

Youngjae Lih

Multiplicity to Singularity then Singularity to Multiplicity

When I see, the sound robusts. but when I listen, the image arising. I see it and it is invisible, I heard it but I am listening still. I ask myself if this was what I saw but it is actually different. I didn't hear but I knew it was coming. I do not remember but it remains the stains, I can not memorise this but it left scars. I look at the traces this brings some smells. This happens now but also this existed before and then recurring but I can not grasp it as I have no idea which one is which one. I believe I do understand causality but I do not understand that I can not expect the moment ahead. Indeed, I do not fully understand what is happened to me so this makes me hard understanding what is happening now. And this present uncertainty might contribute me not to predict well enough anything thus I try to see the past to look for the future. But I question again if what I saw was any meaningful and if I remember enough well to cover entire universe. Not universe but even surroundings. Again I see what I am listening and I hear what I am looking at. Regardless what I am perceiving and memorising are only few sampled fragments in the world, is there any possibilities of understanding how my perceptual institution and memory system works? I only assume these were 'Truely' happened and happening because it never have proven as a 'Not True' so far. In closed loop feedback system from control system analysis, first incident effects second incident and second incident influences first one which will lead second one so this becoming circulating arguments. Its casualty reasoning is not that simple because we need to analyze the system as whole. To do, obviously I need to be positioned at the outside of structure as we know this derived by Incompleteness Theorems. What I get of consistency by perceiving seeing and hearing though this same time stops in embodied cognition again by escalation of my memories which is believed from the past. But, again I have to ask if the memory comes from the past that is temporally and spatially apart. Isn't it more like triggered and composed instantly at the moment of sensing process, so as present progressive form? Perhaps more likely this actually might come slightly later then seeing or listening, so it is consequential event. I recall this was already told by Bergson, he referred memory as activated by possible attractions with current perceptions of status. It is always coming but never happened. Probably its misunderstanding or confusion was caused by visual-centered aesthetic culture or our nature of processing information. As most of visual artifacts exist based on its

physical-spatial characteristics, so it provides parallel continuation as we are. Thus we tend to think these as tangible continued object like the thing from the inventory. Indeed, in Art, aesthetic theory has been developed in distance with its subject to achieve unity of the artwork. But the memory is something to be triggered and internally activated process. The question continues here. If the memory is composed of human mind and the triggers outside, doesn't it work at the present and in the past as well? The present as continuation of past which was triggered, again this is forming current status of us toward outside world. Can I rather say that memory is parallel channels interacting with current stream? If so, forgetting is not about what happened or lost in past, but about something will be appeared and waiting to be triggered in future. And, of course this is totally based on individual system. Now I wonder if any of perception activities really need any meaningful information as subject. In the end any of visual auditory signal would have meaning as trigger, and it will activate our emotion and memory which may guide to another trigger. So I would imagine long long time ago, the first men spoke first sound to his or her company. By mistake or accident rather than intention, with meaningless vowel sound and some movements. Maybe already they were full of emotions to be told and ability to move their body enough. Was it only empty dialogs, probably. And how long time of meaningless dialog continued, I wondered. In this context as you might be noticed, there is not a distance for aesthetics to be involved with fundamental but also personal experiences. The machine is anyway circulating and perceptions are driven individually. But I do not mean to introduce the stage where anything induce emotional status becoming art. Rather I suggest completed system as a whole nature which reflects our own but probably it looks like full of triviality of coincidence. Again it is to challenge critical convention of modernism which provides singular axis to understand and the message. From the tradition of identification of Modernism this seek totality and unity of work. As Lyotard pointed out to flee from its uncertainty caused of doubt, naturally it aim to construct rigid explanation and distanced space. In that context, modernism is strongly attached visual discourses and it assumes only one channel world as infinite temporal space which is assumed universal. But what if the multi sensory and self sufficient system is placed as its own so that we instantly discover and experience it but it as completed system placed as thing in distance. It's completeness could be observed and analysed by us who as outsider from the system, though it keeps triggering our memory even without any subject. As whole closed nature, I imagine probably it is maybe less than human but will be enough to be such as a computer. Who said the computer is so stupid because it only answers the questions.

What about the machines keep questioning? If I am curious enough I will end up questioning why until I find the fundamental 'why' that answers me fundamental and true understanding. We took more than thousands years do find the atom, that literally means uncuttable or indivisible. To just find out it wasn't the fundamental, smallest constituent unit of matter that ancient philosophers thought it was. So we have asked why until we got to know that we are not fully understanding reality, we still have incomplete answers to our why, and again we ask why because we were asked by why.

Above artist's sketch was written and typed following his thought by closed eyes, then misspells were corrected after.