MOVEMENT
IN THE
TWENTY-FIRST

Written in 2010

Movement in the twenty first

Thoughts on a creative movement today, in context of the time that we live and the use of media in it.

Part I: And there was movement

A source. A Movement. A way for the movement to connect. The party that has reached a new status, that is far above the use of drugs and emotional recreation. The people, within the modern urbanized city throwing up inspiration from their environment into musical and artistic output. These activities became identities for whole movements, as a medium for resistance and activism; it connected different people to one direction, and brought up expressions in all kinds of arts. Several examples can be found in the past, drawing connections beginning from the sixties' situationists over to the punk movement and more. These movements already proofed in different ways that there is definitely something that can be reached with young creative culture.

The most recent movement that I can take as a reference, would be the movement within techno music in the nineties. Also with it's interesting background that started as a small revolution by a minor group of young people in the industrialized city of Detroit during the eighties, and then followed to Europe into a huge underground party movement with a corrupt attitude towards politics and moral values, although being largely overshadowed by it's huge commercialization on the other side. The DIY[1]-core of the techno movement, consciously or unconsciously, completely realized the idea of Hakim Bey's "Temporary autonomous zone" [2] with setting up their free parties in abandoned areas, autonomous from any sort of governmental control or moral regulations. A musical movement with a strong connection to activism, but the futuristic atmosphere found in the music and the blindness towards social regulations and set up rules within the attitude of the movement, can also be seen as an inspiration or reflection that is to be found in contemporary art of the 1990's when looking at works of, for example, the "sabotage"-group[3] and others.

Currently the connection between creativity and movement has come to one of the lowest points in history, still curving down apparently.

I believe that we've come to a point where it is time for the current generation of artists to be conscious about the time we're living, start showing themselves and not selling themselves. Create, generate and realize with the goal of reaching influence and change, not only becoming a part in

---

[1] DIY – (Do It Yourself) Represents a culture, having roots in punk and squatting, which has a mentality that aims to replace the dependency on commercial structures, socially and technologically, by creating those themselves

[2] A term coined by Hakim Bey in "The Temporary autonomous zone", which describes a set-up zone where no laws and regulations count, that exists for a certain amount of time only

[3] The Sabotage Group, was an artist-collective from Vienna, that also owned a label called sabotage-records, releasing a broad range of electronic music artists from Detroit to Vienna. Their art-actions in public space fit in the provocative mindset of art at that time, with a certain notion to urban anarchism, in my point of view also connecting back to the music they released.

some vague avantgardist-dream. Authenticity instead of huge wraps of hype created around work of art where the hype has become more well known then the work itself. Action instead of only reaction, not trying to live up to some standards that you haven't created.

I do have a strong believe in the power of the collective and in working together for a shared goal, and that it is a cornerstone for creating influence and change. The basic Idea of a Movement is coming together. However this simple idea is already confronted by a current world of mass-individuality. A phenomenon corresponding to

The time we live in

A void doesn't come from nowhere, and a rolling stone doesn't stop if there's no obstacle that can hold it. The circumstances, that we face nowadays are different reasons that have affected our enviroment, which can show why movement has slowed down or eventually will pop up again. What are the barriers of our time that keep people from moving?

1.	The individuality of our time. Everyone grows up with different influences, Believes and values nowadays. And this makes it more difficult for people to relate to each other. The earlier the times, the more common influences where shared – and you can follow a long history of once huge movements being split into more and more subgroups as time goes on. Nowadays, already with an early age we are free to choose for different influences ourselves, since the media allows almost consciously to decide for yourself what you want to get influenced from. Youtube, which is at the moment one of the most common way's to enjoy visual media in the whole world, has reached tip of the iceberg as far as this direction goes. But of course it has been a process throughout mankind's history, that as time went on you could increasingly have more control on outside influences that make part of your living.

This is what has developed us from helpless Second-to-animal creatures in stone age who where exposed to the wild nature around us, to the powerful civilized status of humans with strong control over their surrounding environment, which we are today.

But the control today exceeds manipulating the challenges of nature by far, and has dived deep into the field of information. Slowly but effectively, we are all are starting to get a stronger grip on shaping our own life's from childhood according to the media we choose.

2.The free accessible information allows not only choosing from a broad spectrum of present media, but also revives long forgotten past media easily. You know what it is, nowadays people can even watch the tv series that they had seen as children again by searching youtube, or youngsters living in the present but trying to be part of a past youth culture that they've never experienced because it happened before their time. There is such a strong „retrofashion" nowadays, a necrophilia for the „back then", that going forward instead of backwards seems increasingly difficult. From the ease of reviewing what had been done in the past, a new thought has been generated and become a conservative momentum of our time:"Everything has been done already". This post-modern thought that seemingly eliminates intentional creativity in present times, can only exist because people actually **know** what has been done. If people weren't that much aware of history they wouldn't even think of the idea that there can be no more ideas generated, rather they would go on as people did in the past before them. Because those people from the past who "already did everything" may have been also inspired by Inventors before them - but they never had the possibility too look at them as we do now, with the strong accessibility of huge archives of past media. In the past there was a much stronger isolation, and creativity had to come out of yourself - and the most inspiration had always to be gathered from your **present**

environment.

3.   The different views that exist nowadays, and the history as we've seen it with our eyes and have followed the past through different media has led to a huge boredom. A generation having totally lost its goal, that was never there – and we are struggling to find the big enemy of our time, that we are searching for so desperately. The trust that public enemy figures are the targets we have to attack in order to restore peace and happiness has been fading away, and getting the feeling to "fight for the good" when we go to demonstrations is less of a motivation than ever before.
This doesn't seem surprising as we have followed good vs. evil fight on different side's of political spectrum's over years and years, and if you look at the level of actual change in your daily environment, it feels like very little of the big ideal's have been reached: looking at any dreams of the past 50 years of some better "social order".

Powerless and tired of walking, we're trying to reconfigure desperately an order of who the bad and who the good one's are, and it all seems totally undefined. Is Globalisation our enemy? Is Socialism completely to be abandoned? Is there still a true political identity with authenticity at all? Throughout history we have tried to take out the disadvantages from every system we brought us into, and yet we still feel unsatisfied. And in our desperate search for evil, it happens that when there is a definite problem incoming there are two things that often happen:
we try to immediately nail someone who is the evil person or group that is to blame, and form different groups according to who we think it is on problems where **everybody** contributes, and we aim to put up a problem to be a much more enormous than it actually is without adding a solution, seeking more of an evil that we can aim our hatred at than thinking of how to solve problems.

Take the climate change as an example. The phenomenon, as well as the counter movement protesting against it gives a good definition on how paradox and complicated solving a problem in our time seems. First of all the state of the problem is tried to be put up as enormous as possible to get increasing followers by the activists for climate protection, while on the other hand large companies are trying to prove the opposite. The whole issue becomes a fireball a huge fight of opposing parties that are either trying to wealth themselves in moral fame, or are fighting for influence on getting the position as being 'the good one'. As a spectator I'm smart enough to realize that climate change is a definitive problem, but not one that will immediately destroy the world. It's easy to have an insight in the scientific proves on climate change that are in fact occurring, and it is more than enough to definitely see it as a problem. But instead of the people working together from a prudent perspective in saying: "there is a problem and we should work on it", it rather gets blown up to be "the planet's gonna die next week", and turns into an ongoing fight of who's fault it is. And from this **seeming** to be hopeless situation, people again fall back into this biedermeierish[4] state of powerlessnes. Like "oh there are too much problem's anyway, I wouldn't know where to start on solving as it all seems too late anyway". On the same side the fight who's fault global warming actually is continues, with the big enemy-search progressively holding back action. As a whole the struggle against climate change appears to me as a vicious cirlce of power and fame, with an actual biological danger as a background.

_____
[4] A historical period in central europe around 1815-1849 where censorship and suppression of free speech was so high, that one's own home became a mole-hole of protection from persecution and escape from outside life. Most paintings from that times are warm illustrative pictures showing people in their homes, in front of a fireplace, or with children around.

The lack of satisfaction in terms of resistance for people today, gets increased by another problem that is very influential on our feeling of "lack of power": that life in our 'western' world seems too good for us to start whining.

We need more problems, while being too blended by the sun to find them, as life overall is just a bit too relaxed. This again is difficult to believe in, as searching for a problem seems like an obscene need in our culture. To overcome this paradox state, modern entertainment serves us an excellent solution to fill the gap that this need creates in us. By defining the world around us thouroughly negative, and reporting only about what "world-problems" are surrounding us that are completely remote to our lives and therefore unsolveable, but yet daily affecting us and making us feel guilty, we can serve a life-long guiltphase being plagued by problems that are always there where you not are, and altogether too big to be solved by someone so little like you. This is also an excellent empowerment for goverments: after all, if you little wimp aren't able to do it the big and powerful government with it's massive army and loads of money that you're paying it can!

Altogether the lack of power and disbelieve, with the side-effect of searching an enemy while not knowing why we should need one, results in a modern biedermeierish state we're we all hiding under our pillows when it comes to problematic issues, and for the rest of the time lying on the couch to forget about them.

As important as it is to analyze this state and recognize it's problematic influence, I think solely restating and whining about it is the first nail into the coffin for trying to get any further. As far as the search for a new direction and a new enemy goes, there is no definite system and no complete solution for life in general, that will serve complete fulfillment in all our wishes. Only total religious control or a "brave new world" as imagined by Huxley, would be something that could stabilize all factors so intense that there's no more questions left, but we've been through the time of a totally controlled state in history and it couldn't solve anything.

And sweeping in nostalgia over past achievements, movement's and action from an engaged young generation (please no more 1968 blabla!), won't help us forward either – they're good to make us understand what a positive influence this can be on our society, but they can never be successfully re-enacted.

-
Yet the advancement in technologies and resulting phenomena of the time we live in hasn't been affecting us without positive sides. I would like to mention

1. The new freedom of global communication through advanced technology, namely the Internet, has given us new possibilities for exchange that where never possible before, and I can feel a barrier of individual differences from different cultures and backgrounds breaking. The ease of communication and the resulting more direct way's of getting in exchange locally or when going other places, has led to a strong exchange between the cultures. More than ever before we finally feel like one global population, where cultural differences play less of a role than a united goal. I personally dream of the idea of having a global movement, where the place of location isn't an obstacle anymore, and you can freely strive towards your goal together. A cosmopolitan unity without borders.
And in that light the aspect of individuality that I named before, might even be just a shade, a phenomenon that on the one hand is effectively existing and having it's influence, but below the surface of outside representation, following of individual

trends and belonging to different interest groups, there is a unity of a population that has become more homogeneous than ever before.

And maybe it just needs a single trigger, a single effective reason, for the whole world to run for one goal.

This chance in global communication is the biggest advantage we have from our time and I see how influential it is already changing our world.

2. Further, the global communication, allows us to break all these difference's in order to not only strive for a united goal, but to learn and vitally enrich each others by the better understanding, no matter what backgrounds we're from. This is a strong plus for everybody, and a base for working together on a shared goal – a base that is quite easier to achieve today, and gives today's population a new educational plus that will come in positive.

Of course, the impossibility of isolating yourself as a culture or as a country in a globally communicating world, also forces to openly communicate certain problems and to not hold back from working on conflicts, which is still a difficult process.

Think of it like different people that where isolated from each other, now all of a sudden have to share a single room together.

At the end of the day they will have to get along with each other since there is no going out of the way, unless they want it all to take a bloody ending – which is happening too.

Making an analysis of our time we can understand much better why a movement will not erupt that easy, but yet again could break out the next moment. The phenomenons of our time are a base to understand what we are doing, why we are doing it and how we are doing it. Yet especially the "how we are doing it", is a difficult question to answer and uncovers a world where mediums and message have changed, and are developing faster than anybody can hold on to.

With that in mind, I am confident that the way a movement tells it's message to the people is of most utter importance, which is why we have to consider

Part II: New ways of Marketing in our time and the effective use of media

The emphasis on the word marketing, lies here in the question of the status and the "how" and "why", rather than the "how much". When I talk about marketing, I'm not talking about getting into everybody's way as much as possible, but more about a status of active communication.

I insistingly use the more economic word marketing as describing the way creative work is being perceived when it comes to generating awareness, and not reducing it to words like "image" or "publicity", because I think it philosophically hits the nail on the top on where we are standing as active creators in a movement: Around us are the recipients of our work (in a company that would be the customers of their product), a huge mass of people that are getting overloaded with information and we want them to look at us (which is equally to creating sales with a product). Secondly I believe that marketing a creative product, and making it are two processes that are coming closer together, and are overlapping each others more and more. In fact in all information that we communicate, we sell something to someone. We sell opinion's and our own ego's in daily life to other's, we sell opinion's and statements in a movement to the people, and in an extended form as companies we sell

product's to the consumers. The process is always the same, only the ambitions are different. Marketing is not a thing that everybody is obliged to generate, it simply exists. There is always a status, an image, a way of being seen when it comes to something you create.

Even in a small market today it is very difficult getting your voice heard due to the huge availability of similar people who are trying too be heard too, with the accessible state that information currently has. And due to this circumstances people are trying too find new way's too stand out. In a time where we get bombarded with new information, hypes and trends are coming and going faster than a humans brain can catch up with, people feel a stronger urge to put themselves big on the map.

But the actual important value, if you want to stand out is efficiency – efficiency without overloading, and efficiency while still remaining authentic. To reach this efficiency in marketing we have to understand the media, that we use to sell, better.

The change in classical media, and new thoughts in using them

I doubt there's still a lot of explanation needed, as far as advancement in technology goes until the year 2010. There's an incredible amount of new media and sub-media, media that form a part of an already existing medium but open new way's of communication in specialized contexts, that the parent medium couldn't achieve yet. The newer media, which I'd emphasize particularly on mobile communication and the Internet, has also a tremendous influence on   already existing media and their appearance today.

With the radical change of media I do see an issue that lots of people nostalgically try to re-enact movements or activist idea's of the past without understanding that the context in which these people have used it's medium in the past, doesn't exist anymore. The medium has changed in a different context of time, and can't communicate the same way it did back then.

Although every Idea has an aesthetic and pragmatical core that stays timeless, it needs to get a makeover in order to work in a new context, and before too much energy is spent into this makeover it's often better to not bother with it at all and start from scratch.

Therefore I conclude that it is essential to completely redefine the state of every existing medium, understanding it from a contemporary perspective and using it effectively according to different contexts.

The difference between creative art forms and the medium's they use has blurred again, and I'm trying to focus on the word 'medium' not only being a tool for an art-form, but rather the art-form itself acting as a medium. Different forms of creativity and not only their children have become a medium to bring over the message of a movement effectively.

Contemporary Art as a Medium

Contemporary art is "the" creative medium per definition. Just as philosophy being the base of all sciences, if there is a total bottom point zero to where you could lead back creativity, then it would always be art. Art could be seen as being the most free and independent way

of doing something. But I think if today's contemporary artists would work according to this notion, the art world would look different. From my points of observation, artists that really strive towards a way of freedom and independence as described before, get mostly less recognition in the influential art-world – that rather enforces a dogmatic way of freedom and independence. The paradox enforcement of liberty is one of the most basic problems within the contemporary art world.

Art shares a very common problematic with other creative artforms to the highest degree among them, it blocks itself by it's own "scene", known as the contemporary art world. In contemporary art, the scene is everything it often seems. In other creative art-forms "the scene" itself is hardly ever getting as much attention as it does in contemporary art, where the "talk about it" is slowly experiencing a detachment from it's essence. And more and more I get the feeling that artwork is hardly ever what the art world is about, but rather everything that is loosely connected to it. Contextualizing an artwork seems like being the essence for giving it a right to exist.

Due to the way artwork is marketed these days, it is almost impossible to actually see an artwork as it's supposed to be seen without being biased by it's own contextualization in form of distracting articles, information plate's, critics, analysis's and other side-information. Actually there is no problem in talking about artwork, reading information about it that is detached from the work, and having a circle of people around it that are keeping themselves busy in with that world - but the circle around shouldn't become bigger than the actual essence – the artwork itself. The created context, which is mostly a way of marketing an artwork picked up by curators, has become a dogmatic style on putting yourself on the map and detaching itself from it's essential aesthetic, and loosing it's authenticity therefore.

The problem here is that artists have become very naive and unaware on how art communicates as a medium today.

An artwork today is not seen in "one way", it is hardly ever, often almost impossible to be perceived as it is, standing for itself. Rather an aesthetic creation tells it's message in more multiple ways then ever. If I could have a look at my personal stats on how much artworks I've seen photographed, filmed or perceived through other mediated forms, and how much I've seen in the actual context they belong in, than it would be about 70% mediated and 30% "as is". And even as it is, you hardly get around an artwork without being infested by ambiguous information plate's, being biased by it's surrounding exhibition, it's marketing campaign, or whatever else is used to position it. Therefore as an artist you should aim to take control of this mediation which can shield it from wrong resulting contextualization. As you are also the one who wants to transmit a message, why shouldn't you be eager in taking control of this mediation that forms part of it? And to get better hold of the perception of your work, marketing it is important to understand. In that sense the marketing has become part of making an artwork more than ever before.

For effectively marketing an artwork, there are mainly 2 routes that can be used to authentically enhance the efficiency of the aesthetic of a product. The first one would be by creating a tunnel-whole where the marketing leads to the work as direct as possible, and the

second by using marketing as an apart extension of the work, while still creating an not obvious reference to it.

What happens a lot of times, is the first method being used but instead of creating a direct lead to the work, they try to put a filter over it. Like a soft lens, magic shades that make everything shinier. This is exactly the case with people trying to artificially pimp up artwork by creating intellectual frames of references around it. This has become so much of a dogma in the art world by now, that artists even believe that it is an essential practice.

So to reach a good way of marketing artwork without loosing authenticity, the most important thing is to draw the bridge between being effective on a communicative level, and being "good" from an aesthetic point of view in an authentic way. There is no point in trying to meet requirements, or slave-like living up to existing standards in your work. Although one would think this goes without saying, I feel that a lot of people feel obliged to be depend their creative way's on standards that they haven't created.

And It isn't unusual to not know precisely where the standards of your own are, and this is also an aesthetic search that everybody who is a creative working person goes through in his life. But if you want to become truly an artist than you have to set your aesthetic standards yourself, and therefore also the marketing, the transmission, yourself.

Contemporary Art was always a progressive thought-pool for autonomous idea's, a medium often thinking ahead of it's time, and it should not loose this position, although it widely has. It was often more contemporary than any other creative artform, since (in an ideal state) it's makers wouldn't try to either copy other thoughts nor move away from their personal views, which is a common practice in other media. Therefore Art has to stay as a progressive thoughtform, as an escape from everyday life, as an independent free space that stays untouched, and takes it's influential position inside a movement as a progressive attitude that a movement should always refer to, thought- and action-wise.

Written thoughts and Spoken Words

With influential changes in language due to less local difference, new communication forms within the Internet being strongly based on writing, and abstract language like programming having influence on it, the medium has reached a different position.

First, there is the influence on language of different forms of new Internet-based communication. Chatting, writing messages, "updating your status" on facebook/twitter/etc. I don't believe that this is in every case a progressive update in communication, more often another way to waste your time. But it is interesting how this communication, and receiving information through the Internet in general has an influence on writing and language. A lot of people see the language in this communication as duff and therefore uninteresting: hasty writing of short sentences and short acronyms minimalising the integrity too the fullest. But it would be conservative to think that this makes it uninteresting. I don't see too much sense in every single facebook message that I read either, but what makes me curious is that people write and communicate that way much more than ever before – which diminishes the fact

that the sentences are often short and dry information-wise. They might be that, but from another side they could also be seen as very effective. Using as less words as possible to communicate doesn't mean you're communicating less, but rather that language is being purged down to it's most basic values. A downfall of language or and advancement in communication? Probably we need to see, as so often with new developments, both sides of this coin. And use it's advantages while knowing its drawbacks. The Internet has also served as an empowerment that language can now take influence on a different scale then it used to. What people already call 'globish' by now, as a simplified English having it's roots in the Internet, shows that language is not anymore as much invented by local cultures as it used to be, but by a global population. Language has become an open source product on a global scale, where everybody can take part in adding and refining the language, without having to be locally connected at all. This renews and enforces the idea that everybody can invent words himself, and furthermore reinvent language.

Secondary, communication with writing has become much more multi-medial. Because digital communication allows implementing images and other media so easy, leveling it down to writing would be an understatement. Moreover, image, sound, moving image and writing are stronger turning into one compact message, where the differences between the media are not a border, but a new possibility to enforce the message as a total. Accompanying writing with the combination of adding another medium to it, being it just image or sound, is an easy task in digital communication, that is starting to take over more and more areas of our daily lives. This gives writing a new position and new possibilities, to effectively enhance it's impact in communicating.

The third aspect that changes the influence of writing is the idea of text structure. Maybe that was also the reason why I had objections about the way we where forced to learn structuring text at school. Structure in text, was always strongly based on beginning and ending, and also often on building high points in between the two. As part of a generation that became Internet-users early, structure has become much more open, diverse and non-linear. On a typical website one can start reading the first page, and then choose himself which page to read next. This a-linear way of reading, returns it's influence back on writing in general. Beginning and ending (if there is one) are less of importance, more likely one can read across.

A movement can take advantage on the openness for language processing, and should develop it's own style of language. Words are relative and meaningless, their value surreal and untouchable and there is no rule that would state redefining the meaning of different words as harmful. The style of a language should be retained homogeneous inside a movement. I believe the simple attribute "raw", as diverse as the meaning of it can be, is something that a movement should go for - imposing towards a radical mentality that can get an easier place of influence with incisive language.

Music, Sound and Movement

Opposed to other media I mentioned before and will mention afterwards, I don't think there should be a description on how music should be made, although I think it is of high importance as a medium for a movement. That is because it must remain its expressive

integrity, as being a medium rather created by feeling, attitude, environment and mentality than rational concepts, although those can have an influence on it too.

For a movement music has a very special, and influential function. It serves as a sign of Identity. Certain tracks, or being it just a certain style, can serve ideal as a uniting theme that forms part of a movement. Because every form of identity, has a soundtrack fitting to it – which is primary because of the medium being so strongly abstract. It has the power to emotionalize people, and can serve not only as a theme but as a war-cry. When music has come far enough to have a strong emotional identity inside a movement, music can be a trigger for people to come in action. Music can unite and emotionalize people, when it comes in taking actions together – whatever these actions may be.

Music must remain as a medium for emotional free space, and should be left out of commercial or artistic standards. Musicians nowadays should start being daring again and stop trying to remake all old music. Where has the radical spirit been left to make music purely from soul, emotion and feeling without trying to program ideal music, which is something that the music software/technology – industry tries to make musicians believe is possible by having processes automated and sound "cleaned" up automatically. Stop the idealization of music and go back to radical free attitude's without trying to follow overhauled ideals.

Digital Multimedial Communication

I do think that in a time where digital communication via the world wide web plays such an influential role, that the sabotage of this abstract communication place should be used much more, to set a sign in this virtual space. The possibilities here seem endless, and apart from the classic (almost forgotten) "hacking", the space of the Internet offers a rich variation of opportunities for sabotage, scamming and creating invented myths. Probably as with other media, the Internet has come to a point where it is so commonly surrounding us, that it hardly attracts any interest as medium itself anymore. Thinking of the Internet as use for a movement, Hakim Bey imagined a "web" in 1988 as being later an informational network in advantage for creating a T.A.Z (temporary autonomous zone), but was rather disappointed with the appearance of the world wide web and it's use. Yet I still believe that the Internet has lots of undiscovered opportunities, not only from sabotaging and modifying the existing, but creating something new inside it. But to discover it we need to take a different point of view, a distanced view at the medium away from the daily and all-surrounding use of it. In today's world the www is still more used as a replacement or an extension of everything from "offline"-reality, rather than using it in it's own reality (think: post becomes email, the library becomes the wikipedia, the shop becomes the onlineshop, etc.). The Internet can stand as a medium for itself, and should be used again this way.

At first there's always the interest for the medium to recreate reality with it, and just later on, mostly when there is another medium that can recreate reality even better, people realize that the medium has got uniqueness and aesthetics of it's own.

The remoteness and "unlocatedness" of the Internet is one of it's biggest powers. The Internet can connect and wrap with and within all kinds of media easily: almost everything that you can connect to a computer in some way you can connect with and influence through

the Internet as well, and vice versa. Though often the technical possibilities here are difficult to understand, I expect more way's of using the Internet's broad range of possibilities, being not only a communicating medium, but also as an interactive one. That makes it sometimes a difficult one too, with the user being able to escape so easy from the perception (one mouseclick exactly) that physical appearance might seem easier. But still you can make people from any place in the world interact with something that can exist anywhere else. This is the Internet's big power of remoteness, which shall have more use in being an interactive possibility with global capacity.

The Happening and Event as a Medium with Integrity

Happenings, Events and meetings are facing a decline and rise at the same time. A decline as social activity is being reduced with the information exchange in modern communication as meeting physically becomes seemingly less important, and a rise for the same reason as an "actual" social meeting off-line has more meaning than before, and the uniqueness of physically meeting in a an event-like situation is getting more attention that way.

The event offers a lot of unique chances in being a medium with more artistic integrity and influence: it can serve as a podium for all so far mentioned media, but also stand as an artistic medium for itself. The underground party, serves till this day as an inspiring happening to not only locally exchange, but to communicate in collectivity and give, even if only reduced to a certain feeling or mentality, a message.

An event as a total artpiece, is something that artists have rarely realized in a way intriguing enough to be remembered as such. But the diversity of possibilities to combine different art-forms in an event-like situation makes it still very interesting as such. Also the way of receiving information through communicating artforms is different. In the event the visitor isn't always recipient by its own will, but will rather find himself to be forced being one, as he can't escape when standing face to face with a performance or a creation of any kind. This makes events an easy medium to communicate, transmit, but also to conceptualize. As such, the event as a total Gesamtkunstwerk, with it's subchild's being a work for itself again, does need a more influential future.

As seen on the graphic the following page, among the wide array of influential factors for the aesthetic result of an event, we have the interesting double-position of the visitor. He is mostly recipient, but is always to a certain extent also partially a creator of the aesthetic result itself. An event without visitors is no event, and they always have an influence on the outcome of the result through their reactions, and even already through their sheer presence. And it doesn't matter for that reason also if the public is on purpose integrated interactively in some way with presenting acts, artists and/or pieces, it always is to a certain extent anyway.

Aesthetics within the Event as a Gesamtkunstwerk

Situation-specific Random Factors	Act(s) of event/ creatieve event content	Marketing

Aesthetics

Visitor(s)