

philosophical subject/object relationship, it is quite obvious that his observations crushed the “binarism” of the traditional aesthetics. Benjamin’s essay is also one of the first among those texts that brought forward a productive new approach to the kind of interdisciplinary theory within the social sciences and humanities by deriving decisive concepts from the phenomenon of the “mechanical reproduction”. It has been obvious more or less for anybody from what was visible “on the surface” of the industrial reality, but it did take time to be read properly.

However, it looks like the definitely dialectical term of *aura*, contrary to its intention, represented a possibility for some readers to inverse Benjamin’s argument against the traditional aesthetics. Naturally, there is a possibility that we have to deal here with a simple misreading of the meaning of the notion.² Anyway, this is not of any big importance; it only gives us some evidence that the “hegemonically” founded comprehension works somehow like the Freudian defence against recognizing the truth. In any case, a wider comprehension of Benjamin’s contribution to the epistemology in the age of the industrial society, and a recognition of his aesthetically informed observation of the displacement of the whole chain of meanings, concerning the “manufacturing” of art, the recognition of works of art in the context of mass culture and the profoundly *changed perception* of works of art, have come rather late. Benjamin’s work became much more transparent for scholars and artists only in the late 1960s, when along the political protests in the prosperous Western world, a new artistic practice, which was previously confined to the narrow public interest, succeeded to make itself visible in the streets and, of course, in the media. A change in the way the public perceives works of art had enormous consequences. Due to this change, people were increasingly seeing the reality, and their own positions within it, very differently as compared to the pre-industrial period; if, of course, we take for granted that we can guess what kind of perception art people could have had in the “pre-technological” age. Even neurologists and psychologists later on, to some extent, confirmed the changes in

- 2 By reading numerous interpretations of Benjamin’s “*reproduction essay*”, no matter how ingenious or simple they may be, one cannot get rid off of the impression that most authors somehow take the concept of the *aura* for granted; almost as if we have to deal with just another application of a term, almost as if we have to deal with just a classification of works of art, dividing them between “auratic” and “non-auratic”. Of course, as soon as the concept of *aura* is uttered, there is no such thing as an “auratic” work of art. Benjamin himself only mentions “traces” of *aura* in this new age, which is constituted by the disappearance of *aura*, which itself became visible only through its disappearance