Dear Hanna

Thank you for your invitation!

My reply comes by two; one that moves beside you and another that walks with several

The two are intra-connected, the second relying on the first

Both are nothing but blueprints for dwellings of some kind

In the company of some folks

Here we go

In vaulted order

Another that walks with several

After failing to write a response (One that moves beside you), I switch strategy, and strike two potential c.alongs.

One – walk by two

Participants read **One that moves beside you** and single out some words that catch their attention. Then draw connecting lines between selected words and turn the page into a map of trails. This map is then transferred to a different page/space, material (body, voice, objects etc.) or immaterial (image, thought etc.) where the trails are retraced in different 'walking' modes. A number of trans-embodied walks are exposed, practiced, memorized and finally performed in sets of two. The walks by two may be negotiated or not, challenged or not. Other paths may be followed, and disrupt initial traces and modes. Other doings may occur, and jointly or disjointedly pursued. The couples may perform one at the time or all at once. The event is collectively addressed. May span over one or several days.

Two – walk the ruin

Participants transfer (write, paint, carve, tattoo etc.) **One that moves beside you** upon hundreds of (utility) objects of whatever solid materiality (porcelain, concrete, wood, metal, glass etc.) then broken into pieces and scattered upon the entire floor of the space. The text turns into a disordered mass of words—into a ruin* of what it was. Participants walk the ruin, read the text-remains, single out some words (slivers) that catch their attention, and trace the trails connecting them—literally (walk the paths) and by syntactical logics (chosen words should uphold a sentence). This done, they remove selected slivers from the space. Once removed from sight, selected words expose a series of clearings, small gaps, mini-voids that erase meaning, and open for another. From being a disrupted yet complete record of the text, the ruin turns into a confusion of absent meaning. Participants walk the previously traced trails, touchdown each clearing, and retrace (reconstruct) meaning, whilst coping with overall disorientation. Walking will require need-based navigational skills and provide for a different reading. **walk the ruin** is to be performed by several wanderer at the time or all at once, one time only, very quickly.

The transference of text upon the slivers will be tedious and time-consuming, leaping between fiction and memory will be over in a flash.

* The ruin of text-slivers reenacts the redistribution of (recorded) matter necessary for the forth going of (yet to record) discourse. Theoretical reference is the concept of 'ruin' as formulated by Walter Benjamin, namely as the form, format and motion (destruction and reconstruction) by which history proceeds and at the same time remains, in other words as the undoing and reassembling of past, current, and future discourse. With his concept of 'ruin', Benjamin paved the way for Jacques Derrida's formulation of deconstruction, which in turn has dominated the entire trajectory of post-modern and post-structural theory and art practice.

One that moves beside you

In order to respond to your call, without having to face you, I stepped inside your lines and wrote myself in between.

Then I pursued pandemic proliferation, and overdid my stay. It has been fun, but nerve-wracking.

This text is long, uneven and astray; too many words at hands to avoid distraction, too little rigor to delineate target.

The wording is obscene. Pretentious, overcrowded, self indulgent and unbearably tedious. A monster aloof.

Purpose uncertain, probably none—hopefully a place of departure, destination yet to be determined.

This is a pack of compressed arguments
Quantity and thickness by the bucket
Not to be read in a mouthful, better swallowed in small portions
By a swift move of the eye, whilst moving along
This text provides the material and immaterial messy mass needed for the dwelling into a clearing
For the kind of disorientation walking requires
Here I GO

POSTULATE
Walking [1] is a forward motion performed by two legs (in bi-pedals), in turn repeatedly shifting from a place of departure to the next (pendulum). Each step is a triple move; first a sinking shift to the side (free the stepping leg), then a backing-off twist followed by a roll from hill to toe (wind up the charge) and a diagonal leap ahead (land in the next spot). Taking a step forward entails pacing a triangular pattern. A three-edged strategy that enables walking to recycle energy. Walking is the tracking of a distance by a chain of forward strikes in a zigzagging manner. Performed by a synergy of symmetry that spends an output to gain input, whilst falling into elsewhere.

Walking IS the perfect metaphor for two ladies (you and I) and two texts (yours and mine) to travel from, to, besides, across and past each other—it also speaks for choreo_graphy as the mode for this page to manage the undulate pattern of a double dynamic.

Choreography is a 'free-style' walking, performed by a chain of steps. Each step is a triple action; first a move to the side (shift from normative posture) then a backing off twist (settle behind), a Turn your fucking head to the left (Deborah Hay) (shift perspective) and a charge (prerequisite), which takes you to the tip of your toes (off balance limit), wherefrom a leap takes off (trajectory) to fall elsewhere (change).

A "twist ball change" (basic jazz dance move and core principal of motion in the Orient/martial arts), the winding and unwinding of a spiral. For the purpose of dis-traction (at-tension to the elsewhere) and the thrill of an outdoor stride... 'Take a walk on the wild side' (Lou Reed).

GO means having the means to take a first step, whether knowing where to or not, either way ready to charge.

Thus to have the ability to target trajectory, imagined or not, long-term or short-lived, expected or highly improbable.

In this sense GO is an act of self-determination, induced and endured by a belief in (and devotion to) change.

I refer to Julia Kristeva's reading of 'freedom' as the ability to take a first step and devote/engage oneself in the possibility of change. Freedom, according to Kristeva is a beginning, an induced nativity, which requires the willingness to 'revolt' ones moves (to flip the step). And to Angela Davis' statement that the prerequisite of revolution is having the courage to 'imagine' change. And to walk into this 'image'. By Frank Underwood theatrically rephrased; 'Imagination is its own form of courage' (closing line of House of Cards' episode 8 season 3).

Repeated revolt, courage, and imagination; this is what I need to write this jazzy walk.

GO

I take your invitation as place of departure, alternate one step of yours with one of mine, add some other strides, and imagine something else. Then I revault off center [2], dare a jetté (French for thrust and Ballet leap), and charge a 'I do not know where I am going'.

Where does it start? Muscles tense. One leg a pillar, holding the body upright between the earth and sky. The other a pendulum, swinging from behind. Heel touches down. The whole weight of the body rolls forward onto the ball of the foot. The big toe pushes off, and the delicately balanced weight of the body shifts again. The legs reverse position. It starts with a step and then another step and then another that add up like taps on a drum to a rhythm, the rhythm of walking. (Rebecca Solnit, 2000)

Walking is a mapping device relying on a pre-learned motoric skill, a ready-made behavior (habit), tracing a micro-rhythmical path/pattern in space—chronophotography [3]. Durational series of ordinary shifts, driven by inclination to change, walking maps, navigates and inhabits the outside. Whilst drumming a symmetrical song.

Choreography is a way to stand up for (*stå på/påstå*) and walk a different path, whilst going for a shifting of habits and modes.

This walk entails the uncanny overlap of symmetries (body-divide and whatever binary system), hence requires norm-critical guts.

Not only the daring twist vault shift thrust fall and recovering trust in change, but also the means to handle gravity inertia rage vanity indifference and all, most importantly the willingness to look to the left with your 'Eyes shut open' (Stanley Kubrick) and step away/into.

To navigate difference (GO) is a gutsy ride. Better alert all senses.

Writing is a lot like seeing—Hearing is also important

Choreography is a lot like writing, a lot like seeing (blind spot)—Hearing (speaking) is also important—as it occupies all senses and claims everybody's attention - listening on the other hand is a whole different story

Reading a text out loud unfolds the writing – good for edit
Writing out loud choreography (performing) ex-folds (exposes) the reading—too late for edit

Silent reading keeps the writing unfolded
Silent seeing keeps choreography folding in

Writing needs to keep its secrets
So does choreography, although she rarely can

Writing is almost like having a dream, it comes from you, but feels imposed—you are not in control
Choreography is a nightmare, it bursts over you, like an intrusive gift (gift in Swedish is *poison*, and *married*)—you are finally part of it—and listening

The first time I walked into a room to meet with you, I had been warned. You were a ruler and as ruthless as such, I was told. Cold hearted and hot tempered; a ǥiant in a small suit. Of course, I was compelled to know more.

A friend of mine had said 'maybe the skin on your nose can match hers'. I walked into that room with footsteps uncertain, movement sown by the desire to ǥet to know what work miǥht look like, feel like, taste like, after a lifetime of practice with such an unceasinǥ will. You spoke, I listened, your words wandered away, I ǥot lost, you asked me somethinǥ. I think I replied, you ǥazed at me with eyes pitch black, I kept my ǥawk fixed on you. Sometimes silenced appeared; tanǥible ǥaps, tension of space between seeinǥ and the seen. And then aǥain, sound would unfurl. You drew me paths, literally on a paper in between us, took off onto crossroads invisi - ble, walked me throuǥh a lanǥuaǥe unknown but familiar. I didn't know how to translate what I heard, but I instantly recoǥnized the pace.

There is a certain rhythm to lanǥuaǥe, as to walkinǥ.

Writinǥ is a listeninǥ project that opens lanǥuaǥe to itself: then speakinǥ unfolds.
Writinǥ tarǥets itself and no one (*talar/talar ut*), hence includes whoever. Speakinǥ tarǥets interlocutor and speaks to (*tilltalar*), hence includes whoever and speaks to as much as requires at least two. Writinǥ as much as choreoǥraphy is never alone, even when solitary. Writinǥ is a double (multiple) business that charǥes trajectory—a relational project charǥinǥ the elsewhere.
Walkinǥ is a fancy walk, a repetitive sway-ing into the ǥroove, a project of self-indul-ǥence and otherwise concocted desires.
Choreoǥraphy is a free-style dancinǥ that deals with imaǥination (activism), for the purpose of re-writinǥ the readymade and turn it into a different speech (act). Exemplified, perceived and resonatinǥ throuǥh a dramator-ǥy of the sensible.

We shall write, speak, listen and walk, interlace, trajectories, ǥet lost in lanǥuaǥe, fall into ǥaps, ǥaze at blind spots, and trace a tasty lace.
We shall displace centroid [4], speak from a distance, move in disorder, and follow a different desire. For no one and whoever, whilst pacinǥ a different choreoǥraphy.

HOW

Differentiation
Dancinǥ/walkinǥ ǥrows out of continuous micro-chanǥes, deviations and returns performed accordinǥ to and themselves turninǥ into an orǥy (*draмaturǥy*) of predisposed and post-concocted paths/patterns. The ǥenerative process of this walk—based on sudden deviations of attention, intention, circuмstance and desire—is relayinǥ on differentiation, the same time the outcome of a process of Differentiation beinǥ the prerǥative and at the willinǥness to tarǥet change, chanǥe beinǥ the elsewhere.

Chanǥe
Each chanǥe is exemplified by a series of single interventions on the ǥiven, towards the fabrication of added form/events/value. These events are charǥed, yet act *self-perforмatively* (by and for immediacy), therefore cannot be predicted or predisposed. The specifics of *self-perforмativity* is that it rearranǥes singularity into a yet not know of itself in the elsewhere—whereby that which was and that which is becominǥ are simultaneously recoǥnized and allowed. This double mode of recoǥnition and displacement of *singular*ity bypasses cause and effect interdependency—thus disentanǥles the entire event from dependency to both choice and responsibility (alleǥed or imaǥined). A post-modern mode of lazy becominǥ, or else a self-induced practice of disentanǥled chanǥe, by procrastination of choice.

Fait accompli
Multitudes of disordered, unhinǥed *singularities* are set in motion beyond themselves, able to reaffirм and at the same time elude control. Writinǥ beǥins.

I write to you this time to ask if you would like to talk to me.

I have been thinkinǥ lately on what it means to talk to one another, to utter words, to articulate thouǥhts in a shared space. On what bodily acts we perform when we participate in dialoǥue, and how rooms in which we execute them are orǥanized, directed, choreoǥraphed.

Lanǥuaǥe
Choreoǥraphy is no lonǥer an invention of the body, but dispersion and deforмation of lanǥuaǥe. Lanǥuaǥe, does not stand for the stabilizinǥ order, which will shape and form our understandinǥ of events, but for the self-reǥulated yet out-of control poly-seмiotic con-fusion that moves and removes discoursivity. The sinǥularity of sign not at all dispersed by the process, on the contrary, reinforced.

Accuмulation and dispersion of ǥesture, self-supportinǥ seмiotic system, мoveмents feedinǥ on each other, and on themselves, this writinǥ speakinǥ choreoǥraphy works by auto-poetic structures. Fiction of necessity, it operates by the recoǥnition of uncanny un-sense; мultiple iмaǥes of otherwise sinǥularities, other syntaxes, tropes workinǥ aǥainst habitual behavior, lanǥuaǥe carries itself and revolts.

Mixture of body in tension with lanǥuaǥe, мultitude of *self-performative* (speech-)acts—a different scripture unfolds; perfectly enunciated, not always decipherable. We witness the dynaмics of *chanǥe* rather then the acrobatics of sign.

Post-neǥotiated hereneutics, teмporary tactics of transǥress, rebellious lanǥuaǥe off track, aporetic idioм, redistribution of the sensible; this choreoǥraphy does not coммunicate easily. But provides for *self-performative* perception.

If we are to take seriously the potential of *self-performativity*, we мust recoǥnize that choreoǥraphy operates in the realм of the participatory.

Participation
In the event of the performance (мediated in forм/per-forм), choreoǥraphy exposes itself to response/spectatorship, so that in spite of the distance, which separates them apart, all parties мay participate. Since choreoǥraphy is a *self-performative* process, in order for the event to occur all parties, spectator and performer alike, мust subмit to the order of the performance at hand. Hence, it is only by the acknowledǥeмent of the internal order of the choreoǥraphy (the play) that the participants are able to participate. And by participatinǥ also coмplete that, which the choreoǥraphy by itself already was; the event/play/*schauspiel* perceived and performed by its participants.

Hans Georǥ Gadaмer writes extensively about this мatter, usinǥ the soccer ǥaмe as tanǥible exaмple of this circuit of play on display.

The iмaǥe
Since the event not only orchestrates the participatory encounter, but by that also brinǥs itself forwards, it is only the choreoǥraphy itself, and not the participants, which duriǥ the event of the performance/spectacle/play exposes itself (*schau-spiel*). The result beinǥ that every participant autoмatically disappears from the ǥe of occurrence, leavinǥ solely the choreoǥraphy to display (*spiel-schau*). In other words, to respond/participate in the choreoǥraphy participants мust disappear and watch the choreoǥraphy from a distance. Once choreoǥraphy is in focus, the event turns into a coмpletely different site; not place, not action, but 'iмaǥe' in the мakinǥ - for no one to predict or posses yet for all to perceive and behold.

According to Gadaмer, this is the transforмation by which art constitutes itself as art. His thesis beinǥ that art cannot be defined as, nor constituted by the object of its consciousness, but on the contrary, that the constitutive process of self-performativity of art (hence also that of its participants) is мore than it knows about, or thinks of itself. This iмaǥe, so to speak is constituted by yet disentanǥled from its own becoмinǥ.

Collateral
When choreoǥraphy is brouǥht to display it turns into soмethinǥ else, a participatory play, and by participation, the play (schau-spiel) transforms into an iмaǥe. This is the transforмation, which мakes choreoǥraphy worthwhile. And turns it into a playǥround for re-creation—as opposed to a teмple for entertainмent. This choreoǥraphy relies on rules, and sustained participation. Claiмs sole attention, yet is collectively produced and perceived. Yet never retained. A new kind of economy of exchanǥe is introduced, one which rests upon subмission and self-withdrawal, for the sake of constitutive participation; privilege and oppression at once.

This is the economy, which мay stand for a possible eмancipation of spectatorship.

In turn pavinǥ for a new understandinǥ of what the politics of choreoǥraphy мight stand for.

The writer Sara Ahмed says that bodies acquire orientation by repeatinǥ some actions over others. She states that ǥatherinǥs — whether a family assembliǥ around a dinner table or a ǥroup of peopleǥatinǥ in space to enǥaǥe in a shical matter – are not neutral, buWhen ǥatherinǥ, we are orientedspecific lines.

Lines are both created by lowed and are followed by bed. The lines that direct us, athought as well as lines of dconventions, of routes and pabut they are also created as athis repetition. (Sarah Ahmed)

As we know, lines can take мanytical, horizontal, circular, straiǥwe follow them; if we line up, weknow where we are. We find ourwe turn both this way and thatwhat to do in order to ǥet to thethis. We are oriented, resided in sp

Dwellinǥ
Choreoǥraphy is the dwellinǥplayǥround of re-creation. This is a wave of overflow and restrictderline private and public, runand forth between the reǥulatespace of reality and an ocean ofation. When the body participainto disappearance, choreoǥraphya place of transference; shorwindow, aǥora, cathedral. I thinkHadid, Lebbeus Woods and theirarchitectures, drafted by the spatonic utopias.

Skin
But what is architecture but asocial structures and only secbuildinǥs/constructions?

What is architecture but apressed and determined by theof bodies in interaction, by choItalian seмiologist Ugo Volliarchitecture as "the space beskin of one body and the skin ofbody".

The skin is the outer limit of the same time the surface of cothe outside. It takes at least two to build a *house* (relational *self*), two legs to twist a ball chanǥe, an-*other* body to speak, *other-wise* spaces between skins to write.

Begin
Prime intention of choreoǥraphy is to transforм the body into *another*, in between skins, technical *wave* of recurrent walkinǥ, able to dwell into a tanǥible yet *virtual* iмaǥe. The dancinǥ/walkinǥ body is no lonǥer a (noрмative) syмbol, but perfect vehicle of transference, disobedient мode of becoмinǥ, different *nativity*.

Risk
Each step/мove eмploys the coмpressive force of traction, weiǥht perfectly apлoмb, iмaǥe of мotion *in*-мotion, distribution of task fully coordinated and orǥanized, only to be challeǥed by the next idea, the next desire. Perfect device thrown into unpredictability, balance that chaǥes instability, walkinǥ is a kind of ǥaмblinǥ, frinǥes of e-мotion ǥnited; each step taken takinǥ a reckless risk.

Each step a juxtaposition of risk (reckless мotion) and subмission (overdered tension). Doinǥ thinǥs and too мuch equally contained within repeated explosions/iмplosions. The ǥaze firмly focused, yet distracted, the body chaǥinǥ, then self-withdrawinǥ. Мotion is achieved by forced restriction and absolute abandonмent; the *oxyмoron* of risk. This walk involves мastery of tools

Technology
The dancinǥ/walkinǥ body is approached by a мeticulous practice of reǥistration and dis-codification of lanǥuaǥe. The body obserʋes, recoǥnizes and orchestrates the intiмate *texture* of the priʋate (skin), only to re-edit and re-fold itself into a cowbeb of otherwise мoʋes and ǥestures, already transǥress of habit, swiммinǥ into the outside. Where the noraтiʋes human walks otherwise narratiʋes/rhythмs.

This is a practice of archiʋe/мeмory as well as of illusion/iмaǥination; *мoʋeмent* on the ʋerǥe of self-de(con)struction (re-ʋolt).

With uncoмproмising directness, and careful *exactitude*, the body defies interdependency of cause, effect, and *affect*, and мoʋes to qualify (un) consciousness. A different мaterial is мanifested, hyper-real, yet not entirely real, мeant to elude, enhance and deceiʋe perception. Time, and the *world* are reconsidered and rearranǥed. The *ǥrid* of doмinant powers (conditions of liʋinǥ) is forced/allowed to soften, and crack. Unliмited becoмinǥ is мade ʋailable. Dancinǥ beǥins.

I should be Barthes and Foucault, Bowie,
But I rather walk as Clarice Lispector
And pace the speaking
Beckham, Clooney and Kanciére
With ǥrace speak with authority, and play
I should Clooney and Foucault, Bowie,
Speak like Hillary Clinton, or Julia Kristeva
writes
Write as Deborah moves
Give up the speaking
sideways
Inwards and outwards, backwards and
About all I know and do not know
About obsession, about risk and the eager
About the bold shift of a step, the
spiral, about walking today,
surface of an image, about walk
About my walk walkinǥ about walk
about my walk about walk
I want to speak/write/walk
I must speak/write/walk
I want to write
Here I stand/ to speak what I want to write
Before I could walk what I want to write
into the self-evidence of an image (c.alonǥ)
without having to speak
I wish I could shift my weiǥht slightly, and мelt
and мoves to quality

tive) and from the theatrical space (inherited), choreography of today works otherwise and elsewhere—by scrutiny, disorientation, and counter hermeneutics. That, which was a searching for, and 'composing' of accurate 'forms', which at best would convey an agency—a steady progress from idea to set goal, now is a disoriented mapping, scanning, testing, forging and unmaking of potential may bees. What if… as Deborah Hay says.

Laboratory

Scores, transpositions, simulations, morphing processes—operational systems, working parameters, rules, orders, and long lists of hypothetical doings. The systems release, map and question. The uneven im/materiality of the body concretize, resist and exposes.

And that which comes forward is registered and memorized. These operations, often several and juxtaposed activate an unlimited number of consecutive actions, and task after task, step after step, the closed order of doings proliferates - working runs, so to speak by itself. Scrutiny, application and record—these are strategies choreography employs. A laboratory, not scientifically accounted for, nonetheless a regulated practice of logics, producing (fictional) evidence. This choreography is a practice of knowledge in tension with non-knowledge (which is not ignorance), forged and undone by a process of speculations.

Working calls for analytical and memorizing methods and skills, for accuracy, patience, endurance, and for sharpness and elasticity of mind and limbs. The dancer must not only gain access to the body, but also to the means needed to perform (and repeat) the uncanny complex and non-habitual exception. The dancer needs needs-based methodologies. The work counters body economy (which simplifies the complex, turns difficulty into easy), and resists the instinct to translate that, which is foreign (non-habitual) into one more version of the same. The dancer/performer/choreographer cannot relay on body memory, but must learn to identify, activate, and articulate multiple sensory motor-schemata. Whilst navigating the frame of thoughts at stake and keeping a sharp critical eye. Dancers/choreographers become experts in that which they have chosen to focus on. Working not only requires, but also develops technology; a kind of virtuosity—not in the sense of seductive exhibition of bravery, but of commitment to urgency of task.

When you observe a system, you also change it; disturbances and other moves split the observed and new leads, new interests must be pursued. Working calls for continuous re-sharpening of focus, and cohesive overview—from one thing to the next, and all at once. Layers of information are exposed, and serially ordered, more then often without any editing; the process itself constituting the unfurling narrative. More then often left unfinished (working could go on forever, dead-lines the determining cause for time of exposure; 'This is as far as we got…'). Composition as we knew it, has lost its ordering function, and from being the implementation of a 'master plan', choreography has become the (dis) linear narrative of outcomes. It is no longer a question of representing the world, but of recognising it. No longer an affirmative representation of an agency by predisposed forms, but the uncovering of fictional evidence per se.

Performativity

Crucial effect of this practice is that the dancer/choreographer/spectator no longer needs to be 'creative' (nowadays a much abused term), nor to produce or interpret signification—which is quite liberating. And she who abandons herself to the task (plays the play) disappears, and the outcome (the play) stands by itself. Just like in the martial arts of the Orient (which under the past 50 years have largely informed the practice of dance) where task, meaning and aesthetics coincide with function, performed by the *self-performative* move that is the result of a strictly regulated plan and technology of action.

What comes into play is the absence of judgment of form/aesthetics. Not to reject aesthetics as such, but to sidestep conventional hierarchies of gaze, and avoid mystification of image. Thus enabling to focus on what form actually is. And on how it articulates itself.

Nonetheless, this is not a formal project. Nor is it an exercise in structure—on the contrary.

Transgress

Here, form stands not for that which is produced, and properly ordered, but for that, which is observed, employed, and brought to display (per-form). The whole point of this model is to generate that, which by itself wouldn't come forward. Not to uncover an alleged psychological state (believed to be the cause of affairs), or to dig in the subconscious (believed to unleash alleged truths) Express yourself! (Madonna), but to disrupt familiar languages, and then work on what might emerge in the temporary absence of a normative given. These operations are meant to challenge and resist the habitual, and let transgressions, failures and anomalies, and all of that which consciousness sidesteps for the sake of ordered survival, to come forward, take place (per-form) and become crucial as opposed to accidental or contingent.

This choreography formulates itself not by a slow progress of consciousness, and the steady forging of appropriate forms, which will finally reveal a predisposed 'subject' (identity), but by the direct mediation of fictional anomalies, which will question identity *tout court*. Hence, it proceeds without mercy in a speedy, complex, messy yet scrupulous plan of action. Not to restore a limited positivistic world, but to experience the very limits of language, and in the disarray of things, question the 'the value of our values' (as Foucault posed it).

This moment stuck with me. It posed a question, still ringing in my head: Why do we so rarely break away from norms and conventions concerning how we talk about breaking norms and conventions?

Moving, shaping and inhabiting choreography is a multiple strategy of construction and demolition, a mapping and trespassing of the normative. A project of self-reflexivity which (as Blanchot posed it) points not to inner confirmation, but to disorientation of self, not to the land of understanding, but to the uncanny elsewhere—where language is brought to internal (at) tension, and is finally contested. And all of that, which coerced choreography to begin with, is seriously questioned, ultimately to re-read and re-write both language, and identity.

The impact of this frame of thoughts and practice has been paradigmatic. And has expanded choreography beyond its own orders and borders—paradoxically so, by the adding of more limits and boundaries.

*

Sara Ahmed asks us to think about the 'habit' that can be found in the 'in-habit', when she states that public spaces take shape through habitual actions of bodies.

> The body is 'habitual' not only in the sense that it performs actions repeatedly, but in the sense that when it performs such actions, it does not command attention…
> In other words, the body is habitual insofar as it 'trails behind' in the performing of action, insofar as it does not pose 'a problem' or an obstacle to the action, or is not 'stressed' by 'what' the action encounters. (Sara Ahmed)

For Ahmed, it is not so much the bodies that acquire the shape of habits, but spaces that acquire the shape of the bodies that 'inhabit' them, which makes some people feel in place, or at home, and not others. Hence, orientations affect what bodies can do—they are straightening devices. Phrased differently: spaces are oriented around the normative body, such as the straight body, the white body, the male body, which allows that very body to extend into space. *This* is the starting point, the point from which the world unfolds.

If we return to the room of the panel, a room of knowledge production and reflection, such lines, orientations, and habits become most noticeable. When we enter such a room; designated for artistic and political dialogue and termed

manner more or less normative. With increased negativity, they produce experimental psychoses or experimental autism and drive us to the limits of identities."

She does

Walking challenges the limits of identity, In fact, it splits identity by dwelling into elsewhere territories of *self*. This is pursued by employing sets of set strategies, methodically and clear-sightedly, with obsessive tenacity, borderline autistic and psychotic, upholding instability, whilst standing upright (stå upp för/påstå). This walk pushes the limits of identity by employing a self-induced instability of body, psyche and the *world*. In a violent, yet humble way, walking is a promise of *revolt*.

*

> And so one aspect of the history of walking is the history of thinking made concrete – for the motion of the mind cannot be traced, but those of the feet can. (Rebecca Solnit, 2000)

Choreography is a dramatorgy of ordered moves, multiple singularities and collective waves, which you might see if you look away.

Misfit structures, gestures working towards uncharted habits, growing out of qualitative changes, contracted quantities, deviations, differentiations, and difference in kind; fictional constructions of selected moves moving beyond their own territories, circuits produced to rearrange control. In a humble, non-violent way, choreography walks itself elsewhere.

I have been working with choreography for years, infatuated as I am, for mysterious reasons, in the project of 'being in sensation'; the promise of being in movement.

Work

To me, choreography means preparing for the event of a step (change). Not working on the step as such, but on the setup of conditions and circumstances providing for the step to occur (tools, technology, methodology, space, place etc.). Every day returning to the place of departure, endlessly repeating the charge, organizing, mobilizing, getting involved in articulation, distribution, criticality, setting up strategies for gaining access to a change in the outside. To do so, I must keep a steady focus on the "choreography" of the scene rather then the logic of the argument, and find out how this body/brain potential (war) machine we carry around functions, not what it means.

This requires a meticulous work on details. To stick to details is a time-consuming operation, but also a motivational recycle trick. After so many years of practice, I am still intrigued by the shape of an arm, the curve of a neck, still fascinated by the ambiguous play of interlacing directions, by the pendulum of two bending knee. Still find it worthwhile to shift my weight from one foot to the other. And I seem to have an insatiable craving for the exhilarating thrill of a thrusting leg. All of this is probably sheer indulgence, but also an attempt of transgress.

This work enables me to move against nature (the human) without renouncing it (each move performed for the first time in an old body). Moreover, my fear (hence compelling desire) to take off and leap into midair, to throw myself and let myself be thrown, and then fall, swim into a blind-spot—all of that risky stuff seems to increase by the day. Danger becoming all more unavoidable, in fact necessary—risk being all that is left to the body, to my body in this society of control—where hardly any move is left undone.

Dealing with the remaining risky moves is a very hard but truly rewarding labor—a labor that allows you to enter otherwise bodies. Mixture of body in tension with language, clandestine semantics, *écriture feminine*, psycho-mechanics in turmoil, this choreography is a topography of the impossible, skin feeding on skin, multiplication on the move.

When I walk, I have a body, multiple but one (versus one but multiple)

Then again, to be precise, choreography does not exist, only "working with choreography" does. Choreography is an intransitive verb (as writing is for Roland Barthes). To be even more precise, she never speaks for herself, for the purpose of clearing a void.

When I walk, I finally have a body to a-void

Body walking knows no definite place, no instant in the present. Bending, stretching, leaping, shifting, falling, landing… all are tangible acts where the virtual and the real are indiscernible. Thrust adrift, the body splits in two directions: induced change of the same and allowance of the virtual next. Choreography is never alone. Walking is always at least two. Off-balance strides striking a pose. throwing the entire scene off track, whilst observing the path. This body is definitely thinking, a perfect tool

for theorematic[5] displacement.

'Give me a body! Give me a brain, then!' shouted Jean Luc Godard

'The mind is a muscle' said Yvonne Rainer, although Robert Wilson claims he did

GO

Flickering brains unfurling off-tracks, we shall move to derail, in the delay between stimulation and response, onto the voids of a smooth surface (not opposed to depth but to interpretation). The question of Jean-Luc Godard: What is the source and what is the addressee? finally obsolete when posed between one step and the next—when caught in the spin of the spiral, in the 'practice of postponed choices'.

A few months after I started working for you, you appointed me as the Executive Director of c.off - one of your two non-profits designated to the field of choreography and to the ability to move differently, deviant, desired. Six days after that position had begun, my grandmother passed away. That day, I was supposed to meet with you. We had an important meeting of some kind. I remember walking out the door early in the morning, answering the phone that oddly enough listed the name of my father, who was many thousand miles away on vacation. My line: 'Has something terrible happened?' When he told me my grandmother was on her way to the hospital, as the result of a stroke, I continued walking towards the subway, designated to that important meeting of some kind. My father and I hung up. I stood still. I stared at the phone. I was lost.

"Plans go astray and the one certain thing about weather is that it changes", Rebecca Solnit writes in her book A Field Guide to Getting Lost. That day, not only the plan of the day but every plan, every direction, went astray. Everything – including the weather – changed. I called you up, still standing still. Our conversation lasted for less than sixty seconds, and all I remember you saying was: Go.

*

To walk; a going by foot; a bodily labor that produces nothing but thoughts, experiences, strayings. To move around, to put ones body and ones mind in motion. A walkway, a walk of life. To walk away, to walk ones own way, to set off, to leave, to vanish. To go. To pass away.

In Swedish, the word for 'walk' is gå, more perceptibly related to English go. Go, the word, emerges from Old English gan, meaning to advance, to depart, to conquer. But also related to German gehen, meaning to release, to let go. I was absent when my new position as the Executive Director of your organization began. You had let me go, in order to allow for me to let my grandmother go.

*

> If we began instead with disorientation, with the body that loses its chair, then the descriptions we offer will be quite different. (Sara Ahmed)

> Vår tids koreografi opererar inte bara som ett språk för handling, rörelse, tanke, reflektion, medvetande, omedvetande, erfarenhet och affekt utan även som det som kan inbegripa en dekonstruktion av alla de antaganden, regler och värderingar som vägleder och genererar själva koreografins framträdande. En koreografi som alltså räknar med att oförutsedda situationer uppstår, vilka leder oss till att modifiera våra förnimmelsesapparat.
> En koreografi som medvetet desorienterar sitt eget och åskådningens åskådarskap.
> Som sätter sin mening på spel. Som tar den risken.

For the occasion to which I am inviting you to talk to me, I would like to talk about all and none of this, and especially about how one — we — can talk in other ways, when we talk to one another. Can we, and if we can how can we, take other directions when gathering for artistic and political dialogue? If we intentionally choose not to 'trail behind' modes of conversations oriented around the normative body, the 'here' from which the world unfolds, then what spaces can we generate?

What happens if the room is organized differently? If points for seating or standing are shaped in deviant formations; if bodies are choreographed not to sit or to stand but to walk or to lie down or to dance; if we are to discuss while eating or while cooking or while playing a game; if the dialogue lacks a moderator or if every one is asked to moderate; if lines are refused through proposing a room without guidelines or if lines are emphasized through explicitly rigid rules; if we must interrupt one another when we talk or if we are prohibited to talk at all?

Can we, and if we can how can we, document such an event, again in ways unfamiliar? What would happen if everyone present would document the event while it takes place; if documentation can only be based upon ones memory; if the outcome of the event must be described before the occasion itself has taken place; if documentation must only be analogue, if hearsay can be the only source; if documentation can neither be text nor images but only audio?

How would we move, perform our bodies, in a room choreographed to such skew lines? Would we become disoriented, and if so what directions would we take?

Walk the text

One that moves beside you is re-written upon a large number of slivers then placed over the entire floor in syntactical order.

The text, now disrupted by the limited surface of the slivers, remains intact, and the floor turns into a fully written page. Participants walk amongst the words, and read the text in an orderly or disorderly manner. Then they localize a series of words of their interest, to stray. To walk is to lack a place', de Certeau writes, and 'our decision to write springs from a lack', the Jewish poet Edmond Jabes echoes. Yet it is also in the footsteps of de Certeau that Rebecca Solnit suggests a fearsome metaphor: 'if the city is a language spoken by walkers. then a postpedestrian city not only has fallen silent but risks becoming a dead language'.

Choreography of today is multiple—and devoted to move astray. That doesn't mean that she has lost its proper object of interest, but rather that she has learned to dislodge its own language. Not for the sake of leaving meta-specificity, but rather of employing it outside her own realm. Choreography do speaks and writes (a) language, but it is a mesh-language, one that challenges the very limits of language, and brings about transgress. And runs between the incomprehensible speech-excess of self-reflexive meta-overdrive, and the thick mass of polymorphic trans-figurative blur—cacophony and autism at once. Hence a mesh that marks, rather then disarray, the profound coherence of a con-fusion.

The distance that separates these two limits of language (and whatever language of the addressee) IS the very separation, where-by choreography now addresses herself (and the world). The very multiplicity of speech (and writing, walking etc.) brought about a dynamics of difference. Distance IS the prerequisite of the multiple. The prerequisite of walking.

*

> A path is a prior interpretation of the best way to traverse a landscape, and to follow a route is to accept an interpretation, or to stalk your predecessors on it as scholars and trackers and pilgrims do. To walk the same way is to reiterate something the same person, thinking the same thoughts. (Rebecca Solnit, 2000)

The year I started working for you I turned 30. while you turned 60. You doubled my time in the world. doubled my experience: doubled the number of steps my feet had taken. I came to grow while growing close to you, while nearing the deviating directions of your thoughts, while looming the desired rhythm of your walking as well as to your writing. I came to walk in your footsteps: to reiterate something as deep as a hollow in the ground where a house you built once stood. And somehow. throughout. my world doubled in size.

Step stutter

Interrupted walking, each step taking off and staying suspended, literally remaining in between. No recognizable pulse, rhythm by rhytmos. Short, chopped-off, irregular utterances, delay and repetition. Not repetition, but the experience of scratched repetition.

Complete void of finalized grammar, and syntactic phrasing—different walks failing to perform normative walking/talking/writing.

Each step continuously returning to its point of departure (the paradox of dichotomy).

Comment

Succeeding in failing is actually very difficult, may be impossible; each attempt to fail itself failing its task. A stepping/walking holding onto and at the same time letting go of both step and stutter. What will become obvious is that in spite of our resistance to, or rejection of syntax, we will not be able to avoid stylistic issues. Writing/talking/walking/dancing imply syntactic work, thus itself IS production of style. Stuttering itself IS its own syntactic style of utterance. It is a matter of rhythm, of the *resonance* of words. Syntax as style, style as 'sense', 'sense' as rhythm, these are the logic's of the stutter; a Deleuzian thought, if I understand him right.

Eye stutter

Two camera eyes moving phlegmatically on a straight path, resisting motion, slouching with undecisive indolence, back and forth, looking astray—catching glimpses of the stuttering walks/talks. Long takes, to be edited by non-judgmental selection (hard for us white, western, protestant[6] fellow who have been raised to define, select and categorize the world. Even when revolting against it. Easier for the computer, body/brain without prejudices, asking no questions, faithful to command—perhaps we will employ a digital system as editing device).

Comment

In spite of the double sets of double dynamics (step stutter and indolence, walks and eyes) the two eyes will GO for symmetrical focus, linear continuity, and stillness (do nothing). Bringing sight to the listening narrative of a fictional 'internality' moving elsewhere. Recorded, and recurrently remembered[7].

Speech stutter

Two speeches are delivered by stuttering. Two times two lips interlacing the failure of speech. No recognizable pulse, or rhythm. Short chopped-off unfinished utterances, delay and repetition. No use of repetition, but rather the experience of repetition. A complete luck of 'finalized grammar, speech modes failing to perform normative speaking. Still utterances will unfurl, perfectly outspoken (utlalade) not always decipherable. A speech stutter holding onto and at the same time letting go of both speech and stutter.

We speak our city… merely by inhabiting it, walking through it, looking at it. (Roland Barthes, as quoted by Michel de Certeau)

Recently, you and I spent ten days together in the glow of Los Angeles. In terms of walking, it is an odd city. Instead of inhabiting the public space of the city, bodies of Los Angeles chose the privacy of cars when they drive to the malls that have replaced main streets. using the valley parking which allows for your body to take as few steps as possible in public space or when they access their homes or public buildings through gates, bars, guards. To be a pedestrian in such a city is both odd and suspicious. Not only does public space drift away, become indistinctive, but so does the body.

I remember walking through Chinatown with you in the pink radiance of dawn, after visiting the art space Human Resources next to one of those wide streets with no sidewalks. on our last evening in this city. Then and there, we were 'practitioners of the city' because the city is made to be walked, as Michel de Certeau phrases it. For de Certeau, the city is a language. a window of opportunities, and thus walking becomes the speech act of that language. Language determines what is possible to articulate. in similar manners as architecture determines where bodies can walk. But bodies invent new ways to walk and practitioners of language formulate other ways to speak: to cross. to drift. to stray. 'To walk is to lack a place', de Certeau writes, and 'our decision to write springs from a lack', the Jewish poet Edmond Jabes echoes. Yet it is also in the footsteps of de Certeau that Rebecca Solnit suggests a fearsome metaphor: 'if the city is a language spoken by walkers. then a postpedestrian city not only has fallen silent but risks becoming a dead language'.

Choreography of today is multiple—and devoted to move astray. That doesn't mean that she has lost its proper object of interest, but rather that she has learned to dislodge its own language. Not for the sake of leaving meta-specificity, but rather of employing it outside her own realm. Choreography do speaks and writes (a) language, but it is a mesh-language, one that challenges the very limits of language, and brings about transgress. And runs between the incomprehensible speech-excess of self-reflexive meta-overdrive, and the thick mass of polymorphic trans-figurative blur—cacophony and autism at once. Hence a mesh that marks, rather then disarray, the profound coherence of a con-fusion.

The distance that separates these two limits of language (and whatever language of the addressee) IS the very separation, where-by choreography now addresses herself (and the world). The very multiplicity of speech (and writing, walking etc.) brought about a dynamics of difference. Distance IS the prerequisite of the multiple. The prerequisite of walking.

*

> A path is a prior interpretation of the best way to traverse a landscape, and to follow a route is to accept an interpretation, or to stalk your predecessors on it as scholars and trackers and pilgrims do. To walk the same way is to reiterate something the same person, thinking the same thoughts. (Rebecca Solnit, 2000)

The year I started working for you I turned 30. while you turned 60. You doubled my time in the world. doubled my experience: doubled the number of steps my feet had taken. I came to grow while growing close to you, while nearing the deviating directions of your thoughts, while looming the desired rhythm of your walking as well as to your writing. I came to walk in your footsteps: to reiterate something as deep as a hollow in the ground where a house you built once stood. And somehow. throughout. my world doubled in size.

Step stutter

Interrupted walking, each step taking off and staying suspended, literally remaining in between. No recognizable pulse, rhythm by rhytmos. Short, chopped-off, irregular utterances, delay and repetition. Not repetition, but the experience of scratched repetition.

Complete void of finalized grammar, and syntactic phrasing—different walks failing to perform normative walking/talking/writing.

Each step continuously returning to its point of departure (the paradox of dichotomy).

Comment

Succeeding in failing is actually very difficult, may be impossible; each attempt to fail itself failing its task. A stepping/walking holding onto and at the same time letting go of both step and stutter. What will become obvious is that in spite of our resistance to, or rejection of syntax, we will not be able to avoid stylistic issues. Writing/talking/walking/dancing imply syntactic work, thus itself IS production of style. Stuttering itself IS its own syntactic style of utterance. It is a matter of rhythm, of the *resonance* of words. Syntax as style, style as 'sense', 'sense' as rhythm, these are the logic's of the stutter; a Deleuzian thought, if I understand him right.

Eye stutter

Two camera eyes moving phlegmatically on a straight path, resisting motion, slouching with undecisive indolence, back and forth, looking astray—catching glimpses of the stuttering walks/talks. Long takes, to be edited by non-judgmental selection (hard for us white, western, protestant[6] fellow who have been raised to define, select and categorize the world. Even when revolting against it. Easier for the computer, body/brain without prejudices, asking no questions, faithful to command—perhaps we will employ a digital system as editing device).

Comment

In spite of the double sets of double dynamics (step stutter and indolence, walks and eyes) the two eyes will GO for symmetrical focus, linear continuity, and stillness (do nothing). Bringing sight to the listening narrative of a fictional 'internality' moving elsewhere. Recorded, and recurrently remembered[7].

Speech stutter

Two speeches are delivered by stuttering. Two times two lips interlacing the failure of speech. No recognizable pulse, or rhythm. Short chopped-off unfinished utterances, delay and repetition. No use of repetition, but rather the experience of repetition. A complete luck of 'finalized grammar, speech modes failing to perform normative speaking. Still utterances will unfurl, perfectly outspoken (utlalade) not always decipherable. A speech stutter holding onto and at the same time letting go of both speech and stutter.

ing away. The double force of (at)traction enabling a joint *narrative*. That's how a proper partnering is performed, risky but safe, in a-synchronized symmetry, perfect synergy of difference, based on reciprocal interest. The dichotomy of the *two* taken not as scenery for, but as manifestation of discourse.

Moving beyond the normative perspective of the couple, walking by two moves in order to approach ontological and metaphysical concerns. Transferred agency; relational writing ignited, multiplicity of *self* affirmed as logos and axiom. One thing is for sure: she is not a young girl, and, if young, then a middle-aged soul re-proposed in a young (double) body spinning her head off. In a spiral.

Spiral [8]

The spiral spins along its vertical axe. Never mind if standing upright or laying down flat.

The political metaphysics of the feminine proposed by Luce Irigaray is relevant to the reading of this double spiral.

Irigaray pleads for, 1) the reassurance of sexual difference, 2) the rights of the feminine to remain other (not to become an equally domineering or stronger 'same'), 3) the appropriation of the vertical axe (to stand up/*stå upp/påstå*) as the symbolic territory along which the feminine (not necessarily female) may spin in spirals. Not necessarily by standing tall.

Partial repeat

Flickering brain de-creating simultaneous existence, the spiral by two moves to recognize what she already loves; secrecy (incomprehensible language), speed (spinning spiral) and affect (e-motion). A woman warrior becoming, experimenting with her force. And it is along the thin line (trajected ax) running between the source and the addressee (distance) that she will spin her head off.

Female warrior, dancer dealing with and trespassing the battle of the sexes, the spiral by two recognizes difference, and allows the feminine to dwell into other territories. As of today, this kind of flight of the feminine subject is never truly allowed. I plead for a different female tout court, performed by the trans-relational self of the cyborg.

Comment

This step does not get rid of, nor exhibits any contempt for the same per se, yet disregards the power abuse of its structures. Hence, it suggests the coexistence of different (not necessarily opposed) languages and powers, where the other and the same join forces to produce a third, unannounced body/event—already claiming and gaining the multiple nature of a common (cyborg) feminine.

In this case, this step proposes a double movement of increased immersion into the (virtual) reality of a common feminine, able to manifest a courageous synthesis of speech; Luce Irigaray (vertical spin), Camille Paglia (power) and Deborah Hay (of the incomprehensible) at once. The main issue remaining: walking by two is not a violent villain; she simply spins and never backs off.

That per se reconfirms the cyborg technology as true partner in crime in the cripqueer- gender- counter- discourse of today.

Failure

Finally: the body, the step, the couple, the cyborg and the place of taking place might all fail to revolt, and agenda will be left un-standing.

This entire enterprise may thus be depicted as a kind of surviving tower of Babylon, unstable constructions for the end of consent, for the battle between languages; a falling (*påfallande/iögonfallande*) project where misunderstanding and structural flaws are perceived and performed. Where pleasure, perversion, failure and dreams (nightmares) embody a different politics.

Last word

Before leaving this wordy battlefield, I must speak of the *jetée* as the suspended thrust of an arrow.

Thrust step, throwing itself. Target still ahead. Suspension imagined. The step *jetée* IS the flight of an arrow, a *trajectile*.

It is Antonin Artaud who first coins the image of language, performance, and body as the thrust of arrow, and Jacques Derrida who, in his text on Artaud' s drawings, To *unsense the subjectile* further rephrases this image into the trajecting/trajected *subjectile* of writing.

Motion in flight, thrown by a *world of senses*, shot along a trajectory, deflecting from itself, body spinning at high speed, with great complexity and lightness, risking a *jetée* into distance, trajectory coinciding with projection, whilst upholding motion.

What if… writing choreography by walking is a *subjectile* throwing itself and being thrown, consciously controlled and fearlessly abandoned, singular *voice*, eloquent and autistic, resisting standing up and resisting lying down. She will not allow us to treat her as servile means of speculum. But claim her reconfiguration of *self*. And allow us to walk along.

Yours,
CC

(1) Walking

Human walking is accomplished with a strategy called the double pendulum. During forward motion, the leg that leaves the ground swings forward from the hip. This sweep is the first pendulum. Then the leg strikes the ground with the heel and rolls through to the toe in a motion described as an inverted pendulum. The motion of the two legs is coordinated so that one foot or the other is always in contact with the ground. The process of walking recovers approximately sixty per cent of the energy used due to pendulum dynamics and ground reaction force. Where in running there is typically a ballistic phase where the runner is airborne with both feet in the air (for bi-pedals), in walking one leg always stays on the ground while the other is swinging. Another difference concerns the movement of the center of mass [2] of the body. In walking the body "vaults" over the leg on the ground, raising the center of mass to its highest point as the leg passes the vertical, and dropping it to the lowest as the legs are spread apart. Essentially kinetic energy of forward motion is constantly being traded for a rise in potential energy. There is an absolute limit on an individual's speed of walking due to the upwards acceleration of the center of mass during a stride - if it's greater than the acceleration due to gravity the person will become airborne as they vault over the leg on the ground. – Edited from Wikipedia

(2) Center

In physics, the center of mass of a distribution of mass in space is the unique point where the weighted relative position of the distributed mass sums to zero. The distribution of mass is balanced around the center of mass and the average of the weighted position coordinates of the distributed mass defines its coordinates. Calculations in mechanics are often simplified when formulated with respect to the center of mass. In the case of a single rigid body, the center of mass is fixed in relation to the body, and if the body has uniform density, it will be located at the centroid. The center of mass may be located outside the physical body, as is sometimes the case for hollow or open-shaped objects, such as ahorseshoe. In the case of a distribution of separate bodies, such as the planets of the Solar System, the center of mass may not correspond to the position of any individual member of the system. The center of mass is a useful reference point for calculations in mechanics that involve masses distributed in space, such as the linear and angular momentum of planetary bodies and rigid body dynamics. In orbital mechanics, the equations of motion of planets are formulated as point masses located at the centers of mass. The center of mass frame is an inertial frame in which the center of mass of a system is at rest with respect to the origin of the coordinate system. – Edited from Wikipedia

(3) Chronophotography

A predecessor of cinematography, Chronophotography was developed with the specific aim to capture and notify movement. It used dance for its experiments and established a new, technological approach to the body and to movement, directly related to dance, which was, at the time, developing into a 'modern' form of expression. In our time, when cinema has taken over almost entirely the function of dance as theatrical stage event, dance is showing a new interest in a cinematographic approach to herself, dance is forging her own 'organic flow' into a chronophotographic system of notation, which resists and manipulates chronology. – From *The Archiotectonics of Embodiment*, Dalibor Vesely

(4) Centroid

In mathematics and physics, the centroid or geometric center of a two-dimensional region is the arithmetic mean ("average") position of all the points in the shape. The definition extends to any object in n-dimensional space: its centroid is the mean position of all the points in all of the coordinate directions. Informally, it is the point at which a cardboard cut-out of the region could be perfectly balanced on the tip of a pencil, assuming uniform density and a uniform gravitational field. While in geometry the term barycenter is a synonym for "centroid", in physics "barycenter" may also mean the physical center of mass or the center of gravity, depending on the context. The center of mass (and center of gravity in a uniform gravitational field) is the arithmetic mean of all points weighted by the local density or specific weight. If a physical object has uniform density, then its center of mass is the same as the centroid of its shape. In geography, the centroid of a radial projection of a region of the Earth's surface to sea level is known as the region's geographical center. – Edited from Wikipedia

(5) Theorematic

an idea, belief, method, or statement generally accepted as true or worthwhile without proof. – From Wikipedia

(6) Protestant

The psychology and rational rigor of the Protestant surpasses by far the spectacular hedonism of Catholicism, of Middle-Age mysticism and astrology, or of Chinese cosmology, hence the use here of the connotation Protestant (protest-*stante*/standing protest) to entail the kind of reverence to order in revolt here meant to convey. – Lost reference

(7) Remember

To remember is translated in Italian, *ricordare*, from the Latin, *-to return to the heart-*, and stands for the replacement in the present (here heart) of an emotional event from the past, perceived as a tangible, *virtual* e-motion of the now. The English *to record* (etymological shift of the Italian *ricordare*) depicts the sound annotation and conservation of past events, which makes them reproducible in the present. In this double reading of the word, remembering and recording are synonymous – a semantic crossover, which conveys with great simplicity conveys the notion of memory by Bergson. – From Emile Amelia, Cristina Caprioli

(8) Spiral

Paul Klee's diagrammatic discussion of the spiral: "Shortening the radius narrows the curve more and more, till the lovely spectacle dies suddenly in the center. Motion here is no longer finite, and the question of direction regains new importance. The direction determines either a gradual liberation from the center through freer and freer motions, or an increased dependence on an eventually destructive center. This is the question of life and death; and the decision rests with the small arrow. The small arrow refers to the line at the base of the spiral pointing in two opposite directions labeled 'either', 'or'." – From *Pedagogical Sketchbook* (1953), Paul Klee