Identity of Work of Fine Arts in the Generated Process

Stjepko Rupčić
Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb

Abstract

In everyday practice computer is used as a means to achieve something. It is rarely used for creative production in which case we speak about the interaction with what the computer enables us to do. We may use the existing programmes as ready-made products as well as places which are changed by reprogramming the already existing programme and changing its settings in a creative way. Thus, a computer's intelligence is situated in its programme. By its nature any programme is a collection of various inputs, strategies and ideas designed to interact with the users. In the case in which a programme transcends the role of a tool and mobilizes its user, it becomes a language, a text, a communicative process. In the emerged identity and knowledge – those terms are the key to the hermeneutical and interactive processes: works of art. The paper studies the relations and aesthetical principles which have emerged as a consequence of co-creativeness in the circumstances in which the work of fine art has been created. It also addresses the problem of the oculocentric culture which, as a dimension of the majority, directs the perception of the crowd towards the traditional understanding derived from the Cartesian doctrine of bipolarity as the foundation of modern thought.

Key words: *hermeneutical, artistic process; identity; oculocentric culture; software*

Introduction
The Origin of Fear

The invention of photography in the 19th century helped demystify art as the only possibility to note the *objective reality* by means of painting or modelling. That fact precisely is considered to be the root of modern art. Modernists use abstract shapes and thus sway away from previous practices. Despite the obvious breach with utilitarianism and the predecessor's morale as well as the lack of the conceptual form, the viewers retain emotional reactions to the works of art. Modernists experience the past and the present equally by departing from them and not accepting the

technological innovation in the creation of art works. They consider works created with the help of technology to be kitsch which stems from cheap and massive production. They also alienate their activity from the mass culture of consumerism which they blame for endangering creativity.

In that line of thought camera is considered to be a potential means of making the artistic talent of fine arts *indolent*. Baudelaire finds it to be art's mortal enemy. At the moment when art touches upon technology and its development, feelings of distrust, refusal and irrational fear start to emerge. It is unusual that the way of thinking which enables art to exist can be so tempted; whether due to the fascination with the new possibilities which extinguish the previous hardship thus creating the complex of the *appearance* of indolence (?), or the possibility that indolence is a character trait which occurs for external reasons.

The intention of the author's research process co-opts all the circumstances in the process, regardless of whether they are obstacles or means of relief and newly discovered *shortcuts* which have emerged from technological conditions. The fact that the 19th century artists did not have to create colours from pigments and could use the ready-made colour did not make the artists grow indolent. Quite the opposite, it started a revolution of plenerist painting enabling artists to create in the nature, and achieve faster painting in their studios thus resulting in greater production. By its nature research process is such a state in which obstacles are used for discovery of solutions. However, that does not mean that in improved conditions the sense of investigation in the (artistic) process is lost; quite the opposite, creative energy is enlarged.

Continuous expansion of industry and technological inventions creates additional modernist fear from commercialisation of the work of art in the artist. This is in part justified as such trend has spread in all areas of performance, but as a by-product of development, and not as a cause of frustration and anxious perspective.

A common occurrence in the society is that the increase in the multitude of all the connections, relations, development…following the logic of the constant spread of the Universe, the existing places, is not challenged. They do not even occur as alternatives, but as a widening of the existing possibilities. The fact that photography could have created the appearance of a more faithful image did not bring an end to fine arts, neither the type painting which created academic-realistic paintings following the path of realism, nor the type of painting which gained freedom of expression through the possibilities which were *introduced* through photography. Even the realistic painting started a more realistic stream of realism by using the possibilities provided by photography which yielded hyper-realistic and other types of realistic representations.

It is possible that the fear of the development of technology is partially based on the covert arrogance of the achieved skill which strives to overrate one's status, which is then preserved in the most elitist fashion. However, whatever its character and

however revolutionary the ever-disputed technological development may have been, it has never disputed artistic production or slowed down (made indolent) creative efforts, quite the opposite. The fear we talk about is partially fake; it is not a fear, but an attempt at manipulating that concept with the aim of *protecting* the achieved positions, *protecting the society from the modern evils*, while in fact the aim is to present oneself as the exclusive protector of one's own position.

Multitude of Perceptions

Trasmus (2007) considers the artistic practices of the 20th century to be the starting points for the development of the process of creation through the transformation which is the consequence of interactivity. Various realities render activity through the simulation of interaction. Lyotard (2005) notices the loss of stability and order, totality, and great narrations which are inherited by the fragmented, partial and relative structures – the mini narrations.

The interdisciplinary nature of approach in the procedures, presentation in contemporary art, multitude of worlds *discovered* by Goodman (2008), plurality… visible in the last decade of the past century and the beginning of this one help deconstruct the frameworks of different artistic fields of activity. Artists as empathic authorities belonging to a certain age consume various types of influence. They lose boundaries: social, cultural, personal… use all the means they have at their disposal, artistic and non-artistic ones. In their desire to create and deliver ideas they are engaged in their environment without hesitation. Artistic procedures leave the boundaries working-spatial environment and often venture off into the non-artistic disciplines and projects as well as various studies. Such interdisciplinary natures of the styles of work, locations, and relations which are established additionally blur the answer to what is the role and function of the artist today and what presents a work of art.

This poses a question of how new technologies influence our perception, how they create new languages and new images, how they mix our cultural practices. The presence of media in all spheres of our relationships is commented by Guy Debord (1999), Marshall McLuhan (1964), Jean Baudrillard (2001, 2006).

Arthur Danto (1997) views postmodernism as openness, eclecticism of styles, pluralism of expressions, procedures in which everything can be a work of art. It was then believed that the crisis of art is merely a means by which one refuses to remove the *a priori* boundaries on what is allowed to be art. The relativized concept of reality which today actualizes the individual orientations of the artistic productions has its origins in the polyperspectiveness of postmodernism. This seeming uncertainty moves the most valuable asset of the artistic offering to the society: search for identity, questioning oneself, experiment. Today we inherit all these values which were recommended to us in postmodernism.

At the beginning of his book *Ways of Worldmaking*, Nelson Goodman (2008) states his famous thought that creation is remodelling, that worldmaking begins with the

known worlds. This paper presents a process resulting in a *world* (painting) which is created from some already existing results. In the presented process different worlds emerge with their numerous interrelations.

Exemplification of Abstract Painting

Working process communicates with the questioning of truthfulness as the category/ concept which finds its value in the conditions and ambience at the moment of conceptualization and analysis/reflection. Truth is less relative than conditions; they are changeable and as such create presuppositions for envisaging the truth. There are two views on the process in which the category of truth is estimated as valid:

– from the point of view of a contemporary person, when the existing truth is comprehended as a discovery and realization,

– when we imagine ourselves to be positioned in the place which evolves and thus state that change is the only truth and that the constant evolution of content, relations, values…is what makes reality, the truth.

The encountered exemplified truth is stressful-restricting. Scientists and artists change what they encounter through inner parallel processes which, by understanding the occurrences of the momentous settings, comprehend their accidental nature, their final shape as only one choice in the process which has preceded those truths. Then they set the foundations for the new invention by changing the ending or, eclectically, transforming it into a continuum. This paper develops on the existing knowledge – the language of expression, in such a way that the available technological circumstances are introduced and through them the process gets restarted. However, it never loses its stream of argument which may be followed through the development of the process only as inner pulsating which is completely unconceivable, invisible to outer/ objective perception. Each painted surface in a thematic painting has its own idea of the evaluation of appearance. Abstraction is always deeply present in the same way Parmenid's reduced particle is present in everything as the only true reality. This conflict of worlds is precisely what exists and at the same time confesses their truth, the indicator of reality which is being perceived.

An abstract painting does not have a topic and it does not strive to refer to anything. Such works act as expression by their sole exemplification.

Two Realities

What is the difference between Duhampes's marking of serially produced items as artwork and work on the screen produced after a creative use of computers and programmes? Still, we are accompanied by the fact that artwork does not only consist of the material part of the work.

If a mirror is given the possibility to be a work of art, the road to such a status should be studied. In what case do we accept a mirror as a work of art while in all the other cases we do not even consider it? What does this possibility of artwork creation lie in?

One poses the question of the *simulacre* computer image which belongs to the computer medium (we can see it on the screen while we are making interventions to it). If the image is computer generated by means of certain programmes, does it present an original? Is the sign for originality, among other things, that which we can continue to intervene with in the image if we so wish? What happens when we use computer programmes to transfer such an image onto a different medium and then change it by using a different technique such as canvass. As Danto in his work *The transfiguration of the commonplace* says that the reflected boys are not boys (1997, p. 23) and that the reflected painting is not *that* painting any more but some other/new reality. Just like the reflection of a figure on the water surface, that reality has no direct analogy, neither in its matter nor essence, with the first reality besides the fact that there would be no second, reflected reality. The two realities are sewn together just like Peter Pan's heel and shadow.

Contexts of the Generative Process

A computer enables a picture to be generated in ways preconditioned by the possibilities yielded by its software. Thus discourses of various positioning perspectives are created from which one may intervene and change the artwork. In this process the question of the formalization of aesthetics is posed as well as the question of the role of accidental nature of such a process (is there a difference between the *accidental nature of performance* of the traditional artistic technique and the computer stimulated one (?) since they are both limited by the features of their own technical circumstances). Can criteria for a critical evaluation of the ways of creation be established which would deal with the aesthetics of the generated image and what of the findings (do they exist?) which emerge in the process of generation which are referential for arts in general.

Postmodern and poststructural temptation of meaning by means of new settings occurs in the process of investigating the present circumstances, which is the case here as well since one lexical system is lost and changes into a different mode of thinking. In this process an increase in the number of possible tools enriches the existing syntax. While the work is being produced, perception is placed into the positions of new contexts and adaptation to the material realities which emerge from the historic circumstances and technical conditions of the moment. The idea of truth in painting and art in general, which can be subdued to the myth of the recognition code as the building structure, it becomes transparent that there is a certain consensus of expectations – *the insecure place* in case of the generation of painting. Following the gestalt incitement to experiment, encounter new situations, carry out change and the process of development, all through the integration of various techniques and approaches by recreating one of the basic laws of gestalt philosophy – the law of companionship, the elements of the given form may be defined only through the whole, the so-called gestalt and by means of the law of pregnancy. The whole (gestalt) yearns to be perceived in a structured, organized and stable way.

Gerhard Richter (Buchloh, 1986) recognizes reality as a new attempt at reaching understanding between individuals.

A generative process has its aesthetics and an open and interactive artistic potential in which the process itself is aesthetically significant. This involves further consideration of artistic results in the context of knowledge and hermeneutics. In order to view the interactive artistic practices/processes we need to define what interaction is and what we wish to accomplish. The problems we encounter involve questions about what interaction is, what is required of arts and what is the cultural identity of software?

Presuppositions of Cultural Identity

The cognitive character of the 20th century art which stretches throughout Hegel's (1974) promise of the *end of art*, abandons the mimetic consideration of reality. The postmodern anti-visual trait questions reality itself, the art. On those bases the concept of truth is questioned in the modern artistic process at the beginning of the 21st century.

Adorno (1979) comments on the existence of the aesthetic phenomenon saying that the work of art negates any outer reality by its mere fact of the work sui generis and that the work by its objectification through art *objects reality*, leaving a part as the aesthetic contents of the truth; *that which in its appearance is not appearance*.

Philosophers considered mind to be the possible mirror for the realization of reality. However, by giving attention to the mind, the thought, they set oxymoron paradigms: the impossibility that the mind which creates realizes that what it sees (thinks) does not have a mirroring potential which would enable it the role of neutral indifferent objectivity, which the mind certainly is not. The paradox is that the Nature reflects within us only upon deep meditation, but that the reflected reality is not *public*, so it does not refer directly to its environment.

Metamorphoses help tackle the problem of the oculocentric culture which, as a dimension of the *majority* directs the perception of the many towards the traditionalist understanding which develops from Cartesian philosophy of bipolarity acting as a fundament of modern thought. The subject gets affirmed as the undisputable place of the objective supervision, which only blocks it on its way to realization. It is naïve to believe that the individual who cannot be self-sustained could take responsibility for freedom and independent conscience with the skill to mirror the yet unconceived nature. Kant's (1957) research reality provides art with a final constructed-fictional nature.

Social codetermination of an individual's consciousness is linked to popular theories of Guy Debord's (1999) spectacle society and the mind which absorbs it. The upgraded mind then becomes part of the actual programmes for the restructuring of reality for the interest aims of the hidden-public users of the social and political power. From Nietzsche to Lyotard, consciousness on the lack of authenticity of cogito and self-realization as its foundation is developed.

Roger Sessions (1951) says that *it is not enough to have the whole world at one's disposal. It seems that the eternity itself excludes possibilities up until the moment when we discover boundaries*. After such a procedure, is *parergon* not an adequate term which completes today's consideration of the character of a modern work of art. This is contradictory to Descartes's principle of clarity and separateness of ideas. Derrida mentions so in the book *The truth in painting* (1990), while talking of an added part of the painting which is inside and outside of the work, and which promotes the unfixed nature of boundaries, the integration into the painting and outside of it. Paregon incites dialogue about the boundary which overgrows Descartes's clear separation as a constant certainty which feeds the intuitive character with the feeling of near truth. Such a truth anchors the spirit into a more meaningful reality which is closer to the unexplored reality.

Hermeneutic Approach as a Condition

Software develops and improves cultural and artistic practices by means of its interactive nature. Knowledge and ability by which the role of *software* as a means responsible for communication and identity in the environment as well as the ways in which the programme corresponds with its users disable abandoning the role of basic creative fundaments in the process of painting. Cultural and artistic reality, the interaction method and the reality we study/create in art will be used to decipher the context and determine *software* identity.

The cultural context of artistic expression with reference to the issue of the value and criteria is additionally relativized and reflected with the postmodern tendencies in the circumstances which incite the development of a responsible and constructive criticism. At the same time quasi-divisions are increasingly more expressed and reflected in the culture of sciences and humanities, implying certain consequences. With the introduction of the IT possibilities into art, traditional techniques may seem obsolete, while reactions to new artistic and technological languages are often intense and not constructive. Also, the apologetic relationship towards new technologies seems to restrict creative expression.

All art which relies on *software* to build it up is considered to be technological innovation due to the relation it has with the scientific terms and procedures. For that reason it is directed to the freedom of the choice of liking and too often fails to ask the aesthetic questions. Umberto Eco (1965) refers to such prejudice as the *undefined character of modern art*. In order for a beholder to experience a work of art and be aesthetically oriented, the appearance of the work needs to be synthesized in the context of new technologies, while it should present implicit relationships at the same time:

– Art is presented as the process and event, a work of art, so it is not deduced from that which is conceived and completed, the artistic one will not be an *a priori* condition which will define the nature of the work.

- By understanding art as a hermeneutic process, it is always intrinsically defined to be manifested through various forms. Such results are phenomena which can be viewed in parallel with the creative performance of art as a process.
- Directing authentic contents when performing a work of art is an interactive process which involves the artist, the work of art itself, and the audience (Gadamer, 2003).
- This interactive process requires participants to compromise: artists are present at the presentation at the moment it is viewed, while the audience are active and through the work they agree to contact with the truth.
- The hermeneutic process filled with a work of art is possible if the process is transparent and not contaminated by selfish interests or deceptions.
- The work of art as the horizon of truth in Heidegger's (1991) words needs a common space and a context of common knowledge, the consequences of a work of art built on truth.

When working in those parameters, generative art is created out of complex and interactive hermeneutic systems which are composed of the following parts: the artist, the beholder, the know-how (mostly scientific, multidisciplinary in its core), the software and computer. Is it possible to find hermeneutic concepts within the digital media? The determining factors and elements which form interactive processes are the knowledge and the linking systems (interfaces).

Interaction is the process which cannot be reduced to exclusively functional-operative efficiency. It is a complex intercultural process in which the conditions for development are necessarily free and democratic, while the context in which interactivity is realized needs to be the balance of the availability of knowledge and the variability of experience. Such exchange gives bases to the complete nature of the work of art which is created in a free hermeneutic process.

Conclusion

Therefore, the computer can be viewed as a means, a simple tool for the predicted effects which in their cultural idea identify and link a great number of consciousnesses into a unison and homogeneous group, equally or similarly informed and even similarly tied to the daily refreshed information. Social networks have the same ambition yet they only satisfy personal communicative and presentational needs for creativity in the sphere of social interactions. In such a case when the programme transcends its role as a tool and immobilizes the user, it becomes the language, text, the communicative process. In the so created *identity* and *knowledg*e – those concepts are the key to the hermeneutic interactive processes: works of art.

The identity of the programme we use we perceive as what is known, while everything else is the unexpected content mostly processed *above* the user's order. Knowledge which is built into programmes is not accessible to the user who will use

only part of it according to the protocol. In such a way a computer can become the means for incapacitating rather than widening of abilities.

The aesthetic principles and structure of the interactive digital systems of generative arts as well as the space of the methodological problems inhibit the development of the process of generative arts.

A great amount of performance in today's generative artistic production as well as a great social influence of that medium urges one to question the critical attitude toward the work of the artists who carry out such performances.

Such aesthetics may incite and incline artistic potentials towards generative processes. Art must be open, interactive and generative and so the artistic process must be aesthetically important. The value of a piece of art should be considered within the context of knowledge and hermeneutics as well as its artistic meaning, rather than kept within the boundaries of the instruments of advanced technology and its effects. So, one should notice what happens in arts in its digital surrounding and be capable of co-opting the existing artistic procedures into the new interactions issues.

References

Adorno, T. W. (1979). *Estetička teorija*. Beograd: Nolit.

Baudelaire, C. (1955). *The Mirror of Art*. London: Phaidon Press Limited /online/. Retrieved on 21st December 2014 from http://www.csus.edu/indiv/o/obriene/art109/readings/11%20 baudelaire%20photography.htm

Baudrillard, J. (2006). *Inteligencija zla ili pakt lucidnosti.* Zagreb: Ljevak.

Baudrillard, J. (2001). *Simulacija i zbilja*. Zagreb: Jesenski i Turk.

Buchloh, B. H. D. (2009). *An Interview with Gerhard Richter*. Cambridge: The MIT Press /online/. Retrieved on 10th January 2014 from http://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/ titles/content/9780262513128_sch_0001.pdf

Danto, A. (1997). *Preobražaj svakidašnjeg*. Kruzak: Zagreb.

Debord, G. (1999). *Društvo spektakla i komentari društvu spektakla*. Zagreb: Bastard.

Derrida, Y. (1990). *Istina u slikarstvu.* Sarajevo: Svjetlost.

Ecco, U. (1965). *Otvoreno djelo*. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša.

Gadamer, H.-G. (2003). *Ogledi o filozofiji umjetnosti*. Zagreb: AGM.

Goodman, N. (2008). *Načini svjetotvorstva*. Zagreb: Disput.

Hegel, G. F. (1974). *Fenomenologija duha*. Beograd: BIGZ.

Heidegger, M. (1991). *O biti umjetnosti*. Zagreb: Mladost.

Kant, I. (1957). *Kritika rasudne snage*. Zagreb: Kultura.

Lyotard, J.-F. (2005). *Postmoderno stanje*. Zagreb: Ibis-grafika.

McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding Media: The extensions of man*. London and New York /online/. Retrieved on 14th January 2014 from http://beforebefore.net/80f/s11/media/mcluhan.pdf

Sessions, R. (1951). *Harmonic Practice*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Tramus, M.-H. (2007). *Arts, sciences et des technologies : une démarche pluridisciplinairede recherche*. 8. édition L'harmattan, actes du colloque organisé par Daniel Danetis. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Stjepko Rupčić
Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb
Savska cesta 77, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
stjepko.rupcic@ufzg.hr

Identitet likovnog djela u generiranom procesu

Sažetak

Računalo se u svakodnevnoj praksi koristi uglavnom kao sredstvo, vrlo rijetko kao alat za kreativne izvedbe. Kod takvog korištenja govorimo o interakciji s onim što nam računalo omogućuje. U tom slučaju postojeće programe možemo iskoristiti kao gotove proizvode, a također i kao mjesta na koja se intervenira programiranjima na već postojeći program i promjenama postavki kreativno djeluje. Računalo, dakle, svoju inteligenciju posjeduje u programu. Na određeni je način bilo koji program, u svojoj naravi, skup najraznovrsnijih unosa, strategija i ideja koji su kao operativni sadržaj predviđeni za interakciju s korisnicima. U slučaju kada program transcendira ulogu samo alata i mobilizira korisnika, tada postaje jezik, tekst, komunikacijski proces. U nastalom identitetu i znanju ti su pojmovi ključ hermeneutičkih interaktivnih procesa: umjetničkih djela. U radu se ispituju odnosi i estetski principi nastali kao posljedica sukreiranosti u okolnostima nastanka likovnog djela. Dotiče se problem okulocentrističke kulture koja kao dimenzija većine usmjerava percepciju mnoštva prema tradicionalističkim shvaćanjima proizašlim iz kartezijanskog učenja o bipolarnosti kao temelja moderne misli.

Ključne riječi: *hermeneutički, umjetnički proces; identitet; okulocentristička kultura; programska podrška.*