1. Introduction

Steven Spielberg’s *Minority Report* (2002), like many other Hollywood movies (Mercury Rising, Conspiracy Theory, etc.), can be viewed as a sample of paranoid exaggeration intrigued/seduced by the limits, or “limitlessness” of human consciousness. If we look at the movie from this point of view, there is nothing much to say about it, except just another sample of the same “genre.” Some mutated creatures (three precogs, Agatha, Dashiell and Arthur) offer prophecy from the future in order to prevent crime. Just, as with the sci-fi fantasy genre, plenty of visual effects are combined in the plot, to
The “Temple” of Reversed Mystery

станува збор за научна фантастика, дејството го надополнуваат голем број визуелни ефекти, со цел да го прикажат исключително модерниот и технолошки градски живот во 2054 година.

Меѓутоа, во Малцински извештаи тоа зема поголем замав и, за да го дешифрираме, треба да се позанимаваме со современата општествена теорија. Од досега прикажаното, некои кодови стануваат прилично јасни, доколку не сте ги откриле и самите додека сте го гледале филмот: имињата на тројцата јасновидци упатуваат на тројцата мајстори на детективскиот роман, Артур Конан Дојл, Дашил Хамет и Агата Кристи. Авторот не сакал само да си поигра туку и да ја смени насоката на традиционалниот механизам на криминалистичката приказна. Оваа почетна точка би можела да ни послужи како основа за макар делумно светлување на загатките во филмот.

2. Каде лежи загатката?

2. Where is Mystery?

Во што се состои обратната загадочност на Малцински извештаи? Прашањево вреди да се разгледа во контекст, да се проанализира создадената стварност во филмот. Прво да се потсетиме на образецот на класичната детективска приказна: главниот лик (во романи на Агата Кристи - Херкул Поаро, а во делата на Артур К. Дојл - Шерлок Холмс) со помош на емпириска истрага и аналитичка обработка на податоците, ги разгледува можните осомничени, го пронаоѓа злосторникот (најчесто убиец) по извршеното злосторство. Развојот на дејството во филмот е повикал да помогне при светлувањето на случај кој властите (полицијата) не успеваат соодветно да го решат. Нешто во заклучоците на властите делува express the ultra-modern and ultra-technological urban life of the future (in the film’s case 2054).

However, Minority Report goes further and the further it goes, the more we should get involved with contemporary social theory to decipher its codes. As you can see in these very first lines of this article, some of the codes have been revealed already. The names of three precogs refer to the three brilliant masters of mystery literature; Arthur Conan Doyle, Dashiell Hammett and Agatha Christie. This is actually something more than a joke and the story is inversing the classical mechanism of mystery stories. Perhaps this point as the first step would provide us with a suitable basis to lighten the riddles of the film.
not sustained, not explained, or not supported. Therefore, the detective is expected to uncover "the truth".

Sherlock Holmes, Hercule Poirot, and their numerous colleagues from the late 19th Century, though the Golden Age of detective novels to the end of 20th Century up-to-now, have always scrutinized the marks of crime, especially at the scene of the crime; looked for signs and clues, after an intellectual/analytical process of all these indications, he/she completes the puzzle. At the end, the solved puzzle shows us the face of the criminal. This typical approach of detective work is compared to the working style of positivist scientist and for sure it is not a coincidence that the birth screams of positivism and modern detective literature were mixed with each other during 19th Century.

As a more interesting comparison, detective fiction is discussed with its interconnections to modern medicine. According to this perspective, “clinical reasoning and the detective fiction genre show many similarities in their cultural background and context. Both try to restore a status quo that has been undermined by a crime or disease. During their golden age, the two disciplines thrived on a climate of faith in the apparently unlimited capabilities of science and based their methods on deterministic interpretation of clues, signs, and symptoms.

Detectives and clinicians reach a final, reasoned “diagnosis” by decoding signs (clues) that are often meaningless or disconcerting to the layman.” Actually Arthur Conan Doyle was a medical doctor himself and “wrote many medical incidents into his stories, ranging from tropical diseases to cardiovascular medicine.” So, the detective and the doctor, who are decoding the signs and symptoms, were connected in the personality of Arthur C. Doyle. However both the doctor and detective

霍尔姆斯，赫尔克力·波洛或他们的众多同事在19世纪末到20世纪末这段时间内，他们总是仔细审视犯罪的痕迹，特别是在犯罪现场。在经过智力/分析的处理过程之后，他/她完成了这个谜题。在最后，解决的谜题显示了罪犯的面容。这种典型的侦探工作方法被比作 positivist 科学家的工作方式，当然，这并非巧合，因为 positivism 和现代侦探文学的诞生时期在19世纪。

作为更有趣的比较，侦探小说与现代医学的相互连接被讨论。根据这一视角，“临床推理和侦探小说类型在他们的文化背景和背景下显示了相似性。两者都试图恢复被犯罪或疾病破坏的现状。在他们的黄金时代，这两门学科在对科学的信仰气候下繁荣发展，并基于决定论解释线索、迹象和症状的方法建立其方法。

侦探们和临床医生最终通过解码迹象（线索）来做出合理的“诊断”，这些迹象对普通人来说通常是无意义的或令人不安的。实际上，阿瑟·康拉德·多伊尔本身就是一名医生，并且“在他的故事中写了许多医学事件，从热带疾病到心血管医学。”因此，侦探和医生，他们在解码迹象和症状，与阿瑟·C·多伊尔的性格相连。然而，无论是医生还是侦探
were looking for a diagnosis after the problem; either crime or disease.

We are coming to the crucial point of our discussion on *Minority Report*. In the movie, in the dark and dystopian days of 2054, just this very essential dimension of classical detective fiction is reversed, through two steps of complexion: first, the detectives (with the representative choice of the names such as Arthur, Dashiell and Agatha) trapped inside a pool as located into the mutated bodies precogs and giving prophecy about the criminal future. Second, after the dislocation of his position by non-official detectives for a long time, finally the official detective (policeman) takes his lost profession back from the private investigator, thanks to their imprisonment inside that pool as mutant. To be clearer, I should admit that we have already begun to make an interpretation rather than do so based on the apparent meaning(s) of the screenplay. However, a reminder of plot would be helpful to make our interpretation clearer. Just a summary, long enough to show the episteme of the movie and short enough not to be boring to the readers who remember details of the screenplay...

**The Plot of Minority Report**

John Anderton (Tom Cruise), a drug addicted police officer, is working in the Precrime Section of the Police Department. The Precrime program is based on the computer analysis of the psychic signals coming from the three precogs, Agatha, Arthur and Dashiell. Dr. Iris Hineman (Lois Smith) developed the precogs, who were the children of drug user parents, with special mental talents on prophecy. Precogs’ bodies are in a kind of paralysis while their faces seem awake. They are somewhere in between death and life and became the integrated parts of a bio-computer system of mid-21st Century. The pool where the precogs are located is filled with a liquid in a building known as the Temple. Precogs report
ваат за идни злосторства преку проекција на нивните мисли на екранот. Џ. Андрerton се обидува да ги открие осомничениите и местата на злосторствата пред да се случат. Еден ден Јасновидците известуваат дека 36 часа по доцна самоот Џ. Андрerton ќе изврши злосторство. Полицаецот наводно ќе уби човек со име Лио Кроу, кого не го ни познава. Започнува да трага по него за да го спречи злосторството. Во оваа своја потрага ги менува очите за да ги избегне системите за контрола на рожниците и да ја „kidnapira“ јасновитката Агата (Саманта Morton). Конечно го наоѓа Лио Кроу кој му вели дека му го kidnapiral и убил синот. Андрerton сака да го уби, но успева да се смири и се обидува да го уапси. Меѓутоа, Кроу му го грабнува пиштолот и го повлекува чкрапалото (слична сцена му се повторува и со Бурџис. Во обата случаи Андрerton беа близо до убивање, но останува “чист”, а “лошите“ се самоубиваат, но го претвораат полицаецот во соучесник). Во текот на истрагата (во која е бегалец и се крие од властите) сфаќа дека многумина биле осудени на биополитички затвор, иако се предомислиле и може и не би го извршиле предвиденото злосторство. На крај, открива и докажува дека Ламар Бурџис (Макс фон Сидоу), директорот на полицијата, и самоот е вмешан во неколку злосторства, меѓу кои и убиството на мајката на Агата, само за да продолжи со програмата.

Во резимето испуштивме некои поединости на кои ќе се навратиме подоцна. Очигледно онтолошката епистема на филмот го помести и сврте редоследот на „загатката“, па дури и ништо не останува загадочно. Благодарение на пророштвата на Јасновидците, ефикасната и техничка анализа на Џон Андрerton во „Аналитичката комора“, врз основа на сликите кои пристигнуваат од Храмот, е просто механички процес, а не интелектуален осврт како научната истрага на класичниот детектив. Андрerton го добива точниот момент кога злосторството ќе се случи, слика од настанот, дури и името на потенцијалниот злосторник преку топчиња налик на оние за билијар future crimes through the reflections of their minds into the monitor. J. Anderton is trying to find out the crime suspects and crime place before a given crime happens. One day the precogs report a murder to be committed by J. Anderton 36 hours later. The officer is to kill a man named Leo Crow, who is not one of his acquaintances. He begins to allow the adventure to reach him and prevent his own crime before it happens. In this adventure he transplants other eyes to escape from the iris control systems and “kidnap” the precog, Agatha (Samantha Morton). Finally he finds Leo Crow, who says he kidnapped and killed his son. Anderton intends to kill him, although later he controls his anger and tries to arrest him instead. However, Crow grabs the gun inside Anderton’s hands and pulls the trigger (a similar scene will happen once more with Burgess. In both cases, Anderton is close to murder, though stays “clean” and “bad men” kill themselves, somehow making the officer a collaborator5). During his investigation (meantime he is a fugitive still and is evading capture from the police authorities) he realizes that many people could be sentenced to biopolitical imprisonment although they had a change and maybe they would not attempt the crime that they were expected to do. Finally, he exposes and proves that Lamar Burgess (Max von Sydow), the Director of Police Department, is involved in several crimes, especially the murder of Agatha’s mother, just to continue the program.

There are several details that we have excluded in this summary to be explicit, although we will refer to them every now and then. It is obvious that the ontological episteme of the movie shifted and reversed the order of “mystery.” In this process nothing remained mysterious. Thanks to the prophecies of precogs and John Anderton’s extremely operative and technical analysis in the “Analytical Room,” based over the images coming from the Temple, investigation is a mechanical process rather than an intellectual reflection of the scientific investigation of the classical detective. The exact time of a given crime in the future, some views of the scene and even the name of possible criminal over billiard ball-like balls (it
never happens! The Precrime policemen alwas go and prevent the potential criminal) are given to Anderton. He should only track down the criminal’s location, go there with his team and arrest him/her before the crime is committed. So, there is no mystery in this new criminological level. Crime, criminal, his/her attempt, everything is revealed from the beginning. By this way the investigation is not looking backward to understand what, why and how something happened, even it is not analytically looking forward to understand why and through which motives the crime will happen. It is rather like a “time race” to prevent what is exact in the future.

But, ontologically it is handicapped: if it is exact, how can it be changed? The dilemma is one of the neo-Zenonian paradoxes that occupy the mind of our protagonist.

Of course, there is something more than reversing the typical mystery mechanism, in the movie’s screenplay, full of references to other fields such as philosophy and religion, either directly or indirectly. An analysis of Minority Report should pass necessarily by the concepts of past, present, future and destiny that have been the interest of both religious and philosophical discourses. Although the references to literature were obvious in the movie (names of precogs), the deep connection with philosophy was hidden masterfully. We should look to the deepest layers of the text to perceive the faded name of the philosopher: Hegel. What would Hegel tell us about Minority Report? Ventriloquism seems to be the fate of contemporary criticism sometimes.
Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel

German philosopher Hegel, defined three different methods of history, in *The Philosophy of History*:

1. Original History;
2. Reflective History;
3. Philosophical History.⁶

His words about “reflective history” are quite interesting in our case and deserve to be borrowed to and used in the contemporary critical field:

Reflective History’s “mode of representation is not really confined by the limits of the time to which it relates, but whose spirit transcends the present. In this second order a strongly marked variety of species may be distinguished. (...) A history which aspires to traverse long periods of time, or to be universal, must indeed forego the attempt to give individual representations of the past as it actually existed. It must foreshorten its pictures by abstractions; and this includes not merely the omission of events and deeds, but whatever is involved in the fact that Thought is, after all, the most trenchant epitomist. A battle, a great victory, a siege, no longer maintains its original proportions, but is put off with a bare mention.”⁷

A theoretical light stream is flooding over our case, from this quote. Hegel, who was critisized and at the same time inherited somehow by Karl Marx and “proletarian warriors”; who was tried to be reversed on his feet again by the dialectical materialistic *Reason*; now, as an evil game of history reversed again in the hands of Hollywood cultural industry, even without condescending his name, at all. Maybe just a Hollywood effect as the hyper-realistic end of History! In the first lines of his *18 Brumaire*, Karl Marx said: “Hegel remarks somewhere that all great world-historic facts and personages appear,
so to speak, twice. He forgot to add: the first time as tragedy, the second time as farce.”

Maybe today we can say that, “theoretical concepts can appear for a third time in history, going beyond tragedy and farce, into the shallow form of a pure product in the market of culture industry”. According to Adorno and Horkheimer, culture industry has degenerated culture and at the same time “intellectualized” entertainment process while working like a big factory producing cultural products. Of course, from the 19th Century Marx was far away to see how the “cultural sector” would work as a mass production that he had named “superstructure” and considered as a reflection of economic structure/basis.

If we go back to the quote from Hegel, what is the explanatory value of these words for us in this film analysis? How the words of Hegel on “reflective history” match with the fiction in Minority Report? What is the theoretical light overflowing from these words? We need a slight refraction to follow the “links” between the movie and Hegel’s philosophical approach. In order to see how the shadows of the texts (the movie’s screenplay and The Philosophy of History) are mingled in with one another, maybe we have to see the reinterpretation possibilities of Hegel’s words. Apparently the philosopher was talking about “the past” (like classical detectives, looking to the past) and his interest was in sieges, battles, wars, etc. i.e. the “major events” of human history. In our “reinterpretation” we will shift the time orientation/direction of his perspective from “past” to the “future” and reduce the sophisticated potentials of these words into a prism directed toward this Hollywood product. In the eyes of Precogs, reflection on crime is not really confined by the “limits of the time,” their spirits transcends the present. This psychic methodology, which aspires to
духои им ја надминува сегашноста. Пророчкиов приспап, кој се стврдли да покрие големи временски периоди, никако не сме да се обидува поединечно да ја претпоставува иднина каква навистина ќе биде. Сликиште мора да ги сведе на апстракции; а ова не подразбира само изосставување на наситани делови, туку на сè што влегува во идејата дека Мислашата е сепак најсилниот оштетувориштел. Кое било убиство или злосторство, не ги задружува првичниот димензија туку само се споменува.

Кога прекршувањето на поимот време на философско ниво од страна на Спилберг – или Ф. К. Дик – ќе се примени во хегеловскиот опис на „рефлексивна историја“, виднаш се јавува прекин на зракот светлина. Умот/очите на Јасновидците, како извртување на рефлексивната историја, гледаат случаи од иднината, не зависат од „временските граници“, при што излегуваат од рамките на сегашноста. Прикажуваат „поединечни претстави“ од злосторничката иднина, онааква каква што наскоро ќе биде, како да е запишана во друго Божјо сценарио. Сликите кои ги создаваат, односно преобликуваат во најсилни отелотворенија, се скратените слики на идните дејства и „само го споменуваат“ злосторството. Иднината веќе не е прилагодлив збир од можности кои лесно се менуваат во зависност од слободната човечка волја, напротив, функционира како железното тркало на неизбежноста. Истината што не е прилагодлив збир од можности кои лесно се менуваат во зависност од слободната човечка волја, напротив, функционира како железното тркало на неизбежноста. Значи, секој добива своја судбина и никое не може да си го смени животот на „подобро“. Ако Јасновидците кажат дека ќе убияте некого, тоа сигурно ќе се случи, па Одделот за преткриминалистика ве апсират да ја спречи оваа можност пред воопшто и да се оствари. Дали е ова толку футуристичка замисла?

When Spielberg’s (and P. K. Dick’s) refracting the time concept, on a philosophical level, is applied to the Hegelian description of “Reflective History,” a cloven appears immediately where the light flows. Precogs’ minds/eyes as a reversal of reflective history, looking to happenings of the future, without being confined by “the limits of the time” and by this way they transcend the borders of the present. They reflect “individual representations” of the criminal future, as it will “exactly” happen soon, as if it is written in another divine screenplay. The images they create or rather pre-shape as trenchant epitomes are foreshortened pictures of the coming actions and put off with a “bare mention” of crime. No longer is the future a flexible diversity of potentials and easy to change according to the free will of human beings. It is, on the contrary, working like the iron wheel of unchanging destiny. So, everybody is stuck to his/her exact destiny and nobody has the power to change his/her life in a “better” way. If Precogs say that you will kill somebody, you have no power to change it and before your action the Precrime Department arrests you to prevent this potential before it is realized. Is this vision that futuristic?
Hence, the reversed image of Hegel’s concepts touches the soul of *Minority Report*. On the one hand this looks like a plain version of prophecy that we have seen thousands of examples of in other movies, stories and novels; on the other hand, especially from the escape of Anderton later on this could be seen as more complicated seductive games of fate. Because, Anderton, as the most conscious person on this system, is seduced by effusing the clues regarding his forthcoming murder; as otherwise it would not be possible to include him in this abstruse trick of the “fate.”

However, we should admit that Steven Spielberg saves himself and his film from cheap bounces of “time journey”, that we can see numerous samples of in other Hollywood science-fiction productions. Spielberg’s disassembling “time perspective” of classical mystery and by this way dissolving mystery in a transparent future cannot be connected only to Hegel’s philosophy; in my opinion it is also possible to trace some lines of associations toward the *Theses on History* by Walter Benjamin. At the end of his theses, Benjamin exposed a complicated idea about comprehension of history:

> “The soothsayers who queried time and learned what it had in store certainly did not experience it as either homogeneous or empty. Whoever keeps this in mind will perhaps get an idea of how past times were experienced in remembrance— namely, in just this way. We know that the Jews were prohibited from inquiring into the future: the Torah and the prayers instructed them in remembrance. This disenchanted the future, which holds sway over all those who turn to soothsayers for enlightenment. This does not imply, however, that for the Jews the future became homogeneous, empty time. For every second was the small gateway in time through which the Messiah might enter.”10
Во овие длабоки и речиси поетски мисли Бенјамин упатува на бинарниот карактер на историјата. Иако пророштвата и гледањето во иднината биле забранети во Тората, а сите прифатливи врски со времето и незаборавот биле свртени кон минатото, во облик на секавање, сепак во секој миг од иднината се наоѓа можен влез за Месија (Спасителот). Иднината не е ниту „единородна“ ниту „празна“, како аморфна маса, туку може да се ослободи. Спасителот, наречен Месија во светите книги, „пролетаријатот“ кај Карл Маркс – во делата на Бенјамин обично има двојно значење и кабалистички асоцијации; некогаш може да ги има двете значења, скриени зад двосмислената завеса од шифрирани зборови.

Зборовите на Бенјамин се позагадочни од филмот на Спилберг. Малцински извештаи, благодарение на Јасновидците, однапред ги прикажува злосторниците, злодела и жртвите, а остатокот од дејството е проста трка со времето. Но, приказната на Спилберг има допирни точки со теоријата на Бенјамин. Речи како противтеза, Спилберг го врти секавањето кон иднината. Тројцата Јасновидци ги подредуваат сликите за да го преуредат утрешното „помнење“... Ослободени се од товарот на линеарниот тек на времето и како да можат да се сетат на иднината. Ова не е дури ни „пророштво“, туку нешто налик на извртувањето на хегеловските поими за кое зборувавме претходно. Така во филмската приказна вестите од иднината се сосема „обезвреднети“ и наликуваат на постојана молитва посветена на миналото (прекршено минато кое станало иднина). Не случајно местото каде се наоѓаат Јасновидците се вика Храм. Тоа е храмот каде се наоѓаат Јасновидците (имињата на мутантите и жанрот кој го претставуваат) дреме во течност (чест симбол за матка), а спасителот (Андертон) може во вистинскиот момент да влезе низ даден „премин“ за...

In these profound and almost lyrical lines Benjamin indicates the binary character of history. Although the soothsaying path and looking into the future were prohibited in the Torah and all acceptable relations with memory and time turned their faces into the past, in a “remembrance” form; still in every second of future there is the possibility of a gateway to allow the Messiah (Savior) to enter. The future is neither “homogeneous” nor “empty,” amorfous rather, it has the potential for emancipation. The savior, called the Messiah in the Scripture, was “proletariat” for Karl Marx. In Benjamin’s works it has dual meanings and Cabalistic associations; it can be both sometimes, behind the ambiguous curtains of coded words.

In Benjamin’s words there is certainly more mystery than in Spielberg’s movie. Minority Report, thanks to Precogs shows the criminals, criminal action and victim beforehand and the rest of the work is just a race against time. However, somewhere in Spielberg’s fiction is a nod to Benjamin’s theory. Almost as an anti-thesis, Spielberg turns the equation of remembrance to the future. Three Precogs are combining the images to reorganize the “memory” from tomorrow... They are liberated from the carriages of linear current of time and as if capable to remember future... This is not even “soothsaying;” something similar to a reversal of Hegelian concepts we mentioned above. In this aspect, in the cinematographic fiction, giving news from the future is “disenchanted” entirely and looks like constant prayers dedicated to the past (a past refracted in a trap and became future). The name of Precogs’ location is not random: Temple. This is the temple where the past (three names of mutants and the genre they represent) let to be half-asleep in the liquid (a very common sign for the womb) and in particular a “gateway” to future the savior (Anderton) can enter exactly at the right time, to save lives of victims, thanks
da ги спасува жртвите, благодарение на ритуалното толкување на претскажувањата на Јасновидците, при што „метафизичките заклучоци“ кои излегуваат од базенот наликуваат на богослужба. Класичните детективи се обсрнуваат, се присекаваат на мина-ти случки и денови; и во Малцински извештај тие се изворот на сознација, само што погледот им е свртен кон иднината. А ако работата им наликува на „претскажување“, плаќаат висока цена, како Божја казна, за да се искупат за ваквиот свој „грев“ – не можат физички да се движеат, заробени се полусвесни во течноста, полуживи, полумртви.

Спасителот најпрво треба самиот да се спаси и го бара преминот низ кој ќе се ослободи и ќе го спречи своето злодело (убиство). Како што се развива патештвението, тој станува се посвесен дека иднината воопшто не е „празна“, туку полна со „разнородни“ можности, иако пред него стои „главна патека“ која станува се појасна. Се спасува на некој начин, никогаш не убива ненамерно и останува невин. Освен тоа, со својата битка Андерсон ги открива недостатоците на Програмата за преткриминалистика, укинатата по смртта на Ламар Бурџис, кој и самиот извршил повеќе злосторства за да ја одржи програмата. Со други зборови, дури и да било нешто налик на „пророштво“, Спасителот го укинал. Спасението се состои во затворање на вратите кон иднината од страна на Спасителот кој минал низ мигот на преминот што се отворил во иднината.

3. Криминолошки дилеми

Философските „огледала“ кои го прекршуваат поимот време не се единственото можно толкување на Малцински извештај. Филмот се развива во склад со криминолошките прашања и расправи и во to all the rituals of reading the omens offered Precogs, in which the “metaphysical conclusions” coming from the pool resemble real worship. The classical detective story writer is looking to the past, recollecting past happenings and old times; in Minority Report, the source of knowledge is a daze stretched to the future. If their work looks like “soothsaying,” they pay a heavy atonement to tolerate this “sin,” losing their ability to move physically and being caged inside the liquid half-conscious, half-alive and half-dead as if by divine punishment.

The Savior should save himself first of all and he is searching for the gateway where he will receive emancipation, preventing his own crime (murder). The more he progresses in his adventure, the further he learns that the future is not “empty” at all. It is full of “heterogeneous” probabilities, although there is a “main route” before him. In one sense he saved himself, did not kill anybody intentionally and kept his purity and innocence. Moreover, Anderton’s struggle showed the harms of the Precrime Program and the entire program was stopped after the death of Lamar Burgess, who committed a series of crimes to continue Precrime activities. In other words, even if there was something like “soothsaying” it was terminated by the Savior. Closing the doors to the future is the sole salvation brought by the Savior who passed through the short moment of the gateway opened in the future.

3. Criminology’s Dilemmas

Looking through philosophical “mirrors” games inverting the time concept is not the only way in which Minority Report could be interpreted. There are much more direct joints to the body of social issues and theories.
Каков беше вообичаениот криминолошкиот дискурс порано? Криминологијата како интердисциплинарна област се појави незavisно меѓу општествените науки, иако потекнува од философијата и теоријата на правото. Уште во дискурсот на „биолошкиот

The movie’s pace goes in harmony with criminological matters and discussions.

However, we should ask ourselves whether the warning of science fiction is about a dark, dystopian future or on the current tendencies of contemporary societies. Maybe not all of them, but for sure Minority Report indicates some existing happenings of today’s world, or at least, it shares the same social and biopolitical episteme with the actual power relations, rather than constructing a mechanical reflection of the world. The concept of crime, criminological discourse, “reproduction” of justice; as a summary all the spirit of age has changed in late 20th Century. So, movies, novels, stories, art works similar to the point of Minority Report are being influenced by these new tendencies and we can see the marks on them. In brief, a body of art, culture and literature inevitably transform; while a deeper change in the social and political body is performed.

What was the conventional criminological discourse in the past? As an interdisciplinary field in social sciences, criminology arose independently, although it had its roots and nucleuses in the philosophy of law and judicial theory. Even the early “biological positivism” discourse
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(Cesare Lombroso) in criminology was appraising some signals of the late 21st century’s new security ideology. In the beginning, the positivist criminological approach was separating the potential criminals according to their features. As a prison doctor, Lombroso believed that he had found some repeating characteristics in the criminals. In this way, criminology was exposing a visual control and precaution methodology to diagnose crime/criminal. However, during the 19th century and until end of the 90’s, the power, states and authorities have not used Lombroso’s and criminologists’ pattern to stop potential criminals, before their actions, in general. I mean, people did not have a period that some were widely arrested just as a look to the abstract “wanted” pictures shaped by classical criminologists and not considered as a criminal just because of the proportions of organs in their faces. With another expression, the classical criminological theories never made the exact majority of all human population the subject of “crime precaution,” or with Minority Report’s terminology, Precrime activities. The threshold of 21st century has been also a “gateway” to these ultra-paranoid activities of new criminological approach, that we can call hyper-criminology. On this level, billions of people can be subject of a wide suspicion easily with actual practices, on the one hand, and through their artistic or cinematic expressions, on the other hand.

Of course, we did not jump to this paranoid level suddenly. Some middle stages were treaded in order to reach this point. Now the genes determining criminality claimed, then some ethnical, racial or religious features “criminalized.” Discussions of a “risk society” accompany this process. According to Ulrich Beck, “three layers of danger can be identified in the world risk society. Each
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one either follows a different logic of conflict, circles around or represses other topics, or crushes or empowers certain priorities: first ecological crises, second global economic crises, and third—since September 11—the risk of transnational terrorist networks.”

Of course, many other “risks” (in health, sex, entertainment, travel, technology, to name but a few) can be mentioned regarding contemporary life. However, these three, especially the last one is the most challenging and this mobilizes the transformation of biopolitical waves in modern power relations, on a global scale.

If Lombroso saw how criminology arrived at the “hyper” level and thanks to “ultra-positivist” empirical technologies, in which modern authorities are trying to find out the criminal and prevent crime, I am sure that he would be greatly surprised. It is stigmatic to see the way that ontological basis of Minority Report and modern security ideology is stepping over the same soil of social existence and production of meaning. Let us analyze two cases in connection, to clarify and proceed better, first is from the movie and second is from life:

Robotic Spiders and EYEdentiscan

In a miserable room the fugitive, Anderton, is sleeping, his eyes are bandaged. He replaced his eyeballs a couple of hours ago to escape from the identity check working through optical iris controls. Wherever he was going, not only security staff, also advertisements, shops and billboards were identifying him, calling with full name and referring to his previous shopping there. After replacing another couple of eyeballs he will be “invisible” for the well-organized net or iris/identity detection. When he was in that illegal operation
room, waiting to recover, a police team came and announced the “Spyders’ Eyedentiscan.” A group of spyders let inside the building, the robots as big as a fist and equipped with a special antenna to check irises are scanning all the building. They are able to locate everybody by searching for body heat. Opening their eyelids (if closed) and checking people’s identities in a few seconds. People eating food, chatting, fighting, making love, etc., only waiting silently when a spyder comes, to let it check their eyes and after continue what they were doing previously. Anderton is hidden in a bath tub, full of cold water and ice, in order to hide his body heat. When spyders appear under the door through the bathroom he is under the water. Small robots are searching skeptically; a bubble is going up to the surface of water. The spyder finds him, opens the bandage and his eyelid: he is clean! Because he has got new eyeballs of somebody else, after the replacement operation.

MALINTENT is reading your mind!

The most “preventive” innovation in security issues is MALINTENT, improved by the authorities, as cutting-edge to complete the old school techniques (screening metal and explosives). This is searching your body for “non-verbal cues that predict whether you mean harm to your fellow passengers.” MALINTENT “has a series of sensors and imagers that read your body temperature, heart rate and respiration for unconscious signs invisible to the naked eye — signals terrorists and criminals may display in advance of an attack.” If the sensors see that there is something off, then they transmit all the warning data to analysts and they (analyst team) decide whether to flag that passenger for further checking and questioning. In the next step there is micro-facial scanning, “which involves measuring minute muscle movements in the face for clues to mood and intention.” A special system developed to define and measure seven primary emotions that are reflected with the movements of facial muscles. MALINTENT can identify these emotions and relay the information back to a security screener, immediately.
Which sounds more like science-fiction, EYEdentiscan or MALINTENT? Actually both share the same level of reality. The relation between the worlds of Spyders and MALINTENT is not an artistic or imaginary representation; rather it is possible to say that the real dimension of connection between these two components is collaboration. These collaborators of modern power relations are working on the same body. Spyders are catching the eyes, to identify the “modern subject;” MALINTENT is going further and reading the mind. Psychoanalysts, criminologists are in sulks aside; as they lost their analytical position on behalf of these robots which (who) are working much more accurately. Fingerprints and questioning by experienced policemen is outdated and archaic already. If the Spyder says who you are and if MALINTENT reveals your “malice intention,” who can defend you? Privacy, human rights, law, justice, freedoms, rights of defense, etc.; these were just un-technical, useless and ideological categories which were performed as side effects of the lower levels of security paradigms! In this highest level of power episteme, one can be diagnosed as a threat, judged and even, in some cases executed in a few minutes. Speed has exceeded old fashion discourse of “rights”! Criminology liberated from its humanistic handicaps and social theoretical obstacles has become a computer program’s function supported with technical and digitalized devices. Hyper-Criminology is like a Hegelian “anti-thesis” of previous levels in criminal studies and future steps will be probably a “synthesis” of different components from different phases. A comparison between MALINTENT

“Future Attribute Screening Technology” (FAST) because it is developed to have passengers pass security in a few minutes."
Karl Marx claimed that the reality of the age is illustrated “upside-down” inside an ideological field of particular period of history. According to Marx, “the language of real life” and material processes (economic basis) directly interwoven with production of ideas, conceptions and consciousness. Thinking and mental production of societies (in politics, law, ethics, religion, etc.) are based on a “definite development of their productive forces and of the intercourse corresponding to these.” In the Marxian interpretation of ideology “consciousness” is only an expression of the social existence of men in their actual life-process. “If in all ideology men and their circumstances appear upside-down as in a camera obscura, this phenomenon arises just as much from their historical life-process as the inversion of objects on the retina does from their physical life-process.”

Karl Marx suggested a materialistic methodology to explain the emergence of imagination, conceiving, different narrations and all superstructural phenomena; i.e. “the development of ideological reflexes” as different forms constructing “the real life-process.” His theoretical approach requires one to consider “the phantoms” formed in the mind of people, as sublimations of “material life-process,” bound to material conditions.
The culture industry in late-capitalism turned the “ideological echoes” process and “material life-process” into a mingled mechanism. Hollywood, in our current case, and its paranoid and dystopian conspiracy fictions, are not reflections of any reality, they are a part, a function of the real, so called “material” life conditions. There are many examples that show how military, security, intelligence and politics levels in contemporary societies, especially in American society, are realized through interconnections of cultural productions, especially cinema. There is a wide knowledge on this issue that I would like to refer to one of the numerous examples. The Institute for Creative Technology, for instance, “draws on the entertainment industry know-how to sharpen military training through futuristc games and simulation. The institute’s Hollywood consultants also write story lines for virtual-reality military training videos–plots with swirling suspense and drama that aim to make a soldier’s training more compelling.”

This is quite beyond the passive reflection of any determining factor. In this complicated and extremely interwoven relations culture (particularly cinema) and actual societal existence became two similar departments of the “reality.” Perhaps Jean Baudrillard was right: “in America cinema is true because it is the whole of space, the whole way of life that are cinematic. The break between the two, the abstraction which we deplore, does not exist: life is cinema.” After the end of the “break” between life and cinema, films became an integral part of current factual power relations, beyond any abstraction. Body, once more, has become the nestling ground where biopolitical practices and devices are located.
4. “Bare Life” Dressed Motion Pictures

If we refer to another paranoid film of last decade. Cube, exit from the labyrinth requires a theoretical interference, even though it can include the risk of death for the reason. At this particular moment we should open a theoretical channel toward Giorgio Agamben.

Agamben’s impressive critical theory constructed its axis on the meanders between zoē and bios. For ancient Greeks the first indicates “bare life,” the concept of life that every living beings (humans, animals, plants) share. As for the second, this is only the life which is organized/realized in society; through social, political and cultural existence. In his enlightening work he is tracing “the entry of zoē into the sphere of the polis – the politicization of bare life as such – constitutes the decisive event of modernity and signals a radical transformation of the political-philosophical categories of classical thought.” Sovereignty which obtains its power as decide to the death (from murder, Operation Theater to concentration or refugee camps), zoē has been the subject of biopower further in modern societies.

The “sacred life” (Homo Sacer), which cannot be sacrificed (because already sacred ontologically), however can be killed, has appeared several times in the history: Homo Sacer, bandit, wolf-man, refugee, the body in “overcoma,” etc. According to bear life notion politics and life have become intertwined so much regarding body, biological life, sexuality, etc. These issues have become political issues (biopolitics). Agamben claims that: “once modern politics enters into an intimate symbiosis with bare life, it loses the intelligibility that still seems to
е характеристика на правнополитическата основа на класичната политика“.

Философот ни ги прикажува различните нивоа на односи меѓу „врховната власт“ и „голиот живот“ и тврди дека животот на бегалецот, кој нема биос (државјанство и граѓански/човекови права), е еден од најочигледните примери за тоа како модерната власт го развива голиот живот. Во логорите, и покрај проникнувањето, се преклюшуваат општественото поле каде се распространива зое на бегалците и просторот на дејствување на врховната власт која функционира со биополитички практики. Влезот во логорот го претставува „прагот на проникнување“. Безизлезноста на современите општества се состои во тоа што се повеќе лица ќе го преминат прагов: од една страна, има сè поголем број бегалци, а од друга страна, пак, биополитиката ги одредува аспекти на голиот живот. Веќе се застарени политичките критериуми на партиска или идеолошка припадност, како и тоа за кого ќе гласате.

In his work the philosopher shows us the different levels of relations between “sovereignty” and “bare life” and he discusses that the refugee’s life, as out of all bios (citizenship and citizen/human rights), is one of the pure and stigmatic examples of how modern power is processing on bare life. In camps, the social field where zoē of the refugees spread and operation spaces of sovereignty working through biopolitical practices overlap, despite the indistinctions. The gate of camps is the “threshold of indistinctions,” at the same time. The impasse of contemporary societies is that everyday more subjects are to pass this threshold: On the one hand literally the number of refugees is growing, on the other hand biopolitics are determining more sides of bare life. Whom you are voting for, which party or ideology you are supporting is the out-dated criteria of politics. Biopolitics is covering, or even passing inside all the bare life. In this point of view, “power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength we are endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society.”

In general these strategies are involved in control technologies and sovereignty over bodies, in 21st Century.

Spyders, small robots searching for the criminals and check their identity, remain un-sophisticated compared to advanced real technologies. However, they were, as metaphors, important: You are making love, eating foot, watching TV and so on... They just come out and find you, opening eyelids and after checking leave immediately; not interfering your bare, “un-political” life, zoē. You can enjoy your life (zoē) as you like, although “they” can come and catch you as they like. This is absolutely a...
post-Orwellian level of dystopia. When Spyders appear, all persons, almost with a bored expression wait and when they leave they continue from where their life was interrupted. *Interruption* is maybe another expression of what Agamben calls “exception.” Bare life does not exist for millions of moments; it is like a current flowing through the lines stretched between these interruptions of ordinary routine. If we follow Agamben’s theoretical routes, as he is keen for etymological games, let us do the same about “interruption.” The word comes from *interruptio*, with the same meaning in Latin. “Inter” is a prefix both in Latin and English, refers to a situation, action, condition or any other features happen “between” or “among” other components. The crucial point of the game starts, when we remember another word “rupture” (*ruptūra* in Latin) which means fracture, break or breach! If nobody stops us (before any Spyder come) we can go further to make up a new word: *interrupture*. Hence we can say that the interruptions of rules by sovereign power are *interruptures*, lines outstretching between breaches (breach of the rule by exception) or breaks (break or fracture between life and old forms of politics) and the thing we called “life” colloquially is only a long break between these “ruptures,” breaches performed by sovereignty. Are we still in Agamben’s episteme? For sure! However, we let the possible conclusions of this word game, or also a possible rebuttal of this conceiving to the followers of philosopher.

---

A што станува со животот на Јасновидците? Дали животот им е зое или биос? Речиси сум сигурен дека професор Агамбен би признал дека животот на Јасновидците е еден од најдраматичните прикази на „голиот живот“ во Холивуд. Ниту се живи ниту мртви.
Precrime Program) has the absolute power over them. A Precog is totally excluded from whatever can be called bios. It was interesting that the lives of Precogs and lives of people imprisoned in the movie were almost the same, something like a deep sleep. Even, we can say that, in this highest level of zoē, “bare life” is extremely handicapped by the biopower. We should remember how Agatha was out of the liquid. She was tottering, hardly moving without an abutment. Bare life, when dressed with advanced biopolitics, is becoming tottering. Power is not only controlling the body, rather it humiliates body. However, this is, through a secularized sacred, the highest level for Homo Sacer, too. It is (Precogs) located inside the Temple of this New Secular Sacred discourse; which does not have a God even. The Temple in the movie has its rituals, sacred lives and a kind of metaphysics as well. But, the most necessary component of the Temple is absent: God. Precogs, computer circuits and police have been consecrated and all took the vacant position of God. Sacredness finds its own paths and operates the New Secular Sacred. In our current case (Minority Report) preventing crime was the canal where the sacred liquid of the Temple flowed. As we tried to show already, in reality, through more complicated canals the same NSS finds its way.

5. News from the Cave

There was an important scene in the movie, which would be a corner stone to complete our philosophical/critical reading on Minority Report: Anderton is driving to his ex-wife’s house, with escaped Agatha. On the coastal highway Agatha says: “Can you see? So beautiful…” Anderton looks at her (at least in the screenplay by Scott Frank,25 although in the movie version we do not see his looking at her in this particular moment), as if she
What is beautiful? We will see that it was the beauty of “Truth.”

When they come to Lara’s (John Anderton’s ex-wife) house Agatha gets inside, sits down in front of a window. Through the window plenty of sunshine is shining through; the light and Agatha’s words are flowing over Lara and Anderton. She is telling the “truth” about their missing son and also a part of the “truth” regarding her (Agatha’s) mother’s murder. Anderton and Lara are listening in awe. Actually, she, her pale face, her words and the extremely bright light are almost fused and unified; they are the Truth. After the dramatic speech her last word was: RUN!26 Because the Precrime team was coming to arrest them.

In this scene Agatha becomes a “conceptual persona” in the Deleuzian meaning of the term.27 In Plato’s dialogues Socrates was speaking as the voice of the truth; in Minority Report Spielberg makes Agatha the spokesperson of the Platonic truth. The composition of the room is quite similar to Plato’s cave. From the window (door of the cave) the light of the ideal forms is coming. Agatha is the personalized (conceptual persona) reflection of “universals,” or the personalized concept of the Truth/Platonic image of illumination. Anderton and Lara, like the caged ones inside the cave, broke their chains and turned their faces to the knowledge coming from the Sun. In our intertextual reading related to Hegel and Benjamin, there was a reversal. However, in this scene, the relations to Plato’s Cave were parallel and it is not that hard to decipher it.

Finally we understand the question that Agatha is constantly asking, “Can’t you see?” was referring to the “truth”. Agatha’s word can be interpreted as “Can’t you...
Треба да обрнеме внимание на уште едно прашање. Зошто Спилберг ја замислил Агата, носителката на Вистината, како ќерка на наркоманка? Навестува ли дека она што го нарекуваме „вистина“ може да е само заблуда? Можеби вака Спилберг уште еднаш си поигрува со нас: во тајно црно кутивче вистината ја кодира како ќерка на „разум“ или за пријатна појава на дрога. Така, слоганот на ваквата „(хи пер) реална игра“ е „Добредојдовте во начукана градина на стварноста.“ Имаше право Бодријар, Малицински може да се сфати како уште еден пример на „сè поголемото проникнување меѓу стварното и виртуелното“.

6. Заклучок

Филмот е една од областите во кои современите општества се прикажани во својата најнапредна и најразвиена форма. Филмскиот јазик и јазикот на модерните биополитички кодови понекогаш делат заеднички речник и граматика. Скромниот придонес на статијата може да биде разјаснувањето на заемната поврзаност и соработка меѓу филмската уметност и биополитиката.

Од друга страна, пак, новата култура на ризик ја реконструира безбедносната идеологија во облик на Нова световна светост, а ваквата преобразба ги менува поимањата на криминологијата и правото. Во криминологијата од 2000-та наваму, правото и правдата се само алатки на НСС и функционираат see that I am the Truth. This is why there is a Temple for me!” the NSS, that is what today’s ideology of security and crime prevention has become and is an advanced mystification of contemporary paradigm which is reproduced globally.

However, there is something that should also be read/discussed. Why Spielberg conceived Agatha, the carrier of the Truth, as the daughter of a drug addict woman? Is it an indication that the thing we call “truth” can easily be an illusion? Maybe this is the last game that Spielberg played with us, in a hidden black box coding truth as the daughter of “reason” that is stoned in ecstasy or something working as a side effect of drugs. Then the motto of this “(hyper)reality game” is “Welcome the stoned garden of reality.” Baudrillard was right, Minority Report can be seen as one of the examples that shows “growing indistinction between the real and the virtual.”

6. Conclusion

Cinema is one of the fields that expresses contemporary societies in its most extreme, advanced and accomplished manifestation. Language of cinema and language of modern biopolitical codes sometimes have a common vocabulary and even grammar alike. This can be the modest achievement of this article, to clarify this correspondence and cooperation between cinema and biopolitics today.

On the other hand, new risk culture reconstructed the ideology of security as a NSS and this transformation also changed the concept of criminology and law. In 2000’s criminology, law and concept of justice are just technical apparatuses of NSS and work as different components of the same “totality,” global capitalist economy and so
како различни составни елементи на истата „целина“, глобалната капиталистичка економија и таканаречените либерални демократии. Малцински извештај е само уште една илустрација на овие општествени прашања.

Во филмот се појавува „трупот“ на дистопијата од 2000-та година наваму, хиперкриминологијата ги заменува старите криминолошки теори, а класичните детективски приказни се свртени наоѓа во испревртената реконструкција на времето и злосторството. Меѓутоа, и покрај сите возможности, „трупот“ веќе почнува да се распаѓа. Малцински извештај, како релативно успешен примерок на современ филм ноар, може да го сфатиме како типолошки израз на овој општествен распад. Освен тоа, во распадот не расте ништо налик на хегеловската противиза – меѓу филмот и општеството се шири само дистописката биополитика, која веќе нема миметички приказ.

The “body” of 2000’s dystopia has appeared from the film, while hyper-criminology takes the place of old school criminology theories and classical mysteries reversed inside the inverted reconstruction of time and crime. However, this “body,” in spite of its many possibilities and potentials, began to decay already. Minority Report, as a comparatively successful Example of contemporary film noir, can be considered a typological expression of this social decadence. Furthermore, there is nothing growing inside this decadence as a Hegelian antithesis; only the dystopian biopolitics are metastasized between cinema and society, beyond any mimetic representation.

Notes:
1. Minority Report is based on the short story by Philip K. Dick, although screenplay writers Scott Frank and Jon Kohen made major changes to the original short story.
3. Ibid.
4. Detectives of classical mystery fiction were pioneers of empiric, scientific and positivist methodology. Turning
them into psychics apparently requiring them to be paralyzed and also caged inside a metaphysical atmosphere called Temple. We will return to this issue later.

5. To see a Lacanian psychoanalytical approach to this situation, the mutual "death desire" between "good" and "evil" and finally the evil’s killing himself through an ambiguous action (especially with an unseen gun, under the view of camera) you can refer to the 2nd Chapter of this book: Slavoj Žižek, *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Jacques Lacan through Popular Culture* (The MIT Press, 1992).


7. Ibid., 17, 19.


13. "Spyder" is an intentional deconstruction made in the film to refer the spider-like robotic devices working like
spider) кои дејствуваат како шпиони (анг. spy) кои ги откриваат злосторниците. Eyedentiscan е слична кованица од око (анг. eye), идентитет (анг. identity) и скенирање (анг. scan) – процес на скенирање на рожницата на окото со цел препознавање.


16. Ibid.


19. Студентот по математика, кој успева да стигне до излезот, загинува на самот крај. Единствено аутистичното момче излегува од „коцката“, а надвор има само бескрајна белина како во лавиринтот, нова замка наместо вистинско спасение.


21. Ibid., 11.

22. Ibid., 71.
23. According to the UN Refugee Agency statistics, the number of refugees rose from 9.9 to 11.4 million by the end of 2007. See http://www.unhcr.org/statistics/STATISTICS/4852366f2.pdf


26. Scott Frank had said “RUN!” too, to the inmates of the French prisons.


28. *Matrix* has been a typical example to show how philosophical processes are related to science-fiction films.

29. The motto in *Matrix* was: “Welcome to the desert of reality.”