

Journal of Fashion Business  
Vol.26, No.6

—  
ISSN 1229-3350(Print)  
ISSN 2288-1867(Online)

—  
J. fash. bus. Vol. 26,  
No. 6:94-104, December. 2022  
[https://doi.org/  
10.12940/jfb.2022.26.6.94](https://doi.org/10.12940/jfb.2022.26.6.94)

## Requirements of Fashion as Popular Art in Contemporary Culture

**Seunghee Suh\***

\*Professor, Dept. of Fashion Design, Sungkyunkwan University, Korea

### Corresponding author

—  
Seunghee Suh  
Tel : +82-2-760-0506  
E-mail :shsuh@skku.edu

---

### Keywords

art, avant-garde art, fashion,  
popular art

### Abstract

The purpose of this study is to analyze the art world's perspective on popular art and the contact point with pure art and to present the requirements of fashion as a popular art. To analyze the artistic value of fashion, this study analyzed and presented the requirements of art by linking the innate characteristics of fashion premised on mass consumption of popular art. The research method consisted of content analysis focusing on books and papers on art and fashion. A critical perspective on expansion of the artistic field amid the blurred boundaries of art is the basis of a critical comparison between popular art and avant-garde art and a critique of popular art as opposed to value-oriented art. Conversely, as a point of contact with popular art with fine art, art is discussed against the ideological strategy of fine art and the shift in hegemony brought about by erosion of the barrier between art and everyday life. In addition, the non-essentialist perspective contradicts the division theory of popular art. The requirements of fashion as a popular art were analyzed based on the value of self-expression through the aesthetic pursuit of creativity and aesthetic expression, discourse as art, and expansion of modern art from the inessentialist perspective of popular art.

---

## I. Introduction

Changes in the position and identity of art have occurred with the shift in society to public enjoyment and consumption of art, which was previously enjoyed only by the privileged classes. The 20th century saw changes in the consumption, forms, and presentation in the media of art. These shifts ultimately obfuscated the notion and realm of art through avant-garde art's attempt to disrupt the concept and form of art.

In aesthetics, popular art was recognized as separate from modernistic art. However, various aspects of contemporary art suggest that this division no longer holds true for contemporary art and aesthetics. The grounds for this are, first, erosion of the boundary between high art and popular art through postmodernism. Second is the generalization of both modernist art and popular art as aesthetic products of an industrialized society and their different countermeasures. Finally, it has been revealed through various art history studies that the theory is an arbitrary rather than confrontational relationship (Youngwook Lee, 2007). Therefore, popular art enjoyed and consumed by the public cannot be disregarded in the art field.

Fashion is a complex field involving aesthetic value of creators, psychological and social expression of consumers, and economic principles. Fashion research is largely divided into design and marketing, within which are specific areas of focus. The artistic value of fashion leads not only to expression contained in the fashion product itself, but also a marketing strategy that utilizes this expression. Unlike fine art, popular art is premised on consumption by the masses, as is fashion, allowing fashion to be viewed as a popular art as a display of artistic value.

Fashion studies related to art have addressed the artistic formativeness of fashion (Kim & Park, 2017; Kim & Park, 2018), the relationships and identities among a creator, fashion designer, and artist (Shin, 2008; Suh, 2021), fashion analysis in connection with art theory (Chae & Yoo, 2010; Suh, 2016), and the relationship between art and fashion (Huh, 2007; Park,

2011; Suh & Kim, 2013). These studies have analyzed the artistry of fashion from various perspectives and indicated a lack of research from the perspective of popular culture. La (2003) has analyzed deconstructive fashion in popular art such as movies and music, and Park and Ha (2021) have analyzed the characteristics of mass art and mass artistic characteristics of modern fashion. However, there was no fashion research including discourse in the art world to define fashion as a popular art.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to analyze the art world's perspective on popular art and its intersection with pure art and to present the requirements of fashion as a popular art. This study is of research significance in analyzing and presenting the requirements of art based on the innate characteristics of fashion based on popular consumption.

The research method of this study consisted of content analysis focusing on books and papers on art and fashion.

## II. Ambiguity of the Concept and Realm of Art

The definition of art has been addressed in the field of aesthetics, and changes in art form have been shown to increase the concept of art.

In the 1950s, the artist who created 'happenings,' Allan Kaprow, agreed to Duchamp's problem-posing about the notion of art and asserted "Art as Life." Robert Rauschenberg, meanwhile, said that "painting is related to both art and life," showing a view about the combination of life and art. Kaprow, in order to prove "Art as Life," tried to destroy the compulsion that art should be positioned in the world of space and time. As a kind of performance, a happening was a work of art created by general people spontaneously, not based on the intentions or plans of artists. It was an experiment to erase the boundary between arts and non-arts, implying that non-art could be art. Happening is an art form created by Allan Kaprow in which not only fixed objects but also the behaviors of artists and spectators, events, and accidents are regarded as art. It included all

of the mental and physical creative activities, either voluntary or random, within the category of art; thus, it anticipated performance art (Riout, 2006). His happenings, which ignored the sacred walls of the white cube, art centers, can be seen as attempts to dilute the boundary between life and art (Min, 2008).

This is an art form created by Allan Kaprow in which not only fixed objects but also the behaviors of artists and spectators, events, and accidents are regarded as art. It included all of the mental and physical creative activities, either voluntary or random, within the category of art; thus, it anticipated performance art (Riout, 2006).

Meanwhile, pop art and minimal art, which were capitalistic art genres utilizing the property of matter in a society, reflected the production system of late capitalism and removed the separation of art and life. Due to the ambiguity of having all objects become arts, this view was criticized by Greenberg, who advocated the perspective of historical art and argued that the format of art is justified in terms of history, based on evolutionism; the neo-avant-garde's artistic concept was, to him, nothing but an "object" which lowered the position of pure arts. Consequently, however, the use of non-art materials and methods – such as metal welding and the silk screen technique – were representative features that determined the future course of contemporary art.

In a work by Rauschenberg titled *Bed*, a bedspread was used as a canvas on which daily objects such as newspaper, clothes, and photos were mingled and coloured by paint; this work combined features of the nihilistic and contemplative ready-mades of Duchamp. Non-art objects became the object of art. This meaning could also be seen in pop art and neo-realism, which used objects of mass production or public consumables. In addition, this could be seen in the minimalism work of Dan Flavin, such as *Monument for V. Tatlin*, which was inspired by Vladimir Tatlin's *Monument to the Third International*.

According to Foster (2001), neo-avant-garde art was not a simple acceptance of the historical avant-garde, but a step forward through creative analysis and

criticism. For example, Jasper Johns's *Flag*, which was created during the period when abstract expressionism in the U.S. was moving toward pop art, reproduced the American flag exactly as the real American flag appeared. By using the traditional encaustic painting technique (*l'encaustique*) – filling the bottom of the canvas with pieces of newspaper and melting pigments into wax – he made a creative and aesthetic work of art. *Flag* did not have an ideological meaning; rather, it was an object of expression. Using *l'encaustique*, which added width to a flat canvas, this work could be seen not as a painting but as an object. It was an avant-garde attempt to mix a quasi-object (*flag*), mass media (newspaper), and a traditional artistic technique (*l'encaustique*).

In addition, Armand Fernandez, a nouveau realism artist from Europe, was influenced by pop art in the U.S. and created junk art using industrial garbage or daily objects as expressive tools. Armand's collection of ready-mades transformed ready-mades into objects of aestheticism and overturned Duchamp's doctrine. In other words, under pop art or nouveau realism, the ready-made was proven to have aesthetic possibilities and institutionality, unlike the historical avant-garde, which made anti-aesthetic attempts through aesthetic indifference (Foster, 2001).

Another aesthetic ready-made work was Andy Warhol's *Brillo Box*. Warhol created the work by making and colouring a Brillo box that could be purchased from a supermarket. This work was a realization or transformation of *Verdinglichung* (物化), and it caused criticism that extended to institutional art, which the historical avant-garde rejected, as the subject of an experiment. According to Foster, pop art regarded the historical avant-garde as a target to challenge, attacked the autonomy of art, and accepted the social creative method and overall view about created objects (Jin, 2010).

The consumer society of the 1960s, with its flourishing post-war economy, faced circumstances where the boundary between high art and public art was ambiguous due to the images produced by mass media.

For the avant-garde, which aimed to overturn tradition and art as life, low-grade and kitsch mass culture were the artistic means that should be absorbed. This was a representative example in which kitsch mass culture became art.

The neo-avant-garde, which used mass media and mass consumables as the means of creation in the 1950s and 1960s, negated the dichotomous outlook that divided art from non-art and high art from public art. Non-art could be included as art, and public art came to be positioned as art.

Modifications in diverse forms of expression and media in 20th-century avant-garde art, such as Nouveau Realism, Happening, Pop Art, and Minimal Art, have resulted in changes in the concept and scope of contemporary art.

### III. Expansion of the Concept of Art to Include Popular Art

In this chapter, expansion of the concept of art was analyzed based on the perspective of popular art in the art world, experimental attempts and hegemony of the art world, and an inessentialist perspective of art. The art world's critical perspective on popular art was based on comparison with avant-garde art and its contrast with value-oriented art. In addition, the intersection of popular art with pure art was identified using ideological strategies and modern hegemony as an aesthetic object brought about by erosion of the boundaries between art and everyday life.

#### 1. Critical Perspectives on Popular Art

1) Critical comparison between popular art and avant-garde art

The avant-garde expansion of the concept and scope of art shows similarities to popular art in terms of genres and the use of mass media. In addition, while creators of traditional fine art took only their own views into account, not considering the perspective of the audience, avant-garde art began to include the viewpoint of

audiences; therefore, avant-garde art was somewhat connected to popular art in the sense that both were based on audiences. Sometimes, avant-garde arts were categorized as high art and distinguished from low-grade, popular arts, but it is also true that to clearly divide popular arts from avant-garde arts is difficult. It seems difficult to elucidate differences in terms of the viewpoints of pop art, which is based on commercial arts such as illustration, trademarks, design, and posters, and the commercial arts. According to Kant, "subjective universality" has equivalence to moral judgment, and it can be interpreted that aestheticism has universality and can garner agreement from all people (Danto, 1997); with this concept, the contemporary arts cannot be discussed any longer. According to Kant, the values of pop art and commercial art should be understood along the same lines.

However, in academic studies of artistic beauty and value, it appears that the recognition of popular art as art and positive views toward popular art are at the beginning stage only. Avant-garde art, meanwhile, appears to occupy the position of high art within the scope of the traditional arts. Despite having similar expressions, avant-garde arts have been evaluated quite differently from popular art in terms of significance and aesthetic value. In evaluating works of popular art, critics contend that they are created in the context of the modernized and industrialized mass society and manufactured/delivered through mass media. However, Noël Carroll refuted this theory of popular art, calling it a sufficient condition rather than a necessary condition and adding that popular arts are those designed to allow easy access to a majority of the public. On the other hand, avant-garde arts have been defined as those which are not devised for mass consumption, but rather for the purpose of being acknowledged as difficult, intelligent, and aesthetically and morally ambiguous due to their distortion of ordinary public sentiment; therefore, these works have been perceived as difficult for the public to appreciate without specific background knowledge or acquired senses (Kim, 2004).

## 2) Criticism of Popular Art Opposed to Value-Oriented Art

In fact, scholars have many different perspectives on the definition of public art. When compared with traditional art, the history of popular art is short and requires continued discussion in the future. As A. Kaplan and Dwight MacDonald observed, institutional art critics were at odds with popular art, which they saw as corrupted and decadent. Many have had such perspectives. For example, Max Hirkheimer and Theodor Adorno viewed twentieth-century art negatively, believing that the commercialization of art was accelerated and influenced by public art; they thought that the creation of artistic values, which was the original function of the arts, had disappeared, and that, as a consequence, the arts were commercialized and decadent. They claimed that the original function of the arts had been to improve human sentiment and foster creativity, but that the cultural industry had standardized human sentiment and made it fall into a habitual routine (Park, 2006).

The cultural products of public art, which offer mere amusement and have familiar, old-fashioned, and commercial features, are sometimes thought to be unrelated to art, though their appearance may be similar. In fact, the term “art” has a value-oriented quality which is serious and unique and does not cater to commercialism. Leo Lowenthal argued that the nature of art is against anything “popular or common” (Park, 1994).

Aspects of the public and the popular have historically been excluded from art and from the nature of fine arts. When eighteenth-century aesthetics was established, beauty (art) was separated from truth (science) and goodness (morality) and limited to creations based on pure aesthetic intentions, different from common forms of art. While art has pursued high quality, purity, autonomy, creativeness, or innovation, public art has pursued low quality, standardization, and even imitation; thus, public art has been considered irrelevant to, or even divergent from, art. This view is firmly rooted in modern culture, especially in the logic of modern art, where high art and public art have engaged in

confrontation since the mid-nineteenth century. In particular, Clement Greenberg wrote in *Avant-garde and Kitsch* that high art has developed artistic identity through differentiation from other genres and media and through self-criticism by Modernism (Youngwook Lee, 2007). Greenberg argued that totalitarian governments, such as those of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin, lowered entire cultures to levels suitable to the public in order to flatter them, and that “art for the public” in capitalistic countries is nothing but propaganda (Jo, 2000).

## 2. The Interface between Popular Art and Fine Art

### 1) Attempts at Art in Contrast with Fine Art using an Ideological Strategy

The separation of Modernism and public culture has collapsed due to suspicions regarding the purity of Modernism and the internal correlation of art with mass culture.

The reasons are the following. First of all, Modernism – whose legitimacy was based on the purity of the artistic medium – was, in fact, used for purposes which were never pure owing to the U.S. government’s political intentions in the Cold War era. After World War II, artists fled to the U.S. from Europe, which had been the center of the art culture; consequently, the center of art was relocated to New York. Because of the political situation during the Cold War era, the U.S. tried to position the nation as the center of the art world. While internationalizing the abstract expressionism of the U.S., the CIA (Central Intelligence Agency) used the purity theory of Greenberg in an effort to establish a U.S. cultural identity representing a liberal democratic country. In addition, abstract expressionist artists were able to gain commercial success by compromising with mass culture, where Modernism drew a line. Along with self-advertisement in magazines such as *Vogue* and *Life*, the expression of public indifference was used as an ideological and commercial means.

In fact, evidence against the division between the aesthetic and practical spheres can be seen in a drawing by Jean Antoine Watteau, the most prominent artist of

the Rococo era, titled Gersaint's Shoppsign. This drawing – his last work and a masterpiece that exemplified the *Fête Galante* – raises questions concerning the aesthetic doctrine that art does not have practical purposes (Danto, 1997). The painting style of Watteau, which focused on festival scenes of couples sharing love with noblemen, was named *Fête Galante*; this style showed representative characteristics of the Rococo era.

Pop art, which walked a tightrope between fine art and public art, was the genre which most successfully reflected society. It used a strategy to prove that the division between fine art and public art was not genuine but merely ideological. Thus, pop art tried to expand the aesthetic range of public art that could be enjoyed in daily life, and thus overcome the alienation that normal people felt toward works by artistic geniuses with special talents. Contemporary aestheticists such as Gernot Bohme, Peter Weibel, Wolfgang Welsch, and Norbert Bolz criticized the strict division between artistic/aesthetic experience and daily life and supported an expanded concept of art. Thus, it was argued that aestheticism should be expanded to daily life given the introduction of new media and mass media, rather than remain limited to conceptual traditional art. Theorists attempted to remove the dichotomy between daily life and art and stated that the division of art based on old-fashioned, conservative views was merely ideological.

Therefore, public art was not an imitation or mimesis of high art; rather it existed together with high art, based on an interconnected relationship. Impressionism, which was the starting point of modernism, expressed the changes to daily life brought on by industrialization with canvas compositions having planar characteristics, in which the internal connectedness between mass culture and a modernistic drawing approach could be seen. This was a time when people experienced changes in daily life owing to the modernization brought on by the Industrial Revolution. Never-before-seen sights at racetracks, circuses, cabarets, opera houses, and cafés were described on canvas. Especially, Japan's *Ukiyo-e* woodcuts, which enjoyed popularity at that time, failed to pursue the principle of reproducibility, which was the basic principle

of Western drawings that had used perspective, perfect composition, and the expression of brightness/darkness. The *Ukiyo-e* style exerted influence over impressionist artists with its expanded sense of space, clear contours, various colours, abstract plane structure, and escape from the center, as though viewing a scene from a high vantage.

The collage technique, which was introduced by the historical *avant-garde* – that is, Cubism, Dadaism, and Surrealism – called people's attention to the fact that daily *objet* could be objects of art. As artists exploited the organic integrity between oil painting and canvas and utilized materials produced through mass production, the wall of pure drawing was torn down. The practice within pop art and Neo-Realism of borrowing cultural elements, such as an *objet*, can be understood in the same context. This meant the removal of the division between beautiful drawings and public culture, and it also revealed the contradiction of the absolute and autonomous relationship of artists to creativeness (Staniszski, 1995).

## 2) Changes in Hegemony Brought about by Erosion of Boundaries between Art and Everyday Life

In the twentieth century, various types of public art produced by the new mass media and mass culture – such as TV, radio, film, and photography – were not included in the scope of art, nor were they called “art.” As such, public art was strictly separated from high art. However, these days, public culture is at the center of contemporary culture. Furthermore, completely ignoring aesthetic experiences during daily life is no longer possible, as the concept of art has expanded in the manner proposed by the *avant-garde*.

By removing the division between art and daily life and selectively employing mass culture, the *avant-garde* expanded the area of social activity; thus, the boundary between high art and mass culture was reshaped amid the interconnectedness of the cultural facets of capitalistic society.

Some argued that, although the popular nature of public art and the seriousness of high art are different,

they need each other in a complementary manner. This standpoint arose from the fact that the public nature of art had proliferated in daily life and become something to be studied as an aesthetic possibility. The public and commercial nature of public art is one of the factors for which popular culture is denigrated, but the essentially commercial nature of public culture is inevitable in today's art. For example, English pop artist Richard Hamilton argued that no artist can escape from the modern capitalistic society, where the commercial mindset is dominant, and no artist can remain aloof from the public reaction to, or commercial success of, their art (Park, 2006). Notwithstanding the abundance of negative views regarding mass culture art, Marshall McLuhan raised the question of why the popular nature of such art should exclude it from the scope of art. He thought that the commercial nature of public art should not be a reason to denigrate it. Thus, the avant-garde appears to have paved the way for the attempt to include today's public art within the scope of art.

Meanwhile, French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu observed that one of the social functions of art was to divide a certain class from other classes. He said that art was a cultural asset for social classification. However, if the art of noblemen and the bourgeois class seized the hegemony of art in the past, it can be argued that public art or public culture seizes hegemony in the present (Park, 2006).

The study of aestheticism targets a group of artistic works created based on the ideological customs of a certain group amid specific social conditions; therefore, the determination of a target of aestheticism is arbitrary. In addition, it is not possible to establish an essential boundary between high art and public culture (Staniszewski, 1995), which mutually define each other and have an equivalent position. Accordingly, there is no reason that public art should not be a target of aestheticism.

### 3. Popular Art from the Inessentialist Perspective

Traditionally, definitions of the essence of art could

broadly be classified into the theory of beauty, representation theory, expression theory of art, and theory of form. In the early twentieth century, Wittgenstein began a movement that had a critical perspective and began to use the term "essentialism" for all of the previously mentioned definitions of art (Hae-Sook Kim & Hae-Ryeon Kim, 1998). The American aesthetician Morris Weitz, who applied aesthetics to the philosophy of Wittgenstein, stated that none of the established art theories, including the representation theory, expression theory, and theory of form, was sufficient to define art. Weitz also stated that, whereas each theory held significance in opening possibilities to survey the various characteristics of art, the theories were incapable of producing a uniform answer in terms of universal laws or norms and would continue to possess such limitations in the future.

Weitz, who abandoned metaphysical research on suspicions regarding the essence of art, argued that certain similarities can be found within art, demonstrating a hierarchical relationship. This is similar to Ludwig Wittgenstein's "family resemblance," which states that some similarity can be discovered among members regardless of a commonality within the entire family. An agreeable definition of art cannot exist if the essence of art varies by era, negating the theory. The creative direction of art is to continuously pursue newness and reject limitations.

That is, the concept of art has been understood differently according to era. In addition, no theory is believed to embrace all of the definitions for the essence of art, particularly when considering the case of expanded contemporary art. This variability can be understood through the anti-essentialist open concept of Morris Weitz. Because art has continuously changed and pursued newness, there can be no essence of art that applies to all eras; this makes it impossible to define the essence of art. The dichotomous modern way of thinking is characterized by receptive flexibility, exemplified by the open concept. Weitz's argument – that it is necessary to acquire a more comprehensive understanding and application of art – has served as a method for

interpreting the ambiguous boundaries of expanded contemporary art.

This inessentialist viewpoint allowed opportunity for change in the contemporary perspective, which view popular art and high art as different entities.

#### IV. Requirements of Fashion as a Popular Art

The use of media expanded with prompting from the avant-garde, and the boundaries between high culture and popular culture were broken down after post-modernism. This, in turn, triggered the expansion and deformation of the previously stable concept and scope of art, allowing art and fashion to cross the boundary separating them and develop a complementary relationship. The expansion of the art domain has led to the creation of a new concept of art, which is extensive enough to include the controversial domain of fashion.

Despite criticism from the art world that popular art lacks inherent meaning and is anti-value-oriented art, popular art is now occupying a vital role in the field of art that cannot be excluded by modern art theory, which includes aesthetic experience in everyday life as art, and by contemporary artists and theorists who argue that the commerciality and popular nature of popular art are not elements of exclusion in art. In the same context, popular music and popular films have a strong influence in the field, and public antipathy against discrimination against fine arts is emerging.

From this point of view, this study addresses issues raised in popular art to fashion, and the requirements of fashion as popular art are 'fashion as an object of communication through aesthetic pursuit', 'fashion leading discourse as art,' and 'popular art.' The analysis was based on fashion from an inessentialist perspective of popular art.

##### 1. Fashion as an Object of Communication through Aesthetic Pursuits

Fashion is created when an outfit – the designer's creative work – is copied and accepted by a

community. In this sense, clothing depends on the progressive spirit of the designer, whereas fashion is continuously effective when dependent on the needs of observers and consumers (Loschek, 2009). Thus, the acceptance of the public is fundamentally required. This public acceptance of fashion creates the perception that, as an industry of mass consumption, fashion corresponds with popular interests and neglects aesthetic values and meanings, thus excluding aesthetic, artistic subjects.

However, since fashion is a form of visual art such as painting or sculpture, Hollander's claim that aesthetic evaluation should be prioritized over social, political, economic, and functional necessities of fashion demonstrates the importance of the aesthetic value of fashion. In emphasizing the aesthetic aspect, fashion emphasizes the image of the ideal body rather than actual body shape (Negrin, 2012), and this self-expression through fashion is a tool for expressing individuality, psychology, and aesthetic standards within a society. Therefore, although the pursuit of business value in fashion is seen to disparage the aesthetic value of fashion, it functions as a form of self-expression of human creativity and of a public aesthetics considering emotions. To categorize fashion as an art – as a subject of communication achieved through artistic pursuits rather than consumer efficiency – one can use creative attempts and communicative methods that deviate from outdated forms.

Unlike the pure art of elitism, popular art, which considers commercialism an important virtue, fundamentally exists only through communication with the public. In this way, fashion that is consumed by and communicated among the public represents the value of popular art.

##### 2. Fashion Leading the Discourse as Art

Following the industrial revolution of the nineteenth century, new arts such as film, photography, and fashion were mass produced to provide standard, low-grade, aesthetic products to the public, an audience that was not seen in previous generations. Thus, an artistic

hierarchy between low-grade and sophisticated works does not exist in the popular arts (Yunyoung Lee, 2007). Nevertheless, the possibility of art is not established when these genres forego aesthetic pursuits. Therefore, they cannot become a tool of artistic expression without adaptation to simple re-production and low-grade public interests.

Therefore, various discourses are needed on the value and role of fashion as a product of mass consumption in modern society, as are statements on fashion based on complex factors such as ideas, actions, and changes leading the flow of culture as modern art.

This discourse can be created through the media. However, the function of a fashion magazine that is distributed based on popularity and commercialization does not result in constructive fashion discourse but in the absence of critical comments. The accusation that there is no tradition of serious criticism and the absence of a culture of criticism is because the fashion industry has an excessively close relationship with the media (Svendsen, 2006), which is used as a fashion marketing tool.

Resolution of this problem caused by complex entanglement of the influence of marketing separately from the creative work of fashion can be achieved through critical fashion discourse in the unbiased academic field. In addition, the types of media consumed today have diversified through the Internet, in which YouTube, as a representative medium, is somewhat free from interests and has fewer restrictions on discourse formation. The Internet is rife with consumer criticism and can provide an opportunity to expand the discourse of fashion as an art in an open space.

### 3. Fashion from the Inessentialist Perspective

The mass production of clothing, which began with America's cultivation of the mass culture industry in the mid-twentieth century, helped position fashion at the center of the popular culture art industry. In today's changed society, popular culture is viewed as a different kind of art from the traditional, sophisticated art,

promoting the perception of fashion as an art domain. Popular art is designed based on the consumption of a majority. According to this definition, fashion corresponds with art in that it inherently keeps public consumption in mind. However, discussions on popular art remain controversial because not all fashion works are based on mass consumption, and other popular arts must be considered, as well. For example, although art films are presented in the form of movies – the media form of popular culture – only a minority of these films is enjoyed by a large audience. In this case, it is unclear whether such art films must be classified as popular art.

Given the extensive spectrum of fashion products, it is not easy to standardize the notion of fashion when affirming it as an area to be included in the scope of popular art. This is because, although fashion designed for the consumption of the majority can enter the scope of popular art, a certain feature of the clothing may be evaluated as fine art and not created for public consumption. However, one cannot dispute the fact that painting is a form of art even though some paintings may lack the standards and conditions to be acknowledged as artwork. In addition, it is not easy to classify all of the films produced by mass media as popular art when there are art films produced without popular appeal. In this situation, controversy can arise over whether popular art ought to be viewed as an art category or whether works should be evaluated and classified individually. However, even though it is reasonable to say that popular works of art compose popular arts, one must not expect common properties from all mass art. This perspective is called the "Inessentialism of Mass Art" and can be understood in the same context as Wittgenstein's inessentialistic perspective on art. Thus, from this viewpoint, all fashion products can be placed within the category of popular art.

There is no reason to exclude the popular culture of fashion from art; this culture embraces the problem regarding the value of re-production that appears in the mass production process from the inessentialistic perspective of popular art. The previous perspective,

viewing only fine art as art, can no longer reject the expansion of new art forms by the mass media. This leaves the transformed aesthetic topic displayed by the expansion and diversification of art media.

## V. Conclusion

In order to analyze and derive the requirements of fashion as a popular art, this study first discussed critical thinking about expansion of the art realm through popular art within the boundaries of the blurred art concept and, in contrast, the point of contact between avant-garde art and fine art and art from an inessentialist perspective.

The following are the art world's critical perspectives on popular art. First, popular art is appraised independently from avant-garde art, which has a similar formal expression to popular art but also inner meaning and worth not easily perceived by the general public due to its elite nature. Second, popular art can be viewed as corny and commercial fads, in contrast to the notion of value-oriented art.

On the contrary, as a point of contact of popular art and pure art is avant-garde art's assaults against the use of pure ideological techniques. Second, the shift in hegemony brought about by blurring of the line between art and everyday life establishes popular art as an aesthetic object.

Changes in contemporary art theoretically require a re-definition of the essence and concept of art, and the inessentialist view that no one theory can define the essence of art has led to dissolution of the division theory of popular art.

The requirements of fashion as a popular art derived based on this analysis are as follows.

First, fashion acts as a visual art by demonstrating the value of self-expression through the aesthetic quest of creativity and aesthetic expression beyond the consumption efficiency of fashion and the search for commercial value.

Second, a fashion discourse that leads the debate as a new art should be established. Expanded discourse in

open space will be created through diverse media that are less influenced by business interests and more by constructive academic critique.

Third, from the standpoint of Inessentialism of popular art, which rejects the idea of common attributes among artworks, fashion can be accommodated based on its value of mass production, demonstrating the expansion of modern art.

As part of a study on the position and characteristics of fashion can be established as popular art based on widespread consumption and use in culture. In the context of contemporary culture, where media evolve quickly, these research findings may need to be revised with additional changes in popular art.

## References

- Chae, H., & Yoo, Y. (2010). Research on British fashion in the view of avant-garde. *Journal of Basic Design & Art*, 11(1), 397-410.
- Danto, A. (1997). *After the end of art: Contemporary art and pale history* (4th ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Foster, H. (2001). *The return of the real: The avant-garde at the end of the century*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Huh, J. (2007). 20세기 현대 미술과 패션의 상호작용에 관한 연구 [A study on the interaction of 20th century modern art and fashion]. *Journal of The Korean Society of Fashion Design*, 7(2), 189-203.
- Jin, H. (2010). *아방가르드란 무엇인가: 아방가르드 미술, 도전과 새로움의 역사* [What is the avant-garde: Avant-garde art, a history of challenges and novelties]. Seoul: Mineumsa.
- Jo, J. (2000). Avant-garde and modernism: On its conceptual confusion. *The Korean Journal of Aesthetics*, 29, 171-197.
- Kim, Y. (2004). N. Carroll's concept of mass art. *Journal of Korean Philosophical Society*, 91, 45-68.
- Kim, Y., & Park, S. (2017). A study on the characteristics of artistic formativeness in modern fashion: Focused on the characteristics of Konstantin

- Mel'nikov's works. *Journal of The Korean Society of Fashion Design*, 17(1), 35–53.
- Kim, Y., & Park, S. (2018). An analysis of the characteristics of geometric and artistic formativeness in modern fashion: Focusing on the conceptual and functional modernism. *Journal of the Korean Society of Costume*, 68(4), 36–55.
- La, U. S. (2003). A study on the deconstructional fashion expressed in the popular art. *Journal of Communication Design*, 13, 28–36.
- Lee, Y. [Youngwook]. (2007). 대중예술문화 [Popular art culture]. In Editorial Committee for the Korean Companion to Aesthetics (Ed.), *Contemporary art and aesthetics* (pp. 241–253). Seoul: Seoul National University Press.
- Lee, Y. [Yunyoung]. (2007). 영화의 지위 논쟁: 영화는 예술인가? [Controversy over the status of film: Is film art?]. In Editorial Committee for the Korean Companion to Aesthetics (Ed.), *Contemporary art and aesthetics* (pp. 87–98). Seoul: Seoul National University Press.
- Loschek, I. (2009). *When clothes become fashion*. New York, NY: Berg.
- Min, B. (2008, March 15). 연금술을 부정한 연금술사의 딜레마 [The alchemist's dilemma who denied alchemy]. *Artrade*. Retrieved August 20, 2022, from <http://artrade.egloos.com/1626746>
- Negrin, L. (2012). Aesthetics: Fashion and aesthetics– A fraught relationship. In A. Geczy & V. Karaminas (Eds.), *Fashion and art* (pp. 43–54). London, England: Berg.
- Park, S. B. (1994). What is the aesthetics of popular arts?. *The Korean Journal of Aesthetics*, 19, 119–135.
- Park, S. M. (2011). An observation on characteristic of mutual-borrowing paradigm in twentieth century fashion and art. *Journal of the Korean Society of Costume*, 61(7), 80–100.
- Park, S., & Ha, J. (2021). Characteristics of mass art in contemporary fashion. *Journal of The Korean Society of Fashion Design*, 21(1), 53–69. doi:10.18652/2021.21.1.4
- Park, Y. (2006). 대중문화, 예술과 일상의 구분 지우기 [Popular Culture, breakdown of boundary between art and ordinariness]. In Philosophical Academy (Ed.), *Philosophy, read art* (pp. 123–141). Paju, Korea: Dongnyok.
- Riout, D. (2006). *What is modern art?*. (J. Jung Trans.). Seoul: Noonbit Publishing. (Original work published 2000).
- Shin, J. (2008). Theoretical inquiry into the relationship between fashion and art: Focusing on the relationship between the artist and fashion, and between the fashion designer and art. *Journal of the Korean Society of Costume*, 58(8), 1–12.
- Staniszewski, M. A. (1995). *Believing is Seeing: Creating the culture of an art*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Suh, S. (2016). Essentials of fashion as art from the perspective of George Dickie's institutional theory of art. *Journal of Fashion Business*, 20(5), 1–15. doi:10.12940/jfb.2016.20.5.1
- Suh, S. (2021). Comparative analysis of the roles and identities of artists and fashion designers. *Journal of Fashion Business*, 25(6), 70–80. doi:10.12940/jfb.2021.25.6.70
- Suh, S., & Kim, Y. (2013). Fashion as art through the expansion of aesthetic concept of contemporary art and fashion. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, 37(4), 577–589. doi:10.5850/JKSCT.2013.37.4.577
- Svendsen, L. (2013). *Fashion: A Philosophy*. (S. Do Trans.). Seoul: MID. (Original work published 2004).

Received (November 24, 2022)

Revised (December 22, 2022)

Accepted (December 23, 2022)

저자 서승희는 현 편집위원장으로 역임 중이나 이 논문의 게재를 결정하는 데 어떠한 역할도 하지 않았으며 관련된 잠재적인 이해상충도 보고되지 않았음.