

THE ECUADORIAN CRISIS OF AESTHETIC REPRESENTATION
FROM THE SECOND HALF OF THE 20TH CENTURY
TO THE BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY

Crisis de la representación estética ecuatoriana
desde la segunda mitad del siglo XX
hasta comienzos del XXI

PABLO EUGENIO CABRERA ZAMBRANO*

Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador, Quito

pcabrera406@puce.edu.ec

Orcid code: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4650-8497>

Abstract

This paper analyzes how Ecuadorian art has three features that characterize aesthetic experiences from the mid-20th century to the present. 'Imposition', because esthetic models that define the production of artistic expressions are transferred without qualms; 'Domain', because this taxing and multifunctional influence is considered preferable in social, cultural, artistic and academic spaces; 'Exclusion', given that there are expressions that are considered inoperative in this dominance and are excluded. This situation comes from the paradigm of postmodernist 'aesthetic samples', conceptualists of neo-Marxist ideological tendencies. This mixture applied to aesthetics and art in Ecuador, has imposed a regime that is guided by the 'high culture' and practices of 'cultured art' associated with curatorial achievements, has caused confusion and instability in the production of artistic expressions; not only those involved in this model, but also those who do not submit to it. In this inquiry sources are consulted at the national and international level and the two features stated in questioning are explored with the theories and ideology that support the aforementioned paradigm, for an interpretative one with three complementary instances. The first refers to the aesthetic paradigms and from which Ecuadorian contemporary art derives; the second, on the axiom of the 'aesthetic samples' and the agency in the artistic expressions. The conclusion states the limitations, openings and results to assign options to the current state of art and the alternative diligence represented by the Andean philosophy for overcoming the Ecuadorian aesthetic crisis.

Keywords

Aesthetic paradigm, artistic expressions, Andean philosophy.

Suggested form of citing: Cabrera, Pablo (2020). The Ecuadorian crisis of aesthetic representation from the second half of the 20th century to the beginning of the 21st century. *Sophia, colección de Filosofía de la Educación*, 28(1), pp. 251-274.

* Doctor of Philosophy, Aesthetics and Art Theory. Master in Culture Studies. Higher Diploma in Cultural Studies and Cultural Policies. Architect. Professor at the Pontifical Catholic University of Ecuador, Quito.

Resumen

El presente trabajo analiza de qué manera el arte ecuatoriano tiene tres rasgos que caracterizan las experiencias estéticas desde mediados del siglo XX al presente. 'Imposición' porque se transfieren sin reparos modelos estéticos que definen la producción de expresiones artísticas; 'dominio', debido que ese influjo impositivo y multifuncional se considera preferente en los espacios social, cultural, artístico y académico; 'exclusión', en vista que existen expresiones que se consideran inoperantes en esta dominancia y se proscriben. Esta situación proviene del paradigma de las 'muestras estéticas' posmodernistas, conceptualistas de tendencia ideológica neomarxista. Esta mezcla aplicada a la estética y al arte en Ecuador, ha impuesto un régimen que es encaminado por la 'alta cultura' y las prácticas del 'arte culto' asociadas a los alcances curatoriales, ocasionado confusiones e inestabilidad en la producción de las expresiones artísticas, no solo de los involucrados en este modelo, también en los que no se someten al mismo. En esta indagación se consultan fuentes a nivel nacional e internacional y se exploran los tres rasgos enunciados en interrogatorio con las teorías e ideología que sustentan el referido paradigma, para una interpretativa con dos instancias complementarias. La primera, se refiere a los paradigmas estéticos y los derives en el arte contemporáneo ecuatoriano; la segunda, sobre el axioma de las 'muestras estéticas' y la agencia en las expresiones artísticas. La conclusión enuncia las limitaciones, aperturas y resultados para asignar opciones al estado actual del arte y la diligencia alterna que representa la filosofía andina para la superación de la crisis estética ecuatoriana.

Palabras clave

Paradigma estético, expresiones artísticas, filosofía andina.

252



Introduction

This article aims to contrast the aesthetic problem caused by the postmodernist trend and the possibility of having alternatives that allow another cognitive view in Ecuadorian art. For the analysis of this issue, two complementary sections have been structured. The first refers to aesthetic paradigms and derives in contemporary Ecuadorian art, which have reached predominance with the operability of postmodernist theoretical and ideological models adjusted to the requirements of the centers of global art. The second is about the axiom of postmodernist 'aesthetic samples' and the agency of artistic expressions, to get out of that paradigm and achieve the emergence of a current capable of facing the current crisis of aesthetic representation in Ecuador.

Because there are no specific references that allow the proposed theme to be located, the approach assumes a cognitive concert of information and reflection with empirical determination to shape the arguments that are carried out with criteria of logical-creative relativity, which finally aspires to reach an action of reasoned judgment. This way of dealing with the problem could be described as controversial, however, to assume the antagonistic threshold of the subject, it requires an investigative character freed of methodological purity that generally disturbs the knowledge process. Furthermore, it is about the aesthetic con-

dition. From the proposed perspective, the analytical statement requires an alternation to activate in a preliminary way this preliminary 'knowing' about the characteristics of the model implanted in Ecuadorian art and the circumstances in which the aesthetic modes that define the forms of expression currently operate. Obviously, this configuration declares its limitations; however, it values an interpretative context to appreciate different elements that seek a conclusive derivation.

Aesthetic paradigms and derives in contemporary Ecuadorian art

Thomas Kuhn, in *The structure of scientific revolutions*, describes the characteristics of paradigms and notes the changes they suffer as a result of scientific revolutions. From this theory, it follows that the paradigm has permanence when it operates within its laws and if others perturb them, it does not last. Likewise, Kuhn did not extend his ideas regarding paradigms to those which imposed on others of different conditions or that because of their qualities are not considered 'scientific' or do fit into the knowledge judgment.¹ This leads us to think that only qualified paradigms of scientists have influence and materialize, and that, according to their success or failure, they remain or are discarded. However, aesthetic paradigms that have theories, ideologies or manifestos that support them, as well as scientists, during their permanence and influence operate until their effects materialize in a variety of trends and expressions that are difficult to control. The latter is a contrast to the scientific paradigm since this can be interrupted *ipso facto*; on the other hand, the aesthetic paradigm, even invaded by another of equal or dissimilar magnitude, can remain in time or between times changing skin as many times as necessary *ad infinitum*.² The fact is that this paradigmatic archetype has the ability to induce the actor or spectator to make use of the jurisdictions of thought and introversion to define artistic dictations and ways of appreciating art, reproducing its sources and renewing its contents. In addition, when it operates it imposes judgments of taste in the same way that the unconscious defines ways of capturing reality; even, during the process of using compulsory induction instruments, it can also constrain modes of expression that are adverse to it; in the Ecuadorian case, those that come from popular art or from ancestral communities that base their artistic and aesthetic experience in Andean worldview.



As with the aesthetic impositions in the Colony and the beginning of the Republic until now, similar schemes have been imposed with three characteristics. 'Imposition', because external aesthetic models that define the production of artistic expressions are remorselessly transferred and are welcomed by local elites, assigning and demanding the transcription of their contents in accordance with that mandate; in some cases, the representations are facsimiles of that dictation, in others, some national tonality is added, but without disregarding the established precepts. 'Dominion', because this multifunctional influence is considered preferential in the social, cultural, artistic and academic spaces. Neglect has predominated in the development of aesthetic forms in the region, which is a sign of the inefficiency of the elites, of the cultural institution and the academy to produce alternatives that can confront the aesthetic models coming from the centers of global art. 'Exclusion', because the imposition of aesthetic forms of colonial evocation persists that adds the internal self-colony exercised by national elites, the cultural institution, and the academy, which, directly or indirectly, exclude or outlaw expressions that are considered inoperative in the dominant aesthetic model.

This aesthetic wandering that has been recurring since the end of the 19th century, in an early era, imitates with creole nuance illustrations from powers that had implanted colonial systems in America, affirming themselves with customary images of fauna and flora that satisfy travelers, geography and botany students, and the, then, novel anthropology, which demanded 'exotic' expressions for their research and as personal property. At the same time, the local aristocracy homologizes that gesture and extends the requirement to the portrait, the landscape and a renewed taste for religious art. The 50s of the 20th century mark the second era of the introduction of aesthetic paradigms applied in Ecuador; behind are left those artistic pretensions mentioned above, to give way to the modernist essay that intermingles with the controversial social, political and economic situation. This late influence regarding Europe and North America brings with it three constraints; first, imported artistic styles and theories that are arranged at the convenience of the 'high culture';³ secondly, aesthetic-political doctrines and manifestos from Mexico, Cuba, Brazil, and the Soviet Union are adapted; thirdly, in sui generis relationship between the previous ones, forms of expression related to the 'historical Indian', the 'racial Indian' and the 'popular' are determined, intervening their environments with expressions of indigenism, social realism, ancestralism, magical realism, among others, adjusted to the aesthetic taste of power groups.⁴ This aesthetic progressivism, led by 'high culture' and instrumented by 'cult art',



cultural institutions and academia, by then, is declared as the prominent of 'national culture' through government officialism. This event accompanies the consolidation of the museum and the establishment of statutes on heritage works; centers and art galleries are promoted, halls and contests are sponsored, theaters are opened and experimental dance is promoted; and the regency of curators and critics that certify the prominent authors begins. This modernist proclamation in Ecuador has a syncretic connotation between tradition and revolution that, against its ideological inspirations, fails to overcome the impositions of the market and the historical incision produced by the well-known aesthetic paradigms;⁵ nevertheless, it extracts from these what is necessary to define 'national' artistic and cultural expressions that end up reaffirming the difference between 'high culture' and 'low culture', between what 'is art' and 'is not', generating a 'semaphore subject'⁶ that activates interests according to the circumstances and that will remain onwards.

From the 90s of the 20th century, with the equally late introduction of postmodernist and conceptualist theories and practices, adjusted to the neo-Marxist doctrine, coming from Europe and North America and some places in South America already occupied by these precepts, the national 'high culture' accustomed to the novelties of artworld (institutional art)⁷ of the global centers that dictate fashion art⁸, shelters this new episode without hesitation and glimpses it as an event destined for national art and culture. This appearance that has already taken much of the artistic and cultural spaces increasingly promotes new derivations that have a marked influence on contemporary Ecuadorian art. In the beginning, this suggestive and insurgent aesthetic paradigm brought with it the 'liberation' of the modernist paradigm that had reached a state of exhaustion, however, it is not enough to foresee that the application of this new spectrum becomes increasingly imposing and dogmatic, gradually taking the institutions of government, cultural and academia. Unlike the practices of modernism that maintain a rigor in the work of artistic expressions and with regard to exhibition and market spaces, the manifestations of this new trend have no specific place, since the practices become disorderly and inconsistent and prevail the performance of nonsense, appropriation and facsimile, the profitability of the show and political and ideological affinity. However, the exercise of this aesthetic gibberish is managed under expert parameters through strict compliance with contractual terms for access to official funds, internships, and residences. Since then, this hegemony continues to reproduce this dogma with novel elaborations provided by the so-called 'aesthetic samples'⁹, which



in the Ecuadorian case are expressed through representations that have preference for inputs obtained from individual and collective intimacy or indiscretion, marauding in the marginality and social psychopathies that are reduced to discursive that pretend to overcome the materiality of the object; and the more advanced, with material investments that translate into facilities and objects that recreate panegyric and disgraceful statements that arrive at simulations in relation to those exposed in the centers of global art.

In the last decade, this national aesthetic necromancy has revealed extraordinary entelechies that vaporize any motivation or resistance to possible options; similarly, 'social images' have been taken by manipulating them to reduce them to diffuse utopias. In sum, the neo-Marxist postmodernist paradigm in art has contributed more conflict than the modernist paradigm, increasing uncertainty and confusion over the way they operate. This appearance, which generally assumes a relationship with vulnerable and emerging sectors in situations of risk or defection, is also assigned mastery in matters of art, aesthetics, and culture in spaces of educational instruction; nevertheless, this exercise between social vindication, aesthetic supremacy, and pedagogy, is nothing more than an inferred strategy to create the new myths for 'works' with aesthetic exercises that ensure the establishment of objects with shining fictions and that speculate in the market.

Given the scope of the issue, it is interesting to locate the scenario of the 'postmodernist 'aesthetic samples' paradigm with some depth, possibly describing the most critical stage of Ecuadorian art from the mid-XX to the beginning of the XXI. This discursive system that emanates from different theoretical starts, but of similar ideology, is heterogeneous in form, but synonymous in the background and is welcomed by national contemporary art. Disseminated this model in the possible spaces in the last decade of the XX century, the 'adaptation' of the model is carried out through intensive courses with agents and promoters of art, who demand a change from the previous paradigm since the artistic concerns are bogged down and an activation is necessary that allows them in accordance with the demands of international contemporary art.¹⁰ The adherents to this paradigm undertake work in their workshops, at the beginning stumbling before the difficulty of resembling the lofty cosmopolitan fashion art; however, soon there is a way to adapt to the new requirements; in some cases, resorting to appropriation and banality; in others, incorporating aspects of popular culture, antagonistic visual amusements, and representations of personalities and events of national and internatio-



nal resonance. At the end of the 20th century, the legitimization of the expressions of the postmodern and conceptualist 'aesthetic samples' is promoted, which already have their own circulation and consumption circuit. Likewise, an assortment of rhetorics declared 'deterritorialized', 'radical' and 'contestants' with grand demonstrations following the dictates of the global street lamps of contemporary art is officially installed.¹¹ At the same time, an eloquence is established that implants a communicational mode with a way of thinking, writing and dialogue through the cultural institution, academy and epistemic systematics.¹²

To deepen the theme of the current model of art and its various allocations, it is necessary to review some of its sources, to understand the facts mentioned above. It can be seen that at present the term 'contemporary' has become controversial; in the case of art, the new model does not wish to be assigned the specific concept of 'contemporary' nor of 'aesthetic paradigm'; it prefers to be called 'expression of the new aesthetics of contemporary art' or simply 'aesthetic samples' because it has adopted as conceptualization high degrees of indeterminacy and expressive variability. Even this form of diffuse rhizome not only declares different contents, but it also assigns indefinite apprehensions and operability to open fields of experimentation regardless of nature, since it does not expect to create concrete situations as in modernism. Such is the openness, that it admits that its sector can be blurred in others and vice versa, since its discursive instance requires open and 'disinterested'¹³ persuasion as an *ultra plus* of its actions. This new paradigmatic example is so versatile that it can be mimicked in any place and circumstance with the purpose of spreading and achieving hegemony. For this reason, it is not surprising that among its strategies it is 'deterritorialize' everything in its path and declare itself 'insurgent' as a maneuver for the exercise of 'deconstruction'.¹⁴ In this way, the way of thinking about the contemporary 'work of art' is declared complex and metamorphic and tends to dissipate its spectrum of empire, using mirrors to hide the image. Ramos Collado (2006), curator and supporter of 'aesthetic samples', criticizes the concepts of 'art', 'artist' and 'aesthetic experience', stating that art must contain the premises of disobedient and radical; even, instead of 'contemporary art' he prefers to call it "contemporary art with relevance to novelty". However, the terms of insubordination or radicality as coetaneity and novelty that it sustains with respect to those it criticizes, contaminate each other because the products that are promoted end up being designated 'work of art', subordinated to its circuit that, like the 'stablished' one, depends on the market.



For his part, N. Richard proposes to shorten the distance between art and life by deconstructing the idea of the ‘frame-format’ to move to ‘landscape-support’ using the living materiality of the body as a support for ‘sacrificially ritualizing it’; all this aesthetic scaffolding, he says, “to avoid authoritarianism of power over the subject and its deformations, docility on the part of the art institution and resignation in front of museums, galleries and criticism of traditional art” (2007, pp. 16-24). Neither more nor less than a failed insurrection, because Richard proposes to change the formats and supports for the expression of art as ‘insurrection’, however, this is not new, it has been a norm used by modernism and centuries ago native communities. innate use of the body as a utility to speculate on the artistic, it asserts the use of all means in order to erect ‘works of art’ judging that this act of ‘ritualized sacrifice’ contributes to ending power, institution, and tradition. However, Richard, to deploy this ‘aesthetic idea’, prefers to hide the need to deploy it in the spaces that it attacks.

A compromise case is the statement of J. L. Brea (2016) who criticizes the current language of contemporary art without assuming partisan responsibility in it. He is right when he considers that the current works are indecipherable and difficult to explain, also that they do not really contribute to the criticism of the institutionality of art since it is necessary to combat artistic languages because they appear suspect and belittle communicability. In addition, he considers that “the paradigmatic figure of contemporary artistic discourse is allegorical” (Brea, 2016, pp. 31-59) calling it false and hermetic; Undoubtedly, Brea questions his own aesthetic territory, but cannot stop belonging to a model with these characteristics.

Without departing substantially from those mentioned above, N. Bourriaud (2006), who is the author of *Relational and Radical Aesthetics*, expresses that diversification is one of the features of contemporary art nonetheless this variation has been characteristic of all ages. Also, mimesis is in crisis, as well as any documentary gesture in its literalness. Of course, in the matter of art, the imitation of reality or nature is a fact since the late 19th and early 20th centuries with representations of expressionism, cubism, abstractionism, etc. Possibly, his question about “How can the representation of the world still constitute a bet for today’s art?” (Bourriaud, 2006, p. 24), could disturb him; however, the answer is obvious, what else art can deal with that is not representations of the world and life. Several thinkers, from ancient Greece, some modernists, and some radical postmodernists, have shown too much efforts so that the interpretative achievement is not a simple reproduction, even those expressions that are linked to the political and social commitment of



art. Bourriaud (2006) does well to maintain that one of the needs in art is participatory collectivism as an attenuator against the extreme uncertainty of the present. On the other hand, in the scenario in which the postmodernist ‘aesthetic samples’ of neo-Marxist flavor unfold, the sincerity of J. Stallabrass is exceptional. Author of *Art Incorporated* where he examines ‘the rules of art today’ following the proposition of the playing field of P. Bourdieu, as well as W. Benjamin in *The author as producer*, Stallabrass identifies contemporary art as “a machine to produce a marketable meaning” (2004, pp. 100-174). This has happened since the Renaissance and in later times; It also happened in the second decade of the 20th century with the privileges achieved by the *ready-made* (Duchamp) and continues to happen with the postmodernists ‘aesthetic samples’ and their versatile configurations. Which, very time, and despite saying they present resistance to power and institutionality, adapt to the privileges governed by the global system of art and the neoliberal version of the economy. T. Smith is more idealistic in *What is Contemporary Art*, when he faces the dilemma of defining the ‘contemporary’ since his discussion, not only covers spaces of art, but also the ontological character of the present and asks “What does it mean to exist in contemporary conditions?” (2012, p. 48). In this regard and referring to art from his theoretical vision, he states that the idea of ‘being together’ becomes an opportunity to appreciate the general and universally participatory, by virtue of which it is urgent to abandon instances of isolation, personal particularity and alienation under the terms of modernity. Smith seems not to notice that modernity and postmodernity not only share almost similar terms, but they are also mediated by increasingly blurred boundaries. Basically, they cannot detach from each other because they are dependent referents and, because of the results, share consequences; the difference is that the first represents the broken promises, the second the fictitious overcoming. Although Smith does not admit it, the proposal of ‘being together’ applies to this last reflection and answers his question.



The axiom of ‘aesthetic samples’ and the agency in artistic expressions

It would be necessary to specify from now on that the postmodernist ‘aesthetic samples’, in the terms stated above, are really an axiom that in Ecuador has had unexpected and counterproductive effects. The causes derive in appropriation and recycling of images, treatments involved in



existing and imaginary objects, artificial interventions in the body, animals, nature and the environment; supposedly to exceed the limits of everyday life and the trances imposed by power.¹⁵ This fateful ‘aesthetic’ befalling, which has the principle of ‘everything goes’, is so diffuse and diluted so quickly that its ephemeral condition presents difficulties in naming specific cases that define ‘works’ with stable conditions for analysis. In this sense, anything can become art, it is enough to add grandiloquent and simulated rhetoric in the familiar terms, to be indicated as ‘unfathomable works of art’. The unusual thing is that the miscellaneous and uncertain objects produced by this apothegm occupy the exhibition spaces available for artistic expressions; at the same time, the reproduction of the theoretical and ideological livelihoods that have covered a large part of the estates dedicated to cognitive work and teaching is quite vigorous. Such is the prodigy of this concert of topical assets with their unstable collection, that they are called ‘objects of reflection’. It is not that this portent is questionable in reflective matters, it is understood that conceptual, theoretical and ideological diversity is lawful at any time and place. The problem is that it has become demanded and protected by a regime that demands a unidirectional and unequivocal treatment; something as absurd as that it turned out that this way of operating has become hegemonic and accepted without qualms in the institutions and the academy.

Unlike the lack of definition of the ‘works’ of the paradigm in question where its specificity and inventory are hindered, with the arguments noted above, it is possible to distinguish with some clarity the forms of administration and how it operates in the possible levels. Even more doable is to identify the subjugated by this model, the postmodernist-conceptualist Creoles, who naively assume that Marxism in orthodox terms is still an option. They generally declare themselves ‘informed’ and defined as mature, favored and evolved. And, on the contrary, those who are not instructed in the regent theories and ideology that and do not handle the guidelines of fashion art, are called ‘uninformed’, that is, immature, limited, retrograde... and are excluded because is considered that they remain in the past, an ‘anomaly’ that has as its purpose the denial of spaces of expression, the favor of the curator, and the access to places of exhibition. This appearance of merit and demerit is the one mentioned by E. Ímaz (1985) when referring to I. Kant about the 1784 text *What is the Enlightenment?* (*Was ist Aufklärung?*).¹⁶ For his part, M. Foucault, in his 1975 conference, calls into question the *Aufklärung* that makes a distinction between those who are ‘of age’ and those who are ‘minors’, which takes sides in the dictates of the developments of the Enlighten-

ment, which is nothing other than the submission to modern rationality to reach the necessary maturity.¹⁷ Dussel, also citing Kant in his 1992 Frankfurt conference, points out that the Kantian idea poses this form of emancipation as a way out of immaturity, carried out by the effort of reason as a critical process that opens humanity to a new historical development of the human being, and criticizes this position in view of the fact that it is a directed strategy for the exclusion of other epistemological ways of conceiving the reality of the world. Apparently, the accidents of modern rationalism are in sight and begin to be analogous to the results of postmodernism; perhaps the divergence lies in the fact that the first case pays for the myth of rational emancipation, while the second unfolds through the myth of irrational agency in overcoming the former. At the present, with similar consequences.

This conflict is undermining possible alternatives to overcome the crisis in the arts; above all, because the theoretical, ideological and expressive question of the 'aesthetic samples' that represented in principle the liberation of an oppressive system, is reaching a state of saturation that prevents the visibility of options. This exhaustion is perceived in Ecuadorian contemporary art, whose 'works' and 'objects of reflection' have become official and part of the aesthetic tradition in the first two decades of the 21st century. However, we continue importing arguments to nourish the aging 'aesthetic samples', activating the dependence and semapherization¹⁸ of the agents and institutions where this subordination governs. This approach prevents, in a certain way, visualizing a 'dissonance'¹⁹ that causes a medium-term exit from this dire preeminence. The brief intervention that emphasizes A. Lesper about this situation, by identifying this imposition and dominance as the "fraud of contemporary art" (Lesper, 2017)²⁰, is enough to warn what is happening with Ecuadorian art.

Some features about the current axiom have already been mentioned, however, it is necessary to deepen the way in which the 'object of reflection' operates from the commented new 'aesthetic samples' when they involve the notion of reality.²¹ We know that every expression contemplates it and is interpreted through abstraction, whatever it may be and at any time; therefore, the object of reflection referred to art is not a patrimony of modernism, postmodernism or the neo-Marxist ideology. It is a thinking substance that has been present in cultures and civilizations during all ages, the different is the way to understand and experience it. However, the reflexive conversion made by postmodernism in art, based on its theories and ideology and the commendable effort to appear 'revolted' against modernism or anything that contradicts its desires, pla-



ces it in diffuse strata that accommodate exedently stubborn expressions. Like modernist practices, contrary to postmodern theories and Marxism, that stubbornness is based on the stray tastes of the capitalist system.²²

When inquiring about the way of conceiving the postmodernist ‘object of reflection’, which attempts to divest itself of precedents, seems to ignore that the capacity for abstraction is based on the founding myth of Western philosophy, whose origin lies in medieval nominalism²³ and modern rationalism, that have gravitated in the discourse modes of contemporary instrumental rationality. The art in the application of the “aesthetic samples” postmodernists is no stranger to that influence. Whatever mode of reflection is presented, it is an inferred conceptual strategy and a maneuver of reason to scrutinize the sensitivity of man and the relationship with nature and objects. The divergence lies in that the reflection of modernist aesthetics impels with strict aspirations, while postmodernists are reactive without desires and move away from the body and objects to transversalities of irrestrictive efforts. It is the case, that the way of conceiving art throughout history settles around pendular events that elaborate increasingly complex rhetoric, it is the case of what happened between the 20th and 21st centuries. The lack of novelty of postmodernist art and aesthetics since the mid-20th century, maybe that they articulate ostensibly to the mythical Marxism, which at the beginning of the 21st century, “are defined based on broader factors such as their circulation and legitimation modes; in other words and if one speaks from a Marxist point of view, it is the modes of production that finally define contemporary art.”²⁴ The anonymous author of this phrase (cf. note 24) perceives that unlike the art of the previous period, the current one is not restrictive and has means of authentication supposedly removed from the capitalist system. Already explained about the latter, it should be added that the postmodernist ‘artistic work’ with a Marxist tendency are now adjusted to the neoliberal model of the economy. This confirms that the ‘deconstructive’²⁵ operation of the ‘aesthetic samples’ that underpin contemporary art, at least in the Ecuadorian case, lends itself to manipulation as many times as necessary. As Regnasco (2004) explains when referring that this form of maneuver reveals “the unfolding of man, the essence man of projected and subjective” (p. 49). The postmodernist version of contemporary art has become official, elementary and hallucinated. It is not utopia and insurrection; it is one of the most confusing aesthetic versions of recent history.

Postmodern play in art is so common today, as obvious are the reasons that induced Ecuadorian ‘cult art’ of the 20th century to adapt



to the isms imported by the national elite. It is inextricable for contemporary art at the beginning of the 21st century to feign novelty with the aphorism: ‘the object does not matter, but the discourse that sustains it’ (“what remains is the idea, not the object”, cf. note 30). Today it is a useless appearance: in the circuit where it is produced and legitimized, physical work is as necessary as evidence and merchandise, that the required presence displaces the rhetoric or the certificate that proves the false absence.

The sublimated situation of the postmodern reflexive object has entered into crisis due to its own concussion. This convulsion is due to the pruritus of separating from Modernity without accepting that the relationship is as close as the correspondence between the Middle Ages and Modernity. More conflictive is when it uses with zeal the rationalist functionality of modern epistemology as a tool to reason its allocations. This is the case of the ‘object of reflection’ of contemporary art. Assuming the terms of K. Wilber (s/f) in *The Three Eyes of Knowledge*²⁶, it can be noted that this thinking in art resonates with what happened in medieval times when the ‘eye of the flesh’ was submitted to the eye of the mind ‘, which resembles the religious reason of the Inquisition that had as its goal the requisition of the body to save the soul as truth in the face of any other human belief. In the case of postmodern aesthetics, the unfolding of rhetoric is the artistic work that refers to the ‘eye of the flesh’ as a means to safeguard the irrefutable ‘eye of the mind’. As noted, this arcane motion of abstraction parodies in the vaporous logic of the neo-Marxist postmodernist aesthetic simulacra. Cheroni (2010) mentions that postmodernists, having not found firm support, accept that modern philosophy is the only one to be taken into account (pp. 84-86).

Obviously, it is largely due to M. Duchamp (1887-1968), one of the precursors of the paradigm of the ‘new postmodern and conceptualist aesthetics’, the situation of contemporary art insofar as discursive seeks the apparent dissolution of the material object for hierarchize the object of reflection. It is not that Duchamp defined the current course, in his time he proceeded impulsively and deciphered a conceptual enigma; it was the later conjectures that built the ‘Duchamp effect’ and disseminated it in a multitude of obsessions. His ‘artistic gesture’ of 1917, as described below, is a product of the exhaustion of the artistic period and dissatisfaction with the established aesthetic system. In the 70s of the ‘Duchamp effect’ is affirmed in the centers of global art; two decades later, it is assumed by the Ecuadorian subsidiary²⁷, which takes in its own way the emanations of the ‘aesthetic samples’ reproducing the installation of objects, technological directions and performance actions²⁸; Likewise,



its production and consumption circuit sponsored by the government sector, the “high culture” and the “curatorship” with skilled transactions in the art market are legitimized.²⁹ In the first decade of the 21st century, this discursive model is imposed, which gravitates substantially in the surrounding reality. Highlighting the case of Duchamp is enough to understand what happened since the second half of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st. Duchamp, using the appellative of R. Mutt signed on a toilet and being a judge and part of the Hall of Independent Artists (NY, 1917), presents this piece of porcelain made in series as a mockery of what he considered the usefulness of art, generating a way of thinking and criticism in symbolic production.³⁰ Since then, a way of legitimizing conceptual objects and metaphorical elaborations that decontextualize reality by means of the hypnotic postmodern deconstructive way that influences artists, curators, and academia has been professed. Medina (in Ávila and Palomera, 2017) in this regard points out:

That contemporary art has the constant need to refer back to Marcel Duchamp is due to the fact that the name of ready-made has become the universal validation resource of the contemporary [...]. In the manner of any myth of origin, ready-made appears at the same time as an argument to justify the daily practice of present art, as an object of an unattainable desire and as an oppressive model and without the possibility of revocation (pp. 4-17).³¹

In this maneuver, Duchamp undoubtedly does not dispense with the author's hand and the presence of the object without which the idealized operation that gives way to ready-made would not have been possible.³² Duchamp knew well, at the beginning of the 20th century, as well as the generators of the ‘aesthetic samples’ of the mid-20th and early 21st centuries, that this ploy favors the transition from material appearance to conceptual³³ and ideological significance. However, in recent years, this logic of floating avalanches has begun to emerge, established as dominant in contemporary art and that does not admit criticism or discussion. However, in recent years, this logic of floating avalanches has begun to emerge, established as dominant in contemporary art and that does not admit criticism or discussion. From spaces of resilience, the system imposed by Ecuadorian fashion art begins to be revealed, which, persisting in self-colonization through postmodernist-Marxist objection in art, has no choice but to remain faithful to the *artworld*, using the academy and the cultural institution.

Another background on the postmodernist aesthetic model is perceived in the enlightened modernist W.F. Hegel, who in the eighteenth



century brings forth the ‘idea’ of the absolute spirit and what concerns history in *Aesthetic lectures: the objective conception of art*, in this case, applied to the aesthetic and arranging it in a unidirectional regime and instrumented by reason. Something similar would be done by I. Kant in his celebrated *Critique of Judgment* when proposing a judgment of aesthetic taste that is not a judgment of knowledge and manipulated by reason. Both Hegel and Kant would have to transfigure the Platonic triangle and the Cartesian cogito to give operability to their philosophical proposals. This maneuver would be emulated by the postmodernists of the 20th century, transmuting the idea of place, body, and everything possible, providing the aesthetic of deterritorialized systems and deconstructive concepts to obtain objects of reflection unlike those provided by modernist reason.³⁴ In this transit, after the disappointment of the Russian revolution that destabilized European and Latin American followers, and disturbed the mixture between modernist art and Marxism, Marcuse appears in *The One-Dimensional Man* (pp. 10-17-28) to formulate a theory of individual and social liberation in rupture with the dominant model. Since the mid-20th century, between disenchantment and desire for emancipation, postmodernist aesthetics hastened a change of route that mixes events of counterpower in art, philosophy and the social, proclaiming the assertion of individual rights and participating in social and gender emergences. As would be expected, Duchamp’s gesture is reprinted and the terms of Lyotard, Marcuse and Marx; Undoubtedly, this appearance is conducive to the settlement of post-modernist and conceptual ‘aesthetic samples’ in contemporary art that Brea, Bourriaud, Stallabrass, Smith, Richard, Ramos, among others, would later fertilize. Henceforth, this aesthetic modeling will govern as a method to operate the work of art.³⁵ In the Ecuadorian case, this doctrinal alignment reaches a sui generis realization activating art forms through cunning, fiction and metaphor against the status quo; also, to overcome the burden on the commodification of these products in the legitimation circuits, a pontific insurrection is assumed that fails to cover what J.L Venegas (2005) calls the ‘double conscience’ that accommodates itself to hide the submission to what is questioned. Generally, the postmodernist ‘artists’ and Creole conceptualists who emulate the cosmopolitans evade the public, philosophical and academic confrontation, attending exclusively to expose their “works” and “ideas” in spaces that reproduce their own ideologies.³⁶ It is known in advance that the public act is risky, for this reason the force of its condition is invoked that it does not admit interpellation in the field that dominates.





At present, the porphyry of contemporary Ecuadorian art contributes to understanding the moment that the work of art experiences at a global and local level. However, assignees of this axiomatic ‘aesthetic order’ prefer not to foresee the eminent tear of this diffuse supremacy that already fully shows their *ad vaculum* fallacy. Even the haste of this practice, which is sometimes dominant and sometimes tame, reissues self-colonization features by serving and reproducing theories and ideology without restrictions, without making any effort for contributions that accredit any alternative; what is worse, in this imitation it is excluding and eliminating artistic forms of expression and aesthetic sensibilities that escape its influence or dominion. Through time it can be seen that in this region of South America there has been a constant aesthetic gloom, in colonialism, modernism and now with postmodernist influence. As M. L. Pratt (1996) rightly points out, in the Andes “contact areas often have their origin in invasion and violence and translate into social forms that are based on drastic inequalities” (p. 3). With the supremacy of that model, it is evident that the dismissal of popular artistic expressions, indigenous art and a large part of expressions with an artistic trade is reissued, because they are not operable in the official enclosures of institutional art, which by Long centuries have had to endure “a long struggle for interpretive power” (Pratt, 1996, p. 3).

It has been characteristic of globalization to build global systems of domination and ‘aesthetic samples’ are part of that geopolitical strategy. In Ecuador, this maneuver of immeasurable proportions is post-colonial in nature, neutralizes the independence of artistic and cultural expressions, expels the Andean and popular imaginary from the field of art, and breaks down any potential dissent. In this context, for two decades the postmodern Creoles, members of the ‘high culture’ that are part of the cultural institutions, government and academia, as well as the followers of the dictates of the centers of global art run by the Local and world economy systems have constituted a sort of national committee to reproduce the practices of the new transnational aesthetic order and its financial constituents.³⁷

Contemporary art has failed in the attempt to oppose the mythical modernist aura and its picture of traditions, as well as the capitalist financial system that it supposedly refuses. Now we can observe the results of the paradox of the ‘postmodernist and conceptualist ‘aesthetic samples’; perhaps to the disgust of Duchamp and other proponents of this aesthetic simulation, the direction that contemporary art has taken with altered versions of the artistic and aesthetic experience is no longer the

same as originally presented by the reflection on the toilet of R. Mutt and the wayward postmodern theory event. Undoubtedly, it is the reissue of the grief that made the freudomarxist J. F. Lyotard (1924-1998)³⁸ visible, when at the end of his life he experienced that his followers had falsified the contents of his celebrated text *The Postmodern Condition* (1979). With the historical and off-key theoretical, philosophical and epistemic dependence that has taken shape in Ecuadorian contemporary art, it is time to assert the principle of contradiction with the break with respect to the 'aesthetic samples' that have stifled the field of art, becoming a barrier to the epistemological advance of art and aesthetics in Ecuador.

Conclusion

A reference has been sought regarding the crisis of Ecuadorian aesthetic representation in the indicated period, without achieving it. It was necessary to begin this inquiry based on the experiences that the author has had in the last three decades, while confronting them with various sources and authors who have expressed opinions on international and national contemporary art. With the limitations of the case, unveiling what happened with the carried-out records allows us to know, in a preliminary manner, how the theories and ideology that support postmodernism and conceptualism in the arts have operated. This shows that the topic is relevant, but it does not suit the interests of the hegemony that transits through government halls, cultural institutions and academia; especially to those who hold the simulation of the paradigms 'aesthetic samples'. Surely for the followers of this paradigm, it will be difficult to get rid of this influence, since they would enter into a state of helplessness as well as the resulting 'works', however, it must be understood that the mode of idealizing them is exhausted, as well as the model of reflection that sustains them. The numbness aggravated by this paradigm since the mid-20th and early 21st centuries has accumulated too much uncertainty in symbolic and cultural achievements; consequently, this situation is signaling the collapse of art and the cognitive treatment of aesthetics in the last century in the Andes region. There are so many questions in this regard that the answers are ongoing and much remains to be elucidated and debated in the context of the productive and educational significance of art, and in the change of course on the knowledge of aesthetics in Ecuador.

In the beginning, defining and developing the theme seemed like heresy, facing it has constituted a risk for future extensions, but putting



the current paradigm on trial is a necessary task that cannot be postponed. This is due to the fact that it is not possible for art to continue deriving proceedings that are fixed in aesthetic prostheses, either by assigning veiled worlds and floating signifiers or also domains with allegorical expressions destined to the ephemeral spectacle and ideological profitability. With greater reason, when the region of the Andes has sufficient philosophical-aesthetic foundations that can contribute to an “other world” for Ecuadorian art.³⁹

The problem is not that the paradigm out of the ‘aesthetic samples’ exists like any other that has produced Western modernity and the capitalist system, the urgent thing is to detach ourselves from this soporific model that is sustained in the immemorial postmodernist, conceptualist, and Marxist theories. First, by providing an opportunity for expressive manifestations that have been buried by this dominance in recent decades; secondly, by opening sources of research and alternative aesthetic expressions; primarily, looking back at the Andean culture and philosophy to propose opportunities for Ecuadorian art.⁴⁰ It is time that the academy, the last stronghold with alternative reflective possibilities, becomes aware of the fraud and what has been positioned in disciplines, subjects and curricular programs regarding the theorization and practices of art, aesthetic philosophy, artistic pedagogy and epistemology of art. The contribution to overcome the crisis caused by postmodernist aesthetics can initiate activation with what is related to the Andes region, the Andean worldview that provides opportunities to overcome the contradictions of contemporary art. This intercultural proposal by J. Estermann (1998/2006) mentioned in *Andean Philosophy*, as well as issues of Ecuadorian art and opportunities presented by Andean aesthetics, mentioned in the publication of the author of this article, *Approach to the Andean indigenous aesthetic*, TSM-SM (2018).⁴¹ These contributions can cement an epistemological flow for alternative aesthetic, artistic and cultural projects in Ecuador and, of course, contribute to these purposes to enrich the universal vision of aesthetics.

268



Notes

- 1 According to I. Kant, the judgment of taste is not the judgment of knowledge. This thinker considers that feeling is an anomalous entity with respect to reason, therefore, the latter must prevail over the former. Kant was among the first with Hegel, Baumgarten and Addison who in modernity have aesthetics as a science but far away from the scientific condition.

- 2 For this reason, even during era changes artistic styles and trends can remain.
- 3 Willing to serve the elites that run the economy and politics. Its beginning is insinuated in the first Government of Ecuador with Juan José Flores, in whose presidency the School of Arts and Crafts Miguel de Santiago is created; thereafter, 'high culture' is made up of the elites who run the government and cultural institutions in relation to political and economic powers. Modernity in pictorial art brings classicism and renewed landscaping, impressionism and expressionism, cubism and abstractionism, surrealism and magical realism, etc.; these currents are also projected in literature, theater, dance, etc.
- 4 The first is exalted and accepted by the power groups; They even claim membership. The seconds are used according to the occasion.
- 5 This trend extends in literature, sculpture, theater and dance.
- 6 Depending on the governmental, cultural and academic institutions, in order to preserve their status, they sometimes glimpse a tendency of the left, sometimes of the right and that of prevention.
- 7 Term used by K. Mandoky in *Everyday aesthetics and cultural games* (2006, p. 28).
- 8 This term is proposed by the author of this article to define the 'fashion art' associated with the postmodernist, conceptualist version associated with the mythical and stubborn Marxism. This expression is enunciated in several sections of the author's publication in Introduction to Andean indigenous aesthetics, TSM-SM (2018). On this occasion, fashion art refers to expressions that fit the paradigm of aesthetic samples'; that every time, they denote signs of decay due to the uncertainty of the 'works' proposed and the decline in aesthetic-ideological indoctrination (postmodernism-Marxism) that leads to the profitability of the collective spectacle and individual egocentrism.
- 9 Among the first Duchamp, later with Brea, Bourriaud, Stallabrass, Smith, Richard, Ramos Collado, among others. This article briefly indicates the characteristics of these authors' thinking but with greater scope the effects that are enunciated in the course of the argument.
- 10 The courses are taught mainly in Guayaquil, Quito, and Cuenca by scholars of this current, among them, Rige (English), Bellido, Mellado (Chileans), Álvarez (Cuban). The author of this article witnessed the introduction of this paradigm and experienced this 'learning' in 1992.
- 11 Since the end of the XX century and the beginning of the XXI, 'deterritorialized' and 'radical' dictations have been imposed which, then, are transmuted into imitations that define Ecuadorian contemporary art. This form of postmodernist interference that brings with it aesthetic attitudes, sometimes barbaric, does not differ much from what has been going on for more than two centuries with respect to popular and ancestral aesthetic manifestations.
- 12 A good number of institutions are already under this aesthetic-ideological regime. Similarly, a jargon is established with postmodernist and conceptualist terminologies typical of the paradigm of new aesthetics or 'aesthetic samples'.
- 13 In the 18th century, Kant enunciates the "disinterest" applied to the judgment of taste as an indispensable requirement to observe the aesthetic feeling. The position in reference does not differ in anything from that proposed by Kant, they pursue the same objective; even, the proposal of the postmodernist aesthetic paradigm (the 'aesthetic samples'), reaffirms the aesthetic as a matter adrift without any opportunity, as Kant prevents, of being thought of as a judgment of knowledge.



- 14 For Foucault, Derrida, among other postmodern structuralists, in the deconstruction of reality subjects and objects are invented through language, turning them into anything. This is also not original of postmodernism, it has been going on for more than ten centuries in literature, poetry, theater, etc.
- 15 In the postmodernists 'aesthetic samples' the 'extraordinary' is imposed, pre-eminent idea that has lost the discernment of reality, including the perceptual imaginary, with hallucinations that are falsely arranged, on the contrary, to dispel the worldliness of the powers of turn.
- 16 E. Ímaz in the Kantian writings makes a broad explanation about the text of Kant *Was ist Aufklärung?* In this article, it is sufficient to understand the denominations of 'majority and minority' regarding the practices, exclusions, and uncertainties caused by the operability of the postmodernist paradigm applied in the arts.
- 17 Foucault in his work on the Enlightenment, analyzes this text by Kant interpreting these verdicts that define the before (immaturity/minority of age) of the arrival of the Enlightenment where the arrival at maturity or 'coming of age' is contemplated. Foucault quotes the Kantian premise: "To characterize the minor status 'obey, do not reason' [...] humanity will grow older when you no longer have to obey, but when it is told to 'obey and you can reason how much you want'" (in Hernández Rodríguez, 2017, p. 154). This classification of the states of being, between those who have maturity and those that do not, has been frequent since the Colony and in what is now Latin America during the twentieth century, with the introduction of modernism and Marxism. Since the mid-twentieth century and early twenty-first, with the postmodernism and neo-Marxism something similar occurs. This way of maneuvering the subject has been favorable in colonial, dictatorial regimes and in the 'revolutionaries' with a democratic appearance.
- 18 A kind of "double conscience" in the terms that J. L. Venegas (2005) points out.
- 19 This term is presented as an outlet to the current state of contemporary art. 'Dissonance', in this case, is synonymous with 'dissent' to think freely and comes close to the Greek term *hairetikós* (heretic) which means 'he who is free to choose' or 'free-thinking person'. Since the Middle Ages the dogmas of each temporality, including colonialism, have transformed the term 'heretic' into derogatory. Each era makes a reference to the term: in the Middle Ages, 'heretic'; in modernism, 'primitive', 'barbaric', 'immature'; in the postmodernist extension, 'uninformed', 'limited', etc.
- 20 Most of the 'objects' of this circuit are what Avelina Lesper calls VIP versions (video, installation, performance), which are presented as dogmas that do not allow doubt or debate. This form of artistic production also stimulates the interaction of the spectator and the work in the physical, sensory, visual-technological, biological necessity, etc.
- 21 The paradigm that represents this aesthetic axiom entails the notion of 'reality' when accounting for the subjects and objects with the treatment of a previous template that simulates and reconstructs them until they become a discursive phantom without certainty.
- 22 Inheritance of the capitalist Modernity that in the period of the postmodernist aesthetic axiom, in contrast, is removed to use the neoliberal version of the economy in terms of the relation of operations by beneficiaries, which is legitimized in the circuits that the 'high culture' handles, the 'cult art' and intervention of 'art curator'.
- 23 In the fourteenth century, with Ficino that raises certain bases of Western rationalism; later, with the pantheistic rationalism of Espinoza. In aesthetic matters it was widely considered the definition of science by Baumgarten in the 18th century, also passing to Kant, Hegel, Addison, Burke, among others; also, with modern thinkers



- between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, until the postmodern of the twentieth century.
- 24 Textual words in the report of the evaluator accredited to the INDEX Contemporary Art journal (Faculty of Architecture, Design, and Arts, PUCE, June 2018). Commits the improvidence of issuing a value judgment on the position of the author who advocates an aesthetic opinion based on Andean cosmology and questions the supremacy achieved by postmodernist aesthetics. The double-blind hopes to impose their theoretical-ideological affection for the author to comply with, betraying adherence to the postmodernist-Marxist vision and hinting at the imprints of Brea, Bourriaud, Stallabrass, among others.
 - 25 Structuralists such as Foucault and Derrida propose the 'deconstruction' of reality. With this operation, there are no subjects and objects, because they can be created in language and it is the latter that creates reality. For example, by arranging flowers on a table, with deconstruction, they can become a river full of stones.
 - 26 Wilber, in *The Three Eyes of Knowledge*, performs a comparison between the Middle Ages and Modernity regarding the functionality of epistemology as a tool of reason.
 - 27 During the 90s, a vast sector of 'high culture' and 'cult art' affiliated with neo-Marxist postmodernism. The local headquarters also operates through curators and critics linked to the cultural institution and the academy. Some artists are not aware of the contents of this aesthetic trend, they follow it because it is fashionable and allows them to access the circuit.
 - 28 Varied disposition of things and actions that are called 'art', the result of late inspirations about Duchamp's gesture that occurred a century ago and the eccentricities of Bouys and Mendieta; divertissements and dislocations that are related to appropriations, transfigured photographs, fabulous manufactures, multimedia linked to the video and the screen, implausible mutilations and bodily functions, workswith animals and vegetation, etc.
 - 29 The 'works' and 'objects of reflection' tend to be covered up in relation to the commercial price, however, they are justified as any other product on the market. In Quito, you can see in buildings of financial, business and transnational corporations, the location of these 'works' that repeat statements located in other latitudes and rooms of contemporary art abroad (MOMA, NY; Venice Biennale, Italy, etc.,) and with that origin they are exhibited in national halls (Contemporary Art Center, CAC; Metropolitan Cultural Center, CCM; Biennial of Cuenca, etc.). All of them with high financing that gives rise to the rhetoric of 'border territories', 'problematize limits', 'register gentrification processes', 'inhabit antagonistic worlds', 'empty pillar translations', etc.
 - 30 For M. Duchamp the problem is not the object, but the mental and critical structure that is applied in a certain field of art. Duchamp had abandoned painting in 1913 and was looking through the ready-made and with the work *La Fuente*, to dissuade that painting as an expression technique is finished; In this way, he wanted to demystify the work of art by giving it a new reality. After the exhibition of the Independent Artists of 1917, Duchamp would take the toilet to gallery 291, where, in a 'properly tuned' environment he is photographed by Alfred Stieglitz, who for his fame and vivacity, would give importance to the insurgency of the ready-made promoter. Duchamp, saying that he has "lost the original", makes four copies with different toilets, which are valued in large sums and are located: 1951 in New York, 1953 in Paris, 1963 in Stockholm and 1964 in Milan. It is clever 'to reproduce the work' in this way, taking the prefabricated one and signing it with the alias: R. Mutt.



As Duchamp himself would say: “What remains is the idea, not the object”. However, there are copies with high market value. Unlike the description of W. Benjamin’s ‘aura’, the case of Duchamp is perhaps the only one in which four objects of the same - called the source - keep aura being original and reproductions at the same time. Moreover, made and elevated to the art category in different years and located in four different places.

- 31 Medina in *Apropos of the ready-made*: notes on a genealogy in dispute, performs an extensive analysis on this ‘work’.
- 32 On the reflection of the work of art, that of Duchamp (1887-1968) has its characteristics, however, it is not distinguished much from that of D. Diderot (1713-1784) or the spirituality of the artistic conceptions of V. Kandisky (1866-1944). In form, they are different visions, in the background, they are abstractions with similar relatum.
- 33 The conceptualist conception in art is not original of postmodernism, every era of art has had a conceptual basis. The postmodernist conceptual legislature that governs in ‘aesthetic samples’ is only possible to manipulate reality with respect to art and induce it to the simulation of uncertain and fictitious worlds that contradict foundations of universal aesthetic feeling.
- 34 The postmodernist deconstructive concept attached to contemporary art, in the period under investigation, is not a separate entity from previous compendiums: without modernism, there would be no postmodernism. To consider them apart is a mental fiction of easy refutation. The two phases, although opposed, are favored as communicating vessels.
- 35 At the time, the modernists attached to Marxism and in the present the local followers of neo-Marxist postmodernism from their ‘logic’ attack against the ‘empires’ and ‘metanarratives’. In certain circumstances, they feel flattered when they are beneficiaries of their resources in the deployment of ‘traffic light’ syndrome. In Ecuador, there are several examples, among many, such as the Non-decorative Art company ARTNO-DECO S.A. Information Brochure, 1999; One Day Domestic Rituals, 2000; Projects with Allocation of Competitive Funds, Ministry of Culture 2008-2017; Imaginaries in barbarism, 2009; Policies at the Edge, 2009; Funka Fest, 2019, etc. Currently, they adjust to funds from the neoliberal diction of the economy.
- 36 In the Guggenheim NY exhibition, from January and May 2018, *Ramas* is exposed, which consists of a few tree branches arranged in a corner of the museum; The artist sells the ‘work’ through a certificate that is exchanged for several tens of thousands of dollars with the corresponding commission for the institution. Same is the case with *Doméstica*, an installation consisting of an old-fashioned washing machine, in the upper part there is a refrigerator of the same condition with a crucifix on the door and ends with a TV of equal era; the ‘work’, arranged as a totem, is one of the ‘objects of reflection’, as are others of the same concept and whose authors are kept in reserve until sale. This was witnessed by the author of this article.
- 37 Primary financier of the ‘works’ that are available in the legitimation and consumption circuit of this ‘artistic’ manifestation.
- 38 He states that “postmodernism is getting used to thinking without molds and criteria” (Iriart, 1985).
- 39 The Andean philosophy inherent in Quichua culture, popular expressions, and ancestral communities maintains an epistemology to understand and carry out in the production of artistic and cultural goods, and the object of aesthetic reflection.
- 40 The *artworld* associated with ‘high culture’ only consider copying and spreading the postmodernist paradigm of ‘aesthetic samples’ to configure ‘national art’. They



reject the Andean philosophy and its cognitive component because it does not suit their interests. On the one hand, it represents a radical change that they could not face; on the other, the canopies and power achieved along with the financial allocations would fall apart.

- 41 The author (2018) carries out an initial opening on the contents of Andean aesthetics, which can support a possible aesthetic theory from Andean worldview in the present contemporary.

Bibliography

- ÁVILA, Sonia & PALOMERA, Mario
 2017 La fuente de Marcel Duchamp, historia de una burla. *Expresiones es Cultura*, 10 de abril de 2017. Recuperado de <https://bit.ly/37rxYVn/>
- BREA, José Luis
 2016 El arte en el contexto contemporáneo. *Lápiz, Revista Internacional del Arte*, 291-2913.
 1999 *Noli me legere: el enfoque retórico y el primado de la alegoría en el arte contemporáneo*. Murcia: CENDEAC.
- BOURRIAUD, Nicolás
 2002 *Relational Aesthetics*. Dijon: Les Presses du réel.
 2006 *Estética relacional*. Buenos Aires: Adriana Hidalgo Editora.
 2008 *Topocrítica: el arte contemporáneo y la investigación geográfica*. Proyecto Arte Contemporáneo. Murcia: Heterocronías.
 s/f *Tiempo, arte y arqueología del presente*. Murcia: CENDEAC.
- CABRERA, Pablo Eugenio
 2018 *Acercamiento a la estética indígena andina, Una visión de la pintura de Tigua*, TSM-SM. Quito: Centro de Publicaciones PUCE.
- DUSSEL, Enrique
 1992 El encubrimiento del otro, hacia el origen del mito de la Modernidad. En *Dos paradigmas de la Modernidad, definiciones* (p. 175).
- ESTERMANN, Josef
 1998/2006 *Filosofía andina: sabiduría indígena para un mundo nuevo*. Quito: Abya-Yala.
- HEGEL, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich
 1977 *Lecciones de estética: la concepción objetiva del arte*. Buenos Aires: La Pléyade.
- CHERONI, Ariadna & PORTILLO, José (eds.)
 2010 *Reflexiones sobre el pensamiento italiano contemporáneo*. Montevideo: Trilce.
- ÍMAZ, Eugenio
 1985 *Was ist Aufklärung? Escritos kantianos sobre ¿Qué es la Ilustración?* México DF: FCE.
- IRIART, Carlos
 1985 Jean-François Lyotard: “El posmodernismo es acostumbrarse a pensar sin moldes ni criterios”. *El País*. 23 de octubre. Madrid. Recuperado de <https://bit.ly/2Qb5v07/>
- KANT, Immanuel
 2001 *Crítica del juicio*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- LESPER, Avelina
 2017 *El espejo del arte* (Material para documental). Quito.



- LIOTARD, Jean-François
1998 *La condición posmoderna*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- MANDOKY, Katya
2006 *Estética cotidiana y juegos de la cultura: prosaica I*. México DF: Conaculta-Fonca.
- MARCUSE, Herbert
2017 *El hombre unidimensional*. Barcelona: Planeta.
- PRATT, Marie Louise
1996 *Apocalipsis en los Andes: zonas de contacto y lucha por el poder interpretativo*. Resumen de la conferencia en el Centro Cultural del BID, Washington.
- RAMOS, Liliana
2006 Los frutos de la pasión: François Pinault y su colección de arte contemporáneo invaden Venecia. *Art Premium*, (15), 50-60.
- REGNASCO, María
2004 *El poder de las ideas, el carácter subversivo de la pregunta filosófica*. Buenos Aires: Biblos.
- RICHARD, Nelly
2007 Márgenes e instituciones: la escena de avanzada. En *Fracturas de la memoria: arte y pensamiento crítico* (pp. 16-24). Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.
- SMITH, Terry
2012 *What is Contemporary Art. Thinking Contemporary Curating*. NY: Independent Curators International (ICI).
- STALLABRASS, Julián
2004 *Art incorporated: historia del arte contemporáneo*. Oxford University Press.
- VENEGAS, José Luis
2005 *Aesthetic De-Coloniality and Crole Double Consciousness*. s/e.
- WILBER, Ken
s/f *Los tres ojos del conocimiento*. s/e.

274



Document receipt date: July 15, 2018
Document revision date: January 4, 2019
Document approval date: May 17, 2019
Document publication date: January 15, 2020