Introduction

The volume at hand presents a critical engagement with art, aesthetics, and the socio-political fabric of contemporary society. The research contributions delve into the complexities of how art operates within industrial structures, examining the essence of art and its commodification, the political aesthetics of boredom as a critique of capitalist society, and the role of the artist and art production. The contributions in this volume collectively underscore a study of art's place and function in a contemporary, hyper-industrialized world.

Inspiration for this volume arose from Annie Le Brun's critique of what she calls *globalist realism* in *Ce qui n'a pas de prix* (2018), highlighting the pervasive influence of market-driven forces on aesthetics and emphasizing the resultant homogenization of artistic expression and a standardized feeling or aesthetic. Her call for a revaluation of the amateur artist and an emphasis on aesthetic experience over commercialism is a plea for preserving the singularity and integrity of art in an alienating, increasingly entropic world. To paraphrase Le Brun, it's intriguing to observe the historical irony wherein the Soviet Union's socialist realist art, aimed at molding public sensibility, finds its contemporary counterpart under neoliberalism. Globalist realism thrives not on propagandistic representations but on integrating art into the neoliberal market's mechanisms, thereby replacing ideological tyranny with a seductive, systematic commercialism. Le Brun's framing allows us to witness artists transforming into entrepreneurs, embracing the capitalist framework, not just in the production but also in the strategic dissemination and control of their art. Figures like Damien Hirst and Anish Kapoor exemplify this shift, gaining notoriety not solely through artistic innovation but through their savvy navigation of the art market, thereby marking globalist realism as an art form that, while echoing the subversive spirit of 20th century modernism, primarily blurs the lines between artistic value and market valuation. Such a discourse finds resonance in the documentary film directed by Nathaniel Kahn, *The Price of Everything* (2018),

which interrogates the complex relationship between art's intrinsic value and its market price, further stressing the tensions between artistry, economics, psychology and philosophy of art.

In the opening, exploratory article titled "Remissions of Disturbances Aesthetics," Roman Bromboszcz outlines a descriptive theory of noise—with diverse types, relationships, and applications. He writes about artistic, axiological and arguably transcendental reasons for making noise and distinguishes between diverse types. A distinction is made between intentional noise made by performers as a result of artistic activity and the kind that is disruptive or results from a sort of breakdown of communications. The author focuses on three types of noise in aesthetics and art: epistemic noise (as the plurality of messages from fragmented communication), structural noise (underlying art's breakdown of established structures), and probabilistic noise (arising from choice and randomness). In the paper, artists, production and reception techniques and practices, and the language used to describe noise are considered, notably semiotic and cybernetic analyses of terms encapsulated by the notion of disturbance, including error, glitch, trash, damage, failure, loss, and so on. As an aesthetic value, liminal noise can be made deliberately or by accident, and the distinction can be challenging to the recipient of noisy artistic activities. To go beyond the discussion, I think it can be extended to the camouflage tactics of social media marketing designed to "blend in" with low-quality, home-made, practically zero-budget *amateur* content online as opposed to "standing out", as is the case with the aesthetic of professional, highly produced and edited media pertinent to the dominant advertising industry. Let's call it "amateur-washing," which aims to obscure source, origin or essence, placing bite-sized media within epistemic noise and the experiences and techniques artists cultivate with noise such as distraction, perceptual disturbance, sensory after-effects, or hallucinations. The article suggests an aesthetic transformation between various high and low entropy states in the context of cultural comprehension. For instance, through the process of symbolic acquisition, we learn to identify meaningful patterns amid apparent chaos, rendering our understanding contingent upon this ability to discern and assess. These evaluations position us within the discordant, often truth-indifferent narratives that pervade an increasingly disrupted, disinhibited and unbound *polis*. Viewed through this lens, the elements of political and marketing rhetoric, along with their accompanying cacophony, evolve into integral modules and short-circuits that contribute fundamentally to cultural programs.

Next, Eugene Clayton Jr in "On the Political Aesthetics of Boredom" argues that this feeling qua concept emerges as a philosophical issue precisely at the advent of capitalist modes of production. Historically, boredom has shifted from indicating the leisure and non-productivity of feudal elites and aristocrats to signaling the lifelessness and burdensomeness of existence under capitalism, highlighting the class nature of boredom and the decadent movement's rejection of the aesthetic subjugation to capitalist imperatives. For Clayton, boredom is a symptom and product of capitalist society. It represents a "revolt of the subject against the total determination of his subjectivity by the objectivity of capitalism." This revolt indicates the potential for an aesthetic redemption within capitalist society. The analysis covers several key points. Boredom is fundamentally linked to the demand that we be continuously entertained, positioning entertainment as boredom's dialectical opposite. The conventional bourgeois separation of "entertaining" as play and "boring" as work masks a material truth under capitalism—that the concept of 'playful work' is an inherent contradiction. Boredom should be understood as one of the core contradictions within the capitalist system, pivotal for the socialization and theoretical comprehension of society. In capitalist society, "boring" signifies those social structures where relations have become completely predictable, calculated, and reified, in contrast to the aesthetic value of artworks following an immanent, conceptual logic that is necessary yet unpredictable. This unpredictability, mystery not commensurable with mystification, is crucial for the political significance of aesthetics in late capitalism. A potential dialectical response is the creation of "boring" aesthetic objects that challenge the culture industry's insistence on entertainment, exposing and critiquing the bourgeois ideology that dismisses boredom as an irrational subjectivity devoid of broader societal implications.

In "Social Art: The Work of Art in Capitalism," Michael Broz reveals the essence and commodification of art within the capitalist paradigm, guided by the philosophical insights of Martin Heidegger, Mikel Dufrenne, and Karl Marx. Broz sets out to unravel the intricate relationship between art and its economic functions, steering clear from a purely historical account to focus on the philosophical underpinnings of art's essence. Broz argues—by drawing upon Heidegger's distinction between the essence of art and the work of art, and Dufrenne's phenomenological perspective on aesthetic experience—that art's essence is rooted in its ability to convey truth through a process of unconcealing. This process, grounded in the artist's craftsmanship and the spectator's engagement, allows art to transcend mere utility and assume a form that is both purposeful and integral to its being. The in-

teraction with art, hence, becomes a labor of phenomenological significance, revealing the inherent *techne* and motivation behind artistic creation. The article further delves into the political economy of art, employing Marx's critique of capitalism to examine how art is assimilated into the commodity form, subject to the dynamics of labor, value, and surplus-value. Broz meticulously analyzes the transformation of art's unique creative energy into a commodified object within the market, emphasizing the nuanced distinction between art's labor-power and its manifestation as a stored value in the goods market. This commodification process not only impacts the production and perception of art but also reflects broader cultural and economic controls exerted by capitalism over artistic expression. By highlighting the interplay between phenomenological elements and Marxist economic theory, Broz elucidates the profound implications of capitalism on the development and valuation of art. In doing so, he offers a compelling narrative that bridges the gap between the philosophical essence of art and its socio-economic dimensions, prompting a reconsideration of art's role and significance in the contemporary capitalist society. The discussion culminates in a reflective outlook on the future of art, pondering over the evolving pressures and systems that continue to shape its trajectory.

The authors navigate the tensions between art's intrinsic value and its market valuation, shedding light on how the forces of capitalism, marketing, and political rhetoric shape the production, reception, and perception of artistic works. Through interdisciplinary lenses, ranging from philosophy and phenomenology to Marxist economic theory, these articles ask the reader to question the transformative potential of artistic practice in the face of the dominant sociopolitical structures. Ultimately, this collection invites us to engage in a deeply thought-provoking dialogue about the future of aesthetics and feeling, the capacity of emotion to subvert, confront, and reimagine the very systems that seek to constrain singularities and mystify art and artworks.

Adrian Mróz