

Alluring Anamodernist: Action, Idea, Attitude, Pre-concept, Concept, Form and Medium

Lepota Lazar Cosmo^{1*}

¹ Independent Scholar, New York, NY, USA

Email Address

lepota.cosmo@hotmail.com (Lepota Luba Cosmo)

*Correspondence: lepota.cosmo@hotmail.com

Received: 8 January 2020; **Accepted:** 1 September 2020; **Published:** 10 November 2020

Abstract:

In the new, anamodernist tendencies, the contextualization of art, the contextualization of acts and processes, the tendency that emerged in performance and interactive art (eg, active performance then participatory performance) its reliable affirmation found in relational art, which has transformed this multi-ferential, in collaboration with installation, instructional art, place art, public media art, turned into one complex relationship. Development of art, out-institutional, out-of-place, transitive, non-conformist. Or in the example of an adversive act of non exhibit, a non-arbitrated act, a parallel and a counter-act, an out-exhibit that can only derive its meaning from a non-exhibit, non-event, event, etc. A work of art is not an object, but a multiactive variable, the ultimate product of experience, perception, presentation, publicity, interaction, positioning. The work does not have to exist, for an artist to exist, form does not have to exist, and even activity itself understood as interactivity with objects does not have to exist. Activity (more precisely, actions, ideas) the object-concept, relation, and actor (the viewer, not the interpretation). Work exists as action, idea, attitude, concept, pre-concept, pre-context. Form, activity, medium, object. Interaction has a long-lasting and mutual value; it is not the work that is produced but the interaction, not the means, but the effect.

Keywords:

Contemporaneity, Non-exhibit, Relational Art, Conceptual Act, Anti-Art, Theory of Contemporaneity, Interactive Art

1. On Contemporaneity

In this momentum, it tries to maintain a position of modernity, which is not at all as easy as it seems. Modernity though specification is not a concept but a reality. Modernism is also a whole series of modernisms, developing, inaugurating a concept that is philosophical in aspect, just as it is postmodern. Modernity is evolutionary, contemporaneity is a modality of art. The problem with art is that it is not retrograde even though it is decadent. The actuality is not different from now, that is becoming more and more ambiguous. Now is always the same, but it is more complex, diffused. Contemporary art is baroque, but not as one-sided. Contemporaneity is given a

holistic approach, a system of interpretations, multiple or multifaceted arts. Contemporaneity exists as a multifaceted modernity. The specific act of art is modern. However, modernity is actual. The baroque is a movement or all-system, a system of reality, but the baroque is still within the capacity of actuality. Art history's attempt to control contemporaneity - and with that the temporal flow of art events - by stripping certain art events of their idiosyncrasy and incidentalness in the name of some absolute system of value, was overwhelmed by the abundance of contemporary art. [31]

What is modernity? Contemporaneity is a metabaroque of facts. Diversification of univariate systems. Neither system is discriminated against. The system is a non-normative reality. [28] Art is a pragmatic, affirmative system. So, can the concept spare the normative conclusions about contemporaneity, is there anything like a non-normative theory of modernity. Why are all theories concepts? Normativity is a major error of conceptualism. The concept is action, creation. Actuality is first and foremost a real act, the concept is actuality not actuality a concept. From a pre-definition standpoint, the concept is an art act. [19]

Modernity is actual art, art should no longer think about theoretical repercussion, but about consistency. Consistent compact art is grounded in modernity. Instead of art theories, art of theories should be introduced.

Instead of modernity, the notion of modernity and modernity should be introduced. [23,24] Modernity is real and hence contemporary. Modernity is, as a reality, transcendent, always actual form of reality, one ultimate contemporary position of reality. So instead of system theory, we introduce a system of theories, instead of art system, we introduce a system of arts.

The point of view is neither modernism nor postmodernism. Everything is actual. [33] Theories of modernity and postmodernity. Without postmodernism there is no new age modernity, without modernism an imminent reality. The concept of art of full discretion should be introduced. Everything is art, nothing is impossible. There is no such art as non-art, or non-act. Hence each act has actual validity. Furthermore, we ask everything that is actual, is it consistent too. What is the concept of modernity? Contemporary art is certainly a permanent art. Contemporaneity is in the system of art.

The aim of anamodernism is to preserve the maximum deflection of art, the greatest civilization achievement of anti-art, one modalistic deact, deinstrumentation. To preserve a degree of modality as a degree of discretion, in this case greater discretion is the new standard of modernity. It seems that the system in its development, the system of theories and the system of movements as interpretive theories, has become effective as a standard, or a degree of discretion. To show that negative phenomena are consequences of progressive art.

One such tendency has emerged in a series of concepts, a modernity that renounces modalities, especially instruments, quotes, absurdities and who knows what.

Modernity is natural. Modernity is a modality of standards. So the whole instrument of reality is different, compared to modern theory. [12]

Baroque yes, modernity yes, but in the electronic age. Modernity in a system or dispersion, anamodernity, in a series of works, does not renounce absurdity, but also a series of imitative experiences. Modernism in conceptual development does not go back a phase; modernism actually acts in the modern act as postmodernism towards modernism, nor as neomodernism.

To see art in the manner of the revolutionary avant-garde, not as institutionalized object but as practice, strategy, performance, production: all of this, once again, is grotesquely caricatured by late capitalism, for which, as Jean-François Lyotard has pointed out, the 'performativity principle' is really all that counts.

Both postmodernism and modernism are a concepts, if only they are, unless they have emotions. Art does not act retrograde, but as a system of values. In this sense, reversible modernism, without being embedded in a particular system, or even postmodernism, without interacting with another system and the possibilities of art, are less contemporary concepts, more concepts of modernity. Ultimate capabilities or systems, which are contrary to the very definition or concept of modernity.

Each new modernism leaves less room for modernity, modernity seems to be exclusive. The absurd thing is, with postmodernism, paradoxically, by closing the intriguing space the possibility of modernity, it opens up an infinite capacity of modernity, new modernities, a complex, experimental, laudit plentiful modernity, modernity in the instrument, or modernity in relatio, but in any case a refractive breadth, a saturation that is in the creation of reality, an extra modernity. Modernity that enables, creates extra spline, extra reality spline, and even goes ahead of that reality, creating modernity to the extreme extensions.

Modernity is absurd localism, partial simulacrum, partial quotation. At the time of postmodernity, modernity is not a system-citation. Postmod opens the possibility for modernity, not only making it ultimate but also multiplicative. Postmodernism is a proactive modernity with these effects.

The main anxieties of the theories are limiting factors, analytical methods, reactions, reactive approach and settings. Theories are reactions, and avant-gardes are reactions. Every modernism seems to be a reaction from the previous one, while postmodernism is a reaction to total modernism (the modern system). [1,4]

The introduction of your article is organized as a funnel that begins with a definition of why the experiment is being performed and ends with a specific statement of your research approach. And it highlights controversial and diverging hypotheses when necessary.

2. Art Connotations, Systems

However, the main focus of modernism is direct relationship, direct art, direct contemporary art. In this sense, art is the radicalization of modernity, the immediate experience of reality. Immediacy is its originality, first of all in theoretical development we should plead the synthetic principle, proactive art, avant-garde method, complementarity, system, ambiguity. The budget of modernity does not exist, it is not diminished but is enlarged, according to the progression of facts and diversification.

In this sense, theories, and not just modern theories (as in case of postmodernism), are systems and should be treated as systems. In anamodernism, theory, an element, is possibility, disponibility, choice. Furthermore, there are no modernity budgets.

The question is not what can be contemporary, but what is contemporary.[8] Less attention should be paid to post-modernity, as post-modernism pays great attention to modernism.

Basically, modernism is a binary reaction, and post-modernism is a poly reaction. The theories are bilateral and multilateral controversies. Instead of ejections, it is necessary to talk about synthesis, it is necessary to introduce poly-lateral synthesis at the place of bilateral ones. Let's not forget the arts are the system, and as such they are multifaceted relations. Anamodernism insists on a polyvalent synthesis of -isms, more precisely in their introduction into a system of values, which as elements can be used and revalidated. These inter-territorial transfers, artistic transfers, happen individually, but not systematically. But for art to be a system, there are no exclusivities, there are systems, and there are exchanges, more or less homogeneous. Exchanges because art is continuity, system, nature. Means, procedures, format, and to some extent styles, are (re) validations of the art system (and hence of art systems). The value of the system is reflected in its contribution to the overall system as new possibilities for modernity, and hence to the individual system.

Modernism has no exclusivity but a synthetic proclamation. If it creates art as a system, the system is exclusive. On the other hand, the exclusivity problem is a theoretical problem not an artistic. Art is not marking, art is marking.

In systems of arts, not only one movement is created, but the system of movements. Functional art, science art, functional concept, art only performs the function affected to perform the function of exposure, zero art, art that is reduced to the minimum, with the convergence of art without art, for example, exhibit with just one act in order to distinguish it from non-art, art without art.

The discourse is attributed to these theories, and the attribution is used as a system, which means to talk about the semiotics of history, semiotic theories and their timeless significance. One does not speak about history but the present, semiotics of systems with a production in not only one but the system of movements. The subject and gesture of art is not more art movement, one concept or idea but rather a system. System of paradigms of past, or systems of paradigms, and system and systems of future paradigms, in positive theory of art.

If there was no theory, art would not doubt. Art works in the medium, and intermodally. Theory is intermodal, theory is the concept of art. The concept versus art, but the concept through art, the concept in art, the concept is articulated through art, it does not define art, but itself is created through art, not intramodally, but intermodally, not as an artifice of attitudes, theory of theories.

Actual art is a concept, non-actual concept is an imposition, the avant-garde does not have this problem. The avant-garde is nonchalant and actual. The avant-garde is contemporary to the experience of art. The avant-garde is actuality and every actuality is an immediate art. The concept is intertemporality in time. As we can see, the concept serves to develop a sustainable contemporaneity. Whether modernity is real or temporary art, is actual art also contemporary art is contemporary art also permanent art, how to preserve modernity in temporal connotation, without concept? That is, how to interpret a concept as a possibility or an experiment, as an element or a connotative means, as a timestamp. A connotative non-timestamp should be introduced. Beauty is a complementary value. Art is quality.

The avant-garde is immediate, non-invasive. Neofluxus, neodada, stuckism, experiment art, are noncontinuous, usable concepts. The avant-garde is a connotation, every act here is a connotative value. The whole series of avant-garde movements do not signify, and yet their concepts are reconnotation. [9]

If anything L.H.O.O.Q. (1919) is a more blatant attack on traditional values than Fountain. Duchamp has taken one of the most celebrated masterpieces of European art – the Mona Lisa – and defaced it. By adding a goatee and moustache, he has turned the enigma into an androgyne and underscored the point with an obscene play on words. When the letters are read phonetically in French they sound like the sentence: ‘Elle a chaud au cul’ (she has a hot arse). Commenting on his motives, Duchamp said: ‘In 1919, when Dada was in full blast, and we were demolishing many things, the Mona Lisa became a prime victim. I put a moustache and a goatee on her face simply with the idea of desecrating it’ [30]. The readymade, then, rejects the values supremely associated with the Mona Lisa and by turning it into an obscene image is primarily intended to disreward aesthetic contemplation. It gives expression to a profound nihilism. The readymades influenced later generations of artists, including Joseph Kosuth and the Conceptualists, many of whom wished to abolish the object partly, among other things, in order to resist the commodification of art and partly to purge art of aesthetics and demonstrate how it could enjoy an independent existence. The Conceptual Art movement, then, appropriates anti-art for its own strategic purposes.

The point is this: aesthetics, as we have pointed out, are conceptually irrelevant to art. Thus, any physical thing can become objet d’art, that is to say, can be considered tasteful, aesthetically pleasing, etc. But this has no bearing on the object’s application to an art context; that is, its functioning in an art context. (E.g., if a collector takes a painting, attaches legs, and uses it as a dining table it’s an act unrelated to art or the artist because, as art, that wasn’t the artist’s intention.)[16]

Art has to learn a lot from these atemporal modernities. How something contemporary remains intertemporal as a concept, and why that concept is reusable. Why Fluxus is the actual method, and why its act is renewingly reconnotative. The bids here are more than desirable, and not theoretical, though they are concepts. Answer: the reason is because the concept here is an act, and not invasive, non-connotative, contemporary. Neofluxus is an art concept.

Anamodernity is an act of reality, a real paradigm, an act-concept, not a pre-concept. Anamodernity occurs, like, interaction, extension. Art is a vanguard need, a necessity for contemporary and original reality, for a new act of new reality, the concept of direct experience, for act-transfer, transfer of real art (art-reality), for development from a controversy to a complex.

From the system of controversy to the absurd, from the problem of the absurd to the problem of modernity. However, to resolve the issue of natural art means to set it to achieve pure civilizational value.

3. The Twenty-First Century Avant-garde

At the same time, it is a fact that the avant-gardes of the XXI century lack new ideas. Some of the avant-garde movements are interpreted as remodernisms, so there is a mixture of avant-garde and non-avant-garde elements, revaluations occur, above all, some modernities, certain artistic groups are formed, or global movements, international organizations around some artistic ideas; these tendencies remain in need of a natural expression of natural art peculiar to remodernism, while artists recognize the necessity of modern techniques, and the convenience of established modes of expression, the means of articulation, while theorists see the necessity of new, non-modernist contemporanities. It is very difficult for art to follow avant-garde attitudes,

primarily because of the lack of technical means, new forms of art that would accompany new theories in means, mediums, originality. Rarely has any original theory created some great original art. Most often the case is reversed.

Theorists, on the other hand, seek to identify tendencies in a number of art pieces that may take on the properties and labels of new understandings. Art is practical, art is modular. The art is real. Art is in the instrument; without expression there is no possibility in setting to establish a new theory, modern theory seeks a new expression. Modern theory seeks contemporary expression. The term is already itself, auto-generative, that is, systemic. The term is explicit, semiotic. Contemporary art is an artistically-driven theory. The concept interacts with two types of art: theoretical-driven art and artistically-driven theory. The concept is the exchange of ideas and processes, means and ideas, ideas and acts.

The “value” of particular artists after Duchamp can be weighed according to how much they questioned the nature of art; which is another way of saying “what they added to the conception of art” or what wasn’t there before they started. Artists question the nature of art by presenting new propositions as to art’s nature. And to do this one cannot concern oneself with the handed-down “language” of traditional art, as this activity is based on the assumption that there is only one way of framing art propositions. But the very stuff of art is indeed greatly related to “creating” new propositions. The case is often made - particularly in reference to Duchamp - that objects of art (such as the Ready-mades, of course, but all art is implied in this) are judged as objets d’art in later years and the artists’ intentions become irrelevant. Such an argument is the case of a preconceived notion ordering together not necessarily related facts. [19]

The starting position of modernity is somewhat difficult, the technical expression of modernity is budgeted. Natural art is so un-contemporary because everything is said, what to say, what to do without it resembling repetition. Not only in style, not only in format but also in formulation. What if the demands of art are highly placed? What if the problem lies in the criterion, not the budget, of contemporary capacity. Means and media are objects, outcomes are possibilities, connotations.

Conceptual artworks, then, should be identified neither with ideas themselves nor with fusions of ideas and artifacts nor with sets of such things. I propose instead that conceptual artworks are imbued artifacts. They are physical objects, events, activities, or perhaps tokens of some other type of object - perhaps even ideas! - that stand in a special relation to certain ideas. [7]

Conceptual art might be considered as work that emphasized the underlying conditions of aesthetic experience: Language was seen as foremost among these conditions. Material form and sensory perception were made secondary to analyses of their discursive and institutional frames. [35]

The question is whether the concept can be proactive except in the present, every other activity is projection - that is, preconceptualization. The possibilities of the concept in the present are great. The concept is active modernity.

In the new, anamodernist tendencies, the contextualization of art, the contextualization of acts and processes, the tendency that emerged in performance and interactive art (eg, active performance then participatory performance) its reliable affirmation found in relational art, which has transformed this multi-ferential, in

collaboration with installation, instructional art, place art, public media art, turned into one complex relationship. [2,27]

Development of art, out-institutional, out-of-place, transitive, non-conformist. Or in the example of an adversive act of non exhibit, a non-arbitrated act, a parallel and a counter-act, an out-exhibit that can only derive its meaning from a non-exhibit, non-event, event, etc.

The problematic nature of anti-art is best illustrated by a crucial but ambiguous question, which Duchamp jotted down in 1913 when he was in the midst of an artistic crisis. That question was: ‘Can one make works which are not works of art?’ It can be interpreted in at least three different ways. The first interpretation takes into account Duchamp’s dismissal of Modernism as so-called ‘retinal’ art, i.e. art that placed painterly, formal values before ideas. Thus, the question could be formulated as: is it possible to make works that are not ‘retinal’ works of art but which embody a broader aesthetic? The second interpretation is more radical: is it possible to make works that eschew the aesthetic altogether and are the antithesis of art? The third interpretation gives the question a very different inflection: is it possible for Duchamp to make works that would not, inevitably, be named as art, i.e. could be anything other than art? It is hardly surprising, then, that the work Duchamp went on to produce between 1913 and 1923 is a mixed bag, and contains both art and anti-art in the strict sense. [16]

Cray argues that we should reconsider the role of the supposedly “dematerialized” object. Schellekens is friendly to this suggestion, stating that “we should be wary of the conceptualist’s claim that the focus of appreciation in conceptual art does exclude the [means] completely and art . [7]

To Leung conceptual artworks, then, should be identified neither with ideas themselves nor with fusions of ideas and artifacts nor with sets of such things. He proposes instead that conceptual artworks are imbued artifacts. They are physical objects, events, activities, or perhaps tokens of some other type of object - perhaps even ideas! - that stand in a special relation to certain ideas. [21]

In Big Torn Campbell's Soup Can the spectacular applique is literally alienated from its referent, but even in the untouched soup cans, this alienation is conveyed through the complete engulfment of the product by its packaging. Pop art is founded in such dualities in which Campbell’s soup, for example, may simultaneously circulate as an image of American family values within the spectacular economy of the media and as an inexpensive processed foodstuff on the shelves of every supermarket. Just as Warhol's EPI dramatized a model of subjectivity in which kinesthetic experience is always on the verge of transforming into mediated experience, his model of objectivity developed years earlier, established an analogous alternating current between the commodity as a representation and the commodity as a use-value. [17,20]

4. Referral and Activity

At 21st century, the relationship is understood as a concept. A work of art is not an object, but a multiactive variable, the ultimate product of experience, perception, presentation, publicity, interaction, positioning, positive impression. [6] A work of art is a synergy of all persons participating in the artistic process, on the other hand, the artistic process does not end with the creation, but with the perception, the effectuation of the work.

Indeed, at least two or more personas are required for art. The work of art is in its full meaning all that is about the work; we can talk about the complex-work, and its full effect. Publicity, recognition, attitude, popularity, perception, interpretation, accessibility, etc. are also included in this context. A work of art is a synergy of relationships and experiences regarding the work. A relationship is a complex experience.

New media is everywhere in museums these days-in the form of hand-held information device, installation art, display supports, and archiving systems, as a means to reorganize working practices, and to keep track of visitors. 1 It is used to make new kinds of museums, such as “virtual museums,” and to represent the things in existing museums. Most simply described as computer-based or digital media, it is the product of the convergence of mass-media practices. [13]

Relational art draws premise from marketing art, namely relationship-marketing art. The product is not an object of art but a variable process, relationship building, as further emphasized, is of importance to.

Interaction has a long-lasting and mutual value; it is not the work that is produced but the interaction, not the means, but the effect.

Since the 1960s an increasing number of artists have been taking active engagement further. Most famously, in the period of happenings, direct and physical audience participation became an integral part of the artwork or performance. Situations were set up, by the artists, in that the audience were meant to engage by actually taking part and so explicitly determine the work. The artwork itself is changed by the audience. Indeed, the activity of engagement became part of the artwork. Often with the help of electronics, members of the audience were able to touch an artwork and cause it to change. Art became interactive. [10]

The avant-garde of the 21st century is characterized by the mixing of movements, that is, the emergence of polyvalent art, and theoretical polynomials, complex systems and semi-complex systems. In considering the necessity of avant-garde incentives, a striking mix of avant-garde and neo-avant-garde directions, in a new connotation, avant-garde and neo-avant-garde, the distinction between the various modernist efforts of (re) modernism is lost; or modernisms and postmodernisms, metamodernisms, neomodernisms. [18,34] In this sense, there are specific connotations (revalidations) of the elements, that is, the art systems of these reconnotated values.

The values of the system are ambiguous, as they are reused (revalidated) or conceptualized inter-temporally.

Their values are reduced, clear, explicit, non-theoretical, or solidly theoretical (core value). The avant-garde is the first system due to its multifaceted act. The avant-garde is an act. The concept of the avant-garde system is always modern. The avant-garde is attitude, principle, set of activities, set of performances, articulatory forms, positive objects and processes. [22,26]

The avant-garde is an eye for modernity of any time.

Because of its mediation, the avant-garde is non-devaluing, general-valid. The less theoretical explication and the more explicit artwork, the more explicit reality, hence the more explicit extravagant modernity. Extravagant art is the answer to explicit modernity. Spectacle and attraction, underart; detraction, ritual, pamphlet, deact.

However, although a conceptual approach, the avant-garde is not an exploited or consumable set, but a concept act.

Theory devalues art in the long run, yes. Theory limits (temporally), art is a timeless sign. Dadaism is one of the most frequently revalidated art movements, and yet it is theoretically infinitesimally explained. Dadaism is a raw artistic act, an act without words. Reaction to reality, art that responds to reality. Yet we know so little about dadaism, though so much has been said. The act of the avant-garde is the perception of reality.

The avant-garde is the negation of everything but modernity, because the avant-garde is modernity. The avant-garde is both experiment and emotion; the hub and the absurd. Is an avant-garde tradition? Hard to say, but in the connotative sense, connotation is a form for an act. The avant-garde is an excess or affirmative. The avant-garde is actual against the mainstream. The avant-garde has no problem with the absurd, as it faces real problems. The absurd really needs to be asked if avant-garde is art, because avant-garde does not contain the problem of absurdity.

Art as philosophy often seeks to circumvent the problem of the absurd, by rejecting it or by falling into it.

The problem of the absurdity of art is exclusivity, not synthesis. Absurdity is understood as a phenomenon, that is, exclusivity, it is exclusive or obsessive. However absurd is the system, difficult to comprehend. Who understands the absurd will understand the reality.

The system is a synthesis of absurdity and reality, against reality without the absurd (and reality with the absurd). That is why the absurd is included in the system.

Although absurdity contradicts modernist efforts, which is, after all, evident in the explications of the neo-modernism series. The absurd is a modernity that is not modern. Art ranges from the theoretical absurd to the absurd of theory, art is an antimodern model. Art is artificial non-modernism. Artificiality has been re-evaluated by being put out of modernity. Artificially, something that is pre-modernist, that is, for remodernism, the artificial model of reality is not contemporary because it is not modern; however, the model is contemporary, and will always be contemporary, because it is modern. However, its modernity will not be a problem, because it is in the system and all other values and arts are contemporary, fetish of art, emotion or love. From reality to the absurdity of the medium, from the model of the absurd to the absurd of the concept.

5. Action, Idea, Concept, Pre-Concept

In non-figurative art, the emergence of non-exhibits occurs with the simultaneous revalidation of the boundary between figurative and fine art. The non-object of new conceptual art brings to the fore the problem of the medium. The medium does not have to exist as such in order for art to exist. What is more, the achievement of the new conceptual art informs us that the art of media exists without media as such. The medium is, therefore, a modality, a position, a human perception. Media is a concept and art is modal, yes, but since the new art of the 21st century, it seems that the activity or viewpoint of the artist is more important than the means or action (final product). [5,11]

The work does not have to exist, for an artist to exist, form does not have to exist, and even activity itself understood as interactivity with objects does not have to exist.

Activity (more precisely, actions, ideas) the object-concept, relation, and actor (the viewer, not the interpretation). Work exists as action, idea, attitude, concept, pre-concept, pre-context. Form, medium, activity, medium, object.

Hilpinen asserts that artifacts are products of human actions and activities, but not all products of human actions are. [15]

Art is intermodal and non-objective. Or is it an intramodal deact.

Non exhibit is an intermediate, immediate represent. Non object non anti-object of pre-contextual art.

It should clearly explain the main conclusions of the work highlighting its importance and relevance. This is where you describe the meaning of your results, especially in the context of what was already known about the subject. You can present general and specific conclusions, but take care not to summarize your article - that's what the abstract is for.

6. Conclusions

Complex avant-garde art is a relational activity. Relational art is, after all, one referral, and one connotative. How something is understood or used in relation to a specific value. However, here the value is what is put in the relation, that is, the connotative is the value of unique process. The concept is the value of all relationships. These relations are neither opposed nor given.

With the advent of digital art and multimedia art, formats gain new, incomprehensible conceptual capacities. [13] For example, the relativity of the color itself or the relativity of the presence of the image.

Transparent ground does not imply the presence of the media or the presence of the substrate, even more so it implies a conceptual void, or a conceptual absence. In much the same way as White canvas implied the absence of artistic action and not of concept as artistic activity. Grid Wall implies the absence of media, moreover the absence of an object, because the idea itself relativized the medium, relativized the color, even the presence of the work. In the relativization of the media there were certainly problems with the object, while the relativization of the funds resulted in better instrumental reduction. The concept occurs as a subversion or a deact, in the case of de-acts of the concept the result or outcome is the instrument.

Work is an instrument of art. Work is a reduced means of artistic activity. From White canvas (white on primed white) to pure Blank canvas and Linen canvas (no artistic intervention). A century of concept and act development.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

References

- [1] Barasch, M. *Modern theories of art: From Impressionism to Kandinsky*; NYU Press: New York, NY, USA, 1998; pp. 2.
- [2] Bourriaud, N.; Pleasance, S.; Woods, F.; Copeland, M. *Relational aesthetics*; Les presses du réel: Dijon, France, 2002; pp. 44.
- [3] Călinescu, M.; Calinescu, M. *Five faces of modernity: Modernism, avant-garde, decadence, kitsch, postmodernism*; Duke University Press: Durham, NC, US, 1987.
- [4] Carroll, N. Danto's new definition of art and the problem of art theories. *Br. J. Aesthet.*, 1997, 37(4), 386-393.
- [5] Cham, K. Aesthetics and interactive art. In *Digital visual culture: Theory and practice*; University of Chicago Press: Chicago, US, 2009; pp. 15-21.
- [6] Choi, S. Relational aesthetics in art museum education: Engendering visitors' narratives through participatory acts for interpretive experience. *Studies in Art Education*, 2013, 55(1), 51-63.
- [7] Cray, W.D. Conceptual art, ideas, and ontology. *J. Aesthet. Art Crit.*, 2014, 72(3), 235-245.
- [8] Gluck, C. The end of elsewhere: Writing modernity now. *Am. Hist. Rev.*, 2011, 116(3), 676-687.
- [9] Goldberg, R. *Performance art: from futurism to the present*; Thames & Hudson: London, UK, 2001.
- [10] Edmonds, E. The art of interaction. *Digit. Creativity*, 2010, 21(4), 257-264.
- [11] Edmonds, E. New directions in interactive art collaboration. *CoDesign*, 2006, 2(4), 191-194.
- [12] Friedman, S.S. *Planetary Modernisms: Provocations on Modernity Across Time*; Columbia University Press: New York, NY, USA, 2015.
- [13] Henning, M. *New media. A companion to museum studies*; Wiley-Blackwell: Hoboken, NJ, US, 2006; pp. 302-318.
- [14] Henry, T. Punk and Avant-Grade Art. *J. Pop. Cult.*, 1984, 17(4), 30.
- [15] Hilpinen, R. On artifacts and works of art 1. *Theoria*, 1992, 58(1), 58-82.
- [16] Humble, P.N. *Anti-art and the concept of art. A Companion to Art Theory*; Wiley-Blackwell: Hoboken, NJ, US, 2002; pp. 244.
- [17] Joselit, D. *Yippie Pop: Abbie Hoffman, Andy Warhol, and Sixties Media Politics*. Grey Room, 2002; pp. 62-79.
- [18] Kostelanetz, R. *A Dictionary of the Avant-gardes*; Routledge: London, UK, 2018.
- [19] Kosuth, J. *Art after philosophy (1969)*. Kosuth, Joseph: *Art After Philosophy and After*. Collected Writings, 1990; pp. 13-32.
- [20] Kunzle, D. Pop Art as Consumerist Realism. *Stud. Vis. Commun.*, 1984, 10(2), 16-33.
- [21] Leung, G. *After the Neo-Avant-Garde? New-Genre Conceptual Art and the Institution of Critique*, 2007.

- [22] MacRitchie, L. Marina Abramovic: Exchanging Energies. *Perform. Res.*, 1996, 1(2), 27-34.
- [23] Mitchell, T. The stage of modernity. *Questions of modernity*, 2000, 11, 1-34.
- [24] Moxey, K. Is Modernity Multiple? *Revista de História da Arte*, 2012, 10, 50-57.
- [25] Osborne, P. Non-places and the spaces of art. *J. Archit.*, 2001, 6(2), 183-194.
- [26] Phelan, P. Marina Abramović: witnessing shadows. *Theatre J.*, 2004; pp. 569-577. DOI: 10.1353/tj.2004.0178. Available online: <https://muse.jhu.edu/issue/9435> (25 August 2020)
- [27] Pollock, V.; Paddison, R. Just art for a just city: Public art and social inclusion in urban regeneration. *Urban Studies*, 2005, 42(5-6), 1001-1023.
- [28] Rancière, J. Rethinking Modernity. *Diacritics*, 2014, 42(3), 6-20.
- [29] Rothko, M. The artist's reality: Philosophies of art; Yale University Press: London, UK, 2006.
- [30] Schwarz, Arturo. The Complete Works of Marcel Duchamp; Thames and Hudson: London & New-York, 1997.
- [31] Smith, T. Contemporary art and contemporaneity. *Crit. Inq.*, 2006, 32(4), 681-707.
- [32] Smith, T. Defining Contemporaneity: Imagining Planetary. *Nord. J. Aesthet.*, 2016, 24, 49-50.
- [33] Turner, B.S. Theories of modernity and postmodernity; SAGE Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 1990.
- [34] Ward, F. Some relations between conceptual and performance art. *Art J.*, 1997, 56(4), 36-40.



© 2020 by the author(s); licensee International Technology and Science Publications (ITS), this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)