

From:

Maria A. Slowinska

Art/Commerce

The Convergence of Art and Marketing in Contemporary Culture

September 2014, 288 p., 34,99 €,
ISBN 978-3-8376-2619-3

This book offers a compelling perspective on the striking similarity of art and commerce in contemporary culture. Combining the history and theory of art with theories of contemporary culture and marketing, Maria A. Slowinska chooses three angles (space, object/experience, persona) to bridge present and past, aesthetic appearance and theoretical discourse, and traditional divisions between art and commerce. Beyond both pessimistic and celebratory rhetorics, »Art/Commerce« illuminates contemporary phenomena in which the aestheticization of commerce and the commercialization of aesthetics converge.

Maria Aleksandra Slowinska studied at Johns Hopkins University, Yale University and Freie Universität Berlin, where she received her doctorate. She is now a Strategy and Innovation Consultant working at the confluence of academic research and industrial development.

For further information:

www.transcript-verlag.de/978-3-8376-2619-3

Contents

Art/Commerce: Blurring the Line | 7

Art Spaces/Commercial Spaces | 19

A Short Stroll through History: Museums and Department Stores, Galleries and Boutiques | 19

An Excursion to Texas: Elmgreen and Dragset's *Prada Marfa* | 29

Prada Marfa: A Site-Specific Installation | 34

Discursive Site Specificity I: *Prada Marfa* and the White Cube | 40

Moving around in Space: Minimalism | 48

Discursive Site Specificity II: *Prada Marfa* and Minimalism | 62

Discursive Site Specificity III: From the Gallery to the Boutique—White Cube Retail Spaces | 72

Moving around in the White Cube Boutique: Aesthetic Perspectives on Commercial Spaces | 87

Discursive Site Specificity IV: Other Art-Related Retail Spaces | 95

Art Objects/Brand Products | 109

What It's Worth: Economic Value and Aesthetic Value | 111

Art into Life: Aesthetic Experience | 123

The Dematerialization of Art: Conceptual Art | 137

Recovering Experience: Shifting Perception in Land Art and Performance Art | 153

Branding: From Object to Experience | 161

Transitions: Aesthetic Experience/Brand Experience | 170

Artist/Entrepreneur | 187

Modernism and Beyond: From Abstract Expressionism to Pop Art | 188

A New Art, a New Artist: Pop Art | 202

From Studio to Factory: Redefining the Artist's Work | 217

Where's the Artist? From Auctorial Artist to Entrepreneurial Artist | 226

Here's the Artist: The Creative Industries and the Creative Economy | 238

Lead Actor in the Creative Economy: The Artist/Entrepreneur | 250

Art/Commerce: The Question of Autonomy | 261

Bibliography | 271

Art/Commerce: Blurring the Line

“Ours is a moment, at least (and perhaps only) in art,
of deep pluralism and total tolerance.
Nothing is ruled out.”

ARTHUR DANTO

This is the time of aesthetic openness in art. Not only is it difficult to find an answer to the question “What is art?” It often seems pointless even to ask. Attempting to define art is a Sisyphean task, and it has been so for more than a century. From the historical moment in the 18th century when the modern understanding of art emerged as a significant philosophical concept in its own right, the forms and boundaries of ‘this thing called art’ have been much contested. Efforts to define art became a constant uphill struggle with the onset of modern culture and new technologies of reproduction in the late 19th century. It is during this time that art began to question its own categories. While a work of fine art had once had a more or less defined form (a painted canvas or a bronze sculpture), content (the human figure or nature), context of presentation (churches, museums, galleries), and producer (the artist persona as it developed since the Renaissance), these categories became subject to scrutiny and subversion over the next half-century.

Beginning with European Impressionism and Expressionism and then erupting with the historical avantgardes of the early 20th century, art’s questioning of its own means became a recurring cutting-edge strategy. As Arthur Danto suggests, “with modernism, the conditions of representation themselves become central, so that art in a way becomes its own subject.”¹ In dynamic interaction with practice, theory both followed and shaped these artistic developments. Today, we have at our disposal a multitude of theoretical approaches that try to grasp and define art by means of aesthetic theories that are, for example, representational, expressionist, formalist, communicational, institutional, or reception-based, to name the more influential ones. And

1 | Arthur C. Danto, *After the End of Art* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998), 7.

yet, any attempt to conclusively define art by means of these theories is bound to fail. If there is one thing to be said about the strategies of art in the 20th century, it is that a significant number have sought not to establish and confirm existing categories, but rather to subvert them, thereby questioning the boundaries of art. The constant subversion of these boundaries is a central aspect of the history of modern art.

Three particularly strong examples of the subversion and ensuing extension of the boundaries of art can be observed in three major art historical movements of postwar American Art—Minimalism, Conceptualism, and Pop Art—all of which would not have been possible without the trailblazing role of Abstract Expressionism. With the influx of European refugees and émigrés around World War II, New York became what Paris had been: the center of the Western art world. With Abstract Expressionism, American culture not only produced an original art movement to be taken seriously on the international scale; it was during these years that the United States (particularly New York and California) also gained relevance as the new international hub of the art world. The emerging American art market achieved worldwide importance, and the American art world became a motor of Western art for decades to come. Minimalism, Pop Art, and Conceptual Art reached critical importance in the United States at this time and have in common their particular and pronounced subversion of the categories of art. This led to an opening of art, both voluntary and involuntary, towards what had formerly been its supposed other: the commercial market. The convergence of art and commerce that results from this subversion is the subject of this book.

My study starts out from an emphatic notion of art, established primarily on the basis of Immanuel Kant's philosophy, which postulates that fine art (*schöne Kunst*), as opposed to agreeable art (*angenehme Kunst*), is autonomous from all other spheres of life and has no purpose aside from itself.² In their

2 | This should not, however, be interpreted as a total and absolute autonomy of art. For Kant, art's autonomy is to be understood in terms of art's being non-instrumental for other instrumental purposes. This still leaves art with the power to develop the human capacity for reflection. "Schöne Kunst dagegen ist eine Vorstellungsart, die für sich selbst zweckmäßig ist, und obgleich ohne Zweck, dennoch die Kultur der Gemütskräfte zur geselligen Mitteilung befördert ... und so ist ästhetische Kunst, als schöne Kunst, eine solche, die die reflektierende Urteilskraft und nicht tdie Sinnempfindung zum Richtmaße hat." Immanuel Kant, *Kritik der Urteilskraft*, ed. Wilhelm Weischedel (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, [1781] 1974), §44, 240. "Fine art, on the other hand, is a mode of representation which is intrinsically purposive, and which, although devoid of an end, has the effect of advancing the culture of the mental powers in the interest of social communication ... Hence aesthetic art, as art which is beautiful, is one having for its standard the reflective judgment and not bodily sensation." —, *Critique of*

famous critique of the culture industry, Adorno and Horkheimer take up this emphatic notion of an autonomous art that has no purpose but itself yet still holds the capacity to further human powers of philosophical self-reflection.³ Adorno further developed this view in his aesthetic theory.⁴ Adorno and Horkheimer criticize that this autonomous art is destroyed by the culture industry. Their particular analysis results from their experience of a politically battered early 20th century; it is a harsh reckoning with the historical consequences of Enlightenment philosophy. They argue that reason, the fundamental principle of Enlightenment, has been narrowed down to instrumental reason and in this goal-orientedness has been fundamentally abused—not least for the barbaric purposes of Nazi and fascist politics. In their view, the culture industry is an expression of the fact that the Enlightenment project has failed.

All the more, Adorno and Horkheimer hold up the emphatic notion of an autonomous art as the last refuge from instrumental reason. For them, art should both propose and embody an avantgardist ideal of negativity, fragmentation, and dissonance (Adorno offers Beckett, Kafka, and Schönberg as examples). When Adorno and Horkheimer criticize the culture industry as an instrument of mass deception, their critique is directed primarily against the instrumentalization of art for goals outside of art itself. In their view, this instrumentalization can be observed particularly in modern American culture, with the culture industry's primary goal of commercial profit. In light of the authors' historical experience, their critique has generally been explained with reference to an underlying fear of political instrumentalization. Yet, their critique is also fundamentally a critique of the overall dominance of instrumental reason in capitalist culture—for which the market is the quintessential playground.

Adorno and Horkheimer considered avantgarde art to be a potential force outside of these workings of instrumental reason. My discussion in the three chapters that follow suggests otherwise. Analyzing the three main American art movements of the postwar second avantgarde, I will argue that avantgardist art strategies have undermined the aesthetic and institutional categories which had helped to determine the boundaries of art, and that avantgarde art thus opened the realm of art to instrumental reason and market thinking. In a number of paradoxical moves, these avantgardist strategies have led to a separation of art and aesthetics and to a blurring of the line between art and instrumen-

Judgement, trans. James Creed Meredith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), §44, 135.

3 | Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, "Kulturindustrie: Aufklärung als Massenbetrug," in *Die Dialektik der Aufklärung* (Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer Taschenbuchverlag, [1944] 2001).

4 | Theodor W. Adorno, *Ästhetische Theorie*, 15th ed. (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1970).

tal reason. Both this separation and this blurring take form in contemporary commercial culture, a culture that, in turn, has become increasingly aestheticized. This aestheticization can be understood as a consequence of the capitalist necessity to constantly increase consumer demand for goods. Aesthetics and instrumental reason have thus become intertwined. As a result of these two converging dynamics, much contemporary avantgarde art can no longer be located in a realm outside of commercial culture or the workings of instrumental reason.

The growing intrusion of instrumental reason into different spheres of life can also be observed in the traditional institutions of art. Winfried Fluck notes that today art is often used “as a bargaining chip for securing the future of the institution.”⁵ Yet, this very intrusion of instrumental reason into art has rendered the institutions of art problematic themselves. This development has been pushed forward by the curatorial practice of various museums of modern art since the late 1990s, which brought luxury consumer products into the art museum and thus challenged the credibility and normative power of the museum as an art institution. Examples include the *Armani* exhibition (2000) or the *BMW Art of the Motorcycle* exhibition (1998), both at the Guggenheim, as well as such exhibitions as Takashi Murakami’s, in which handbags designed by Murakami for Louis Vuitton were both exhibited and sold at the MOCA and the Brooklyn Museum.

At the same time, the art market has become a fundamental force in the art world. Since the 1980s, there have been several art market booms, with prices for art rising steeply. Art has become a preferred object of financial investment. Accordingly, the art market has gained an increasing importance for the definition of art. This is not to claim that artists, gallerists, or art dealers suddenly started to define their work only or primarily by means of market criteria. However, as Olav Velthuis shows in his study of pricing in the art market, art prices are not just economic indicators of current or projected financial value. Prices have also acquired significant symbolic meanings, indicating artistic value, the status of the artist in the art world, and sometimes even the artist’s self-esteem.⁶

Moreover, contrary to some expectations, the art market has not lost its importance after the 2007 recession in the United States. Although the American art market was still contracting slightly in 2010, on an international scale art sales were increasing again, with the sales of contemporary art works

5 | Winfried Fluck, “The Search for an ‘Artless Art’: Aesthetics and American Culture,” in *The Power and Politics of the Aesthetic in American Culture*, ed. Klaus Benesch and Ulla Haselstein (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2007).

6 | Olav Velthuis, *Talking Prices: Symbolic Meanings of Prices on the Market for Contemporary Art* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005), 8f.

tripling between 2001 and 2011.⁷ Considering the radical openness of contemporary art both in terms of aesthetics and value systems, it is only a small step from Velthuis's account of the symbolic importance of prices to the claim that visibility and success in the art market are no longer ancillary to art. At this point, it seems there is one minimal definition we can give to art: art is what sells as art (in the form of ticket sales or artwork sales to institutions or collectors)—a definition that is based on the logic of the art market and at the same time reinforces it.

How can we explain these developments? One way would be to follow a directional, formalist narrative of art, such as the one presented by seminal critic Clement Greenberg and since taken up by various contemporary thinkers. Here, modern art is determined by its growing self-reflexivity and by the continuous reduction of its forms until every art form reaches its essence—for example, the condition of flatness in the case of painting.⁸ In order to understand contemporary art developments in the vein of such a directional narrative à la Hegel, one does not even need to be a straight formalist of the Greenbergian type. Another example of this view is the approach Arthur Danto takes, depicting the development of modern art as a continuous reflection on its own means and conditions. In Danto's view, this development is fueled by epistemological and, in contrast to Greenberg, not just formal concerns. However, in his narrative, too, art reaches a final point at which it is no longer definable by any aesthetic trait but only by philosophical thought. For Danto art now lies in “creating art explicitly for the purpose of knowing philosophically what art is.”⁹ The Hegelian narrative reaches its end point and realization when the definition of art becomes a question not of art, but of philosophy.¹⁰

When we observe the relation between the emphatic notion of art in the tradition of Enlightenment philosophy on the one hand, and contemporary manifestations of art on the other, a particularly odd twist is revealed. Although such self-reflexive strategies in art are meant to fuel the development of an emphatically autonomous art, they ultimately appear to lead not to an increasing autonomy from instrumental reason, but rather to the opposite result. This process is not to be understood as a linear development guided by an inner logic; after all, we are dealing with a multitude of actors and interests and not with ‘art’ as a unified entity or directional force. Yet, it does appear that several generations of artists and theorists have dealt with very similar concerns. The avantgardist

7 | Abigail R. Esmán, “The World’s Strongest Economy? The Global Art Market,” *Forbes*, 29 February 2012.

8 | Clement Greenberg, “Modernist Painting,” *Art and Literature*, no. 4 (Spring 1965).

9 | Danto, *After the End of Art*, 31.

10 | This self-reflexive turn of art can be thought in parallel with the earlier turn of philosophy towards its own conditions as it took place in Kant’s work.

motivation of overcoming the boundaries between art and life has time and again propelled the questioning and undermining of established categories of art. The contemporary consequence of this development seems to be not an increase in the autonomy of art but rather an undermining of its autonomy and its subjection to the forces of instrumental reason. Where art strategies work to undermine the categories and concepts that attempt to define and evaluate art on its own terms, the one crucial yardstick that remains is external instrumentality.¹¹

Contemporary developments in the art world indicate that Adorno and Horkheimer's fears of the subjection of art to instrumental reason in the form of market rationality have not been unfounded. However, the argument put forward here proposes an alternative to their pessimistic Hegelianism. Even though art might no longer be understood in terms of a negative dialectics that situates it outside of instrumental reason and thus outside of mainstream society, this does not mean that art has lost its cultural function or importance. Arthur Danto's view is a possible alternative to the Frankfurt School's pessimistic view of art in consumer culture. Danto proposes that the relation between art and aesthetics was only a passing historical phase. He concedes that art is still being made today, but suggests there is no longer a master narrative with which it can be fully grasped—no generational style, no developmental direction, no unifying aesthetic theory: "... if you were going to find out what art was, you had to turn from sense experience to thought ... to philosophy."¹²

Danto's observations seem quite accurate in view of the pluralism and de-aestheticization of art today, when art can take any shape the artist wants it to have (even none), and when aesthetic traits are no longer a defining factor of art. However, as I have already suggested, the teleological orientation of this theory, which ends with the overcoming of art through its realization in philosophy, makes it yet another take on the discourse about the end of art that Hegel initiated in his 1817-1829 *Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik*. Since then, it seems that art has almost continuously been reaching its end. And yet, somehow it never quite got there. Even the approach that Danto chooses—less pessimistic than Adorno and Horkheimer, yet still fundamentally Hegelian—therefore remains unsatisfactory. Danto's central claim about the end of grand narratives in art remains in tension with the core narrative of his thinking, namely the grand narrative of the end of art in philosophy.

11 | Wolfgang Ullrich summarizes, "Da sich die Kunst den Bedingungen des Marktes angepasst hat, braucht nicht zu verwundern, dass dieser auch konstitutiv für sie geworden ist." ("Since art has adapted to the conditions of the market, it is not surprising that the market has also become constitutive of art.") Wolfgang Ullrich, *Gesucht: Kunst! Phantombild eines Jokers* (Berlin: Klaus Wagenbach, 2007), 275.

12 | Danto, *After the End of Art*, 13.

The question of whether art has now finally reached its end is not at the core of my discussions in this book, and neither do I want to determine philosophically what is art. The question I will be engaging with in the following chapters cannot and will not be “What is art?” or “Is there (still) art?” or even “Is this art?” Rather than trying to draw clear lines between an inside and an outside of art, I will proceed in a slightly more cautious manner and ask the following: What different strategies, forms, and tensions can we observe when we look at aesthetic phenomena today? How do these phenomena relate to the practice and discourse of art as it can be reconstructed from the history of artistic practice and theoretical discourse? The truism is that whether something is art or not depends on whether we decide to apply the idea of art to it. In spite of my cautionary remarks about not trying to define art, I will be using specific concepts of art in my discussion. However, this will be primarily for heuristic and practical reasons. In particular, these concepts will be based on philosophical, institutional, or aesthetic theories and practices.

The motor that drives my discussions will not be the question of whether we identify certain aesthetic phenomena as art. Rather, the crucial question is how we can think about these phenomena in light of the historical stretching of the categories and boundaries of art. How do strategies that emerge from the broad institutional and discursive realm of art deal with the radical openness of art’s boundaries? How did we get to this moment of precarious openness? And what does this mean for the commercial instrumentalization of aesthetics? It may be pointless to define what art is or to determine art’s boundaries. It is not pointless, however, to analyze various contemporary phenomena situated on the unstable verges of art’s conceptualization. Such an analysis will not answer the question of what art is, but it will help us to openly and critically evaluate phenomena that navigate the blurry line between ‘art’ and ‘commerce.’

In the three main thematic chapters of this book, I will look at such contemporary phenomena from three different perspectives: a spatial one, one that focuses on the aesthetic object and aesthetic experience, and one that deals with the artist persona. These three perspectives are not to be understood strictly in chronological terms or as parts of a directional narrative. Rather, they are reflections of three principal ways of understanding art: in terms of the institutional and aesthetic context in which it is presented, in terms of the form and content that is presented and experienced, and in terms of the culturally legitimizing function of the creative artist. The three perspectives also show that the form, function, and theoretical conceptualization of art are subject to cultural and historical conditions, as well as to an internal dynamic of interaction between these three fundamental ways of conceptualizing art. When an art object can look like anything and aesthetic experience is conceived not as the exclusive domain of art but on a continuum between everyday life and the sphere of art, then the institutional (conceptual) and spatial (aesthetic)

framings of this object and experience gain importance. If, in turn, the institutional and spatial framings are undermined because artists move their work outside of these contexts or because the institutions undermine themselves, then we may need to orient our attention towards the artists themselves. And if these artists undermine their own cultural position by epitomizing market values traditionally considered alien to the sphere of art, then our search for a framing concept for art might come full circle and back to institutional or aesthetic concepts. A major consequence of these various destabilizations of art is the growing influence of a commercial logic, which today extends well into the core of how art is culturally defined and legitimized.

If we were to go in search of a foundational moment of these major destabilizations, it would likely be Marcel Duchamp's invention of the found object. This crucial art historical moment most famously manifested itself in Duchamp's decision to place a urinal in an art exhibition.¹³ Ultimately, we can trace all three developments that will be discussed in this book back to this moment: the dwindling importance of an aesthetic definition of art and the de-definition of the art object that ensued,¹⁴ the fundamental questioning of the art institution, and the undermining of the myth of the artist as inspired maker. Duchamp's pervasive influence on different avantgarde movements in art can hardly be overestimated. My particular interest, however, lies not in revisiting the importance of this historical moment in modern art for the theory and practice of contemporary art. Instead, I will look at the postwar artistic movements of the neo-avantgarde. These movements are unquestionably connected with Duchamp's work. However, contrary to readings such as Peter Bürger's,¹⁵ they should not be understood merely as feeble repetitions that confirm the first avantgarde's failures. Rather, the American art movements of the 1950s, '60s and early '70s introduced an avantgardist dynamic that has undermined the categories of art in unique ways. They effectively opened up the concept and institutional framework of art (in its emphatic meaning) to the commercial logic of the capitalist culture in which it is embedded today.

Against this background, I will elaborate on my argument that the convergence of 'art' and 'commerce' should be understood not as a simple instrumentalization of a formerly autonomous aesthetic sphere, but rather as a development that is closely linked with the strategies of avantgarde art itself. I will combine thematic discussions of contemporary aesthetic phenomena with art historical perspectives on the major movements of the postwar North American avantgardes. This historical horizon is necessary to understand contemporary

13 | See Image 4, page 56.

14 | Harold Rosenberg, *The De-definition of Art: Action Art to Pop to Earthworks* (New York: Horizon Press, 1972).

15 | Peter Bürger, *Theorie der Avantgarde* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 2008).

developments properly. The first analysis, *Art Spaces/Commercial Spaces*, will focus on the spatial and institutional framing of art and will be coupled with a discussion of the spatial strategies of Minimalism and the white cube as the paradigmatic exhibition format.

Admittedly, Minimalism questioned not just the conditions of reception but also such crucial categories as the status of the art object, the theoretical and art historical discourse it was part of, and the role of the artist as creator. However, my discussion of Minimalism will focus specifically on the spatial conditions of perception and reception that it suggested, and which it so emphatically and lastingly put on the agenda of art practice and theory. In its engagement with the conditions of reception, Minimalism's fundamental tensions—what Hal Foster has termed “the crux of Minimalism”—come to bear most strongly: its simultaneous realization and overcoming of modernism.¹⁶ Minimalism strayed from the emphatic and autonomous, or in one word, modern, notion of art as it had been famously championed by Clement Greenberg. It did so particularly in terms of the conditions of reception, turning towards the here and now of the viewer and thus effectively proposing a phenomenological opening of art. However, this phenomenological opening was counterbalanced by a self-reflexive closing off of the theoretical discourse of art, seeking to emphasize the autonomy of the sphere of art. It is in terms of the spatial conditions of reception that Foster's “crux” is most apparent.

Where Minimalism scrutinized the modes and conditions of perception in space, conflicted between a modernist notion of an autonomous art object and an avantgardist impetus towards a phenomenological opening up of art, the white cube as a paradigmatic exhibition format carries a comparable tension. The white cube is the physical manifestation of a modernist discourse on the autonomy of art, a space that presents itself as a neutral and neutralizing backdrop for the experience of the autonomous art object. It stabilizes the modernist discourse of art as a separate sphere in both spatial and institutional terms. In this function it has remained the paradigm of art exhibition until the present. Theoretical and practical critiques that started developing in the 1970s aim at demasking this normative, stabilizing function and the purported neutrality of the white cube. As a consequence of these critical strategies, which emanate from the sphere of art itself, the paradigm has become destabilized. Thus, the white cube can no longer claim to be a modernist countermodel to capitalist consumer society. When commercial spaces imitate or reinterpret the white cube exhibition concept, they tap right into a tension—I will call this the present absence of the commercial—which the white cube and its critiques have

16 | Hal Foster, *The Return of the Real: The Avant-Garde at the End of the Century* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1996).

already established in the realm of art. The white cube has entered a distinct tension between a commercial and a non-commercial spatial identity.

The second perspective I will take, Art Objects/Brand Products, will focus on the aesthetic object and aesthetic experience as key concepts in art. I will link the theoretical discussion of these concepts with an analysis of the core strategies of Conceptual Art. Notably, Conceptual Art did not only question and undermine the categories of art on the level of the aesthetic object and aesthetic experience. It also proposed a significantly new idea of the creative artist, namely as conceptual developer and intellectual thinker. Conceptual Art renegotiated the function of the artist by trying to leave out subjective intention, while strengthening the artist's discursive position instead. This established a complex tension between the de-subjectification and the (self-)empowerment of the artist. Furthermore, Conceptual Art also problematized institutional notions of art by radically declaring that art may be just an idea (and an unspoken one at that). This undermining of conventional notions of how art was supposed to be produced, bought, collected, and exhibited instigated what could be understood as a radical democratization of art.

The most consequential concern of many Conceptualists, however, was with the dematerialization, de-objectification, and de-aestheticization of their work. Art was redefined as not needing any specific materiality, and even as needing no materiality at all. At the same time, Conceptual Art fundamentally questioned the traditional notion of aesthetic experience as a dual experience of body and mind, a notion that had been proposed in variations since Kant put it forward. Many Conceptualist works undermined this notion of duality by decisively focusing on the intellectual side of the experience, all but taking the phenomenal, sensual experience out of the equation. While the dematerialization and de-aestheticization of art aimed at increasing its autonomy from market forces, a closer analysis of these strategies will show how ambivalent they proved to be. Effectively, the destabilization of core categories of art that the Conceptualists proposed finds a contemporary reverberation in the de-objectification of brand marketing and the commodification of (aesthetic) experience. These commercial strategies should not simply be understood as a late appropriation of Conceptual Art. They must also be viewed in relation to Conceptual Art's own undermining of aesthetic and discursive definitions of art.

Finally, my third discussion, Artist/Entrepreneur, will analyze the changing role of the artist in contemporary culture, suggesting that the artist persona in contemporary culture is increasingly converging with the persona of the entrepreneur. I will anchor my observations about the artist/entrepreneur by revisiting the strategies employed by Pop Art, and most prominently by Andy Warhol, which brought the artist out of the Bohemian corner and positioned him or her at the very center of consumer culture. In what has today come to be

known as the creative economy, we can even claim that the artist/entrepreneur is positioned as an economic role model. Of course, strategies employed by Pop artists were also pivotal in questioning the status of the art object in relation to the consumer product.¹⁷ While the fundamental change in the public idea and image of the artist was therefore by no means the only influential avant-garde strategy of Pop Art, I consider it to be the most consequential approach to undermining traditional notions of art at the time. This strategy appears to have come to full fruition in contemporary consumer culture.

In the case of the cultural image and role of the artist, the convergence of art and commerce reaches yet another level. What is taking place is not just an opening of art to the logic of the market and the increasing, even pivotal, valuation of the aesthetic in the realm of the commercial. More than that, it appears that we can observe a reversal of roles between the artist and entrepreneur. It is no longer anathema to art or to the cultural role of the artist to present himself or herself as an entrepreneur. In fact, the market success of artists like Damian Hirst, Jeff Koons, Takashi Murakami, and Olafur Eliasson seems to prove that it is precisely this entrepreneurial approach that is an expression of and a factor in the cultural and social legitimation of art. The new persona of the artist/entrepreneur is another case in point that underscores the difficulty of separating contemporary forms and functions of art from commercial considerations.

The convergence between contemporary art and contemporary commercial strategies can be observed on many levels; in this book, I have chosen three major ones. Using these three perspectives, I will read contemporary manifestations of art/commerce phenomena against their cultural and art historical backgrounds. The question this discussion will ultimately have to face is the question of the autonomy of art. Can we still think the concept of autonomy in art in light of these processes of delimitation both in art and in commerce—and if so, how? This is the broader horizon of my analysis, and the discussion will come back to it in the final chapter of this book. The question of the autonomy of art will frame a critical summary of my arguments while also opening up a wider perspective on the convergence of art and marketing in contemporary culture.

17 | For an overview of these discussions, see Christin J. Mamiya, *Pop Art and Consumer Culture* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992).