

Voreinstellungen - Presets.

“There is nothing outside the text” ‘There is nothing outside the machine’

"The Dematerialization of the Art Object" Lucy R Lippard.

"There is no special way works of art have to be. And that is the present and, I should say, the final moment in the master narrative. It is the end of the story." Danto, Arthur Coleman (1998).

"The “value” now of an original Cubist painting is not unlike, in most respects, an original manuscript by Lord Byron, or The Spirit of St. Louis as it is seen in the Smithsonian Institution. (Indeed, museums fill the very same function as the Smithsonian Institution – why else would the Jeu de Paume wing of the Louvre exhibit Cézanne’s and Van Gogh’s palettes as proudly as they do their paintings?) Actual works of art are little more than historical curiosities. As far as art is concerned Van Gogh’s paintings aren’t worth any more than his palette is." Art After Philosophy (1969) Joseph Kosuth

What if we ‘invert’ Kosuth’s idea...

What if the actual work, object, technology was responsible and not the 'idea'. The technology of paint in tubes, the railway system and a bourgeois society for impressionism... printing with moveable type for The Enlightenment. The Plough made civilization possible... Telescopes made Modern Astronomy and Astronomers... without the Santa Maria, Pinta & Nina no colonization of America...! (“the carrack was one of the most influential ship designs in history”)... Evolution theory was made by HMS Beagle... Chemistry Hegel's dialectics.. the Steam Engine made Marx and Marxism.. Technology not only provides what we think but how we think.

We are identified by our technology. A historical fact in which the idea of invention rather than accident or a technological intervention is thought to create the identity. As if a desire for a technology was in reality a desire for something the technology can achieve. So the desire for warmth produced the desire for fire and so the 'invention' of fire creation. The desire for a certain music created the desire for certain instruments which involved the invention of those instruments in order to fulfil the desire. This is nothing other than the belief in magic where 'desire' is instrumental in physical change, as much as a non physical 'spell' can manipulate and bring into existence or alter physical reality. It is as mistaken and misguided as the interpretation of evolution by natural selection. The desire to reach high branches is the initiation of long necks. To the extreme nonsense of the desire for intelligence necessitated the acquisition of large brains of some 86 billion neurons and a sophisticated prefrontal cortex responsible for cognition. Proto humans without cognition had the idea of cognition and so desired the necessary biological structures for it to exist! This is not to deny once the situation is given a subsequent adaptation to it cannot occur, but this is outside of the primary act which instigates any change. An animal with a long neck has to learn how to employ it and can do so in new ways, but these are external to the ontology of the neck. It is no different from the initial invention, which should be more the accident than of any intentional technology. Which produces the argument that in the case of the animal the long neck was not a desire for it. The long neck in itself has nothing to do with eating from higher branches. The neck qua neck was nothing to do with eating. What of human technologies. The subsequent human adaptation of

accidental technologies covers their actual non determined accident. It renders them purposeful. And in doing so it occludes the actual technology qua technology. We never hear the piano qua piano. And there is then the development of the telos of the technology, say the piano which denies the piano its pianoness for a desire for innovation. This invocation is retroactively produced then seen as the ontological basis for the technology, in this case the piano, in the first place. Which is obviously (now seen to be) false.

What can be argued from this is that in any activity especially art any intervention is always both a denial of what it is given, a refusal to see, hear, interface with it in itself for some other spurious activity. So rather than discover what it is, whatever it is is ignored for some other intention.

"A synthesizer (often abbreviated as synth) is an electronic musical instrument that generates audio signals that may be converted to sound... instrument presets (i.e. sounds, or programs or patches, previously stored in the instrument's memory)"

"the presets being a number of stored sounds arranged in banks which come ready programmed by the manufacturer which can be triggered by midi data, each bank having sounds, e.g. '5 preset banks (128 patches each), the JV Session card (another 256 patches!) that add up to more than a thousand patches of preset sounds."

Given this – at first sight – obvious nonsense I committed myself to not playing anything, but the presets.

Voreinstellungen - Presets.