

FLORENTIN SMARANDACHE

META-GARDE

The Structural Condition of Art

Theory and Applications



META-GARDE SERIES, 1



NSIA

NEUTROSOPHIC SCIENCE
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
PUBLISHING HOUSE

META-GARDE SERIES, 1

FLORENTIN SMARANDACHE

Meta-garde: The Structural Condition of Art *Theory and Applications*

Meta-garde designates a structural condition in which entities—artistic, linguistic, or conceptual—are no longer governed by binary distinctions, but exist through the coexistence of multiple, non-exclusive states. Within this condition, an artwork may simultaneously affirm and negate its own status, while remaining partially indeterminate, without requiring resolution into a single category.

Meta-garde does not describe a movement, style, or historical phase, but a formal regime in which contradiction, ambiguity, and reflexivity are constitutive rather than exceptional. It provides a framework for understanding art not as a fixed entity defined by exclusion, but as a dynamic configuration of coexisting aesthetic states.

More broadly, meta-garde extends beyond aesthetics to a philosophical condition: a logic of coexistence in which oppositions are not eliminated but sustained, and in which entities are defined relationally rather than exclusively. In this sense, artistic practices such as pArAdOXisM and oUTER-aRT do not merely exemplify meta-garde, but make visible a structural principle that resonates across domains, including language, culture, and non-binary ontologies.



Neutrosophic Science International Association (NSIA)

Publishing House

<https://fs.unm.edu/NSIA/>

Division of Mathematics and Sciences
University of New Mexico
705 Gurley Ave., Gallup Campus
NM 87301, United States of America

University of Guayaquil
Av. Kennedy and Av. Delta
"Dr. Salvador Allende" University Campus
Guayaquil 090514, Ecuador

ISBN 978-197250210-5



9

781972

502105

META-GARDE SERIES, 1

FLORENTIN SMARANDACHE

**Meta-garde:
The Structural Condition of Art**

Theory and Applications



Neutrosophic Science International Association (NSIA)
Publishing House
META-GARDE SERIES, 1
Gallup - Guayaquil
United States of America – Ecuador
2026

PEER-REVIEWERS

Alok Dhital

Mathematics, Physical and Natural Sciences Division
University of New Mexico, Gallup Campus, NM, USA
adhital@unm.edu

Le Hoang Son

VNU Univ. of Science, Vietnam National Univ. Hanoi, Vietnam
sonlh@vnu.edu.vn

Xiaohong Zhang

Shaanxi University of Science & Technology, Xian, China
zhangxh@shmtu.edu.cn

Table of Contents

Foreword.....	7
Core Concepts of Meta-Garde.....	9
I The Crisis of Aesthetics	
1 What Is Aesthetics?.....	15
2 Historical Trajectories of Aesthetic Thought	18
3 The Failure of Binary Aesthetics	22
4 The Need for a New Framework.....	26
II Foundations of Meta-garde	
5 Formal Foundations of Meta-garde.....	30
6 The Meta-garde Object	33
7 Structural Variables and Aesthetic Profiles	36
8 Minimal Axiomatic System for Meta-garde	39
Primitive Terms	39
Axioms	40
Derived Definitions	41
Remarks on the System.....	41
III The Meta-garde Space	
9 Aesthetic State Space and Mapping	44
10 Indices and Measurement	47
11 Context and Relativity.....	50
IV Domain Instantiations	
12 Visual Domain: oUTER-aRT	54
13 Literary Domain: pArAdOXisM	57
14 Action and Performance	60
15 Cross-Domain Invariants	63
V Toward a General Theory	
16 Aesthetic Classes and Cluster Logic.....	68
17 Meta-garde in the History of Aesthetics	71

Theory and Applications

18 From Anti-Art to Meta-garde.....75

19 Meta-garde Beyond Aesthetics..... 78

20 Limits and Open Problems.....81

21 Conclusion: A New Stage of Aesthetics84

Appendix: Worked Example (*Fountain*, 1917).....87

 1. Why *Fountain* is an ideal test case88

 2. Object definition88

 3. Contextual framing.....88

 4. Triadic evaluation in context C2.....89

 5. Structural-variable mapping.....91

 5.2 Full vector92

 6. Interpretation of the vector.....92

 7. Comparative contextual shift93

 8. What this example proves94

 9. Provisional classification94

 10. Concluding formulation94

Glossary of Meta-garde95

Foreword

This book begins from a simple but far-reaching dissatisfaction: the inadequacy of traditional aesthetic categories when confronted with the most radical forms of modern and contemporary art. The familiar oppositions—art versus non-art, meaningful versus meaningless, poetic versus anti-poetic—have long structured aesthetic judgment. Yet, as the avant-garde repeatedly demonstrates, these binaries do not merely fail at the margins; they collapse at the center of artistic practice.

Meta-garde emerges precisely at this point of collapse.

It is not a new artistic movement, nor a continuation of the avant-garde by other means. It is a redefinition of the conditions under which art exists. Where traditional frameworks rely on exclusion—this is art, that is not—meta-garde describes a structural condition in which such distinctions no longer hold. It introduces a model capable of accommodating coexistence: a framework in which affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy can operate simultaneously, without being reduced to one another. At the core of this approach lies a fundamental shift: the recognition that an artwork may simultaneously affirm and negate its own status, while remaining indeterminate in ways that are not reducible to either pole. Such a perspective is not merely theoretical. It is demanded by the works themselves—by objects that function as both art and anti-art, by texts that are both poems and non-poems, by constructions that resist stable classification. Among the movements that most clearly expose this condition is pArAdOXisM.

pArAdOXisM does not generate this condition, but makes it particularly visible.

Too often treated as marginal, eccentric, or derivative, pArAdOXisM is in fact uniquely positioned to illuminate the limits of traditional aesthetics. Its insistence on contradiction as a generative principle, its expansion of the poetic object beyond language, and its continuous self-theorization all point toward a deeper transformation: the emergence of a condition in which contradiction is not an error, but a structural feature of art. This book argues that meta-garde provides a framework adequate to this condition.

The chapters that follow do not seek to celebrate pArAdOXisM uncritically, nor to subsume it into an abstract theory. Instead, they pursue a double movement. On the one hand, they reconstruct pArAdOXisM as a coherent and distinct literary formation, defined by its procedures, its forms, and its theoretical articulation. On the other hand, they develop a formal model capable of analyzing not only

Theory and Applications

pArAdOXisM, but a wide range of artistic practices that operate under the same structural condition.

In doing so, the book moves across several levels:

- from historical reconstruction to conceptual analysis,
- from literary interpretation to formal modeling,
- from individual works to comparative mapping.

The result is not a closed system, but an analytical space—a field in which artistic objects and movements can be located, compared, and understood in terms of their structural properties.

What ultimately emerges is a different way of thinking about art and literature. Not as fixed categories, but as dynamic configurations. Not as objects defined once and for all, but as states that can shift, overlap, and coexist. Not as resolved meanings, but as fields of tension in which affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy interact.

In this sense, meta-garde does more than describe contemporary practices. It makes visible a condition that has already taken hold within them. It does not replace the avant-garde, but reveals the structural logic that follows from the collapse of its assumptions.

If this book succeeds, it will not be by closing the questions it raises, but by articulating them more precisely. For what is at stake is not only the interpretation of particular movements, but the possibility of an understanding of art adequate to a condition in which contradiction is no longer an exception, but a structural principle.

Core Concepts of Meta-Garde

1. The Triadic Ontology of the Artwork

At the foundation of **meta-garde** lies a simple but powerful claim:

Any aesthetic object exists simultaneously in states of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy.

This condition can be described, and where needed, formally expressed through three independent components:

- **T(w)** — degree of aesthetic affirmation (the extent to which something functions as art / poetry)
- **F(w)** — degree of aesthetic negation (the extent to which it functions as anti-art / anti-poetry)
- **I(w)** — degree of indeterminacy (the extent to which its status remains undecidable)

These components are not mutually exclusive. A work may be strongly artistic and strongly anti-artistic at the same time, while also remaining partially indeterminate.

This triadic ontology defines the structural condition of meta-garde. It replaces classical binary logic (A vs non-A) with a system of **coexisting, graded states**.

In literary terms, this allows a non-poem to be:

- fully poetic (high T),
 - fully anti-poetic (high F),
 - and undecidable (high I),
- simultaneously.

2. Independence of Components

A crucial feature of this model is that:

T, F, and I are independent variables, not complementary proportions.

This means:

- $T + F + I \neq 1$ (there is no normalization constraint),
- each dimension can reach high values simultaneously.

This independence is essential to the logic of meta-garde. Contradiction is not treated as a transitional state or an error to be resolved, but as a **structural possibility**.

In paradoxist contexts, this independence becomes particularly visible, as affirmation and negation are not opposed stages, but co-present dimensions.

3. The Multidimensional Variable Space

Beyond the triadic structure, meta-garde introduces a **multidimensional description of artworks**.

Each work can be represented as a vector defined by a set of structural variables (adapted here for literary analysis):

- **u** — anti-euphony
- **m** — material-linguistic negation
- **s** — anti-craft
- **d** — definitional destabilization
- **p** — paradox density
- **i** — semantic indeterminacy
- **c** — institutional contradiction
- **r** — reflexivity
- **ℓ** — explicitness of procedure
- **ϕ** — phonetic autonomy
- **α** — authorial dissolution
- **σ** — extra-verbal transfer

An artwork is therefore not a fixed category, but a **point in a high-dimensional space**.

This allows:

- fine-grained comparison between works,
- mapping of artistic practices,
- identification of structural clusters across domains.

4. Aesthetic Indeterminacy as Structural

In traditional aesthetics, ambiguity is often treated as:

- a byproduct,
- a lack of clarity,
- or a temporary interpretive difficulty.

In meta-garde, indeterminacy is understood differently:

it is a primary structural dimension of the artwork.

In paradoxist contexts, for example:

- indeterminacy is not something to be resolved,
- it is something to be produced and sustained.

Thus, **I(w)** is not noise—it is a constitutive signal of the aesthetic state.

5. Contradiction as Generative Principle

In classical aesthetics, contradiction is typically avoided or resolved.

In meta-garde:

contradiction is allowed, and in certain cases, it becomes generative.

A work may derive its structure and value precisely from the coexistence of opposing states.

This leads to a fundamental shift:

The value of an artwork is not diminished by contradiction; it may be constituted by it.

This principle is directly observable in paradoxist constructions, non-poems, and anti-language forms, where contradiction is not a defect, but a method.

6. Anti-Art as a Continuous Dimension

Meta-garde dissolves the rigid boundary between:

- art
- and anti-art.

Instead, it treats anti-art as a **dimension within the same structural system.**

A work may be:

- strongly artistic (high T),
- strongly anti-artistic (high F),

without contradiction, because these dimensions are independent.

This perspective allows a more precise understanding of:

- Duchamp-like gestures,
- conceptual works,
- paradoxist constructions.

7. Contextual and Relational Evaluation

In meta-garde, the status of an artwork is not fixed.

It depends on:

- context (institutional, cultural, historical),

Theory and Applications

- framing (gallery, text, performance),
- interpretation.

Thus, the same object may exhibit different values of *T*, *F*, and *I* across contexts.

This reinforces a central idea: aesthetic status is **relational**, not intrinsic.

8. The Aesthetic Field as a Topological Space

When multiple works are described using triadic values and structural variables, they form an **aesthetic field**.

This field can be understood as a topological space in which:

- movements form clusters,
- transitional zones appear,
- new regions emerge.

Within this space, pArAdOXisM occupies a region characterized by:

- high paradox density (*p*),
- high definitional destabilization (*d*),
- high reflexivity (*r*) and explicitness (*ℓ*),
- high indeterminacy (*l*),
- and simultaneous high affirmation (*T*) and negation (*F*).

This makes it a dense and structurally complex zone within the meta-garde condition.

9. Reflexivity as Structural Feature

Meta-garde places strong emphasis on **reflexivity**.

Works may:

- describe their own status,
- expose their own construction,
- theorize their own logic.

This is captured by:

- high **r** (reflexivity),
- high **ℓ** (explicitness of procedure).

pArAdOXisM is exemplary in this respect:

- its manifestos are part of its poetics,
- its theory is embedded in its practice.

10. From Aesthetic Theory to Formal Logic

Finally, meta-garde is not limited to aesthetics alone.

It reflects a broader shift toward a **formal logic of coexisting states**, applicable beyond art.

In this sense:

- the aesthetic model becomes a specific case of a more general structural logic,
- and artistic practices serve as experimental domains in which this logic is made visible.

pArAdOXisM can thus be understood as one of the first domains in which this condition is explicitly enacted.

I

The Crisis of Aesthetics

1

What Is Aesthetics?

Aesthetics, as a discipline, occupies a peculiar and evolving position within philosophy. It is often described as the philosophy of art, yet this characterization is historically incomplete. From its inception, aesthetics has been concerned not only with art, but with **the nature of perception, sensibility, and the conditions under which objects are experienced as meaningful, valuable, or beautiful**. Its scope has continually expanded, following transformations in artistic practice and in philosophical thought itself. Yet, despite these transformations, aesthetic thought has remained structurally dependent on distinctions that assume stability and exclusivity.

The term “aesthetics” was first introduced in the eighteenth century by Alexander Baumgarten, who defined it as the *scientia cognitionis sensitivae*, the science of sensory knowledge. For Baumgarten, aesthetics was not yet a theory of art in the modern sense, but a discipline concerned with the logic of perception—an attempt to give philosophical legitimacy to forms of knowledge that were not reducible to rational cognition (Baumgarten, 1750/1954). This initial formulation already signals a fundamental tension that will persist throughout the history of aesthetics: the relationship between **sensibility and conceptualization**, between what is felt and what is understood.

The development of aesthetics as a philosophical discipline reaches a decisive stage with Immanuel Kant. In the *Critique of Judgment*, Kant redefines aesthetic judgment as a form of reflective judgment that is neither purely subjective nor fully objective. Judgments of beauty, he argues, are grounded in a feeling of pleasure that arises from the free play of cognitive faculties, yet they claim a kind of universality without relying on determinate concepts (Kant, 1790/2000). This paradox—subjective universality—establishes aesthetics as a domain in which **experience resists full conceptual capture**, while still demanding communicability.

In the work of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, aesthetics undergoes another transformation. For Hegel, art is no longer primarily a matter of sensory cognition or judgment, but a historical manifestation of spirit (*Geist*). Art becomes one of the modes through which truth appears in sensible form, and its development follows a dialectical progression from symbolic to classical to

romantic forms (Hegel, 1835/1975). With Hegel, aesthetics becomes explicitly a **philosophy of art**, embedded in a broader theory of history and culture.

These foundational moments establish a trajectory along which aesthetics evolves from a theory of perception, to a theory of judgment, to a theory of art as a cultural and historical phenomenon. Over time, the discipline shifts its center of gravity. What begins as an inquiry into beauty gradually becomes an inquiry into art, and later, into **aesthetic experience more broadly**. This expansion reflects not only philosophical developments, but also changes in artistic practice. As new forms emerge and challenge existing categories, aesthetics is forced to reconsider its own foundations. By the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, aesthetics becomes increasingly concerned with questions of form and expression. Formalist approaches emphasize the internal organization of the artwork—its structure, composition, and relations—while expression theories focus on the communication of emotion or inner states. Despite their differences, both approaches presuppose that art is a relatively stable domain, characterized by identifiable properties or functions. This assumption is profoundly destabilized in the twentieth century, particularly with the emergence of avant-garde movements such as Dada. Here, objects that appear to negate the very conditions of art—ready-mades, nonsense texts, acts of destruction—are nevertheless presented as artworks. The question “What is art?” becomes inseparable from the question “Who decides?” and “Under what conditions?” Aesthetics can no longer rely solely on intrinsic properties of objects; it must account for **context, framing, and institutional recognition** (Dickie, 1974).

As a result, the discipline undergoes a gradual but decisive transformation. The focus shifts from defining art through necessary and sufficient conditions to analyzing the **processes through which objects acquire aesthetic status**. This includes the role of interpretation, the influence of cultural context, and the participation of audiences. Aesthetics becomes less a theory of what art is in itself, and more a theory of how art is constituted as such.

Within this broader framework, three core functions of aesthetics can be identified.

First, aesthetics serves a **classificatory function**. It seeks to determine what counts as art, or more generally, what counts as an aesthetic object. This involves drawing boundaries, even when those boundaries are contested or

unstable. The classificatory function is particularly evident in debates over anti-art, conceptual art, and other practices that challenge traditional definitions.

Second, aesthetics performs an **evaluative function**. It addresses questions of value: what makes an artwork good, significant, or meaningful? Even when contemporary theory resists universal standards, evaluation remains implicit in critical discourse and institutional practices. The criteria may shift—from beauty to innovation, from harmony to disruption—but the question of value persists.

Third, aesthetics has an **interpretive function**. It provides frameworks for understanding how artworks produce meaning and how they are experienced. Interpretation connects the object, the context, and the observer, allowing aesthetic experience to be articulated and communicated. In modern and contemporary contexts, interpretation often involves navigating ambiguity, multiplicity, and indeterminacy.

These three functions—classification, evaluation, and interpretation—are not independent. They interact continuously. How an object is classified influences how it is evaluated; how it is interpreted affects both its classification and its value. Aesthetics, therefore, operates as a **system of relations**, rather than a set of isolated judgments. At its core, aesthetics is not simply concerned with art as a category, but with the **conditions under which objects are perceived, understood, and valued as aesthetic phenomena**. It investigates how meaning is assigned, how status is conferred, and how experience is structured. As artistic practices evolve and increasingly challenge established categories, the discipline must adapt, often by rethinking its most basic assumptions. In this light, aesthetics can be understood not only as a theory of how we assign status and meaning to objects, but increasingly as a theory of how such statuses become unstable, overlapping, and, in certain cases, simultaneously affirmed and denied.

References

- Baumgarten, A. G. (1954). *Reflections on Poetry* (K. Aschenbrenner & W. B. Holther, Trans.). University of California Press. (Original work published 1750)
- Dickie, G. (1974). *Art and the Aesthetic: An Institutional Analysis*. Cornell University Press.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1975). *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art* (T. M. Knox, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1835)
- Kant, I. (2000). *Critique of the Power of Judgment* (P. Guyer & E. Matthews, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1790)

2

Historical Trajectories of Aesthetic Thought

The history of aesthetics is not a linear progression toward a definitive theory of art, but a sequence of **reconfigurations of its central problem**. Each major phase expands the domain of what may be considered aesthetic, while simultaneously preserving a deeper structural assumption: that aesthetic judgment ultimately operates through distinctions—between beauty and ugliness, art and non-art, meaning and non-meaning. The trajectory of the discipline can therefore be understood as a movement of expansion constrained by an underlying **binary logic**. This persistence suggests that the development of aesthetics is not only a history of expansion, but also a history of unresolved structural constraints.

In its classical formulations, aesthetics is inseparable from the concept of beauty. From antiquity through the early modern period, aesthetic reflection is oriented toward harmony, proportion, and order. Although the term “aesthetics” itself is a modern invention, the philosophical treatment of beauty can be traced back to figures such as Plato and Aristotle. For Plato, beauty is associated with the realm of forms, an ideal and intelligible order that transcends the sensory world (Plato, *Symposium*). Aristotle, while more attentive to artistic practice, still emphasizes structure, unity, and coherence, particularly in his analysis of tragedy (*Poetics*). In both cases, beauty is not arbitrary; it is grounded in principles that can be articulated and, to some extent, rationally justified.

This classical orientation persists into the eighteenth century, where it is systematized within the emerging discipline of aesthetics. Even as thinkers such as Immanuel Kant complicate the notion of beauty by introducing the idea of subjective universality, the underlying framework remains oriented toward the distinction between what is aesthetically valid and what is not. Beauty may no longer be reducible to objective properties, but it still functions as a **regulative concept**, organizing aesthetic judgment around a shared, if indeterminate, standard (Kant, 1790/2000).

The nineteenth century introduces a significant shift. Aesthetics begins to move away from beauty as its central category and toward a broader concern with art as a domain of human activity. In this modern phase, the focus turns to

form and expression. Formalist approaches, later developed in the twentieth century, emphasize the internal organization of the artwork—its composition, structure, and relations—while expression theories understand art as the manifestation of emotion or inner life. Thinkers such as Leo Tolstoy argue that art communicates feeling, establishing a connection between creator and audience (Tolstoy, 1897/1995).

Despite their differences, these approaches share a common assumption: that art can be identified through certain defining features, whether formal or expressive. The object of aesthetics is no longer beauty alone, but **art as such**, understood as a distinct and identifiable category. The discipline expands, but it does not abandon the idea that there is a boundary—however complex—between art and non-art.

This assumption is radically challenged in the early twentieth century with the emergence of the avant-garde. Movements such as Dada introduce practices that deliberately undermine the conditions of traditional aesthetics. Objects that appear arbitrary, meaningless, or even destructive are presented as artworks. The gesture of placing an everyday object within an artistic context—most famously exemplified by Marcel Duchamp’s ready-mades—calls into question the very criteria by which art is defined (Duchamp, 1917/1973).

The avant-garde rupture does not simply expand the domain of art; it destabilizes its conceptual foundations. If anything can be art, provided it is framed as such, then the distinction between art and non-art becomes uncertain. Yet even here, the binary logic persists. The debate shifts from “What is art?” to “Is this art or not?” The categories are no longer secure, but they are not abandoned. Instead, they become sites of contestation.

Theoretical responses to this crisis often take the form of institutional or contextual accounts. George Dickie, for example, proposes that art is defined by its relation to the “art world,” a network of practices, institutions, and conventions that confer artistic status (Dickie, 1974). Such approaches acknowledge that aesthetic classification cannot be grounded solely in intrinsic properties, but they still rely on a distinction between what is recognized as art and what is not.

In the late twentieth century, aesthetics enters what is often described as a postmodern phase. Here, the emphasis shifts toward plurality, fragmentation, and the rejection of universal criteria. Grand narratives about

the nature of art are replaced by localized, context-dependent analyses. The work of thinkers such as Jean-François Lyotard highlights the collapse of overarching frameworks and the proliferation of heterogeneous practices (Lyotard, 1979/1984).

Postmodern aesthetics expands the field even further. It incorporates hybrid forms that blur the boundaries between media, practices that challenge authorship and originality, and works that foreground indeterminacy and ambiguity.

At the same time, it often resists the attempt to provide a unified theoretical account. Aesthetics becomes plural, and in some cases, anti-systematic.

Yet even in this context, the underlying structure of binary distinction is not entirely dissolved. The language of opposition—art versus non-art, meaning versus non-meaning, form versus anti-form—continues to shape discourse, even when it is being critiqued. Postmodernism exposes the instability of these binaries, but it does not fully replace them with an alternative logic.

Across these historical phases, a consistent pattern emerges. Each stage of aesthetic thought expands what can be considered art or aesthetic experience:

- from beauty to art,
- from art to anti-art,
- from stable forms to indeterminate practices.

However, each stage also retains, in some form, the assumption that aesthetic judgment involves **drawing distinctions**. The boundaries may shift, become porous, or even collapse temporarily, but the conceptual framework remains oriented toward differentiation.

The result is a discipline that is both expansive and constrained. It can accommodate an ever-widening range of practices, but it lacks a formal mechanism for describing objects that simultaneously belong to and exceed established categories. This limitation becomes increasingly evident as artistic practices move toward contradiction, hybridity, and indeterminacy.

Across these developments, a recurring pattern becomes visible: aesthetic theory expands its domain, but retains a logic that presupposes exclusion. As a result, it lacks the conceptual tools necessary to describe coexistence of opposites within a single object.

The history of aesthetics can thus be understood as a sequence of expansions that progressively reveal the limitations of binary logic. Each stage brings new forms into view, yet continues to rely on distinctions that cannot fully account for them. What emerges is not merely a broader field of aesthetic objects, but a growing mismatch between the objects themselves and the conceptual framework used to describe them. This mismatch indicates the need for a different kind of logic—one capable of representing not only difference, but the coexistence of opposing states within the same aesthetic structure.

References

- Aristotle. (1996). *Poetics* (M. Heath, Trans.). Penguin Classics.
- Dickie, G. (1974). *Art and the Aesthetic: An Institutional Analysis*. Cornell University Press.
- Duchamp, M. (1973). *The essential writings of Marcel Duchamp* (M. Sanouillet & E. Peterson, Eds.). Da Capo Press. (Original texts written 1910s–1920s)
- Kant, I. (2000). *Critique of the Power of Judgment* (P. Guyer & E. Matthews, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1790)
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1979)
- Plato. (2008). *Symposium* (R. Waterfield, Trans.). Oxford University Press.
- Tolstoy, L. (1995). *What Is Art?* (R. Pevear & L. Volokhonsky, Trans.). Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1897)

3

The Failure of Binary Aesthetics

The historical trajectory outlined in the previous chapter reveals a persistent structural feature of aesthetic thought: its reliance on binary distinctions. Whether articulated explicitly or implicitly, aesthetics has traditionally operated through oppositions—art versus non-art, meaningful versus meaningless, poetic versus anti-poetic, form versus anti-form. These distinctions have provided the discipline with conceptual clarity and evaluative criteria. However, in the context of modern and contemporary artistic practices, they increasingly fail to account for the objects they are meant to describe.

This failure is not merely a matter of borderline cases or interpretive disagreement. It is structural. Certain aesthetic objects do not simply fall between categories; they **simultaneously occupy positions that binary logic treats as mutually exclusive**. The result is not ambiguity in the ordinary sense, but contradiction.

The distinction between art and non-art provides a useful starting point. Classical and modern aesthetics assume that, however complex the criteria may be, it is ultimately possible to determine whether an object belongs to the category of art. This assumption is destabilized in the twentieth century, most visibly through the practices associated with Dada. The readymades of Marcel Duchamp exemplify this disruption. An ordinary object, such as a urinal, when placed in a gallery and presented as art, challenges the idea that artistic status depends on intrinsic properties (Duchamp, 1973).

The theoretical response to such gestures often takes the form of contextual or institutional definitions. George Dickie, for example, argues that an object becomes art when it is accepted by the “art world” (Dickie, 1974). While this approach successfully accounts for the inclusion of unconventional objects, it does not eliminate the underlying tension. The readymade remains, at once, an ordinary object and an artwork. Its status is not resolved but **doubled**. It is both art and non-art, depending on the perspective adopted. The binary distinction is preserved, but the object no longer fits neatly on one side of it.

A similar problem arises with the distinction between the meaningful and the meaningless. In traditional aesthetics, even when ambiguity is acknowledged, artworks are assumed to possess meaning, whether explicit or implicit. However, avant-garde and post-avant-garde practices frequently produce objects that appear to resist or negate meaning altogether. Dadaist texts composed of nonsensical syllables, or later conceptual works that foreground absence or emptiness, seem to challenge the very possibility of meaning.

Yet these works cannot simply be dismissed as meaningless. They are experienced, interpreted, and discussed. Their apparent lack of meaning becomes itself meaningful, functioning as a critique of established linguistic and cultural structures. In this sense, they occupy a paradoxical position: they are **meaningful precisely insofar as they negate meaning**. The binary opposition between meaningful and meaningless is thus insufficient. It cannot account for objects that derive their significance from the tension between the two poles.

The distinction between poetic and anti-poetic forms is similarly destabilized. Traditional poetics is grounded in recognizable features—meter, imagery, figurative language, and so on. Even when these features evolve, the category of the poetic remains tied to certain expectations about language and form. The emergence of anti-poetry, and more radically, of paradoxist writing, challenges these expectations.

pArAdOXisM explicitly embraces contradiction as a generative principle. Statements such as “I’m not a poet, that’s why I write poetry” encapsulate a position in which poetic identity is affirmed through its negation (Smarandache, 1990). The work does not simply reject poetry; it **redefines it through anti-poetic means**. The result is not a transition from poetry to non-poetry, but the emergence of objects that are both poetic and anti-poetic at once.

This duality becomes even more pronounced in the case of non-poems. In *NonPoems*, Smarandache proposes forms that may consist of fragmented language, visual elements, or even the absence of text. These works are presented as literature while simultaneously undermining the conditions that traditionally define it. A blank page, for example, can function as a poem insofar as it is framed and interpreted as such, yet it also negates the presence of language that is typically considered essential to poetry (Smarandache, 1990).

The non-poem is thus an object that cannot be adequately described as either poetic or non-poetic. It occupies both positions simultaneously.

The opposition between form and anti-form encounters a comparable difficulty. Formalist aesthetics assumes that artworks possess an internal organization that can be analyzed in terms of structure and relations. Anti-form practices, by contrast, appear to reject structure, embracing randomness, fragmentation, or process. However, many contemporary works do not simply abandon form; they **incorporate its negation into their structure**. What appears as anti-form may itself be governed by a higher-order organization, often conceptual or procedural.

Conceptual art provides a clear example. Works that consist of instructions, ideas, or minimal interventions often lack the traditional markers of form, yet they are not formless. Their form lies in the conceptual framework that defines them. The distinction between form and anti-form thus becomes unstable, as anti-form can function as a form of its own (Lippard, 1973). Once again, the binary opposition fails to capture the complexity of the object.

Across these cases—art and non-art, meaningful and meaningless, poetic and anti-poetic, form and anti-form—the same pattern emerges. The binary distinctions that have historically structured aesthetic thought are not simply blurred; they are **simultaneously affirmed and negated** by certain objects. These objects do not fit between categories; they **inhabit multiple categories at once**, generating a state of tension that cannot be resolved within a binary framework.

This condition is particularly evident in contemporary art, where the boundaries between media, genres, and practices are increasingly fluid. Conceptual art, performance, digital works, and experimental literature all contribute to a landscape in which classification becomes problematic. The question is no longer simply whether an object belongs to one category or another, but how it can be described when it **belongs to several, including mutually incompatible ones**.

The failure of binary aesthetics, therefore, is not an incidental problem. It reflects a deeper limitation in the conceptual tools available to the discipline. As long as aesthetic theory relies on oppositional structures, it will struggle to account for objects that are defined by contradiction and indeterminacy. What is required is not a refinement of existing categories, but a different kind of framework—one capable of describing **coexisting and non-exclusive states**.

Contemporary art, in its most radical forms, produces objects that cannot be classified without contradiction. This is not a deficiency of the objects themselves, but an indication that the conceptual apparatus of aesthetics must evolve. The next step is to articulate a framework in which such contradictions can be formally represented rather than eliminated.

References

- Dickie, G. (1974). *Art and the Aesthetic: An Institutional Analysis*. Cornell University Press.
- Duchamp, M. (1973). *The essential writings of Marcel Duchamp* (M. Sanouillet & E. Peterson, Eds.). Da Capo Press. (Original texts written 1910s–1920s)
- Lippard, L. R. (1973). *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object from 1966 to 1972*. University of California Press.
- Smarandache, F. (1990). *Nonpoems*. Phoenix & Chicago: Xiquan Publishing House.

4

The Need for a New Framework

The preceding chapter has shown that the difficulty confronting contemporary aesthetics is not merely classificatory, but structural. Objects produced within modern and postmodern artistic practices do not simply resist clear categorization; they actively generate **states of contradiction** that cannot be resolved within traditional conceptual schemes. This raises a fundamental question: how should aesthetics respond to such objects?

Existing approaches have not ignored ambiguity or paradox. On the contrary, much of twentieth- and twenty-first-century theory has been devoted to acknowledging and describing them. The language of indeterminacy, openness, plurality, and undecidability is now well established. However, these approaches tend to remain **descriptive rather than formal**. They recognize that certain works are ambiguous or paradoxical, but they do not provide a framework capable of representing these conditions in a systematic way.

One influential line of thought emerges from post-structuralism and deconstruction, particularly in the work of Jacques Derrida. Derrida emphasizes the instability of meaning and the impossibility of final interpretation, arguing that texts are characterized by internal differences that prevent closure (Derrida, 1967/1976). This perspective has had a significant impact on aesthetics, encouraging attention to ambiguity and multiplicity. Yet, while it reveals the limits of fixed meanings, it does not offer a structured model for analyzing how different states—such as affirmation and negation—coexist within a single object.

Similarly, the concept of the “open work,” developed by Umberto Eco, highlights the role of the observer in completing the artwork. Eco argues that certain works are intentionally open to multiple interpretations, inviting active participation from the audience (Eco, 1962/1989). This approach successfully captures the dynamic nature of aesthetic experience, but it remains focused on **interpretive plurality**, rather than on the formal coexistence of contradictory states.

Even theories that directly address paradox tend to treat it as a limit case or a rhetorical device. In many contexts, paradox is something to be resolved, explained, or ultimately overcome. When it is embraced, as in certain strands

of avant-garde or postmodern practice, it is often treated as a gesture—an expression of resistance or critique—rather than as a **structural condition that can be systematically analyzed**.

The same limitation can be observed in institutional and contextual theories of art. By shifting the focus from intrinsic properties to external conditions, these approaches successfully account for the inclusion of unconventional objects within the category of art. However, they do not eliminate the underlying tension between art and non-art; they merely relocate it. The object remains caught between categories, and the theory provides no formal means of describing this coexistence.

What unites these diverse approaches is a common feature: they **tolerate paradox without modeling it**. They acknowledge that aesthetic objects may be ambiguous, indeterminate, or contradictory, but they do not provide a conceptual apparatus that treats these features as primary and structurally definable. As a result, contradiction remains an anomaly within the system, rather than a principle that can be integrated into it.

This limitation becomes increasingly problematic as artistic practices continue to evolve. In conceptual art, the distinction between object and idea is destabilized; in performance, the boundary between art and life becomes fluid; in paradoxist literature, the opposition between poetry and anti-poetry is explicitly foregrounded. In each case, the object of analysis is not simply ambiguous, but **internally structured by opposing forces**.

To describe such objects adequately, aesthetics requires a shift at the level of its basic assumptions. Instead of attempting to refine binary distinctions or to accommodate exceptions within them, it must adopt a framework in which **multiple, non-exclusive states can be represented simultaneously**. This involves moving beyond the logic of either/or toward a logic capable of handling coexistence without reduction.

The key claim that follows from this diagnosis is that aesthetics requires a framework capable of representing **simultaneous affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy**. An aesthetic object may affirm its status as art while also negating it; it may generate meaning while undermining it; it may exhibit structure while disrupting it. These are not sequential stages or interpretive alternatives, but **co-present dimensions** of the object.

Such a framework must satisfy several conditions. It must allow for degrees rather than absolute categories, so that affirmation, negation, and

indeterminacy can vary in intensity. It must treat these dimensions as independent, so that the presence of one does not exclude the others. And it must be applicable across different domains—visual, literary, performative—without being tied to a specific medium.

The transition from binary to triadic thinking is not merely a technical adjustment; it represents a fundamental reorientation of aesthetic theory. It requires recognizing that contradiction is not a defect to be eliminated, but a **feature to be modeled**. It also requires acknowledging that indeterminacy is not simply a lack of clarity, but a **constitutive aspect of certain aesthetic objects**.

At this point, the resources of traditional aesthetics prove insufficient. What is needed is a framework that originates outside the binary logic that has historically structured the discipline. It is here that neutrosophic thinking becomes relevant. Developed as a general theory of truth, falsity, and indeterminacy, neutrosophy provides a formal structure in which these dimensions are treated as independent and coexisting.

When applied to aesthetics, this framework allows for the definition of an aesthetic object not in terms of exclusive categories, but in terms of a **triadic state**. An object can be characterized by the degree to which it affirms, negates, and destabilizes its own status. This does not eliminate the need for interpretation or evaluation, but it provides a more adequate foundation for both.

The introduction of Meta-garde thus marks a transition from a discipline that describes ambiguity to one that can **formally represent complex aesthetic states**. What is at stake is not simply a new method, but a redefinition of the object of aesthetics itself: from stable categories to **dynamic configurations of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy**.

References

- Derrida, J. (1976). *Of Grammatology* (G. C. Spivak, Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1967)
- Eco, U. (1989). *The Open Work* (A. Cancogni, Trans.). Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1962)
- Dickie, G. (1974). *Art and the Aesthetic: An Institutional Analysis*. Cornell University Press.

II
Foundations of Meta-garde

5

Formal Foundations of Meta-garde

The preceding chapters have shown that the difficulty confronting contemporary aesthetics is not merely classificatory, but structural. Certain objects produced within modern and contemporary artistic practices cannot be adequately described within frameworks that rely on binary distinctions. They do not simply fall between categories; they simultaneously occupy positions that traditional logic treats as mutually exclusive. If such objects are to be understood without reducing their complexity, aesthetics requires not only new concepts, but a formal structure capable of representing coexistence without resolution.

Meta-garde emerges as a response to this need. It does not propose a new category of art, nor does it attempt to redefine existing categories through refinement. Instead, it introduces a different way of modeling aesthetic states. The question is no longer whether an object is art or non-art, meaningful or meaningless, poetic or anti-poetic, but how these states can coexist within a single structure. To address this question, it is necessary to move beyond the constraints of classical logic, which presupposes that such oppositions must ultimately be resolved.

In classical logic, the principles of identity, non-contradiction, and excluded middle establish a framework in which an entity cannot simultaneously possess mutually exclusive properties. When applied to aesthetics, this framework leads to distinctions that organize the discipline: an object is either art or it is not, either meaningful or meaningless, either structured or unstructured. As the previous chapters have demonstrated, such distinctions become increasingly difficult to sustain in the face of artistic practices that deliberately produce contradiction, indeterminacy, and reflexivity. The limitation lies not in the objects themselves, but in the logical structure used to describe them.

Meta-garde adopts a different orientation. It allows for the coexistence of states that would traditionally be considered incompatible, without requiring their reduction to a single value. This shift does not abolish distinction, but transforms its function. Distinctions remain, but they no longer operate as exclusive boundaries. Instead, they become dimensions along which an object

can be simultaneously positioned. The formal foundation of this approach can be expressed through a triadic structure that characterizes the aesthetic state of an object. Any aesthetic object may be described in terms of three independent components: a degree of affirmation, a degree of negation, and a degree of indeterminacy. Affirmation corresponds to the extent to which the object functions as art or poetry; negation corresponds to the extent to which it functions as anti-art or anti-poetry; indeterminacy corresponds to the extent to which its status remains undecidable. These components do not exclude one another. An object may strongly affirm and strongly negate its own status at the same time, while also remaining partially indeterminate.

The crucial feature of this model is the independence of its components. There is no requirement that an increase in one dimension must be compensated by a decrease in another, nor is there a fixed total that these values must sum to. This absence of normalization reflects the structural condition that meta-garde seeks to describe. Contradiction is not treated as a transitional state between two determinate positions, but as a configuration that can be maintained. In this sense, the model does not resolve contradiction; it represents it. This representation introduces a broader concept of multivalence. Multivalence, in this context, does not simply refer to the plurality of interpretations that an object may support. It refers to the coexistence of multiple structural states within the object itself. The difference is significant. Interpretive plurality concerns the relation between the object and its observers; multivalence concerns the internal configuration of the object. Meta-garde is concerned with the latter. It provides a way of describing how an object can embody affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy simultaneously, regardless of how it is interpreted.

The triadic structure also makes it possible to extend the analysis beyond simple classification. Once an object is understood as a configuration of independent components, it can be situated within a broader space of aesthetic states. This space is not defined by discrete categories, but by continuous variation across multiple dimensions. The result is a shift from categorical thinking to relational modeling. Art is no longer defined by what it is or is not, but by how its states are configured.

The formal orientation adopted here is compatible with several non-classical logical systems that allow for degrees of truth, the coexistence of opposites, and the inclusion of indeterminacy as a primary value. Such

systems have been explored in various contexts, including multi-valued logics and other extended frameworks. Among these, certain approaches explicitly articulate independent values corresponding to affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy. However, meta-garde does not depend on any particular formal system. The triadic model should be understood as a general schema, capable of being expressed in different logical languages.

What matters is not the origin of the formalism, but its capacity to represent the condition identified in previous chapters. Meta-garde does not derive from a specific logic; rather, it identifies a structural situation in which such logics become necessary. The role of formalization is therefore not to impose a framework on aesthetic objects, but to make explicit a condition that is already present within them.

Although developed in response to problems in aesthetics, the structure described here is not limited to artistic practice. It reflects a more general possibility: that entities may be defined through the coexistence of non-exclusive states. Art provides a particularly clear domain in which this condition becomes visible, because it actively produces and foregrounds contradiction, ambiguity, and reflexivity. Yet similar configurations can be observed in language, in conceptual systems, and in philosophical traditions that resist binary categorization.

The formal foundation of meta-garde thus operates at two levels. At one level, it provides a model for analyzing aesthetic objects that cannot be adequately described within binary frameworks. At another level, it points toward a broader logic of coexistence, in which contradiction and indeterminacy are not anomalies, but structural features. This dual character allows meta-garde to function both as an aesthetic framework and as the basis for a more general philosophical extension.

References

- Smarandache, F. (2002). Neutrosophy, a new branch of philosophy. *Multiple-Valued Logic / An International Journal*, 8(3), 297–384.

6

The Meta-garde Object

If aesthetic theory is to move beyond binary classification, it must first reconsider what it means to describe an object as aesthetic. This requires a shift from viewing the object as belonging to a single category toward understanding it as a **configuration of coexisting states**.

Let w denote an aesthetic object. The term is used here in a broad sense. It includes not only traditional artworks—paintings, sculptures, poems—but also anti-art objects, conceptual constructions, performances, and hybrid forms. The defining feature of an aesthetic object is not its material composition or institutional status alone, but the fact that it is **subject to aesthetic attribution**, that is, to processes of classification, evaluation, and interpretation.

Within the meta-garde framework, the state of an aesthetic object can be described triadically. Each object w is associated with three components:

$$T(w), I(w), F(w)$$

where $T(w)$ represents the degree of aesthetic affirmation, $F(w)$ the degree of aesthetic negation, and $I(w)$ the degree of indeterminacy. These components do not describe separate objects or successive stages; they describe **different aspects of the same object**, considered simultaneously.

Aesthetic affirmation refers to the extent to which an object functions as art within a given context. This includes recognition, coherence within a medium, and the capacity to sustain aesthetic engagement. A painting exhibited in a museum, a poem published in a literary volume, or a performance presented within an artistic framework may all exhibit high degrees of affirmation.

Aesthetic negation, by contrast, refers to the extent to which an object challenges, subverts, or denies the conditions that define it as art. Anti-art gestures, the rejection of form, the use of non-art materials, or the deliberate undermining of meaning all contribute to this dimension. Negation does not necessarily remove the object from the domain of art; rather, it introduces a tension within it.

Indeterminacy captures the degree to which the status or meaning of the object cannot be decisively fixed. This may arise from ambiguity, openness to

multiple interpretations, or structural undecidability. Indeterminacy is not merely a lack of information; it is often a **constitutive feature** of the object itself.

The crucial point is that these three components are **non-exclusive**. The presence of affirmation does not eliminate negation, nor does either exclude indeterminacy. An object may strongly affirm its artistic status while simultaneously negating it and remaining indeterminate in its classification. This coexistence is not an anomaly, but a condition that must be accounted for.

The admissibility of contradiction follows directly from this structure. In classical aesthetics, contradiction is typically treated as a problem to be resolved. An object cannot be both art and non-art, both meaningful and meaningless, without generating conceptual difficulty. In a meta-garde framework, such coexistence is not only possible but expected. Contradiction becomes a **describable state**, rather than an error.

This shift allows for the introduction of the concept of the **aesthetic paradox**. An aesthetic object w may be said to be paradoxical when it exhibits significant degrees of both affirmation and negation:

$$T(w) > 0 \text{ and } F(w) > 0.$$

In such cases, the object cannot be adequately described as belonging exclusively to one category or another. It is simultaneously included and excluded, affirmed and denied. The paradox is not external to the object; it is part of its internal structure.

Examples of aesthetic paradoxes are readily found in modern and contemporary practices. The readymades associated with Marcel Duchamp affirm their status as art through their placement within the institutional context, while negating it through their ordinary, non-artistic origin (Duchamp, 1973). Paradoxist texts developed by Smarandache explicitly construct statements that are both poetic and anti-poetic, meaningful and self-negating (Smarandache, 1990, 2006). In each case, the object is structured by a tension that cannot be resolved within a binary framework.

The broader category that emerges from this analysis is that of the **Meta-garde Object**. An object w may be considered a fully meta-garde object when all three components—affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy—are present in a significant way:

$$T(w) > 0, I(w) > 0, F(w) > 0.$$

Such objects are not simply ambiguous or complex; they are **triadically constituted**. Their identity depends on the interaction of the three components, none of which can be reduced to or eliminated by the others.

The concept of the meta-garde object allows aesthetics to move beyond the limitations identified in previous chapters. Instead of forcing objects into exclusive categories or treating contradiction as a failure of classification, it becomes possible to describe the object in terms of its internal configuration. This does not eliminate the need for interpretation or evaluation, but it provides a more adequate framework within which these activities can take place.

At the same time, it is important to emphasize that the triadic state is not static. The values of $T(w)$, $I(w)$, and $F(w)$ may vary depending on context, interpretation, and historical conditions. An object that is initially perceived as negating art may later be fully integrated into the canon, increasing its degree of affirmation. Conversely, shifts in context may heighten indeterminacy or foreground aspects of negation.

By describing the aesthetic object in terms of a triadic state, meta-garde provides a foundation for analyzing phenomena that resist binary classification. It allows for the formal inclusion of contradiction and indeterminacy within the structure of the object itself. The next step is to examine how these states are grounded in the internal features of the object, that is, in its structural variables.

References

- Duchamp, M. (1973). *The essential writings of Marcel Duchamp* (M. Sanouillet & E. Peterson, Eds.). Da Capo Press. (Original texts written 1910s–1920s)
- Smarandache, F. (1990). *Nonpoems*. Phoenix & Chicago: Xiquan Publishing House.
- Smarandache, F. (2006). *Paradoxist distiches*. Automaton.

Structural Variables and Aesthetic Profiles

The triadic formulation of the aesthetic object developed in the previous chapter provides a necessary but not sufficient description. To say that an object *w* is characterized by degrees of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy is to describe its **global state**, but not the internal structure that produces that state. If meta-garde is to move beyond descriptive generality, it must introduce a second analytical layer—one that accounts for the **features and operations through which aesthetic states are generated**.

This second layer is defined by the concept of the **structural profile** of an object. Each aesthetic object *w* is associated with a vector of variables:

$$x(w) = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$$

where each x_k represents a dimension of aesthetic structure. These variables do not correspond to superficial attributes, but to **operative features**—the ways in which the object constructs, disrupts, or reconfigures meaning, form, and status. The structural profile is therefore not an inventory of properties, but a **map of functional intensities**.

Within this variable system, a distinction must be made between **core invariants** and **domain-specific variables**. The former are dimensions that recur across different media and practices; the latter are adapted to the particular conditions of a given domain.

At the most general level, four core invariants can be identified. These invariants correspond to the structural meta-garde conditions that make neutrosophic analysis necessary in the first place.

The first invariant is **contradiction**. This refers to the degree to which an object incorporates opposing determinations within its structure. Contradiction may take the form of semantic inversion, conceptual tension, or the coexistence of mutually incompatible properties. In paradoxist literature, for example, contradiction is not incidental but generative; it functions as a principle of construction rather than a rhetorical device (Smarandache, 1990).

The second invariant is **indeterminacy**. While indeterminacy has already been introduced as a component of the triadic state, it also has a structural dimension. Certain features of an object—ambiguity of reference, openness of form, instability of interpretation—contribute directly to the degree of

indeterminacy. This invariant captures the ways in which the object resists closure and maintains a field of unresolved possibilities.

The third invariant is **definitional instability**. This refers to the extent to which an object destabilizes the category to which it ostensibly belongs. A work that challenges the definition of poetry, painting, or performance contributes to this dimension. In the case of non-poems, the object not only deviates from poetic norms but calls into question the criteria by which something is recognized as a poem (Smarandache, 1990).

The fourth invariant is **reflexivity**. Reflexivity measures the degree to which an object reflects upon its own status, structure, or conditions of production. Manifestos, meta-poetic texts, and conceptual works that explicitly articulate their own procedures exhibit high levels of reflexivity. This invariant is particularly important because it contributes to the **formal articulability** of the object, making its operations visible and, in some cases, reproducible.

These four invariants—contradiction, indeterminacy, definitional instability, and reflexivity—form the **core of the meta-garde system**. They are not exhaustive, but they are sufficient to establish a common framework across different domains. Any aesthetic object that exhibits significant values along these dimensions can be analyzed within the formal model of meta-garde.

Beyond these invariants, each domain introduces additional variables that capture medium-specific features. In visual art, variables may include the use of non-traditional materials, the disruption of compositional norms, or the incorporation of everyday objects into artistic contexts. In literary domains, variables may address phonetic structure, syntactic deviation, narrative instability, or the dissolution of authorial voice. In performance, variables may involve temporality, embodiment, audience interaction, and the relation between scripted and improvised elements.

The introduction of domain-specific variables does not fragment the theory; rather, it allows it to remain **flexible and extensible**. The triadic structure remains constant, while the variables provide the means to describe how that structure is realized in different contexts. The same underlying logic—coexistence of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy—can thus be instantiated in multiple ways.

The relationship between the structural profile $x(w)$ and the meta-garde state $N(w) = \langle T(w), I(w), F(w) \rangle$ is central to the theory. The variables do not simply accompany the triadic state; they **generate it**. More precisely, the

values of $T(w)$, $I(w)$, and $F(w)$ can be understood as emergent functions of the structural variables:

$$T(w) = f_T(x(w)), I(w) = f_I(x(w)), F(w) = f_F(x(w)).$$

These functions need not be explicitly quantified at this stage. What matters is the conceptual relation: the triadic state is a **projection** of the structural profile. Changes in the variables lead to changes in the degrees of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy.

For example, an increase in contradiction and definitional instability will typically raise the value of $F(w)$, as the object more strongly negates established categories. At the same time, these variables may also increase $I(w)$, by making the object more difficult to classify. Reflexivity, by making the structure of the object explicit, may simultaneously reinforce $T(w)$, as the work asserts itself as a coherent aesthetic construct. The interplay of variables thus produces a **dynamic configuration**, rather than a fixed classification.

This layered model—structural variables generating a triadic state—allows meta-garde to operate at multiple levels. At the micro level, it analyzes the internal features of the object; at the macro level, it describes the overall aesthetic state. The two levels are connected but not reducible to one another.

By introducing structural variables and aesthetic profiles, meta-garde gains the capacity to move beyond abstract characterization toward **comparative and analytical precision**. Objects can be compared not only in terms of their overall state, but in terms of the specific dimensions that produce that state. Movements can be understood as clusters of objects with similar profiles. Transitions between forms can be traced as shifts in variable configurations.

References

- Smarandache, F. (1990). *Nonpoems*. Phoenix & Chicago: Xiquan Publishing House.

8

Minimal Axiomatic System for Meta-garde

The preceding chapters have introduced the conceptual elements of meta-garde: the triadic state of the aesthetic object and the system of structural variables that generate it. In order to establish the discipline on a formal basis, these elements must now be articulated within a minimal axiomatic system. The purpose of this system is not to exhaust the complexity of aesthetic phenomena, but to provide a **clear and consistent foundation** upon which further analysis can be built.

The axiomatic system presented here is intentionally minimal. It defines the essential terms, specifies their relations, and establishes a framework capable of accommodating contradiction and indeterminacy without reducing them to anomalies. It is sufficient to ground both the theoretical developments of this volume and the domain-specific applications that follow in subsequent works.

Primitive Terms

The system begins with a set of primitive terms, which are not defined within the system itself but are taken as basic.

An **aesthetic object**, denoted w , is any entity that is subject to aesthetic attribution. This includes artworks, anti-art objects, literary constructions, performances, and hybrid forms. The definition is intentionally broad, reflecting the expansion of the aesthetic domain in modern and contemporary practice.

The **meta-garde components** of an aesthetic object are:

$$T(w), I(w), F(w)$$

where $T(w)$ denotes aesthetic affirmation, $F(w)$ aesthetic negation, and $I(w)$ aesthetic indeterminacy.

A **structural profile**, denoted $x(w)$, is a vector of variables associated with the object, as introduced in the previous chapter. These variables describe the internal features and operations through which the object generates its aesthetic state.

These primitive terms are sufficient to construct the system.

Axioms

The axioms define the fundamental properties of aesthetic objects within the meta-garde framework.

Axiom 1. (Triadic State)

Every aesthetic object w is associated with a triadic state:

$$N(w) = \langle T(w), I(w), F(w) \rangle$$

where each component takes values in the interval $[0, 1]$.

This axiom establishes that aesthetic objects are not characterized by a single property or category, but by a configuration of three dimensions.

Axiom 2. (Independence of Components)

The components $T(w)$, $I(w)$, and $F(w)$ are independent. In general:

$$T(w) + I(w) + F(w) \neq 1$$

This axiom ensures that affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy are not mutually exclusive. The presence of one does not determine the absence of the others.

Axiom 3. (Coexistence of Contradiction)

There exist aesthetic objects w such that:

$$T(w) > 0 \text{ and } F(w) > 0$$

This axiom formalizes the admissibility of contradiction. An object may simultaneously affirm and negate its own status.

Axiom 4. (Structural Mediation)

Every aesthetic object w possesses a structural profile:

$$x(w) = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$$

such that the triadic state $N(w)$ is generated in relation to the structural profile.

This axiom connects the global state of the object to its internal structure.

Axiom 5. (Emergent State)

The components $T(w)$, $I(w)$, and $F(w)$ are functions of the structural profile:

$$T(w) = f_T(x(w)), I(w) = f_I(x(w)), F(w) = f_F(x(w))$$

The functions f_T, f_I, f_F need not be explicitly specified, but their existence establishes that the triadic state is an emergent property.

Axiom 6. (Contextual Variability)

The triadic state of an aesthetic object may vary with context C :

$$N(w | C) = \langle T(w | C), I(w | C), F(w | C) \rangle$$

This axiom reflects the fact that aesthetic attribution is influenced by historical, institutional, and interpretive conditions.

Axiom 7. (Domain Generality)

The triadic structure applies across aesthetic domains, while the structural variables may vary.

This axiom ensures that the system is both unified and adaptable.

Derived Definitions

From these axioms, several key concepts can be defined.

An **aesthetic paradox** is an object w for which affirmation and negation coexist:

$$T(w) > 0 \text{ and } F(w) > 0$$

Such an object cannot be adequately described within a binary framework. Its identity depends on the simultaneous presence of opposing determinations.

An **anti-art object** is an aesthetic object w in which negation is dominant relative to affirmation, while indeterminacy remains significant:

$$F(w) > T(w) \text{ and } I(w) > 0$$

This definition captures objects that actively undermine traditional aesthetic categories, without excluding them entirely from the aesthetic domain.

An object w may be considered meta-garde when all three components are present in a non-trivial way:

$$T(w) > 0, I(w) > 0, F(w) > 0$$

Such objects are characterized by the coexistence of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy. Their analysis requires the full framework of meta-garde.

Remarks on the System

This axiomatic system does not aim to replace interpretation or to reduce aesthetic experience to numerical values. Its function is to provide a **conceptual structure** within which complex aesthetic states can be described consistently. It formalizes the insights developed in earlier chapters, making explicit the relations between objects, their structural features, and their meta-garde states.

The minimal character of the system is deliberate. It leaves open the specification of variables, the form of the functions f_T, f_I, f_F , and the methods of measurement. These elements may be developed differently in specific domains, such as visual art, literature, or performance. What remains constant is the triadic structure and the principles that govern it.

By establishing a set of primitive terms, axioms, and derived definitions, this chapter provides the formal core of meta-garde. It transforms a set of conceptual intuitions into a **systematic framework**, capable of supporting both theoretical analysis and empirical application.

This system does not impose a structure on aesthetic objects, but formalizes a condition that becomes visible through them.

Although formulated in relation to aesthetic objects, this structure is not limited to them and may extend to other domains in which coexistence of non-exclusive states is observed.

References

- Smarandache, F. (2002). Neutrosophy, a new branch of philosophy. *Multiple-Valued Logic / An International Journal*, 8(3), 297–384.

III
The Meta-garde Space

9

Aesthetic State Space and Mapping

The axiomatic framework developed in the previous chapter defines the structure of the aesthetic object and the relations between its components. The next step is to extend this structure into a **spatial model**, within which aesthetic objects, forms, and movements can be located, compared, and analyzed. This model constitutes what may be called the **Meta-garde Space**.

The concept of space used here is not physical, but analytical. It is described by the dimensions introduced earlier: the structural variables $x(w)$ and the triadic state $N(w) = \langle T(w), I(w), F(w) \rangle$. Taken together, these dimensions form a **multidimensional coordinate system** in which each aesthetic object can be represented as a point.

Formally, an object w is mapped as:

$$w \mapsto (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n; T(w), I(w), F(w)).$$

This representation allows for a shift in perspective. Instead of asking whether an object belongs to a particular category, one can ask **where it is located within the aesthetic space**, and how it relates to other objects. Classification becomes a matter of position and relation, rather than categorical assignment.

The multidimensional nature of the space is essential. A single dimension would be insufficient to capture the complexity of contemporary aesthetic phenomena. Even the triadic structure of T , I , and F , while necessary, does not account for the specific mechanisms through which these states are produced. The inclusion of structural variables allows for a more fine-grained analysis, in which different objects may share similar global states while differing in their internal composition.

Within this space, each aesthetic object occupies a point determined by its structural profile and its meta-garde state. Objects that are similar in structure and state will be located near each other, while those that differ significantly will be more distant. This makes it possible to identify **clusters**, that is, regions of the space in which multiple objects share comparable configurations.

The notion of clustering provides a new way of understanding aesthetic movements. Traditionally, movements such as Dada or Surrealism are defined

historically, through manifestos, groups of artists, and shared intentions. While these factors remain important, the spatial model allows movements to be described as **regions within the aesthetic space**, characterized by specific patterns of variables and triadic states.

For example, works associated with Dada tend to exhibit high degrees of negation and indeterminacy, reflecting their emphasis on disruption and anti-art gestures. In the meta-garde space, such works would cluster in a region where $F(w)$ and $I(w)$ are elevated, while structural variables associated with contradiction and definitional instability are also significant. This does not reduce Dada to a set of numbers, but it provides a **formal description of its structural tendencies**.

Similarly, paradoxist works would form a distinct cluster characterized by high values of contradiction, reflexivity, and definitional instability, along with significant degrees of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy. The cluster is defined not by a single feature, but by a **configuration of dimensions**.

The concept of movement as region also allows for the identification of **overlapping zones**. Different movements may share certain structural features, resulting in partial overlap within the space. For instance, conceptual art and certain forms of paradoxist practice may both exhibit high reflexivity and explicit procedural structure, even if they differ in their use of contradiction. The spatial model thus accommodates both similarity and difference without forcing objects into rigid categories.

In addition to clusters, the aesthetic space makes it possible to analyze **transitions between regions**. Artistic developments can be understood as movements through the space, as objects or practices shift their structural profiles. A transition from traditional poetry to anti-poetry, for example, can be described as a gradual increase in variables associated with negation and definitional instability, accompanied by changes in the triadic state.

These transitions need not be linear. They may involve complex trajectories, including reversals, overlaps, and discontinuities. The avant-garde rupture discussed in earlier chapters can be interpreted as a **rapid displacement** within the aesthetic space, in which objects move from regions of high affirmation and low indeterminacy to regions characterized by strong negation and instability. Postmodern practices, in turn, may occupy more diffuse regions, reflecting their emphasis on plurality and hybridity.

The spatial model also allows for the identification of **boundary regions**, where objects exhibit extreme or unstable configurations. These regions are particularly important for meta-garde, as they often contain objects that most clearly demonstrate the coexistence of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy. Non-poems, conceptual gestures, and hybrid forms frequently occupy such positions, challenging the limits of classification and interpretation.

The introduction of the aesthetic state space has significant implications for comparative theory. It provides a common framework within which different movements, media, and practices can be analyzed without reducing them to a single standard. Comparison becomes a matter of **relative position and structural configuration**, rather than hierarchical evaluation.

For example, instead of asking whether one movement is more “advanced” or “radical” than another, one can examine how their respective clusters differ in terms of contradiction, indeterminacy, reflexivity, and other variables. This approach avoids the pitfalls of linear or teleological histories, while preserving the possibility of systematic analysis.

At the same time, the spatial model does not eliminate the role of historical and contextual factors. The position of an object within the space is influenced by its context, as established in the axiomatic system. Changes in context may shift the coordinates of an object, altering its relation to other objects and clusters. The aesthetic space is therefore dynamic, capable of accommodating both structural and historical variation.

By introducing the concept of a multidimensional aesthetic space, this chapter extends meta-garde from a set of definitions and axioms to a **method of mapping and comparison**. It provides the basis for analyzing not only individual objects, but also the relations between them, the formation of movements, and the trajectories of artistic development.

References

- Smarandache, F. (n.d.) *pArAdOXisM, the Last Vanguard of the Second Millennium*.
University of New Mexico, <https://fs.unm.edu/a/paradoxism.htm>

10

Indices and Measurement

The introduction of the Meta-garde Space in the previous chapter provides a structural and relational framework for positioning aesthetic objects. However, in order to move from qualitative mapping to **comparative analysis**, it becomes necessary to introduce instruments capable of summarizing complex configurations. These instruments take the form of **indices**, which condense multiple variables into interpretable measures without eliminating the underlying structure.

Indices do not replace the multidimensional model; rather, they function as **projections** of it. Their purpose is not to reduce aesthetic objects to numbers, but to enable comparison across objects, clusters, and movements by highlighting dominant tendencies within their structural profiles.

The first such instrument, developed in the context of visual anti-art, is the **Anti-Art Intensity Index (AII)** that measures the degree to which an object exhibits features associated with anti-art—such as negation of form, material disruption, and definitional instability. It is constructed from a set of variables corresponding to these dimensions, producing a composite value that reflects the **intensity of anti-art characteristics**.

AII serves as a model for how indices can be integrated into meta-garde. It demonstrates that complex aesthetic configurations can be systematically evaluated without abandoning the richness of the underlying variables. At the same time, it reveals the need for domain-specific adaptations. The variables relevant to visual anti-art do not fully capture the dynamics of literary or linguistic forms.

For this reason, literary extensions of the index have been proposed, such as the **Paradoxist Anti-Poetry Intensity Index (PAII)** and the more general **Non-Poetry Index (NPI)**. These indices are designed to measure the intensity of anti-poetic and paradoxist features in literary objects. They incorporate variables such as contradiction density, semantic indeterminacy, definitional destabilization, and reflexivity—dimensions that are particularly salient in paradoxist texts (Smarandache, 1990, 2006).

While AII focuses on the negation of visual form, PAII and NPI emphasize the **linguistic and conceptual operations** through which poetry is

transformed into anti-poetry or non-poetry. A paradoxist distich, for example, may exhibit a high value of paradox density and procedural explicitness, resulting in a high PAII score, even if it retains a recognizable poetic structure. Conversely, a non-poem that eliminates language altogether may score high in definitional destabilization and indeterminacy, reflecting its position at the boundary of literature.

The introduction of such indices raises an important methodological question: what is the role of quantification in aesthetics? Historically, attempts to measure aesthetic value have often been met with skepticism. The experience of art is seen as irreducibly qualitative, resistant to numerical representation. Meta-garde does not deny this. It does not claim that aesthetic experience can be fully captured by indices, nor that numerical values can replace interpretation.

Instead, indices are understood as **analytical tools**. They provide a way of organizing information, identifying patterns, and facilitating comparison. By translating structural variables into composite measures, indices allow for the detection of similarities and differences that might otherwise remain implicit. They make it possible to compare objects across domains, to identify clusters within the aesthetic space, and to trace transitions between different configurations.

At the same time, the limits of quantification must be clearly acknowledged. An index is always a **reduction**. It selects certain variables, assigns them weights, and combines them according to a specific rule. In doing so, it inevitably omits aspects of the object that may be aesthetically significant. Different choices of variables or weighting schemes may lead to different results, reflecting the interpretive dimension that cannot be eliminated from aesthetic analysis.

Moreover, indices operate at a level of abstraction that may obscure the **internal tensions** of an object. Two works may have similar index values while differing significantly in their structure. A high AAll score, for example, may result from different combinations of variables—one object may emphasize material disruption, another definitional instability. The index captures the intensity of anti-art features, but not their specific configuration.

For these reasons, indices should be used in conjunction with, rather than in place of, the full multidimensional analysis. They are most effective when

they are understood as **entry points** into the aesthetic space, guiding attention to certain regions or patterns without exhausting their complexity.

The comparative utility of indices becomes evident when they are applied across multiple objects or movements. By assigning values to a set of works, one can identify clusters characterized by similar intensities of anti-art or anti-poetic features. These clusters correspond to regions within the aesthetic space, as described in the previous chapter. Indices thus provide a bridge between **quantitative measurement and spatial mapping**.

They also allow for the analysis of transitions. Changes in index values across a sequence of works may indicate shifts in structural emphasis, revealing the dynamics of artistic development. A movement toward higher values of paradox density and indeterminacy, for example, may signal a transition from conventional poetry to paradoxist practice. Such patterns can be identified more clearly when the underlying variables are aggregated into indices.

In this way, indices contribute to the development of a **comparative aesthetics** that is both systematic and flexible. They enable the analysis of differences not only between individual works, but between entire movements and domains.

The integration of indices into meta-garde thus represents a step toward greater analytical precision, without sacrificing conceptual depth. It demonstrates that quantification, when used appropriately, can enhance rather than diminish the study of aesthetic phenomena.

The following chapter will address another essential dimension of the framework: the role of context in shaping the meta-garde state of the aesthetic object, and the implications of this for interpretation and evaluation.

References

- Smarandache, F. (1990). *Nonpoems*. Phoenix & Chicago: Xiquan Publishing House.
Smarandache, F. (2006). *Paradoxist distiches*. Automaton.

11

Context and Relativity

The formal structure developed in previous chapters—triadic states, structural variables, and spatial mapping—provides a robust framework for analyzing aesthetic objects. However, this framework remains incomplete unless it accounts for a fundamental feature of aesthetic phenomena: their **dependence on context**. The aesthetic status of an object is not fixed once and for all; it varies according to the conditions under which the object is encountered, interpreted, and situated.

To formalize this, the meta-garde state of an object must be expressed not simply as $N(w)$, but as a function of context:

$$N(w | C) = \langle T(w | C), I(w | C), F(w | C) \rangle,$$

where C denotes a set of contextual conditions. These conditions may include institutional settings, cultural frameworks, historical moments, and interpretive practices. The introduction of context does not alter the triadic structure itself, but it modifies the values of its components. The same object may therefore occupy **different positions in the aesthetic space**, depending on the context in which it is considered.

One of the most evident dimensions of context is **institutional framing**. The role of institutions in defining art has been extensively discussed, particularly in the work of George Dickie, who argues that art is constituted through its relation to the “art world” (Dickie, 1974). Within this perspective, museums, galleries, publications, and critical discourse do not merely display or describe artworks; they actively participate in **conferring aesthetic status**.

From a meta-garde standpoint, institutional framing directly affects the value of $T(w)$, the degree of aesthetic affirmation. An object placed within a recognized artistic context may exhibit a higher level of affirmation than the same object encountered outside that context. At the same time, such framing may also influence $F(w)$, particularly when the object is presented as a challenge to established norms. A readymade displayed in a museum affirms its status as art through institutional recognition, while simultaneously negating traditional criteria of artistic production.

Institutional context also interacts with indeterminacy. In some cases, framing reduces indeterminacy by providing interpretive cues; in others, it may

increase it by introducing ambiguity or irony. The triadic state thus reflects not only the object itself, but the **network of relations** in which it is embedded.

A second dimension of context is **cultural variation**. Aesthetic values, categories, and expectations differ across cultures and historical periods. What is recognized as art in one context may not be recognized as such in another; what is considered meaningful in one framework may appear obscure or trivial in another. This variability affects all three components of the meta-garde state.

Cultural context influences $T(w)$ by determining the criteria for artistic recognition. It affects $F(w)$ by shaping what counts as negation or transgression. It also plays a crucial role in $I(w)$, as unfamiliar or hybrid forms may generate higher degrees of indeterminacy when encountered outside their original context. An object that is relatively stable within one cultural framework may become highly indeterminate when displaced into another.

The importance of cultural variation underscores the need to treat aesthetic analysis as **situated** rather than universal. Meta-garde does not assume that the values of $T(w)$, $I(w)$, and $F(w)$ are absolute; it recognizes that they are contingent upon the frameworks within which objects are interpreted.

This leads to a third dimension of context: **interpretation**. The role of the observer, reader, or audience is central to aesthetic experience. Different interpretations may emphasize different aspects of the same object, leading to variations in its meta-garde state. A work that appears primarily affirmative under one interpretation may reveal strong elements of negation or indeterminacy under another.

Interpretation is not arbitrary, but it is not fully determined by the object either. It operates within a space defined by the object's structural profile and the contextual conditions in which it is encountered. The interaction between these elements produces a range of possible states, rather than a single fixed value. In this sense, interpretation contributes to the **dynamic character** of the aesthetic space.

The introduction of context raises an important question: if the aesthetic state of an object varies with context, does this undermine the possibility of systematic analysis? The answer is negative. Contextual variability does not eliminate structure; it **modulates it**. The structural profile $x(w)$ remains a defining feature of the object, but its projection into the triadic state depends on contextual parameters.

This relation can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned}T(w | C) &= f_T(x(w), C), \\I(w | C) &= f_I(x(w), C), \\F(w | C) &= f_F(x(w), C).\end{aligned}$$

The functions f_T, f_I, f_F now depend not only on the structural variables, but also on context. This formulation preserves the connection between structure and state, while incorporating the variability introduced by different conditions of reception.

The key implication of this analysis is that the aesthetic state of an object is **relational, not intrinsic**. It does not reside solely in the object, nor solely in the observer, but in the interaction between the object's structure and its context. This relationality does not imply relativism in the sense of arbitrariness; rather, it reflects the fact that aesthetic phenomena are constituted through **networks of relations**.

By formalizing context and relativity within the meta-garde framework, this chapter completes the transition from a static to a dynamic model of aesthetics. Objects are no longer treated as fixed entities with stable properties, but as configurations whose states vary across contexts. This prepares the ground for the final part of the book, in which the implications of this model for classification, comparison, and the future of aesthetics will be explored.

References

- Dickie, G. (1974). *Art and the Aesthetic: An Institutional Analysis*. Cornell University Press.

IV
Domain Instantiations

12

Visual Domain: oUTER-aRT

The general framework developed in the preceding chapters finds its first concrete instantiation in the visual domain. This domain provides a particularly suitable testing ground for meta-garde, not only because of its historical centrality, but also because it offers some of the clearest cases in which traditional aesthetic categories break down. Within this context, the concept of **oUTER-aRT** serves as a paradigmatic field for applying and validating the theory.

The visual aesthetic object, like any other, can be described through its structural profile $x(w)$ and its triadic state $N(w) = \langle T(w), I(w), F(w) \rangle$. However, the variables that constitute the structural profile in this domain reflect the specific conditions of visual production and reception. These include, among others, the use of unconventional materials, the disruption of compositional norms, the incorporation of non-art objects, and the degree of reflexive engagement with the concept of art itself.

In the context of oUTER-aRT, these variables tend to be oriented toward **negation and destabilization**. The use of everyday objects, industrial materials, or discarded elements challenges the traditional distinction between artistic and non-artistic matter. The absence or deliberate disruption of compositional coherence undermines expectations of form. The explicit questioning of artistic status introduces a high degree of reflexivity. Taken together, these features produce structural profiles characterized by strong values along the invariants of contradiction, indeterminacy, definitional instability, and reflexivity.

These structural configurations generate corresponding meta-garde states. oUTER-aRT objects typically exhibit a significant degree of aesthetic affirmation, insofar as they are presented, interpreted, and often institutionalized as artworks. At the same time, they display a strong degree of negation, as they reject or subvert the conditions that traditionally define art. Indeterminacy is also prominent, as the status and meaning of such objects often remain open to interpretation.

The resulting configuration is one in which $T(w)$, $F(w)$, and $I(w)$ are all non-trivial and often elevated. oUTER-aRT thus provides clear instances of

Meta-garde Objects, in which affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy coexist in a structurally significant way.

The centrality of anti-art within this domain becomes evident when one considers the role of negation in generating these configurations. Anti-art is not simply a rejection of art; it is a **mode of operation** through which the boundaries of art are explored and redefined. The gestures associated with anti-art—removal of form, substitution of materials, displacement of objects—introduce tensions that cannot be resolved within a binary framework.

Historical precedents for such practices can be found in the work of Marcel Duchamp and the broader context of Dada. The readymade, in particular, exemplifies the coexistence of affirmation and negation: an object that is both an ordinary item and an artwork, depending on its framing (Duchamp, 1973). oUTER-aRT extends and systematizes this logic, incorporating a wider range of materials and strategies while maintaining the fundamental tension.

From the perspective of meta-garde, anti-art is not an external category, but an **internal dimension** of the aesthetic space. The value $F(w)$ is not a marker of exclusion, but a component of the object's state. This allows anti-art to be analyzed within the same framework as traditional art, without reducing it to a deviation or anomaly.

The application of structural variables in this domain also illustrates the role of indices such as the Anti-Art Intensity Index (AAll). By aggregating variables associated with negation, disruption, and instability, AAll provides a measure of the degree to which an object participates in anti-art practices. While such indices do not capture the full complexity of the object, they facilitate comparison across works and help identify clusters within the aesthetic space.

oUTER-aRT thus functions as a **calibration domain** for meta-garde. It offers clear, empirically accessible cases in which the coexistence of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy can be observed and analyzed. The structural variables are relatively transparent, and the resulting triadic states are often pronounced. This makes it possible to test the coherence of the theoretical framework and to refine its components.

At the same time, the visual domain reveals the limits of any purely formal approach. The interpretation of oUTER-aRT objects remains dependent on context, as discussed in the previous chapter. Institutional framing, cultural

expectations, and critical discourse all influence the values of $T(w)$, $I(w)$, and $F(w)$. The meta-garde framework does not eliminate these dependencies, but it provides a way of integrating them into a systematic analysis.

By examining the visual domain through the lens of oUTER-aRT, this chapter demonstrates how the general principles of meta-garde can be applied to a specific field. It shows how structural variables generate triadic states, how anti-art functions as a central mechanism, and how objects can be located within the aesthetic space.

References

- Duchamp, M. (1973). *The essential writings of Marcel Duchamp* (M. Sanouillet & E. Peterson, Eds.). Da Capo Press. (Original texts written 1910s–1920s)
- Smarandache, F. (n.d.). oUTER-aRT. University of New Mexico, <https://fs.unm.edu/a/oUTER-aRT.htm>

13

Literary Domain: pArAdOXisM

If the visual domain, through oUTER-aRT, provides a clear calibration for meta-garde, the literary domain—particularly pArAdOXisM—offers its most **systematically articulated realization**. While many avant-garde movements produce objects that exhibit contradiction and indeterminacy, pArAdOXisM distinguishes itself by transforming these features into **explicit principles of construction**. It is a domain in which they are **consciously generated and theorized**.

pArAdOXisM, developed in the 1980s, emerges as both a literary practice and a theoretical movement. Its defining characteristic is the use of contradiction not as ornament or exception, but as a **generative mechanism**. Statements such as “everything is possible, even the impossible” or “I’m not a poet, that’s why I write poetry” do not simply juxtapose opposites; they construct meaning through the **simultaneous affirmation and negation of a proposition** (Smarandache, 1990).

Within the meta-garde framework, such constructions can be described in terms of elevated values of all three components of the triadic state. A paradoxist text typically exhibits a strong degree of aesthetic affirmation, insofar as it is recognized as a literary object and engages with poetic or discursive forms. At the same time, it displays a pronounced degree of negation, as it undermines the conventions of language, genre, and meaning. Indeterminacy is also central, as the coexistence of contradictory elements prevents the stabilization of interpretation.

The result is a configuration in which $T(w)$, $F(w)$, and $I(w)$ are all simultaneously significant. Paradoxist works thus occupy a region of the aesthetic space characterized by **high triadic intensity**, making them exemplary instances of Meta-garde Objects. Unlike many other practices, where contradiction emerges as a byproduct of experimentation, pArAdOXisM places contradiction at the center of its method, ensuring that the triadic structure is not incidental but **systematic**.

This systematicity is closely linked to what may be called **procedural contradiction**. In pArAdOXisM, contradiction is not only present in the content of individual statements; it is embedded in the procedures that generate the

text. The construction of paradoxist distiches, for example, often follows patterns of inversion, symmetry, or semantic tension, producing pairs of statements that are mutually incompatible yet interdependent (Smarandache, 2006). The procedure itself guarantees the coexistence of affirmation and negation.

Procedural contradiction distinguishes pArAdOXisM from other literary movements that employ paradox or ambiguity. In many forms of poetry, paradox appears as a rhetorical figure, a momentary disruption that ultimately contributes to a larger coherence. In pArAdOXisM, by contrast, contradiction is **structural and recurrent**. It is not resolved at the level of interpretation; it is sustained as a defining feature of the text.

This structural emphasis is reinforced by the movement's reflexivity. pArAdOXisM does not merely produce paradoxical texts; it also generates manifestos, theoretical statements, and meta-poetic reflections that articulate its own principles. This reflexive dimension corresponds to a high value of the invariant associated with reflexivity, as introduced in Chapter 7. It also contributes to the clarity with which pArAdOXisM can be analyzed within the meta-garde framework.

The expansion of the literary object beyond traditional text further strengthens the alignment between pArAdOXisM and meta-garde. In works such as *NonPoems*, the concept of the poem is extended to include fragments, visual elements, or even the absence of language (Smarandache, 1990). A blank page, a diagram, or a minimal inscription can function as a poetic object, while simultaneously negating the conditions that define poetry. This introduces a high degree of definitional instability, as the boundary between literature and non-literature becomes uncertain.

The coexistence of these dimensions—affirmation, negation, indeterminacy, contradiction, reflexivity, and definitional instability—makes pArAdOXisM an **ideal meta-garde system** within the literary domain. It provides a set of objects in which the principles of meta-garde are not only observable but explicitly enacted.

From a comparative perspective, pArAdOXisM occupies a distinctive position. While movements such as Dada or Surrealism introduce elements of negation and indeterminacy, they do not systematize contradiction to the same extent. Dada emphasizes disruption and absurdity, often privileging negation over affirmation. Surrealism explores the unconscious and associative logic,

generating indeterminacy without necessarily producing structured contradiction. pArAdOXisM, by contrast, integrates these dimensions into a **coherent procedural framework**.

The application of indices such as the Paradoxist Anti-Poetry Intensity Index (PAII) further illustrates this distinctiveness. By aggregating variables related to contradiction density, semantic indeterminacy, and reflexivity, such indices allow for the identification of paradoxist texts as a cluster within the aesthetic space. The high values associated with these variables correspond to the elevated triadic state, reinforcing the characterization of pArAdOXisM as a region of **maximum meta-garde intensity**.

At the same time, the analysis of pArAdOXisM confirms the importance of context. The interpretation of a paradoxist text depends on linguistic, cultural, and institutional factors, which influence the values of $T(w)$, $I(w)$, and $F(w)$. The meta-garde framework accommodates this variability, allowing the same text to occupy different positions within the aesthetic space under different conditions.

By examining the literary domain through the lens of pArAdOXisM, this chapter demonstrates how meta-garde can account for forms of writing that are structured by contradiction. It shows that the triadic model is not only applicable to literature, but particularly well suited to practices in which language itself becomes a site of tension and instability.

References

- Smarandache, F. (n.d.). *pArAdOXisM, the Last Vanguard of the Second Millennium*. University of New Mexico, <https://fs.unm.edu/a/paradoxism.htm>
- Smarandache, F. (1990). *Nonpoems*. Phoenix & Chicago: Xiquan Publishing House.
- Smarandache, F. (2006). *Paradoxist distiches*. Automaton.

Action and Performance

The transition from visual and literary domains to action and performance introduces a decisive shift in the ontology of the aesthetic object. In this domain, the object is no longer a stable artifact—such as a painting or a text—but an **event unfolding in time**. This transformation has significant consequences for meta-garde, as it intensifies the role of indeterminacy, amplifies the effects of context, and redistributes the components of the triadic state across performers, situations, and audiences.

Performance-based practices, including theatre, happening, and performance art, challenge the assumption that the aesthetic object is a fixed entity. Instead, the object becomes **processual**. It exists only in its execution, and its identity cannot be fully separated from the conditions of its realization. This instability complicates the notion of the structural profile $x(w)$, which must now account not only for material or linguistic features, but for **temporal sequences, bodily actions, and situational interactions**.

The emergence of performance as a central aesthetic domain in the twentieth century can be traced to the avant-garde, particularly movements such as Dada, where theatrical gestures, improvisation, and public disruption played a key role. Later developments in performance art further destabilized the boundary between art and life, as artists incorporated everyday actions, audience participation, and ephemeral events into their work. In such contexts, the aesthetic object cannot be isolated from its enactment; it is inseparable from the **event in which it appears**.

Within the meta-garde condition, this shift has several implications. First, the triadic state $N(w)$ must be understood as **temporally distributed**. The degrees of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy may vary over the course of the performance. A sequence may begin with a recognizable theatrical structure, affirming its status as art, and then introduce disruptive elements that negate this structure, before moving into a phase of heightened indeterminacy where the distinction between performance and non-performance becomes unclear.

Second, the instability of the object leads to an increased prominence of indeterminacy. Because performances are contingent on numerous

variables—environment, performer behavior, audience response—their outcomes are not fully predictable. This does not imply randomness, but rather a structured openness in which multiple trajectories are possible. The value of $I(w)$ is therefore often elevated in this domain, reflecting the **inherent variability** of the event.

Third, the role of negation acquires a distinct form. In performance, negation may operate through the disruption of theatrical conventions, the refusal of narrative coherence, or the breakdown of the separation between stage and audience. These gestures do not simply reject form; they reconfigure it, producing situations in which the distinction between art and non-art is actively contested. The value of $F(w)$ thus reflects not only opposition to established norms, but the **transformation of the conditions of performance itself**.

The role of the audience becomes central in this context. Unlike visual or literary objects, which can be encountered independently of their creator, performance requires the presence of observers who are often also participants. The audience does not merely receive the work; it contributes to its realization. Reactions, interpretations, and interactions feed back into the event, influencing its trajectory and, consequently, its meta-garde state.

This participatory dimension reinforces the relational character of aesthetics, as discussed in the previous chapter. The state $N(w | C)$ is here strongly dependent on the audience as part of the context C . Different audiences may produce different configurations of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy, even when the same performance is repeated. The aesthetic object is thus **co-constructed**, emerging from the interaction between performers and observers.

The structural variables relevant to this domain must therefore include dimensions such as **temporal instability, performative contradiction, audience interaction, and embodiment**. Temporal instability captures the variability of the event over time; performative contradiction reflects the coexistence of opposing actions or meanings within the performance; audience interaction measures the degree to which observers influence the event; embodiment addresses the role of the body as a medium of expression and transformation.

These variables generate triadic states that are often highly dynamic. A performance may oscillate between affirmation and negation, or maintain a

sustained tension between them, while indeterminacy fluctuates in response to unfolding conditions. The mapping of such objects within the aesthetic space requires attention not only to their position, but to their **trajectory**—the path they trace over time.

From a comparative perspective, the action domain extends the reach of meta-garde by demonstrating that its principles are not limited to static objects. The coexistence of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy can be observed not only in artifacts, but in **events and processes**. This reinforces the generality of the framework, while also highlighting the need for domain-specific adaptations.

The connection to pArAdOXisM becomes particularly relevant in the context of paradoxist dramaturgy, where contradiction is not only present in language, but enacted through performance. Here, procedural contradiction takes on a temporal and embodied form, as actions themselves become paradoxical. A gesture may simultaneously affirm and negate its own meaning, or a sequence may construct and deconstruct a narrative in real time. Such practices exemplify the extension of neutrosophic logic into the domain of action.

By incorporating event-based aesthetics, the meta-garde framework expands its scope to include forms in which the object is inherently unstable and relational. It shows that the triadic structure can accommodate not only static configurations, but dynamic processes in which states evolve and interact over time.

References

- Dickie, G. (1974). *Art and the Aesthetic: An Institutional Analysis*. Cornell University Press.
- Smarandache, F. (n.d.) *pArAdOXisM, the Last Vanguard of the Second Millennium*. University of New Mexico, <https://fs.unm.edu/a/paradoxism.htm>

15

Cross-Domain Invariants

The preceding chapters have examined three distinct domains of aesthetic production: the visual domain through oUTER-aRT, the literary domain through pArAdOXisM, and the domain of action and performance. Each domain introduces specific variables, media conditions, and modes of realization. At first glance, this diversity might suggest that meta-garde is a collection of loosely related applications rather than a unified theory. The purpose of the present chapter is to demonstrate the opposite: beneath this diversity lies a set of **cross-domain invariants** that constitute the structural core of the theory.

These invariants are not tied to any particular medium. They are not dependent on whether the object is visual, textual, or performative. Instead, they define the conditions under which an aesthetic object requires meta-garde analysis. Four such invariants can be identified: contradiction, indeterminacy, reflexivity, and definitional destabilization. Together, they form the **common architecture** that unifies all domain instantiations of meta-garde.

The first and most fundamental invariant is **contradiction**. In each domain, contradiction appears not as a peripheral feature, but as a generative mechanism. In visual anti-art, contradiction is evident in objects that are simultaneously ordinary and artistic, such as the readymades associated with Marcel Duchamp (Duchamp, 1973). In paradoxist literature, contradiction is constructed explicitly through statements that affirm and negate themselves (Smarandache, 1990). In performance, contradiction is enacted through actions that simultaneously establish and undermine their own meaning.

What remains constant across these cases is not the form of contradiction, but its function. Contradiction operates as a **structural principle**, producing tension within the object and preventing its reduction to a single determinate state. It is this invariant that directly generates the coexistence of $T(w)$ and $F(w)$ within the meta-garde framework.

Closely related to contradiction is the second invariant: **indeterminacy**. While contradiction involves the coexistence of opposing determinations, indeterminacy refers to the **inability to fix the object within a stable interpretive or classificatory framework**. In visual art, indeterminacy may

arise from ambiguous forms or contexts; in literature, from semantic openness or paradox; in performance, from the variability of the event.

Indeterminacy is not merely a byproduct of complexity or obscurity. It is often deliberately constructed, as in the case of conceptual art or paradoxist writing, where the object resists closure and invites multiple, incompatible interpretations. Within the meta-garde state, indeterminacy corresponds to $I(w)$, but as an invariant, it also functions at the structural level, shaping the variables that contribute to this component.

The third invariant is **reflexivity**. Across all domains, many contemporary aesthetic objects exhibit a capacity to reflect upon their own conditions of existence. They do not merely present content; they comment on the processes through which they are produced, classified, and interpreted. This reflexive dimension is evident in manifestos, meta-poetic texts, conceptual artworks, and performances that foreground their own construction.

Reflexivity plays a crucial role in stabilizing contradiction. By making its own operations visible, the object provides a framework within which its internal tensions can be understood. In pArAdOXisM, for example, the explicit articulation of paradox as a method allows contradiction to function systematically rather than arbitrarily. In visual and performance contexts, reflexivity often takes the form of self-referential gestures that expose the boundaries between art and non-art.

The fourth invariant is **definitional destabilization**. This refers to the extent to which an object challenges the very category to which it belongs. In oUTER-aRT, the boundary between art and everyday object is destabilized. In paradoxist literature, the distinction between poetry and non-poetry is brought into question. In performance, the separation between art and life becomes uncertain.

Definitional destabilization differs from contradiction in that it operates at the level of categories rather than propositions. It does not simply produce opposing statements within a given framework; it **undermines the framework itself**. This invariant is essential for understanding why certain objects cannot be adequately classified within existing aesthetic systems.

Taken together, these four invariants define a **cross-domain structure** that persists regardless of medium. They explain why the same triadic configuration—coexistence of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy—

emerges in visual, literary, and performative contexts. The specific variables may differ, but the underlying logic remains constant.

This can be expressed formally by considering that, for any aesthetic object w , the structural profile $x(w)$ includes components corresponding to these invariants:

$$x(w) = (p, i, d, r, \dots)$$

where p represents contradiction, i indeterminacy, d definitional destabilization, and r reflexivity. These components contribute to the generation of the triadic state:

$$N(w) = \langle T(w), I(w), F(w) \rangle.$$

The presence of these invariants ensures that the meta-garde framework is not domain-specific, but **domain-general**. It can be applied to different forms of aesthetic production without losing coherence.

At the same time, the invariants do not eliminate the need for domain-specific variables. They provide a common foundation, but the full description of an object requires additional dimensions that capture the particularities of its medium. The relation between invariants and variables is therefore hierarchical: invariants define the core structure, while variables specify its realization.

The identification of cross-domain invariants has important implications for the unity of the series as a whole. It demonstrates that the different volumes—visual, literary, and performative—are not independent studies, but **coordinated explorations of a single theoretical system**. Each domain instantiates the same underlying principles, even as it introduces new variables and complexities.

This unification also supports the comparative ambitions of meta-garde. By providing a common set of dimensions, the theory makes it possible to compare objects and movements across domains. A paradoxist text and a performance piece can be analyzed in terms of their respective degrees of contradiction, indeterminacy, reflexivity, and destabilization, even if their forms differ radically. Comparison thus becomes a matter of **structural alignment**, rather than superficial similarity.

Finally, the identification of these invariants clarifies the position of meta-garde within the broader field of aesthetic theory. It shows that the framework is not limited to a particular movement or medium, but addresses a more general condition of contemporary art: the emergence of objects that are

Theory and Applications

defined by the coexistence of opposing determinations and the instability of their own categories.

By establishing contradiction, indeterminacy, reflexivity, and definitional destabilization as cross-domain invariants, this chapter provides the conceptual link that unifies the entire system. It prepares the ground for the final part of the book, in which these principles will be integrated into a general theory of aesthetic classes, historical positioning, and future developments.

References

- Duchamp, M. (1973). *The essential writings of Marcel Duchamp* (M. Sanouillet & E. Peterson, Eds.). Da Capo Press. (Original texts written 1910s–1920s)
- Smarandache, F. (1990). *Nonpoems*. Phoenix & Chicago: Xiquan Publishing House.

V

Toward a General Theory

Aesthetic Classes and Cluster Logic

The development of the Meta-garde Space in Part III and its instantiation across domains in Part IV makes possible a further step: the formalization of **aesthetic classes**. If aesthetic objects can be represented as points within a multidimensional space, and if movements correspond to clusters within that space, then it becomes necessary to define what constitutes a class, how classes are formed, and under what conditions they can be distinguished from one another.

Traditionally, aesthetic classes—such as genres, movements, or styles—have been defined through historical, institutional, or thematic criteria. A movement like Dada is identified through manifestos, shared practices, and historical context. While these criteria remain important, they do not provide a formal account of what unifies the objects within a class or distinguishes them from those outside it. The meta-garde framework allows for a more precise formulation by grounding classes in **structural and state-based configurations**.

An **aesthetic class** may be defined as a set of objects K such that each object $w \in K$ exhibits a structural profile $x(w)$ and a meta-garde state $N(w)$ that fall within a bounded region of the aesthetic space. This region is not defined by a single value or property, but by a **range of values across multiple dimensions**. The class is thus characterized by a pattern or configuration, rather than by a fixed essence.

Formally, if $\Phi(K)$ denotes the set of structural profiles and $\Psi(K)$ the set of triadic states associated with the class, then:

$$\Phi(K) = \{ x(w) \mid w \in K \}, \Psi(K) = \{ N(w) \mid w \in K \}.$$

A class is identified by the coherence of these sets, that is, by the degree to which the elements of $\Phi(K)$ and $\Psi(K)$ cluster within a region of the space.

This leads to the notion of **cluster formation**. A cluster is a region in the aesthetic space where multiple objects are located in relative proximity due to similarities in their structural variables and triadic states. Clustering is not imposed externally; it emerges from the distribution of objects within the space. When a sufficient number of objects share similar configurations, a cluster becomes identifiable as a potential class.

The formation of clusters depends on the interaction of the core invariants identified in the previous chapter—contradiction, indeterminacy, reflexivity, and definitional destabilization—with domain-specific variables. For example, paradoxist texts cluster in a region characterized by high contradiction and reflexivity, along with significant indeterminacy. oUTER-aRT objects cluster in a region where negation and definitional instability are prominent. These clusters are not arbitrary; they reflect **systematic tendencies** in the production of aesthetic objects.

In order for a cluster to be recognized as a distinct class, certain **threshold conditions** must be satisfied. These conditions ensure that the cluster is not merely a loose aggregation, but a coherent and distinguishable region within the space.

The first condition is **internal coherence**. The objects within the cluster must exhibit a sufficient degree of similarity in their structural profiles and triadic states. This does not require uniformity, but it does require that the variations within the cluster are smaller than the differences between the cluster and its surroundings.

The second condition is **external separation**. The cluster must be distinguishable from neighboring regions. This means that there exist boundaries—however gradual—across which the values of key variables or components change significantly. Without such separation, the cluster cannot be clearly identified as a distinct class.

The third condition is **reproducibility of configuration**. The structural pattern that defines the cluster must be capable of being instantiated in multiple objects. This implies the existence of underlying procedures, principles, or conventions that generate similar configurations. In pArAdOXisM, for instance, the use of procedural contradiction ensures that new texts can be produced within the same structural framework (Smarandache, 2006).

The fourth condition is **recognizability within context**. Although the meta-garde framework provides a formal basis for classification, aesthetic classes also depend on contextual recognition. Institutions, critics, and practitioners contribute to the identification and stabilization of clusters as movements or genres. This condition links the formal structure to the contextual variability discussed in Chapter 11.

When these conditions are met, a cluster can be considered a **distinct aesthetic class**. It is important to note that classes are not static. They may

expand, contract, merge, or dissolve over time as new objects enter the space and as contextual conditions change. The boundaries of a class are therefore dynamic, reflecting the evolving nature of aesthetic practice.

The concept of cluster logic also allows for the analysis of **intermediate and hybrid regions**. Not all objects belong clearly to a single class. Some may occupy positions between clusters, exhibiting features of multiple configurations. Such objects are particularly significant for meta-garde, as they often display high levels of indeterminacy and contradiction. They challenge the stability of classes and may contribute to the emergence of new clusters.

From a comparative perspective, cluster logic provides a powerful tool for analyzing relationships between movements. Instead of comparing movements in terms of influence or chronology alone, one can examine the **relative positions of their clusters** within the aesthetic space. This makes it possible to identify affinities, overlaps, and divergences in a systematic way. For example, the cluster associated with pArAdOXisM may overlap partially with those of conceptual writing or anti-poetry, while remaining distinct due to its emphasis on procedural contradiction.

The formalization of aesthetic classes thus completes an important stage in the development of meta-garde. It transforms the notion of movement from a historical or descriptive category into a **structurally defined region** within a multidimensional space. It also provides the basis for a comparative theory that is grounded in measurable and analyzable configurations.

At the same time, this formalization does not eliminate the complexity of aesthetic phenomena. Classes remain open to reinterpretation, and clusters remain subject to change. The value of the meta-garde approach lies not in fixing these categories once and for all, but in providing a framework within which their formation, transformation, and interaction can be understood.

References

Smarandache, F. (2006). *Paradoxist distiches*. Automaton.

17

Meta-garde in the History of Aesthetics

The preceding chapters have developed meta-garde as a structural condition capable of describing aesthetic objects characterized by contradiction, indeterminacy, and instability. The purpose of the present chapter is to situate this condition within the broader history of aesthetic thought. The aim is not to reconstruct that history in detail, but to clarify how meta-garde emerges from its internal tensions, and how it reconfigures the conceptual trajectory of the discipline.

Modern aesthetics, as articulated in the work of Immanuel Kant and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, is grounded in the attempt to establish the conditions under which aesthetic judgment is possible and the nature of art can be understood. Despite their differences, both approaches assume that aesthetic phenomena can be situated within a structured conceptual framework. Kant emphasizes the reflective and indeterminate character of aesthetic judgment, yet maintains the possibility of a shared, though non-conceptual, universality. Hegel, in turn, integrates art into a systematic and historical process in which contradictions are not sustained, but ultimately resolved within a higher unity (Kant, 1790/2000; Hegel, 1835/1975). In both cases, contradiction is not allowed to persist as such; it is either bracketed or overcome.

The twentieth century introduces a decisive transformation. The emergence of the avant-garde, particularly in movements such as Dada and later conceptual practices, produces objects that resist integration into these frameworks. The use of non-art materials, the rejection of form, and the deliberate destabilization of meaning challenge the assumption that art can be defined through stable criteria. Marcel Duchamp's readymades, for example, do not merely expand the category of art; they expose the fragility of the distinction between art and non-art (Duchamp, 1973). As a result, aesthetic theory is compelled to expand its scope, giving rise to institutional, conceptual, and anti-aesthetic approaches that attempt to accommodate these developments (Dickie, 1974; Danto, 1981).

This expansion reaches a critical point in postmodern theory. In the work of Jean-François Lyotard, the collapse of grand narratives leads to an emphasis on plurality, heterogeneity, and the incommensurability of forms of knowledge

(Lyotard, 1979/1984). Aesthetic discourse becomes increasingly attentive to fragmentation, hybridity, and the instability of meaning. Rather than seeking universal criteria, it foregrounds the impossibility of such criteria. Contradiction and indeterminacy are no longer anomalies, but pervasive features of aesthetic experience.

This shift marks an important development. Postmodern aesthetics recognizes that objects may resist definitive classification and that meaning may be multiple, deferred, or undecidable. In doing so, it moves beyond the rigid binaries that structured earlier frameworks. However, this movement remains largely descriptive. It identifies the breakdown of binary logic, but does not replace it with a formal structure capable of representing the resulting configurations. Contradiction is acknowledged, but not systematically articulated; indeterminacy is described, but not structurally modeled.

It is at this point that meta-garde becomes necessary. It does not reject the insights of postmodern theory; rather, it takes them as its starting point. The recognition of plurality, ambiguity, and instability is preserved, but their status is transformed. Instead of marking the limits of theory, these features become the basis for a new form of analysis. Meta-garde does not simply describe the collapse of categories; it provides a way of understanding the configurations that emerge from this collapse.

The introduction of a triadic structure—affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy—marks a decisive shift in this direction. Unlike classical logic, which excludes contradiction, and unlike dialectical logic, which resolves it, the meta-garde condition allows contradictory states to coexist without reduction. Affirmation and negation are no longer treated as mutually exclusive, nor as stages in a process of synthesis, but as dimensions that may be simultaneously present. Indeterminacy is not a temporary suspension, but a structural component of the object.

In this sense, meta-garde operates beyond both binary logic and the critical stance of postmodernism. It does not merely expose instability; it renders it structurally intelligible. The aesthetic object is no longer defined by its conformity to a category, nor by its resistance to categorization, but by its position within a configuration of coexisting states. What was previously described in terms of ambiguity or undecidability can now be articulated in terms of relations between affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy.

This transformation may be understood as a movement from description to formal articulation. Where postmodern theory emphasizes fragmentation and plurality, meta-garde introduces a framework capable of describing the internal structure of such plurality. It does not eliminate complexity, but provides a means of engaging with it systematically. The language of instability is not abandoned, but translated into a set of relations that can be analyzed and compared across objects and domains.

The philosophical significance of this move lies in the redefinition of contradiction. In classical logic, contradiction signals error; in dialectical logic, it is a moment to be surpassed; in postmodern discourse, it often appears as an index of undecidability. Within the meta-garde condition, contradiction becomes a constitutive feature. It is neither eliminated nor resolved, but sustained as part of the structure of the object. This does not imply that all contradictions are equivalent, but that they can be described without being reduced to a single outcome. Such a redefinition has implications that extend beyond aesthetics. It suggests a broader shift in the understanding of complex phenomena. Instead of seeking coherence through exclusion or synthesis, it becomes possible to think in terms of coexistence. Entities are no longer defined solely by what they exclude, but by the way in which multiple states are maintained within them. Aesthetic objects thus become instances of a more general condition, one that may also be observed in language, conceptual systems, and certain philosophical traditions that do not rely on rigid binary oppositions. At the same time, meta-garde retains a commitment to theoretical articulation. It does not abandon the aspiration to system, but reconfigures it. The introduction of formal structures, including triadic states and relational variables, demonstrates that it is possible to construct a framework capable of accommodating contradiction and indeterminacy without reducing them. In this respect, meta-garde continues the philosophical project of aesthetics, while transforming its foundations. The position of meta-garde within the history of the discipline can therefore be understood as follows. It emerges after the expansion and fragmentation associated with postmodernism, responds to the limitations of binary logic, and introduces a formal articulation of coexistence as a structural condition. It does not return to earlier notions of unity or essence, but neither does it remain at the level of descriptive plurality. Instead, it establishes a stage in which complex aesthetic states become conceptually and analytically accessible.

By situating meta-garde in this way, the present chapter clarifies its philosophical scope. It is not a continuation of any single tradition, nor an application of a pre-existing system to art. It is an attempt to articulate, in formal terms, a condition that becomes visible through the transformations of modern and contemporary aesthetics. In doing so, it opens the possibility of extending this condition beyond the aesthetic domain, toward a broader philosophical framework in which coexistence replaces exclusion as a primary mode of understanding.

References

- Danto, A. (1981). *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace*. Harvard University Press.
- Dickie, G. (1974). *Art and the Aesthetic: An Institutional Analysis*. Cornell University Press.
- Duchamp, M. (1973). *Salt Seller: The Writings of Marcel Duchamp*. Oxford University Press.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1975). *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art* (T. M. Knox, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1835)
- Kant, I. (2000). *Critique of the Power of Judgment* (P. Guyer & E. Matthews, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1790)
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1979)

18

From Anti-Art to Meta-garde

The analysis developed throughout this book has treated anti-art as a central case for understanding the limitations of traditional aesthetics and the necessity of a meta-garde condition. However, anti-art should not be understood merely as a historical phenomenon or a marginal category within art. It signals a broader transformation: the emergence of a cultural condition in which contradiction, indeterminacy, and hybridization are no longer exceptional, but structural and pervasive. What is at stake is not simply a new type of object, but a shift in the conditions under which aesthetic objects exist.

The notion of anti-art, as it emerged in the twentieth century, was initially defined in opposition to established artistic norms. Movements such as Dada, and later conceptual practices, introduced objects and gestures that negated form, authorship, and aesthetic value. These practices challenged the boundaries of art, forcing aesthetic theory to reconsider its criteria. Yet, over time, anti-art itself became integrated into the artistic field. What was once a radical negation came to be recognized, exhibited, and theorized as part of art (Bürger, 1984; Duchamp, 1973).

This integration marks a decisive shift. Anti-art no longer operates as an external critique, but as an internal dimension of artistic production. The distinction between art and anti-art does not disappear, but becomes unstable and reversible. Objects may affirm and negate their status simultaneously, as described in earlier chapters. This condition is no longer limited to specific movements; it becomes characteristic of a wide range of contemporary practices.

One of the most visible manifestations of this transformation is the proliferation of hybrid objects. These are works that combine elements from different media, categories, or conceptual frameworks, resisting classification within a single domain. Installations that incorporate text, image, and performance, literary works that integrate visual or algorithmic components, and performances that blur the boundary between art and everyday activity all exemplify this tendency (Krauss, 1999).

Hybridization intensifies the structural features identified by meta-garde. By combining heterogeneous elements, such works increase indeterminacy, as

their classification becomes uncertain. At the same time, they often exhibit a reflexive awareness of their own hybridity, foregrounding the conditions of their construction. Contradiction emerges not only within individual components, but between them, as different systems of meaning interact. The categories that once organized aesthetic practice are not simply expanded; they are rendered unstable as organizing principles.

The development of digital and computational media further amplifies these tendencies. In digital art, the distinction between object and process is frequently blurred. Works may be generated algorithmically, exist in multiple instances, or change in response to interaction. The aesthetic object becomes distributed, dynamic, and often non-localized. This challenges traditional notions of form, authorship, and permanence, while reinforcing the coexistence of multiple states within the same structure (Manovich, 2001).

Conceptual art, already discussed in earlier chapters, finds new extensions in these contexts. The emphasis on idea over material form is reinforced by the use of code, data, and networks. In such cases, the work may consist of a set of instructions, a system, or a process rather than a stable artifact. This shifts the locus of affirmation and negation from the object alone to the conditions that generate it, increasing the role of indeterminacy (Lippard, 1973; Osborne, 2013).

Artificial intelligence introduces an additional layer of complexity. AI-generated works raise questions about authorship, intentionality, and creativity. The object may be produced by a system that operates according to defined rules, yet generates outputs that are not fully predictable. In such cases, affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy coexist in a particularly pronounced form, not as separate aspects, but as interdependent dimensions of the same process (McCosker & Wilken, 2020).

In this broader context, anti-art can no longer be understood as a discrete movement. The features that once defined it—negation of form, destabilization of categories, reflexive critique—have become distributed across contemporary cultural production. They are no longer confined to the margins, but have become structural features of the field itself.

Meta-garde does not impose a framework on this condition; it names and articulates it. By allowing for the coexistence of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy, it provides a way of describing objects that cannot be reduced to a single category or function. By incorporating structural relations and

contextual variability, it makes it possible to engage with hybrid, processual, and distributed forms without reducing their complexity.

The transition from anti-art to meta-garde also has implications for the role of aesthetics. If contradiction and indeterminacy are no longer exceptional, but pervasive, then aesthetics can no longer be limited to the classification of objects. It must address configurations, processes, and networks in which objects are situated. The aesthetic object becomes part of a larger field, and its state reflects not only its internal structure, but its position within this field.

This shift also clarifies the broader significance of meta-garde. What appears within art as a proliferation of hybrid, contradictory, and indeterminate forms points toward a more general condition. The coexistence of non-exclusive states is not confined to aesthetic objects, but may characterize other domains in which rigid distinctions give way to relational configurations. Art does not create this condition, but makes it visible.

In this sense, meta-garde is not simply a response to past developments, but a framework oriented toward emerging forms of cultural production. It does not seek to restore stability or to define art once and for all. Instead, it provides a way of engaging with a field in which boundaries are fluid, categories are unstable, and objects are constituted through the interaction of multiple states.

The transition from anti-art to meta-garde thus marks a movement from a localized challenge to a general condition. What began as a negation within art becomes a structural feature of cultural production more broadly. This expansion prepares the ground for considering the implications of meta-garde beyond aesthetics, as a condition that may extend into other domains of thought and practice.

References

- Bürger, P. (1984). *Theory of the Avant-Garde*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Duchamp, M. (1973). *Salt Seller: The Writings of Marcel Duchamp*. Oxford University Press.
- Krauss, R. (1999). *A Voyage on the North Sea: Art in the Age of the Post-Medium Condition*. Thames & Hudson.
- Lippard, L. (1973). *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object*. University of California Press.
- Manovich, L. (2001). *The Language of New Media*. MIT Press.
- McCosker, A., & Wilken, R. (2020). *Automating Vision: The Social Impact of the New Camera Consciousness*. Routledge.
- Osborne, P. (2013). *Anywhere or Not at All: Philosophy of Contemporary Art*. Verso.

Meta-garde Beyond Aesthetics

The analysis developed in the preceding chapters has been situated primarily within the domain of aesthetics. Meta-garde has been introduced as a structural condition of art, and its formal articulation has been constructed in response to objects that resist binary classification. However, the question arises whether the condition described here is specific to artistic practice, or whether it reflects a more general structure that extends beyond aesthetics.

The model proposed by meta-garde suggests that certain entities cannot be adequately described through exclusive distinctions. Instead, they must be understood as configurations in which multiple, and even contradictory, states coexist without being reduced to a single value. While this condition becomes particularly visible in art—where contradiction, ambiguity, and reflexivity are often deliberately produced—it is not limited to this domain. Rather, art may be understood as a privileged field in which a more general structural possibility becomes explicit.

This possibility concerns the way in which entities are defined. In classical frameworks, definition proceeds through exclusion: an entity is what it is by not being what it is not. Identity is stabilized through distinction, and contradiction is treated as a sign of inconsistency or failure. The meta-garde condition challenges this model by introducing a different form of identity, one that does not depend on exclusion, but on the coexistence of non-exclusive states. In this sense, an entity may be constituted not by resolving oppositions, but by sustaining them.

Such a perspective suggests that the formal structure developed for aesthetic analysis may have broader implications. The triadic configuration of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy is not limited to artworks. It can be understood as a general schema for describing situations in which oppositions do not collapse into unity, but remain active within the same structure. The relevance of this schema is not confined to theoretical speculation; it corresponds to phenomena that can be observed in language, in conceptual systems, and in cultural practices that resist strict categorization.

In language, for example, paradox, self-reference, and semantic instability already indicate the limits of binary description. Statements may affirm and

negate simultaneously, or produce meanings that cannot be fully stabilized. In such cases, the problem is not one of interpretation alone, but of structure. The same applies to conceptual systems that incorporate inconsistency without disintegration, or that operate with categories that overlap rather than exclude one another. What these examples share is not a specific content, but a structural feature: the coexistence of states that classical logic would separate.

Beyond these domains, similar configurations appear in philosophical traditions that do not organize knowledge around rigid oppositions. In various non-binary and relational ontologies, entities are understood not as isolated units defined by exclusion, but as nodes within a network of relations, capable of sustaining multiple, context-dependent states. In such frameworks, contradiction is not necessarily eliminated, but may be integrated as part of a broader structure of coexistence. Without reducing these traditions to a single model, it is possible to observe that they articulate, in different forms, a condition that resonates with the one described here.

From this perspective, meta-garde can be understood not only as a theory of art, but as an indication of a more general structural condition. It does not claim to replace existing philosophical systems, nor to provide a universal model applicable in all contexts. Rather, it identifies a pattern that becomes visible in certain domains and suggests that this pattern may have a wider scope. The role of the formal structure introduced in this work is not to impose a uniform framework, but to offer a language capable of describing coexistence where it occurs.

This extension also clarifies the position of artistic practices such as pArAdOXisM and oUTER-aRT within the broader framework. These practices do not merely represent isolated experiments within the history of art. They function as sites in which the meta-garde condition is explicitly enacted. By foregrounding contradiction, indeterminacy, and reflexivity, they make visible a structural possibility that may otherwise remain implicit. In this sense, they are not only objects of analysis, but also forms of theoretical articulation.

The transition from aesthetics to philosophy does not require a change in the fundamental structure of the model, but a shift in its scope. What has been described as an aesthetic condition can be reformulated as a more general logic of coexistence, applicable to different kinds of entities and domains. This shift does not dissolve the specificity of art, but situates it within a broader field in which similar structural features may be identified.

At the same time, this extension raises important questions. If meta-garde describes a general condition, to what extent can it be formalized without losing the specificity of the phenomena it seeks to capture? How can a model of coexistence be applied across different domains without reducing their differences? And to what degree can such a framework engage with philosophical traditions that articulate similar conditions in non-formal terms? These questions do not undermine the model; rather, they define the horizon of its possible development.

For the purposes of this volume, it is sufficient to indicate that the formal structure of meta-garde is not restricted to aesthetics, even if it finds one of its clearest expressions there. The analysis of its broader implications requires a more detailed engagement with philosophical and cultural contexts, which exceeds the scope of the present work. What can be established at this stage is that the condition described by meta-garde is not confined to a particular domain, but points toward a more general way of understanding entities as configurations of coexisting states.

Meta-garde is not proposed as a closed system, but as a structural perspective capable of engaging with multiple domains, including those that have historically developed outside Western aesthetic frameworks.

20

Limits and Open Problems

The development of meta-garde in the preceding chapters has established a formal framework for analyzing aesthetic objects structured by affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy. It has introduced axioms, variables, state spaces, and indices, and has demonstrated their applicability across multiple domains. However, no theoretical system is complete without a critical examination of its own limits. The present chapter addresses several open problems that define the current boundaries of meta-garde and indicate directions for further development.

One of the most immediate concerns is the **limit of quantification**. The introduction of indices such as the Anti-Art Intensity Index (AAII) and the Paradoxist Anti-Poetry Intensity Index (PAII) suggests that aesthetic phenomena can be measured, at least to some extent. These indices provide useful tools for comparison and clustering, but they also raise the question of how far quantification can go without distorting the object of analysis.

Aesthetic experience is inherently qualitative. It involves perception, interpretation, and affective response, none of which can be fully reduced to numerical values. While structural variables can be assigned degrees and combined into indices, these operations inevitably involve simplification. The choice of variables, the assignment of weights, and the form of aggregation all introduce **interpretive decisions** that cannot be eliminated by formalization.

This leads to a second issue: the role of **subjectivity**. Although meta-garde seeks to provide an objective framework, the evaluation of variables and the determination of triadic states depend, at least in part, on interpretation. Different observers may assign different values to the same object, particularly in cases where indeterminacy is high. This variability is not a flaw, but a reflection of the relational nature of aesthetic phenomena, as discussed in Chapter 11.

The challenge is to balance subjectivity and structure. On the one hand, the framework must allow for variation in interpretation; on the other, it must maintain sufficient consistency to support comparison. One possible approach is to treat individual evaluations as points within a distribution, rather than as definitive values. This would allow the meta-garde state of an object to

be represented as a **range or spectrum**, capturing the diversity of responses without abandoning formal analysis.

A third issue concerns **variable selection**. The structural profile $x(w)$ plays a central role in the framework, but the choice of variables is not fixed. Different domains require different variables, and even within a domain, alternative sets may be proposed. This flexibility is one of the strengths of the theory, but it also introduces a risk of inconsistency.

If variables are chosen arbitrarily, the resulting analyses may not be comparable. To address this, it is necessary to distinguish clearly between core invariants—such as contradiction, indeterminacy, reflexivity, and definitional destabilization—and domain-specific variables. The invariants provide a stable foundation, while the variables allow for adaptation. Even so, the process of selecting and defining variables remains an open problem, requiring further refinement and standardization.

A related concern is the possibility of **variable inflation**. As new domains are introduced, there is a tendency to add more variables in order to capture additional features. While this increases descriptive power, it can also reduce clarity and make the system difficult to apply. A balance must be struck between completeness and usability, ensuring that the framework remains both expressive and manageable.

The fourth major issue involves **domain gaps**. Although the present work has addressed visual, literary, and performative domains, other areas of aesthetic production remain to be explored in detail. Music, for example, introduces dimensions of temporality, harmony, and sound that require specific variables. Digital and interactive media raise questions about algorithmic generation, user interaction, and networked distribution. Everyday aesthetics and environmental aesthetics extend the field beyond art into broader experiential contexts.

Each of these domains may reveal new configurations of variables and triadic states, testing the generality of the framework. The extent to which meta-garde can accommodate these domains without losing coherence remains an open question. At the same time, the identification of cross-domain invariants suggests that the framework has the potential to be extended, provided that domain-specific adaptations are carefully integrated.

Another limitation concerns the **formalization of functions** that relate structural variables to triadic states. In Chapter 7, these relations were

expressed as functions f_T, f_I, f_F , but their precise form was left unspecified. This reflects the current stage of the theory, in which the emphasis is on conceptual clarity rather than mathematical precision. Future work may seek to define these functions more explicitly, possibly drawing on methods from computational modeling or data analysis.

However, such formalization raises additional questions. To what extent can aesthetic phenomena be modeled mathematically without losing their qualitative richness? How can empirical data be integrated into a framework that remains sensitive to interpretation and context? These questions point to the need for an **interdisciplinary approach**, combining philosophical analysis with methods from digital humanities, cognitive science, and related fields.

Finally, there is the broader issue of **theoretical scope**. Meta-garde has been presented as a framework capable of addressing the complexities of contemporary art and culture. Yet it remains to be seen how it will interact with other theoretical approaches, such as phenomenology, semiotics, or critical theory.

These limitations should not be seen as weaknesses, but as **conditions of development**. They indicate areas where the theory can be extended, tested, and revised. By making these issues explicit, the present chapter ensures that the concept of Meta-garde remains open to critique and capable of growth.

References

- Smarandache, F. (n.d.). *pArAdOXisM, the Last Vanguard of the Second Millennium*. University of New Mexico, <https://fs.unm.edu/a/paradoxism.htm>

Conclusion: A New Stage of Aesthetics

The development of this book has followed a precise trajectory: from a diagnosis of the limitations of traditional aesthetics to the construction of a formal framework capable of addressing those limitations. The central problem identified at the outset was not the absence of theories of art, but their **structural inadequacy** when confronted with contemporary aesthetic objects. The persistence of binary distinctions—art and non-art, meaningful and meaningless, poetic and anti-poetic—proved insufficient for describing objects that simultaneously affirm and negate their own status while remaining indeterminate.

This problem is not marginal. It emerges at the very center of modern and contemporary artistic practice, from the readymades associated with Marcel Duchamp to the paradoxist constructions. In each case, the object resists classification not because it is unclear, but because it is **internally structured by contradiction**. Traditional aesthetics can describe such cases, but it cannot formally represent them without reducing their complexity.

The response developed in this book has been the introduction of **meta-garde** as a new framework. Drawing on the triadic logic of neutrosophy, the aesthetic object has been redefined in terms of a state composed of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy. This triadic structure replaces binary classification with a model in which multiple, non-exclusive dimensions coexist.

The framework is not limited to abstract formulation. It has been articulated through a minimal axiomatic system, a set of structural variables, and the concept of an aesthetic state space. These elements together provide a **multi-layered model**: at the foundational level, axioms define the relations between components; at the structural level, variables describe the internal features of objects; at the global level, triadic states summarize their configuration; and at the relational level, the aesthetic space allows for mapping and comparison.

The introduction of indices such as AAll and PAll has further demonstrated that this framework can support forms of measurement, enabling comparative analysis without eliminating qualitative complexity. The incorporation of

context has ensured that the model remains sensitive to the relational nature of aesthetic phenomena. The identification of cross-domain invariants has unified the theory across visual, literary, and performative domains, showing that the same underlying structure governs diverse forms of aesthetic production.

What this framework enables is a shift in the way aesthetic objects are understood. Instead of asking whether an object belongs to a category, it becomes possible to analyze its **position within a multidimensional space**. Instead of resolving contradictions, the framework allows them to be described and compared. Instead of treating indeterminacy as a limit, it becomes a dimension that can be articulated and integrated.

This shift has implications for the broader discipline of aesthetics. It suggests that the task of aesthetics is no longer to define the essence of art or to establish definitive criteria for its identification. Such projects, while historically important, are increasingly at odds with the complexity of contemporary practices. What is required instead is a framework capable of handling **dynamic, hybrid, and contradictory objects**.

The Meta-garde offers such a framework. It does not eliminate the need for interpretation, evaluation, or historical analysis, but it provides a foundation on which these activities can be grounded. It allows for the comparison of objects across domains, the identification of movements as clusters within an aesthetic space, and the analysis of transitions and transformations.

At the same time, the framework remains open. As discussed in the previous chapter, questions of quantification, subjectivity, variable selection, and domain expansion remain to be addressed. This openness is not a limitation, but a condition of adaptability. The theory is designed to evolve alongside the practices it seeks to describe.

The broader significance of this work lies in its redefinition of the object of aesthetics. The aesthetic object is no longer a stable entity to be classified, but a **configuration of interacting dimensions**. Its identity is not fixed, but relational and dynamic. Its analysis requires a framework that can accommodate coexistence, variation, and change.

In this sense, meta-garde marks a new stage in the development of the discipline. It moves beyond the binary logic that has historically structured aesthetic thought, and beyond the descriptive pluralism that characterizes much of postmodern theory. It introduces a formal system capable of modeling

Theory and Applications

the complexity of contemporary aesthetic phenomena, while remaining sufficiently flexible to incorporate future developments.

The implications of this shift extend beyond aesthetics. They suggest a more general approach to phenomena that are structured by contradiction and indeterminacy, offering a way to think about complexity without reducing it to simplicity or dissolving it into ambiguity.

The central insight that emerges from this work can be stated succinctly:

Aesthetics is no longer about defining art, but about mapping states of aesthetic existence.

However, Meta-garde is not proposed as a theory of art alone, but as a structural perspective on coexistence that extends beyond the aesthetic domain.

Appendix: Worked Example (*Fountain*, 1917)

To illustrate how meta-garde operates in practice, this appendix applies the framework to one of the canonical crisis-objects of modern aesthetics: Marcel Duchamp's *Fountain* (1917). This example is especially suitable because the book repeatedly identifies the readymade as a decisive challenge to binary distinctions between art and non-art, form and anti-form, and meaning and non-meaning.



Marcel Duchamp, 1917, *Fountain*, photograph by Alfred Stieglitz at the 291 (Art Gallery) following the 1917 Society of Independent Artists exhibit, with entry tag visible. The backdrop is *The Warriors* by Marsden Hartley.

1. Why *Fountain* is an ideal test case

Fountain is not merely a controversial artwork. It is an object that forces aesthetic theory into contradiction. A urinal, displaced from its ordinary function, signed “R. Mutt,” and submitted to an art exhibition, appears to occupy at least three positions simultaneously:

- it is **art**, because it is intentionally presented within an artistic context;
- it is **non-art** or **anti-art**, because it lacks the traditional properties expected of sculpture or fine art;
- it is **indeterminate**, because its status remains structurally contested even after more than a century of interpretation.

This is precisely the type of object that binary aesthetics struggles to describe, and precisely the kind of case for which meta-garde was proposed.

2. Object definition

Let:

$$w = \text{Fountain}$$

We analyze w on two levels:

1. the **triadic level**:

$$(T(w), F(w), I(w))$$

where:

$T(w)$ = degree of aesthetic affirmation

$F(w)$ = degree of aesthetic negation

$I(w)$ = degree of aesthetic indeterminacy

2. the **structural-variable level**:

$$V(w) = (u, m, s, d, p, i, c, r, \ell, \phi, \alpha, \sigma)$$

Not all variables are equally relevant for every domain. Since *Fountain* is a visual-conceptual object rather than a poem, some variables must be reinterpreted analogically.

3. Contextual framing

A central thesis of the draft is that aesthetic status is **relational and contextual**, not intrinsic. The same object can take different values depending on institutional, historical, and interpretive framing.

Accordingly, we distinguish three contexts:

C1: sanitary-functional context — the urinal as an ordinary utilitarian object

C2: exhibition context (1917) — the object submitted as art

C3: retrospective art-historical context — the object as a canonical work of modern art

The worked example will focus primarily on **C2**, since that is where contradiction is maximally visible.

4. Triadic evaluation in context C2

We now assign provisional meta-garde values.

4.1 Degree of aesthetic affirmation: $T(w)$

$$T(w) = 0.78$$

Justification

Fountain has a high degree of affirmation because:

- it is intentionally framed as an artwork;
- it enters an art-exhibition system;
- it is presented for aesthetic and conceptual consideration;
- it produces extensive interpretation, criticism, and historical influence.

Even if it lacks traditional handcrafted form, it functions powerfully as an aesthetic object in the expanded modern sense.

Why not 1.00?

Because its artistic status is not pure or unproblematic. It is not a conventional affirmation of art, but a provocative and unstable one.

So $T(w)$ is **high**, but not maximal.

4.2 Degree of aesthetic negation: $F(w)$

$$F(w) = 0.83$$

Justification

Fountain has an even stronger negational component because it actively undermines inherited criteria of art:

- no traditional craftsmanship is displayed;
- the object is industrial and prefabricated;
- its ordinary function contradicts expectations of artistic elevation;
- it appears as an attack on established taste, medium, and artistic seriousness.

It does not merely fail to satisfy traditional aesthetic expectations; it **stages that failure as method**.

Thus $F(w)$ is also **high**, and slightly higher than $T(w)$ in the original scandal-context, because the anti-art force is what initially dominates perception.

4.3 Degree of indeterminacy: $I(w)$

$$I(w) = 0.69$$

Justification

Indeterminacy remains substantial because:

- the object oscillates between artifact and gesture;
- its meaning is not exhausted by either “it is art” or “it is not art”;
- interpretation depends heavily on historical knowledge, curatorial framing, and theoretical commitments;
- it is unclear whether the aesthetic focus lies in the object, the act of selection, the signature, the institutional challenge, or the concept.

The indeterminacy is therefore not accidental but structural.

Why not higher?

Because *Fountain* is not radically unintelligible. It does produce recognizable theoretical effects and now occupies a stabilized historical role. Its indeterminacy is real, but not total.

4.4 Resulting triadic state

Thus, in exhibition context $C2$:

$$N(w) = (T(w), F(w), I(w)) = (0.78, 0.83, 0.69)$$

This is already enough to show the advantage of meta-garde. In a classical binary model, one would be forced into a choice:

- art or non-art
- meaningful or meaningless
- form or anti-form.

In the formal model of meta-garde, the object is describable as:

- strongly art,
 - strongly anti-art,
 - and substantially indeterminate,
- all at once.

That coexistence is not a defect of the model. It is the accurate formal expression of the object’s aesthetic condition.

5. Structural-variable mapping

We now turn to the multidimensional vector.

Because the variable system in the draft is partly derived from literary analysis, some adaptation is necessary. The point here is not rigid literal transfer, but structural analogy consistent with the general theory.

We assign values on a scale from 0 to 1.

$$V(w) = (u, m, s, d, p, i, c, r, \ell, \phi, \alpha, \sigma)$$

5.1 Variable-by-variable assessment

u: anti-euphony

For poetry, this refers to sonic resistance. In visual/conceptual art, the analogue is **anti-harmony** or resistance to classical visual pleasure.

$$u = 0.74$$

Fountain strongly resists traditional visual elegance as sculpture.

m: material-linguistic negation

In literary contexts this refers to negation at the level of language/material. Here it becomes **material-aesthetic negation**: the refusal of noble artistic materiality.

$$m = 0.91$$

The industrial urinal is almost paradigmatic material negation of fine-art expectations.

s: anti-craft

$$s = 0.96$$

This is near maximal. The work rejects virtuoso making and foregrounds selection over fabrication.

d: definitional destabilization

$$d = 0.98$$

This is one of the strongest variables. *Fountain* directly destabilizes the definition of art itself.

p: paradox density

$$p = 0.88$$

The object is conceptually dense with paradox:

- ordinary / extraordinary
- functional / aesthetic
- object / statement
- art / anti-art

i: semantic indeterminacy

$$i = 0.72$$

Its semantic content is neither empty nor stable. It supports multiple interpretations without closure.

c: institutional contradiction

$$c = 0.95$$

The work derives force from conflict with the institution that supposedly should receive it. It both depends on and contests the artworld.

r: reflexivity

$$r = 0.84$$

Fountain reflects on the conditions of art, exhibition, authorship, and selection. It is strongly meta-aesthetic.

ℓ: explicitness of procedure

$$\ell = 0.81$$

The procedure is relatively clear: choose object, displace context, sign, submit. The act is not hidden.

φ: phonetic autonomy

This variable is minimally relevant for a visual object. We assign a low value.

$$\phi = 0.05$$

α: authorial dissolution

$$\alpha = 0.87$$

Authorship is displaced from making to choosing; the signature “R. Mutt” further complicates authorial identity.

σ: extra-verbal transfer

$$\sigma = 0.93$$

This is very high. The aesthetic act is transferred beyond verbal and even beyond conventional artistic medium.

5.2 Full vector

So we obtain:

$$V(w) = (0.74, 0.91, 0.96, 0.98, 0.88, 0.72, 0.95, 0.84, 0.81, 0.05, 0.87, 0.93)$$

6. Interpretation of the vector

This profile shows that *Fountain* occupies a region of aesthetic space characterized by:

- very high **anti-craft** (s)
- very high **definitional destabilization** (d)
- very high **institutional contradiction** (c)
- high **paradox density** (p)
- high **authorial dissolution** (α)
- high **extra-verbal transfer** (σ)

This means that *Fountain* is not merely “strange” or “controversial.” It belongs to a structurally identifiable cluster of works that produce aesthetic force by negating inherited definitions while remaining within aesthetic circulation.

In other words, the work occupies a dense zone in Meta-garde Space where affirmation and negation are both intense, and where indeterminacy is not residual but constitutive.

7. Comparative contextual shift

To show the contextual flexibility of the model, let us compare the same object across the three contexts introduced above.

C1: functional-sanitary context

As an ordinary urinal:

$$N_{C_1}(w) = (0.05, 0.97, 0.08)$$

Here the object has almost no artistic affirmation, very high negation, and low indeterminacy.

C2: exhibition context (1917)

As submitted artwork:

$$N_{C_2}(w) = (0.78, 0.83, 0.69)$$

Contradiction becomes maximal.

C3: retrospective museum-history context

As canonized modern masterpiece:

$$N_{C_3}(w) = (0.92, 0.54, 0.38)$$

Over time, institutional stabilization increases affirmation and reduces indeterminacy, though anti-art force remains significant.

8. What this example proves

8.1 Binary aesthetics is insufficient

A binary model cannot capture the fact that *Fountain* is both art and anti-art without collapsing into contradiction.

8.2 Contradiction is formally representable

The formal model of meta-garde does not eliminate contradiction. It represents it through independent high values of *T* and *F*.

8.3 Indeterminacy is structural

The uncertainty surrounding *Fountain* is not a temporary failure of interpretation. It is one of the work's constitutive dimensions.

8.4 Context matters without destroying formal description

The object's values change across contexts, but the model remains stable enough to describe those shifts.

8.5 Variable-space mapping allows comparison

Once similar vectors are built for other objects, one can compare *Fountain* with Dada objects, conceptual works, anti-poems, and paradoxist constructions.

9. Provisional classification

On the basis of the above profile, *Fountain* may be classified as:
*a high-negation, high-affirmation, medium-high-indeterminacy
conceptual anti-art object with extreme definitional destabilization
and institutional contradiction.*

This is precisely the kind of classification that traditional aesthetics cannot generate with sufficient precision.

10. Concluding formulation

Duchamp's *Fountain* shows that the aesthetic object is not always a stable bearer of artistic identity. It may instead function as a site where affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy coexist at high intensity. The object is not misclassified by binary aesthetics because it is marginal, but because it belongs to a different logical regime. Meta-garde makes that regime visible by replacing exclusion with coexistence, and by treating contradiction not as theoretical failure, but as analyzable structure.

Glossary of Meta-garde

Aesthetic Affirmation (T)

The degree to which an object is recognized or functions as art (or poetry) within a given context. It measures the extent of **positive aesthetic status**, independent of negation or indeterminacy.

Aesthetic Negation (F)

The degree to which an object resists, contradicts, or undermines its own status as art. It captures **anti-art, anti-poetic, or anti-formal properties** internal to the object.

Aesthetic Indeterminacy (I)

The degree to which the aesthetic status of an object is undecidable, ambiguous, or structurally open. Unlike ambiguity in classical aesthetics, indeterminacy is treated as a **primary and constitutive dimension**, not a residual effect.

Neutrosophic Triad (T, F, I)

The foundational model of meta-garde, according to which any aesthetic object simultaneously exhibits degrees of affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy. These components are **independent and non-exclusive**.

Independence Principle

The principle that *T*, *F*, and *I* are **not complementary** and do not sum to a fixed total. High values in one dimension do not reduce values in the others.

Meta-garde Object

An artwork or aesthetic entity understood as a **multivalent structure**, capable of simultaneously affirming, negating, and destabilizing its own status.

Binary Aesthetics

Traditional aesthetic frameworks based on oppositions such as:

- art / non-art
- meaningful / meaningless
- form / anti-form

Meta-garde critiques these as **structurally insufficient**.

Contradiction (Aesthetic)

A condition in which an object simultaneously occupies positions that classical logic treats as mutually exclusive (e.g., both art and non-art). In meta-garde, contradiction is **allowed and analyzable**, not resolved.

Generative Contradiction

A form of contradiction that is not merely tolerated but **produces aesthetic value and structure**, especially in avant-garde and paradoxist works.

Aesthetic State

The specific configuration of an object in terms of its values:

$$N(w) = (T(w), F(w), I(w))$$

Aesthetic Profile

The combined description of an artwork using both:

- its triadic state (T, F, I) , and
- its multidimensional variables

This defines its position in aesthetic space.

Multidimensional Aesthetic Space

A conceptual space in which each artwork is represented as a point defined by multiple structural variables. This allows:

- comparison of works
- clustering of movements
- mapping of aesthetic regions

Structural Variables

Quantifiable or semi-quantifiable features describing an artwork's internal structure. In the literary-adapted model:

- **u** — anti-euphony
- **m** — material-linguistic negation
- **s** — anti-craft
- **d** — definitional destabilization
- **p** — paradox density
- **i** — semantic indeterminacy
- **c** — institutional contradiction
- **r** — reflexivity
- **ℓ** — explicitness of procedure
- **φ** — phonetic autonomy
- **α** — authorial dissolution
- **σ** — extra-verbal transfer

Definitional Destabilization (d)

The degree to which a work challenges or undermines the definition of art, literature, or its own category.

Paradox Density (p)

The intensity and frequency of contradictory or paradoxical structures within a work.

Semantic Indeterminacy (i)

The extent to which meaning is open, unstable, or undecidable within the work.

Institutional Contradiction (c)

The degree of tension between the artwork and the institutions (galleries, literature, academia) that frame or legitimize it.

Reflexivity (r)

The extent to which a work refers to, analyzes, or exposes its own conditions of production, meaning, or classification.

Explicitness of Procedure (ℓ)

The degree to which the generative method of the artwork is visible or conceptually articulated.

Authorial Dissolution (α)

The weakening or displacement of the traditional author figure, often through anonymity, pseudonymity, or procedural creation.

Extra-Verbal Transfer (σ)

The extent to which aesthetic meaning is transferred beyond language into objects, actions, or conceptual gestures.

Anti-Craft (s)

The rejection or negation of traditional technical skill as a defining feature of art.

Anti-Euphony (u)

The rejection of aesthetic harmony, especially in sound or form; in broader contexts, resistance to sensory pleasing structure.

Material-Linguistic Negation (m)

The use of material or language in ways that negate or subvert their conventional aesthetic function.

Aesthetic Field

The total configuration of artworks within meta-garde space, forming:

- clusters (movements)
- gradients (transitions)
- zones of high contradiction or indeterminacy

Aesthetic Cluster

A group of works sharing similar structural profiles and occupying a region of aesthetic space (e.g., Dada, Surrealism, pArAdOXisM).

Topological Aesthetic Space

The interpretation of the aesthetic field as a **continuous and relational structure**, where proximity reflects structural similarity rather than categorical identity.

Contextual Relativity

The principle that the meta-garde values of an artwork depend on:

- historical context
- institutional framing
- interpretive conditions

Aesthetic Relocation

The shift in an object's meta-garde profile when it moves between contexts (e.g., everyday object → gallery → historical canon).

Anti-Art

Not the absence of art, but a **dimension within the same system**, representing the negational component F .

Continuous Spectrum of Art

The idea that art and anti-art are not separate domains, but **continuous and overlapping dimensions** within meta-garde space.

Neutrosophy

The broader philosophical and logical framework underlying meta-garde, based on the coexistence of truth, falsity, and indeterminacy.

Meta-garde

A theoretical framework that models artworks as **multidimensional, triadic, and context-dependent structures**, capable of representing contradiction and indeterminacy without reduction.

Selected Bibliography

1. Foundations of Aesthetics and Philosophy of Art

Baumgarten, A. G. (1954). *Reflections on Poetry* (K. Aschenbrenner & W. B. Holther, Trans.). University of California Press. (Original work published 1750)

Hegel, G. W. F. (1975). *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art* (T. M. Knox, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1835)

Kant, I. (2000). *Critique of the Power of Judgment* (P. Guyer & E. Matthews, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1790)

Tolstoy, L. (1995). *What Is Art?* (R. Pevear & L. Volokhonsky, Trans.). Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1897)

2. Avant-Garde, Anti-Art, and Institutional Theory

Bürger, P. (1984). *Theory of the Avant-Garde*. University of Minnesota Press.

Danto, A. (1981). *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace*. Harvard University Press.

Dickie, G. (1974). *Art and the Aesthetic: An Institutional Analysis*. Cornell University Press.

Duchamp, M. (1973). *Salt Seller: The Writings of Marcel Duchamp*. Oxford University Press.

3. Postmodernism and Contemporary Aesthetic Theory

Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1979)

Osborne, P. (2013). *Anywhere or Not at All: Philosophy of Contemporary Art*. Verso.

Krauss, R. (1999). *A Voyage on the North Sea: Art in the Age of the Post-Medium Condition*. Thames & Hudson.

4. Conceptual, Dematerialized, and Process-Based Art

Lippard, L. (1973). *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object*. University of California Press.

Manovich, L. (2001). *The Language of New Media*. MIT Press.

McCosker, A., & Wilken, R. (2020). *Automating Vision: The Social Impact of the New Camera Consciousness*. Routledge.

This volume develops meta-garde as a structural condition of art in which aesthetic states are no longer governed by binary distinctions, but coexist in multivalent configurations. Moving beyond the traditional oppositions that have shaped aesthetic theory—such as art and non-art, meaning and non-meaning—the study argues that contemporary artistic practices reveal a condition in which affirmation, negation, and indeterminacy operate simultaneously within the same object.

The book proceeds by first examining the historical development of aesthetics, from classical frameworks grounded in binary logic to the fragmentation associated with postmodern theory. While postmodernism recognizes the instability of aesthetic categories, it remains largely descriptive. In response, this work introduces a formal articulation of coexistence through a triadic structure that allows contradictory states to be represented without reduction.

This framework is then applied to a range of aesthetic phenomena, including anti-art, paradoxism, conceptual practices, and hybrid and processual forms. Particular attention is given to the role of indeterminacy, reflexivity, and contradiction as constitutive features rather than anomalies. Through the development of a minimal axiomatic system and the concept of an aesthetic state space, the study provides tools for analyzing objects that resist classification within traditional models.

Finally, the volume situates meta-garde within the history of aesthetic thought and argues for its extension beyond aesthetics. Rather than a movement or style, meta-garde is proposed as a general condition that may also be observed in language, culture, and non-binary philosophical frameworks. In this sense, the book advances a shift from exclusion-based models of understanding toward a logic of coexistence, offering a foundation for further theoretical and interdisciplinary development.

ISBN 978-197250210-5



9

781972

502105