

Freedom! Not theirs (or: ...nothing new under the sun...)

Blog - 10/3/2019

Michael Grossmann, translated by Stella Grossmann

October 3, 2019

The only thing that can possibly reply the aestheticization of the politics is the de-aestheticization of art. Our hyperliberal system acquits itself from the political practical constraint and is therefore without alternative, as a necessity, therefore as only totality and thereby speaking of (design) freedom. But free is only the one, who possesses. The possession becomes a replacement for religion in our secularized world. And the freedom of possession is kept clean with a neurotic washing obsession.

With the de-aestheticization of art, its product (possession) character (its secularized, bourgeois cult) is lost. The destruction of the aura (Die Zertrümmerung der Aura, Walter Benjamin, *Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner Reproduzierbarkeit*, Frankfurt 1970, p.19) liquidizes the bourgeois concept of art through its reproducibility. The destruction of the aura becomes the signature of a perception (Signatur einer Wahrnehmung, *ibid.*, p.19), the destruction of the concept of art transfers to the mirrored aesthetics of politics. But here, reproducibility is confused with interchangeability, de-ideologized through the ideology of no alternative (*ibid.*, p. 49). The result of that is the aesthetic utopia of capitalist totalitarianism (*ästhetische Utopie des kapitalistischen Totalitarismus*, MARTIN JÜRGENS, in: *Ästhetik und Gewalt*, Gütersloh; 1970; p.19).

Art-art, fluxus, art as an anti-product, anti-art, no-art, dada, multiples etc... they all have stepped up to break apart from the established art, which has eventually lost its character as a cult(art) since the renaissance and has degenerated to a product through art(-art). Art galleries can hardly be distinguished from shops selling higher priced goods. But the dog likes to chase its own tail and the anti-art almost immediately became a good after being brought to gallery.

WALTER BENJAMIN's still very present essay *Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit* (*The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*), Frankfurt, 1970, is the first to examine the change, as far as I'm concerned.

The fluxus-artists ALLAN KAPROW in *Essays on the blurring of art and life*, University of California Press, 2003 and DICK HIGGINS in the first of his Something Else Newsletter (in: *Intermedia, Fluxus and the Something Else Press*; New York, 2018) firmly approach the topic with reference to the possibilities of reproduction of their time (HIGGINS) and the problematic of what to do with the anti- art if one is in fact an artist and the object therefore automatically becomes art. But art does not yet mean product here.