

Thoughts on (Conceptual) Art, Cryptocurrency and Beyond by Rob Meyers

This article starts out by showing various new forms of currency that artists have come up with as well as their critiques about monetary policy. Considering money is this “untouchable,” that you cannot reproduce and that there are crimes relating to redistributing and altering money; some of these projects read to me as forms of activism or perhaps, artivism. I agree with the author in loving the currency piece of the pressed flowers that speaks to production, nature in conjunction with economics. To me it shows the delicate care and time one might give to something and then almost the worthlessness of it. It seems we live in a broken economy where many people cannot afford the costs of living. One self funded healthcare bill for some bloodwork could cost someone making minimum wage six months savings to pay for.

A Lot of the art discussed in this article was pretty fascinating. While, I do not completely understand how blockchains and bitcoins work still- I can appreciate the message the artists are saying about the economy, and cryptocurrency. I had no idea it was “easy” to create a cryptocurrency.

Another piece that stood out to me was, Caleb Larsen’s “A Tool To Deceive and Slaughter,” which was created in reaction to smart contracts. It's interesting that it takes something that we all feel is necessary to carry on with our day to day lives- the internet and then surrenders its freedom to be auctioned off, to be taken in by the highest

bidder. We definitely surrender ourselves to technology and large companies everyday. We do not even realize what we are signing into, or how the biggest companies know everything about us. Market dominance has leverage. Those contracts seem crazy long on purpose. There was a strange South Park episode I saw recently that made people turn into the Human Centipede because they arbitrarily agreed to an Apple Contract without reading the fine print.

This article was also good because it pointed out the fact that not all art is created equally, not all artists get paid for their work, and not all people get to own artwork. When Meyers mentions a lot of artwork is owned by some bourgeois upper class as a symbol of status exclusively whom probably didn't know what the piece of art meant or cared, it makes one wonder about the artists intent of making art as well.