

Yonggeun Kim (kr)Media Art in Aesthetic Technology Lab.,
Soongsil University
Researcher
yonggeun@maat.kr**Joonsung Yoon** (kr)Soongsil University
Professor, Global School of Media
dryoon@maat.kr**Quasi-autopoiesis;
Sublimed Human
Intellect****Introduction**

This paper acclaims the sublime of objectified human intellect by utilizing the quasi-autopoiesis in the generative art. Unlike the computational sublime, my discussion turns the computation as a tool for projecting the sublime to the computation as a copied intellect and connects the computation to the humanness.

The Generative Art as Quasi-autopoiesis

As an object for aesthetic judgment, the generative art makes its emergence not by the autopoiesis but by the quasi-autopoiesis. Though it is true that the representation of generative art is unpredictable, this cannot be an approval for what our intellect result in a true genesis. Regardless of whether the human has enough ability to judge the generation or not, we have to consider how the result of human intelligence can be independent from the viewpoint of human intelligence itself. And this logic also can be applied to the autonomy in generative art. So, it is not an exaggeration to say that the man-made autopoiesis reflects only the human understanding for the autonomy and emergence. Because the autopoiesis of generative art is always regulated by the human intelligence that designs and demarcates the boundary of generative art. (McCormack and Dorin 2001; 73) Moreover, as Immanuel Kant noted as he-autonomy the autopoiesis that human makes in reflective manner of nature is prescribed "*only in a subjective aspect*" (Kant 1914; V186) for human and human intelligence. Thus the emergence of generative

art is delimited by human intelligence and the autonomy in the generative art is an abstraction of intelligence, the quasi-autopoiesis, derived from the he-autonomy of human.

Recursion in Sublime

As similar as the man-made autopoiesis is always the quasi-autopoiesis in the reflective manner, if any generative art with the quasi-autopoiesis can be judged as sublime, that judgment is recursive. The magnitude of computation and its unpleasantness in generative art with quasi-autopoiesis can be judged as sublime in the notion of computational sublime. (Moloney 2009; 65-66) If we agree with this, on the basis of the Kantian mathematical sublime, the discontinuity between the computer-generated emergence and its unpredictable magnitude noticed by human reason is a premise for the judgment of sublime in generative art. In the notion of the mathematical sublime there exists the incomprehensible magnitude that we encounter. (Kant 1914; V248) In addition, the magnitude of what is represented in the imagination, which relates the distance between the subject and the representation, comprehends the maximum beyond where our reason cannot reach. (Kant 1914; V252) Moreover, the sublime, the pleasure with this comprehension, is enabled by the faculty of reason that tells the imagination the maximum beyond itself. (Deleuze 1984; 50) Thus it is possible to say that, in the judgment of sublime, the reason has a significant role as it informs the imagination that the maximum exists. So, to the extent that the reason relates not to the representation in cognitive sense but to the imagination in one's subjective judgment of sublime is recursive. Namely what can be judged as sublime in the generative art is not the representation which is resulted from the quasi-autopoiesis but the quasi-autopoiesis which renders the representation.

Sublimed Quasi-autopoiesis as Recursive Question

By the assertion that the sublimed quasi-autopoiesis exists in some generative art, the machine intelligence in generative art can be regarded as a reflection of the human intelligence. For the judgment of sublime, the human reason should be aware of not only the sublimed object but also the failure of the intelligence, the imagination. Thus the judgment of sublime means not only the aesthetic judgment on specific object but also, in its basis, the reflective consideration on the human intellectual ability.

Every moment when the scientific knowledge for what is observed leapt decisively comparing with prior level, men threw the questions of self-reflection which is ignited by this knowledge leap. Each time when the scientific leap occurred by such as man-machinism, Darwinism, psychoanalysis and communism/capitalism, human has objectified the humanness and deepen the understanding by this objectification. (Mazlish 1995; 3-13) Thus, generally speaking, the theoretical understanding expands its continuity with the reflective question on the humanness. In the same sense, the computation ability of the generative art also can be regarded as a question on the continuity between the computing machinery and human intelligence. With

its aesthetic conditions the generative art questions the objectified human intellect in the name of sublime. What the generative art renders is not a possibility for man-made autonomy but a question on the continuity and the discontinuity between the man and machine in the aspect of intellectual ability. And the sublimed quasi-autopoiesis in the generative art is on the edge of this question.

References

- Bernard, John Henry (1914) *Kant's Critique of Judgement*, London, Macmillan.
- Deleuze, Gilles (1984) *Kant's Critical Philosophy*, London, Athlone, 46-67
- Mazlish, Bruce (1995) *The Fourth Discontinuity*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 3-57.
- McCormack, Jon, and Alan Dorin (2001) 'Art, emergence, and the computational sublime', *Second Iteration: a conference on generative systems in the electronic arts*, CEMA, Melbourne, Australia, 67-81.
- Moloney, Jules (2009) 'Kinetic Architectural Skins and the Computational Sublime', *Leonardo*, Vol. 42, No. 1, 65-70.