

The end of art

Khelifa MAHMOUDI

University of Oran 2 Mohamed Ben Ahmed

Philosophy and its history Laboratory

mahmoudi.khelifa@univ-oran2.dz

Orcid: 0009-0008-2665-2329

/

Wahid BELAKHDAR

University of Oran 2 Mohamed Ben Ahmed

Human Sciences Research Unit for Philosophical Social and Humanistic Studies

belakhdar.wahid@univ-oran2.dz

Orcid: 0009-0005-7199-8538

RASS. Pensées Genre. Penser Autrement. VOL 4, No 3 (Novembre 2024)

Abstract

This study examines the end of art, focusing on the trivialization that has impacted art in the contemporary period, influenced by various challenges faced by modern society, including social media. This raises concerns about the possible end of art. In the current era, art is no longer purely an emotional expression. Instead, it has become intertwined with market demand and supply. Artworks are treated as commodities, and the artist has assumed the role of a craftsman. As a result, there has been a shift from focusing on the substance of art to prioritizing spectacle, leading to a crisis of triviality.

Today, individuals lacking true artistic depth are often labeled as artists. This makes it essential to redefine art and determine whether every creation should be considered a genuine work of art. Furthermore, it is crucial to explore the reasons behind the current superficiality in art. The vulgarity that has infiltrated contemporary art, largely due to liberalism and the shallow tendencies of certain individuals, signals the potential end of art in its original form. This study questions whether the end of art is inevitable in light of this decline in quality and substance.

Is it possible for art to maintain its relevance and authenticity amidst this growing vulgarity?

Key words: Artistic Authenticity, Contemporary Art, Cultural impact, Trivialization, Vulgarity

La fin de l'art

Résumé

Cette étude examine la fin de l'art, en se concentrant sur la banalisation qui a eu un impact sur l'art dans la période contemporaine, influencée par divers défis auxquels la société moderne est confrontée, y compris les médias sociaux. Cela soulève des inquiétudes quant à la possible fin de l'art. À l'époque actuelle, l'art n'est plus uniquement une expression émotionnelle. Au lieu de cela, il est devenu étroitement lié à la demande et à l'offre du marché. Les œuvres d'art sont traitées comme des marchandises et l'artiste a assumé le rôle d'un artisan. En conséquence, on est passé d'une focalisation sur la substance de l'art à une priorité donnée au spectacle, ce qui a conduit à une crise de la trivialité.

Aujourd'hui, les individus manquant de véritable profondeur artistique sont souvent qualifiés d'artistes. Il est donc essentiel de redéfinir l'art et de déterminer si chaque création doit être considérée comme une véritable œuvre d'art. En outre, il est crucial d'explorer les raisons de la superficialité actuelle de l'art. La vulgarité qui a infiltré l'art contemporain, en grande partie due au libéralisme et aux tendances superficielles de certains individus, signale la fin potentielle de l'art dans sa forme originale.

Mots clés : Authenticité artistique, Art contemporain, Impact culturel, Banalisation, Vulgarité

Introduction

Since the dawn of time, humans have expressed themselves through various forms of art—auditory, visual, and kinesthetic. Art became the voice of humanity, reflecting life and its challenges. The power of art is measured by the artist's imagination and the audience's ability to appreciate it. Artistic works vary in impact—some amaze, while others merely stir curiosity about the artistic process. Art often carries symbolic meaning rather than literal truth, as it reflects the artist's pure vision. The inclusion of symbols adds an aesthetic and artistic dimension.

However, in modern times, art has shifted from pure emotional expression to a commodity shaped by market demands. Artists have become more concerned with spectacle than substance, leading to a crisis of superficiality in art. Today, those who contribute little of artistic value are often called artists. This situation has made it necessary to redefine art and question whether every creation is indeed art. The rise of triviality, fueled by liberalism and human superficiality, signals the end of art as it was once known.

This so-called "end of art" is part of a broader trend in philosophy, which includes other proclamations like Nietzsche's "death of God." For Nietzsche (2013, p 07), the death of God symbolized the end of divine authority and the rise of human autonomy. But just as humanity established itself as the master of existence, thinkers like Roland Barthes declared the "death of the author." The death of the creator, or the artist, naturally leads to the death of art itself. This progression extends further, with some even declaring the death of meaning. V. Frankl (1982, 131), suggested that, despite this, humanity still searches for meaning, hoping that it might bring life back into art and existence.

In the midst of this, we are constantly bombarded with triviality, even while lying in bed scrolling through our phones. Art was declared dead along with the end of grand narratives, like morality and meaning, which once gave it value. In a world where these concepts hold little significance, art has become an incurable manifestation of triviality.

Research Problem

Given all this, the central question arises: Is the end of art truly possible?

To explore this issue, we examine several key points. First, we need to clarify the concept of art so that we can determine whether something is truly art or not. Next, we look at the historical discourse surrounding the "endings" in philosophy, from the death of God to the death of meaning. Finally, we discuss what is meant by the "death of art".

The second phase of our exploration addresses the core question: Is there really an end to art? We explore four main areas. First, we discuss the shift in art from imitation theory to chaos theory (also known as erasure theory) and the consequences of this change. Second, we address artificial intelligence and the theory of replacement, exploring how AI may replace human artists and what this means for the future of art. Third, we consider whether the death of the artist also signifies the death of art. Finally, we reflect on the degradation of aesthetic taste and the future of art, contemplating whether it is moving toward insignificance.

1- Methodology

We used a critical analysis method by examining the perspectives of philosophers on the potential end of art. We also analyzed contemporary humanitarian works to assess whether they still fall within the scope of art. Today, it is impossible to ignore the overwhelming insignificance in the world, which supports the claim that the end of art is indeed possible.

2- Results

2. 1. Philosophy and the Concept of Endings

2. 1.1 Concept of Art

There is confusion today about what qualifies as art. This confusion demands a prompt and mature reconsideration of the concept of art. The term "work of art" has been applied too loosely, often without meaning, to works that do not fit within the artistic domain. Conversations on the street or even ramblings in novels are now considered art. This suggests a lack of understanding of art, both in a general and specific sense. Thus, it is necessary to redefine art. Many people respond to their whims and ideologies, defending creations that no art critic or connoisseur would consider genuine art.

Historically, art refers to anything created by humans in various fields. These creations are judged based on aesthetic criteria, which fall under the philosophy of art and beauty. Philosophically, the term "art" is used in two ways. In a general sense, it refers to "a set of rules followed to achieve a specific goal, whether it be beauty, goodness, or utility. If the goal is beauty, it is called fine art. If the goal is goodness, it is called moral art. If the goal is utility, it is called craftsmanship" (J. Saliba, 1982, p. 165). Art is understood by the purpose it serves, which helps in classifying it.

In a more specific sense, art refers to "the methods used by humans to evoke a sense of beauty, such as painting, sculpture, engraving, decoration, architecture, poetry, music, and so on. These are known as the fine arts" (J. Saliba, 1982, p. 165). Based on this definition, art can

be categorized into two types: plastic arts, like architecture and photography, and rhythmic arts, such as poetry, music, and dance. In this particular sense, art is confined to the artistic creation itself and is evaluated based on aesthetic judgment. It does not represent the meaning of the world but rather reflects human aesthetic taste. When we talk about the artist, we refer to the individual who creates, appreciates, and experiences beauty in art. Therefore, we use the term "artistic" as a reference to something related to art.

2. 1.2 The Major Endings: From the Death of God to the Death of Art

In the history of philosophy, three significant endings ultimately led to the declaration of the death of art. The first of these was Nietzsche's proclamation of the death of God. This did not mean the literal death of a deity, but rather the end of the dominance of an external power over humans. According to Nietzsche, humans became the center of the universe and the true agents of their own existence. Nietzsche's philosophy celebrated the death of God and the birth of human autonomy. He wrote, "It is very strange, did not this elder in the forest know that the god is dead?" (F. Nietzsche, 2013, p. 7). For Nietzsche, the death of God represented the end of submission to any higher power. It was impossible for a "higher man" to be subordinate to a force beyond the human self or to something external to the earth. Nietzsche believed that humans must ascend on their own, without relying on divine intervention.

With the death of God, humanity was left to navigate the world independently, creating civilization on its own. However, this event also marked a narrowing of art's scope. Without a divine power to imitate, humans turned away from representing nature—since nature was not their creation—and instead focused on imagination. As a result, the scope of art diminished. The death of God, while empowering humanity, also restricted the domain of art by distancing it from nature, which was seen as divine creation. This raises the question: Can art truly escape the influence of nature? The decline of art seemed inevitable.

Another significant end was the death of the author, as proposed by Roland Barthes. Barthes argued that associating a text with its author limits its interpretation. He claimed that in order for a text to remain open to multiple meanings, the author must be metaphorically executed. He wrote, "When we attribute the text to the author, this means that we force him to stop. It also means that we impose on him ultimate semantic authority and close the writing" (R. Barthes, 1999, p. 81). Barthes believed that language and writing could only flourish when freed from the author's dominance. However, this raises an important question: Can language exist without the author who gives it meaning? Barthes' notion of killing the author also meant celebrating the reader's freedom to interpret the text without being constrained by the author's

authority or ideology. He stated, "We know that in order for writing to reclaim its future, the myth must be overturned. The death of the writer is the price demanded by the birth of the reader" R. Barthes, (1999, p. 83). For Barthes, the author's death was essential for the reader's survival, as the author's power hindered the reader's ability to explore multiple interpretations of the text. But the question remains: Can we truly kill one self (the author) for the sake of another (the reader)? This is where the existential crisis began, with the death of the human being (the author). Philosophers began to question the purpose of existence after the death of the author. Does existence retain meaning when the true human agent in creation is removed?

Roland Barthes (1980/ 1915) argues that killing the author effectively destroys the artwork. The death of the author creates a significant divide, severing the connection between the reader and the author, leading to the loss of the artwork. This is because the author, through their work, conveys suggestions of experiences and meanings. Thus, killing the author essentially kills the foundational elements of the artwork, cutting off the connection with the creator. Roger Garoudy (1913/ 2012) emphasizes that what is "offered to us today in literature and the plastic arts, such as the new novel, the Tel Quel group, abstract painting, and films like those of Godard and Truffaut, represents a tangible expression of the absence of the *Sujet*, in both senses of the word: the absence of the story and the absence of the storyteller simultaneously. It is a concrete representation of what history might be without man, without man as the central figure of activity, the source of meaning, and the diagnostic initiator of every historical action" (R. Garoudy, 1979, pp. 10-11). Doesn't this resemble the death of art itself?

Moreover, the death of humanity signifies the death of art's purpose. Art, when imbued with a moral dimension, aims to alter human behavior or achieve happiness by depicting a better life for mankind. But with the death of humanity, what remains of art? It becomes merely a reflection of the tragedy of death, exacerbating human suffering. In this way, art turns into a source of pain, no longer serving its original purpose of bringing happiness.

This leads to the third and final shock: the death of meaning. Viktor Frankl, in *Man's Search for Meaning*, highlighted the importance of purpose. With the death of meaning, existence itself loses its purpose, and everything becomes absurd. Derrida in his work on deconstruction, alerts us to a critical issue: the relationship between the signifier and the signified. Philosophy has traditionally focused on presence at the expense of absence—on the presence of meaning and the absence of meaning. Derrida warns us against a false belief that has been perpetuated: that spoken words inherently carry meaning. This assumption, which Derrida terms *logocentrism*, suggests that nothing precedes the text. Even words derive their meaning only through their

association with other words. There is no inherent meaning that precedes the text, thus contributing to the death of meaning.

As a result of these three shocks—the death of the author, the death of humanity, and the death of meaning—art has been declared dead. Can we still consider something as art or creative expression if it lacks meaning or purpose? If, as Frankl suggests, "meaning is a primary force in human life" (F. Frankl, 1982, p. 131), what remains of art when intention and meaning are absent? It becomes nothing more than useless absurdity.

2.1.3. The meaning of the End of Art

After exploring the historical concept of "ends" in philosophy, from the death of God to the death of meaning, we now arrive at the concept of the end of art. This idea prompts us to ask: What does it mean for art to end? The conversation about the end of art emerged in the late 20th century when Arthur Danto and Hans Belting published articles on the subject, discussing the "death of art." However, the concept first appeared with Hegel, who questioned the fate of art during the Romantic period. Danto later clarified that the end of art referred to a significant historical shift in the conditions of artistic production. He stated, "an important historical change took place in the productive conditions of art. you can think of art after art is finished, as if we are taking the art age out into something else whose exact form and structure still have to be understood" (A. C. Danto, 2021, pp. 33-36). This marked a transformation in how art was perceived, signaling a historical change rather than an actual cessation of artistic creation.

According to both Danto and Belting, the end of art signifies the internal exhaustion of creativity. Art had reached limits that could not be surpassed. Danto uses the example of Robert Ryman's all-white paintings, which embody the "death" of painting. Yet, these works did not represent the literal end of art. A. C. Danto (2021, p. 37) notes: "Art should be extremely active and show no sign of exhaustion whatsoever". Thus, the end of art refers not to its termination but to the depletion of possibilities within its traditional frameworks.

Hegel also discussed the end of art, focusing on how artists merely imitate the past. In his view, this imitation signaled the death of art. For Hegel, returning to ancient subjects wasn't shameful, but treating them in the same way was. He remarked, "It is true that a modern artist can belong to the Ancients...But the indestructible value of subjects and their value and originality is something. And the way she handles it is something else. Our age does not allow any Homer, any Sophocles, any Dante, any Ariosto, any Shakespeare to be produced" (F. Hegel, 1986, p. 460). Blindly copying ancient artists, in Hegel's eyes, resulted in the death of art. Even the greatest of the old masters would not succeed today by following the same methods they

used. Artists today must find new ways to address contemporary themes; otherwise, art will lose its relevance and vitality.

Danto further argued that the end of art is tied to the conclusion of the grand narratives that once underpinned it. The end of these narratives marks the "death" of art, not in the sense of the physical art object, but rather the death of the guiding principles that defined art. Danto writes, "It was this narrative that seemed to me to come to an end. A tale that is finished, and I did not think that it would not be more art as suggested by the word death" (A. C. Danto, 2021, p. 37). Here, Danto speaks of the loss of the spirit that once animated art. Contemporary art, lacking this soul, led Danto to declare the end of art. Art has become fragmented, as Max Ernst (1891/1976) described it, a "collage." Today, people view artworks in museums, appreciating their external form but failing to grasp the spirit within. This detachment has drained contemporary art of its essence. So, does the end of art truly mean its death?

The end of art, as expressed in Husserl's (1859/1938) terms, signifies the cessation of both intent and the function of the artwork itself. In the contemporary era, art no longer serves humanity or humankind as a whole. Instead, it has become purposeless, embodying anarchism. For example, Adrienne Hart's 1962 black oil painting on canvas appears devoid of meaning when observed. While art typically conveys understanding, this particular black painting offers no such insight. Art has lost its purpose and is now often used to serve personal or political ideologies (Hawari, novel *Issued* in 2024). Consequently, the purpose or intent of art has effectively died.

With the end of intent in art, it becomes difficult to grasp its purpose. Philosophy traditionally encourages us to explore and comprehend this purpose. As Hegel explains, "Art invites us to mental insight, not to instill the creativity of art again, but to know what art is philosophically" (A. C. Danto, 2021, p. 56). Art that fails to achieve a human moral or aesthetic goal is considered a deviation. Such art must be philosophically challenged and removed from the realm of true art. Art that does not qualify as art should not be counted as such. Given this chaotic interpretation of art, one must ask: Can art still be understood?

2.2. Is There Really an End to Art?

2.2.1 From Simulation to Chaos (Erasure Theory)

The history of art, up until the end of modernist art, has been rooted in the concept of simulation. Artists would represent the world by capturing and shaping it as they perceived it. For example, they might sculpt a human figure or paint a landscape. However, with the emergence of modernist art—driven by shifts in philosophical thinking—art itself underwent a

significant transformation. This change can be traced back to what is referred to as the "Cartesian moment." This moment marked a turning point in the history of thought, as the focus shifted from an outward contemplation of nature to an inward contemplation of the self. The idea became "I think, therefore I am," reflecting a shift from viewing art as a representation of nature to an exploration of the artist's inner world and perceptions.

A major philosophical influence on this shift was Immanuel Kant, who questioned how knowledge is possible. This led to a reevaluation of art, and the question arose: Is it possible to create art that goes beyond mere simulation? According to Danto, this shift in thought also transformed art. Artists no longer aimed to simply represent the visible world (mimicry). Instead, they began to ask deeper questions about the nature of the creative process itself. Danto observed that art had moved "from the representative project to a new project in which the means of representation became the subject of representation ... The transition from pre-modern art to modernist art" (A. C. Danto, 2021, pp. 43-44). If we consider Greatberg's perspective, this transition was a movement from mimicking attributes to non-mimicking attributes in art. Arrenberg adds that this shift did not necessarily make art more objective or empirical. Rather, modernism viewed representational traits as secondary, whereas they were central in pre-modern art. As a result, art moved away from simulation and toward anarchism, with the collapse of the grand narrative that had previously guided artistic creation.

Initially, both philosophers and artists rejected mimicry, arguing that it lacked imagination and creativity. Mimicry was seen as nothing more than copying something from nature without true artistic insight. For instance, "Hegel mocked works of art that mimicked nature, such as Zeuxis painting a grape, where a pigeon was fooled by it and attempted to peck it" (M. Al-Awni, 2009, p. 37). Hegel criticized imitation because he believed that while it might deceive animals, it lacked meaning for humans. He argued that such works relied solely on memory, reproducing what was seen, rather than tapping into the imagination and creative power of the artist to reach the soul's ultimate artistic expression.

However, the movement away from simulation in favor of creativity went too far, leading to new issues. Art, in some cases, became more chaotic than the simulation it aimed to replace. This is particularly evident in the romantic movement. Ironically, Hegel, who had once criticized imitation, later criticized romantic art for its chaotic nature, which he believed marked the "death" of art's original intent. He argued that with romanticism, art lost its ability to satisfy human needs or lead to absolute knowledge. Instead, it became a mere tradition devoid of soul. The core task of art, which had once been centered on artistic creation and engagement with objects, was replaced by an overemphasis on subjectivity and stylistic flourishes. This led to a

loss of the true purpose of art. F. Hegel (1986, p. 123) asserted: "From it can be inferred a humanly comprehensible vocabulary, a moral principle, a doctrine, or a rule of behavior" As these new artistic movements developed, art lost its original mission. It descended into anarchy, the death of intent, and the erasure of the great purpose for which art had existed.

Art has shifted towards anarchism, making it challenging to teach its meaning through examples alone. This change is evident with movements like Neorealism, Pop Art, Optical Illusion, and Cinema. Art no longer relies on the narrative meaning of modern human thought. Instead, it has become contemporary art, evolving significantly since the 1980s. This new form of art might be seen as the art of forgery, marking the end of the traditional model of art.

2.2.2 Artificial Intelligence and the End of Human Art (Replacement Theory)

Technological advancements have improved many aspects of human life, including art. On the industrial front, technology has reached a point where it can replicate and enhance artistic creations, adding three-dimensional effects to sculptures and paintings. However, this development has raised a major philosophical issue: the replacement of the artist by machines. Can art persist if the artist is no longer present?

Artificial intelligence (AI) has introduced new dimensions and purposes to art, which were previously unimaginable. Philosophers are now questioning the future of art amidst this profound scientific progress. "Art may disappear, it may lose its capacity to exist, it may fail to prove its essence in industrial societies where technology prevails over other things and where spiritual dimensions lose their importance and usefulness in industrial civilization" (M. Al-Awni, 2009, p. 7). Industrial civilization, being predominantly materialistic, has diminished the spiritual aspects of human existence and artistic creativity. Heidegger, for instance, warns about the dangers of technology and its impact on humanity. Under the influence of technology, human existence has become superficial, which affects art and renders it inauthentic.

Although AI represents significant scientific progress, it has changed art in its traditional sense. Previously, creating intricate drawings took artists weeks. Now, AI can produce these drawings in minutes with high quality. This advancement reduces effort, speeds up work, and lowers costs, particularly in three-dimensional imaging. However, AI has also transformed art into something devoid of soul. AI can generate hundreds of holograms and images that surpass human-created art in terms of precision but lack emotional depth. This shift has led to the decline of traditional art forms, such as Picasso's "Guernica." AI's capability to create art without the artist's touch signifies the end of art as we once knew it.

AI has effectively replaced the artist, making the human role obsolete. The artist's function has been diminished to merely providing data for AI, which creates art based on consumer desires rather than artistic intuition. Clive Bell argues that contemporary art, especially with AI's involvement, has lost its original essence. Art has become linked to public and materialistic values, losing its metaphysical character. For primitive cultures, art was a way to express their understanding of form and nature. Today, with AI, art has become emotionless. It has turned into a display of power rather than a means of genuine emotional expression. Artists have become mere craftsmen, creating works tailored to market demands rather than personal expression. "Here's the money before our eyes," says Clive Bell, "watching art in Europe slowly take over from Ravenna's sensational design to the boring portraiture of the Netherlands. While the bulk of the Romantic and Norman sculpture is transformed into a Gothic manipulation of stone and glass, and it was said that the Renaissance noon was almost over, the art was almost extinguished, and the arena was no longer abounding except with all the pretentious illusion-makers and masters of the craft" (K. Bell, 2018, p. 36) This marks a clear declaration of the end of art as it became a matter of supply and demand, reducing artists to mere artisans. AI has led to the death of art's emotional core, reducing it to a mere material resource.

True art involves sharing spirituality, feelings, and artistic expression. With AI, art has become a mere act of drawing pictures. "For if works of art were not of a common character, they would all be included. Our talk of works of art would be rhetorical" (K. Bell, 2018, p. 37). AI has replaced the poetic essence of human-created art with physical representations devoid of soul. While AI assists in many artistic tasks, it undermines the spirit of traditional art.

2.2.3 Does the Death of the Artist Mean the Death of Art?

It may seem that "there is no greater means to good than art" (K. Bell, 2018, p. 91). Art aims to achieve human perfection through a conception of existence. However, the death of art, like all things, must be anticipated. Can humanity survive this end (De Gourmont, 2021, p. 5) through the death of the artist? Does the artist's death necessarily imply the end of art?

Historically, literary stories were passed down through narrators who seemed to embody the story (perhaps Nietzsche's reference to Zoroaster). In modern times, the artist has become both the narrator and the creator. Art has been closely linked to the artist, "and the essence of criticism is still, for the most part, to say, that the work of Baudelaire represents the failure of man Baudelaire, that the work of Van Gogh represents his madness, and that the work of Tostaitkovsky represents his vice. Thus the search for an explanation of the work always turns

to the side of that person who produced it” (R. Barthes, 1999, p. 76).. Art has been intrinsically tied to the artist, and understanding the artist’s life and personality has become crucial in art criticism.

According to this view, the death of the artist means the death of art, as art is directly related to its creator. The artist’s understanding of their own work is essential, but literary criticism has evolved. Today, everyone (the reader) can engage with art by understanding its rules. French poet Valéry mocked the notion of accessing the writer's inner world as a myth (R. Barthes, 1999, p. 77). If art is tied to the artist alone, it is confined to them. However, art, like a free bird, should not be restricted by the artist's life and environment. Otherwise, it ceases to be truly art.

The artwork is not inherently tied to the artist or their environment; otherwise, only a small group from that context would be able to appreciate it. [Chuckles] On the contrary, art can be appreciated by anyone with a refined sense of beauty and taste. Therefore, art transcends personal or cultural boundaries and can be appreciated by anyone, anywhere. Art is detached from individual identity and is free for anyone to experience. Thus, the artist's death does not equate to the death of art. The only impact of the artist's death is the absence of the creator. The relationship between the artist's death and art can be viewed from two perspectives. The first perspective argues that the artist's death signifies the end of art through the theory of substitution. This theory suggests that the artist could be replaced by a craftsman or artificial intelligence. This raises the question: Can art evolve independently of its creator? The answer is no. Contemporary art created by artificial intelligence, lacking intention and meaning, leads to the demise of true art. Replacing a human artist with artificial intelligence signifies the end of art’s deeper purpose.

The second perspective asserts that the artist's death does not imply the end of art. According to this view, the artwork itself remains unaffected by the death of its creator. Readers and viewers can offer limitless interpretations and meanings that the original artist might not have anticipated. Thus, tying the artwork to the artist's identity can limit its potential interpretations. Instead, the artist's death can invigorate the life of art, as Roland Barthes suggested with his notion of the "death of the author." Barthes argued that the end of the author's life does not spell the end of art.

2.2.4: The Corruption of Aesthetic Taste and the Future of Art

It may seem that we live in a world where triviality pervades every aspect of life, including art. The art world has increasingly embraced superficiality, with trivial works being

celebrated as art. This trend represents a significant degradation of aesthetic taste. With the rise of modern social media, mediocrity and distortion have become prevalent, overshadowing genuine artistic content. Art has become a soulless entity, more akin to a mold than true art. The focus on presenting "realistic" but vulgar content, such as the use of obscene language in novels, raises questions about whether art truly requires such degradation of taste.

Alain Deneault's (1970/ ...) critique resonates here. He argues that contemporary art has succumbed to market and institutional triviality, losing its aesthetic value: "A number of artists, such as Dries Verhoeven, denounce the fact that in recent times the institutionalization of art has frustrated the endeavors of many artists to be subversive artists. The works of these artists, according to the novelist, have become a pattern to satisfy the expectations of the Ministry of Culture, museums, and other academies... It's subversive, pay attention, here" (A.C. Deneault, 2020, pp. 289-290).

According to Deneault (1970/ ...), contemporary art is being undermined and trivialized by commercial and institutional influences. The aesthetic taste has been overshadowed by a profit-driven vulgarity. This shift has diminished the appreciation of true beauty, as pettiness and superficiality dominate. Claimants to art, who seek fame and money rather than artistic excellence, contribute to this decline. This phenomenon parallels Nietzsche's description of "degenerate poets," who, despite their claims of depth, merely stir up the mud of triviality. Such individuals have stifled genuine artistic creativity, leaving behind only a distorted form of taste.

However, can we predict the absolute decline of art and the permanent loss of good taste? It is irrational and illogical to assert that the corruption of taste will be everlasting. The current decline in taste could be a temporary phase that might lead to a higher level of sophistication and aesthetic appreciation. As Walter Benjamin (1892/ 1940) suggested, history moves in a continuous cycle of renewal. The current degradation of taste might eventually give way to a more refined artistic sensibility.

Conclusion:

To address the question of whether the end of art is possible, several key results emerge:

-The notion of the end of art did not arise suddenly; rather, it follows a series of conceptual shifts. Nietzsche's declaration through Zarathustra, "God is dead," marked a significant change by removing divine limitations on human power. This idea of the "death of God" signified the end of traditional guardianship. Subsequently, Roland Barthes proclaimed the "death of the author," suggesting that the author's presence is no

longer necessary for interpreting a text. The idea is that the author's involvement limits the text's multiple meanings. This concept is closely related to the idea of the artist's death, which contributes to the end of art. Additionally, the declaration of the "death of meaning" further signals the end of art as a significant and essential cultural phenomenon. Thus, art is considered to have reached its final stage

-The term "end of art" signifies a historical shift in the perception of art. It represents the cessation of the grand narratives that once drove artistic creation. According to Danto, "I really meant to announce that some sort of occlusion has occurred in the historical development of art, and that an era of spectacular creativity that lasted perhaps six centuries in the wild has come to an end. And that every art that will be created from that period onwards will be marked by what I was ready to call a posthistorical trait" (Danto, 2021, p. 65). The end of art implies that art reached a certain historical moment beyond which it could no longer evolve in the same manner.

-The advent of artificial intelligence, which I refer to as the theory of substitution, has further complicated the notion of art's end. AI can generate numerous images and three-dimensional models almost instantly, replacing the human artist. However, this replacement has stripped art of its traditional essence. Art created by AI becomes a mere simulation, lacking the soul and emotional depth inherent in human-created art. The human artist, who infuses their emotions and intentions into their work, is crucial for authentic art. AI's involvement has diminished the emotional and spiritual aspects of art, reducing it to a mechanical process.

-The death of the artist does not necessarily equate to the end of art. While the artist is a central figure in the creation of art, their death does not necessarily signify the end of art's significance or existence. Many artworks gain prominence and new interpretations after their creators have passed away. For instance, Nietzsche's work "Thus Spoke Zarathustra" gained resonance and multiple interpretations posthumously. The reader's engagement with and interpretation of the work can breathe new life into it. Thus, while the artist's death may influence the evolution and production of art, it does not inevitably lead to art's end.

Bibliographic references

Alan Dunno (2020). *Nizam al-Tafaha* [The System of Dullness]. Dar Su'al, Lebanon.

Arthur C. Danto (2021). *Ba'd Nihayat al-Fann: al-Fann al-Mu'asir wa Nihayat al-Tarikh* [After the End of Art: Contemporary Art and the End of History] (Trans. Hadiya al-Arqi). Hay'at al-Thaqafa wa al-Athar, Bahrain.

- Clive Bell** (2018). *Al-Fann* [Art] (Trans. Adel Mustafa). Hindawi CIC, United Kingdom.
- Hegel Wilhelm friedrich** (1986). *Al-Fann al-Ramzi al-Klasiki al-Romansi* [Symbolic, Classical, and Romantic Art] (Trans. George Tarabishi). Dar al-Tali'a, Beirut.
- Jameel Sleiba** (1982). *Al-Mu'jam al-Falsafi* [The Philosophical Dictionary] (Vol. 2). Dar al-Kitab al-Lubnani, Beirut.
- Mundhir al-Aouni** (2009). *Hegel wa Mas'alat Mout al-Fann* [Hegel and the Question of the Death of Art]. Doctoral thesis, University of Tunis.
- Nietzsche friedrich** (2013). *Hakadha Kalama Zaradusht* [Thus Spoke Zarathustra] (Trans. Yasmine Breihom). Dar al-Almiya lil-Nashr wa al-Tawzi', Beirut. (Original work published 1883)
- Remy de Gourmont** (2021). *La fin de l'art* [The End of Art].
- Roger Garaudy** (1979). *Al-Buniyawiyya Falsafat Mout al-Insan* [Structuralism: Philosophy of the Death of Man] (Trans. George Tarabishi). Dar al-Tali'a, Beirut.
- Roland Barthes** (1999). *Hassasat al-Lughah* [The Sensibility of Language] (Trans. Mundhir Ayashi). Markaz al-Inma' al-Hadhari, Syria.
- Victor Frankl** (1982). *Al-Insan Yabhath 'an al-Ma'na* [Man's Search for Meaning]. Dar al-Qalam, Kuwait, p. 131.

Mahmoudi Khelifa Member of the research team on Western Philosophy and Science Research focus: "The Question of Otherness in Contemporary Western Philosophy" PhD in Philosophy Also interested in research on otherness in the philosophy of science.

Mahmoudi Khelifa

Lecturer in the Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Oran 2 Mohamed Ben Ahmed
Responsible for the Philosophy and History research axis
Laboratory: Laboratory of Philosophy and its History
khelifafilo@gmail.com

Belakhdar wahid Member of the research team on Western Philosophy and Science Research focus: " knowledge and culture in Edgar Morin " PhD in Philosophy Also interested in research on " knowledge and culture.

Belakhdar wahid

Lecturer in the Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Oran 2 Mohamed Ben Ahmed
Responsible for the Philosophy and History research axis
Laboratory: Human sciences Unit
Belakhdarwahid@gmail.com