

artists were neglected or condemned until they were dead and their works could be separated from their creators' intentions and treated as impersonal commodities (Berger, 1965: pp. 203/204).

The cultural ideology that probably serves well to what is increasingly labelled as the “tourism industry” – and one cannot really blame it too much for this – can be comprehended as a sanctuary for everything from artists’ narcissism to what is considered the “taste”. This supposedly distinguishes class from masses, high from lowbrow, the West from the rest, and “us” from “them”. This ideology is quite transparently based on a projection into the past, in which a construction of a world, in which “true values” were respected, is the central invented idea. As we know this imaginary world of “true art” is attached to the time of romanticism, which is also the time of the peak of aesthetics as a philosophic discipline. As Berger persuasively argued, such a “world” actually never existed.

Let us then return to the problem of the so-called “falling barriers”. The meaning of this term in the text, that we are trying to decipher more closely, consists of two (possible) aspects: the first meaning refers to breaking through barriers by artists and/or their works. We may connect this meaning to Immanuel Kant’s rule of genius, which operates outside of specific rules (Kant, 1997, §46). In a different language and a different context of modernity, we are talking here about inventions, about new ideas and things, exhibitions and performances.¹ The other aspect concerns barriers between fine and commercial art. The difficulty, which we found in distinguishing between them, can be taken as an indication that the phrase about the “barriers that have fallen” refers to something like this. No matter what the writers “really meant”, we may ask here whether there is an overlapping between both meanings. The answer most definitely is that there is such overlapping, before, within, and after the period, which is the object of the book *Art Without Boundaries*, but in the period between 1950 – 1970 such an intersecting is especially obvious. As much as one could agree or disagree with the authors’ selection of over the apparently most representative

1 “Essentialists” would claim that these inventions and the genius behind it are somehow “god given” and, therefore, they cannot pass un-recognized. However, in the period of modernity inventions in different arts that often break a wide range of rules and defy social and moral conventions, become, in such a view, questionable as products of a “genius”. The essentialist approach, therefore, must succumb to the very traditional idea of art and in its normally (but not as a rule) conservative discourse tries to set the cannon as determining the limits of the artistic expression, which qualifies to be recognized as such.