

## **ALIENATION EFFECT IN CONTEMPORARY ART: USHERING INTO CREATIVITY**

**FRANCIS ANKYIAH, PHILIP KWAKU BOATENG**

Department of Fine Arts  
francisankyiah@yahoo.com

### **ABSTRACT**

This paper is to show that, it is just the strangeness originating from postmodernism aesthetics experience that is absolutely different from those with which we have long been familiar with: that is the aesthetic of the beautiful, and that of the aesthetic of the sublime. To provide the empirical evidence necessary to show that, it is indeed, the aesthetic of the strange that has informed art of since Modernism and Postmodernism, the paper seek to give more elaborate argument to back up any such introduction of aesthetic of the strange alongside the traditional ones of the beautiful and the sublime. This paper is also to argue that the experiencing of the “strangeness”, rather than beauty or sublimity, has drawn us more deeply into the creative works. With regards to more recent discussion, the paper focused on Immanuel Kant, Jean–François Lyotard, the prime motivator for my engagement with the problem in hand.

**Key words: Alienation, Strangeness, Beauty, Sublimity, Creativity**

### **Introduction**

Art in its revolution appearing somewhat strange to us at the time of their first appearance is not surprising; but it is a curious fact that, art from the periods of Modernism through to Postmodernism continues to be strange to the broader public. This has created disaffection in many people from most of the artistic productions of their time in an unsuccessful condition; one that has been interpreted as a shocking side-effect of constant experimentation with new concepts, new forms and new materials. Contemporary art is now considered as the ‘making strange’ that can be observed in the work of Modernist through to postmodern artists being celebrated as it has been both creative for it reception and institution in our artistic practice.

This paper is to show that, it is precisely the strangeness originating from postmodernism aesthetics experience that is absolutely different from those with which we have long been familiar with: that is the aesthetic of the beautiful, and that of the aesthetic of the sublime. It seeks to educate the public on the extent that the present demonstration has proven successful for it understanding and consequently, enjoyment in our experiencing of Modernist and Postmodernist art, even for those who feel overpowered or put off by pure difficulty of access. This paper is also to argue that the experiencing of the “strangeness”, rather than beauty or sublimity, has drawn us more deeply into the creative works.

The notion of the aesthetic of the strange has been used in a generally accessible and straightforward manner, reserving the finer points for a later subheading. In order to provide the empirical evidence necessary to show that, it is indeed, the aesthetic of the strange that has informed art since Modernism and Postmodernism. The paper has provided a detailed survey of the various strategies by which artists have repeatedly succeeded in 'making strange'.

The paper seek to give more elaborate argument to back up any such introduction of aesthetic of the strange alongside the traditional ones of the beautiful and the sublime. A theoretical discussion that focuses on the differentiation between the aesthetic of the strange, on the one hand, and the aesthetic of the beautiful and that of the sublime, on the other was accordingly included. In the introduction, the paper has provided a sufficient explanation for why artists have found 'making strange' so vital and why it pays to make a serious effort to contend with the ensuing strangeness. With regards to more recent discussion, the paper focused on Immanuel Kant, Jean-François Lotard, the key motivator for this engagement with the problem in hand.

Art informed by the aesthetic of the strange remains a challenge, and what follows has been written as an appeal to take up that challenge rather than giving up on its complexities.

### **The Aesthetic of the Unfamiliarization**

#### **Against Beautiful, but Strange**

The arrival of Modernism art has shaped our senses to a form of alienation as a result of a growing encounter with the strange. This occurrence has results of going astray from the normal norms established in art conversions and partly forced on us as an unavoidable effect of ever faster changes in the social, cultural and technological spheres; but at the same time, the experience of the strange in terms of a disturbing otherness is sometimes enjoyed, often feared, or in the long run simply acknowledged. How then do we have to acknowledge it? The best way of dealing with the strange is therefore not only politically and morally desirable, but also practically necessary in the face of increasing rates of change in the world around us, increased migration, and clear tendencies to globalization. Dealing with the strange is not easy, based on the insecurity which such causes may lead not only to rejection, but also expresses itself as aggression.

Art which provides the ground for the encounter with the very strange can cause such reactions. In the history of art, one has to remember that it was the arts that first offered the opportunity of particularly shocking experiences of strangeness to the latest since the early twentieth century. In fact, it is possible to speak here of a dominion of the strange; because, what has remained largely unchanged since then, despite the large variety and change to be found in art is the fact that most works not only appeared strange upon their emergence, but managed to retain their fundamental strangeness in the sense of a disturbing originality.

The emergence of artistic movements in modernism is manifestations of alienation that encounter with the visual arts proved the intense effort into ensuring that the strangeness remained. After 'Modernism-created-strangeness' seemed 'exhausted', then followed 'Postmodernism' with serious intensification of the strange. This has led to shifts in taste and expression, anyone who has a more than passing interest in the products of the artistic imagination must admit that,

contemporary art or Postmodernist continues to create a sense of alienation. If now aesthetic of the beautiful has been defeated, it is as a result of this strangeness.

According to Kant “Fine art shows its superiority precisely in this, that it describes things beautifully that in nature we would dislike or find ugly” (Critique of Judgement 48, 180). Modernist and Postmodern visual arts are no longer beautiful because the initial alienation which they caused hinders them from the “directly a feeling of life’s being furthered” (Critique of Judgement 23, 98). Kant also continued by saying therefore it has been “presented ... as the object of a universal liking” (Critique of Judgement 6, 53). Here we see the pleasure created in art by the Modernist and Postmodern works if and only if one is prepared to deal with this indirect pleasure which makes the aesthetic of the strange so specific in repeated manner. An initial sense of strangeness is created in the viewer, intended to produce multiple attempts on his part to overcome this reaction, and in this way finally leads to expansion of one’s perceptivity and awareness.

Robert Hughes proclaimed “the shock of the new” as the driving force behind twentieth-century art (Hughes), as the evident in the strange inherent in the ‘new’ for its succession of avant-garde for plurality of styles we find in Postmodernism. It is now seen in the practice of contemporary art to create a large sense of strangeness as possible through the constant presentation of ‘the new’ and the use of new modes of presentation as driving force. If we are challenged by the new, then what type of newness are we waiting for? “It must be nature in the subject, that gives the rule to art; in other words, fine art is possible only as the product of genius” (Critique of Judgement 46, 175). Yes in creating “The new”, it had to be completely new and the talent of the original genius was the ability to create it.

However, as arts cripple under the arms of aesthetic of imitation of beautiful and the good, the newness could not really create a sense strange. “It was, therefore, less the cult of genius than a revaluation of the horrible, the frightful, in eighteenth-century art theory; a revaluation leading to the establishment of the aesthetic of the sublime” (Dieckmann), and it with this that opened the way for a more radical strangeness in art. To experience sublime aesthetic, one needs the power of the strangeness to cause a life-threatening shock; but it is not ready to be accepted in the realm of art.

The strange or uncanny is witnessed both within the metaphysical world and within the depths of the human soul in order to create association of fear and pleasurable excitement. An aesthetic of feeling is common to the aesthetic of the sublime not only the unintended creation of pleasure; but also the fact that this pleasure was narrowly bound up with the agitation caused by the encounter with the horrible. The strangeness of what we are experiencing is presented mainly to its “would-be” to cause such emotional anxiety as potential which was quickly used up, thereby making it necessary; constantly to create new and more extreme forms of the terrible. Contemporary art reviewing the strangeness is indeed for the most part identical with ‘the new’, in terms of the unexpected or yet unencountered.

The practicing of the strange became clear in art when Modernism pursue autonomy, began to free itself from the principles of imitation and presented alternative worldviews as well as alternative worlds in forms that were not only unusual but that could no longer be derived directly from one’s experience of the world. Of course, it is unquestionable that when they first appeared they caused at least in part intentionally the “Shock of the New.”

One can witness strangeness in works like Picasso’s “Les Femmes d’Alger (O. J. R. M.)” (1907), Duchamp’s “Cycle de bicyclette” (1913), Colonies (Settlement 2013) and (OUTCAST 2013) for the visual meaning of the strange. Not only in the ideas of the artist were the works being created, but works were made open ended for more interpretations and even makes them opaque even for

specialists. This has brought the idea of pastiche, hybridity, ephemeral and in the visual arts since the 1980s to a series of “Neo” movements (such as “New Fauves,” “Neo-Geo,” “Neo-Figurative,” and “Neo Conceptualist”). This started in art because artists wanted to be free from “anxiety of influence” (Bloom, 1973), which reviews evident of creativity in contemporary art.

However, moving from the absolute beauty to sublime therefore also led to the revival of the sublime which is obvious in the practice of Modernism and Postmodernism aesthetic.

### **Against Sublime, but for Strange**

In recent art, what is ‘beautiful’ cannot be the complete aesthetic practice as it is surrendered to the sublime. The sublime provided pleasure in art only indirectly. Seen in Modernist and Postmodern art, it is exactly its strangeness that causes an initial sense of alienation and only after this has been overcome that allows for a particular kind of pleasure. Due to this, many critics have equated this with the indirect creation of pleasure in the eighteenth-century sublime which Edmund Burke calls “relative pleasure” or “delight” “to express the sensation which accompanies the removal of pain or danger”. Then also from Kant, it “is a pleasure that arises only indirectly: it is produced by the feeling of a momentary inhibition of the vital forces followed immediately by an outpouring of them that is all the stronger” (Critique of Judgement 23, 98)

The public examinations of art today, has proven ‘shocked’ experience by audiences often enough. According to Weiskel, in experiencing sublime the “relative pleasure” follows the “inhibition of the vital forces” immediately, whereas the sense of estrangement caused by Modernist and Postmodern art can as a rule only be overcome gradually: only after a more intense engagement with the artwork does a sense of pleasure result.

Jean-François Lyotard provided the opportunity to show “the existence of something unrepresentable; showing that there is something we can conceive of which we can neither see nor show” (Lyotard)

According to Lyotard, the imagination fails, but in failing manages to activate the ability of the mind to take recourse to ideas. These ideas are then recognized and experienced as being superior to all sense perception, thereby bringing about a subjective increase in power, a sense of being uplifted (Critique of Judgement 27, 114–15, and 29, 129). From Lyotard’s studies, it shows how certain type of sensory experience leads to the failure of the imagination and then to the thought of ideas which cannot be represented in a material form.

Since the start of Modernism, however, art has developed in habits which could not have been foretold in the eighteenth century and cannot be reconciled with the basic assumptions of the aesthetic of the sublime.

In the aesthetic of the sublime from the eighteenth century, the feeling of powerlessness, the failure of the imagination, is a result of an encounter with the incredibly large and powerful

Modernist and Postmodern art, on the other hand, produce such a feeling by means of the experience of uncertainty, seeming randomness, and the inescapably subjective nature of all attempts to determine meaning. This powerlessness cannot be suddenly overcome by mere recourse to the idea of eternity, but only through the use of creative problem-solving strategies which often demand considerable effort.

Beautiful is being opposed with sublime simply because, Modernist and Postmodern art can no longer be incorporated under the beautiful; and because this more recent aesthetic is indeed quite different from that of eighteenth century; the term sublime is redefined so that it fits to extent.

## **The Aesthetic of the Strange**

The aesthetic of the strange shows a wide range difference between the beautiful and the sublime; as a rule no longer directly appealing and beautiful, but also not so terrifying that it causes “an inhibition of the vital forces” said Grabes, as in the sublime where Modernist and Postmodern art makes use of the range from almost beautiful to almost sublime to create a sense of alienation which reaches from slight irritation to the experience of the uncanny. This demands of viewers that they are especially creative in their attempts to understand the works, lead in turn to a pleasurable expansion of perception, feeling, and consciousness. The cause of this initial alienation, varying in its intensity, is as just as varying extent of strangeness created by the artists in many different ways.

We are confronted with the strange in the sense of the alienating order, whose wide range is between the beautiful and the sublime. At the same time, the possibility still exists that the strangeness may in exceptional cases become so extreme that, it is sufficient to cause an experience of the sublime. Outside the aesthetic of the strange, there remains only the purely beautiful because, only then is there no strangeness to be found which could cause a sense of alienation.

Often, however, a small degree of strangeness is enough to destroy the overall beauty and already unsettle the viewer to such an extent that the process of reception moves towards the aesthetic of the strange. The wide-ranging of strangeness of changing intensity from frustrating to uncanny would on its own, almost explain the diverse nature of Modernist and Postmodern art. This reviews itself clearer in its endless number of ways through which strangeness might be created. It is already enough if the presentation of the subject either somehow vary from our usual and familiar experience of the world and the cultural norms which direct these experiences, or if they do not fit within the limits of the traditional areas of beautiful art. The variety of possibilities which appeared in Modernism alone is irresistible; and just when the characteristic strategies used to create a sense of strangeness in Modernism seemed to have exhausted their possibilities, Postmodern art demonstrated that, the aesthetic of the strange was nowhere near its end. That this is still the case today and will remain so for a while to come is more easily understood if one does not just consider strangeness itself, but also the specific process of aesthetic experience which it sets in motion. Still facing the strange has made the process to be characterized by a challenge with sense of disaffection brought about by the strangeness of recent art, in which the viewer devotes even more effort into integrating these strange elements into his or her understanding of art and the world. This brought about a transformation: in doing so, they can be given some meaning and be dealt with at an emotional level. At the climax, it leads to pleasure in the viewer, which indeed is based in large part on satisfaction with one’s own ability to creatively solve problems, but is also a result of an appreciation of art which caused the process in the first place.

For this process to be achievable, it needs to be proven for its desired result. In the aesthetic of the strange, who ever wanted to achieve immediate pleasure promised by the aesthetic of the beautiful as a result of Modernist and Postmodern art, will rather react to the strangeness ‘found there with displeasure, disappointment, perhaps even anger, and refuse to further deal with these works.

This means in the first place that, the aesthetic of the strange relies upon a cultural preparation of the recipient, an explanation of an introduction to the ways in which the effect of literature and art has changed. In addition, in order to be successful the recipient must have sufficient resources to not only be open for this strangeness, but also to cope with it. The artists themselves, as well as those who deal in their profession with art, were aware that this is not necessarily the case, and so they have attempted since the early days of Modernism to make these apparently confusing works

more accessible through the publication of manifestos, commentaries, and theoretical tracts. It seems that, it is necessary to provide conceptual support for the process of coming to terms with recent art in order to turn the sense of alienation which results from the encounter with these works into aesthetic pleasure. In other words, it became quite clear that the understanding of Modernist and Postmodern literature and art requires the help of theory, a point which in the meantime, has become commonplace in the development of aesthetic theory.

As the study of anthropologic perception is subjective, which is generally applicable enough within the frame of a certain culture to successfully forecast certain effects in part conditioned by individual experience for example, whether something will be perceived of as beautiful or disturbing. The sense of separation which art in question here sets in motion through their otherness cannot be relativized or resolved at the level of perception itself because this is an automatic process in culture defines. What is essential is reflection which tries to reveal the ways in which perception is conditioned, and such reflection can only be connected to conceptually. Perception needs to be to de-automatize as seen in the practice of both Modernist and Postmodernist.

The function of automaticity in perception and that which appears strange remains strange, conceptual reflection might still enable a reaction to this strangeness which is not rejection but, rather, sees it as a chance to expand one's consciousness and to change set emotional patterns. The recent art, with their provocative strangeness, provide at least the possibility to change in-built modes of perception or to test the limits of conceptual thought in the attempt to mix even what appears to be very strange.

In establishing strange as the aesthetic of the day, one may learn to see the confrontation of the strange as a basic constituent of one's experience of the world and self. This may lead one to ask why art need to strengthen the overabundance of possible grounds for separation which already exist in the world instead of integration the differences between subjective desire and existential facts through beauty. After all, this possibility does exist: "Fine art shows its superiority precisely in this, that it describes things beautifully that in nature we would dislike or find ugly" (Mondrian). The aesthetic of the strange strengthening of the creativity of the reader and viewer interplay of imagination and conceptual thought, without which the initial estrangement cannot turn into aesthetic pleasure. Then also in contrast to the experience of the beautiful, where the viewers are in the first place truly "recipients" of what is presented, the aesthetic of the strange demands a considerable amount of effort.

In contrast to the aesthetic of the sublime, this subjective increase in power, this increased awareness of one's own abilities, is not achieved by means of a momentary consideration of moral ideas, of the basic superiority of humans as rational beings over everything which can be perceived by means of the senses, at least not as a rule. Since the alterity of Modernist and Postmodern literature and art causes estrangement of varying intensity, but with perhaps a few concessions which does not overpower the viewer, the hope remains that, the strange might be made comprehensible or at least less strange with some effort and the aid of certain resources such as the imagination and conceptual thought. Kant may have been able to define the beautiful as "what, without a concept, is liked universally" (Critique of Judgement 9, 64), only because he could assume that, the principle harmony of the free play of the imagination with the concepts of the understanding seemed guaranteed in any case by the intrinsic purposiveness found in the beautiful. In the case of the aesthetic of the strange, it is precisely this harmony which is in question: this is not a given, but it is given, so to speak, to the viewer as a problem to be solved. Therefore, this is necessary in dealing with the aesthetic of the strange and there must be an interplay between

imagination and conceptual thought during this aesthetic process which Modernist and Postmodern art set in motion.

The question of why art should increase the wide range of possibilities to encounter alterity already found in the world rather than simply presenting beauty can, of course, also be answered with recourse to the connection between the realm of art and culture as a whole. Notwithstanding such interests as commercialism and social prestige which often play a role in the arts scene, art constitute a domain in which viewers can react to what is presented in a state that is relatively free of extrinsic interest. “Now art never asks anybody to do anything, or to think anything, or to be anything” (Pound 46) . It is for this reason that estrangement results more exclusively from the encounter with the strange itself and not from practical fears connected with it in other areas of life. By the same token, the process of dealing with strangeness can take place in a more relaxed fashion because there is no pressure for it to be successful. This process allows us to develop our creativity freely and allows us to reflect upon our own reaction to what appears strange to us; since we are neither under time pressure nor under the pressure of having to make a practical decision. A culture that produces ‘interest-free’ art of the type which is not necessarily beautiful but often provocatively alienating helps to ensure, in perhaps the most effective way, its own preservation and further development. It is essential, however, that the potential of this art be seized upon by as many as possible; and the aesthetic of the strange arguably requires a firmer education in aesthetics than any before it.

Distancing the Aesthetic of the Strange as the Aesthetic of Modernism and Postmodernism

In the above headings the paper has sought to discuss the art of contemporary art as underlie with aesthetic of the strange. What deserves more attention, however, is the question of whether Postmodern aesthetics represents a type of return to the aesthetic of the sublime, not least because this tenet has become quite influential as a result of Jean–François Lyotard’s writings.

According to Lyotard, Modernist aesthetics is merely a “nostalgic version” of the aesthetic of the sublime because it compensates for the loss of meaning at the level of content (as a presentation of the unrepresentable) with a consistency of form as a consolation and source of joy. In Postmodernism however, the unrepresentable is itself presented by a refusal of good form in representation in order that this no longer pleases but rather mediates a stronger impression of the unrepresentable (Lyotard 15).

In art history the Modernist art, example; paintings of the Impressionists, Expressionists, and Cubists, undeniably caused at first a strong sense of alienation and anything other than pleasure at their ‘good form’. As in modern art, deformed and formless is now embraced to be ‘good form’ to shows that strangeness is not only a relative concept, but that art which aims at an estranging effect becomes more ‘beautiful’ with time and loses to a certain extent, its original function because it becomes more familiar and causes a change in general taste. The fading out of modern art therefore need a successor in concept and style which brought about new avantgardes and in the shift to Postmodernism.

Ihab Hassan pointed out that the Postmodern break with conventions by integrating kitsch, elements and genres taken from pop culture, as well as self-reflexive metafictional discourse was presented in a more playful, ‘cooler’ way than the experiments of the early avantgardes (Hassan 25). Under the wings of the modernism means the aesthetic practices appeared less strange and, therefore, were less dependent on accompanying theories. Postmodern theoretic treatise, however, was strong-minded to not just let this playfulness stand on its own. It was interpreted as a crisis of representation, a shift from the epistemological skepticism of Modernism to an ontological

skepticism according to which all apparent consistency in the world was reduced to mere construction, to variants of a possible world-making without ontological foundation.

This has brought about a changed in most marginally comparison to Modernism. The alterity of Postmodern art also causes a sense of alienation, and if this is not to lead to a rejection of this art then, an even stronger cultural preparation is necessary.

Being challenged with the integration of provocative triviality and contingency on the one hand, the mixture of genres and the destruction of illusion by means of metafiction on the other hand, viewers require mediating help in the form of accompanying criticism and theory. Without this help, it has become nearly impossible to provisionally synthesize the apparent lack of any coherence in the presentation of a plethora of heterogeneous elements or to find a path through a labyrinth of multiple connections. It is by overcoming such crises of understanding and perception that the certain type of pleasure connected with the aesthetic of the strange can result.

Since the late 1970s, art at least in part, no longer present their strangeness in such an extreme form as in the previous two decades during which they were reminiscent of the Avantgarde of early Modernism. For instance, in painting, this was a result of a return of figural painting and variations on already familiar styles (e.g., in the work of the “Neuen Wilden,” in “Neo Geo,” “Neo-Abstract,” or “Neo-Conceptualism”), as well as the ironic combination of differing historical styles in the works of the Italian “Transavanguardia” and American painters such as Schnabel and Salle. Even if the illusion of the reliability of what is presented was undermined in both recent historical novels and by relativizing and marking the way in which what counts as ‘real’ depends on how it is represented and in the ‘ethnic novel’ through the inclusion of magical elements. This return to realistic forms of representation is also apparent in the plays of the time. However, the unimportant alienation caused by this art of variation instead of radical difference is merely another form of the aesthetic of the strange. What now seems strange is the apparent repetition of what is already familiar ( representation of coffin as art, appropriation of the Ashanti kente cloth) and the subtle difference which constitutes novelty in this case only becomes fully clear if one is adequately familiar with those conventions and styles which are being varied upon. It is in large part art which works with pastiche, which only became possible because the “anxiety of influence” for the fear of appearing influenced by others which according to Harold Bloom defined the previous art periods (*The Anxiety of Influence*, 1973), no longer holds sway. The alterity of this recent art and literature only becomes truly apparent, therefore, when set against the background of the history of art the aesthetic process, is more dependent than ever on the cultural preparation of the recipient. Instead of having to overcome an initial impression of radical strangeness, it is a question of discovering the other in what is already familiar. In this way, a sensibility for diversities is developed (Grabes, “The Inversion of the Sublime: Infinity in the Postmodern American Novel,”). Just as alienating, though, it is the initial impression that one is faced with a mere repetition of what is already very familiar.

If one takes this into account, we have very long way from being able to speak of an aesthetic of the sublime; but even the art of early Postmodernism is no longer sublime. Lyotard proposes that, Postmodern aesthetics is based to a great extent on the aesthetic of the sublime because its art is supposed to mediate a stronger impression of the unrepresentable. However, the very ontological supposition of an ‘unrepresentable’ forms a contrast to the ontological skepticism, the anti-foundationalism and constructivism, which is at the heart of Postmodern theory. It may be true that the sense of the bottomlessness of the process of creating meaning has been mediated by Postmodern works which can at the same time bring the idea of eternity in a negative sense into play. This is not a result, however, of being suddenly overwhelmed by something incredibly large



and powerful as occurs in the aesthetic of the sublime; it is, rather, a question of being repeatedly reminded of the merely provisional nature of deciding between multiple possibilities to create meaning within an arbitrarily extensible process of striving towards understanding. The semantic over determination of Postmodern art and literature mediates the interminability, the near endlessness of the process of creating meaning and thereby the experience of radical estrangement. On the one hand, this art incites our imagination to repeatedly come up with new possible solutions and animates the uncertain logic by which we solve problems to constantly judge differing levels of likelihood, thus, strengthening our ability to overcome crises of meaning. Nevertheless, at the same time, we are made aware that any possible solution or allocation of meaning is indeed merely provisional and that our coping with the strange cannot mean a total closure of its strangeness.

The negative sense of eternity which results from the encounter with Postmodern art no longer mediates; therefore, that ecstatic feeling of being uplifted of an enormous momentary increase in power according to Kant, is essential for the aesthetic of the sublime (Grabes, "The Inversion of the Sublime: Infinity in the Postmodern American Novel,"). We may indeed take pleasure in our ingeniousness in solving problems as well as in the fact that we can meet the challenge of understanding and appreciating more recent art and literature which wishes to confront us with strangeness by means of our imagination and new concepts and theories; however, on the emotional side, the result remains ambivalent. The awareness of the free play of signifiers, the near interminability of the process of creating meaning, destroys at the same time any hope of certain orientation, produces a feeling of fundamental insufficiency in any attempt to overcome the difference between the self and the alienating other, between the subject and the world. The aesthetic of the strange no longer mediates that feeling of untroubled empathy which characterized the aesthetic of the beautiful.

It may, however, contribute to the development of that more "vigorous" attitude which Kant sees as necessary for the experience of the sublime and which Hillis Miller in *The Ethics of Reading* portrays as a significant ethical reaction to the Postmodern insight into the fundamental uncertainty of all allocation of meaning and therefore of all understanding (Miller). The ethical is found here in refusing to give up the attempt at understanding and appreciation despite this basic awareness of the irreconcilable alterity of what is presented. In this sense, too, the aesthetic experience enabled by both Modernist and Postmodern art to have an exemplary character; for the subject can apply this ability just as well to all other areas of life. The aesthetic of the strange may center on the experience of the alienating other, but for this very reason also on the experience of our deepest self.

## CONCLUSION

The German dramatist Bertolt Brecht adapted the Russian formalist concept of "defamiliarization" into what he called the "alienation effect" (*Verfremdungseffekt*). In German term, it has also been translated as estrangement effect or distancing effect, then also it is closest to Brecht's idea in that, it avoids the meaning of jadedness, incapacity to feel, and social apathy. This effect, Brecht said, is used to make familiar aspects of the present social reality seem strange, so as to prevent the emotional identification or involvement of the viewers with the characters and their actions in a play. In this paper, the strangeness has aimed to evoke a critical distance and attitude in the spectators; in order to arouse them to take action against, rather than simply to accept, the state of society and behavior represented on the stage.

On the one hand, this art incites our imagination to repeatedly come up with new possible solutions and animates the uncertain logic by which we solve problems to constantly judge differing levels of likelihood, thus, strengthening our ability to overcome crises of meaning.

## References

- Bloom, H. (1973). *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Boulton, J. T. (Ed.). (1987). *A Philosophical Enquiry Into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. 1757; Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Dieckmann, H. (1968). "Das Abscheuliche und Schreckliche in der Kunsttheorie des 18. Jahrhunderts," *Die nicht mehr schönen Künste: Grenzphänomene des Ästhetischen*. (H. R. Jauss, Ed.) Munich: Wilhelm Fink.
- Grabes, H. (1993). "The Inversion of the Sublime: Infinity in the Postmodern American Novel," *American : Amerikastudien/American Studies* 38.4.
- Grabes, H. (1996). "The Subtle Art of Variation: The New Aesthetic," in *Fremde Texte Verstehen: Festschrift für Lothar Bredella zum 60. Geburtstag*. (H. C. Legutke, Ed.) Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Hassan, I. & (Ed.). (1983). "Ideas of Cultural Change," in *Innovation/Renovation: New Perspectives on the Humanities*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Hughes, R. (1980). *The Shock of the New: Art and the Century of Change*. London: BBC.
- Kant, I. (1987). *Critique of Judgement*. Indianapolis: Hackett; Werner S. Pluhar.
- Kant, I. (1998). *Critique of Pure Reason*. (P. Guyer, & A. Wood, Eds.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1988). "An Answer to the Question, What is the Postmodern?" in *The Postmodern Explained: Correspondence 1982–1985*. (J. Pefanis, & T. Morgan, Eds.) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press: 1992.
- Miller, J. H. (1987). *The Ethics of Reading: Kant, de Man, Eliot, Trollope, James, & Benjamin*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mondrian, P. (1921). *Le Néo-Plasticisme: Principe général de l'équivalence plastique. Excerpt in Harrison & Wood, Art in Theory 1900–2000, 289–92*.
- Pound, E. (1960). "The Serious Artist," *Literary Essays of Ezra Pound*. (T.S. Eliot, Ed.) London: Faber & Faber.

*The Anxiety of Influence*. (1973). New York: Oxford University Press.

Weiskel, T. (1976). *The Romantic Sublime*. Baltimore MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.