

AESTHETIC THEORIES AND THE ALTERNATIVES: REMIX STRATEGIES IN CULTURE AND CONTEMPORARY ART PRACTICE

Divna VUKSANOVIĆ¹

1. Assoc. Prof., PhD, Faculty of Drama Arts, University of Arts, Serbia.
Corresponding author: divnavuk@Eunet.rs

Abstract

The paper aims to review the status of aesthetics today, also to problematize its subject area (art) and eventually to mark basic relations that it establishes within the world of culture and media, as well as with issues of contemporary artistic creativity. On the trail of the postulates of the society critical theory and Benjamin's reflexions on "desaturisation" of art, the meaning of art theory, in period of sophisticated aesthetic, is replaced by one type of meaningless, technical-technological mediatization, directly derived from digitized interactive environment. The ruling paradigm, so called remix of cultural strategy detected by Lev Manovich in his article „What comes after Remix", doesn't leave enough space for development of the artistic alternatives, as for existing outside the world of media culture, as well the aesthetic theory which gradually loses one of its traditional subjects as it is art, changing by this also the current position, orientation and identity.

Keywords: *Culture, Media, Aesthetics, Contemporary Art, Remix*

The key issue we will address here is: "Wherefore art in the era of sophisticated theory?" At the same time, this issue implies the question of the meaning behind contemporary aesthetics, as well as the claim that, today, dominant (aesthetic) theories significantly - or even decisively - influence the modeling of contemporary art practice, or even the future of art as such. Still, it should be emphasized that this is happening in one very specific, or it could be said, rather indirect way. This symptomatic fact is tightly connected to cultural, media and market contexts of production of increasing number of pieces from the field of contemporary arts, in which certain transformations are occurring, which altogether subsequently has obvious repercussions on contemporary aesthetics and the theory of arts of the various schools of thinking, directions and orientations, as well as onto the field of the current artistic creation. Hence, the traditional aesthetic

theories, and even the ones of critical provenance, are retreating in the face of the idea of the comprehension of aesthetics as an ontology of apparitions, whereas arts, through the loss of its "aura", a metaphysical dimension or a privileged status, have been, for the most of their parts, assimilated into the world of the material culture, vulgar market relations and their acute and all-encompassing symbolization, which is occurring through the application of new directing skills and communications technologies. Consequently, not much space is left for an alternative action, not within the field of research of the aesthetics itself, nor within the framework of contemporary art practice.

In other words, in the era of theory (of watching, perceiving) prevailing over practice (the activity, action), the intensifying circulating, exchange and consumption of information in relation to standard working activities - thus, of the world of culture over arts - the aesthetic paradigm, when read as a synthesis of almost every (cultural, media and market) practice, often leaves at the periphery of its own interests the relation between aesthetics and arts. Hence, it redirects the questioning of contemporary research towards, for instance, general metaphysical questions of the ontology of genes (biology) or the quest for the so-called "divine" spark (theoretical physics). It is through these lines of questioning that the ideals of the ontology are being significantly transposed into the domain of fundamental and positive sciences examinations. To a certain degree, this reaches into contemporary aesthetics as well, through working on those artificial or theoretically generated materials that are being created beyond the too "narrow" field of artistic creation.

In this explicit rhetorical question, apart from

a partially proposed diagnosis of one *time of the culture*, i.e., the relation that has been founded among the theory and practice of contemporary artistic creation; the one that has been, in a certain way, twisted in favour of the unreflective idea that current theoretical platforms constitute the present art world, which in previous times - except for the intentions of Aristhoteles' *Poetics* for instance, or normative aesthetics from the era of classicism, and other characteristic historical projects - was not the case; a certain reductionism is being hidden. This mainly concerns the apparently varied world of aesthetic and aesthetical theories today, which certainly could not be reduced to an identical relation towards the entire empirical range of creation, reception and critique of the sphere of contemporary arts.

However, that would not mean that the thorough differences among those theories today are not being reduced to a minimum, and that they could not be discussed from the standpoint of some sort of conditional, mutual indifference. It is possible to differentiate them only in terms of the scope of themes (objects) to which present aesthetic theories are applied, while they, as it seems, increasingly lose their interest for the domain of questioning contemporary arts. This, in fact, means that for contemporary aesthetical standpoints art is not (if it has ever been) the privileged object of examination, but rather one of the various areas of interrogations, which have, in the meantime, developed a completely altered flow of their problem-based directions. This is simultaneously happening because of the inclusion or marginalization of the disciplines such as philosophy - thus, the philosophy of art and aesthetics - from the global development plan of the present cultural matrix.

At the same time, various theories of arts, while examining their own too broadly defined object, through specialized or cross-disciplinary possibilities of research, are obviously moving away from the traditional questions of aesthetics, such as those of the notions, sense, ontological status, or critically-reflective relation of arts towards the transcendental, historical, social subject, or the very art itself. One of the leading

reasons for this change is, most probably, that the mentioned theories or aesthetic explanations of art are becoming part of that all-encompassing plan for the development of culture, following the trends of its growth and rapid transformations. Thus, the strategic perspective of movements of the currently globalized horizon of culture, and within it, the theoretical reflections on arts, contextualize and undoubtedly shape the reception, understanding, as well as the production of contemporary modes of creating.

Concerning this, a certain number of contemporary economical theories and theorists support the comprehension of the (political) economy in the context of the exchange of cultural goods, while emphasizing the trend of inclusion of contemporary artists into the market flows of consumption (marketing, public relations, creating attitudes and the taste of consumers, etc.), as well as the aesthetization of the entire practice of market commerce in terms of consumer styles, as well as the production of goods and favours; in particular, those who generate their interpretations under the strong influence of Pierre Bourdieu's sociology, as well as Fiske and the British cultural studies.¹ Observing this empirically, it is hard to separate the economic from general cultural practice of mankind, where we wish to evade such a corporate behaviour that is being led and motivated only by the greed for profit.² This would be possible to avoid only by building the so-called *cultural impulse*³ into the commercial moments of productive processes as directed by the economic imperatives, which would then empower the weakened institutions, organizations and corporations.

On the other hand, conspicuously present tendency that the contemporary art world should be perceived as a special "sector" of acting within the culture, connected to entertainment and recreation or the increasingly aggressive impact of mass communication media (radio, television, film, etc.), is being framed in terms of technological innovations that strongly influenced the so-called performing arts, such as theatre, symphonic

performances of music, opera, dance, and other, as well as the co-called fine arts by theoretical literature directed towards this question; while the role of museums is being emphasized, they have a completely different role in the development of cultural and artistic life of our time due to organizational and other transformations made in the domain of introducing new technologies into the exhibiting spaces of current settings.

The intensified trend of growth of this sector, supported by technological innovations carried throughout the entire sphere of the industrial culture and entertainment, especially in the USA, Canada, Australia, as well as in Western Europe, could be tracked, as noted in the book *The Economics of Art and Culture*, as beginning in 1929 (firstly in America, and then in other countries of the developed world), and growing with the enlargement of the new audience/consumers obtained for this form of mixing artistic, cultural and amusing contents, which is altogether directly related to the question of meaning of art, as well as its aesthetic reflections.⁴

Hence, for the current world of aesthetics, the thematization of arts, as such, presents, according to our opinion, an inadequately attractive field of examinations for at least two reasons: firstly, the contemporary understandings of culture push out the original artistic creation to the margins, by trying to transform it into a socially and historically readable, and thus easily acceptable, cultural heritage of the world, or else, to reproduce it following the development directions given by a certain cultural policy (that is market orientated, as well as its management), as well as due to the changes that the very notion of art, as well as its practice undertake as a result of their clash with the effects of the so-called "media culture" that is taking over the primate in the terms of production of various aesthetic forms and contents, and the very reality itself.

The "imaginary worlds", as written by Dragan Āalovi  in his introduction for *The Introduction to the Theory of Media (Uvod u teoriju medija)*, "have already, since a long time ago,

become constitutive of our understanding of reality. This relation should not be seen as the consequence of the development of electronic technology and mass media in their present specifications. Regardless of possible religious or personal reasons, man has been developing, since the earliest time, an ability to take part in constructed, imaginary worlds. Until the development of electronic media, the imaginary worlds were most often presented throughout various artistic practices."⁵ On the contrary, present development tendencies, in the world culture, aim at partial or complete substitution of artistic practice by media creativity, which is then being confirmed by contemporary understanding of media, as well as of art. Certainly, without these cultural, or media, contexts that inform the recognition of crucial questions from the field of contemporary aesthetic theory, the present art could not be understood, nor created/produced.

This briefly described situation dictates, at the same time, theoretical interest for questions of contemporary arts causing its gradual transposition towards their questioning in the context of various interpretations from the world of culture, media and economy, assimilating this group of problems into the domain of broad determinations of cultural and media studies. In that sense, the contemporary aesthetics, through its interests, coincides and corresponds to the object based interests of especially those two theoretical disciplines,⁶ while they, reciprocally, impact the redefining of traditional objects of aesthetic examinations. As a specific ideological creation of present times, as the aesthetics used to be, cultural studies situate themselves in those same interpretative contexts, those that they theoretically (and practically) produce along with their values. Cultural pluralism, multi- and interculturality, the notions of Otherness and Difference, cultural and/or alternative identities, relations: local – global, and so on, became the topics of not only cultural, but also media studies, and indirectly of the present aesthetics as well.

This is especially apparent within examinations of the popular culture and its

phenomena, which broke down the barrier that has been uncritically held throughout centuries among the so-called "high" and popular culture (as the "lower" form of cultural expression and action) and disrupted the traditional aesthetic valorisation of the art world in relation to kitsch and potboiler, which consequently influenced the implicit preservation of those differences. On the other hand, actual market mediations among the phenomena of contemporary arts and the audience⁷ led to the rising commercialization of this sphere, while aiming at its democratization (that is, its potential availability to consumers) and the growth of its profitability. Warhol's pop art adequately illustrates the loss of these borders in the creative practice itself: that contemporary art could present a cultural artifact as well as the highly commercialized product of the world of popular culture. This way, the artistic audience and market are gaining the power of standardization of artistic and cultural products, by undertaking the function of "prescription" of normative aesthetics' values, while the art critique is being more often redefined as the skill of PR.

Except for the market, as it is written by Mirosljub Radojkoviæ in his study *The Medium Syndrome (Medium sindrom)*, the currently performed communications revolution "engraved an inevitable mark into the culture. Books, newspapers, film and television imposed a dilemma: elite or mass culture."⁸ The technical democratization and lower prices of cultural goods have standardized cultural creations, making them closer to the taste of a broader audience, comments Radojkoviæ. "In return, the creativity is industrialized (team work), the dominantly present mass taste inclines the fall, the functional illiteracy spreads, the language dries out, the subcultures and countercultures sprout. If the already standardized communications technology destroyed the aura surrounding the artistic objects, it is only logical that in the next step it will destroy the aura around the creator (...). Communications technology has already penetrated into the ontology"⁹ unequivocally concludes this author.

Generally speaking, contemporary (aesthetic)

theory, through its research directed towards media as well as culture and art in general, followed the intense technological growth within the field of mass communication and, to some extent, it absorbed it ideologically, by turning the mass media paradigm into the *here* and *now* of contemporary culture. At the same time, it determined the directions and frameworks of total activity within the field of artistic creation. Thus, the future of arts has been uncritically brought into relation with the so-called new technologies and their expressive, distributive and consuming possibilities, which had as a consequence the "mediatization" of contemporary arts, and determined its movement towards the sphere of multimedia. The identical process, the one that logically preceded this event, took place within the so-called media convergences, which after all led to the characteristic "mixture of genres" of arts and media, and, within the range of global culture movements and existing market relations, encouraged this very transformation through their interests.

Many applied aesthetic and media theories of our time, perceived and problematized "the loss of aura" of art work in the era of technical reproducibility in a relatively correct, analytical and reflective way.¹⁰ However, throughout their analysis or critique they did not reach the essence and completion of the problem in most of the cases, which indirectly further supported the strengthening of existing connections among the world of culture, market and media, or technology on one side and the contemporary arts on the other while the entire area of theory could be "read" as one of the (many) texts of contemporary culture. In brief, the contemporary market, mass media and new technologies, generate one culture that significantly determined the direction of theoretical interpretations of the world of contemporary experiences, as well as of contemporary arts.

Still, it is evident that the present cultural context of research is, above all, materialistically determined. There from the aesthetic interpretations of the art world, or experience in general, today fewer in number, which preserve

an idealistic tendency of the approach to its object, avoid the thematization of technology in relation to the relevant artistic practice, while, on the contrary, one, and not that small number of aesthetic and artistic theories and theoretists hypostatize this newly-founded relation among the world of technology and arts. This, at the same time does not mean that – although the materialistic position is strongly present in contemporary creations – this situation is reflected upon enough, or else, sufficiently critically questioned in our time.

However, it is interesting that the newest culturally-media, as well as socially-economical paradigm, the one in which the contemporary arts occurs, generates at the same time the new profile of artists as creators, those who create their poetics in correspondence to the tasks given by the theoretical movement within contemporary aesthetics. In this sense, the characteristic example is one of Lev Manovich, a visual artist who explores the possibilities of his expression through the means used by new tools and communicational technologies, which has, after all, resulted with his works from the field of theory of arts and media, and a construction of a new approach to aesthetics and new aesthetic phenomena, or culture, media and contemporary art practice.¹¹

In his program text “What comes after Remix”, led by the vocabulary of contemporary DJ subcultures, Manovich notices that after the experience of postmodernism of the 1980s, the main cultural term at the beginning of the 21st century is the syntagm “remix culture”, which alludes to fusion, collaging, and, in general terms, the mixture of various “cultural and living styles” present within the field of music, fashion, design, web application, and so on.¹² Remix is also that complex synthesis of various shapes of culture, or else, current cultural practice that strategically connects with the activities of postmodernism, as well as processes of globalization and the so-called new (artistic) media, which is altogether articulated by the contemporary media aesthetics.¹³

Although, at first, connected to current cultural patterns and phenomena, the

remixability as a potential of specific media combinatorics, the one that is moving towards a multimedia artistic expression, presents, according to Manovich’s impressions, the leading aesthetic demand of our time, which faces the contemporary artists with the new challenges of “collaging” different media and media technologies. Sometimes, this hybridization is visually clear and observable, and sometimes it is a combination or juxtaposition of visual and “visible” artistic components, or of various media forms and techniques of expressions, so that they manifest the visible as well as the invisible effects of this type of collaging. Remix is thus, in its base, not only that what it manifests, but also the latent (and sensory un-receptive) element of cultural creation, while the entire reality, as well as the potential of culture, understood in this way, determines the world of new media and communications technologies.

In that sense, contemporary aesthetics, according to Manovich’s suggestions, explores (or should explore) what is “behind” those effects of art. It is clear that they are being produced intentionally, for instance similarly to the “special effects” in contemporary films, but not always with the intention to be noticed. However, this is not, as it could appear at the first glance, some unreflected metaphysicality of the artwork itself, but rather its technologically constructed assumptions, according to which Manovich’s theory (and poetics) significantly differs from other aesthetic-metaphysical exertions of his predecessors. Thus, in the case of theoretical reflections of this artist – that are symptomatic for the entire scene of applying the newest technological accomplishments within the domain of polymedia arts – it is definitely not the traditional thinking of essentialism and metaphysical connotations that determine certain levels of artistic work(s), but rather the generic (software) characteristics of that which enables, determines and finally constructs “aesthetic” effects within the reception of the large number of contemporary artworks.

In his farsightedness, Manovich goes even further, and anticipates the existence of the so-

called postmedia aesthetics,¹⁴ the one that would postulate the aesthetic (creative and consuming) experiences after the era of remix. Postmedia aesthetics is, thus, determined as that theoretical position that within itself integrates the experience of previous media culture, the ones that accomplished itself within the frameworks of a broad spectrum of activities of the so-called new media. The culture is, in this interpretative frame, seen as a completely circular cultural software, or else, that media creation that its continuum provides as a technical (electronic) synthesized creation, along with all its artistic derivatives.

According to Manovich's understanding, the change within its relation towards the traditional aesthetics, which art typologically determines led by the very medium of creation, while dividing, through that, artistic disciplines into the so-called temporal (music, dance) and spatial ones (painting, sculpture, architecture), occurred once the media of mass communication used in the function of an artistic expression, and above all photography and film, followed by the television *as the mass media* and video *as the artistic media*, practically levelled this traditional distinction and typology by translating it into the differentiation that was concerned with the distribution of artworks, which was/became then an economical, that is social (and, finally – technical) issue, rather than an aesthetic question.

Further on, the fields of culture, arts and traditional aesthetics, as thought by Manovich, went through a fundamental transformation, due to the expansion of media of mass communication of the 60s, and then, also digital media of the 80s and 90s. While the first phase of this change brought into question the difference between the artistic media and the ones of mass communication, the second phase of the so-called "digital attack," which is performed by the new so-called digital media in relation to electronic media of mass communication, significantly changed the modes of production, storage and distribution of information and artifacts by simultaneously attempting to perform one all-encompassing digitalization of

every one of the existing media forms and contents, or of their combination (of electronic and digital contents) within an unified media (infra)structure of a global character.

In other words, the change of traditional notion of the (artistic) medium influenced the transformation of the very idea of entire culture, of traditional art and its aesthetic paradigm, which has, reciprocally acted upon the creative practice of artists and art groups that actually act within the space of *post-digital* and *post-net* culture. Revolutionary change that is taking place today within the field of media (which are not that any longer in the sense of the traditional notion, but are rather established within the computer technologies), claims Manovich, does not refer anymore to the concrete material, as to the medium in which an art piece is articulated or produced, but rather to the technology in which the piece is being created and represented, that is, distributed to its users. Apart from the fact that this technology is digital, it is also becoming more interactive, which means that the notion of the authorship of a piece is brought into question, not only technically but also essentially. This then gives to the users broader possibilities of manoeuvring within the open field of creative expression (co-authorship).

Along with the developing co-authorship concept of creative behavior within artistic media today, the larger number of pieces are occurring as a result of a group (collective) interactive action (for instance Internet theatre, particular literal and music creations written deliberately for the computers or Internet, and other), which is being indicated by general technological presumptions of articulating media culture, as well as theoretical literature which follows, reflects, brings into question, or else, subverts and critiques, and also partially supports, these artistic strategies.

And not only that. The starting binary opposition: author – user of an artwork, is becoming increasingly complex due to the growing replacement of authors by interest coalitions of artists, philosophers, aestheticians and theorists on one hand, and engineers/designers, or creators of a certain computer

program that is being necessary for the realization of an artistically or theoretically shaped idea, on the other hand. This would mean that sometimes the theoretical (aesthetic, philosophical, as well as ideological, that is political) concepts change the original artistic ideas, while, on the other hand, appropriate technological solutions substitute artistic dispositions of realizing a piece, process, action or artistic project, entirely or in its parts.

These are, certainly, the effects of the switch that consists of the fact that (aesthetic) theory and poetics are declining, along with the realization of an artwork, within the sphere of the new communications technologies and media, even though often they temporarily, or even logically, precede it. This is the result of theoretically founded knowledge in the field of creation of reality through media significantly impacting the contemporary, *mainstream* art practice. Although they are, most often, applicable, and not the fundamental knowledges connected to the field of media as well as communications technologies research, a certain theoretical paradigm, through which the conceptualization, and then the realization of these works moves, cannot easily be brought into question. This certainly provokes, again, various questions of traditional as well as contemporary aesthetics, that are concerned with the ontological status of the artwork that is being read in the context of the strategic action of a remixed media culture, or that which is established among an idea and the empirical realization of the artwork created in new medias, i.e, the problems of authorship, questions of reception of the work, and, finally, of deriving of the entire artistic and aesthetic present space.

However, the crucial question that arises here according to the flow of interpretation so far, is: are we here discussing the art or its (new) media surrogate, and what about the attempts to direct (aesthetic) theory towards constant questioning in terms of what has been going on with the traditional modes of creating art in era of remix culture? Further on, how is art possible, or any other alternative human practice in the time of all-encompassing technically-technological or

else notionless mediation and aesthetization of the reality? One of the strategic possibilities is the autonomous artistic work, the one that is attempting to establish itself aside from the dominant paradigm (through the traditional or non-traditional means: for instance the calligraphy, old skills, or the so-called "the hand return"), or else, the art that within a critical attitude towards the remix, still does not use neither "auratic" nor (multimedia) creating potentials (which is hard, but still possible, to imagine today), while the other type of activity would be one of a tactical nature, which would practically involve turning media against the very media: the new against the old ones, the social against the mass ones, the sophisticated against technologically obsolete ones, and *vice versa*.

The double status of the aesthetics today (the hypostasis and critique) is being opened as well as the question of the range of the art itself in relation to reality – either it will be media formatted and codified through the language of the advanced technologies and the world of business, or its critically-creative position will result with some sort of new quality, which will, to a certain degree, urge the change of reality. In any case, present (aesthetical) theory is co-responsible for the future of art, at least in that measure in which it is art itself, as the self-consciousness of one era in becoming. If it intends to change and anticipate some new reality, the various creative potentials will definitely be of use – especially in the case of generic worlds of art.

Endnotes

1. Compare, for instance, the text by Keith Negus, „Identities and Industries: the Cultural Formation of Aesthetic Economies“, in: *Cultural Economy*, Edited by Paul Gay and Michel Pryke, SAGE Publication, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, First published 2002, Reprinted 2003, p. 115-117.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p. 115.
4. See: James Heilbrun, Charles M. Gray, „Growth of the Art Sector“, in: *The Economics of Art and Culture* (Second Edition), Cambridge University Press, United

- Kingdom, 2001, p. 11.
5. Dragan Ćalović, „Savremeni mediji između imaginacije i refleksivne stvarnosti“, in: *Uvod u teoriju medija*, Megatrend univerzitet, Beograd, 2009, p. 11.
 6. Sometimes they are treated as one discipline, and in other cases they are defined independently.
 7. The differentiation of public on audience and non-audience reached its peak, according to the words of Ortega y and Gasset, in the context of reception of new, modern arts (Debussy, Stravinski, etc.), since the “class” gap between those who understand it and the others who do not, and by that do not accept it, from the sociological point of view, became so severe and vivid, that it caused the division of the privileged minority on one side and inferior mass on the other. After this, the market and mass media mechanisms of mediation, that is, the popularization of the forms and contents of “high” culture and elitistic (and avant garde) art works, led to the levelling of those differences, through which the masses were apparently or really included into the current world of culture and society and thus became the constitutive part of these entities. Compare Ortega y Gasset, *The Dahumanization of Art, and Other Writings on Art and Culture*, Doubleday Anchor Books, Garden City, N.Y., 1956, p. 6.
 8. Miroljub Radojković, *Medium sindorm*, Protocol, Novi Sad, 2006, p. 20.
 9. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
 10. In his attempts to establish the connections among art, technology and politics Benjamin, as it is known, inaugurated a number of new aesthetic notions such as: “aura”, “reproducibility”, “monumentality”. See Howard Caygill, „Technology and the Work of Art“, in: *Walter Benjamin, The Colour of Experience*, Routledge, London and New York, 1998, p. 93.
 11. In the local context, there is an entire generation of young artists, creators, who work within the field of fine and visual arts, as well as the so-called expanded media. They have been educated in Theory of Arts and Media at the University of Arts in Belgrade interdisciplinary studies (for instance: Saša Petrović, Predrag Terzić, Danilo Prnjat, Dragan Ćalović, Vladislav Šaepanović and others) and have applied within the framework of their own creativity the theoretical knowledge of aesthetics, theory of arts, theory and philosophy of media. Most of them critically rethink the world of present culture, art and media, from the standpoint of socially engaged art through intervening into the reality.
 12. See: Lev Manovich, “What comes after Remix”, http://www.manovich.net/DOCS/remix_2007_2.doc
 13. “In conclusion let me offer you a different metaphor to think with about this cultural slice which we also call ‘new media.’ This metaphor is that of ‘remix.’ I often look at contemporary culture in terms of three key processes - three different kinds of remixes. The first remix is what already for a few decades we referred to as ‘post-modernism’- the remixing of previous cultural contents and forms within a given media or cultural form (most visible today in music, architecture, and fashion). The second type of remixing is that of national cultural traditions, characters, and sensibilities intermingling both between themselves and also interacting with a new ‘global international’ style. In short, this is the remix of ‘globalization.’ ‘New media’ then can be thought alongside these two types of remixes as the third type. It is the remix between the interfaces of various cultural forms and the new software techniques - in short, the remix between culture and computers. Its cultural logic is new not because this is ‘modernist new’ which tried to erase the past - on the contrary, it is new because of the scale of the remix process at work, its speed, and the components themselves involved. Some of the results, which are being generated, are trivial, some are OK, and some are brilliant. While computer is a very powerful remix instrument, what comes out from it is ultimately up to the creative individuals who are at the controls of the computers - you.” Lev Manovich, http://www.nyartmagazine.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=26308&Itemid=694
 14. See: Lev Manovich, *Post-media Aesthetics*, http://www.isisconcpetuallaboratory.com/teaching/Post_media_aesthetics1.pdf