(Devouring Danto: The Dark Side of the End of Art; Tomáš Murár).

There is no need of something outside for the existence of a such system. However, in the same time it cannot exist separated from the outer world. Thus when the general conditions change, the change is required in its own being in order to negate its self-sufficiency to be able to control its own ends and beginnings. Such changes can lead to the end of one type of form or content, however, when one such variable in the self-sufficient system ends and even affects other variables included in the system, the constant remains the same, because it is not governed by a linear (historical) flow, how might suggests Hegelian concept used by Danto, but by its own premises securing its existence by negating itself, thus as an open structural emergence of the meaning in the given time and place. Therefore, the end of art does not mean a disappearing of art’s meaning, but it provides vitalizing shifts in the order to retain art’s meaning; ends of art are stipulations of art’s existence in a given system of society governing art’s possibility to exist as art.

When Danto ended art as art history, he revealed his own position in the social system in which occurred the need to retrieve not the essence of art, but its social comprehension. Danto’s end of art, viewed from the perspective how Luhmann understood the concept, can be thus taken as only another inevitable end produced by art in order to validate its own continuation by its social comprehension. When Danto thought about the art historical development from Vasari to Gombrich and Greenberg as not capturing the essence of art, it was not that these concepts were not able to grasp the essence of art in general – which is unrealizable until art exists in any social structures giving it its meaning – rather they were unable to show what art meant in Danto’s social conditions in the mid-1980s.