will embrace.”

Seni yang Berterlibat dan Melibatkan Khalayak

Sememangnya, wadah seni adalah pengucapan estetika manusia yang bukan saja memberikan kepuasan alami, tetapi juga mendidik akal budi, kedalaman rasa dan keluasan berimajinasi. Tentunya keperluan berestetika, yakni keperluan mendapat keindahan dan kesempurnaan, adalah sebahagian daripada fitrah manusia. Tetapi keperluan estetika ini

¹¹ Untukuraian umum berkenaan subjek ini, rujuk. Ashley Montagu & Floyd Matson, *The Dehumanization of Man*. (New York: McGraw-Hill , 1983)

¹² Carol Becker, “The Social Responsibility of Artists,” dlm Andrew Buchwalter, (ed.) *Culture and Democracy: Social and Ethical Issues in Public Support for the Arts and Humanities* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1992), h. 246

sebagai fitrah usah dibuntukan dengan estetikisme. Yang terakhir ini, menurut seorang pemikir eksistensialis agama, Nicholai Berdayaev, khasnya dalam wacana agama, boleh menyebabkan konsekuensi yang tidak diingini. Ini adalah pukauan *estetekisme* agama yang menawan ketarikannya disebabkan oleh bahasa dan simbolisme agama yang terpakai, sehingga persoalan *bentuk* mengambil tempat utama daripada *isi*. Ini adalah petanda kebuntuan kerana “*the aesthetic seduction is the lure of passivity, the loss of capacity for activity of spirit.*”¹³ Beliau menjelaskan:

“Moral, intellectual, religious values can be replaced by aesthetic [inclination].... Aestheticism in religion commonly assumes the form of the exclusive predominance of its liturgical aspects. Psychologically this means that a man surrenders himself to a state of stupefaction. Aestheticism in morals replaces the relation of a concrete being to concrete personality by a relation to beauty and to personal attractiveness...”¹⁴

Seni yang bergengsi dakwah dan bersifat moralistik dengan pendekatan *pedagogi tabungan*¹⁵ bukan saja tidak berkesan malah sambutan dari khalayak/sasaran niscaya hambar. Malah kalau kita masih terikat dengan lensa fikih yang *rigid*, makanya persoalan kita menanggapi seni dalam masyarakat masih terbantut dalam tingkat halal-haram sesuatu bentuk sastera, melebihi daripada memikirkan isi dan persoalan yang cuba dibawakan dalam sesuatu karya seni. Kalau hanya mahu kita gunakan seni sastera, seni suara (nasyid, berzanji) dalam berdakwah bererti kita telah membatasi wadah seni yang boleh kita manfaatkan untuk program dakwah. Semakin didaktik dakwah disarad dengan bertubi-tubi menganjur kebesaran agama, semakin itu, dan itulah ironisnya, persoalan dakwah itu tidak akan mencapai tingkat substantif, malahan tidak akan dipandang secara serius. Begitu jugalah bagi seni. Kalau bergantayangan mengklaim otonominya, ia tidak akan diperkirakan dengan serius betapapun mungkin ia menarik perhatian seketika.

¹³ Ibid., h.238

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Sebagaimana yang ditegaskan Paulo Freire: “Those truly committed to liberation must reject the banking concept in its entirety, adopting instead a concept of men as conscious beings, and consciousness as consciousness intent upon the world. They must abandon the educational goal of deposit-making and replace it with the posing problems of the problems of men in their relations with the world.” *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum, 2002), h. 66

Seniman yang mahu berkarya atas nama seni atau hanya untuk seni, (ataupun mendebak dada ia bebas daripada ideologi) seharuslah tidak dipandang secara serius. Yang lebih penting bahawa kita dan mereka harus menyedari bahawa,

“the artist cannot escape from the social dimension of his or her existence. In many respects, when the artist creates, the artist is projecting, in his or her work, the social influence, the political influence, the ideological influence with which the artist lives. It is social and not only individual, no matter if the artist is working alone. The artist is a social being. There are possibilities of different readings of the production of the artist. Nevertheless, it is possible that all of us find some nucleus, and this nucleus in the artist’s production, is the reflection of the social condition.”¹⁶

Jelasnya tiada seorang seniman yang secara teoretis boleh mengakui akan keneutralalan mereka. Sesiapa yang mengakui bahawa ia berseni hanya untuk berseni-senian, seharusnya ditepis pengakuan seperti itu.

¹⁶ Paulo Freire, “Interview: Paulo Freire, Dicussing Dialogue,” dlm Tom Finkelppearl, *Dialogues in Public Art* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2000), h. 287