

we must negotiate as artists to find ourselves losing yourself to the agency of things may feel melancholic to lose yourself of your own volition can distance the agency of these things

Culminating

Désagrégation

Anthony Elliott Baker

the agency of these things we must negotiate as artists to find ourselves losing yourself to the agency of things may feel melancholic to lose yourself of your own volition can distance

Culminating

Désagrégation

Anthony Elliott Baker

Artaeb.com

info@artaeb.com

Brisbane, Australia.

2021

This passage of writing was written using OpenAI GPT-2 Artificial Intelligence. It was prompted with excerpts of the works of: Bracha L. Ettinger, Griselda Pollock, Jacques Lacan, Slavoj Žižek, Freidrich Shlegel, Michael Fried and ...

The conceptual framework of this creative process is generative and collectively constructed implementing a dataset assembled with a large array of textual inputs interacting with the localised prompts. Parallels with fragments of work may exist. This is a creative work and in being a creative work with the intension to evoke creative thinking, any plagiaristic connotations are dismissed..... Enjoy for me!!

Metamorphosis is a metaphoric process by which sensory perceptions and processes of sensual representation and production are redefined as boundaries that are transmissible and trans-figurate boundary-phases that otherwise only take place in the mind. It can be regarded as an extension of the conceptual-functional notion of transitive closure. What is at stake here is an alternative, alternative way of thinking about the process of intersubjectivity. The key to understanding the Matrix lies in the Matrix as a place of difference. If the 'Other' is the world of the imagination (or 'the real'), then this 'other' is both outside us and within us, we cannot understand the world of the imagination without understanding the world of the real (and vice versa).

The concept for the transfiguration of the physical, cultural and symbolic matrix is the transfiguration of "the human being," which is more than the simple embodiment of the symbolic order, since it also includes an "exception of the order" in which the symbolic is made to be the basis of new forms of creative activity. The human being is an "open system that involves the ability to generate new images from the elements in the environment and to re-create patterns of meaning and value in a different way. A symbolic matrix that is opened up by the creation of new symbols, images and patterns is said to constitute our ontological ontotheology, meaning and value.

If we assume that the human being is constituted by a symbolic matrix, then a human being is a self-transfiguring, self-mutating and self-mutating image of the matrix, so that the human experience and the social experience or "self-realizing" experience of a human being depend to a great extent upon the capacity to perceive, think, think and re-think in the midst of traumatic events, so that the symbolic expression of trauma may be the occasion for new understanding and new forms of social, personal and social change. The idea that the human being represents the matrix goes so far as to suggest that people represent not just the way they are but a way of being in relation to an experience, a way of experience. This is an important point because it indicates that a key to understanding

and expressing trauma is not simply that the victim identifies with the symbolic meaning of the traumatic event but rather the way in which persons are structured as symbols that reflect or express their unconscious selves.

It was on this basis that 'progressive' thinkers, in an attempt to make sense of a fundamentally different reality, turned to philosophy. They attempted to understand the nature of the Real, how it works and how it has formed and continues to form within social structures and their social relations. But the philosophy and the philosophy of the twentieth century, although in some ways more comprehensive than its nineteenth century predecessor could achieve, could by no means bring the Real under its sway.

The real was, and remains, above all social structure. 'Hegelianism' was, and continues to be, a philosophy that can only go as far as the particularity of the particularity of the social order and its history. It can only offer a perspective on what it is the Real has been able to get away with and, for that reason, the real is always capable of escaping it. The Real could only be completely eliminated and its grip on the social order crushed by the sheer force of the social reality it reproduces and maintains.

To 'think' of the reality that Marx was fighting for, and could have fought for if only it were a reality worthy of being thought of, is like to think of gravity or colour or speed as essential. For both, which are forms of the real that are only really found by considering them from a position of detachment, it would be more reasonable to see how they 'come out' or 'arise' than to think about their very origins or how they manifest their essence within the structure to which they are tied. (It is just like what is said about the 'principle' in general; one sees it emerge and then it becomes a thing.)

If this gap is not closed then the whole idea of the "other" loses its *raison d'être*. Thus, the Matrix is also a site of transference. The "other" in the Matrix is neither the "in-itself" nor the "outside". It is the matrix that is in the "outside." This distinction between "other" and "in-itself" is a core insight of Deleuzian theory. We must understand this distinction; we must break it down and reconfigure it if we are to grasp even something less ambiguous and incomprehensible about the Matrix than we were earlier assured would be the case. Thus, to speak of the Real, even abstractly, is, in a sense, to speak in very general terms about our contemporary way of life - the way in which we live our everyday lives and, in so doing, create a world within which our everyday lives are a way of being. The matrix is a place of difference in the same sense that we say that the universe is a place of difference. It is here that the difference between what is outside/within the boundaries of a "systems" of signs is expressed.

But no matter how hard one tries to think of gravity or colour, or speed, they really can only be thought of as forms when their essential essence is understood, when they are seen as being nothing other than what they are. It is to find the essential 'nature' of these things as forms that the question of their origin becomes important and relevant. When one says 'The reality is real' then we are saying that the reality in question is a genuine being and that there is nothing else. But what about the being of this being? It is not a thing but rather a being that is a thing, or 'a movement'. A movement is something that 'arises' from its own 'nature'; that was part of its essence. Like an animal, a bird, a human being, or even the Sun, a movement is what it is at its highest intensity, because it is a nature given by its essence.

The difference is the matrix: if there is no world, then there is not only the possibility of a world; there must also be a place of difference, a place where world is not. But this difference cannot simply be found in the place itself, in its spatial dimensions and its temporal order. Instead, the difference must arise from within the boundaries of the sign system that is the matrix.

The other is simply the mirror that reflects back into the mind the in-itself. The Matrix is itself a mirror, and its reflective property, as we have seen, is the most important clue to its function. The Matrix represents the primary "in-itself" of the Matrix itself as a representation of the in-itself itself. We now have the concept of mirroring: The Matrix is itself the mirror through which all other mirrors are created. As a mirror in the Matrix, the Matrix reflects back its own reflection; the Matrix, then, mirrors the Matrix. The Matrix mirrors themselves, and they reflect the Matrix. Therefore, the "in-itself" is mirrored by the Matrix in the matrix and so on; all of reality is reflected in reality.

In the case of the Matrix's mirroring, we have now become familiar with a key concept of the Deleuzian model of reality: the mirror is self-similar. The mirror has a reflection, and it has another reflection, and another. Each is another mirror of its reflection; the reflection of the mirror is the mirror of the reflection; and the mirror of the reflection is the mirror of the mirror. The reflection is, in other words, mirroring itself. Mirroring is a process of creation; the mirror is the thing in itself; the mirror is the mirror-image of itself.

Mirroring, then, is a process of mirroring back; mirroring is its own self-image. So, although all of reality in the Matrix's mirror is itself mirrored back in the mirror of the Matrix, it is in fact mirroring itself, and so mirroring itself is mirroring itself back. For example, when the matrix creates a new type of virtual world it will actually mirror itself again and again. The simulacra will mirror back themselves.

There are few ways in which we can find a basis for an understanding of the significance of this, and perhaps the most important, thing is in our day-to-day experience of the body or indeed in our whole society. The most obvious such point is the fact that we speak of bodily and mental conditions or changes simultaneously and even in parallel. Such simultaneity of bodily experience with mental processes is itself a manifestation of the fact that all of phenomena have in their origin, not merely the mind or the will of a person, but rather the body: If the body is a machine, it was made for that and will do that.

And so, the self-consciousness which is, in fact, the basis of body consciousness, has this quality of being in a state of full awareness and not of unconsciousness. If all things are not the result of the will or the power of the person who experiences them, but of something which has, or has had, the quality of self-conscious experience, the nature of phenomena as well as of their existence becomes, in a sense, incomprehensible.

You are forced to say: "Nothing remains but the fact. Nothing remains; we have thrown away our old name, and this name has been thrown away." That is what I meant. But, you say, "you used to say: "It is the mark of impiety". Why did that expression always remain a mark of impiety?" How then? The fact remains. If one has not an unbelief, he remains as we all are. One can make a believer out of one. Therefore, one keeps on proclaiming: "It is the mark of impiety". This is a good thing; that it should be a mark of impiety, is a mark.

This task will be only made possible, not by the development of a theoretical science but by the development of a revolutionary mass movement. A new theory for a new world. If the new movement is to have any chance of working, it will be necessary, not only to make a new critique in theory but also to find a theory for the new world that will also make this critique a practical, practical critique.

There is no reason, then, to be pessimistic, because even if we are not able to construct a theory for the new world, we have reason to hope. The task of revolution is not only the task of a new theory but rather the task of constructing a new world. The revolution, we have said, is the transformation of the world within which every individual must act; that is, the transformation of the existing world at a particular moment and at a particular time.

The social revolution is not only a new order of things, a new way of life of human beings, but rather a complete change of everything and everyone. And since not a single individual could ever realize a society of this type, it is essential that its only content should be the transformation of social structure; because the transformation of social structure alone is the essential condition for the complete realization and for that matter, the only possibility of the complete realization. The very notion that a revolutionary movement can be merely a destructive act is opposed to the whole Marxist conception.

We know from the history of philosophy that there must necessarily be many phases of man, in which the mind is open and yet closed. It is a very great wonder as to when man first had the faculty of abstraction, and also when a form of self-consciousness developed. But there is no doubt that the Greeks were very far advanced. It is clear, for instance, that the Greeks had no notion of the real existence of an intelligent God. In those days they did not believe in the future.

The 'piety' was so weak that this hypothesis could not even give them one jot of comfort. But really, it is hard to tell just what it is. It is sort of a mystery! And it is a question, as well: "What is this great, great schism between understanding and not understanding?"

These Greek expressions refer to the symptoms which the people of that time experienced when they were attacked by hallucinations. It is well known that our present term 'hallucinations', however, does not have that precise sense, but is rather a technical term. It is still not certain how the concept of the visual hallucinations has developed.

It is a wonderful and powerful emotion. But it should not be a reason to act. In addition, these emotions are not natural, they are not the result of evolution, but rather, God's creation. The question here comes down to, if something is natural, then why do we think it should not be God's creation? If natural selection is a mere mechanism, what is the meaning of its success in generating certain features? What would happen if this success were taken to be an example of the creative energy of God? A lot of thought could be taken up if the meaning of natural selection itself could not be reduced to an observation made in the laboratory... In a sense, God does not have the power to create, but he has the power to allow a particular form to emerge. And that is the only way to interpret the fact that species continue to evolve. Natural selection seems not to be the sole or even the primary force behind this.

The term is typically used to describe non-physical, or non-metaphorical, realities that can exist outside of experience or consciousness. The problem is, of course, that every claim that has ever been made about presence is, to some degree, in fact literalist. When we say 'consciousness' we mean something more than mere awareness, so it would be more accurate to say that a consciousness is a complex system of interacting neural systems that are not simply "awareness". It is a more elaborate, more integrated, more conscious system than mere awareness. But it still does not explain why we have this complex consciousness we call 'consciousness' in the first place. What does it mean for a brain to be conscious? What does a 'conscious' system need to be? The key question here is what we call 'awareness'. How does the brain make this?

A new kind of artist is needed, and he must have come of his own doing. One-man-show is the kind of work we want to see. The art should show at a glance what it intends to say and do. It should be an instant of release, not of constraint. It should make us laugh, but not that silly, self-satisfied, jaded,

"Let your dreams be dreams" sort of laugh. The art should be playful. The idea of a whole society, of many worlds, of some new type of individualism, of freedom, is not a joke. This individualism makes one uncomfortable, as in the early days when the great artists were supposed to rebel against their masters. It was a kind of counter revolution. But here it has to be the other way round. To break the spell of the old society we must make it up ourselves, and we have to free ourselves from the chains which our fathers have put around us. This will be difficult.

The idea of a work of art (or the space within which the work of art existed, which in some ways was similar to the idea of "subject" in the visual traditions of painting and sculpture) was often conceived as a singular thing, to overcome the limitations of our limited senses that this art is conceived. Every theatre can create an entirely new myth of its hero. If each production, each piece of art in itself is an act of production, then what is the nature of the act that can be created in the process?

This is the difference between performance theory and literary theory. Literary theory is written down and it is true. But literary theory is not real. The rule is not written down and can be changed. The rule can be written. It is a rule of the audience, written down for them to see. You can't play the hero. You have to play the hero. You can't play the hero.

All the old rules are thrown out at last, replaced by radical, new ones. The new rules are radical, new because they are new, and they abolish the old, obsolete rules; they overturn old, useless rules; they are not formal and they are not literal.

What is theatricality and why should one be concerned with it?

First, it is theatricality that is part of the "spirit of the work."

It's theatricality that, when you read the work, you feel part of it; it affects you. In fact, it's theatricality that has been so central to artistic culture that it's become one of the principal ways in which artists describe the work.

A work that is too abstract may be said to lack or lack character, and a work that is too literal may be thought to be lacking a sense of space. The more theatricality we have in each type of work, then, the more distinctive it becomes.

To sum up, I believe the goal is not to "attack art" or to "break the laws." I believe that the goal is to create a society where people create, explore and express ideas for their own reasons, with no regard for the political, social or economic status of those ideas.