Art (in the twentieth century and beyond)

Susanne Küchler & Timothy Carroll

Introduction:

Twentieth century art objects exude, self-consciously at first and reactively later on, an engagement with science, innovation and discovery. Avant-garde artists of the first decades of the twentieth century worked in the field of 'the science of the concrete,' much like the practitioners captured by the anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss in his account of the *Savage Mind* (1966), drawing out new vocabularies and modalities of attention that resonate emergent trajectories of being and thinking. This sensitivity among the avant-garde toward form as carrier of ideas and its quasi alchemic potential to usher forth a radical rethinking of ways of being in relation was undoubtedly made possible by the arrival of new forms, the spoils of the extension of science, commerce and markets into the furthest niches of the world, and by the new technologies these forms helped to enchant, from new material technologies to the new technologies of the image. In tracking the forms of art objects, both received and made, as springboard for ideas of how to be in relation, this chapter will trace the story of art objects in the twentieth century. This story of art as indexed relations is at heart an 'anthropological' one, one that sees the concern with form as a concern with understanding the biographical and epistemic nature of the idea of relation. It follows, then, that any object or artefact that makes manifest such an indexical relation can be, and for our purposes is, considered 'art' (Bracken 2002; Gell 1998). It is thus not to be confused with yet another narrative of the institution of art and its products, either local or global, nor with accounts of creativity, whether local or global (Gombrich 1967 [1950]; Onians 1996; Bois and Krauss 1997; Wagner 2001).

Instead of tracking institutions and expressions of creativity, the chapter will draw out examples in which art objects came to be recognized as indexes of relations, both prospective and retrospective, and thus form the basis for an emerging canon of art. This canon is made of objects which, being grounded in their highly localised origins of production, come to transcend cultural boundaries and resonate with ongoing intellectual concerns between art and science in the Western intellectual tradition. These indexed relations are *post hoc* attributions, as all causation is, and it is for this reason that conflict arises both within the academy (such as George Marcus' and Fred Myers' critique of ethnographic investigation of indigenous art, 1992) and within indigenous art contexts (such as First Nation artists' reticence towards being shown in commercial galleries).

The inclusion of objects in this chapter is necessarily selective, exemplifying via case studies that may already be well known to the reader, important shifts within the spheres of art and representation that came to resonate within twentieth century cultural history. These works may be in dialogue with local cultural histories, but our concern is principally with their capacity to map epistemic models. This is not to deny the possible influences that artists may be working with, but rather to say that the art object is primary. Each art object is itself a cognitive action and formative of subsequent epistemology. In this approach, we are not building on a 'west' / 'other' dichotomy of artist production. Neither are we implying a resolution to be found in the concept of 'World Art'. Rather we follow in the footsteps of the relatively unknown early twentieth century art historian Carl Einstein's work on African sculpture (in critique of period German art historicism) and read this work in tandem with the resonances of his ideas in the work of Franz Boas (1897, 1916, 1955), Claude Levi-Strauss (1955, 1963 [1955], 1966), Alfred Gell (1992, 1993, 1995, 1996, 1998) and Patrice Maniglier (2013). Each in their own way, these theorists emphasise the importance of a qualitative and formal investigation of art and social form, whereby the objects are fundamentally important from both an analytical (i.e. *post hoc*) and epistemological (that is stimulating intuitive recognition) point of view.

This approach to form, called here 'relational immanence', has been a minor discourse, often in the shadows of a dominant paradigm in the nineteenth and twentieth-century art history. This dominant paradigm, called here 'optical naturalism', assumes the primacy of the process of art vis-a-vis the position of the viewer, as frontal and distanced, thus determining the pictorial aspect of sculpture (Zeidler 2004: 29; Einstein 2004a,b). While Einstein marks 'optical naturalism' as an issue of spatial distanciation, our specific interest here is in the relational aspect of the piece and in the relationship it establishes via the work of art. Optical naturalism proposes the art object as conduit between viewer and artist, implying the unimportance of the art object itself, except as mediator of symbolic, relativistic meaning. In proposing relational immanence, we offer a perspective that allows us to think through the peculiar phenomenon of twentieth century art, in which forms without precedence gave rise to new art worlds.

Object forms are conventionally taken as the strategic starting point "for engaging the historically specific circumstances of intercultural circulation" (Myers 2004: 206; Thomas 1991). Equally important as an analytical vantage point are ideas of material and expressive culture that are deployed by those working in support of artists, from art collectors to dealers

and agents, spurred on by interests that resonate with political and cultural events in often complex ways (Harris 2012; Wagner 2007). This chapter will not pursue such an account of entanglement so much as bring to the fore the consequences of the formal autonomy of art objects, provoking as it does an aesthetic reception that conjures up an immanence that is quite literally out of sight and difficult to reconstruct. Recognising the importance of Alfred Gell's idea of the 'graphic gesture' as a 'constitutive act', not a representational one (1998:191) we situate ourselves in a line of thought that can be traced through the work of the early twentieth-century art historian Carl Einstein on African sculpture, on the American anthropologist Franz Boas (1916) who formulated around the same time the idea of virtuosity underpinning relations between art objects, and the French sociologist Claude Levi-Strauss (1966) who took the idea of the logic of the concrete as a methodological and theoretical paradigm for the study of culture. By emphasising the logic of art as commensurate with culture, not only informed by it, we are thus able to draw out the epistemic potential of twentieth century art.

This chapter makes the argument that twentieth century art works as 'made objects' are part of aesthetic systems and formal styles that are indexical and thereby show forth complex relations between persons and persons and things. What is important to note, however, is that this 'showing forth' is not, in the first instance, representational of something beyond. Einstein makes the point that art, as a 'totality', 'makes possible concrete apprehension and by means of it every concrete object becomes transcendent' (2004b: 119-120). This 'transcendence', as Zeidler (2004: 38) points out, 'is not a realm of pure ideas or forms that hover above the empirical world as its purified *summa*; transcendence is rather the immanence that knowledge must produce as outsider in order stabilize itself.' As Gell notes, a 'tattooed *etua* [god figure] was protective of the person because it *was* an *etua*, right there on the body, not because it 'looked like' an *etua* somewhere else' (1998:191, emphasis original). Art – as a category and as unique objects – cuts across existing trajectories within wider social and material domains. It is not a subsidiary category within a larger hierarchy of epistemological framing. Rather, in that it is an index of relation and relationality, 'art transforms vision' and 'the individual work of art itself constitutes an act of knowing and of judgement' (Einstein 2004b: 116-117). This is not simply knowing *that* something is, but knowing *how* to be in the world. As such, art objects and their institutions in the twentieth century gave form to – and made further the evocation of – new ideas and new modes of self-expression in the world.

So far we have situated our position through what it is not. We do not follow a narrative of the institution of art, nor an account of creativity, we distance ourselves from optical naturalism, and from idea that the entanglement of art objects and broader social trends offer an explanation for the form and materiality of art works. Instead we argue that the very architecture of relations made manifest in object form is more complex and variable than has been commonly conceived.

It is our suggestion that since 1900 we have seen three new methodological approaches to art, all emerging from a preoccupation with the possibilities of relational immanence. While there are numerous ways to approach the numerous kinds of art movements in the past century, the chapter is laid out following this tripartite manner. These three approaches each deal with the role of the referent to reside in the invisible rather than, as assumed in the dominant paradigm of ocular naturalism, in the visible. These three approaches are not only analytical, but inspired art making and art reception throughout the twentieth century. At different periods one may have gained greater purchase over others, but all have been present throughout. The first approach associates the invisible with the bodily interior, including emotion, and the systemic quality of the lived-in world, both its imaginary and evidentiary constitution. The second privileges the capacity of the visible to make manifest transformational properties that are independent of vision, concretising the states of consciousness and unconsciousness and the blending of sensory modalities. The third explores the role of art objects in the comprehension of relational immanence, via absences presenced in representations via recollection and hermetic intuition.

Alongside these three methodological approaches to imminent relationality, prevailing across the production and reception of art objects in the twentieth century, are three modes of representation. We are not suggesting a one-to-one correlation between the approaches to and modes of representation, but rather highlight the combinatory possibilities instantiated by twentieth century art objects. Artists may, in fact be drawing upon two or more modes in combination with any given art production. The three modes of representation are the substitutional, the mimetic, and the immanent. The first two are well noted in critical literature in, for example the work of Carlo Ginzburg (2001:63ff), following Roger Chartier, and in the anthropological interpretation of magic, following James Frazier and Walter Benjamin (see Taussig 1993, Gell 1998:100). It is our contention that the rising importance of representational immanence in the European context was, in no small part, in response to the arrival of the

artefacts from around the world. Imminent representation is not, itself, foreign to the European tradition of art production, as may be attested by Bakhtin's (1984) *Rabelais and his World*, but had become quieted through the rise of modernity and scientific rationalism. When brought into the European context, artefacts from abroad were consolidated into institutions of experience – such as museums, rather than institutions of the natural sciences. In their source contexts, the objects, however, have the same acute importance as the sciences (viz. Levi-Strauss 1955; Stengers 2010). As these new objects arrived, filling new museums that had been built in opposition to science museums, artists began to see that these objects opened up new avenues for what art objects are able to do as they showed forth in new ways the behaviour of complex systems. It is in this regard that Gell makes the comparison between avant-garde artists and their understanding art, as opposed to the common conception held by wider – and art historical – audiences (1996).

Europe at the turn of the twentieth century, as we outline in more detail in this next section, witnessed an important juxtaposition and entanglement of discourses within the art historical and philosophy of aesthetics traditions, on the one hand, and the visually arresting artefacts of colonial exploration (and theft) on the other. The patriation of artefacts and material samples from abroad, and their reception into the national collections and research institutions, has left an indelible mark of colonialism on the face of the global discourse of art. The enchantment, disenchantment, and disavowal of colonialism's heritage has, at various stages in the past century, framed the uptake and impact of various materials and forms in important ways. Without going too deeply into the politics of art, it is, however, important to highlight the impact of the colonial legacy. Along with wider political strife – most explicitly during the World Wars – the stages of colonialism and post-colonialism shaped a movement first away from the dominant narrative of European exceptionalism, and then a movement, globally, toward increased localised particularism.

The subsequent section first provides a brief backdrop to the start of the twentieth century, and then the paper moves through the three methodological approaches to representation. The first, *Art and the interiority of the lived in world*, explores the movement away from surfaces in favour of the invisible. The second, *Art as transformation*, highlights the capacity of visual media to manifest transformational processes and properties that may be otherwise invisible. The third and final, *Art making immanent absent presences*, considers the role of art and the comprehension of and relationship within systems, as a nexus of intersubjective knowing. The

case studies have been chosen because they clearly manifest the concern with relational capacity and the role of art objects in harnessing it. They are not exhaustive, nor do we exhaust the discussion of works, as this chapter is decidedly not yet another history of twentieth century art. Rather the case studies have been chosen as exemplars of the trends we see in the twentieth century.

§ historical context

Experimentation in early twentieth century art and debates about the nature of form that provide the backdrop to the re-invention of culture have to be understood against the background of momentous changes in science and society. Pivotal to these changes was the burgeoning trade and exploration of far flung regions in the world that had followed in the wake of earlier expeditions, returning with objects, materials and people for exhibition in a sequence of world expositions of industry, arts and technology taking place across the industrial world, starting at Crystal Palace in London in 1851 and to the present day. In London, the spoils of the first World Expo came to form the collections of new museums. New materials such as rubber and artefacts such as cloth made from the bark of the paper mulberry tree, inspiring new possible ways of manufacturing non-woven materials, entered as economic botany collection the first materials library of its kind at Kew Gardens. Artefacts displaying such new materials, yet with more distinctive stylistic or decorative appearance, entered the newly founded Victoria and Albert Museum displaying decorative arts. Yet more artefacts, falling in between these two categories of objects, were judged to be of more general classificatory significance in allowing the mapping of cultures across the world, and were handed to the British Museum. Around the same time that new materials in artefact or raw form arrived from all over the world, industrial manufacturing began to seize on the idea of infinitely malleable materials such as steel and rubber and the emergence of new object-types permitting new activities – from diving suits made of rubber to fire hoses – and realized the possibility of mass produced objects. By 1870, mail-order catalogues were a gateway to a new world of objects, each with its own variations for age and gender specific consumers. The idea of objectification, whereby objects came to be seen to stand in for subjects, formed the basis of a new philosophy of materialism. Though the advent of the synthetic replication of material properties had to wait to the late 1940's, the fascination with form which was inspired by new material properties and machine technology had led to the development of an early form of plastic called Bakelite in 1907, introducing a full spectrum of colour into everyday objects in a way not possible before. The stage was set

for cultural imagination to seize hold of transformation, rhythm and translation in the world of objects and create new modalities of abduction.

Part 1: Art and the interiority of the lived in world

At the turn of the twentieth century, Vienna was a centre of intellectual and artistic advancement, the leading centre for the advancement of modernity in Europe. Many noted artists and intellectuals – including Arthur Schnitzler, Johann Strauss (the Younger), Sigmund Freud, Max Reinhardt, Gustav Mahler, Gustav Klimt, Theodor Billroth, to name a few – met in salons hosted by influential women, such as Berta Zuckerkandl; herself a student of biology and Darwinian evolution. Berta's salon thrived on her zeal for modernity and the free exchange of ideas between scientists and artists. She and her husband Emil, an anatomist, introduced Gustav Klimt to the ideas of Rokitansky and Darwin. Emil Zuckerkandl also invited Klimt to observe autopsies, and gave a series of lectures to a group of artists, writers, and musicians on topics such as cell growth, foetal development within the womb, and the fantastical worlds within – as Berta records Emil to have said, "a drop of blood, a little bit of brain substance, [and] you will be transported to a fairy-tale world" (in Kandel 2012:32). At the same time, Sigmund Freud was introducing new methods of treating patients with psychotherapy. This movement inside displaced preceding phrenological understandings of personality and moral character based on the visual surface and proportion of protrusions on the subject's head. While in some regard distinct, the movement inside the psyche (Freud) and the movement inside to body (Rokitansky) and the movement inside the womb, cell, and microbial (Zuckerkandl), all speak to a growing dissatisfaction with the veracity of the external and a need to move within in order to find what is true. These were elements within an 'inward turn' characteristic of Vienna in the early 1900s (Kandel 2012).

Klimt's work, intimately in dialogue with these scientific advancements, makes this same move. This may most clearly be seen in his *Portrait of Adele Bloch-Bauer* (1907), where the motivic pattern on the dress is not, as many may assume, stylised eyes, but the cellular composition of the portrayed subject (Figure 5.1). To show Lady Bloch-Bauer as she is, Klimt does not array her in fineries, but speaks to the internal makeup of her being. This shift toward the physiological inside can be seen within a larger movement calling into question how vision itself functions and its epistemological purchase.

[Figure 5.1 here]

Within the context of early twentieth century art production, guided to a large extent by optical naturalism, the debates within the wider art critical arena – as highlighted by Einstein's critiques of both Hildebrand and Simmel – was concerned with the means of movement between three- and two-dimensional form. The assumption that the pictorial gesture should flatten form along the lines of visual representation was held unquestioned on both sides. It is for this reason that movements such as cubism sought to show multiple vantage points of the same object; while their method broke from Hildebrand's distanced, mono-optical stance that favoured the statuesque in relief, cubism still assumed the same optical naturalism, advocating the derivation of 3- to 2-dimension with only a change to a poly-optic perspectivalism. Thus the cubist portraiture captured several partial perspectives of the same sitting subject, but maintained the pictorial gesture as a flattening of the three dimensional form to flat viewing surface. It is for this reason that Duchamp's *Nude descending the staircase No 2* (1912) brings about his rejection from the cubist movement. For while the piece is formally cubist in the shapes which fill the canvas, it radically rejects the optical naturalism of the cubist and wider artistic modes of representation. Like Muybridge's studies of movement at the end of the preceding century – most notably for *Nude*, his 1887 *Woman Walking Downstairs* – Duchamp's figure is not a collapse of the third into the second dimension. Instead it is a collapse of the fourth (viz. Gell 1998:243). Duchamp's *Nude* is not a project of showing multiple perspectives of the stationary form, but an exploration of movement, the visualisation of time lapse.

Also notable for their relation to duration and movement, which cannot be conceptualised except via objects that capture and map time, are the mobiles of Alexander Calder. These kinetic sculptures, named mobiles, in fact, by Duchamp, play in open space, moving with air currents. Calder came from a family of artists (sculptors on his father's side and his mother was a portrait artist), was formally trained as a mechanical engineer, and excelled in mathematics. The highly mathematical quality of the mobiles, characterised by balance and the extended reaching trajectory of counter balancing arms and paddles requires patience of the audience. Like his earlier *Cirque Calder* (1926-31), made of wire-framed animals, unicyclists, and tightrope walkers – which he himself performed for audiences, the mobiles are performances. There is a playful quality to Calder's work, albeit a serious sort of play, and it is helpful to think of 'mobiles' in both senses of Duchamp's French pun: indicating both movement and motivation. While many reviews of Calder's work note the influence of Mondrian on Calder,

in terms of the possibilities of abstraction, Mondrian rejected Calder's suggestion to make his bold bright shapes move (Calder 1937). The movement, and the expansive gesture of the slow, swinging arms of Calder's mobiles make visible (and in some cases, such as *Antennae with Red and Blue Dots 1953,* audible) the relations between parts of balance and counterbalance. The slow stir of wind within a gallery space propels a gentle oscillation, and the audience is caught gazing at the movement. Each piece is never the same twice; this is because the architectonics of the piece is always the same, however the movement within the branches makes the configuration of nodes always changing. As such, the interiority of the piece is always in flux, while the exterior experiences both stasis and motility. Both Duchamp and Calder, like Freud and Klimt, draw out the difference between the interior and the exterior, highlighting the place of the invisible as constitutive of complex and intersecting modalities of experience.

Part 2: Art as transformation

In his 1916 essay on Rembrandt, Georg Simmel articulates an awareness of the poetic properties of form whose logic facilitates the same kind of intuitive and immediate understanding offered by language without being replaced by it. Simmel's call for the social forms of art to express an 'inner life' of persons and the 'art' of social forms alike resonates a sensitivity for the efficacy of art that was unparalleled in its widespread acceptance. Around the time Simmel first directed his interest to art as index of complex relations a number of scholars searched for ways to account for the question of the nature of being human: the American anthropologist Franz Boas (1955 [1927]) published the first treatise on *Primitive Art* as an account of virtuosity[1] underpinning language made manifest in material form; the German art historian Aby Warburg sought to identify what he termed the 'pathos formula' (1999, 2000[2]) that enables diverse images to be recognized as related to one another; Sigmund Freud (1923) developed the psychoanalytical method to uncover the complex systemic relations between Ego and Id intrinsic to the articulation of personhood; and Walter Benjamin (1921), in his essay on the *Task of the Translator,* directed attention to the onomatopoetic quality of names that connect concepts and material worlds in ways enabling him to identify arcades and play as agents of cultural resistance.

That artefacts could enable one to deduce shared human ways of conceiving ideas of personhood and society (ways that were, at times, politically subversive in the face of colonialism and the rise of fascism) had become commonplace at the start to the twentieth

century with the arrival of tens of thousands of artefacts from the new horizons of trade and imperialist expansion. Alongside botanical specimen, birds, reptiles, insects and other amphibians that entered the newly created ethnographic museums, artefacts in their thousands were collected as evidence for the new disciplines of ethnology and anthropology. While Europe and America contributed to the emerging disciplines primarily through arm chair ethnographies in the early decades of the century, Russia, with its own indigenous populations, supported direct research with communities. The practice of Russian ethnology came, by a twist of fate, to inform perhaps the most radical formulation of the potential of object worlds, later framed by Walter Benjamin as the language of objects (Bracken 2002). The first indication of an incursion of the practice of ethnology into European painting came in 1911 when Wassily Kandinsky exhibited his painting *Saint George vs Dragon* (1911), with St George astride a blue horse with golden flecks that associated St George with a Siberian shaman. The piebald colouring of the horse fits within an indigenous network of sacred shamanic imagery, ritual drumming, technical terminology and notions of riding to produce metonymic and synesthetic properties which were harnessed by the Siberian shaman as conduit for transference between the inner and outer worlds. Kandinsky's study of ethnography in Russia where Siberian shamanism had already been well studied and described has been captured in his memoires, yet has been largely overlooked in favour of the more populist reception of his later work that translated synaesthetic or cross sensory experience, itself fundamental to Siberian shamanism, into painting (Weiss 1995). Kandinsky became a member of the Russian Imperial Society of Friends of Natural History, Anthropology and Ethnography while a student in Moscow in acknowledgement of an essay he wrote on a summer research trip to the then still remote region of Vologda province. The essay contains a wealth of ethnographic observations, largely untapped by art historians in search for influences on his later artistic development but of such quality to have been incorporated into ethnographic publications on Siberia (Weiss 1986:45). As recalled in his memoirs *(Rűckblicke)*, it was not just shamanic practice that left a strong impression, but houses in which every wall was brightly painted, covered with lots of pictures 'like a painted folksong' (Weiss 1986:44). His interest in ethnology and in Siberia in particular had a personal motivation as his father's family had come from the border of Russia and Mongolia, having settled there from west Siberia, near the region of Vologda province, which the family had to leave for political reasons (Weiss 1986:44). Kandinsky's mother's family was from the German Baltic and, with this complex biographical history in mind, it is not difficult to see why Kandinsky would have continued to build on the resonances of coloured soundscape as means for and expression of translation across cultures long after leaving

Moscow for Germany. These biographical insights are important to note in no small part because it highlights a much more diverse set of influences coming out of the practice of ethnography woven into the European art tradition. Kandinsky's ethnographic work and familial history might be by no means unique, yet were undoubtedly influential antecedents to rethinking the possibilities of art objects throughout the twentieth century.

The potential of objects collections emerging through colonial and ethnographic contact to serve as vehicles of ideas that, moving from one culture to another, transform ways of understanding was realized via the arrival of African sculpture in private collections whose owners had close ties with the artistic community (Barasch 1998:274). In Germany, *Die Brücke* artists Max Pechmann and Emil Nolde visited New Guinea and the island of Palau, respectively, influenced by Ernst Ludwig Kirchner who had first been exposed to Oceanic art in the Dresden museum of ethnology in 1904. For their part, the Munich-based *Blaue Reiter* group likewise used ethnographic museum collections as inspiration. Henri Matisse visited Morocco in 1912 and 1913 and Paul Klee, together with August Macke and Louis Moilliet went to Tunisia in 1914, where they moved away from artefactual form to abstract patterns and shapes observed in fabrics and the environment, recreating them in the studio after observation *in situ*. Matisse's early observations of the interplay between light and colour, the three-dimensional illusion on canvass and the folded and crumpled surface of textile, narrative description and emotion take on an acute ethnographic quality with the incorporation of Moroccan wall hangings, wall paper, and fretwork (*Moorish Screen* 1921). Beyond acute observation of the indexical qualities of assemblages made manifest on canvas, Matisse was actively drawn to exploring the epistemic quality of the geometric thinking afforded by textile and it is this concern that led him to retrace the steps of Paul Gauguin in his visit to Tahiti during the 1930s. In the 1930s and 1940s sewing large patchwork coverlets known as *tifaifai* was culturally prominent in Tahiti and the presence of this distinctly geometric textile would have led him to look again at Gauguin's polyphony of perspective depicted in his quasi sculptural Tahitian paintings and edgings (such as the *Nave Nave Fenua (Delightful Land)* woodcut in *Noa Noa* [1894]). Tahitian textile and the topological geometry inspiring its translation of three-dimensional shapes onto two dimensional surfaces inspired Matisse's gouache collages (*The Snail* 1953) and his stained-glass windows (*Chapelle du Rosaire de Vence* 1948–1951). Matisse's correspondence with Pauline Schyle, shows that Matisse owned two *tifaifai*, although they are not listed as part of his collection (Klein 1997:58–9; Küchler and Eimke 2009:87). Matisse documents the influence of *tifaifai* on his paper cut-outs in a note on

the back of a photograph he sent to Mme Schyle in the 1940s (see Klein 1997: note 54). Klein also refers to the unpublished research paper by Angela Levy (University of Pennsylvania n.d.) which establishes interesting connections between Matisse's cut-outs and Tahitian *tifaifai* (Klein 1997).

The exploration of objects as transformative, facilitating the cross sensorial and spatial dimensions that shaped artists' imagination for the first half of the century was complemented by an as yet largely undisclosed interchange with anthropologists. Concerned with uncovering the nature of the modelling of biographical relations, the influential theoretician Claude Levi-Strauss (1955), in post war France, brought the intellectual lives of masks and myths to the attention of the public. Equally influential, Edmund Leach (1954), in post war Britain, highlighted the role of mathematics and geometry in modelling complex social systems. The reception of first retrospective of the relation between anthropology and art in the 1984 Museum of Modern Art show on *Primitivism in Modern Art* focused almost exclusively on the postcolonial intellectual environment in which such an interplay could be opened up, effectively closing off the return to an epistemic exploration of style that outlines how art is capable of transforming understanding (Rubin 1984). The relational, agentive and language-like potential of art in the service of such transformation that had driven both artists and anthropologists to search out its possibilities had, at the close of the century, been taken over by digital technology whose seemingly irrepressible memory made a concern with the intricacies of translation in the service of remembering obsolete. With the advent of new digital technology and the capacity of images and sound to be streamed and multiplied, the mnemonic charge of material transduction that knew no boundaries had lost its hold on collective imagination.

While at the close of the twentieth century synaesthesia and the possibility of translation across perceptual boundaries was understood as neurological phenomenon, in the early years of the century, it was an enculturating potential. Artists such as Kandinsky and Klee were publically recognised to be synaesthesic, and their visual art production is – in some cases explicitly, such as *Fugue* 1914 (Kandinsky) or *Ad Parnassum* 1932 (Klee) – the visualisation of aural fields. For other artists, like Georgia O'Keeffe, the possibility of translation between sound and image was a matter of experimentation and exploration of how sensory phenomena may be known (e.g. *Blue and Green Music* 1919–1921). Along with the artful production, these individuals also were actively involved in the formation of the discipline through their teaching at the

Bauhaus and the publication of programmatic treatises, such as Kandinsky's essay on style (1911) and Klee's textbook *Pedagogical Sketchbook* (1953 [1925]). Kandinsky's (2008 [1911]) essay *Concerning the Spiritual in Art* elaborates his theory of style as a translation of inner rhythm (*Innere Klang*) into shapes of emotions; 'in each picture is a whole lifetime imprisoned' (2008:13), he argues, such that each art object is, via its relational immanence, able to bring about associations with music, translating music's rhythmic and mathematical abstract construction into repeated notes of colour – setting colour into motion. Klee's *Sketchbook*, starting from the simple figure of the 'active line' (1953:16), builds a sort of qualitative mathematics of line, form, and colour, mapping out the emotions and animation of the still, flat image.

Similar in terms of making visible and animate the interior emotional worlds, O'Keeffe's early work, specifically her charcoal sketches (such as *Drawing XIII* 1915) which were brought to Gallery 291 by a friend. The photographer and art collector, Alfred Stieglitz, who owned the Gallery, was captivated by O'Keeffe's capacity to translate emotion into line (Roberts 1988).[3] The monochrome sketches, like *Blue and Green Music*, opened the transductory – that is an intentional movement across borders – capacity of art representation. *Music* arose from an art instructor's invitation to paint what the music playing in the art studio sounded like. Colour was not a physiological response to sound – as it was for Kandinsky and Klee – yet she seized the possibility of making visible the aural scape as a way of making emotion manifest via an act of mimetic representation. So whereas Kandinsky and Klee were using their own personal synaesthetic experience as an avenue for transformational art production, O'Keeffe's work creates an experimental space which permits the exploration of synaesthesia as an agent of artful insight. O'Keeffe and Stieglitz, initially met over the charcoal sketches developed a much longer relationship, both intimate and professional. His portrait photography, notably of her nude form, played with this similar capacity of the visual to make manifest emotion and character qualities.

These qualities of emotional character and the possibilities to move the immaterial into the material have important resonances with the work of Yves Klein. Originally conceived in 1947-8 (at the same time as Cage's 4'33", though with no influence one way or the other) Yves Klein's *Monotone-Silent Symphony* was performed for the first time in March 1960 (Klein 2007). While the performance was scaled down musically – having only ten musicians, conducted by Klein himself, instead of the 70-strong vocal and orchestral arrangement it was written for, the

debut performance was nonetheless monumental in its own way. There were 100 guests invited to the Galerie International d'Art Contemporain in Paris, and accompanying the music was a live production of the *Anthropometries in Blue*.[4] Using his synthetic ultramarine pigment, which he patented two months later as IKB (International Klein Blue), three models covered themselves and each other in blue and pressed their otherwise nude form against artist paper hung on the walls, and dragged each other across paper laid out on the floor. This visual performance accompanied only the first half of the symphony, which constitutes a single note (a D major chord) sustained without variation, vibrato, nor rest for twenty minutes. The note starts, full force abruptly, and ends, halfway through the symphony, abruptly. The subsequent half of the symphony is silence. During this silence Klein, the musicians, and the models remained still. The exhibition space, attendees noted, had no air circulation and the space became warm with the 100 plus bodies fitted tightly into the space. Klein's artistic project was a movement toward immateriality and gesture. His movement to the use of a single colour, his partnership with the models who he would, at times direct, but largely leave to their own performance, was a conscious effort on his part toward immateriality, via the removal of the artist from the artwork. The mix of live performance, sound, warmth, colour, and other human bodies pushed the boundaries of art at a time before 'conceptual art' was a recognised genre. His own descriptions of the symphony suggest that the unwaveringly sustained singular sound of the Monotone-Silent Symphony was 'free from the phenomenology of time'. The effect upon the hearing audience is striking. Many who have attended subsequent performances note the emotional impact, and the array of insights and nuances experienced in the art. The archivist for Klein's estate, Daniel Moquay, highlights the impact of the silence, particularly, saying 'You get into the deepness of silence and you realise that silence is not nothing.' As Pwyll ap Stifin (2017) argues, silence is a material thing, achieved through the aggregation of specific conditions and intentions. Klein's movement to blue followed disappointment in the reception of his earlier monochrome paintings, where each was a unique size and colour. Audiences attempted to find meaning in the works, linking a colour to a biographical aspect of Klein's life, or suggesting the works were *avant garde* interior design. This mode of representation was not, however, Klein's aim. Rather Klein was working toward the (re)presentation of the immaterial with his art. The pieces themselves – hung on the gallery wall – were, in his own words, 'the ashes of my art'. This performative gesture of art itself was, for Klein, an act of impregnation. Sponges, having the capacity to draw into themselves the pigmentation of IKB, became important in his pursuit of immateriality, as did gold, which, Klein explained, as an elemental source of light 'impregnates the painting and gives it eternal life'. The capacity of art can,

therefore be seen to bring into the audience's (and art-practitioner's) experience something which is not representational, which is not mimetic, but impregnated with, and therefore is, something beyond – something akin to Einstein's immanent sort of transcendence.

In terms of the questions of mimicry and representation, contemporary movements in computer-based art production cloud the relationship between the artist, intention, art objects and the role of creative imagination. This is even more poignant concerning the distanciation of the (human) artist from the art object while shifting the transformational move from the 'invisible' associated with the organic to that of the mechanical, shifting emotion from the subjective being (akin to Freud's Id) to a disembodied code. Harold Cohen, for example, in a project developed from 1973 to his death in 2016, programmed an autonomous artist, named AARON. At first only programmed to paint abstract images, Cohen taught it to paint representational imagery in the 1980s. Initially this representation was only of inanimate objects, essentially still lives, and eventually the code was developed to include animate and finally human subjects. In the 1990s, Cohen added the capacity to paint figuration in scene, and subsequently gave AARON the freedom to add colour.

AARON and other, subsequent, autonomous computer artists (such as Oliver Deussen and Thomas Lindenmeier's e-David, or Simon Colton's 'The Painting Fool') cloud the boundaries of agentive causality. While newer projects, such as The Painting Fool, have code written that allows them to make subjective, emotionally driven decisions during the painterly process – in response, for example, to reading a series of news articles – AARON's creative output is the result of coded executable skills, not contextual learning. Cohen wrote each line of code, building AARON's total capacity and technical know-how over the years. As such, the place of the 'artist' and 'art' categories are somewhat conflated, and while AARON-as-artist is capable of original works, made without input nor guidance from Cohen, it is nonetheless itself the art-like index of Cohen's artistic mastery. AARON, born out of Cohen's interest in minimal artful representation and his interest in cybernetics, is an exploration and experimentation with the behaviour of complex systems. It is also important to note that AARON is, more than simply one index, a complex system in itself. There is the code (first in C and then in Lisp), as well as various plotter devices (originally a purpose built 'turtle'), painting machines, and inkjet printers over the years. In some cases, Cohen let AARON operate solo, at times he 'partnered' with AARON, doing the colourisation himself. In effect, AARON is a layering of the three modes of representation. In the first order, Cohen's program is a substitutional representation of his

own painterly skill and technical knowledge. In running its code, AARON is then performing an artistic act, mimicking the work of a 'real' artist. From the 1980s, as AARON was taught to produce representational imagery, these images were also mimetic of real objects, first inanimate, and eventually human. It is important to note, however, that AARON was never shown images. It was not producing a portrait based on (cyber)optic input (as does Colton's Fool). There is nothing 'behind' or beyond the image; the art work produced by AARON is, in this sense, immanent representation.

While cases like AARON, and to a greater degree The Painting Fool, trouble our understandings of agency and intentionality, they are – to greater or lesser degrees – bounded by a certain predictability and obedience.[5] There is an element that is unsettling, as it rests in the 'uncanny valley', where it is not human but mimics the anthropological condition of having to be in relation to itself in a way that is recognisable by abduction to the human subjects, intersubjectively. While there is, therefore, a novelty around the works of art produced by these artificial artists, they may be best understood at this stage as exuviae of the programs, which are in turn art objects in their own right.

The emphasis given to the biographical, subjective, and emotional aspects of art played a profound role in the early decades of the twentieth century. It resurfaced at the close of the century against a background of emerging digital and materials technologies whose reach placed unprecedented challenges on received ideas of personhood and collective representation. While at the start of the century art collections from the heyday of imperial aspirations were central to rethinking what form does in society and culture, at the close of the century it is the art of settler societies, from Australia to the American and Canadian Northwest and New Zealand, that top the charts of exhibitions and private collections. In the same way as the coded AARON is the artwork, the intentions at work in these fourth-world contexts are producing the sort of output that knowingly manipulates the intuitive emotion and associative recognition of its audiences. The difference in take up of these artworks speaks volumes about the complex intentions that allow social forms of art to reimagine an art of social forms, offering strategies for resistance and control that are hidden in bright light.

Northwest coast American art forms are known for their complex stylistic properties famously discussed by the anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss (1963 [1955]) in his essay on split representation, involving the characteristic splitting of an image so that two halves face one

another, which can be traced across both Asian and American art. By tracing the splitting of an image to the actions informing the process of the creation of this pattern via the translation of an image from three dimensional into two-dimensional form, Lévi-Strauss was able to draw a parallel with the characteristic collapsing of the concept of person with a socially effective office in ways symptomatic of hierarchical societies in which men compete over structurally and genealogically conferred status that outlasts the individual person. The virtuosity and complexity of motivic composition, both distinct elements and rules for combination, has been well studied by generations of anthropologists and art historians (Boas 1955; Holm 1965). The most distinctive use of the logic of style in contemporary artworks, produced distinctly not for display in settler (colonial) galleries, is permitting irony to provoke understanding, one that is intuitive and intersubjective, yet which binds people together as fervently as it shuts others out (Hutcheon 1985; Hutchinson 1992; Ryan 1999). If ideas underpinning Northwest coast artworks covertly frame understanding via the cognitive saliency of its patterns, Maori art of New Zealand overtly asserts ideas that challenge and reframe ideas of artistry as person bound endeavour into a collectivising process like no other (McCarthy 2007; Skinner 2008). In ways not too dissimilar to Northwest Coast American Indian art, though sacrosanct as gateway to Pakeha identity, the intricacies of the sculpted Maori house and its modern reconfigurations lock out those who have no basis for engaging knowledgeably with its forms (Gell 1998). In Maori production, knowledge is closely guarded here via restricting access to materials, thus allowing the preservation of a distinct Maori identity within and separate from the wider New Zealand context. Although similarly pattern based, involving the complex transposition of topologically conceived geometric forms onto a two-dimensional surface, Australian Aboriginal Acrylic painting has had a notably distinct trajectory, as compared to traditional Maori production – in no small part due to the difference in materials used and their sourcing. Emerging in response to the introduction of acrylic paints to camps in the 1970 for the purpose of art education, Aboriginal Acrylic painting entered international art markets rapidly and with seemingly irreverent verve. Identified with narratives about land, mobility and identity, it is here the fit between the cognitive saliency of style, materials and consumer imagination, poignantly placed in the last two decades of the century in which digital networking began to undermine the hold of the nation state on imagination, which has supported what is known as 'the phenomenon of Aboriginal Australian art as new modernism'. While it seems that they are 'painting culture' (Myers 2002), there is a necessarily oblique aspect of the Aboriginal work that makes it infinitely accessible, in terms of market saturation, and at the same time entirely inaccessible in terms of eliciting an understanding that enables a knowledgeable engagement

with these artworks. As such, the works, like New Zealand art and Northwest Coast American art, as well, are – from the gaze of the art market – produced by quasi-automata, such that while the product of the artful gesture is appreciated for aesthetic purposes only, it – like the work of AARON – cannot be engaged with in terms of the possibility of intersubjective relations and the translatability of social form into art.

While in AARON, the inaccessibility of the program is an unintentional by-product of the technical basis of the art production, here – in the art of settler societies – the inaccessibility is an intentional act of obfuscation and preservation. Translation itself is, then, in these works covertly bounded, and thereby illuminating the possibility for cuts and closure which question the seemingly infinite world of digital communication and capital investment. Where translational capacity of art was, at the start of the century, a panacea for rethinking the epistemic possibilities inherent in object worlds, at the close of the century the displacement of the European monopoly on cultural production, and the turn from modernity to postmodernity (Araeen 1989) means that translation itself is a mimetic representation, and as multiple is impossible to capture and singularise.

Part 3: Art making immanent absent presences

The classical episteme captured by Foucault's (2001) *Order of Things* assert that a representation manifests itself as about something else, with the order manifest in the relation between things reflecting relations between persons and persons and things that can be independently verified via observation. This ontology of order was active during the Renaissance, yet it comes to be overthrown during the twentieth century by artists who invoke a homological and systemic ordering that is immanent within a representation. The logic informing this ordering inherent in artworks initially was conceived in terms of the unconscious, the realm of dreams, made manifest in artworks that are not inviting interpretation, but incantation by evoking associations that cross sensory domains and are accessible to perception only via actions of translation. Acoustic rhythms and spatial-temporal geometries predominate as tapestries of immanence in the first half of the twentieth century, drawing on ethnographic collections whose specimens were found in workshops across western metropolises. In the last two decades of the twentieth century, inspired by artists who self-consciously reflect on the legacy of colonialism via their work, the textuality of the supra-social world of dreams gives way to a logic of transposition and transformation underpinning parody

and humour. The self-bounded nature of trickster art refuses understanding from outside. Whereas the code of AARON is accessible and replicable, these art objects, while physically accessible, refuse epistemic access. Trickster art is characterised by two modes of transformation, the first, like a computer code consists of independent variables and works to store information via its composition; the second reconfigures the composition in order to make it legible to only those who recognise the transposition of the patterns of composition – in many ways working like a fugue. The issue of legibility is not only about knowing how to read, but having access to the epistemic apparatus needed for understanding. It should follow, that art, as an index of relations, will include and exclude persons depending on their position to, and in, the index.

Of the ethnographic artefacts that came to notoriety among artists during the first decades of the twentieth century, masks from Africa and sculptures from Oceania are known to have figured most prominently (Rubin 1984). Apart from their obvious difference in material and form, what they have in common is to represent not what can be seen, but instead make manifest ideas that can only be arrived upon by unravelling the composition. As the anthropologist Knut Rio (2009:284) has observed, sculptors in Oceania could easily produce likenesses with the recently departed and the living. The fact that they do not points to an understanding of representation that runs contrary to an understanding formulated most clearly in mid nineteenth century theory of objectification, namely that objects stand in for subjects and therefore reference what lies outside their own constitution and is independently verifiable. A good example of such sculptures are known as *Malanggan*, translatable as 'likeness.' Malanggan are made for the final funerary ceremony on an island northeast of Papua New Guinea (Küchler 2002). Carved from wood they are destroyed after the ceremony if they are not sold to collectors visiting the island from abroad, a practice that reaches back to the earliest days of colonial rule. Malanggan figurines came to the attention of artists working in Paris, Munich and Berlin via Serge Brignoni, a Swiss painter and sculptor. Works such as *The Cage* (1930-31) by Alberto Giacometti and *Mother and Child* Henry Moore (1936) pick up on the open fretwork of Malanggan-sculptures and the enchaining of motifs that, although recognizable, do not depict what can be seen, but conjure up connections and associations whose conceptual and emotional underpinning eludes verbalisation. While Malanggan figures with their allusion to the intersubjective and relational constitution of the unconscious proved a hit for *avant garde* artists in the first half of the twentieth century, another corpus of sculptural and painted artefacts from the Sepik River area on the Papua New Guinea mainland inform the intellectual rethinking

of art in both history of art and anthropology in the decades following the Second World War. Ernst Gombrich's *Art and Illusion* (2002 [1960]) used the non-referential qualities of Sepik River painted house fronts to argue that the artist starts with a concept and an idea not with a perception. Taking the notion of schemata, ordering principles derived from redundancy, standardization and stereotyping in sequential remembering of one and the same storyline or imagery (c.f. Bartlett 1932), Gombrich adds geometric and mathematical elements as foundational to image making, an argument that is matched by the anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss (1963 [1955]) who argues for a 'canonical formula,' composed of algebraic elements and rules for their combination, to underpin cultural production from myth to images. The anthropologist Anthony Forge (1965) took both these theoretical ideas and resulting approaches to style forward to a comprehensive analysis of Sepik River art which constituted the foundation for the much acclaimed theoretical work by the anthropologist Alfred Gell (1998) on *Art and Agency*. The analysis of African art and other contemporary art forms, such as Australian Aboriginal Art, that have sprung up in the proximity of the art market, have, with the notable exception of Ron Eglash's (1999) attempt at a fractal analysis of style, continued to espouse the same historical, contextual or world art perspective propagated in Western art historical debates.

The ethnographic lens was, all too often, employed to further substantiate the European epistemological presupposition that the absent that is presented in representation can be revealed via discursive analysis of remembering (Ginzburg 2001). It is our understanding on this point that the disjuncture between the modern European need for historical contextualisation and the non-Western future-directed presencing, captured by anthropology and art alike, arises out of a misunderstanding that conflates the concrete biographical qualities of life with the abstract generative capacities inherent in the idea of relation.

Even within the canon of the Euro-American art market, this predilection for understanding art within the biographic, or lineal narrative structure provides only part of the overall frame. Take for example the series of photographs taken by Alfred Stieglitz from the early 1920s up to 1934, where he moved photography away from representationalism and into the realm of abstract art. While the claim that this was the first move in photography toward abstraction is troubled by the Vortographs of Alvin Langdon Coburn, there is a notable difference between Coburn's kaleidoscopic tessellations of reflected partial images and the pure lens-to-sky work performed by Stieglitz. The cloud work was started as a protest against the accusation (levelled

at him by Waldo Frank) that the strength of Stieglitz's work lay in the character of his seated subjects, not in the mastery of his craft. The simple concept of photographing clouds was, at the time, a very difficult task to achieve due to the limitations of photographic technology at the time. With the introduction of a new colour emulsion process it became easier to capture the details of low-contrast shapes in the sky. In 1923, he exhibited ten cloud photographs, titling the collection 'Music: A Sequence of Ten Cloud Photographs'. His subsequent cloud photographs, each called Equivalents, or Equivalence, where practices in pure framing. The sky was available to everyone, and the mastery of the photographs was, therefore, clearly Stieglitz's own. But while the biographical narrative of the pieces helps us understand the genesis of the genre, to say that Stieglitz took photographs of clouds in order to show that Frank was wrong is short-sighted and one dimensional. The Equivalence images, which on the whole are shot without clear orientation (though a few have parts of trees or horizon), destabilize the viewer, removing frames of reference via the framing itself. It is recorded that when asked by a gallery visitor what the images were of (Were they water? Were they clouds?) his answer was that 'it did not matter', for these were not representational images. Rather, they were lyrical images, they made visible and tangible the invisible. Whereas O'Keeffe's *Blue and Green Music* was the visual translation of actual songs played in the art studio, Stieglitz's cloud photography was its own novel composition, and the exhibition of 'Music' was received as such by musicians such as Ernest Bloch.

There is marked contrast, however, between the anonymous gallery goer's repeated questions asking for representation and Bloch's reported recognition of Music. It is an art form that, though simple, keeps out the outsider. This legacy of Equivalents appears explicitly in Carl Andre's work *Equivalence VIII* (1966). The reproduction of which, commissioned by Tate, is modelled after what was originally one in a series of eight configurations of 256 fire bricks. Each Equivalence was arranged in a different ratio of height to width to depth, but each had the same number of bricks included. Andre's work was considered important by the Tate Gallery because of his role as a father of minimalism, or ABC art (Morphet 1976). This art movement, on one hand exceedingly simple – and at times publicly mocked for it – is intentionally so in order to be off putting to audiences not willing to engage. The artwork, in its own dumb simplicity, being literally a pile of bricks, acts as a shibboleth, keeping out those unwilling or unable to engage with it in its own terms. This self referentiality, done within a clear art-historical tradition, is both the genius of the work and cause for public outcry over the 'waste' of public funds.

By no means, however, is all art in the twentieth century characterised by a selective weeding out of popular audiences and limiting access. However, even in popular schools of art, such as that of Andy Warhol, the similar play between overt and covert representation is striking. Andy Warhol's capture of the market of dreams, from everyday consumer items to film stars, speaks to the representation of what can only be remembered and informs, as a kind of collective memory (of meals had and films watched), inter-subjective recognition and empathy. His screen prints quite literally raise to the surface the generative, iterative and transitive nature of mass production, illustrating in indexical signs the covert relations that define biographies in ever so subtle and irrepressible ways. Warhol's screen prints and other artworks partake of the absent generative capacity of pass production in their own seemingly infinite reproduction and replacement in a process that cycles works between the category of rubbish and durable art value in a seemingly volatile manner (Thompson 1979).

What is covert, invisible and absent, and can only be recalled from memory via art like works, potentially is haunting and suggestive of an emotional weight that requires a different response. Such is the response of Doris Salcedo, whose work captures the political trauma of *La Violencia* in post-World War II Colombia (Princenthal 2000). Salcedo uses everyday artefacts such as wardrobes and chairs and materials associated with impenetrable walls, collected from the survivors whose relatives were among the thousand 'disappeared' in Colombia. Salcedo's work, while visceral and biographical, 'silently', as the artist puts it, 'scream the dead' (Salcedo 2005). The work is not, however, bounded by the specific narrative of the victim, but rather opens the gallery space to the emotional rawness of human loss and the limitations of remembering in the face of terminal, unrecoverable absence.

Equally underscoring the unrecoverable absence of biographical subjects, however in this case with a larger overarching political critique of the intentions behind the absence of these subjects from historical discourse, Yinka Shonibare's artworks deploy wax-print fabric whose trail of production, unbeknown to those who use it to make garments, exposes the lasting legacy of colonialism and the long fingers of capitalism (2004, 2007). Originally invented in the 1870's by a Dutch manufacturer for Indonesia, where it failed as a commodity intended to imitate Javanese Batik with machine produced wax resist fabrics, wax print cloth came to West Africa by chance and was adopted straight away, becoming the most common fabric for apparel. Wax print cloth is still manufactured in Holland, yet traded as a quintessentially West African fabric

whose distinctive intense high-saturated colour, consistent across front and back and branded patterns that play on modernity and on the practice of verbal punning distinctive to West African cultures, is exploited by Shonibare to bring to life the nexus of relations and expose the complex intentions in the vicinity of this fabric's production, circulation and use. In so doing, he highlights the slaves made absent from the history of slavery, and the indelible mark of this loss. Added to the props composing his artworks, consisting of headless figures clothed in wax prints, are potted flowers, artefacts of market oriented intentions and manifestations of relations whose immanence and interiority makes them impossible to unravel.

Conclusion

The lasting political impact of this sort of immanent, and externally impermeable, representation will, we think, be immense. Art has had, and will continue to have, a role in redefining science through the indexical work that shows, and forms, the systemic relations of knowledge making.[6] These systemic relations encompass different parts of the global system and give rise to increasing tensions around ownership, intellectual property and rights of representation (and self-representation); including scientific, ecological, medical knowledge and more.

The possibility of closing off is itself an artful process in an age of digital advancement that, through its democratising capacity, makes accessibility rapid and 'universal'. Issues of access to knowledge carry the baggage of twentieth century concerns such as universal education, civil rights, and self autonomy; but issues at stake in the start of the twenty-first century, such as energy and the environment, are not about access so much as management. In the democratisation of knowledge and resources – through programs seeking to provide universal internet access and locally sufficient wind and solar farms – we see an ease of movement for immaterial resources, at the same time as an increased restriction on the movement of material things (including persons). There is, however, on the part of media companies and others who capitalise on intellectual property, the effort to bring increased constraints on immateriality, too.

The art object at the turn of the twenty-first century is, then, characterised by the trickster switch. It is open, accessible, readily available – in galleries open to the public or on Google Arts and Culture. But, like the double coded aspects of Fourth World art discussed above, it is exclusionary and new art production is, as was seen in the publicly notorious case of 4chan's

Pepe the Frog, violently guarded. In an age of neoliberal equality and the ideal universal access, exceptionalism can only be maintained if the scarce resources of identity (cf. Harrison 1999) are closely guarded in plain sight. What we see, then, is the return to ideas of language as algorithm, rather than strictly for communication as such, which were common at the turn of the nineteenth to twentieth centuries. These ideas are beginning to be important again. There is now a move away from the late twentieth century interpretation of early twentieth century art, allowing for the exploration of elements in this art that have not taken up upon, but now stand to be rediscovered.