

# Borut Savski – Orakelj (2004/2010)

Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika:

- orakelj -kla m (a) pri starih Rimljanih preročišče: oditi v orakelj / delfski orakelj / prerokba
- orakeljski -a -o /k\*lj/ prid. (a) nanašajoč se na orakelj: orakeljske besede / ekspr. dobil je orakeljski odgovor - nejasen, dvoumen

## Preročišče

Projekt ORAKELJ izhaja iz mitskega in zato popolnoma funkcionalnega sistema Oraklja/ preročišča, ki ga dekonstruiramo in potem ponovno sestavimo. Na ta način se mnogo bolj zavemo vseh sestavnih delov – vseh plasti, ki so se v človeški zgodbini na podlagi človeške psihologije sestavili v tako efektno podobo, kot je podoba/ telo Oraklja/ preročišča. Pri mitskih telesih je sicer tako, da se primarno funkcionalna – se jih neposredno uporablja – o razlogih za njihov obstoj se ne razmišlja – podobno kot mobilni telefon uporabljamo, ne vemo pa kako deluje. Nekaj drugje sem dozkaloval, da to okno funkcionalnosti/ uporabe za določen čas zapre možnosti razumevanja, ki se tiče obravnavanega telesa/ objekta. Tudi skoraj nemogoči kakšno koli umetniško rabo, ki sodi bolj v segment razvoja, oziroma razmisleka in torej ne-uporabe - oziroma sodi na področje ne-tipične rabe. Neuporaba je lahko ne-še-uporaba ali ne-več-uporaba. Antični orakelj je ravno prav odmaknjen, da ga lahko z razmislekom dekonstruiramo, hkrati pa je tako temeljen človeški koncept, da nas napeljuje da ga poiščemo v kakšni od metamorfoz, ki jih re/producira sodobni svet.

Osnovna vloga Oraklja je v njegovi podobi očeta/ gospodarja - nekoga, na katerega se nanašamo (z vprašanji; kot na referenčno polje definicij, pomenov) - nekoga, ki ga gledamo, zato ker on nas gleda - ker je njegov pogled/ odziv/ mnenje naša referenca - torej simbolično polje moči. Ker mu dodelimo kredibilnost – dovolimo mu, da se on odloča namesto nas: žreba namesto nas - nas gleda od zgoraj navzdol - torej nadzira; njegov pogled ustvarja/ predstavlja/ reprezentira simbolno/ evalvaciju polje - trdno strukturo: jasno razločevanje dobrega in zlega, pravilnega in napačnega – torej: sistem Resnice. Na njegovi strani je vedenje, obvladovanje preteklosti in prihodnosti – torej: Absolutno. Tu smo tako že uvideli funkcionalnost človeškega boga. Na drugi strani ostane človek, spet deloma pomjanščan za tako delegirano avtonomijo odločanja – v logi otroka – oziroma v sodobnem svetu: v vlogi konzumenta. Človek se je odločil poenostaviti svoje življenje in je izumil boga - stroj za resnico. Oziroma v primeru manjših bogov: druge reprezentacijske sisteme gospodarstva/ gospodarstva.

## Povednost povedanega

Kljub imenu/ pomenu (Orakelj ima v korenju pomen govoriti, povedati) pa je v antični varianti njegovo povedano vedno poudarjeno dvoumeno in v primarni obliki skoraj vedno nerabno – vendar pa s tem odprt za interpretacije. Ta princip je vgrajen v sam sistem Oraklja in njegovega napovedovanja/ pripovedovanja. Stroj torej vrne žogico človeku – sam se odločaj! Kar nam orakelj predloži sicer ni enoznačna resnica, ampak reducirani sistem resnice - odločamo se lahko na podlagi enega povedanega stavka, oziroma misli in nam ni treba jemati v obzir celotne negleprednost sveta. Ne glede na kriptičnost odgovora, ki je vsebovana v sistemu, je pomeč dobrodošča.

Po drugi strani pa lahko opazujemo, da se sistem resnice/ moči s svojo immanentno netočnostjo odgovora na nek način izolira, osamosvoji – postane telo s sebi lastnim smislom/ domišljijo/ humorjem – in proizvaja lastno estetiko. Govorjeno je lahko celo le naključno besednozvočno pretakanje. Če povedano ni popolnoma funkcionalno za javno rabo, je lahko s pomočjo oddaljenega pogleda, s strani stroja tudi poljubno kreativno. In če ni več uporabno niti za javno rabo, potem je lahko Orakljevo klokotanje morda le še umetniško izvajanje.

## Relevantnost odločitve

Interpretacija sicer reducirane orakeljske izjave vseeno zahteva proces odločanja, ki je običajno odločanje za diametralno nasprotno poti: če greš na levo - ne boš šel na desno, in če greš na desno - ne boš šel na levo. Pri tejih odočitvah se zdi, da povratka ni - da je pot enosmerna - odločitev pa enoznačna.

Pri odločanju uporabljamo mehanizme. Lahko so v obliki kulturnih ali folklornih vzorcev, kar bi pomenilo izkušnje drugih - skupnosti (to so lahko zakoni, navade, pregorji, pesmi, pravljice), ali pa na podlagi lastnih izkušenj. Le malokrat se odločamo na podlagi intenzivnega razmisleka, saj za to ni časa - odločitve pogosto zahtevajo ukrepanje že v naslednjem trenutku. Kulturni vzorec in izkušnje so instantne/ trenutne rešitve. Lahko jih uvidimo kot formule, s katerimi hitro dobimo rezultat. V sodobnih matematičnih teorijah se zaradi čim hitrejšega računanja pogosto poslušujejo za posamezne dele kompleksnega računanja naključnih (heurističnih) algoritmov. Pri tem seveda enoznačnosti rezultata ni več, govorimo lahko o približkih, oziroma o verjetnosti pravilnega rezultata - o statistiki.

Če se vrnemo k sleherniku: gledano od končnega rezultata/ odločitve nazaj, se le malokdaj zdi, da je bila odločitev napačna - še posebej, ker ima človek velike možnosti adaptacije vrednostnega sistema (etike), kar pomeni upravičevanje lastnih odločitev/ dejanj. Po domače bi se temu reklo goljufanje, vendar je vsekakor izjemno zanimiva tehnologija spremnjenja na videz trdne logične sistema - sistema resnice. Na nek način se človek pomika po časovnih premici nazaj in adaptira preteklost glede na trenutno stanje. To je tako, kot bi pri matematiki adaptirali formulo, da bi dobili želeni rezultat (kar seveda prav tako počnejo). Napake torej lahko popravljamo - pravilnost odločitve se ovrednoti za nazaj.

Orakelj torej predstavlja reducirano stanje, proces interpretacije pa je intenzivno odločanje znotraj abstraktnega prostora spregovorjenih besed. Za kriptično poetsko zapletenost in večpomenskost lahko ugotovimo, da vnaša večdimenzionalnost, kar pomeni možnost različnih razumevanj (pravega; pravilnega), za tem pa v matematičnem besednjaku uvidimo nelinearnost višjega reda kot razlog za multiplost rezultativ. Od nekega reda dalje rešitve sistema enač več ni. Človeške poetske abstrakcije po kompleksnosti hitro presežejo še takо kompleksne matematične modele. Morda bi za orakeljsko kriptografijo lahko hitra našli humor.

## Čas kot človekova dimenzija

Zaporejanje - nizanje stvari in dogodkov v času in prostoru je za človeka temeljna dramaturgija, ki se ji reče življenje. Življenje je pot: življenska pot. Povratka ni. Zadostiti je potrebno svoji ideji o sebi in zadostiti je treba idejam drugih o tebi. Življenje je projekt estetizacije sebe. Nizanje v času se sicer dogaja na videz neogibno, vendar lahko v precejšnji meri vplivamo na zaporedje.

Dimenzija časa se med vsemi živimi bitji najbolj trdno pojavi pri človeku. Povezana je z razvojem imaginacije, zato se človeku lahko dogodki in stvari postavljajo izven tekočega časa - v prihodnosti in preteklosti. To ni le potencialna možnost, ki bi jo lahko uporabili prostovoljno - torej ni le orodje, ampak je tudi neke vrste usodenost. Je neločljiva komponenta dojenjanja sveta. V praksi je tudi precej neobvladljiva - veliko pogosteje smo z mislimi drugje kot z dejANJI. Lahko rečemo, da smo nekako razsuši v času in prostoru. Pri tem je dobro vpeljati razlikovanje med trdnimi in mehkejšimi realnostmi. Trdne se tičejo fizičnih, materialnih prisotnosti (stvari), mehkejša pa domišljajskih teles (idej) - lahko tudi dokaj trdnih konceptov, ter potem tudi bolj ohlapnati trenutni misli. Nekatere realnosti so pomembnejše, druge ne. Pretežni del človekove psihološke dejavnosti je urejanje lastne biti v prostoru in času - razporejanje, zaporejanje.

Orakelj je domislek, ki iz kopice možnosti, ki jih nudi svet, potegne fragment in nam ga predloži v obravnavo. Fragment je bodisi iztrgan naključju, kaosu ali pa nekemu naravnemu redu. Med obema je bistvena razlika v svetovnem pogledu bralca. Pomembna je tehnologija poseganja po fragmentu. V antiki je bilo to pogosto podobno žrebanju, kjer se od medija pričakuje odmaknjenost od realnosti, iztrganost iz časa, neobremenjenost z zemeljskimi stvarmi in tudi lastni neinteres. Pogosto se je to dogajalo v transu, ekstazi. Ta ritual se v neprimerno manj ekstatičnem stanju dogaja tudi dandanes.

V veliki meri je dandanašnji stroj za žrebanje prevzel tehnologijo neodvisnega medija (človeka v transu). Stroj za žrebanje je sicer danes tehnološki izdelek, ki mora zadostiti nekaterim pogojem - čim bolj naključen mora biti - proizvajati mora torej čim manj razpoznavnih, ponovljivih vzorcev, kar je enako kot: čim več različnih vzorcev. S tem se ukvarja znanost in še posebej matematika v svojih oddelkih, ki so bližu teoriji kaosa in sistemskim teorijam. Tudi z napovedovanjem prihodnosti se seveda ukvarja znanost, oziroma: v imenu Znanosti se pogosto alarmira ljudstvo za skrb za bodočnost sveta ali človeštva. Nekdaj je bilo to v imenu boga, vere, nacije - zdaj je to v imenu napredka. Pri tem seveda še vedno ne gre za 100-odstotne napovedi - kot prej gre za strahove in up. Tudi znanost ne priskrbi le ene rešitve, temveč nekaj možnih scenarijev. Posamezniki se odločimo za enega, odgovor o pravilnosti pa prepustimo Času.

## Vertikalni in horizontalni bog

Ker se rad dotikam interpretacije preprostih simbolov, se tokrat ponovno dotikam križa, na katerega se da marsikaj razpeti, tokrat pa bom razpel čas in ne-čas - slednji lahko poimenujem tudi "ta trenutek". Ta trenutek je vedno ubrežna točka, ki niti ne pripada časovni premici, četudi se trenutki potem lahko nizajo na časovni osi – kar pomeni, da smo izvedli prevedbo. Vendar je trenutek pravzaprav brezčasje, zato je v svoji pojavnosti izvet iz časa in torej ponazorjen kot vertikalna.

Horizontalna je seveda bolj ali manj urejeno zaporedje dogodkov, spominov, ki sega v preteklost in prihodnost. Ker je to v bistvu logični red in razmislek, jo imenujem horizontalni bog. Vertikalna pa je neuvoljiva in predstavlja neposredno doživljjanje, čutenje in ni niti najmanj razmislek. Morda bi kdo to poimenoval tudi kot Hudič ali Peklenšček, vendar to ni nujno – predvsem je verjetno, da bi to lahko bila krščanska dogmatična izjava. Vendar si je cerkev simbol le prisvojila – a ne v njegovi celoti.

Ko smo v vertikali, ne moremo biti v horizontalni in obratno. To pomeni, da sta dimenziji pravokotni ena na drugo - zato križ. Zakaj boga? Obe dimenziji omogočata stik s popolnostjo, neskončnostjo in ničem - singularnostmi.



## Distributed bodies / identities

For the most part, parts of the sound body / identity are determined by their movement / sound properties. It is important that they can listen / watch / speak / communicate—in short: make contact / establish communication. This is not achieved by replicating / cloning them, but by differentiating / distinguishing / mutating them. This is also a precondition for a distributed system. Every part is be autonomous in terms of its electromechanical properties. Here we toy with the idea of the borderline conditions of autonomy on the one hand, and the idea / metaphor of a distributed, i.e.: dis-united body, on the other. In the functioning whole, this leads to the necessity of synthesis, which is the basic message / point of the installation.

Parts of the system = limbs of the body. An eye, ear, arm, mouth, foot, penis, vagina, hair, nose, tongue, anus, etc. At this point, the field of the humorous approach opens up, constituting an additional motif / motive / motor for the construction of the installation. We might not use a computer for this, believing that an individual decision is basically arbitrary - we do not make a judgment about it, we are content that a decision has been made. Anyway – there is always a happy end.

Another important feature seems to be the ability to autonomously lift (the body, the head / the sensor) and to selectively observe the environment. We would enter a field of true autonomy if we enabled the limbs self-observation (observation of the positions of their constituent parts).

## Myth = meat

*Aestesis* is a word derived from old Greek word meaning *sensing*, so it is closely linked to perception – the superficiality (or sensation, also on the emotional level). On the other hand the sensing is also closely linked to the process of understanding ("do you see" = do you understand; in at least two languages), and has to do with unveiling (of the "seven veils") - what one searches for (when it's not material) is some kind of truth (-> Truth) - which could eventually (because now we already entered under the skin) be meat ... (or myth). The superficial sensing (skin-deep...) does not bring understanding, instead it brings mystification, which is a sort of "instant" knowing – the (emotionally full) feeling.

Before I described myths as "complex bodies of meaning" - the systems b/ structures of thought - in some ways "machines for production of the meaning". They do not bring understanding and do not allow to be decomposed easily. However, we are made to be thinking with "bodies of meaning". Therefore we always "construct" complex issues into something that we can take along (in the memory) and use instantly. But we cannot carry around the understanding itself - to achieve this, we must perform a deconstruction (or demystification) on the spot - each and every time. And each time the result can be very different.

In their most simple (superficial) appearances myths are just stories without any deeper meaning – therefore not bringing understanding (-> demystification) but instead – the knowing (emotional extracts; behavioral patterns; instant decision-makers). Such stories are almost timeless - the root of culture (and our patterns of public behavior and relations). They are symbols, stereotypes, etc... They are the basis of our "collective mind". One does not doubt them - therefore they are the cohesive cultural element - we all happen to agree upon them.

## Aesthetisation = Mystification

Just as they were composed, the myths can be decomposed / deconstructed, and what one finds there is the history of human kind, the "nature of human" and civilization. The humans had always had fascination with the machines. Of course, we know that it is the fascination of the humans with themselves (-> narcissism) – the machine's ability (and inability) to achieve perfection. Beauty, goodness, etc... are universal ideas that are transcendent - the perfection incarnated. The aesthetics is a derived term (as such it is more precise), describing the human ability "to sense the quality" of things. Here we are much closer to understanding - to the process of gaining knowledge. It is no more just about the beauty of things. The departure is noted as the gap between the Platonists and Aristotelians.

In my confrontation to aesthetisation (when it is acting as a layer of mystification, covering the "true meaning" of things, or just covering "the sweet nothing", or just being there without any purpose - covering and hiding away the "meaning" - even when there is meaning), I don't want to go as far as to describe it as unnecessary. Here I point out to another "classic" confrontation - the Dionysian and the Apollonian - the confrontation between body and mind. To translate that to "artistic objects nad principles" I would describe it as the predominance of "skin" against "the meat" ("the bones" have yet another meaning - no flesh, no blood...). The superficial against the structure - the myth against the meaning.

Art (again understood as a derivation - a higher level of abstraction - of human ability to sense and reconstruct reality - mainly for communication reasons) has roots in both: the ritualistic approaches concerned with body (and emotional) transformations and the (more) transcendental approaches concerned with spiritual transformations. First has to do with sensing, feeling, knowing and the second with understanding (but also with knowing). Both methods return an answer: the first method is much quicker (instant?) based on experiential, the second method is slower, but it can provide a variety of results.

However, if one chooses to explore, experiment, to gain knowledge, it is only the second method that produces new results. In any case, experiential method is more or less inevitable to all of us - but individualization (a departure from the common / collective roots...) comes from the second method. In experimental art it is the only viable method, because it uncovers the truth (or better: the new; new view of inner / inter-relations..., etc.). It is the only changing element - it defines new points of reference for observation of the world - and to see the Truth.

## Art as the last stand of the Humanists?

Art has not always been the domain of critical point of view - it was introduced around the end of the 20th Century and the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> (my guess would be Paul Gauguin's "Where Do We Come From? What Are We? Where Are We Going?", from 1897/98). This marked the beginning of departure with the decorative and opened up the conceptual approaches of the historic avantgarde. Decoration is the skin (the veil) that hides away the meaning.

Art recently became about the only area for humanistic ideas. Why do social issues enter the galleries? Does Art still keep a certain dose (or doze) of moral integrity in the advent of art market? It may be something about the shifting paradigms - decoration went elsewhere, creation partly also, but is it linked with responsibility? Contemporary art is marginalized, when it is not pop-culture - and this then means that the social issues are also marginalized. A Russian performer Aleksandr Brenner recently wanted to point out to the (Slovene) artists that they should be aware that they are adding to the capitalistic and anti-social relationships - that they are sold out and that they are selling out. Everybody is responsible (but nobody is responding).

While a demand for humanistic position in art is very true, it is also a bit funny to demand from the artists to be the only stand for humanistic position. Was it not very recently that the humanism was performed elsewhere? What happened to the philosophers, to the social critique from the academies, with the independent intellectuals? Did they all join the marginal areas as art - or did they just become a kind of performers? Like Aleksandr Brenner? Performers and actors are sometimes looked at as one and the same. It is a total mistake – performers are in exact opposition to actors, who are clowns...).

To return briefly to "bodies". When we internalize something as a kind of memory we make a kind of mind structure / image of it. Be it 2-dimensional or 3-dimensional - it is a reduced system of evaluation -> a kind of melting / philosophers stone ("that can change any cheap metal to gold"). This is a kind of simple translation (in the form of a simple story) of what the alchemists were doing. The point, of course, is elsewhere: The alchemists were searching for Truth - the gold representing it, and the cheap metal just being the ordinary omnipresent material (world).

But the hard point with the bodies becomes when it is clearly not humanly possible to visualize anything more complex than the 3-dimensional dynamically changing object. This is usually related to as the 4-dimension space. The problem is sometimes overcome with observation of patterns of this dynamic behavior that we can observe while the system is changing. But here it becomes really abstract. Primary correlations are lost - a new object emerges. It is funny when people relate to the perfect fractal images as representation of the chaos...

A very similar explanation is possible with the observation of various degrees of juggler's skills. A juggler with one ball is even not thought of as a juggler. Almost anybody can learn playing with two balls. It becomes hard with three balls - with one ball always in the mid air... I believe that the four balls represent the ultimate skill. The fascination of the observer here starts with the introduction of three balls. This is the point where it becomes "magical". Our eyes (-> brain) can no longer follow the "logic" (-> the technology) of action, so we transfer our understanding to observing the pattern (a new "object" or "body" or "abstraction", as described above).

A translation process between the old to new is that of fascination - or any other kind of alienating effect (like the passing of time), described by Victor Shklovsky as "estrangement". It is of course about the "production of reality". Last remarks are not valid only for language (a production of symbolic bodies) but also for any other kind of bodies. My point here (and critique) has to do with the use of techniques of fascination which hide away all the ideas linked to the production process – of the structuring of object. Mistakes and failures are "de-mystifiers" and perfection is sin. In art.