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INTRODUCTION

When the modes of music change, then the whole constitution of the state is bound to change also. (Plato, The Republic, 424 BC)

The subject of this paper is a study of the composite relationship between new media advancement and contemporary art. The author provides a case study of contemporary Egyptian art with a particular focus on the political uprisings of 2011. In what way does the rise of social media affect artists’ and exerts’ influence on art’s potential to offer an alternative to existing reality, its ability to realign the established order and challenge the habitual? These questions represent the author’s primary research interest. State-controlled media and politically-motivated reports provided by the authorities could hardly represent a reliable source of information about the state of society and the problems it faces. Arguably, artists act as the mediators of truth, who can challenge the established socio-political orders and reframe ‘le partage du sensible’ in society, to use Jacque Ranciere’s phrase. ¹ Or possibly, that is the way it used to be in the past. Does the recent advancement of personal journalism and instantly updated news weaken artists’ socio-political commentaries? Can contemporary art aspire to political agency when it is the new media, arguably, that possess the power to shape our imaginations and ideologies the most? To reverse the question, could Documenta XI which ‘presented us with a multicultural spectacle or a radical re-visioning of a non-totalisable representational space’² take place after the new media revolution? How do new modes of communication affect artistic production, alter its meaning and redefine the role of the art produced?
The year 2011 was a year of change for many nations in the Arab countries and around the world. The popular uprisings in Tunisia in December 2010 gradually spread all over the MENA region, toppling many of the old authoritarian regimes and ousting dictators who had been in power for decades. The unrest in Egypt in particular was labelled a “Facebook revolution”, acknowledging the primary role that the social media played in reshaping the routes and means of communication, initiating the protests and bringing people on to the streets.

Behind the politics, Egypt has historically had a vibrant art scene (compared with newly emerged art centres such as Dubai and Doha) combining private galleries, state museums, foreign institutions and local initiatives. Numerous Egyptian artists are internationally renowned, including Mona Hatoum, Hassan Khan, Adel el Siwi, Khaled Hafez and Youssef Nabil. This combination of rich contemporary art scene and political unrest and revolution, arguably brought about by the new media, makes Egypt a particularly fruitful example for the purposes of this study.

The effects of new media on contemporary art are manifold and are indeed impossible to grasp within the limits of one study. The research therefore concentrates on some particular aspects. One of them is the adoption by contemporary art of journalistic tools and techniques and the growing convergence of art and journalism - this phenomenon was thoroughly examined by Alfredo Cramerotti in his study Aesthetic Journalism. Cramerotti focuses on the traditional media; the present paper, however, applies his findings to the new modes of communication. Today artists are active users of social networks, and many of them ‘contribute to media coverage with their own political and activist expression, constructing parallel narratives and reporting additional stories, which can be commonly found on the Internet.’

The distinction between artists, activists and journalists is therefore being eroded.

This paper argues that the dissolution of barriers between art and new media, and hence, between art and life, fosters the commodification and monetization
of art. The argument posited is largely based on the writings of Frankfurt School philosopher Herbert Marcuse. The author suggests that, though written half a century ago, Marcuse’s theory remains a brilliant critique of capitalist society, particularly relevant to a world witnessing the crash of economies and the failure of democracy, a world which proves unable to cope with the irregularities that the capitalist system introduces. The relevance of Marcuse’s ideas refracted through recent political and technological developments is one of the crucial points this study makes.

Marcuse hypothesises that the ‘advanced industrial society’ promotes one-dimensional thinking, where any opposition to the system and critical thought are obliterated. The existing system of production and distribution acts as a totalitarian force that regulates individual and social needs and motivates overconsumption. The role of mass media in this ‘one-dimensional universe’ is that of manipulation and indoctrination; media creates false needs and fosters false consciousness and illusionary freedom. On the face of it, new media provide an alternative to ‘one-dimensional thought’ and inspire critical thinking by raising awareness and filling the gaps in the flux of information and commercials heaped on us by the mass media. This paper warns of the danger of taking the truthfulness of the new media for granted and suggests that they can commodify contemporary art production just as the traditional media do. The channel for such commodification is the instant reduplication of images and signs that turns art into a part of everyday reality which, as Marcuse suggests, transforms works of art into commercials. Featherstone (1991) further discusses the commodification of culture through the media. The result of this is absence of distinction between life and culture, when society lives in an ‘aestheticized hallucination of reality’, to use Baudrillard’s term, and the distinction between high and mass culture is being erased. New media, as this paper discusses, accelerates the erosion of boundaries between art and reality, which then reduces art’s capacity to challenge this reality, or to offer an alternative vision to that imposed on us by those in power.

Part 1. What is New Media?

‘New media’ is not at all novel. The term has been used by scholars of media and communications in the last few decades to describe various phenomena taking place in the realms of media, press and information channels. Eickelman (1999) used the term “small media” to describe innovations such as cassettes, photocopies, desktop publications and electronic email. These are forms of communication that were reaching full force in the 1990s to resist the attempts of authorities to suppress the printed and spoken word in the Middle East and evade government control of the mainstream press and broadcast media. As early as in the 1970s, these innovative modes of communication contributed to the fragmentation of political and religious authority by bypassing established mass media channels; they facilitated public dialogue on various social and political matters and fostered pluralism of ideas. In pre-revolutionary Iran, for example, audiocassettes spread the sermons of Ayatollah Khomeini and others, while in the 1990s videotapes of anti-regime preachers and demonstrations circulated throughout several Arab countries.

Today, by new media we understand various social networks: Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, blogging and other contemporary modes of communication all united by the common channel of distribution - the Internet. Through these channels the audience receives ‘non-official’ pieces of information and instant updates of news, eye-witness accounts in the form of mobile phone snapshots and videos, or simply the opinions of their peers, all of which either enrich or undermine dominant media representations. In the last two to three years the world has witnessed an exponential growth of these new media (or ‘post-media’ as they are also called). They facilitated the formation and growth of virtual communities of various interests, in particular, political, and arguably they played a crucial role in the uprisings that swept the MENA region starting from December 2010. New media represents both an instrument of transmitting new knowledge, and a source of knowledge itself. Blogging, Twitter, Facebook, YouTube - all these modes of communication are modern tools for sharing information, as well as sources of it. Therefore, each user can act as a potential sender and receiver. The
The participatory character of new media is undermined by the fact that every message is contestable and is a subject of discussion; intercommunication and reversibility of roles are its essential features. In discussion of the effects of new media on art and culture that are the focus of this paper, the author will use the term ‘new media’ as it was broadly defined above.

Part 2: Aesthetic journalism in the age of New Media

Today, on a growing basis, social media is taken up by artists as an instrument and medium for producing and disseminating their work. To use Marshall McLuhan’s term, artists exploit media for ‘extension of consciousness’: ‘when the creative process of knowing will be collectively and corporately extended to the whole of human society.’ Alfredo Cramerotti has studied how the artists embrace various journalist techniques such as interviews, archiving, filming and documenting in order to explore the reality, as well as in the actual process, of making an artwork where the outcome is often presented as graphic visualisation, text-based and photo reportage, or documentary. He has introduced the term ‘aesthetic journalism’ to describe artistic practices that involve journalistic techniques of investigating social, cultural or political circumstances. Cramerotti’s study was carried out before the “social media revolution” was in full swing. This paper argues that aesthetic journalism identified by Cramerotti still remains an important practice in contemporary art today; artists continue to investigate reality through the instruments that are normally conceived as journalistic rather than artistic tools, i.e. archive and field research, interviews and surveys. What is new, however, is that following the revolution in journalism that arrived with the advance of social media artists have also embarked on the extensive use of new modes of communication in their work. As a result, contemporary artists continue using journalist techniques, as much as these techniques have been transformed recently by the phenomena of new media: blogging, “twittering” and “you-tubing”. Cramerotti names art’s capacity for aesthetic-political objectivity and progressive criticism as a cogent reason for scrutinising the relationship between art and journalism. As with the media, art operates in the field.
of knowledge production. Art also employs images and documents in order to conduct its discourse on reality. The new media and art today, arguably possess even more in common. In both of these practices information and opinion blend increasingly into one another to the point where it is hard to tell where the border between the two exists; both tend to construct an alternative vision of reality to that produced by mainstream media and controlled press. Mosireen is one example of art-journalistic projects that emerged in Egypt in 2011. Mosireen is a Cairo-based collective of artists, photographers, film-makers and activists that was created during the revolution to record, collect, and broadcast footage from the ground. ‘They research and document torture, illegal military trials and detentions, or conduct live-streaming workshops from mobile phones. They also initiated Tahrir Cinema, which started during the sit-ins on Tahrir Square in July 2011 and was a series of public screenings that focused on counter-propaganda and aimed at raising awareness about biased media coverage.’

Part 3. Art merging with new media. Consequences for art
The paper proceeds to examine some effects that might develop in arts and the broader cultural sphere following the merger of art and new media. Arguably the marriage between art and new modes of communication triggers the processes of commodification of art and the gradual deterioration of high culture. Art and life all becomes one, where art dissolves into everyday reality, and reality acquires an aesthetic dimension to it.

Does new media de-commodify art?
Before examining the question of whether new media facilitates and promotes commodification of contemporary art, an opposite question will be considered: does new media de-commodify and de-
institutionalise contemporary art production, and, if it does, in what way?

Art painted on the walls tries to escape the realm of the contemporary art scene and the authority of art institutions, and therefore proudly announces its total independence and autonomy from such. Street artists declare they want to alienate their work from the entire sphere of art business, and they want to address entirely different audiences from those who normally attend private views and openings in art galleries. In a way, when artists use new media to disseminate their work they all become “street” artists. The online space where the work is exhibited is accessible to any visitor at any time, it is not subject to the power of state authorities and can’t be removed from the wall. Facebook’s ‘wall’ is the canvas of artists in the 21st century. By putting the artwork online, the artist strips the work from its normal exchange value defined by the market, and thus de-commodifies it. Art that is not objectified cannot be an object of fetishism.

Does new media commodify art?

At the same time, the presence of an image or the artwork itself (in case of video art for example) online leads to endless reproduction of the image, where the work is repeatedly ‘exposed’ and ‘utilised’. This strips it from the Art essence, making it a particle of everyday reality and dissolving it in the ocean of visual and textual information. Art made visible is made recognisable to the extent that the next step is selling it on T-shirts and mugs. The debate between autonomous and committed art has entertained both artists and critics for the last 100 years. Eagleton (1986), in his analysis of capitalism and postmodernity, argues that modernism is a strategy for resisting the commodification of art by removing art from the everyday world. Does art that dissolves itself with life automatically fall under the risk of rapid commodification?

Art and life in the aesthetic commodity world

New media comes into artistic work in a number of ways: it informs the artist of the present state of affairs and reinforces his social and political consciousness; it provides an enormous amount of visual information and thus affects his visual language by populating it with various signs and symbols commonly experienced online; finally, it is exploited by the artist to make his work available to the audience in the virtual space, to promote and make it visible. On each of these stages new media brings the artist’s output closer to life - by both effecting the subjects he undertakes and by shaping
the language he uses. Art also becomes part of everyday reality in the way it is delivered to the audience via new media. It literally arrives on our desktops, which neither requires effort nor calls for deep analysis and reflection on the part of the spectator. The artworks become incorporated in society, ‘they circulate as part and parcel of the equipment which adorns and psychoanalyses the prevailing state of affairs. Thus they become commercials - they sell, comfort, or excite,’ Marcuse derives. Media effectively blends art and politics, religion and economics, news and commercials in the endless flux of signs and images that saturate the fabric of everyday life. Commodity of form becomes a common denominator for everything and exchange value becomes dominate in defining relationships between the subjects. Something that acquires value and recognition in the media, immediately increases in value on the market - the public likes the familiar and recognisable - this is the primary source of media’s power. Hence, through the endless reproduction of images and signs, new media can become a powerful instrument, as well as a motivator, of art’s commodification. According to Marcuse, culture normally constitutes oppositional and alien elements - so called another dimension of reality. However, when culture approaches life the antagonism between culture and social reality is flattening out.

Featherstone (1991), in analysing Baudrillard’s writings, discusses the postmodern shift in culture from production to reproduction, ‘to the endless reduplication of signs, images and simulations through the media which effaces the distinction between the image and reality.’ The effect of this is that the consumer society becomes essentially cultural. Not only art becomes commodified, but in return commodities acquire a new range of qualities, or ‘imagistic and symbolic associations.’ As a result, culture is everywhere, ‘actively mediating and aestheticizing the social fabric and social relationships.’ Baudrillard refers to this as ‘hyper-reality’, a world in which the piling up of signs, images and simulations through consumerism and television results in a destabilised, aestheticized hallucination of reality. If we replace television by the new media in this formula, the outcome is very similar. The new media intensifies the process of reproduction and reduplication of artefacts, it bolsters the advance of an aestheticised commodity world where art and reality switch places. In this sense, works of art referring directly to the Egyptian revolution, such as Rania Ezzat’s live performance Be Safe O Egypt, or Ashraf Foda’s Stones from Tahrir (which are literally stones picked up by the artist from Tahrir square), also provoke ‘aestheticized hallucination of the real’. Another example is Nekh by Ahmed El Shaer, a digital print using 8-bit technique. ‘Nekh’ means ‘sit down’ to a camel, so according to the
artist the work aims to represent a ‘digital nostalgia’ in reference to the ‘Camel Battle’ on Tahrir. A recent exhibition at Darb 1718, a cultural centre in Old Cairo, called ‘Elections’ was dedicated to the presidential elections taking place in Egypt during the same period: ‘If you are an Activist, Idealist, Realist, Surrealist or whichever identity you portray, this is an experience that can’t be overlooked! It’s a momentous event,’ states the description of the show. Art in a helpless chase of visualising the quotidian gets caught in an endless loop of mirroring the media. It is so absorbed with the present state of affairs that it does not aspire to change anymore. The ‘revolutionary’ idea, image or event is being repetitively appropriated by artists. As a result, the message loses its critical poignancy and becomes nothing but an emotional and sensational garden for the like-minded. As Adorno and Horkheimer (1979) have warned, ‘repeated exposure to commodified mass-mediated entertainment activates and stimulates the senses in order to dull them, undermining the possibility of revolutionary action’. The rapid flow of images and constant exposure to visual expressions can indeed cause a sensory overload, a “crisis in perception” and thus turn revolutionary art, such as portraits of the martyrs on the streets, into an aesthetic anaesthetic. As a result, art that dissolves itself with life is inviting a passive viewer, while leaving the status quo undisturbed.

Deterioration of high culture

The history of the 20th-century provides two examples of the aesthetization of everyday life and the forms it can take. In the first instance we witnessed the migration of art into industrial design, advertising, television and fashion. The aesthetic dimension was included into products through the enhancement of their surface appearance. In the second instance, the phenomenon was promoted from within the art itself with the birth of the avant-garde movements that advocated the merge of life and art: Dada and surrealism in the 1920s and
Pop Art in the 1960s sought to demonstrate that any everyday object could be turned into a work of art if so wished by the artist. Art could be anywhere and anything, including the detritus of mass culture and the debased consumer commodities (Duchamp’s urinal and Warhol’s soup cans). This was a direct challenge against the classic definition of what was called ‘art’. 20th century avant-garde aspired to dissemble art’s sacred halo and challenge its respectable location in museums and galleries.

With the erosion of boundaries between art and everyday reality, the distinction between high and mass culture is being erased; pop culture and “serious high culture”, art and design, art for masses and art for elites are all equally validated. Arguably, new media, is a huge vortex that mixes all of the above and thus accelerates the erosion of boundaries. The ever-present new media stands firm in the favour of equality and democracy by granting access to all and by filtering none when ‘the alien and alienated oeuvres of intellectual culture become familiar goods and services.’

When approaching life, art liberates itself from its privileged position, and possibly from the demands that such a privileged position imposes. The developing technologies, be they analogue or digital, undermine not only the traditional forms but the very basis of the artistic alienation, and by doing so they can invalidate the very substance of art. As Marcuse warns, ‘when high culture becomes part of broader material culture it loses the greater part of its truth’.

**Conclusion**

Today, when the oppositions between aesthetic and life are flattened, when there is no distinction between art and activism, art and journalism and, for some, even between art and creativity, it is useful to remember Bourriaud’s remark that, ‘the issue no longer resides in broadening the boundaries of art, but in experiencing art’s capacities of resistance within the overall social arena.’ The primary question that this study raised is how do contemporary artists react to the pressure to keep up with and contextualise the arts within the most up-to-date socio-political happenings imposed on them by the ‘post-media’ society? The paper has sought to argue that the renewed process of commodification of aesthetic brought about by the advance of new media technologies makes the theories of Adorno and Horkheimer particularly relevant today; cultural industry, in other words art, integrated in everyday reality (via new media, in particular), is unable to produce change. One is left to believe in the power of autonomous art in its enclaved position, which can allow artists to resist and speak the truth. Such art contains the rationality of negation, and only it can stand in opposition to the status quo. Today we witness the development of postmodern society into a ‘post-media’ society which preserves certain characteristics of the former but transforms them through the on-going digital revolution. This intensifies the flow of images, signs and information on an unprecedented scale. When the all-embracing aestheticisation of everyday life (extending to the aestheticisation of revolution) has stirred the boundaries between art and activism, and art and media, ‘the distanced appreciation demanded by the artwork’ is hard to achieve. It is therefore up to art whether it can still stand against reality while remaining engaged, and whether art’s capacity to challenge the status quo can be ‘updated’ in the age of new media.
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