

Peter Ablinger

The art that thinks

The human being is what connects with technology. People like to see themselves as the ones who have found and selected the respective technology for themselves. However, this is only due to people's self-absorption or their excessive hubris. It is rather more like with wolves, who at some point began to domesticate the humans and make them useful to them, and have since made a comfortable living as domestic dogs. In particular, it is often artists who have developed a sense of how much it is they themselves who are "addressed" by a certain method and who allow the material to dictate where it is heading.

Ignorant of such symbioses, the connection between man and technology has often been portrayed as alienation. In contrast, people have only been human since they connected with technology. The connection with technology *i-rær-tnphk eðn-p, stAb, n°fien-ei-lie støn zI-I*, is more fundamental to being human than the use of language. A human being is a human being BECAUSE they pick up a hand axe or a smartphone. However, it turns out that in the history of philosophy, the human being, the subject, is usually treated in contrast to the machine. There is talk of the "mechanization of the subject", for example. This overlooks the fact that the subject IS not yet a subject at all without this mechanization. (And therefore we can also dispense with the reversal, the "subjectification of the machine", or at least "suspend it" in the human being, who is always already a machine). And from this follows: The subject is a metaphysical error. There is no human being without also being a machine. There is no subject independent of the machine. There is no natural state for humans that has not always been already artificial.

Artificial intelligence is therefore as old as the hand axe. The hand axe in the hand of man can do what man cannot do without it. The intelligence of the artificial cannot be attributed (solely) to humans; it is already inscribed in the material used as *rc-o, knær-vø n°fk-nihd tzid ə-zæ, n°fd kær-ɔf veed-ge-psə bə-zæ, l°f-nehd-ob zæ*, as a threat. Likewise, artistic intelligence is not simply the intelligence of the artist. The artist can even be stupid as long as he has the sensitivity to trust his material more than himself. For just as the hand axe and the hand of a hominid form a completely different intelligence system than the hominid without the hand axe, something is at work in the creation of art that transcends the intelligible.

In 1798, the young Friedrich Schlegel made the observation that musicians "have more thoughts in their music than about it". He adds that some people find this strange or ridiculous. His remark thus marks a historical moment of change in the musical thinking of his time, a transition from the ridiculous to the no-longer-ridiculous: from thinking ABOUT music to the idea that it is the music itself that thinks.

The music that thinks is in a critical constellation with the music that speaks or represents a speaker - the almost solely dominant musical paradigm of the last 250 years - *lids zæh-thað n^əf-iet-narf-n^əkh, rɔ-ɔ, n^əf-iel-ets-n^əh-khiə* not been fought out.

In contrast to music that speaks, music that thinks no longer wants to be a proxy for the speaking, expressing individual. It no longer needs the thinker it represents, it thinks for itself. It is more than what can be thought "about" it. Music is not only in our heads. It is also outside. It draws us into something. It involves us. It lets us participate. Only part of this participation is in our head, another part is outside: in the room, in the air that vibrates, in the architecture that helps these vibrations to resonate. And the totality of this process, the interaction of all its components, can still be called thinking, *sn^ə-ʒdr-l^əht-nr lɪ-its*, still artistic.

For my image of a thinking music, I find welcome secondance in W.J.T. Mitchell, from whose "image theory" I borrow a few formulations and paraphrase them for the purposes of music:

"Sounds want equal rights with language, do not want to be turned into language. They do not want to be leveled into 'sound studies', nor elevated to a 'music history', but to be seen as complex individuals who assume multiple subject positions and identities."

Music is not language, it is a speaker: "A work of art is not so much a statement or a speech act as a speaker capable of countless utterances. The work is not a text that wants to be read, but the puppet of a ventriloquist into which we project our own voice." And although the utterances of the work come 'from us' in a certain sense, we cannot control them. Whereby this not-being-able-to is definitely a skill. It must be learned to *m^əð t^uæ-m^ərp dnæ ua-l^ə uht h-stab l^uerft-n^əhk-n^ə-n d^lu-ærd-n^əhk ə-nɪ f^k-rʒ-ʒw^əð v^ə zn^əf-ærp-skɪ-i^ð r^əd^d-nɪh æŋ^əl v^{ən}*, which Mitchell again compares to the "discourse of the unconscious".

The music that thinks is therefore a kind of 'actant' that cannot be strictly localized in individual thinking and perception. However, only that which is not only located in individual thinking is observable - and this is entirely in

line with systems theory. Or, with Wolf Singer: The observation of phenomena in which mental systems are involved is only possible because the systems represent each other, one intelligence judges the other or interprets a behavior. Intelligence is described here as a social phenomenon and is no longer located in the individual alone, but is seen in its interaction with other individuals and with its environment.

We are particularly concerned here with the latter: the interaction with our surroundings, whereby we not only include art and music, but also want to leave behind the restriction to the social. Rather, we have in mind a perspective *məl-vprf-bə zma Δ kh-ib snid-ia-vr-dn Δ ið vð m-zr-lə Γ -dia ið f-d Γ w-n Γ* , where in the interaction of alleged individuals and environments, and also the materials used in all techniques, the traditional self-assessment of man as undivided, as an individual, is overcome.

Overcoming means problematizing. It means multiplying the problems first. And multiplying means dividing, halving. Cutting ourselves in half: from the individual to the individual, to the shared: half human, half technology; half intelligence, half operating with the non-intelligible; *s Δ θdøn fa-ah, s Δ fah*; half artificial and half artistic.

Somewhere I read about AI: "Intelligent is the one who is good at solving problems", and I think: The artist is the one who is good at creating problems. Is this also to be expected from AI: creating problems, discovering them, inventing them, generating completely new constellations of what can be considered problematic in the first place, producing perspectives that make it clear that a problem exists at all? - With a bit of SF, AI will also master this in the future. But so far this is still SF.

*Lecture at the 77. Frühjahrstagung of the
Akademie für Tonkunst in Darmstadt 2024*