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MONSTROUS BODIES AND SUBVERSIVE ERRORS

1. Monstrous bodies: The Eastern Europe paradigm as a Woman

I would like to start with a theoretical-political positioning of feminist theory and practice and subsequently deal with the relationship between philosophy and cyberfeminism. The idea of taking a conceptually specific stand is in order to philosophically identify and articulate a position specific to Eastern Europe. This desire does not grow out of the identity politics game as used by certain feminists to legitimize their right to colonize cyberspace; rather, it is a militant response to this constant process of fragmentation and particularization. Furthermore, I insist on the re-politicization of the cyberworld by taking a stance that is based neither on a geographical space nor on a location on the map of the "New Europe" but is, as E. Said would say, a concept.

It is important to emphasize that the cyberfeminists' posture is not, as it was during the legendary period of feminism in the 1960's (or even earlier, paralleling the period of modernism in art), a product of a natural and in fact, existential position, but is a strictly artificial and conceptual position owing its existence to theory and not to the existential universe. This is what renders it so problematical; if it were existential, it would be easy to deal with; but being purely theoretical, mediated and artificial, it now
Moeto pre-obmisluvanje na deneshtata poziciyata na (post)feminizmot e reakciya i na chestata zamernka deka sega ne e vreme da se delat (Evropskiot) Istok i Zapad, i deka, soocheni so segashnata ideologija na globalizaciya, toku domot e vazen, za shto svedochi i izrekata „Nitu zapad nitu istok kako doma ne se isto!“.

Ostavayki go nastrana ideolooshkoto selipilo na vakviot stav, koj ne gleda podaleku od klaustrofobicnite i totilitarini tendenции вообичaeni za sekoja ideologija vtemelena vo nacionalnoto i vkoroneta vo „domot“, morame повторно да се запрашаме, каде е овој „dom“ каде што се loziirani spirituelni kontekst i konceptualniot kon­tekst, ako voopshto mozhem da postavime vakov kontekst?

Ja pravam ovaa zabeleshka nasproti cela niza pi­shuvanja, tekstovni i ideolooshki poziciyonirana, rariirani преку popularniologi as oonoj pogore, koj se stremat da gi igniriraat razlikite me k Istokot i Zapadot, fo­kusirajki se na koncepti kako „doma“, nebare ima некое место на planetava koe e nadvor od sferite na politich­koto, soциjalnoto i posreduvanoto! Ili, poznaku kajano, „doma“ vo ovoj kontekst se percepira kako intimno i лично место, na nekoj način iskluchenoto od differencijacija, i grashno implicerata deka postoi nekoj „jadro“ cini vrednosti, kako shto se intimnosti, odnosno jenstvenosti, mozhat da se spristavat na promenite.

Namesto da se opishuvam себеси kako saiber-feminist od Istocna Evropa, jaс pretchupitam radikalni obrt na ovaa istochno-evropska pozicija, ili paradigma. Predlagam redefiniciya na mojata istochno-evropska pozicija (ili, ako gi pretchupitate terminite na Lyotar: mojata istochno-evropska sostojba) na (post)feministka, na „saiberfeministichka paradigma“. corresponds perfectly to the same situation that produced it and which it dramatically subverts.

My rethinking of the position of (post) feminism today is also a response to the frequent complaint that now is not the time to divide into East and West (Europe), and that in the face of the current ideology of globalization, it is home that matters, as exemplified in the expression: "Neither East, nor West, home is the best!"

Apart from the ideological blindness behind such an attitude, which fails to see beyond the claustrophobic and totali­tarian tendencies natural to any nationally-grounded, "home"-rooted ideology, we have to ask again, where is this "home" in which the spiritual and conceptual context is located, if indeed we can posit such a context?

I make this remark in the face of a barrage of writings, texts, and ideological positions spread by popular slogans such as the one above which endeavor to ignore the differences be­tween East and West by focusing on a concept such as "home", as though there were any place on earth outside the sphere of the political, the social and the mediated! Or, to put it differently, "home" in this context is perceived as an intimate and personal site in some way excluded from differentiation, and implying, wrongly, that there exists a "core" whose features such as intimacy, or the feminine, can resist change.

Instead of describing myself as a cyberfeminist from Eastern Europe, I prefer a radical reversal of this Eastern Euro­pean position or paradigm. I propose to redefine my own East­ern European position (or, if you prefer in Lyotardian terms: my Eastern European condition) as a (post) feminist, as a "cyberfeminist paradigm".
Eastern Europe is to be seen as a Woman paradigm, in other words, as the female side in the process of sexual difference, whether grounding ourselves in the real or the cyberworld. This concept is a very precise one, as it indicates a re-politicization of the real and the cyberworld. It is rooted in a much deeper universal demand for identity, politics, strategy and tactics of action, theorization, emancipation and uselessness (to fight capitalism, we have to insist on a position that is equal to absolute uselessness, which is not productive at all for the capitalist machine). It can be perceived as the militant theorization, on entering the third millennium, of a particular position in the crucial debate regarding ways and modes and, last but not least, protocols for entering the (cyber)space of hopes, uselessness, theory and terror.

To return to radical politics means to demand the universal of politics, and not to be squeezed into the narrow confines of a politics of constant exaggeration and of incessantly renewed identities and needs. This is crucial for an understanding of the changing position of the self and identity.

What becomes apparent here is that in front of the computer console the relation of the subject, along with her body, history, geography, space, etc., takes on a kind of paradoxical communication which is not direct, but a communication with the excrescence behind her, mediated by the third gaze: that of the computing-machine.

What is at stake here is the temporal loss of the subject's symbolic identity: she is forced to perceive that she is not what she thought herself to be. What does this mean? We find ourselves within all media, in all bodies, in all possible spaces at once. This calls into question some fundamental positions concerning art and culture.

Operating from this new standpoint, from a new position of identity, other internal media and social processes are revealed to us. We are faced with leaving a historically defined
historical deconstructed position which imitated the natural world of our senses. With new media and technology, we have the possibility of an artificial interface which is dominated by non-identity. Instead of producing a new identity, something much more radical is produced: the total loss of identity. The subject is forced to assume that s/he is not what s/he thought her/himself to be, but somebody-something else.

This somebody-something else that can be perceived as a body with geographical and organizational politics may also be attached to the rhetoric and logistics of space. We can be taken elsewhere and nowhere.

Trinh T. Minh-ha has proposed a model for re-thinking Asian space and the so-called third world through the concept of the "inappropriate/d Other". This can also be seen as a possibly useful tool for developing specific concepts for reading the former Eastern European territory. It is time to find and to re-write paradigms of specific spaces, arts and media productions in Eastern Europe.

The whole of Eastern Europe functions as a symptom of the condition of the developed West, especially in media or when using avant-garde media and art strategies. In examining the parallels between East and West, in Eastern European media and artistic production we can find significant examples of the perverted and/or symptomatic logic of Western media strategies and visual representation, employed in quite different ways. This can be shown, for example, in the use of pornographic representation, which has been something generally not regarded as acceptable in the West because pornography is seen as part of the commercialization or consumerism of both the body and the media. In Eastern Europe, however, if we use pornography or pornographic visualization in the media as a political stance, a form of resistance to political conformity rather than sexual liberalization, then we get a completely inverted reading of what pornography represents.
To be more precise, the process of pornographic visualization was effected in Eastern Europe through the externalization of sexuality that had been adopted from the underground film tradition exemplified by Fassbinder, Rosa von Praunheim, Warhol, etc., whose films were shown in underground venues in the 1980's.

The externalization of sexuality took the form of overtly staged pornography and gender confusion ('gender-bending') of gay, lesbian and transvestite sexual attitudes. It was a process that can be simply explained: the sexual and civil rights (!) stereotypes and prototypes were not only consumed in and by the underground, but also immediately performed. In front of a VHS camera, in private rooms and bedrooms, an unparalleled political repositioning of the sexual and social could be acquired. In these works, the masquerade of re-appropriation ensured not only the simple question of the formation of the identity of the artists or of the underground community, but also the process of negotiation required to produce continually ambiguous and unbalanced situations and identities.

The acquired hybrid and non-heterosexual positioning of sexuality, in the context of the remarkably impermeable gender boundaries of Communist Eastern Europe, was a way of overtly politicizing the sexual in Socialism and Communism, and fighting for civil rights.

With regard to the parallels between Eastern European space and Woman: just as Woman is not the "weaker part" of Man ("God's second mistake" - Nietzsche) so Eastern Europe is not simply the distorted mirror or, more accurately, the "ailing member" of the West. However, it is perceived as such - inasmuch as Western Europe wishes to see it as ailing, since for the West, Eastern Europe functions as a deceptive illusion of Western desire. The same can be said for Woman: She can be seen as the "weaker part" of the man but that does not define her ontological status. Similarly, one can say of Eastern Europe that it may be a "symptom" of the West's condition but that does not define its ontological status either.
In the dawn of the third millennium, collective, simultaneous processes of reception and communication in cyberspace have become a determining metaphor for the new media environment. What is happening on the Internet is increasingly seen and utilized as the "new" public space. The Internet and the World Wide Web are becoming spaces which are not only parallel to the existing public one but are also increasingly becoming a substitute for it. So called public opinion is being formulated via the Internet and is perhaps replacing any actual public opinion.

Firsthand information transmitted via email and then spread through the Web, but without additional analysis and reflection, is sometimes enough to lead certain people to proclaim that they are also taking part in the media revolution because they are obtaining firsthand and "eyewitness" information through the Net; although the community on the Net and its opinions are, in most cases, the sum total of read-and-forwarded messages and the information obtained therein.

An important issue concerning the Internet today, following the decade of the fall of the Berlin Wall, is to identify who the old and the new actors are in the construction of this brave new world (which could be renamed the World Wide Web); and to ask, who is allowed to develop a criticism of the Internet? Generally speaking, I have identified two broad lines of critical thought that form positioning matrixes in this debate.

The first emphasizes individuals or groups linked neither historically nor geographically, but who consciously take the position of the counter-culture. I name this position the "Scum of Society Matrix" - not as a mere critical label but to indicate that this matrix represents a condition of life and activism, a
Monstrous Bodies and Subversive Errors

Marina Grzinic

The Scum of Society Matrix proposes a new, autonomous economy and new structures developed from the appropriation and restructuring of the so-called old ones.

The Monsters insist on pointing out a difference - a critical inherent difference, not simply a special classification method based on markers, such as apartheid, as Trinh T. Minh-ha suggests. The question of who is allowed to write about the history of art, culture and politics in the area once known as Eastern Europe has to be posed along with the questions of how and when important political, cultural and media events are marked. The following questions or synthetic moments are crucial, as formulated by Yvonne Volkart: "Which spaces do subjects and agents cross when they communicate? What do they call themselves? Are they subjects, cyborgs, monsters, nomads or simply hackers?"
We have to ask ourselves what space, which actors, whose agents and what subjects? The concepts of matrix, structure, position and constellation are to be thought of and perceived in a strictly theoretical and not existential way.

This attempt to define a new position of the subject has been meticulously covered, especially with regard to the potential means of organization on the Internet and in the real world.

Donna Haraway invented the "cyborg" to permit us to understand something much more important: that everybody can be reinvented as such; everybody can be in the position of the cyborg, in the position of "the perfect excremental leftover". Just as "the proletariat" was at a certain point in time, the cyborg today is not something that is predefined, i.e. the features that differentiate the cyborg from the others are not objective, positively defined and understood. A positive definition of the cyborg does not exist in advance, but takes shape at the precise moment of its appearance; no positive distinguishing feature exists. Positioning matches re-politicization. We can ask further: how does an 'excremental leftover' qualify for reinvention? My answer is that this reinvention must be perceived and understood in terms of meaning and positioning. The point is not that the cyberfeminist identity re-invents itself, but that this reinvention be re-articulated, re-read through theory.

I have stated that at the end of the millennium, the two matrices, the Western European "Scum of Society Matrix" and the Eastern European "Monsters' Matrix," not only raise questions for reflection, but also highlight elements of political and analytical intersection that need to be discussed and articulated further and in a much more radical manner.
Establishing the difference between East and West on historical premises only is extremely limiting, and I would like to proceed in a different way, albeit in a way not indifferent to history. I will attempt to explicate some generative principles behind the matrices and their complex functioning, and try also to explain why the Eastern Europe paradigm is to be seen as a ‘Woman paradigm’ or as the female side in the process of sexual differentiation, as a means of grounding ourselves in (cyber)space. The “Monsters’ Matrix ” acts in comparison to the Western Matrix as a purely theoretical entity, and as such is fully permissible.

Thesis One: That East and West, despite our constantly redefining them, are not predicates (positively existing entities); which means that the label East or West, rather than increasing our knowledge of the subject, qualifies the mode of failure of our knowledge; and failure is assumed, according to Copjec, to be inherent.

Kant in the Critique of Pure Reason and the Critique of Judgment first made the distinction between the two ways in which reason falls into contradiction with itself. In both works, he demonstrated that the failure of reason was not simple, but based upon an antinomic impasse through two separate routes: the first failure was mathematical; the second was dynamical. The first thing to note is that the two propositions that compose each side appear to have an antinomic relation to each other, i.e., they appear to contradict each other. Subsequently, in his Seminar XX entitled Encore, drawing upon the Kantian antinomic relations, Lacan defined the two formulas of sexuation (Of Sexual Difference) as two ways, or paths, of failure: the male and the female.

In her book Read my Desire: Lacan against the Historicists2, which may be defined as a user’s manual of Lacanism, Joan Copjec strongly emphasized these two antinomic ways as two ways of failure. The antinomies and the formulas of sexuation are presented through a scheme that is clearly divided between
шематски прикажани со јасно подвоени леви и десни страни. Левата страна на шемата е назначена како машка страна, а десната е женска. Левата, машка страна одговара на кантовските динамички антиномии, а десната, женска страна, одговара на кантовските математички антиномии.

Втора теза: Источноевропската Матрица на монструми е истородна со десната, женска страна, ја окупира, и затоа ја претставува кантовската математичка грешка, а пак западноевропската Матрица на отпадници од општеството е истородна со левата, машка страна, односно кантовската динамичка грешка.

Во неверица, ќе запрашате: како е можно ова? Што дозволува ваква истородна позиција?

Од суштинска важност е што Лакан, во неговите формули на сексуација, ги употребува термините аргумент и функција наместо субјект и предикат (кои се спомнуваат во формулите на Кант). Оваа замена означува важна, а за нас и критична, концептуална разлика.

Принципот на класификација (се мисли помеѓу Исток и Запад) веќе не е дескриптивен, т.е. не е прашање на исти особини или заедничка матерija. Колјец вели „Дали некој припаѓа во класата на мажи или жени (или, јас би додала во матрицата на грешки „Отпадници“ или „Монструми“ - МГ) зависи, всушност, од тоа која позиција ќе се заземе“.

Антимоните треба да се гледаат како позиции на Мебиусова лента, односно како континууми на разлики.

Постои неоспорна асиметрија помеѓу математичките и динамичните антиномии. Повторно според Колјец, кога се движиме од една до друга, како да влегуваме во сосема различен простор.

the left and right sides. The left side of the scheme is designated as the male side, while the right side is female. The left, male side corresponds to the Kantian dynamical antinomies, and the right, female side, corresponds to the Kantian mathematical antinomies.

Thesis Two: That the Eastern European Monsters' Matrix occupies, and is homologous with, the right, female side, and therefore represents the Kantian mathematical failure; while the Western European Scum of Society Matrix is homologous with the left, male side, or the Kantian dynamical failure.

Dubious, you may ask: How is this possible? What permits such a homologous position?

Of crucial importance is the fact that Lacan, in his formulas of sexuation, employs the terms argument and function instead of subject and predicate (as they are referred to in the Kantian formulas). This substitution marks an important, and for us a critical, conceptual difference.

The principle of classification (between East and West, I mean) is no longer descriptive, i.e., it is not a matter of shared characteristics or of common substance. Copjec states, "Whether one falls into the class of males or females (and I would add, whether one falls into the Scum or the Monsters failure matrix - MG) depends, rather, which enunciative position one assumes."

The antinomies should be read as positions on a Moebius strip, i.e., as a continuum of differences.

There is an unmistakable asymmetry between the mathematical and the dynamical antinomies Again, according to Copjec, on moving from one to the other, we seem to enter a completely different space.
I am not starting with the Monsters just to get some sympathy. Contrary to the fairly common prejudice that psychoanalysis constructs the Woman as secondary - as a mere alteration of man - these formulas suggest, according to Copjec, that there is a kind of priority, an advantage of sorts on the right side.

This reading of the formulas is also consistent with the privileged position accorded the mathematical antinomies by Kant, who grants the mathematical synthesis a more immediate certitude than its dynamical counterpart. In Kant's analysis, it is the dynamical antinomies (the male side of the formula, or the Western European's Scum Matrix in our reading) that appear in many ways secondary, a kind of resolution to the more complete impasse manifested by the mathematical conflict. I will proceed in a very schematic way to reach my point.

What is a mathematical antinomy? First, every antinomy is composed of two propositions: thesis and antithesis. The mathematical antinomy we borrowed from Kant is occasioned by the attempt, generally speaking, to think the world. The thesis of the mathematical antinomy is this: the world has a beginning in time and is also limited in regard to space. The antithesis of the same mathematical antinomy is this: the world has no beginning and no limits in space but is, in relation to both time and space, infinite.

"After examining both arguments, Kant concludes that while each successfully demonstrates the falsity of the other, neither is able to establish convincingly its own truth. This conclusion creates a skeptical impasse, and the solution he arrives at is the following: rather than despairing over the fact that we cannot choose between the two alternatives, we must come to the realization that we need not choose, since both alternatives are false. The thesis and antithesis, which initially
appeared to constitute a contradictory opposition, turn out to be contraries."4

We might note that the structure of a contrary opposition that we find in a mathematical antinomy is demonstrated by the kind of joke Slavoj Zizek uses widely in his lectures:

In your village there are no cannibals anymore.
When did you eat the last one?

The form of the question does not allow the addressee to negate the accusation implicit in the question, but only to choose among contraries. Having demonstrated the impossibility of the existence of the world, Kant can then dismiss both the statements of thesis and antithesis. Kant’s two statements regarding the solution of the first mathematical antinomy formally reduplicate those that Lacan gives for Woman, who, like the world, does not exist.

Lacan argues that a concept of "Woman" cannot be constructed because the task of fully unfolding her conditions cannot, in actuality, be carried out. Since we are finite beings, bound by space and time, our knowledge is subject to historical conditions.

And here we come to the most important point: "The existence of Woman is not only denied; it is also not condemnable as a normative and exclusionary notion; on the contrary, the Lacanian position argues that it is only by refusing to deny - or confirm - her existence that normative and exclusionary thinking can be avoided. That is, it is only by acknowledging that a concept of Woman cannot exist, that it is structurally impossible within the symbolic order, that each historical construction of her can be challenged. After all, nothing prohibits these historical constructions from asserting their universal truth; witness the historical assertion that a general, trans-historical category of Woman does not exist."5
It is crucial to see that Woman is the consequence, and not the cause, of the nonfunctioning of negation. She is the failure of the limit, not the cause of the failure. 

Now, following this rather crude and schematic cutting up of one part of the excellent chapter on the forms of sexuation in Copjec’s book Read my Desire: Lacan against the Histori­cists, we must return to our Monsters Matrix - to accept the consequences of such a homologous position.

Thesis Three: Similarly to Lacan’s positing the nonexistence of Woman, we can speak of the nonexistence of the Matrix of Monsters. If the Matrix of Monsters does not exist, this is because it cannot be found. The Matrix of Monsters cannot be constructed because the task of fully unfolding its conditions cannot, in actuality, be carried out. Our conception of the (Matrix of) Monsters cannot run ahead of these limits and thus, we cannot construct a concept of the whole of the Matrix. 

The existence of the (Matrix of) Monsters is not only denied; it is also not condemnable as a normative and exclusionary notion; on the contrary, the Lacanian position argues that it is only by refusing to deny - or confirm - its existence that normative and exclusionary thinking can be avoided. That is, it is only by acknowledging that a concept of the (Matrix of) Monsters cannot exist, that it is structurally impossible within the symbolic order, that each historical construction of this Matrix can be challenged. As long as it can be demonstrated that the world or the (Matrix of) Monsters cannot form a whole, a universe, then the possibility of judging whether or not these phenomena or signifiers give us information about a reality independent of us vanishes.

It is crucial to see that the Matrix of Monsters, to paraphrase Copjec, is the consequence, and not the cause, of the nonfunctioning of negation. It is the failure of the limit, not the cause of the failure.
THE LEFT, MALE SIDE:  
DYNAMICAL FAILURE  
and the Western European  
"Scum of Society Matrix"  

Where the thesis and antithesis of the mathematical antinomies were both deemed to be false because both illegitimately asserted the existence of the world, the thesis and antithesis of the dynamical antinomies, the dynamical failure, are both deemed by Kant to be true. In the first case, the conflict between the two propositions was thought to be irresolvable (since they made contradictory claims about the same object); in the case of dynamical failure, the conflict is resolved by the assertion that the two statements do not contradict each other.

The thesis of the dynamical antinomy is, according to Kant, the following: Causality according to the laws of nature is not the only causality operating to originate the world. A causality of freedom is also necessary to account fully for these phenomena. The Kantian antithesis of the dynamical antinomy, or failure, is: There is no such thing as freedom, but everything in the world happens solely according to the laws of nature.

Kant says that the antithesis in the dynamic antinomy is true, just as Lacan confirms the existence of the universe of men. Since the existence of the universe was regarded, in the case of Woman, as impossible because no limit could be found to the chain of signifiers, it would be logical to assume that the formation of the all on the male side, in fact, depends on the positing of a limit.

The shift from the female to the male side is a subtraction. The thesis and antithesis of the mathematical failure, according to Kant, said too much. On the dynamical side, this surplus is subtracted, and it is this subtraction that instals the limit. It means that on this side it will always be a matter of saying too little. Incompleteness on the dynamic side, and inconsistency on the mathematical side.
Furthermore, according to Copjec, the question of existence that caused the conflict on the female side is silenced on the male side because it is, precisely, existence - or being - that is subtracted from the universe that is formed here. Kant taught us that if one were to say that a man existed, one would add absolutely nothing to this man, or to the concept of man. Thus we could argue that this concept lacks nothing. And yet, it does not include being, and is in this sense inadequate.

Again, the two failures or forms of sexuation according to Lacan consist of the following: the woman and the man are not to be treated symmetrically nor conceived as complements of each other. One category does not complete, or make up for what is lacking in, the other. While the universe of women is simply impossible, a universe of men is possible only on the condition that we except something from this universe. The universe of men is then an illusion based, according to Copjec, on a paradoxical prohibition: do not include everything in your all! The sexual relation fails for two reasons: it is impossible, and it is prohibited. And this is why we will never come up with a whole.

For an easy solution we could say that, like the Eastern European Monsters Matrix, the Western European Scum of Society Matrix does not exist. But there is no problem in locating it on the left side, homologous to the Lacanian sexuation table. Kant taught us that, if one were to say that the Western European Scum of Society Matrix existed, one would add absolutely nothing to the concept of the Western European Scum of Society Matrix. Rather than defining a universe of men that is complemented by a universe of women, we can define, relying on Lacan, the Western European Scum of Society Matrix (MALE SIDE) as the prohibition against constructing a universe, and the Eastern European Monsters Matrix (FEMALE SIDE) as the impossibility of doing so.

Because of this implicit impossibility of constructing a universe, we have constantly to re-locate ourselves.
Поради ова, позиционирањето и реарткулацијата подразбираат реполитизирање.

II. Грешка, промашување и вирус

Не се работи за одење на далечни геополитички простори какви што се Африка, Азия или дури и Источна Европа, туку за капитализацијата на идеите и концептите кои сами по себе стануваат територија. Теоријата е таква територија, а и Интернет, и светската мрежа. Овие огромни нови територии, проширени и еволуирани на бројни сервери, овозможуваат Капиталот, тој централен механизам на најчистиот Капитализам, уште поброј да се триплицира. Теоријата, уметноста и културата се огромни архиви, а исто и нашите тела. Она што е основно за капитализмот е што се може да се трансформира во територија за проширување на Капитал. На овој начин, самата идеа за територија се менува - радикално.

Годината 2000-та со неа донесе сосем нов начин на гледање на територијата. Територија како чист геополитички простор veke не постои. Територија е сега многу поширок концепт. Нашиите интелектуални концепти, нашиите книги, нашиите дела и сите наши архиви се новите територии. Оттаму, приложувањето концепти е гест на проширување и продлабочување на концептот на самата територија.

Втората важна промена која влијае врз ИСТОК и ЗАПАД, СЕВЕР и ЈУГ е дека во осумдесетите беше достоволно да си ВИДЛИВ; во 2000-та ова е прашање на реарткулација и, уште повеќе, ре-локација - многу повеќе отколку обична видливост.

Во денешниот свет фотографските, електронските и дигиталните слики се на работ на ефективна дезинтеграција. Дури и со многу слаб компјутер можеме да манипулираме било каква слика. Особено фотографиите ја губат нивната кредитibilnost, како на пример во процесот на расудување за настаните во светот. Сликите, а посебно фотографиите, стигнаа до точка кога нивната внатрешна

This is why positioning and re-articulation means re-policization.

2. A failure, an error and a virus

It is not really a question of going to distant geopolitical spaces such as Africa, Asia or even Eastern Europe, it is, rather, about the capitalization of ideas and concepts becoming territory in itself. Theory is such a territory, as is the Internet with the World Wide Web. These huge new territories, expanded and evolved on numerous servers, allow Capital, the most internal vehicle of Capitalism at its purest, an even faster triplification. Theory, art and culture are huge archives, and it is the same with our bodies. That everything can be transformed into a territory for the expansion of Capital is something that is fundamental to capitalism. In this way, the idea of territory itself changes - radically.

The year 2000 brought with it a completely different idea of how we think about territory. Territory as a pure geopolitical space is gone. Territory has become a much broader concept. Our intellectual concepts, our books, our works and, last but not least, all our archives are the new territories. Contributing concepts is, therefore, a gesture of expanding and broadening the concept of territory itself.

The second crucial change that has an effect on EAST and WEST, SOUTH and NORTH is that in the eighties, it was enough to be VISIBLE; [at] @2000 it is a question of re-articulation, and moreover, re-location, much more than pure visibility.

In today's world, photographic, electronic and digital images are at the point of effective disintegration. Even with a very small PC, we can manipulate any image. Photographic images especially are losing their credibility, as, for example in the process of judging world events. Images, and especially photography, have reached the point where their internal reality is questioned. This is not simply a question of truth or falsity.
Questions of plausibility and implausibility override those concerning whether an image is simply true or false. The problem, therefore, no longer has to do with mental images and consciousness only, but with the paradoxical facticity of new media images, especially computer-generated photographic images. If art poses, according to Scott Bukatman, the enigma of the body, then technique poses the enigma of art.

In such a context it is possible to establish an important connection between the image and the power structures that form and surround it and to approach the video or film image, etc., as part of a larger system of visual and representational communication. This approach is fundamentally politics of representation in terms of the video and media image is not something that is directly connected with everyday politics but it is connected in so far as the aesthetics of the image is always inscribed in a field of power. Power takes different forms; therefore, electronic and media images as a form of representation have different connections with different types of power.

Cyberspace treats material as a toxic agent. Materiality is extracted from cyberspace and reduced from object to abject - to a senseless, obscene intervention (Julia Kristeva, Critical Art Ensemble and Pell). Something similar is happening with the body. It is possible to identify a process of estrangement: the body is a malfunctioning machine (Katarzyna Kozyra, Poland), or bodies are having love affairs between servers (Olia Lialina, Russia) waiting for a possible re-articulation. From an acrobat to an experimental engine, the body may take up any position, as exemplified by, in this order, Marina Abramovic (Yugoslavia/Netherlands), Vlasta Delimar (Croatia), Egle Rakauskaite (Lithuania) Sanja Ivekovic (Croatia). In the case of Marina Abramovic the body is a screen used for all sorts of changes including the complete masquerading of identity; Vlasta Delimar is the living work herself: she presents herself as the reservoir of the virus, reminding us of her potentiality waiting to become a...
Vo delo: se prezentira sebesi kako rezervar na virus, potsetuvajki ne na nezinhata potencajnilnost koja cheka da stane realnost. Deloto na Egle Rakauskaite повторно го измислува потенциалниот киborg (ги поврзува учесниците во незиниот перформанс преку незината коса, не преку интернет); a pak Sanja Ivecovic ja razviva pretposlednata forma na kiborg, eden moderen Frankevstajn.

Оттаму, внесувањето на грешки, промашувања, потенциални тела и вируси во совршене, симулирани околини и во сајбер-ветот може да се смета како средство за развивање на нови естетски и концептуални стратегии, бидејки грешката, како обект - обект на ужасот и гадењето - не може да се интегрира во матрицата. Всушност, како што вели Жак Дерилда, ние можеме на грешката да гледаме како на начин за развивање на логиката на ре-маркирањето (re-marque). Логиката на ре-маркирањето е слична на функцијата на грешката или симптомот, каде она што открив наликува на информативен, генерален поглед на еден настан - еден истерел, така да се каже, од нутра, объективна далекина - одеднаш се претвора во нешто и загрозува и отелотворено. Грешката, всушност, е самото „нешто”; таа е субјектот кој зборува и кој кажува повеќе од самиот субјект.

Она што ја карактеризира замената на просторната длабочина со длабочината на времето е двоењето на гледиштето, споделувањето на перцепцијата на околината помеѓу анимираното (животот субјект), неанимираното (обектот, гледачката машина) и, отсега натаму, обектот (грешката, промашувањето, неуспехот). Гледиштето(-ата) на овој поглед, неговите визуализации, се она што е веќе во около на камерата(-ите), останувајќи во состојба на латентна непосредност во огромниот куп глубин од она што е тикво на меморијата, сакајќи повторно да се појават, неизоставно, кога ќе им дојде време (Пол Вирилио). Оттаму, одново да се присвои местото на оваа меморија, на виртуелната меморија, на модерен начин, значи да не се остават никакви други траги (бидејки виртуелната меморија не е веќе функција на миналото, туку на инднината) туку да се остават грешки, промашувања и неуспеси! Брои-

The introduction of errors, failures, potential bodies and viruses in perfect, simulated environments and the cyberworld can be viewed, therefore, as a means to developing new aesthetic and conceptual strategies, since the error as abject - an object of horror and disgust - cannot be integrated into the matrix. We can actually think about the error, in the words of Jacques Derrida, as a way of developing the logic of re-marking (re-marque). The logic of re-marking is similar to the function of the error or of the symptom, where what at first seemed an informative, general view of an event - a shot, so to speak, from a neutral, objective distance - suddenly turns out to be both threatening and embodied. The error is actually ‘the thing’ itself; it is the subject that is speaking, and tells more than the subject itself.

What characterizes the replacement of the depth of space by the depth of time is a splitting of viewpoint, the sharing of perception of the environment between the animate (the living subject), the inanimate (the object, the seeing machine) and, from now on, the abject (the error, mistake, failure). The vision(s) of this viewpoint, its visualizations, are what is already there in the eye of the camera(s), remaining in a state of latent immediacy in the huge junk heap of the stuff of memory, wanting to reappear, inexorably, when the time comes (Paul Virilio). To reappropriate the place of this memory, of virtual memory, in the modern way means, therefore, not to leave any more traces - as virtual memory is no longer a function of the past, but of the future - but instead to leave mistakes, errors, and failures! The speed at which TV and radio information circulates (in terms of one way distribution) has already been overtaken by the static speed of computer calculations; this means the speed of Internet
connections becomes more and more important. A failure, an error, a mistake is, therefore, the route leading to a transformation from the subject to the abject, which with its senseless, obscene intervention, can be perceived as the new (failed!) subject position.\(^8\)

NOTES

1 Quotation from the essay by Yvonne Volkart “Stubborn Practices in the Age of Information and Biotechnology”, written as a part of her curatorial project Tenacity: Cultural Practices in the Age of Information and Biotechnology, presented at the Swiss Institute, New York, 2000 and at the Stedhale, Zurich, 2000.


3 Ibid., p. 217.

4 Ibid., p. 218.

5 Ibid., p. 225.

6 Ibid., p. 226.

7 Ibid., p. 221.

8 I would like to express my gratitude for the English language editing of the present paper to Tina Horne and as well to Verena Kuni and Claudia Reiche for their engagement in the production, distribution and future publishing of this essay. I would like to acknowledge the support in preparation of this essay (discussion and invitation to Skopje to share, present and partly publish the essay) by dr. Nebojsa Vilic, Suzana Milevska and dr. Elizabeta Seleva.
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