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Abstract
This article investigates how cultural circulation of art may be considered from two different perspectives: one sees the circulation of art within a globalization paradigm according to which contemporary art has become increasingly global by circulating among and transgressing different geographical and national borders, whereas the other focuses on the circulation of art across different epistemological borders. Thus, the first is an intra-discursive circulation of art insofar as the epistemological discourse of art itself is not transgressed despite the focus on cultural transgression within the globalization paradigm. The latter, on the other hand, is an inter-discursive circulation of art, since it focuses on art's ability to work, simultaneously, within different epistemological discourses. By analysing the artwork Free Universal Construction Kit, the article critically investigates the aesthetic potentials of these two different paradigms. The analysis is carried out by considering how Kantian subject positions regarding the aesthetic can be taken on within each paradigm. The author demonstrates that, paradoxically, the inter-discursive circulation of art prompts for greater aesthetic potentials than the intra-discursive circulation of the globalization paradigm.
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This article investigates and compares two different paradigms of understanding cultural dispersion of art: One is the modern Western globalization paradigm that considers the circulation of artistic works and practices within the global temporal and spatial framework of the institutional art world. Within the institutional discourse of this art world, a geographical globalization has taken place since the 1990s, which means that today more and more regions in the geographically non-Western part of
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the world have entered the institutional world of contemporary art. This is demonstrated, for instance, by the gradual growth of national participations at the Venice Biennial. Since in this case works of art are circulated among different geographical cultures within the same epistemological discursive domain, the domain of art, I shall refer to this globalization of contemporary art as an *intra-discursive* circulation.

The other way of understanding the circulation of art is quite different. Instead of thinking of art as something that is exchanged in the sense of a process of globalization within one discursive domain, this is a kind of circulation where works of art are exchanged among several different institutional domains. For instance, an object that is identified and appreciated within the art institutional domain as a “work of art” may be considered a “scientific experiment” or “research” when circulated to the domain of science. Thus, instead of circulating among different geographical cultures on the premises of a shared discourse, the work of art is now circulated among different epistemological cultures, that is, between different discourses. Therefore, I shall refer to this practice of artistic circulation as *inter-discursive* circulation.

These two paradigms do not contradict or exclude each other, since they are not straightforwardly comparable, but it is of relevance to consider their relation because the latter inter-discursive paradigm of cultural artistic exchange gains currency in the actual artistic practice of contemporary (global) art, though in art criticism and academia it has been overshadowed by the well-known intra-discursive paradigm of globalization. Furthermore, investigating this inter-discursive exchange of works of art helps us recognize some of the blind spots of the globalization paradigm of the art world.

The following accounts for the intra-discursive circulation of art and analyses its premises before elaborating on the inter-discursive circulation of art to finally consider the relation between the two. The relation between the two is sketched in a model (Figure 4) towards the end of the article, and though the model is not explained until later, some readers may find it useful to consult the model regularly. To concretely illustrate the difference between the paradigms, an analysis of a specific work of art’s circulation within each paradigm supplements the theoretical investigations. One final introductory remark: When I write about the circulation of art, this is to be understood very concretely in the sense that it is the circulation—either physically in exhibitions or by way of communicative photo documentation or text descriptions in books, journal reviews, and so on—of specific works of art or actual artistic practices, and not of “art” as an abstract overall idea.

**INTRA-DISCURSIVE CIRCULATION OF ART**

The specific work of art that will serve to illustrate the two different paradigms of art circulation throughout the article is the *Free Universal Construction Kit*, created in 2012 by Golan Levin and Shawn Sims of F.A.T. Lab (Figures 1–3). The work is essentially a set of 80 different STL files, which is a file format that designates 3D objects and thus is printable by a 3D printer. Each file in the *Free Universal Construction Kit*, when printed on a 3D printer, results in a different plastic adapter that enables users to combine two sets of different toy systems that are normally incomparable.¹ For instance, item “uck-02f00m” enables one to expand a *Duplo* structure by *Gears!* elements, since it sutures the two systems. Taken together, the adapters make it possible to combine 10 different toy systems. The *Free Universal Construction Kit*’s STL files are licensed under a Creative Commons licence and as such are free for everyone to download and share, but the files cannot be traded commercially (it is, however, legal to trade the printed, physical adapter items for commercial purposes).²

The *Free Universal Construction Kit* was exhibited at the Ars Electronica Festival’s exhibition CyberArt in 2012, along with other works of art that somehow address new technologies in a general sense. The exhibition included artists from 74 different countries³ and thus fully demonstrated how works of art travel across regional borders within the art world of contemporary art. This art world can be described as a discursive framework in which works of contemporary art exist in a variety of concrete institutional and regional settings (museums, art schools, festivals, auction houses, art journals, etc.), which, all taken together, make up the domain of contemporary art.⁴ These concrete institutions have expanded geographically across the globe during the last couple of decades—to an extent that the institutional art world is today also a global art world.⁵
Figure 1. Golan Levin and Shawn Sims with the FAT (Free Art and Technology) Lab and Sy-Lab: The Free Universal Construction Kit adapter matrix—an overview of the different STL files. Photo: http://fffff.at/free-universal-construction-kit.
Thus, Western galleries, museums and auction houses establish new branches in non-Western parts of the world to promote Western contemporary art and vice versa. A collector of art in Shanghai or Idaho may be well informed of the latest art gallery shows in Los Angeles or new tendencies on the Senegal art scene. The wider the geographical coverage, the more global the art world is, and today the world of contemporary art has a global reach.

This globalization of the institutional art world has obviously been furthered by developments in communication tools, not least the communication possibilities offered by the Internet. The Free Universal Construction Kit as a specific work of art also makes use of the Internet as an artistic medium.
in the sense that all the STL files of the work are free for everyone to download from different webpages—for instance, from thingiverse.com, which is a forum where amateurs and semi-professionals display their 3D-printable designs and make the files available for others. We should, however, distinguish carefully between the two different levels of global circulation that are at work in the Free Universal Construction Kit: One circulation takes place at the level of the work itself—the possibility of downloading the files is a part of the work, just like the possibility of touching the marble to feel the curves is a part of a carved sculpture—and the other circulation takes place at the institutional level around the work—in the sense that the work is part of a global art world and was exhibited in an international setting at Ars Electronica.

But what actually makes the Free Universal Construction Kit art in the first place?

According to the institutional art theory, the art world has the institutional power to constitute and define an artefact as a piece of “contemporary art” and not just as an everyday phenomenon or a random object. In this sense, art is descriptively defined as that which belongs to the art world. Thus, the very fact that the Free Universal Construction Kit was accepted for exhibition at the Ars Electronica Festival establishes it as a work of art. Concretely, the inclusion of objects and practices by the art world occurs because experts of the art world find them to be of aesthetic interest, and aesthetic appeal is a very significant characteristic of the intra-discursive circulation of art.

THE AESTHETIC, HUMANISTIC SUBJECT POSITION

Even though the institutional theory of art is descriptive insofar as it names and frames art instead of judging it as either good or bad art, normativity is at work when for instance works by hitherto unknown or amateur artists are accepted by agents in the art world, because they find that the work has aesthetic value. The transformation of graffiti to “street art,” accompanied by the genre’s entrance into fine art galleries, would serve as one example of this mechanism. Another is the fact that many of fifteenth-century painter Jan van Eyck’s Madonnas are now on display in major museums of fine art and not in the Belgian churches for which they were originally created, not to mention the shamans’ tools, collected and exhibited by institutions of fine art even though they were originally created (by anonymous craftsmen) with a different purpose in mind.

In the exhibition at Ars Electronica, the Free Universal Construction Kit was presented in the form of a poster on a wall and a number of printed toy plastic adapters in a vitrine. Thus, the work was fundamentally presented as a concept for contemplation and not as toys to be played with. Such a mode of presentation fits very well with the art institutional culture in which works of art are basically meant to be aesthetically intriguing rather than functional everyday objects. This is similar to how street art and altar pieces are appreciated for their aesthetic appeal when they are positioned within the overall epistemological domain of art, and not, for instance, within the epistemological domains of religion or vandalism. This contemplative staging of the Free Universal Construction Kit also fits the intentions expressed by the work’s creators, who claim that “the Free Universal Construction Kit offers a ‘meta-mashup system’ ideally provisioned for the creation of transgressive architecture and chimeric ready-mades.” And furthermore:

In producing the Free Universal Construction Kit, we hope to demonstrate a model of reverse engineering as a civic activity: a creative process in which anyone can develop the necessary pieces to bridge the limitations presented by mass-produced commercial artefacts. We hope that the Kit will not only prompt people to create new designs, but more importantly, to reflect on our relationship with material mass-culture—and the rapidly-evolving ways in which we can better adapt it to our imaginations.

By expressing a wish that the work will prompt people to “reflect on our relationship with material mass-culture,” the creators implicitly align with an important art theoretical ideal that stems from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. This ideal, also known as the romantic or speculative theory of art, is founded on the belief that art should serve an aesthetic purpose only.

According to Immanuel Kant, art—which is related to nature by way of the genius—is characterized by submitting to reflective aesthetic judgement of taste, which is not governed by a
determined concept. Kant specifically states, "[t]he satisfaction which determines the judgment of taste is disinterested."\(^{12}\) This means that when a person encounters a phenomenon and considers it to be a work of art by subjecting it to a judgement of taste—and not, for instance, a judgement of cognition—he or she takes on an *aesthetic subject position* in which no determined concept is brought down on the work. This person may take on all other kinds of subject positions in other situations, but when judging a work of art, an aesthetic subject position is applied—otherwise, that person is not judging art but something else. If, for instance, a person should enter a gallery without realizing that it is a gallery and start to use Marcel Duchamp’s *The Bottle Rack* (1914) as a real bottle rack, then he or she simply would not judge the piece as a work of art but as a practical everyday appliance, and would have taken on a practical, functional subject position.

The subject position that is taken on when judging art is also humanistic insofar as aesthetic judgement, according to Kantian thinking, springs from the free will of the individual subject, whose aesthetic experiences equip him or her to better participate as an enlightened citizen in societal matters in general.\(^{13}\) Even though this humanistic, aesthetic subject position—which is the ideal when judging art—stems from a specific European tradition of philosophy, it still dominates the institutional domain of contemporary art. The reason for this is simple: The globalization of the contemporary art world is the result of a profound dispersion of Western art institutional concepts (e.g. art schools and commercial galleries) that are all founded on this specific aesthetic concept of art. The circulation of non-Western works of art on a global scale happens within the institutional framework governed by the aesthetic concept of art. In other words: Those works that circulate in the global contemporary art world, regardless of their geographical origin, are all found by the experts of this art world to conform with this specific concept of art—otherwise, they would not be included in the art world at all. That is, despite the fact that these works originate from a number of different geographical cultures, they circulate within the same epistemological discourse.

Even works of art that strongly challenge this aesthetic paradigm of art—by encouraging political activism, pointing at the commercial interests in the art world, turning spectators into participants or co-creators, and so forth—fail to destroy this concept of art insofar as they all inevitably end up in the art institution where they are subjected to aesthetic, reflective judgement of taste. And even if actors within this institution apply different criteria to art than an aesthetic one (e.g. commercial criteria governed by specific economic interests), they can do so successfully only if they play along and pretend to have taken on the humanistic, aesthetic subject position, since, as Julian Stellabrass has argued, the aesthetic concept of art is what guarantees a work’s commercial value.\(^{14}\)

Cultural critic Johanna Drucker demonstrates how art is considered to be an act of interactive communication between individuals holding a humanistic subject position, when she states,

> A work always functions provocatively, drawing forth from artist and then viewer a whole host of responses and reactions. An art object functions as a relay, a switching device among people whose exchanged conceptions are passed from one to another like signals bouncing off a way station [...] This concept of interactivity is fundamental to our understanding of a work of art in this sense, whether it is generated through computational methods, from electronic media, or from a piece of Carrera marble.\(^{15}\)

A similar point of view is presented by philosopher Bernard Stiegler, according to whom works of art are able to play the role of “trans-individuators,” thus initiating diachronic processes or “long circuits” that enable the “I” to be part of a larger, more universal “we.” For Stiegler, the work of art is “the first link” in the process of transindividuation in the following sense:

> What is brought to sight or to hearing in a work, painting, poetry, music, performance, and so on is this first time when an aspect of the thingness of things that noticize is sealed. All those who share the symbols generated by transindividuation participate in the becoming of the circuits of transindividuation, for to share is to individuate oneself and individuate in turn, and to inscribe oneself within the chain of transindividuations whose first link is the work.\(^{16}\)

In this quote, Stiegler actually assigns this trans-individuating capacity to the singular work of art itself, whereas Kant describes it as a feature that we ascribe to the singular judgement *as if* it had...
universal value. But both express the idea of connecting people who are positioned as aesthetic, reflective, and humanistic subjects. The ideal of this subject position is also expressed by Stiegler in his statement,

In going to see an exhibition at the museum, in reading a novel, in watching a film in a non-consumerist manner. [...] I participate in the weaving of the long circuits of transindividuation. 17

The Kantian ideal of the disinterest of the aesthetic experience is the core of this ideal; that art should be approached in a “non-consumerist manner.” In line with this thought, Stiegler strongly condemns the cultural industries, which are “totally subjected to the logic of the marketplace”18 and – by compressing the time of human experience into synchronised image-objects on the global “consciousness market”—result in a “political-spiritual, if not also [...] material and corporal, apocalypse.”19 The cultural industries, according to Stiegler, govern all areas of contemporary life to the extent that it is no longer possible to distinguish between, for instance, science, digital technology, knowledge, education, and capital.

As demonstrated here, despite the fact that there are non-aesthetic interests at work in the art world, and that art according to the institutional theory of art is a matter of descriptive inclusion in an institutional framework, the circulation of contemporary artwork among different geographical cultures (i.e. cultural globalization) takes place within one overall epistemological discourse in which we approach the specific works of art by taking on an aesthetic, humanistic subject position. Whereas Kantian aesthetics implicitly permeates this globalization paradigm of the art world, what is explicitly the focus of this paradigm is the coming together of many different regional aesthetics (in the sense of different artistic expressions from different geographical cultures) within the art discourse. But as it has sometimes been debated in discussions on the globalization of the art world, the idea that different regional aesthetics exist is a false assumption. 20 Thus, examples of actual questions that disturb the idea of intra-discursive circulation of art are: What does Australian aesthetics look like—does it originate from an aboriginal tradition or not? How do we deal with ink painting created in 2013 when we talk about Chinese contemporary art? How do one region’s everyday artefacts become another region’s art (like the exhibition of Ghanian funeral coffins at Magiciens de la terre in 1989)? Do we apply a regional prefix to the art created by a Texan-born artist who resides in Norway and has Mexican parents (if “yes,” which one)? How do we deal with a white artist who is heavily inspired by Rastafarian culture in her work?

Such questions point to a number of contradictions inherent in the perspective of an intra-discursive circulation of art. And they also point to the limitations of applying a humanistic, aesthetic subject position only to the discourse of art. As the following will demonstrate, works like the Free Universal Construction Kit, prompt for indeterminate, aesthetic encounters between different epistemological cultures.

INTER-DISCURSIVE CIRCULATION OF ART

Whereas the circulation of art within the intra-discursive globalization paradigm is based on a humanistic aesthetic subject position, the inter-discursive paradigm is characterized by a multiplicity of subject positions—of which an aesthetic humanistic subject position is only one among others. Rather than circulating among different geographical cultures within one shared discourse, art circles among different epistemological cultures or different discourses of knowledge. Let us see how this works with the Free Universal Construction Kit, whose significance as art has been ascribed by the aesthetic subject position mentioned in this article.

The fact that this work in itself makes use of a very concrete way of dispersion, in the sense that the files can be downloaded from anywhere via the Internet and then printed wherever on any 3D printer, is a feature that has far-reaching economic potentials. As Chris Anderson argues, with the new combination of atoms and bits that 3D printing represents,

[T]he things that are expensive in traditional manufacturing become free:
1) Variety is free: It costs no more to make every product different than to make them all the same. 2) Complexity is free: A minutely
detailed product, with many fiddly little components, can be 3-D printed as cheaply as a plain block of plastic. [\ldots] 3) Flexibility is free: Changing a product after production has started just means changing the instruction code. The machines stay the same.\textsuperscript{21}

Hence, a work like the Free Universal Construction Kit may be considered to suggest a new business model for toy companies like Lego that thus could make their bricks available as files for customers. At thingiverse.com—a MakerBot-sponsored universe for amateurs and semi-professionals who design 3D-printable things and make the files available for download—several users have already designed Lego bricks (some of them normal, “official” bricks and others specially customized). Once household 3D printers have been developed and refined to provide a better print quality than today and will meet the quality of retail Lego bricks, the Lego Company will most likely launch their bricks in the format of digital files for sale online (obviously with some kind of security code that enables the customer to print each file a limited number of times).

Thus, in a very concrete manner, the Free Universal Construction Kit suggests a new business model that may make a lot of sense to toy companies. Engineers and market analysts of such companies may study the Free Universal Construction Kit along with similar projects regarding how to expand the market by using the same technologies. This business interest in the Free Universal Construction Kit, however, differs dramatically from the interest of the aesthetic subject position, and as such we are now dealing with a different subject position. That subject position may be termed a capitalist subject position, which transforms the Free Universal Construction Kit altogether from its status as a work of art into another status. It becomes a business model that it makes sense to compare to other business models, but that it does not make sense to compare to works of art.

We may also imagine the Free Universal Construction Kit as an example of construction design—comparing it to the crafts of joinery, shipbuilding, and even programming—and, in that case, it would be an engineering subject position that ascribes meaning to the Free Universal Construction Kit.

\section*{The Transformative Character of Works of Contemporary Art}

What happens in these examples is that the work changes when circulated among the different discourses. To the humanistic, aesthetic subject position, the Free Universal Construction Kit consists of a number of different elements (digital files, existing toy systems, rules and cultures around copyright issues, the idea of free creativity when playing, the technical possibility of 3D printing, etc.) which, taken together, (ideally) constitute an intriguing phenomenon that arouses feelings in us that we cannot categorize under one determined concept.

To the capitalist subject position, the Free Universal Construction Kit consists of something that is very different. Whereas that subject position may not see free creativity of play, it may detect a potential of distributing goods in a new way, which cuts costs for storage space and transportation and even leads to lower CO\textsubscript{2} emissions, which may be used as a marketing feature to attract new customers. None of those elements were present in the Free Universal Construction Kit encountered by the humanistic, aesthetic subject position. And to the engineering subject position, yet a different set of features are present. The point is that in this case, the Free Universal Construction Kit is no longer one phenomenon but three different ones, each consisting of different materials or media, and each with a different set of features and potentials, because we are dealing with different epistemological cultures.

Accordingly, it is much more relevant to consider this kind of inter-discursive circulation with contemporary works of art than with classic or modern works of art, because there is no longer a fixed dogma that would claim that some media or material are more artistic than other. Since the 1960s, Western art has paraded a number of artistic tendencies that incorporate forms and media from non-artistic discourses. Whereas, for instance, oil paint on canvas does not make a lot of sense outside the domain of art, several of the means of contemporary art (like iron bars, street happenings, computer images, cardboard boxes, social meetings, etc.) may be of interest to domains that are external to the traditional arts.
As such, works of contemporary art carry no features—in terms of motives, themes, or media—that are exclusive to these in any essential way, and this renders them open for circulation among different epistemological discourses. We may consider the inter-discursive circulation of phenomena that are known as works of art to the humanistic, aesthetic subject position to be irrelevant insofar as these phenomena are not of aesthetic interest when they are approached by other subject positions. After all, why should we care if a banker looks at the Free Universal Construction Kit and sees a business model instead of a work of art?

AESTHETIC CONSEQUENCES OF INTER-DISCURSIVE CIRCULATION

Normally, we do not find business models to be aesthetically very intriguing, so why should we consider the Free Universal Construction Kit as a business model to be of any interest when discussing art and aesthetics?

The reason is that the inter-discursive circulation of works of art may in some respects provide for greater aesthetic potentials than the intra-discursive circulation. This may seem paradoxical since, as we have seen, the latter is governed by a humanistic, aesthetic subject position. As accounted for here, the aesthetic subject position encounters phenomena without subjecting them to any specific interest, and this relationship of a projecting, undetermined dialogue between subject and phenomenon, constitutes the very core of aesthetic experience.22

Since the rise of speculative art theory in the nineteenth century, aesthetic experience has been the governing ideal of the art discourse. This, however, does not mean that all phenomena that are institutionally accepted as works of art are de facto always prompt aesthetic experience in all members of the audience—even though the audience may all have taken on an aesthetic subject position by visiting the exhibition—since aesthetic experience is a matter of subjective feelings arising individually when encountering a specific phenomenon.23

As demonstrated by the institutional theory of art, it has been clear since the 1960s that a split exists between the aesthetic, prescriptive ideal of the art discourse and the actual, institutional, descriptive facts of how the art discourse functions practically; and that the two do not always coincide for all members of the art audience. Instead, they sometimes coexist in mutual isolation within the art discourse.

The consequence to be drawn from this split between an aesthetics ideal and an institutional art world is that it makes sense to seriously consider the potentials of taking on the humanistic, aesthetic subject position outside the domain of art. This is certainly possible since, as Kant initially suggested, pure aesthetic judgement of taste is not related to art but to nature, and works of art only become subject of aesthetic judgement by mediation of the genius, who is able to express the undetermined purposiveness of nature without even fully comprehending it.24 It may well be that the humanistic, aesthetic subject position is better fuelled outside the art discourse than within it, since, according to philosopher Martin Seel,

when it is a question of the scope of aesthetic experience, its reach, we cannot stop at the arts, as if they were the true fulfillment [sic] of aesthetic experience. Aesthetic experience knows no true canonical fulfillment. It finds fulfillment in being drawn into possibilities for perception and understanding both inside and outside art, and it discovers that these possibilities cannot be exhausted, controlled, or determined.25

Since the art discourse is controlling and determining the works of art by pinning them down as unique and static works of “art”—a mechanism that Jon Ippolito has accurately termed “death by wall label”26—the humanistic, aesthetic subject position may very well find an even wider field of aesthetic potential if brought from the intra-discursive domain of art to the inter-discursive domain of several different epistemologies. This is not an easy exercise, since—due to the fact that the heritage passed down from speculative art theory has been very influential, as demonstrated here—we normally do not take on aesthetic subject positions when relating to non-artistic discourses. But today, contemporary art’s use of materials and media formats that are not exclusive to the art domain enables the works to be included in non-artistic epistemological domains to a larger degree than earlier, and this prompts a greater
focus on the aesthetic potentials of inter-discursive circulation than intra-discursive circulation.

So far, I have related globalization to intra-discursive circulation insofar as globalization has been the profound agenda of the art world since the mid-1990s. But a closer focus on inter-discursive circulation does not do away with globalization. First of all, as mentioned in this article, the two different kinds of circulation are not mutually exclusive—you can pay attention to how a specific work of art circulates within the art world from one geographic culture to another, and at the same time consider how the work circulates among different epistemological domains; it is merely two different perspectives. Second, the inter-discursive circulation of art congenially takes place on a global scale, as demonstrated by the example of the Free Universal Construction Kit’s potential existence within a capitalist discourse and an engineering discourse, both of which are today global discourses that exchange mechanisms and elements across national and regional borders. So, even if geographic globalization is not addressed specifically when we investigate the inter-discursive circulation of art, it permeates this kind of circulation since today a global perspective has become a default setting in all epistemological domains.

The contours of a matrix now emerge (Figure 4): As accounted for, the intra-discursive circulation of art has for a couple of decades focused on the extent to which art is exchanged across international borders. Using the terminology of Arjun Appadurai, we may, thus, think of the art domain as a kind of art-“scape.” The five different dimensions of global flows suggested by Appadurai (ethnoscape, mediascape, technoscape, financescape, and ideoscape)27 can be thought of as constituting five different entities on the x-axis of a chart—and we may image the art world as a sixth—whereas the y-axis measures the level of globalization based on the extent to which ideas and concrete elements circulate across different geographical regions worldwide. Hence, the difference in height of the columns of the chart indicates that one scape has a certain level of globalization, whereas another has a different level of globalization (the values indicated in Figure 4 do not relate to real data but serve only to illustrate the general idea of the chart). Some of the globalization levels may influence each other in the sense that an increased globalization of the ideoscape may correspond to an increase in the globalization of the mediascape. And in reality, as stressed by Appadurai, the different scapes often overlap.

The point of referring to Appadurai’s ideas on scapes of globalization is that in the intra-discursive perspective of the circulation of art, questions of cultural encounters are confined to one determined epistemological discourse: the discourse of art, which fixates the aesthetic experience in one particular direction (of art).
What is ideally (according to speculative art theory) an undetermined judgement of taste thus turns out to be epistemologically determined. But if we apply a broader perspective to our imaginary chart, we see the possibility of expanding the possible circulation of art from a vertical movement (on the y-axis scale of geographic globalization) to a horizontal movement (among different epistemological cultures).

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the what has been discussed in this article, it is fair to conclude that the intradiscursive circulation paradigm of globalization somewhere along the line seems to have forgotten Kantian aesthetics, which is paradoxical, since this implicitly is the very foundation that holds the art world together as one coherent epistemological discourse. Focusing on Kantian aesthetics implies a broadening of the perspective beyond the confinement of the art world to consider a wider field of indeterminacy for works of art. The aesthetic potentials seem greater when the scope of indeterminacy is expanded, which is exactly what happens when works of art circulate inter-discursively among different epistemological cultures. Thus, the humanistic, aesthetic subject position may prove to be of even greater relevance outside than inside the discourse of art for which it is traditionally designated.
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