

<https://artnodes.uoc.edu>

ARTICLE

Blockchain culture and digital image precariousness. Questioning NFTs as an art preservation strategy

Luis D. Rivero-Moreno

Universidade Nova de Lisboa (Portugal)

Universidad de León (Spain)

Date of submission: May 2023

Accepted in: November 2023

Published in: January 2024

Recommended citation

Rivero-Moreno, Luis D. 2024. «Blockchain culture and digital image precariousness. Questioning NFTs as an art preservation strategy». *Artnodes*, no. 33. UOC. [Accessed: dd/mm/aa]. <https://doi.org/10.7238/artnodes.v0i33.416449>



The texts published in this journal are – unless otherwise indicated – covered by the Creative Commons Spain Attribution 4.0 International licence. The full text of the licence can be consulted here: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Abstract

In the last decades, the digital image has moved between the thin line that separates its exponential multiplication and its continuous danger of invisibility and loss. Despite the fact of being constantly used on the internet or social network interactions, the difficulties in filtering, gathering, authenticating and preserving new media images have led them to be a type of art barely collected by contemporary art museums. Even more, the huge amount of material produced not only by artists or creatives but also by citizens makes it impossible for cultural institutions to tackle the task of preserving a significant percentage of it. Museums seem to be unable to distinguish what might be considered art or heritage among the massive amount of images that fed popular culture. Nevertheless, the irruption of blockchain culture has focused on the importance of digital images as an identity, social and economic asset. NFTs seem to attempt to remedy the weaknesses of the digital image by associating it with a verifiable and supposedly incorruptible contract. This study tries to analyse the precariousness of the digital image as a key element in the emergence and sudden rise and fall of the so-called “crypto-art”. To this end, the idea of the “poor image” outlined by Steyerl is followed. The aim is to clarify whether the digital images associated with blockchain transactions solve the problematic obsolescent and unstable condition of the works, or if, on the contrary, these are used as fuel for a new ultra-liberal financial machine being quickly consumed and discarded.

Keywords

contemporary art; art market; blockchain; digital art; crypto culture

La cultura blockchain y la precariedad de la imagen digital. Cuestionando los NFT como estrategia de conservación del arte

Resumen

En las últimas décadas, la imagen digital se ha situado entre la línea delgada que separa su multiplicación exponencial y su peligro continuo de invisibilidad y pérdida. A pesar de que se utilizan constantemente en internet o en las interacciones de las redes sociales, las dificultades para filtrar, recopilar, autenticar y preservar nuevas imágenes de nuevos medios las han llevado a ser un tipo de arte apenas coleccionado por museos de arte contemporáneo. De hecho, la enorme cantidad de material producido no solo por artistas o creativos, sino también por ciudadanos, hace imposible que las instituciones culturales aborden la tarea de preservar un porcentaje significativo de este. Los museos parecen incapaces de distinguir lo que podría considerarse arte o patrimonio entre la enorme cantidad de imágenes que alimentaban la cultura popular. Sin embargo, la interrupción de la cultura blockchain se ha centrado en la importancia de las imágenes digitales como activo de identidad, social y económico. Los NFT parecen intentar remediar las debilidades de la imagen digital de modo que la asocian con un contrato verificable y supuestamente incorruptible. Este estudio intenta analizar la precariedad de la imagen digital como elemento clave en la emergencia y el aumento y caída repentinos del llamado «criptoarte». Con este fin, se sigue la idea de la «imagen deficiente» (poor image) descrita por Steyerl. El objetivo es aclarar si las imágenes digitales asociadas con las transacciones de blockchain resuelven la problemática condición de obsolescencia e inestabilidad de las obras, o si, por el contrario, se utilizan como combustible para una nueva máquina financiera ultraliberal siendo consumidas y descartadas rápidamente.

Palabras clave

Arte contemporáneo; mercado de arte; blockchain; arte digital; cultura criptográfica

Introduction

The irruption of NFTs (or Non Fungible Tokens) in the art market implied throughout 2020 and 2021 an important revulsive in the contemporary art realm. Encouraged by the exceptional pandemic conditions and the advance of Web3 tools, this new technology boosted the virtualization of the art system, challenging some of its most established actors and mediators (galleries, curators...) and shaking some of its pillars. NFTs, driven by a new and unregulated monetary and financial structure, related to cryptocurrencies, came to rise as a cultural and economic asset perfectly attuned to the blockchain transaction machinery. After an accelerated development of this bubble, 2022 and 2023 have witnessed a drastic drop in the value of cryptocurrencies and, in parallel, of NFTs transactions (Wang *et al.* 2022).

Within an atmosphere of great instability and volatility, NFTs have been defended (and also questioned) as an element with a disruptive potential within the usually opaque and hermetic system of the contemporary art market (Colella 2022). First of all, this new market conditions would potentially grant control to an artist who is intended to be as independent as never before was: capable of producing, distributing and selling digital artworks without any other intermediation. Consequently, creatives may establish new ways of communication leading to direct sales to the public in an automated and apparently safe method.

A large part of the platforms that have attracted artists willing to enter this market have appealed to this “liberation” from the “gate-keepers” that controlled access to institutional legitimization and/or entry to the art market (Currid 2007). They have offered, after all, the possibility of receiving economic and automatic remuneration through the use of smart contracts (van Haaften-Schick & Whitaker 2020). After years of difficulties when selling artworks in the digital environment, the blockchain would arrive as a method devoted to improve the professional expectations of artists by facilitating royalty payments through hypothetical successive sales from which they were traditionally excluded. This fact has, however, been questioned by different authors based on the evidence of the low percentage of artists able to make profits from these subsequent sales (Murray 2022), as well as the low percentage of second sales that occur on most platforms (Fazli, Owfi & Taesiri 2021).

In any case, NFTs would have made it possible to grant some sense of security and generate confidence (Zarifis & Cheng 2022) to potential collectors by relying on a network of data and metadata that is presumably incorruptible, verifiable, transparent and available for consultation. All this is caused by the automation and traceability offered by the blockchain system, a system based on the codification and encryption of information associated with artistic images. Ultimately, NFTs “point to” or “represent” in some way an artwork, indicating its origin, owner

and previous transactions, as well as informing of the conditions of purchase and sale through metadata.

The NFT market has offered a long-awaited solution to many of the problems that have led digital art to distribution and sales problems in the contemporary art market. The instability, obsolescence and volatility of works and formats, sometimes openly ephemeral and collective, have chronicled the technical and economic difficulties of collecting and preserving new media art (Rivero-Moreno 2017). Not only gallery owners but also museums had accused the technical complexity of its conservation and the issues derived from the impossibility of guaranteeing the acquisition of unique, original and/or authentic works, characteristics absent by definition in the digital image.

This fact was due to an accumulation of multiple factors, such as the originally rebellious, transgressive and even revolutionary character of much of new media art, based on an anti-commercial and anti-system stance. Much of it is based on strategies coming from Dadaism or conceptual art. However, the need for digital artists to try to make a living (or, at least, survive) has led many of them to explore, more or less convincingly, different options for selling their works. From attempts of pay-per-view systems to sales using platforms such as eBay. Some others made an earlier and pioneering exploration of blockchain technology through the Monegraph project (Zeilinger 2018). A large part of these strategies has been studied by Waelder in different texts (2012; 2013).

In the new context of image consumption, most of the images are produced extremely quickly (and often lacking in technical expertise) by the users themselves and are mainly spread by social networks of all kinds. All in all, it is possible to state that, in the last decades, the digital image has moved between the thin line that separates its exponential multiplication and use and its continuous danger of invisibility and loss, between its enormous appreciation and quick disuse and oblivion. The aforementioned problems have meant caused that most of these kinds of new media art forms, in fact, have not been a type of art collected with assiduity by contemporary art museums. This has been the most common scenario for some complex digital images as generative creations, but as well for those related to “low culture” communicative techniques like pixel art or memes, associated with massive use on the internet and social network interactions. It is possible to affirm that digital images have not achieved a major impact on the art system and market beyond a few exceptional examples of exhibitions and sales.

Art in the blockchain environment, therefore, takes up a large part of the issues and debates that have been open in new media art since the 1990s, transporting them to new social, cultural, economic and, above all, technological circumstances. Blockchain transfers to the art system a narrative based on attending to the “solution of all problems”, from the absence of a transparent and democratic structure to that of the possibility of a free and autonomous development of creativity (whether self-taught or formal) capable of embracing the new culture of the viral image and digital identity. All these persuasive tactics, common in the financial and technological field from which it was born, had not yet been

successfully used in the digital artistic field. These narratives, based on the promises of liberation, are related to heroic characters becoming successful from anonymity. Mostly in what can be read as an almost mystical or pseudo-religious way, as Faustino, Fària and Marques (2021) have pointed out. The possibility of correcting the previous problems is posed in a quasi-magical mood, attending to the possibilities opened by a new technology that needs to be embraced somehow uncritically.

The final objective of this paper is to clarify if digital images associated with transactions in the blockchain environment solve their aforementioned problems of conservation, correcting their unstable condition and danger of loss. Or if, on the contrary, these images are simply mere fuel for a new ultraliberal financial machine, an asset that creates quick capital gains based on symbolic value. Ultimately, the so-called “cryptoart” would thus become perfectly and paradoxically fungible and replaceable by it. The digital images associated with crypto culture may have been used then as raw material available to be consumed and discarded once an economic profit has been made from them. Consequently, the precariousness of the digital image might be reflected as a crucial element in the understanding of the sudden rise and fall of the artworks related to blockchain in the last years. A metaphor of the wild acceleration of cultural capitalism.

1. A “poor image”

In a globalized world, the democratization of image production and distribution has turned users themselves into creators capable of supplying a system that has largely denied the need for “image professionals”. The valorization of artistic images in the digital environment has suffered a significant decline, both socially and economically. All this happening in the midst of an enormous acceleration in the consumption of media images. These have experienced exponential growth through their use on social networks and platforms based on the fast scrolling and viewing of images as free, abundant and available material.

The new spectator is then emancipated by becoming not only the consumer but also the producer and distributor. The new social and cultural conditions have put in dire straits the work of the traditional qualified author. This might be understood as an extension of the historical avant-garde critique of the figure of the genius artist. New technologies facilitate access to a democratized, simple, automated, ready-to-use, and user-friendly image production. In this context, images are multiplied and used without paying much attention to their aesthetic characteristics and their preservation once they have been used. This is what could be called “burn-out aesthetics”, updating the terms used by Byung Chul Han (Rivero-Moreno 2023). The user’s interaction with the image is quick and prevents a prolonged, rational and critical experience that would allow him to question its origin, context, contents or objectives. A “scattered gaze” pointed out by authors such as Martin Prada (2018).

Creative experiences on the internet or social networks have played with this new culture of viral images. They have tried to be nourished by it while revisiting it in a critical way (Martín Prada 2012). However, they are immersed in a diffuse territory, misinterpreted on most occasions and hidden by the magnitude of information flows. Sometimes, artworks are difficult to distinguish from the rest of the popular creations made by users, thus they are rarely accepted by the official circles of high culture.

At a still early stage, Fhrone (1999) did not hesitate to highlight the reluctance of museums to accommodate a media culture of enormous popular impact but questionable taste and quality. This is due to the fear of the enormous number of images very close to the mundane event, often disconnected from the traditional rules of visual language. The banality of the digital image, obsolescent and dynamic, will place the museum in a difficult position when it comes to digesting and valuing them. Thus, since the end of the millennium, there has been a profound gap between the massive use of the image on the internet and its denial as a heritage to be preserved by cultural institutions. This fact is even more tragic if we consider the enormous danger of heritage loss already pointed out by UNESCO (2003).

This paradoxical situation led the artist and researcher Hito Steyerl to coin an enlightening term: the “poor image”. Steyerl refers to this enormous quantity of images capable of circulating for a short period of time on the net, being used and discarded quickly and falling into rapid oblivion and eventually disappearing. The poor image, for her, is also an image of low quality, tending to pixelation, change of format or composition, or cropping, which usually appears decontextualized, in many cases without mentioning any previous references behind it such as place of origin or author who made it. The “lumpen proletariat in the class society of appearances” in her words (Steyerl 2009).

The poor images appear as illegitimate daughters of the digital culture, bastard, disgraced, born of remix. No one seems to want to take responsibility for them. However, in many cases they are, curiously, the only possibility of survival or resurrection of a contesting culture that is neither commercially distributed nor officially promoted.

The poor image is, however, beyond its alarming precariousness, an undeniable symbol of the culture of its time. That is why Steyerl does not hesitate to defend it. Somehow, close to this idea but in practical terms, the photographer Thomas Ruff in his *jpegs series* (2004) aligns himself with Steyerl. In this project, Ruff rescues, legitimizes and monumentalizes the pixelated image, allowing a reflection on the remaining information in this type of image, still capable of recalling in the viewer the question about distant, confused or indirect referents. In any case, these images represent the verification of the aesthetics of failure that assumes the impossibility of filtering, storing, paying attention and caring for the images in the so-called, paradoxically, “image culture” (Jansson 2002).

As Steyerl will note, the poor image places us on the verge of a potential cultural tragedy: that of the impossibility of bequeathing a heritage that will allow future generations to understand the culture of our time. It is rejected by the official culture but rescued by users and

visible on platforms like Youtube in various formats and qualities. Films of enormous value for their experimental or avant-garde character fall into the poor image category. Interestingly, the poor image makes users new active agents in the preservation of heritage, correcting somehow the failures and oversights of the official institutions devoted to this task. This amateur yet very valuable work leads us to a new conception of preservation efforts: done from a precarious, anonymous, collective, unsupported, scattered and disjointed side.

Some years later, and thanks to the arrival of the blockchain culture, the poor image seems to have gained momentum and strength. Recovered, but reverted in the sense Steyerl analysed them. Not as an image of resistance anymore, outside the control of the privatization of culture. Quite the contrary, this low-cost image is reconverted into a product, “re-auratized” thanks to its cult value, precisely pointed out by the author. Reintroduced into the market once its potential commercial value has been intuited and recovered, being, thus, privatized.

Much of the art associated with blockchain communities and culture rescues the poor aesthetic of the pixelated *naïve* image, now as a method of distinction, a marketing strategy. In the new conditions of cultural consumption, art will be pushed to the need to make itself visible in networks of quick use and platforms that deny the possibility of a calm aesthetic experience. Consumption is prioritized, ending up in what is called “platform capitalism” (Srnicek 2017). Bauman, some time before, had warned about the arrival of an art tending to the “liquidization” of its consumption.

The so-called “cryptoart” can be easily read in these terms since it adapts perfectly to the radiography drawn by Bauman, permeating a market and collectors with a propensity “[...] for change and movement, it seeks objects that adjust to itself, that are like itself: impatient, ever-changing, chameleon-like” (Bauman 2007, 22). Therefore, beyond a timeless art capable of resisting time and its fashions, the new art in the blockchain environment seeks the irrationality, acceleration and excitement of consumption that ultimately “[...] accelerates the devaluation and ageing of those objects.” (Bauman 2007, 22).

The artistic image tends to become, more than ever, a rapidly exhausted product as it is thrown to a user saturated by the huge number of images viewed in a few minutes. The media culture forces the call for attention, the search for a surprise to break the bland wandering of the public through the net. Thus arises the need to use new mechanisms, such as hype, to generate interest and enthusiasm, resulting in the subsequent fast decay of attention. The added value created by a supposed and transitory “originality” of the proposals is ephemeral and there are very few images and projects with options to survive in time and memory.

Bauman’s theses corroborate the approach to a consumption that requires and provokes a “poverty of the image”, which requires neither quality nor resistance to time but, on the contrary, is used and discarded with unprecedented speed once the required productivity and surplus value have been extracted from it. Returning to the neo-Marxist terms

used by Steyerl, the “proletarian” amongst images is, thus, consciously used by the new power structures established by the Web3.

The constant acceleration in the production, distribution and, now, transaction, use and discarding of images deepens the idea of an “aesthetics of disappearance” previously pointed out by Virilio (1998). Scrolling on the web implies a new type of accelerated travel, in this case, virtual and without leaving home, where it is difficult to retain what we have experienced, which passes before our very eyes, blurred, confused and irrelevant to our future memory. Everything solid seems to vanish into thin air.

2. Gasoline for the blockchain

“The work of art considered as a source of amusement ends up becoming tediously familiar, it loses its initial capacity to provoke sensations, to shock, to surprise: it ends up promising the heavy sensation of *déjà vu* instead of adventure.” Bauman (2007, 21)

As we see, the enormous availability of poor images, bastardized, absent of fathers and mothers who claim them, is a perfect breeding ground for the new possibilities glimpsed by the blockchain and its need for fuel with which to energize the transaction system on which it depends. The blockchain operation is nothing more than a huge archive or database, a state-of-the-art “ledger”. Beyond data and metadata, nothing else is preserved on the blockchain, just because, in the vast majority of the cases, the artworks themselves are not contained inside the NFT smart contracts.

NFTs appear as the ultimate possibility of legitimizing the image dumps that largely make up the internet in an economic sense. Almost as a way of recycling, the digital image, thanks to crypto culture, recovers not only strength but also productivity with a simple and low-risk mechanism. The enormous number of producers subsisting in precarious conditions (available and ready to eagerly respond to the call) must be added to image inflation (the enormous number of free or very low-cost images available).

The new generation of tech communities has developed methods of communication in which images achieve a symbolic and identity sense. In this breeding ground, forgotten cultures, popular or populist, alien to aesthetic reflection, to any analysis of the “hows” and “whys”, will end up triumphing and vindicating themselves through the debris of the previous system, that of elitist art and quality images. The “good taste” defended by mediators in the form of critics, curators or art dealers will then be boycotted through this new culture. A vision of the digital image as a “collectible” is, undoubtedly, one of the most successful mechanisms in the blockchain environment, from the pioneering case of *Rare Pepe to Cryptopunks* or *Bored Ape Yacht Club*, to many other projects following in its wake.

The new crypto communities are born from a new generation with little interest in art history or any previous artistic tradition, sometimes even unable to glimpse the clear connections of the images they use with previous creative currents. These communities will use the image

with the intention of affirming their group belonging through a new imaginary that reuses the poor image without embarrassment. The absence of image quality in many cases is justified in a technical and practical sense derived from the very limits of storage and processing of the platforms. The designs created for the various metaverses, for the same reasons, will tend to be low-resolution.

In a context clearly tending to kitsch, to what some have called in more direct terms “bullshit art” (Botz-Bornstein 2015; 2021), crypto culture asserts itself as an amalgam as superficially varied as it is empty of content, very much in line with a media world dominated by fake news and populism. It could be asserted as a retro-futuristic culture, where opposites eventually converge and dialectics merge, nullifying debate. As ridiculously utopian as dystopian, the result of the constant basic contradiction of an ideology that pretends to assert itself as anarcho-capitalist in an impossible rhetoric.

This generates a varied and eclectic aesthetic, although, nevertheless, with certain lines in common. The need for enormous speed in production deepens its carelessness. Blockchain culture will thus be nourished not only by video games and their playful or violent characters but also by the trashy humor of the memes and the idea of virality over quality (Tanni 2021). Also, by the capacity of identification in the form of more or less funny and/or personalized avatars, emoticons, gifs...

This kind of image, as a group defining feature, introduces small alterations to seek a virtual difference in homogeneity. Without offering anything of its own it pretends to stand out as something new. It follows Virilio’s idea of a technological culture tending towards a growing and incessant appropriation that leads to nothingness, precisely “because only nothingness is continuous and, therefore, conductive” (Virilio 1998, 123). New media, allied with informational capitalism, end up phagocytizing and appropriating digital images as a part of a clockwork mechanism dominated by algorithms, data and metadata. The image becomes nothing but chum for cultural and economic automation. All this in a mechanized culture, or in other words, in the absence of any human intelligence “at the wheel”.

The digital image in the blockchain machinery is forced to be easily digestible since complexity could only slow down its distribution process and success. Art in the blockchain structure loses all transcendence, all its metaphysical or philosophical character. The new art market denies the possibility of useless or unproductive art. As Bauman points out, recalling Arendt, Gadamer or Ortega, “[...] Functionality, so to speak, dissolves objects and makes them vanish from the phenomenal world by virtue of their own use and consumption” (Bauman 2007, 16).

As Han warns, in today’s society (that he calls “transparency society” – a crucial term in the blockchain culture), there is a clear lack of time for anything that requires attention and time, such as artistic enjoyment and analysis (2015). There is also an absence of interest in what might require large doses of effort or has a limited or no capacity at all to generate economic dividends in return, such as the care and preservation of that same art. Transparency acts as a tool of systemic

control, a neoliberal device that eliminates dissent and difference. As a member of a community, in the form of a private club, transparency forces the ideological acceptance of the system, or, even better, prevents the alternative by standing as monolithically positive. It deactivates criticism by turning everyone in the system into a stakeholder.

Conclusions

Like any sociocultural context, the blockchain or crypto culture is based on consensus. In this case, on the general collective acceptance of the economic value of what previously had a marginal cultural or social significance only for a reduced group of people. It is also based on trust in an inflationary and deregulated financial market, capable of generating rapid capital gains, equally rapid transactions and particularly accelerated enrichment possibilities never before seen in the financial system. Much less ever seen in the art market, whose previous bubbles had been based on slow but safe revaluations.

The precariousness of the digital image can be understood, therefore, in many ways, both in the aforementioned difficulty of its preservation and in the arbitrariness of its appearance and disappearance: sudden, random, tragic and unannounced. There are clear inequalities within the cultural capitalism equation: benefits are growing while the cultural and aesthetics side is fading, losing control. The image seems to be understood as raw material, an element of extraction and use. It does not seem coincidental that the crypto narrative uses terms such as mining in the extraction of coins as well as visual metaphors and conceptualizations that take it back to the purest physical capitalism.

The utility, in a primarily economic and financial sense, of cryptoart ends up consciously dissolving the possibility of converting it into creations beyond specific circumstances. It corroborates its short-sightedness. It turns it into applied art, usefully designed for specific purposes. At the service of the financial machinery of which it forms part. There are no protocols to preserve the artworks that are supposedly contained on the blockchain. Users alone cannot handle, either economically or technically, the difficulties of preserving digital artworks over time.

In this society where everything is exhibited and everything is measured by its economic value, the digital image faces enormous pressures based on extreme competition that makes it difficult to distinguish it from the rest of the images also exhibited. Adorno and Horkheimer, in their *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, already warned about the uses of the (then) newly-arrived commodification of culture. According to the authors, the culture industry makes culture a tool not of differentiation but of resemblance (Adorno & Horkheimer 2007, 165).

Cryptoart rescues from the ashes what is in danger of disappearing in a shrewd move where there is little to lose. Paradoxically, without any pretension of preserving it for the future. Under a narrative of the new, it bets on the recycling of those precarious images. The potential of what is discarded, the reuse of the digital garbage accumulated on the net

becomes the basis of its aesthetics. Economically, this trash represents a “zero point” of value where what is about to disappear becomes an opportunity for reinvention, reinterpretation and revaluation (Pye 2010,7). Any price rise will exceed its starting point, what is, of course, a safe business.

The new platforms became interested parties, as new mediators that facilitated the use of a complex and convoluted technological structure, in most cases unknown to the artists themselves, facilitating the “mining” and auctioning of the works on their websites, and, obviously, obtaining quick profit for it. Platforms have, thus, emerged in great numbers and with very different methods, from those that barely upload all the tokenized material (such as Opensea) to those that have developed new systems of strict content selection and curatorship (FeralFile). There are many possibilities, some of them supported by other blockchain systems such as the development of DAOs (or Decentralized Autonomous Organizations) or self-developed currencies (as would be the case of SuperRare, for example). Others have specialized in some specific types of digital art, such as generative art (in the case of ArtBlocks, among others). None of them are responsible, anyway, for the preservation of the traded artworks. Consequently, there are no preservation projects associated with crypto culture platforms so far.

It is clear that, as Virilio pointed out, art seems to be bound to continuous transformation in a kind of law in which “to stop is to die” (Virilio 1998, 95). The extreme speed of new technologies somehow deactivates rationality and prevents us from feeling anything about the images. Gambling passion is what seems to activate the user-collector of works in the form of NFTs, as well as, obviously the drive for accelerated profit. This affirmation is sustained by the need for quick buying and selling activated by profit, by the high risk of betting on art, a financial asset of an ultra-accelerated economy, which prevents thinking and calls for quick action.

In the end, NFTs do not seem to be the ultimate method for preserving digital images. They are, after all, not a conservation method. Smart contracts, or what is the same, the data and metadata associated with the artworks, are finally abandoned to believing in the incorruptibility of the blockchain. This faith is opposed to previous experiences pointing to the crash or abandonment of the networks. In this context, the idea of heritage disintegrates. The image becomes precarious to the point of multiplication and volatilization, becoming technological garbage after the consumption of a significant amount of energy in the process. Data and metadata are finally unconnected to the artwork in an effort that multiplies the processes, making them more complex, encrypted, irretrievable without the support of technological tools and still susceptible to issues like obsolescence and instability. The parallel worlds of the artworks and the ledger containing their data do not amend the traditional topics concerning the preservation of new media artworks. Where to put the stress now, in the works themselves or in the documentation of the traded assets?

The irrationality of crypto art provokes the accelerated consumption of images born to die quickly, of works thought to live just through their transaction from one hand to another. After all, this mechanism of

life may be the best metaphor representing the very fragility of human culture at a time of crisis and anxiety. The great majority of digital images remain in an irremediable invisibility. Overproduced, unsustainable, unseen, lost. Are crypto communities, and society in general, really appreciating this trend as something valuable for the future in a cultural sense? Are we talking about a way of creativity or a way of doing business? Is business definitely a kind of art, the last and final step of the Warholian view? In the meanwhile, art disappears at high speed without leaving traces that could help for future archaeological efforts, driving us to a potential heritage tragedy.

References

- Adorno, Theodor W. and Max Horkheimer. *Dialéctica de la Ilustración*. Madrid, Ediciones Akal, 2007.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. *Arte ¿líquido?* Madrid, Sequitur, 2007.
- Botz-Bornstein, Thorsten. "Kitsch and Bullshit". *Philosophy and Literature*, vol. 39, no. 2, (2015): 305-321. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/phl.2015.0053>
- Botz-Bornstein, Thorsten. "Bullshit Art" and Non-Fungible-Tokens". *The Polish Journal of Aesthetics*, vol. 63, no. 4, (2021), 69-83. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.19205/63.21.4>
- Colella, Silvana. "Disrupting the art market? Blockchain, NFTs and the promise of inclusion". *IL CAPITALE CULTURALE. Studies on the Value of Cultural Heritage*, no. 26, (2022): 233-256.
- Currid, Elizabeth. "The economics of a good party: Social mechanics and the legitimization of art/culture". *Journal of Economics and Finance*, vol. 31, (2007): pp. 386-394. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02885728>
- Faustino, Sandra, Inês Faria and Rafael Marques. "The myths and legends of King Satoshi and the knights of blockchain". *Journal of Cultural Economy*, vol. 15, no. 1, (2022), 67-80. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2021.1921830>
- Fazli, Mohammad Amin, Ali Owfi and Reza Taesiri. "Under the skin of foundation nft auctions". *arXiv*, (2021). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2109.12321>
- Frhone, Ursula. "Old art and new media: The contemporary museum". *Afterimage*, vol. 27, no. 2, (1999): 9-11. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/aft.1999.27.2.9>
- Han, Byung-Chul. *The transparency society*. Stanford University Press, 2015.
- Jansson, André. "The mediatization of consumption: Towards an analytical framework of image culture". *Journal of consumer culture*, vol. 2, no. 1, (2002): 5-31. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/146954050200200101>
- Joselit, David. "NFTs, or the readymade reversed". *October*, no. 175, (2021): 3-4. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/octo_a_00419
- Lévy, Pierre. *Collective intelligence: Mankind's emerging world in cyberspace*. Perseus books, 1997.
- Martín Prada, Juan. *Prácticas artísticas e Internet en la época de las redes sociales*. Madrid, 2012.
- Martín Prada, Juan. *El ver y las imágenes en el tiempo de Internet*. Madrid, Ediciones Akal, 2018.
- Murray, Michael. D. "NFTs rescue resale royalties? The Wonderfully Complicated Ability of NFT Smart Contracts to Allow Resale Royalty Rights". *Case Western Reserve Journal of Law, Technology & the Internet*, vol. 14, no. 2, (2023). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4164029>
- Pye, Gillian. "Introduction: Trash as cultural category". In: Pye, G., & Schroth, S. (eds.). *Trash culture: Objects and obsolescence in cultural perspective*, (Peter Lang, 2010), 1-14. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-0353-0204-2>
- Rivero Moreno, Luis David. "Inmaterialidades. Problemas de conservación del arte de los nuevos medios". *De Arte. Revista de Historia del Arte*, no. 16, (2017): 227-238. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18002/da.v0i16.4974>
- Rivero Moreno, Luis David. "Cuestiones sobre la criptocultura y los NFTs. Hacia una estética del cansancio". *Arte, Individuo y Sociedad*, online version, (2023): 1-11. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5209/aris.87798>
- Srnicek, Nick. *Platform capitalism*. John Wiley & Sons, 2017.
- Steyerl, Hito. "In defense of the poor image". *e-flux journal*, n. 10, (2009). <https://www.e-flux.com/journal/10/61362/in-defense-of-the-poor-image/>
- Tanni, Valentina. *Memestetica: il settembre eterno dell'arte*. Nero, 2020.
- UNESCO. Charter of the Preservation of Digital Heritage, 2023.
- Van Haaften-Schick, Lauren and Whitaker, Amy. "From the artist's contract to the blockchain ledger: New forms of artists' funding using NFTs, fractional equity, and resale royalties". *Fractional Equity, and Resale Royalties*, (14 December 2020). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3842210>
- Velthuis, Olav. *Imaginary economics: Contemporary artists and the world of big money*. NaiUitgevers Pub, 2005.
- Virilio, Paul. *Estética de la desaparición*. Editorial Anagrama, 1998.
- Waelder, Pau. "An Interview With Carlo Zanni: On Pay-per-view Net art". *ETC. Revue de l'art actuel*, no. 95, (2012): 45-46.
- Waelder, Pau. "Coleccionar intangibles: estrategias de venta de obras de net art". ALSINA, P. (coord.). *Artnodes Revista de Arte, Ciencia y Tecnología*, no.13, (2013): 111-119. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7238/a.v0i13.2015>
- Wang, Yizhi, Florian Horky, Lennart J. Baals, Brian M. Lucey, and Samuel A. Vigne. "Bubbles all the way down? Detecting and date-stamping bubble behaviours in NFT and DeFi markets". *Journal of Chinese Economic and Business Studies*, vol. 20, no. 4, (2022): 415-436. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14765284.2022.2138161>
- Whitaker, Amy. "Artist as owner not guarantor: The art market from the artist's point of view". *Visual Resources*, vol. 34, no. 1-2, (2018): 48-64. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973762.2018.1435609>
- Zafirir, Alex and Xusen Cheng. "The business models of NFTs and fan tokens and how they build trust". *Journal of Electronic Business & Digital Economics*, 2022. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEB-DE-07-2022-0021>
- Zeilinger, Martin. "Digital art as 'monetised graphics': Enforcing intellectual property on the blockchain". *Philosophy & Technology*, vol. 31, (2018), 15-41. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-016-0243-1>

CV

**Luis D. Rivero-Moreno**

Universidade Nova de Lisboa (Portugal)

Universidad de León (Spain)

irivem@unileon.es

<https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=6XleBQoAAAAJ&hl=es><https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Luis-Rivero-Moreno><https://unileon.academia.edu/LuisDRiveroMoreno>

He has a PhD in Art History from the University of Granada (Spain). Associate Professor at Universidad de León and visiting researcher at Universidade Nova de Lisboa with more than fifteen years of professional experience. As a researcher, his main aims are enclosed in the realm of contemporary art and its relations with wide aspects of culture, society and technology such as new media art, digital humanities, visual studies, museums... He has given lectures and talks at congresses, conferences and seminars, and published a large number of articles and papers at national and international level. He has done professional and academic stays in Brussels, Berlin and Lisbon. Collaborator in online universities like UNED and UOC. Member of research groups at the University of León, the Universidade Nova (The Art, Museums and Digital Cultures cluster) and other research networks like EuropeanaPro. He has been a member of the task force of the European Year of Cultural Heritage 2018 and has worked on different projects, featuring the European Commission H2020 ROCK (Regeneration and Optimization of Cultural Heritage in Creative and Knowledge Cities) Project.

