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*Whatever images of net.art projects grace these pages, beware that, seen out of their native HTML, out of their networked, social habitats, they are net.art equivalents of animals in zoos. (Rachel Greene)*

I have been conditioned when offered urls in art related articles to expect some sort of documentation, memorial or post mortem of a performance, installation, physical canvas… which imperfectly attempts to recreate the experience of, or retell the affect of a work of art ex situ. For this reason one can imagine how strange and exciting it was for me to read an introduction to an article explaining that the urls it offered and the sites they represented were the only authentic manner in which to experience the art (genre?/movement?) which it would be chronicling.

Exploring the various works referenced in Rachel Greene’s article was creatively inspiring and made me realize just how small and rigd my idea of the website is. I found particularly inspiring *JODI.org* mainly because of how overtly hostile many of the web pages were, whether it was flashing lights, dense seas of alpha numeric text or ip adresses, sites which implored you enter your password and then reportedly *XSSPOSED* you or absurdly unituitive UI’s. This hostility and plain deconstruction or streak of the architecture of the internet (naked code, file names, hyper aware of the architecture of the internet itself) reminded me of The White Cube, and unpretensious if Duchamp.

Going to the different websites was inspiring, particularly JODI.org was inspiring and made me reflect on just how uncreative I am.

It reminded me of just how affective hostility can be in art, It reminds me of what I think I first encountered The White Cube by Brian O’Doherty, we try to be ahistorical and give art and the gallery space this godlike power by disembodying ourselves and the art, feigining a ahistorical universality. But when art is hostile we’re forced again to consider the space and the relationship of our bodies to it, throwing away all a historical disembodied pretensions. In the same way when a website is hostile and inhibs us, we are forced to think of our relationship to the website and therefore are forced to remember ourselves, our individual intentions and the user interface (gallery space) of the website, similarly throwing away all pretensions of disembodied transedental UI. Through the website inhibiting are actiosn, we are forced to think of the user interface and architecture of the website itself, and are forced also to consider our relationship to the website, deconstructing any dissmebodied/a historical pretensions we may have had.

Lastly the article addresses briefly the struggles of net.art to adapt to a society in which the net is no longer a fringe, inheriently subversive medium. Also the article talked about the struggles of net.art to sell itself because it is inheriently public and open access, so I wonder if art scenes like Canada which rely not on private buyers but instead government grants would tend to favour net artists?

and the interactions between

introduced to the history of net.art

the odd, exciting and in many ways vindicating experience I had when to be introduced to net.art with a sentence explaining that the urls and the sites they represent are the only authentic and full experience of that art.

It is a really exciting and new experience for me to copy paste a url from an art related writing and be presented not with documentation – a slice or memory – of what the art was, but

I agree that web is converging power, empowered by their pending popularity

Exciting to think of web art as a separate category, moving away from web pages.

How do you market in an American environment where money is coming from private super-rich.