

A Question of Desire

Interview with Chilean scientist Humberto Maturana

Q: You conceive of living beings as closed units that self-produce. How does this occur?

A: What is living is primarily concerned with conservation, not change. Living beings are molecular systems, networks that manufacture and transform molecules. The organization, the processes, do not change. What changes are the particular molecules, the components that enter into the process. That which is modified I refer to as structure. For example, someone becomes ill and loses weight, loses molecules. Then he improves, recovers his weight, his musculature. A series of structural changes have occurred, but the organization has been conserved, the life. Living beings are machines that define themselves through their organization, through their processes of conservation, and distinguish themselves from other machines through their capacity to self-produce.

Q: Descartes said something similar, that living beings are the same as automatons, robots without emotions. According to your mechanist understanding of life, do living beings have emotions?

A: Of course, all animals have emotions.

Q: But how would you explain these emotions that perhaps would be different in a machine?

A: I'll tell you about a machine that has emotions: the automobile.

Q: A car has emotions?

A: Of course. You put it in first gear and you have a powerful car. You say, "Look how powerful this car is in first!" It's aggressive, because when you scarcely touch the accelerator, vrrrooom! It takes off!

Q: But isn't that metaphorical?

A: To a certain extent, but more than metaphorical it is "isophorical," that is, it refers to something in the same class. You put the car in fifth and you travel at a higher speed, and the car is peaceful, fluid, serene. What is happening there? Each time you change gears, you change the internal configuration of the automobile and it does different things. Emotions correspond precisely to that, from the biological perspective they are internal changes in configuration that transform the reactivity of the living being, such that the living being in the relational space is different.

Q: What would be specific to human emotions?

A: A human being can look at his emotions, can reflect because he has language. But animals, which Descartes treated so negatively as an automaton, do not have a way to carry out this reflective gaze.

Q: So an animal's emotions are like those of an automobile?

A: It is like your emotions when you are not aware of them. For example, if you have a child who is extremely upset but does not know exactly what is happening, and you say Say, "you're upset, that's what is happening to you." In that conversation the child begins to deal with what is occurring as an emotion, and that is where the reflective gaze appears. A

-image) and Godard. The development of cinema thus recapitulates in image form the path leading up to a fundamental moment in philosophical modernity the realization that time is the condition of the world, that it has no beginning and end, and we are at the mercy of it. Cinema for Deleuze is possessed of a singular power in that not only is it a fundamentally temporal art form, but it is always potentially a mass art form as well, and thus is in a perfect position to crystallize a nascent human coming-to-consciousness of the fundamental character of time in the post-Kantian world.

We should comment on the justice of this apparently entirely philosophy-centric view of the cinema. Is Deleuze's claim, then, that cinema is a kind of spatio-temporal incarnation of ideas that have their pure form in philosophy? What would it mean to answer 'yes' to this question? On the plus side, if cinema is the spatio-temporal incarnation of a set of ideas about space and time, doesn't that mean that cinema, rather than being parasitic upon philosophy, assumes a powerful autonomy as a realization of philosophy? It would complete philosophy's speculation by realizing it in practice. So what philosophy gives to cinema, it gets back by realizing itself in more concrete form. However, this may seem to many to give philosophy a ridiculously exaggerated role in the internal logic of the development of cinema. So Deleuze qualifies this idea a little. If cinema in its second phase confronts time in all its purity, and overcomes the traditional ideas about time as movement that were holding it back, this moment is triggered by a specific set of socio-historical conditions. Specifically, cinema only enters its second phase after the Second World War.

The new cinema records the ruins of the old world, and depicts characters who can no longer rely on traditional, habitual ways of life, who can no longer react in the way they used to. The period after the Second World War is also marked by a new phase of capitalist development: not only are people uprooted or deterritorialized from their traditional forms of life (as in the first phase of capitalism), but their desires are now manipulated and deterritorialized by the new consumer society. Not only are old ways of living and working abolished, but people's interior lives, their very desires, are deterritorialized. Western societies become radically cut off from their past. We enter a new phase of history, governed by the tendency towards absolute deterritorialization. It is these social conditions that allow the Kantian theory of time to become relevant for everybody. And cinema is the privileged place where we can become spectators of the process of this transformation. The darkened space of the cinema auditorium, populated by bodies whose sensory-motor life is suspended along with their social being, provides the ideal space for the unfolding of what Deleuze calls 'the pure form of time', a form of time in which the temporal syntheses of memory and anticipation are permitted to detach themselves from their ballast in everyday active social experience.

This is the strong central thesis that undergirds Deleuze's Cinema. It implies an evaluation, as it implies that films which remain caught up in mere movement-images must be seen as outmoded. It also has an ethical component in that it shows that the great modern directors were attempting to come to terms with, and imagine ways of dealing with, life in a world with a profoundly new temporal structure. Deleuze's Cinema is thus a great progressive work of aesthetics. But we must note it was written in the early 1980s that is, in what perhaps now looks like the twilight of the great age of European cinema. So perhaps here as well the owl of Minerva only flies at dusk.

Champagne Supernova Oasis

How many special people change
How many lives are living strange
Where were you while we were getting high?
Slowly walking down the hall
Faster than a cannonball
Where were you while we were getting high?

Someday you will find me
Caught beneath the landslide
In a champagne supernova in the Sky
Some day you will find me
Caught beneath the landslide
In a champagne supernova
A champagne supernova in the sky

Wake up the dawn and ask her why
A dreamer dreams she never dies
Wipe that tear away now from your eye
Slowly walking down the hall
Faster than a cannonball
Where were you while we were getting high?

Some day you will find me
Caught beneath the landslide
In a champagne supernova in the sky
Some day you will find me
Caught beneath the landslide
In a champagne supernova
A champagne supernova

'Cause people believe that they're
Gonna get away for the summer
But you and I, we live and die
The world's still spinning round
We don't know why
Why, why, why, why

How many special people change
How many lives are living strange
Where were you while we were getting high?
Slowly walking down the hall
Faster than a cannonball
Where were you while we were getting high?

Someday you will find me
Caught beneath the landslide
In a champagne supernova in the sky
Some day you will find me
Caught beneath the landslide
In a champagne supernova
A champagne supernova

'Cause people believe that they're
Gonna get away for the summer
But you and I, we live and die
The world's still spinning round
We don't know why
Why, why, why, why

How many special people change
How many lives are living strange
Where were you while we were getting high?
We were getting high
We were getting high
We were getting high
We were getting high
* We were getting high
* We were getting high
* We were getting high
* We were getting high
* We were getting high
* We were getting high

French grammar

French is a moderately inflected language. Nouns and most pronouns are inflected for number (singular or plural); adjectives, for the number and gender (masculine or feminine) of their nouns; personal pronouns, for person, number, gender, and case; and verbs, for mood, tense, and the person and number of their subjects. That said, case is primarily marked using word order and prepositions, and certain verb features are marked using auxiliary verbs.

Verbs

In French, as in English, a verb is the controlling element in most sentences, although it is more common in French than in English for a sentence to have no verb. Verbs are conjugated to reflect the following information:

- ☐ a mood (indicative, imperative, subjunctive, infinitive, participle, or gerundive¹);
- ☐ a tense (present, preterite², imperfect², future, or conditional³, though not all tenses can be combined with all moods);
- ☐ an aspect (perfect¹ or not);
- ☐ a voice (active, passive¹, or reflexive¹).

1. The gerundive mood, perfect aspect, and passive and reflexive voices are not synthetic. That is, there are not separate, one-word, conjugated forms that express these distinctions; rather, additional words modify the verb in order to convey them; see periphrasis.

Also, note that French's gerundive mood (le gérondif) is not analogous to the gerundive in certain other languages (such as Latin and Esperanto).

2. In instruction, the preterite and imperfect tenses are sometimes called the preterite past tense and imperfect past tense to make clear that they generally correspond to the English past tense. Additionally, the preterite is often called the simple past tense to better reflect its French name, le passé simple.

3. Some grammarians consider the conditional to be a distinct mood, rather than a tense of the indicative mood. There is no disagreement over the correct usage, only over the best classification.

Nouns

Every French noun has a grammatical gender, either masculine or feminine. The grammatical gender of an animate noun usually corresponds to the noun's natural gender. For such nouns, there will very often be one noun of each gender, with the choice of noun being determined by the natural gender of the person described; for example, a male singer is a chanteur, while a female singer is a chanteuse. In some cases, the two nouns are identical in form, with the difference only being marked in neighboring words (due to gender agreement; see the section on articles); a Catholic man is un Catholique, while a Catholic woman is une Catholique. Nonetheless, there are some such nouns that retain their grammatical gender regardless of natural gender; personne ("person") is always feminine, while (at least in "standard" French) professeur ("teacher") is always masculine, regardless of the sex of the person being referred to.

A noun's gender is not perfectly predictable from its form, but there are some trends. As a very broad trend, nouns ending in -e tend to be feminine, while the rest tend to be masculine, but there are very many exceptions. More consistently, some endings, such as -tion, occur almost exclusively on feminine nouns, while others, such as -eau, occur almost exclusively on masculine ones. Nonetheless, a noun that seems masculine from its form might actually be feminine (e.g., souris "mouse"), or less commonly, vice versa (e.g., squelette "skeleton").

As with English, nouns are inflected for number; to form a plural noun from the singular, usually add -s, or sometimes -x. However, since final consonants are generally not pronounced in French, adding -s or -x does not generally affect pronunciation, so the singular and plural forms of most nouns are generally pronounced the same. Further, nouns that end in -s (e.g., Français "Frenchman") in their singular forms generally do not change forms even in writing. However, some nouns are pronounced differently in their plural forms: for example, œil ("eye") becomes yeux, cheval ("horse") becomes chevaux, and os ("bone" or "bones") is pronounced differently when it is plural ([o]) from when it is singular ([ɔs]); and even with nouns for which this is not the case, a distinction will still usually be made in speech, as there will usually be a neighboring article or determiner whose pronunciation does change with the noun's number (due to number agreement; see the section on articles). As with English, most uncountable nouns are grammatically treated as singular, though some are plural, such as les mathématiques (mathematics), and some nouns that are uncountable in English are countable in French, such as une information (a piece of information).

Nouns in French are not inflected for case or person. (However, pronouns are; see the section on pronouns.)

Articles and determiners

Articles and determiners agree in gender and number with the noun they determine; and, unlike with nouns, this inflection is made in speech as well as in writing. Perhaps for this reason, they are required in French much more often than in English: this enables nouns' genders and numbers to be reflected in speech.

French has three articles: definite, indefinite, and partitive. The difference between the definite and indefinite articles is similar to that in English (definite: the; indefinite: a, an), except that the indefinite article has a plural form (~some). The partitive article is similar to the indefinite article, but is used for uncountable nouns.

Adjectives

An adjective agrees in gender and number with the noun it modifies. To make an adjective feminine, most simply add -e; to make most adjectives plural, just add -s. There are a few common exceptions: the feminine of -eux is -euse; beau ☐ belle; -ien ☐ -ienne; -f ☐ -ve; etc.

Most adjectives appear after the noun (le vin rouge), but a small subset of common adjectives, frequently for beauty, age, goodness, or size (BAGS) come before it: une belle femme, un vieux camion, une bonne bière, un grand appartement. For these adjectives that come before a noun, there are certain changes that occur, for the sake of pronunciation, when such an adjective precedes a noun that starts with a vowel. For example, consider the masculine noun ami. Ami means friend, and, to say new friend, one would just add the masculine version of the adjective new (nouveau), which comes before

the noun according to the BAGS rule stated above. Therefore, the construction would be nouveau ami. This is wrong, however. To make the pronunciation smoother, the French language uses the feminine version of new (nouvelle) and simply drops the feminine ending. Thus, new friend becomes nouvel ami. Another example of such an adjective is vieille (old), which becomes vieil.

For some adjectives, the meaning changes based on its position relative to the noun:

☐ mon ancienne maison ("my former house") vs. ma maison ancienne ("my ancient house")

☐ ma propre maison ("my own house") vs. ma maison propre ("my clean house")

Many compound words contain an adjective: belle-mère (one word: "mother in law") vs. belle mère (two words: "beautiful mother"). Some of them use an archaic form of the feminine adjective (without -e): grand-route, grand-mère (but une grande route "a long way", une grande mère "a tall mother").

Adverbs

As in English, adverbs in French are used to modify adjectives, other adverbs, and verbs or clauses. Most adverbs are derived from an adjective by modifying its ending and adding the suffix -ment (analogous to the English suffix -ly), though some adverbs are derived irregularly, and many do not derive from adjectives at all.

Adverbs are invariable; that is, unlike nouns, verbs, and adjectives, they are not inflected in any way.

[Edit]

6 Pronouns

Main article: French pronouns

In French, pronouns can be inflected to indicate their role in a clause (subject, direct object, etc.), as well as the person, gender, and number of their referent. Not all of these inflections may be present at once; for example, the relative pronoun que (that, which, whom) may have any referent, while the possessive pronoun le mien (mine) may have any role in a clause.

As noted above, French - like English - is a non-pro-drop ("pronoun-dropping") language; therefore, pronouns feature prominently in the language. Impersonal verbs (e.g., pleuvoir to rain) use the impersonal pronoun il (analogous to English it).

The French object pronouns are all clitics, and some appear so consistently - especially in everyday speech - that some have commented that French could almost be considered to demonstrate polypersonal agreement.

Negation

French has a two part negation, consisting of the ne particle, which signifies a global negation, preceding the verb, and one of several other words following the verb, clarifying the type of negation:

- ☐ ne ... pas "not"
- ☐ ne ... rien "nothing"
- ☐ ne ... jamais "never"
- ☐ ne... jamais plus "never again"

- ☐ ne ... jamais rien "never anything"
- ☐ ne ... personne "nobody"
- ☐ ne ... aucun(e) "not any", but not identical to the German kein
- ☐ ne ... plus "not any more, no longer"
- ☐ ne ... guère "not much, not any, ~hardly" (archaic)
- ☐ ne ... que "only"
- ☐ ne ... point "not, not at all" (mostly literary)

Examples:

- ☐ « Je ne sais pas. » "I don't know."
- ☐ « Nous n'avons vu personne. » "We didn't see anybody."
- ☐ « Il ne fume plus. » "He doesn't smoke anymore."
- ☐ « Je n'ai aucune idée. » "I have no idea."

Note that some of these negations have positive meanings when they are not preceded by the ne particle:

- ☐ Jamais "ever":
 - o « Tu l'as jamais vu? » "Did you ever see him/her?"
- ☐ Personne "person":
 - o « Il y a une personne ici. » "There is a person here."
- ☐ Plus "more":
 - o « Il y en a plus. » "There is more (of it)."

Personne and rien can also be used as negative subjects. In this case, the negative subject takes the normal place of the subject in a sentence, while the verb is preceded by the ne particle. There is no negation after the verb, unless two negations are being combined.

Example:

- ☐ « Personne n'est venu. » "Nobody came."
- ☐ « Rien ne se passe plus. » "Nothing happens any more."

In colloquial French it is common to drop the ne in fast speech, although this can create some ambiguity with the ne...plus construction, as plus can mean either "more" or "not anymore." Generally when plus is used to mean "more", the final "s" is pronounced, while it is never pronounced when used to mean "not any more". So the informal sentence "Il y en a plus" can be pronounced with the final "s" to mean "There is more", or without to mean "There is none left".

It is also common in literary style to omit the pas when the construction is of the ne...pas form with the verbs vouloir and pouvoir ("to want", "to be able to"). Examples with "I don't know":

- ☐ « Je ne sais pas. » (standard)
- ☐ « Je sais pas. » (spoken)
- ☐ « Je ne sais. » (literary)
- ☐ « Je n'ai pas pu. » (standard)
- ☐ « J'ai pas pu. » (spoken)
- ☐ « Je n'ai pu. » (literary)

Word order

- ☐ Subject
- ☐ ne (establishes global negation within phrase)
- ☐ Reflexive pronoun
- ☐ Indirect Object pronoun me, te, nous, vous

- ☐ Direct Object pronoun
- ☐ Indirect Object pronoun lui, leur
- ☐ y and/or en
- ☐ Finite verb form
- ☐ complement to ne to clarify form of negation (pas, rien, personne, jamais)
- ☐ Past participle
- ☐ Object (may be a negative complement)

Rem Koolhaas

JUNKSPACE

Because we abhor the utilitarian, we have condemned ourselves to a life-long immersion in arbitrariness...

The average contemporary lunch box is a microcosm of Junkspace: a fervent semantics of health - slabs of eggplant, topped by thick layers of goat cheese - cancelled by a colossal cookie at the bottom...

Polarities have become equatorial, nothing left in between. There is nothing between desolation and turmoil, between beauty and crassness

.
LAX: welcoming - possibly flesh-eating - orchids at the check-in counter...

'Identity' is the new junkfood for the dispossessed, globalization's fodder for the disenfranchised.

"Logan Airport : a world-class upgrade for the 21st century" (Late 20th century billboard)

JUNKSPACE

If space-junk is the human debris that litters the universe, junk-space is the residue mankind leaves on the planet. The built (more about that later) product of modernization is not modern architecture but Junkspace. Junkspace is what remains after modernization has run its course or, more precisely, what coagulates while modernization is in progress, its fall-out. Modernization had a rational program: to share the blessings of science, universally. Junkspace is its apotheosis, or meltdown... Although its individual parts are the outcome of brilliant inventions, lucidly planned by human intelligence, boosted by infinite computation, their sum spells the end of Enlightenment, its resurrection as farce, a low-grade purgatory... Junkspace is the sum total of our current achievement; we have built more than all previous generations together, but somehow we do not register on the same scales. We do not leave pyramids. According to a new gospel of ugliness, there is already more Junkspace under construction in the 21st century than survived from the 20th..

.
It was a mistake to invent modern architecture for the 20th century; architecture disappeared in the 20th century; we have been reading a footnote under a microscope hoping it would turn into a novel; our concern for the masses has blinded us to People's Architecture. Junkspace seems an aberration, but it is essence, the main thing... product of the encounter between escalator and air conditioning, conceived in an incubator of sheetrock (all three missing from the history books). Continuity is the essence of Junkspace; it exploits any invention that enables expansion, deploys the infrastructure of seamless: escalator, air conditioning, sprinkler, fire shutter, hot-air curtain... It is always interior, so extensive that you rarely perceive limits; it promotes disorientation by any means (mirror, polish,echo)... Junkspace is sealed, held together not by structure, but by skin, like a bubble. Gravity has remained constant, resisted by the same arsenal since the beginning of time; but air conditioning - invisible medium, therefore unnoticed - has truly revolutionized architecture. Air conditioning has launched the endless building. If architecture separates buildings, air conditioning unites them. Air conditioning has dictated mutant regimes of organization and coexistence that leave architecture behind. A single shopping center now is the work of generations of space planners, repairmen and fixers, like in the middle ages; air conditioning sustains our cathedrals. (Unwittingly, all architects may be working on the same building, so far separate, but with hidden receptors that will eventually make it cohere.) Because its costs money, is no longer free, conditioned space inevitably becomes conditional space; sooner or later all conditional space turns into Junkspace

When we think about space, we have only looked at its containers. As if space itself is invisible, all theory for the production of space is based on an obsessive preoccupation with its opposite: substance and objects, i.e., architecture. Architects could never explain space; Junkspace is our punishment for their mystifications. OK, let's talk about space then. The beauty of airports, especially after each upgrade. The luster of renovations. The subtlety of the shopping center. Let's explore public space, discover casinos, spend time in theme parks... Junkspace is the body-double of space, a territory of impaired vision, limited expectation, reduced earnestness. Junkspace is a Bermuda triangle of concepts, a petri dish abandoned: it cancels distinctions, undermines resolve, confuses intention with realization. It substitutes hierarchy with accumulation, composition with addition. More and more, more is more. Junkspace is overripe and undernourishing at the same time, a colossal security blanket that covers the earth in a stranglehold of seduction... Junkspace is like being condemned to a perpetual Jacuzzi with millions of your best friends... A fuzzy empire of blur, it fuses high and low, public and

private, straight and bent, bloated and starved to offer a seamless patchwork of the permanently disjointed. Seemingly an apotheosis, spatially grandiose, the effect of its richness is a terminal hollowness, a vicious parody of ambition that systematically erodes the credibility of building, possibly forever..

Space was created by piling matter on top of matter, cemented to form a solid new whole. Junkspace is additive, layered and lightweight, not articulated in different parts but subdivided, quartered the way a carcass is torn apart - individual chunks severed from a universal condition. There are no walls, only partitions, shimmering membranes frequently covered in mirror or gold. Structure groans invisibly underneath decoration, or worse, has become ornamental; small shiny space frames support nominal loads, or huge beams deliver cyclopic burdens to innocent destinations... The arch, once the workhorse of structures, has become the depleted emblem of 'community', welcoming an infinity of virtual populations to non-existent there's. Where it is absent, it is simply applied - mostly in stucco - as ornamental afterthought on hurriedly erected superblocks. 13% of all Junkspace's iconography goes back to the Romans, 8% Bauhaus, 7% Disney - neck and neck - 3% Art Nouveau, followed closely by Mayan..

Like a substance that could have condensed in any other form, Junkspace is a domain of feigned, simulated order, a kingdom of morphing. Its specific configuration is as furtitious as the geometry of a snow flake. Patterns imply repetition or ultimately decipherable rules; Junkspace is beyond measure, beyond code... Because it cannot be grasped, Junkspace cannot be remembered. It is flamboyant yet unmemorable, like a screensaver; its refusal to freeze insures instant amnesia. Junkspace does not pretend to create perfection, only interest. Its geometries are unimaginable, only makable. Although strictly non-architectural, it tends to the vaulted, to the Dome. Sections seem to be devoted to utter inertness, others in perpetual rhetorical turmoil: the deadest resides next to the most hysterical. Themes cast a pall of arrested development over interiors as big as the Pantheon, spawning stillbirths in every corner. The esthetic is Byzantine, gorgeous and dark, splintered into thousands of shards, all visible at the same time: a quasi-panoptical universe in which all contents rearrange themselves in split-seconds around the dizzy eye of the beholder. Murals used to show idols; Junkspace's modules are dimensioned to carry brands; myths can be shared, brands husband aura at the mercy of focus groups. Brands in Junkspace perform the same role as black holes in the universe: essences through which meaning disappears... The shiniest surfaces in the history of mankind reflect humanity at its most casual. The more we inhabit the palatial, the more we seem to dress down. A stringent dress code - last spasm of etiquette? - governs access to Junkspace: short, sneaker, sandal, shell suit, fleece, jean, parka, backpack. As if the People suddenly accessed the private quarters of a dictator, Junkspace is best enjoyed in a state of post-revolutionary gawking. Polarities have merged, there is nothing left between desolation and turmoil. Neon signifies both the old and the new, interiors refer to the stone- and the space age at the same time. Like the deactivated virus in an inoculation, Modern architecture remains essential, but only in its most sterile manifestation, High Tech (it seemed so dead only a decade ago!). It exposes what previous generations kept under wraps: structures emerge like springs from a mattress, exit stairs dangle in didactic trapeze, probes thrust into space to deliver laboriously what is in fact omnipresent, free air, acres of glass hang from spidery cables, tautly stretched skins enclose flaccid events. Transparency only reveals everything in which you cannot partake. At the sound of midnight it all may revert to Taiwanese Gothic, in three years segue into Nigerian Sixties, Norwegian Chalet or default Christian. Earthlings now live in a kindergarten grotesque.

Junkspace thrives on design, but design dies in Junkspace. There is no form, but proliferation... Regurgitation is the new creativity; instead of creation, we honor, cherish and embrace manipulation... Superstrings of graphics, transplanted emblems of franchise and sparkling infrastructures of light, LED's, and video describe an authorless world beyond anyone's claim, always unique, utterly unpredictable, yet intensely familiar. Junkspace is hot (or suddenly artic); fluorescent walls, folded like melting stained glass, generate additional heat to raise the temperature of Junkspace to levels where you could cultivate orchids. Pretending histories left and right, its contents are dynamic yet stable, recycled or multiplied as in cloning: forms search for function like hermit crabs for a vacant shell... Junkspace sheds architectures like a reptile sheds skins, is reborn every Monday morning. In previous building, materiality was based on a final state that could only be modified at the expense of partial destruction. At the exact moment that our culture has abandoned repetition and regularity as repressive, building materials have become more and more modular, unitary and standardized; substance now comes predigitized... As the module becomes smaller and smaller, its status become that of a crypto-pixel. With enormous difficulty - budget, argument, negotiation, deformation - irregularity and uniqueness are constructed from identical elements. Instead of trying to wrest order from chaos, the picturesque now is wrested from the homogenized, the singular liberated from the standardized.

Architects thought of Junkspace first and named it Megastructure, the final solution to transcend their huge impasse. Like multiple Babels, huge superstructures would last through eternity, teeming with impermanent infill that would mutate over time, beyond their control. In theory, each megastructure would spawn its own sub-systems, and therefore create a universe of rampant cohesion. In Junkspace, the tables are turned: it is subsystems only, without superstructure, orphaned particles in search of framework or pattern. All materialization is provisional: cutting, bending, tearing, coating: construction has aquired a new softness, like tailoring... The joint is no longer a problem, an intellectual issue: transitional moments are defined by stapling and taping, wrinkly brown bands barely maintain the illusion of an unbroken surface; verbs unknown and unthinkable in architectural history - clamp, stick, fold, dump, glue, shoot, double, fuse - have become indispensable. Each element performs its task in negotiated isolation. Where once detailing suggested the coming together, possibly forever, of disparate materials, it is now a transient coupling, waiting to be undone, unscrewed, a temporary embrace with a high probability of separation; no longer the orchestrated encounter of difference, but the abrupt end of a system, a stalemate. Only the blind, reading its faultlines with their fingertips, will ever understand Junkspace's histories..

While whole millenia worked in favor of permanence, axialities, relationships and proportion, the program of Junkspace is escalation. Instead of development, it offers entropy. Because it is endless, it always leaks somewhere in Junkspace; in the worst case, monumental ashtrays catch intermittent drops in a grey broth. When did time stop moving forward... begin to spool in every direction, like a tape spinning out of control? Since the introduction of Real Time? Change has been divorced from the idea of improvement. There is no progress; like a crab on LSD, culture wobbles endlessly sideways... Junkspace is draining and is drained in return. Everywhere in Junkspace there are seating arrangements, ranges of modular chairs, even couches, as if the experience Junkspace offers its consumers is significantly more exhausting than any previous spatial sensation; in its most abandoned stretches, you find buffets: utilitarian tables draped in white or black sheets, perfunctory assemblies of caffeine and calories - cottage cheese, muffins, unripe grapes - notional representations of plenty, without horn and without plenty. Each Junkspace is connected, sooner or later, to bodily functions: wedged between stainless steel partitions sit rows of groaning Romans, denim toga's bunched around their huge sneakers..

Because it is so intensely consumed, Junkspace is fanatically maintained, the night shift undoing the damage of the day shift in an endless Sisyphean replay. As you recover from Junkspace, Junkspace recovers from you: between 2 and 5 am, yet another population, this one heartlessly casual and appreciably darker, is mopping, hovering, sweeping, toweling, resupplying... Junkspace does not inspire loyalty in its cleaners... Dedicated to instant gratification, Junkspace accomodates seeds of future perfection; a language of apology is woven through its texture of canned euphoria; 'pardon our appearance' signs or miniature yellow 'sorry' billboards mark ongoing patches of wetness, announce momentary discomfort in return for imminent shine, the allure of improvement. Somewhere, workers sink on their knees to repair faded sections - as if in a prayer - or half-disappear in ceiling voids to negotiate elusive malfunction - as if in confession. All surfaces are archaeological, superpositions of different 'periods' (what do you call the moment a particular type of wall-to-wall carpet was current?) - as you note when they're torn

Traditionally, typology implies demarcation, the definition of a singular model that excludes other arrangements. Junkspace represents a reverse typology of cumulative, approximative identity, less about kind than about quantity. But formlessness is still form, the formless also a typology... take the dump, where successive trucks discharge their loads to form a heap, whole in spite of the randomness of its contents and its fundamental shapelessness, or that of the tent-envelope that assumes different shapes to accomodate variable interior volumes. Or the vague croches of the new generation. Junkspace can either be absolutely chaotic or frighteningly aseptic - like a bestseller - overdetermined and indeterminate at the same time. There is something strange about ballrooms, for instance: huge wastelands kept column free for ultimate flexibility. Because you've never been invited to that kind of event, you have never seen them in use, only being prepared with chilling precision: a relentless grid of circular tables, extending towards a distant horizon, their diameters preempting communication, a dais big enough for the politburo of a totalitarian state, wings announcing as-yet unimagined surprises... acres of organization to support future drunkenness, disarray and disorder. Or car shows.

Junkspace is often described as a space of flows, but that is a misnomer; flows depend on disciplined movement, bodies that cohere. Junkspace is a web without spider; although it is an architecture of the masses, each trajectory is strictly unique. Its anarchy is one of the last tangible ways in which we experience freedom. It is a space of collision, a container of atoms,

busy, not dense... There is a special way of moving in Junkspace, at the same time aimless and purposeful. It is an acquired culture. Junkspace features the tyranny of the oblivious: sometimes an entire Junkspace comes unstuck through the non-conformity of one of its members; a single citizen of an another culture - a refugee, a mother - can destabilize an entire Junkspace, hold it to a rustic's ransom, leaving an invisible swath of obstruction in his/her wake, a deregulation eventually communicated to its furthest extremities. Where movement becomes synchronized, it curdles: on escalators, near exits, parking machines, automated tellers. Sometimes, under duress, individuals are channeled in a flow, pushed through a single door or forced to negotiate the gap between two temporary obstacles (an invalid's bleeping chariot and a christmas tree): the manifest ill-will such narrowing provokes, mocks the notion of flows. Flows in Junkspace lead to disaster: department stores at the beginning of sales, the stampedes triggered by warring compartments of soccer fans, dead bodies piling up in front of the locked emergency doors of a disco: evidence of the misfit between the portals of Junkspace and the narrow calibrations of the old world. Traffic is Junkspace, from airspace to the underground; the entire highway system is Junkspace, a vast potential utopia clogged by its users, as you notice when they've finally disappeared on vacation. The young instinctively avoid the Dantesque manipulations/containers to which Junkspace has condemned their elders in perpetuity. Within the meta-playground of Junkspace exist smaller playgrounds, Junkspace for children (usually in the least desirable square footage): sections of sudden miniaturization - often underneath staircases, always near dead-ends - assemblies of under-dimensioned plastic structures - slides, see-saws, swings - shunned by their intended audience - kids - turned into junkniche for the old, the lost, the forgotten, the insane... last hiccup of humanism...

Like radioactive waste, Junkspace has an invidious half-life. Aging in Junkspace is nonexistent or catastrophic; sometimes an entire Junkspace - a department store, a nightclub, a bachelor pad - turns into a slum overnight without warning: wattage diminishes almost imperceptibly, letters drop out of signs, air conditioning units start dripping, cracks appear as if from otherwise unregistered earthquakes; sections rot, are no longer viable, but remain joined to the flesh of the main body via gangrenous passages. Judging the built presumed a static condition; now each architecture embodies opposite conditions simultaneously: old and new, permanent and temporary, flourishing and at risk... sections undergo an Alzheimer-like deterioration as others are upgraded. Because Junkspace is endless, it is never closed... Renovation and restauration were procedures that took place in your absence; now you're a witness, a reluctant participant... Seeing Junkspace in conversion is like inspecting an unmade bed, someone else's. Say an airport needs more space. In the past new terminals were added, each more or less characteristic of its own age, leaving the old ones as a readable record, evidence of progress. Since passengers have definitively demonstrated their infinite malleability, the idea of rebuilding on the spot has gained currency. Travelators are thrown in reverse, signs taped, potted palms (or very large corpses) covered in body bags. Screens of taped sheetrock segregate two populations: one wet, one dry, one hard, one flabby, one cold, one overheated. Half the population produces new space, the more affluent half consumes old space. To accommodate a nether world of manual labor, the concourse suddenly turns into cashbah: improvised locker rooms, coffee breaks, smoking, even real campfires... The ceiling is a crumpled plate like the Alps; grids of unstable tiles alternate with monogrammed sheets of black plastic, improbably punctured by grids of crystal chandeliers... Metal ducts are replaced by breathing textiles. Gaping joints reveal vast ceiling voids (former canyons of asbestos?), beams, ducting, rope, cable, insulation, fireproofing, string; tangled arrangements suddenly exposed to daylight. Impure, tortured and complex, they exist only because they were never consciously plotted. The floor is a patchwork: different textures - concrete, hairy, heavy, shiny, plastic, metallic, muddy - alternate randomly, as if dedicated to different species...The ground is no more. There are too many raw needs to be realized on only one plane. The absolute horizontal has been abandoned. Transparency has disappeared, replaced by a dense crust of provisional occupation: kiosks, carts, strollers, palms, fountains, bars, sofas, trolleys... Corridors no longer simply link A to B, but have become 'destinations'. Their tenant life tends to be short: the most stagnant windows, the most perfunctory dresses, the most implausible flowers. All perspective is gone, as in a rainforest (itself disappearing, they keep saying...). The formerly straight is coiled into ever more complex configurations. Only a perverse modernist choreography can explain the twists and turns, ascents and descents, sudden reversals that comprise the typical path from check-in (misleading name) to apron of the average contemporary airport. Because we never reconstruct or question the absurdity of these enforced derives, we meekly submit to grotesque journeys past perfume, asylum seeker, building site, underwear, oysters, pornography, cell phone - incredible adventures for the brain, the eye, the nose, the tongue, the womb, the testicles..

There was once a polemic about the straight line; now the 90-degree angle has become one among many. In fact, remnants of former geometries create ever new havoc, offering forlorn nodes of

resistance that create unstable eddies in newly opportunistic flows...Who would dare claim responsibility for this sequence? The idea that a profession once dictated, or at least presumed to predict, people's movements, now seems laughable, or worse: unthinkable. Instead of design, there is calculation: the more erratic the path, eccentric the loops, hidden the blueprint, the more efficient the exposure, inevitable the transaction. In this war, graphic designers are the great turncoats: where once signage promised to deliver you to where you wanted to be, it now obfuscates and entangles you in a thicket of cuteness that forces you past unwanted detours, turns you back when you're lost. Postmodernism adds a crumple-zone of viral poche that fractures and multiplies the endless frontline of display, a peristaltic shrinkwrap crucial to all commercial exchange. Trajectories are launched as ramp, turn horizontal without any warning, intersect, fold down, suddenly emerge on a vertiginous balcony above a large void. Fascism minus dictator. From the sudden dead-end where you were dropped by a monumental, granite staircase, an escalator takes you to an invisible destination, facing a provisional vista of plaster, inspired by forgettable sources. (There is no datum level; you always inhabit a sandwich. 'Space' is scooped out of Junkspace as from a soggy block of ice cream that has languished too long in the freezer: cylindrical, cone shaped, more or less spherical, whatever...) Toilet groups mutate into Disney Store then morph to become meditation center: successive transformations mock the word 'plan'. The plan is a radar screen where individual pulses survive for unpredictable periods of time in a Bachanalian free-for-all... In this stand-off between the redundant and the inevitable, a plan would actually make matters worse, drive you to instant despair. Only the diagram gives a bearable version. There is zero loyalty - and zero tolerance - toward configuration, no 'original' condition, architecture as has turned into a time-lapse sequence to reveal a 'permanent evolution'... The only certainty is conversion - continuous - followed, in rare cases, by 'restoration'. That is the process that claims ever new sections of history as extensions of Junkspace.

History corrupts, absolute history corrupts absolutely. Color and matter are eliminated from these bloodless grafts: the bland has become the only meeting ground for the old and the new... Can the bland be amplified? The featureless be exaggerated? Through height? depth? length? variation? repetition? Sometimes not overload but its opposite, an absolute absence of detail, generates Junkspace. A voided condition of frightening sparseness, shocking proof that so much can be organized by so little. Laughable emptiness infuses the respectful distance or tentative embrace that architects maintain in the presence of the past, authentic or not. Invariably, the primordial decision is to leave the original intact; the formerly residual is declared the new essence, focus of the intervention. As a first step, the substance to be preserved is wrapped in a thick pack of commerce and catering - like a reluctant skier pushed downhill by responsible minders. To show respect, symmetries are maintained and helplessly exaggerated; ancient building techniques are resurrected and honed to irrelevant shine, quarries reopened to excavate the 'same' stone, indiscreet donor names chiseled prominently in the meekest of typefaces; the courtyard covered by a masterful, structural 'filigree' - emphatically uncompetitive - so that continuity may be established with the 'rest' of Junkspace (abandoned galleries, display slums, jurrasic concepts...). Conditioning is applied; filtered daylight reveals vast, antiseptic expanses of monumental reticence and makes them come alive, vibrant as a computer rendering... the curse of public space: latent fascism safely smothered in signage, stools, sympathy... Junkspace is post-existential; it makes you uncertain where you are, obscures where you go, undoes where you were. Who do you think you are? Who do you want to be ? (Note to architects: you thought that you could ignore Junkspace... visit it surreptitiously, treat it with condescending contempt or enjoy it vicariously... because you could not understand it, you've thrown away the keys... but now your own architecture is infected, has become equally smooth, all-inclusive, continuous, warped, busy, atrium-ridden...) JunkSignature™ is the new architecture: the former meglomania of a profession contracted to managable size, Junkspace minus its saving vulgarity. Anything stretched - limousines, body parts, planes - turns into Junkspace, its original concept abused. Restore, rearrange, reassemble, revamp, renovate, revise, recover, redesign, return - the Parthenon marbles - redo, respect, rent: verbs that start with re-, produce Junkspace.

Junkspace will be our tomb. Half of mankind pollutes to produce, the other pollutes to consume. The combined pollution of all Third World cars, motorbikes, trucks, buses, sweatshops, pales into insignificance compared to the heat generated by Junkspace. Junkspace is political: it depends on the central removal of the critical faculty in the name of comfort and pleasure. Politics has become manifesto by Photoshop, seamless blueprints of the mutually exclusive. Rabbit is the new beef. Comfort is the new Justice. Entire miniature states now adopt Junkspace as political program, establish regimes of engineered disorientation, instigate a politics of systematic disarray. Not exactly 'anything goes'; in fact, the secret of Junkspace is that it is both promiscuous and repressive: as the formless proliferates, the formal withers, and with it all rules, regulations, recourse. Babel has been misunderstood. Language is not the problem, just the new frontier of Junkspace. Mankind, torn by eternal dilemmas,

The impasse of seemingly endless debates, has launched a new language that straddles unbridgable divides like a fragile pedestrian designer's footbridge... coined a proactive wave of new oxymorons to suspend former incompatibility: life/style, reality/TV, world/music, museum/ store, food/court, health/care, waiting/lounge. Naming has replaced class-struggle, sonorous amalgamations of status, high-concept and history. Through acronym, unusual importation, suppressing letters, or fabrication of non-existent plurals, they aim to shed meaning in return for a spacious new roominess... Junkspace knows all your emotions, all your desires. It is the interior of Big Brother's belly. It preempts people's sensations. It comes with a soundtrack, smell, captions; it blatantly proclaims how it wants to be read: rich, stunning, cool, huge, abstract, 'minimal', historical. It sponsors a collective of brooding consumers in surly anticipation of their next spend, a mass of refractory periods caught in a Thousand Year Reign of Razzmataz, a paroxysm of prosperity. The subject is stripped of privacy in return for access to a credit nirvana. You are complicit in the tracing of the fingerprints each of your transactions leaves; they know everything about you, except who you are. Emissaries of Junkspace pursue you in the formerly impervious privacy of the bedroom: the minibar, private fax machines, pay TV offering compromised pornography, fresh plastic veils wrapping toilets seats, courtesy condoms: miniature profit centers coexist with your bedside bible...

Junkspace pretends to unite, but it actually splinters. It creates communities not of shared interest or free association, but of identical statistics and unavoidable demographics, an opportunistic weave of vested interests. Each man, woman and child is individually targeted, tracked, split off from the rest.. Fragments come together at 'security' only, where a grid of video screens disappointingly reassembles individual frames into a banalized, utilitarian cubism that reveals Junkspace's overall coherence to the dispassionate glare of barely trained guards: videoethnography in its brute form. Just as Junkspace is unstable, its actual ownership is forever being passed on in parallel disloyalty. Junkspace happens spontaneously through natural corporate exuberance - the unfettered play of the market - or is generated through the combined actions of temporary 'Czars' with long records of three-dimensional philanthropy, bureaucrats (often former leftists) that optimistically sell off vast tracks of waterfront, former hippodromes, military bases and abandoned airfields to developers or real estate moguls that can accommodate any deficit in futuristic balances, or through 'default preservation' (the maintenance of historical complexes that nobody wants but the Zeitgeist has declared sacrosanct). As its scale mushrooms - rivals and even exceeds that of the Public - its economy becomes more inscrutable. Its financing is a deliberate haze, clouding opaque deals, dubious tax breaks, unusual incentives, exemptions, tenuous legalities, transferred air rights, joined properties, special zoning districts, public-private complicities. Funded by bonds, lottery, subsidy, charity, grant: an erratic flow of yen, euros and dollars (¥×\$) creates financial envelopes that are as fragile as their contents. Because of a structural shortfall, a fundamental deficit, a contingent bankruptcy, each square inch becomes a grasping, needy surface dependent on covert or overt support, discount, compensation and fundraising. For culture, 'engraved donor bricks'; for everything else: cash, rentals, leases, promises, chains, the underpinning of brands. Junkspace expands with the economy but its footprint cannot contract... when it is no longer needed, it thins. Because of its tenuous viability, Junkspace has to swallow more and more program to survive; soon, we will be able to do anything anywhere. We will have conquered place. At the end of Junkspace, the Universal?

Through Junkspace old aura is transfused with new luster to spawn sudden commercial viability: Barcelona amalgamated with the Olympics, Bilbao with Guggenheim, 42nd with Disney. A shortage of masters has not stopped a proliferation of masterpieces. 'Masterpiece' has become a definitive sanction, a semantic space that saves the object from criticism, leaves its qualities unproven, its performance untested, its motives unquestioned... Masterpiece is no longer an inexplicable fluke, a roll of the dice, but a consistent typology: its mission precarious, most of its exterior surfaces bent, huge percentages of its square footage dysfunctional, its centrifugal components barely held together by the pull of the atrium, dreading the imminent arrival of forensic accounting... The more indeterminate the city, the more specific its Junkspace; all Junkspace's prototypes are urban - the Roman Forum, the Metropolis; it is only their reverse-synergy that makes them suburban, simultaneously swollen and shrunk. Junkspace reduces what is urban to urbanity...instead of public life, Public Space: what remains of the city once the unpredictable has been removed... space for 'honoring', 'sharing', 'caring', 'grieving' and 'healing'... civility indicated by an overdose of serif.

In the third Millennium, Junkspace will assume responsibility for both pleasure and religion, exposure and intimacy, public life and privacy. Inevitably, the death of God (and the author) has spawned orphaned space; Junkspace is authorless, yet surprisingly authoritarian... at the moment of its greatest emancipation, humankind is subjected to the most dictatorial scripts... from the pushy oration of the waiter, to the answering gulags on the other end of the telephone, the safety instructions on the

airplane, more and more insistent perfumes, mankind is browbeaten to submit to the most harshly engineered plotline... The chosen theater of megalomania - the dictatorial - is no longer politics, but entertainment. Through Junkspace, entertainment organizes hermetic regimes of ultimate exclusion and concentration... Concentration gambling, concentration golf, concentration convention, concentration movie, concentration culture, concentration holiday. Entertainment is like watching a once hot planet cool off: its major inventions are ancient: the moving image, the roller coaster, sound, cartoons, clowns, dinosaurs, news, war. Except celebrities - of which there is a dramatic shortage - we have added nothing, just reconfigured. Corpertainment is an galaxy in contraction, forced to go through the motions by ruthless Copernican laws. The secret of corporate aesthetics was the power of elimination, the celebration of the efficient, the eradication of excess: abstraction as camouflage, the search for a corporate Sublime. On popular demand, organized beauty has become warm, humanist, inclusivist, arbitrary, poetic and unthreatening: water is pressurized through very small holes, then forced into rigorous hoops; straight palms are bent into grotesque poses, air is burdened with added oxygen - as if only forcing malleable substances into the most drastic contortions maintains control, satisfies the drive to get rid of surprise. Not canned laughter, but canned euphoria.... Color has disappeared to dampen the resulting cacophony, is used only as cue: relax, enjoy, be well, we're united in sedation... why can't we tolerate stronger sensations? Dissonance? Awkwardness? Genius? Anarchy? Junkspace heals, or at least that is the assumption of many hospitals. We thought hospitals were unique - a universe identified by its smell - but now that we are used to universal conditioning we recognize it was merely a prototype; all Junkspace is odor-defined. Often heroic in size, planned with the last adrenaline of modernism's grand inspiration, we have made them (too) human; life or death decisions are taken in spaces that are relentlessly friendly, littered by fading bouquets, empty coffee cups and yesterday's papers. You used to face death in appropriate cells, now your nearest are huddled together in atriums. A bold datum line is established on every vertical surface, dividing the infirmary in two: above an endless humanist scroll of 'color', loved ones, children's sunsets, signage and art... below a utilitarian zone for defacement and disinfected, anticipated collision, scratch, spill and smudge... Junkspace is space as vacation; there once was a relationship between leisure and work, a biblical dictate that divided our weeks, organized public life. Now we work harder, marooned in a never-ending casual Friday... The office is the next frontier of Junkspace. Now that you can work at home, the office aspires to the domestic; because you still need a life, it simulates the city. Junkspace features the office as the urban home, a meeting-boudoir: desks become sculptures, the workfloor is lit by intimate downlights. Monumental partitions, kiosks, mini-Starbucks on interior plazas: a Post-it universe: 'team memory', 'information persistence'; futile hedges against the universal forgetting of the unmemorable, the oxymoron as mission statement. Witness corporate agit-prop: the CEO's suite becomes 'leadership collective', wired to all the world's other Junkspace, real or imagined. Espace becomes e-space. The 21st century will bring 'intelligent' Junkspace: on a big digital 'dashboard': sales, CNNYSENASDAQ-SPAN, anything that goes up or down, from good to bad, presented in real time like the automotive theory course that complements driving lessons...

Globalization turns language into Junkspace. We are stuck in a speech-doldrums. The ubiquity of English is Pyrric: now that we all speak it, nobody remembers its use. The collective bastardization of English is our most impressive achievement; we have broken its back with ignorance, accent, slang, jargon, tourism and multitasking... we can make it say anything we want, like a speech dummy... Through the industrialization of language, there are too few plausible words left; our most creative hypotheses will never be formulated, discoveries remain unmade, concepts unlaunched, philosophies muffled... We inhabit sumptuous Potemkin suburbs of weasel terminologies... Aberrant linguistic ecologies sustain virtual subjects in their claim to legitimacy, help them survive... Language is no longer used to explore, define, express, or to confront but to fudge, blur, obfuscate, apologize and comfort... it stakes claims, assigns victimhood, preempts debate, admits guilt, fosters consensus. Entire professions impose a descent into the linguistic equivalent of hell: condemned to a word-limbo, inmates wrestle with words in ever descending spirals of pleading, lying, flattening, bargaining ... a Faustian/satanic orchestration of the meaningless...

Intended for the interior, Junkspace can easily engulf a whole city. First, it escapes from its containers - linguistic orchids that needed hothouse protection emerging with surprising robustness - then the outdoors itself is converted: the street is paved more luxuriously, shelters proliferate carrying increasingly dictatorial messages, traffic is calmed, crime eliminated. Then Junkspace spreads, consuming nature like a forest fire in LA... The global spread of Junkspace represents a final Manifest Destiny: the World as public space... All the resurrected emblems and recycled ambers of the formerly public, need new pastures. A new vegetal is coralled is for its thematic efficiency. The outing of Junkspace has triggered the professionalization of denaturing, a benign ecofacism that positions a rare surviving Siberian tiger in a forest of slot machines, near Armani, amidst an arboreal Baroque...

Outside, between the casinos, fountains project entire Stalinist buildings of liquid, ejaculated in a split-second, hovering momentarily, then withdrawn with an amnesiac competency... Air, water, wood: all are enhanced to produce hyperecologyä, a parallel Walden, a new rainforest. Landscape has become Junkspace, foliage as spoilage: trees are tortured, lawns cover human manipulations like thick pelts or even toupees, sprinklers water according to mathematical timetables... Seemingly at the opposite end of Junkspace, the golf course is in fact its conceptual double; empty, serene, free of commercial debris. The relative evacuation of the golf course is achieved by the further charging of Junkspace. The methods of their design and realization are similar: erasure, tabula rasa, reconfiguration. Junkspace turns into biojunk; ecology into ecospace. There is only a 31% difference between ecology and economy; in Junkspace they have already merged, it is an ecolomy. The economy has become Faustian; hyperdevelopment depends on artificial underdevelopment; a huge global bureaucracy is in the making to settle, in a colossal yin/yang, the balance between Junkspace and golf, between the scraped and the scraped, trading the right to despoil for the obligation to create steroid rainforests in Costa Rica. Oxygen banks, Fort Knoxes of chlorophyll, ecoreserves as a blank check for further pollution. Junkspace is rewriting the apocalypse; we may die of oxygen poisoning.

The baroque complexities of Junkspace were compensated by the stark rawness of its adjunct infrastructures; parking garages, filling stations, distribution centers that routinely displayed a monumental purity that was the original aim of modernism. Now, massive injections of lyricism have enabled infrastructure - the one domain previously immune to design, taste or the marketplace - to join the world of Junkspace, and for Junkspace to extend its manifestations under the sky. Railway stations unfold like iron butterflies, airports glisten like cyclopic dewdrops, bridges span often negligible banks like grotesquely enlarged versions of the harp. To each rivulet its own Calatrava. (Sometimes when there is a strong wind, this new generation of instruments moves as if it being played by a giant, or maybe a god, and mankind shudders) Junkspace can be airborne, bring malaria to Sussex; 300 anopheline mosquitoes arrive each day at GDG and GTW with the theoretical ability to infect 8 to 20 locals in a 3 mile radius, a hazard exacerbated by the average passenger's reluctance, in a misplaced gasp of quasi-autonomy, to be disinfected once he or she has buckled up for the return journey from the dead-end of the tourist destination. Airports, provisional accommodation for those going elsewhere, inhabited by assemblies united only by the imminence of their dissolution, have turned into consumption gulags, democratically distributed across the globe to give every citizen an equal chance of admission... MXP looks as if all the leftovers of East Germany's reconstruction - whatever was needed to undo the deprivations of communism - have been hurriedly bulldozed together according to a vaguely rectangular blueprint to form a botched sequence of deformed, inadequate spaces, apparently willed into being by the current rulers of Europe, extorting limitless euros from the community's regional funds, now causing endless delays for its duped taxpayers too busy on mobiles to notice. DFW is composed of three elements only, repeated ad infinitum, nothing else: one kind of beam, one kind of brick, one kind of tile, all coated in the same color - is it teale? rust? tabacco? - its symmetries inflated beyond any recognition, the endless curve of its terminals forces its users to enact relativity theory in their quest for the gate. Its drop-off is the seemingly harmless beginning of a journey to the heart of unmitigated nothingness, beyond animation by Pizza Hut, Dairy Queen...

Valley cultures are the most resistant to Junkspace: at GVZ you can still see a universe of rules, order, hierarchy, neatness, coordination, poised moments before its implosion, but at ZHR huge 'timepieces' hover in front of interior waterfalls as an essay in regionaljunk. Duty free is Junkspace, Junkspace is duty free space. Where culture was thinnest, will it be the first to run out? Is emptiness local? Do wide open spaces demand wide open Junkspace? Sunbelt: huge populations where there was nothing; PHX: warpaint on every terminal, dead Indian outlines on every surface - carpet, wallpaper, napkins - like frogs flattened by car tires. Public Art distributed across LAX: the fish that have disappeared from our rivers turned as public art in the concourse; only what is dead can be resurrected. Memory itself may have returned into Junkspace; only those murdered will be remembered...

Deprivation can be caused by overdose or shortage of sterility; both conditions happen in Junkspace (often at the same time). Minimum is the ultimate ornament, a self-righteous crime, the contemporary Baroque. It does not signify beauty, but guilt. Its demonstrative earnestness drives whole civilizations in the welcoming arms of camp and kitsch. Ostensibly a relief from constant sensorial onslaught, minimum is maximum in drag, a stealth laundering of luxury: the stricter the lines, the more irresistible the seductions. Its role is not to approximate the sublime, but to minimize the shame of consumption, drain embarrassment, to lower the higher. Minimum now exists in a state of parasitic co-dependency with overdose: to have and not to have, craving and owning, finally collapsed in a single signifier. Museums are sanctimonious Junkspace; no sturdier aura than holiness. To entertain the converts they have attracted by default, they massively turn 'bad' space into 'good' space; the more untreated the

oak, the larger the profit center. Monasteries inflated to the scale of department stores: expansion is the third millenium's entropy, dilute or die. Dedicated to respect mostly the dead, no cemetery would dare to reshuffle corpses as casually in the name of current expediency; curators plot hangings and unexpected encounters in a donor-plate labyrinth with the finesse of the retailer: lingerie becomes 'Death and Survival', cosmetics 'The Human Figure'. All paintings based on black grids are herded together, compressed in a single white room. Large spiders in the humongous conversion offer DT for the masses... Narrative reflexes that have enabled us from the beginning of time to connect dots, fill in blanks, are now turned against us: we cannot stop noticing: no sequence too absurd, trivial, meaningless, insulting... through our ancient evolutionary equipment, our irrepressible attention span, we helplessly register, provide sense, squeeze meaning, read intention; we cannot stop making sense out of the utterly senseless... On its triumphal march as content provider, art extends far beyond the museums' ever increasing boundaries. Outside, in the real world, the 'art planner' spreads Junkspace's fundamental incoherence by assigning defunct mythologies to residual surfaces and plotting three-dimensional works in left-over emptiness. Scouting for authenticity, their touch seals the fate of what was real, taps it for incorporation in Junkspace. Art galleries move en masse to where it is 'edgy', then convert raw space into white cubes... The only legitimate discourse is loss; art replenishes Junkspace in direct proportion to its own morbidity. We used to renew what was depleted, now we try to resurrect what is gone... Outside, the architects' footbridge is rocked to the breaking point by a stampede of enthusiastic pedestrians; the designers' initial audacity now awaits the engineer's application of dampers. Junkspace is a look-no-hands world...

The constant threat of virtuality in Junkspace is no longer exorcized by petrochemical products; the synthetic cheapens. Junkspace is like a womb that organizes the transition of endless quantities of the Real - stone, trees, goods, daylight, people - into the virtual. Entire mountains are dismembered to provide ever greater quantities of authenticity, suspended on precarious brackets, polished to a blinding state of flash that makes the intended realism instantly elusive. Stone only comes in light yellow, flesh, a violent beige, a soapilke green, the colors of communist plastics in the fifties. Forests are felled, their wood is all pale: maybe the origins of Junkspace go back to the Kindergarten... ('Origins' is a mint shampoo that stings the anal region). Color in the real world looks increasingly unreal, drained. Color in virtual space is luminous, therefore irresistible. The average Powerpoint presentation displays sudden bursts of Indian exuberance that Junkspace has been the first to translate into realityä, a simulation of virtual vigor. A surfeit of reality TV has made us into amateur guards monitoring a Junkuniverse... From the lively breasts of the classical violinist, the designer stubble of the big-brother outcast, the contextual pedophilia of the former revolutionary, the routine addictions of the stars, the runny makeup of the evangelist, the robotic movements of the conductor, the dubious benefits of the fundraising marathon, the explanation of the politician: the swooping movements of the TV camera suspended from its boom - an eagle without beak or claws, just an optical stomach - swallows images and confessions indiscriminately, like a trashbag, to propell them as cyber-vomit in space. TV studio sets - garishly monumental - are both the culmination and the end of perspectival space as we've known it: angular geometric remnants invading cosmic, starry infinities; real space edited for smooth transmission in virtual space, crucial hinge in an infernal feedback loop... the vastness of Junkspace extended to infinity. Because we spend our life indoors - like animals in a zoo - we are obsessed with the weather: 40% of all TV consists of presenters of lesser attractiveness gesturing helplessly in front of of windswept formations, through which you recognize, sometimes, your own destination / current position. Conceptually, each monitor, each TV screen is a substitute for a window; real life is inside, cyberspace has become the great outdoors...

Mankind is always going on about architecture. What if space started looking at mankind? Will Junkspace invade the body? Through the vibes of the mobile? Has it already? Botox injections? Collagen? Silicone implants? Liposuction? Penis enlargements? Does gene therapy announce a total reengineering according to Junkspace? Is each of us a mini-construction site? Mankind the sum of 3-5 billion individual upgrades? Is it a repertoire of reconfiguration that facilitates the intromission of a new species into its self-made Junkbiosphere?

God is dead, the author is dead, history is dead, only the architect is left standing... an insulting evolutionary joke...

The cosmetic is the new cosmic.

Manon Lescaut Libretto

Giacomo Puccini

ATTO I

Edmondo
Ave, sera gentile, che discendi
col tuo corteo di zefferi e di stelle.
Ave, cara ai poeti ed agli amanti...

Studenti
... e ai ladri ed ai briachi!
Noi t'abbiamo spezzato il madrigale!

Edmondo
E vi ringrazio.
Pel vial giulive vengono a frotte a frotte,
fresche, ridenti e belle, le nostre artigianelle...

Studenti
Or s'anima il viale.

Edmondo
Preparo un madrigale furbesco, ardito e gaio.
E sia la musa mia tutta galanteria.

Edmondo, Studenti
Giovanezza è il nostro nome,
la speranza è nostra iddia,
ci trascina per le chiome indomabile virtù.
Santa ebbrezza!
Or voi, ridenti, amorose adolescenti, date i cor...

Fanciulle
Vaga per l'aura un'onda di profumi,
van le rondini a vol e muore il sol.
È questa l'ora delle fantasie
che fra le spemi lottano e le malinconie.

Studenti
Ecco Des Grieux!

Edmondo
A noi t'unisci, amico, e ridi
e ti vinca la cura di balzana avventura.
Non rispondi? Perché?
Forse di dama inaccessibile acuto amor ti morse?

Des Grieux
L'amor! Questa tragedia,
ovver commedia, io non conosco!

Alcuni studenti
Baie! Misteriose vittorie cauto celi e felice!

Des Grieux
Amici, troppo onor mi fate.

Edmondo, Studenti
Per bacco, indoviniam, amico...
Ti crucci d'uno scacco!

Des Grieux
No, non ancora. Ma se vi talenta,
vo' compiacervi... e tosto!
Tra voi, belle, brune e bionde,
si nasconde giovinetta vaga e vezzosa,
dal labbro rosa che m'aspetta?
Sei tu, bionda stella? Dillo a me!
Palesatemi il destino
e il divino viso ardente che m'innamori,
ch'io vegga e odori eternamente...
Sei tu, bruna stella? Dillo a me!

Studenti
Ma bravo!

Edmondo
Guardate, compagni, di lui più nessuno si lagni.

Tutti
Festeggiam la serata, com'è nostro costume.
Suoni musica grata nei brindisi il bicchier, e
noi rapisca il fascino ardente del piacer!
Danze, brindisi, follie, il corteo di voluttà or
s'avanza per le vie
e la notte regnerà.
È splendente, ed irruente, è una poema di fulgor.
Tutto avvinca la sua luce e il suo furor.
Giunge il cocchio d'Arras!
Discendono... Vediam!
Viaggiator eleganti, galanti!

Studenti
Chi non darebbe a quella donnina bella
il gentile saluto del benvenuto?

Lescaut
Ehi, l'oste!
Cavalier, siete un modello di squisitezza!
Ehi, l'oste!

L'Oste
Eccomi qua!

Des Grieux
Dio, quanto è bella!

Geronte
Questa notte, amico, qui poserà.
Scusate, Ostiere, v'occupate del mio bagaglio.

L'Oste
Ubbidirò. Vi prego, mi vogliate seguire.

Des Grieux
Cortese damigella, il priego mio accettate:
dican le dolci labbra come vi chiamate.

Manon
Manon Lescaut mi chiamo...

Des Grieux
Perdonate al dir mio,
ma da un fascino arcano a voi spinto son io.
Persino il vostro volto parmi aver visto,
e strani moti ha il mio cuore.
Quando partirete?

Manon
Domani all'alba io parto. Un chiostro
m'attende.

Des Grieux
E in voi l'aprile nel volto si palesa e fiorisce!
O gentile, qual fato vi fa guerra?

Manon
Il mio fato si chiama "voler del padre mio".

Des Grieux
Oh, come siete bella! Ah, no!
Non è un convento che sterile vi brama!
No! Sul vostro destino riluce un'altra stella.

Manon
La mia stella tramonta!

Des Grieux
Or parlar non possiamo.
Ritornate fra poco e,
cospiranti contro i fato, vinceremo.

Manon
Tanta pietà traspare dalle vostre parole!
Vo' ricordarvi! Il nome vostro?

Des Grieux
Sono Renato des Grieux.

Lescaut
Manon!

Manon
Lasciarvi debbo. Vengo!
Mio fratello m'ha chiamata.

Des Grieux
Qui tornate!

Manon
No, non posso. Mi lasciate!

Des Grieux
O gentile, vi sconsiglio!

Manon
Mi vincete!
Quando oscuro l'aere intorno a noi sarà.

Des Grieux
Donna non vidi mai simile a questa!
A dirle "io t'amo" a nuova vita l'anima mia si desta.
"Manon Lescaut mi chiamo..."
Come queste parole profumate mi vagan nello spiro
e ascose fibre vanno a carezzare.
O sussurro gentil, deh, non cessare!

Studenti, Edmondo
La tua ventura ci rassicura.
O di Cupido degno fedel, bella e divina
la cherubina per tua delizia scese dal ciel!
Fugge: è dunque innamorato.

Studenti
Venite, o fanciulle! Augurio ci siate di buona fortuna.

Fanciulle
È bionda od è bruna la diva che guida la vostra tenzon?

Geronte
Dunque vostra sorella il velo cingerà?

Lescaut
Malo consiglio della gente mia.

Geronte
Diversa idea mi pare la vostra?

Studenti
È calva la diva: ma morbida chioma voi fa desiar.
Chi perde e chi vince, voi brama,
o fanciulle, chi piange e chi ride.
Noi prostra ed irride la mala ventura.
Ma lieta prorompe d'amore la folle, l'eterna canzon.

Fanciulle
Amiche fedeli di un'ora, volete il bacio?
Volete il sospir? Orniam la vittoria,
e il core del vinto al tiepido effluvio
di molle carezza riposa obliando,
e l'onta e il martir.

Edmondo
Addio, mia stella. Addio, mio fior,
vaga sorella del Dio d'amor.
A te d'intorno va il mio sospir,
e per un giorno non mi tradir.

Lescaut
Certo, certo, ho più sana la testa di quel che sembri,
benché triste fama mie gesta circonda.
Ma la vita conosco, forse troppo.
Parigi è scuola grande assai.
Di mia sorella guida, mormorando,

adempio al mio dovere, come un vero
soldato!
Solo dico che ingrato evento al mondo
non ci coglie senza qualche compenso.
E voi conobbi, Signor?

Geronte
Geronte di Ravoir.

Lescaut
Diporto vi conduce in viaggio?

Geronte
No, dovere. L'affitto delle imposte a me fidato
dalla bontà del Re, dalla mia borsa.

Lescaut
(Che sacco d'oro!)

Geronte
E non mi sembra lieta neppur vostra sorella.

Lescaut
Pensate! Ha diciott'anni!
Quanti sogni e speranze...

Geronte
Comprendo. Poverina! È d'uopo consolarla.
Questa sera meco verrete a cena?

Lescaut
Quale onor! E intanto permettete...

Geronte
Scusate, m'attendete per breve istante:
qualche ordine io debbo all'ostier impartir.

Gli Studenti
Un asso! Un fante! Un tre!
Che gioco maledetto!

Lescaut
Giocano! Oh, se potessi tentare anch'io
qualche colpo perfetto!

Studenti
Puntate! Carte! Un asso!

Lescaut
Un asso? Mio signore, un fante!
Errore, errore!

Studenti
È vero, un fante. Siete un maestro!

Lescaut
Celiate! Un dilettante...

Studenti
A noi... v'invito ... Banco!

Lescaut
Carte!

Geronte
Amico, io pago prima e poche ciarle! Una
carrozza e cavalli che volino sì come il vento.
Fra un'ora!

L'Oste
Signore!

Geronte
Dietro l'albergo fra un'ora, capite?!
Verrano un uomo e una fanciulla.
E via sì come il vento, via verso Parigi!
E ricordate che il silenzio è d'or!

L'Oste
L'oro adoro.

Geronte
Bene, bene! Adoratelo e ubbidite.
Or mi dite, questa uscita ha l'osteria
solamente?

L'Oste
Ve n'ha un'altra.

Geronte
Indicatemi la via.

Edmondo
Vecchietto amabile, incipriato Pluton sei tu!
La tua Proserpina di resisterti forse avrà
virtù?
Cavaliere, te la fanno!

Des Grieux
Che vuoi dir?

Edmondo
Quel fior dolcissimo che olezzava poco fa,
dal suo stel divelto, povero fior,
fra poco appassirà! La tua fanciulla,
la tua colomba or vola, or vola:
del postiglione suona la tromba...
Via, ti consola: un vecchio la rapisce!

Des Grieux
Davvero?

Edmondo
Impallidisci? Per Dio, la cosa è seria!

Des Grieux
Qui l'attendo, capisci?

Edmondo
Siamo a buon punto?!

Des Grieux
Salvami!

Edmondo
Salvarti?! La partenza impedire?
Tentiamo! Senti! Forse ti salvo.
Del gioco morse all'amo il soldato laggiù.

Des Grieux
E il vecchio?

Edmondo
Il vecchio?
Oh, il vecchio l'avrà da far con me!

Manon
Vedete? Io son fedele alla parola mia.
Voi mi chiedeste, con fervida preghiera,
che voi tornassi un'altra volta.
Meglio non rivedervi, io credo
e al vostro prego benignamente opporre il mio
rifiuto.

Des Grieux
Oh, come gravi le vostre parole!
Sì ragionar non suole l'età gentile
che v'infiora il viso:
mal s'addice al sorriso che dall'occhio traluce
questo disdegno melanconico!

Manon
Eppur lieta, assai lieta un tempo io fui!
La quieta casetta risonava di mie folli risate,
e colle amiche giocando ne andava a danza!
Ma di gaiezza il bel tempo fuggì!

Des Grieux
Nelle pupille fulgide profonde sfavilla
il desiderio dell'amore...
Amor ora vi parla!
Date all'onde del nuovo incanto e il dolce
labbro e il core.
V'amo! Quest'attimo di giorno rendete eterno
ed infinito!

Manon
Una fanciulla povera son io, non ho sul volto
luce di beltà,
regna tristezza sul destino mio...

Des Grieux
Vinta tristezza dall'amor sarà!
La bellezza vi dona il più vago avvenir.
O soave persona, mio infinito sospir!

Manon
No, non è vero!
Ah, sogno gentil, mio sospiro infinito!

Lescaut
Non c'è più vino? E che? Vuota è la botte?

Des Grieux
Deh, m'ascoltate:
vi minaccia un vile oltraggio, un rapimento!

Un libertino audace,
quel vecchio che con voi giunse,
una trama a vostro danno ordì.Manon
Che dite?

Des Grieux
Il vero!

Edmondo
Il colpo è fatto, la carrozza è pronta.
Che burla colossal! Presto! Partite!

Manon
Fuggir?

Des Grieux
Fuggiamo! Che il vostro rapitor un altro sia!

Manon
Voi mi rapite?

Des Grieux
No, vi rapisce amore!

Manon
Ah, no!

Des Grieux
V'imploro!

Edmondo
Presto, via ragazzi!

Des Grieux
Manon, v'imploro: Fuggiamo!

Manon
Andiam!

Edmondo
Oh, che bei pazzi!
Geronte
Di sedur la sorellina è il momento!
Via, ardimento!
Il sergente è al gioco intento!
Vi rimanga. Ehi dico: pronta è la cena?

L'Oste
Sì, Eccellenza!

Geronte
L'annunziate a quella signorina che...

Edmondo
Eccelenza, guardatela!
Essa parte in compagnia d'uno studente.

Geronte
L'hanno rapita!

Lescaut
Chi?

Geronte
Vostra sorella!

Lescaut
Che?! Mille e mille bombe!

Geronte
L'inseguiamo! È uno studente!

Geronte
Vostra sorella!

Lescaut
Che?! Mille e mille bombe!

Geronte
L'inseguiamo! È uno studente!

Lescaut
È inutil! Riflettiamo...
Cavalli pronti avete? Il colpo è fatto!
Disperarsi è da matto!
Vedo... Manon con sue grazie leggiadre
ha suscitato in voi un affetto di padre.

Edmondo, Studenti
Venticelli, ricciutelli
che spirate fra vermigli, fiori e gigli,
avventura strana e dura, deh, narrate per mia
fe'!
Assetato labbro aveva coppa piena.
Ber voleva, e avidamente già suggeriva...
ah, ah, ah!
A volpe invecchiata l'uva fresca e vellutata
sempre acerba rimarrà.

Geronte
Non altrimenti!

Lescaut
E a chi lo dite! Ed io, da figlio rispettoso,
vi do un ottimo consiglio.
Parigi! È là Manon! Manon già non si perde...
Ma borsa di studente presto rimane al verde.
Manon non vuol miserie!
Manon riconoscente accetterà un palazzo
per piantar lo studente!
Voi farete da padre ad un'ottima figlia ed io
completerò,
Signore, la famiglia.
Che diamine! Ci vuole calma, filosofia...
Ecco il vostro tricornio!
E, domattina, in via! Dunque, dicevo...
A cena e il braccio a me! Degli eventi
all'altezza esser convien!
Perché...

ATTO II

Manon
Dispettosetto questo riccio!
Il calamistro, presto!
presto!
Or... la volandola!
Severe un po' le ciglia!...
La cerussa!
Lo sguardo vibri a guisa
di dardo!
Qua la giunchiglia!

Lescaut
Buon giorno, sorellina!

Manon
Il minio e la pomata!

Lescaut
Questa mattina mi
sembri un po' imbronciata.

Manon
Imbronciata?... Perché?

Lescaut
No? Tanto meglio!
Geronte ov'è?
Così presto ha lasciato
il gineceo?...

Manon
Ed ora, un neo!

Lescaut
Lo sfrontato!...
il birichino!...
No?... il Galante!...

Manon
Non saprei...
Ebben... due nei!
All'occhio l'assassino!
e al labbro il voluttuoso!

Lescaut
Ah! Che insieme delizioso!
Sei splendida e lucente!
M'esalto! E n'ho il perché!
È mia la gloria
se sei salva dall'amor
d'uno studente.
Allor che sei fuggita, là,
ad Amiens,
mai la speranza il cor
m'abbandonò!
Là, la tua sorte vidi!
Là il magico fulgor
di queste sale balenò.
T'ho ritrovata!

Una casetta angusta
era la tua dimora;
possedevi baci...
e niente scudi!
È un bravo giovinotto
quel Des Grieux!
Ma, ahimè, non é
cassiere generale!
È dunque naturale che
tu abbia abbandonato
per un palazzo aurato
quell'umile dimora.

Manon
E dimmi...

Lescaut
Che vuoi dire?...

Manon
Nulla! ...

Lescaut
Nulla? Davver?

Manon
Volevo dimandar...

Lescaut
Risponderò!

Manon
Risponderai?

Lescaut
Ho inteso!
Nei tuoi occhi io leggo
un desiderio.
Se Geronte lo sospettasse!

Manon
È ver! Hai colto!

Lescaut
Brami
nuove di lui?

Manon
È ver! L'ho abbandonato
senza un saluto, un bacio!
In quelle
trine morbide...
nell'alcova dorata
v'è un silenzio
gelido, mortal,
v'è un silenzio,
un freddo che m'agghiaccia!
Ed io che m'ero avvezza
a una carezza
voluttuosa,
di labbra ardenti e
d'infuocate braccia...

or ho tutt'altra cosa!
O mia dimora umile,
tu mi ritorni innanzi
gaia, isolata, bianca
come un sogno gentile
di pace e d'amor!

Lescaut
Poiché tu vuoi
saper...
Des Grieux
(qual già Geronte),
é un grande amico mio.
Ei mi tortura sempre:
Ov'è Manon?
Ove fuggì? Con chi?
A Nord? Ad Est? A Sud?
Io rispondo: non so!
Ma alfin l'ho
persuaso!...

Manon
Ei m'ha scordata?

Lescaut
No! No! Ma che vincendo
può coll'oro
forse scoprir la via che
mena a te!...
Or... correggendo la
fortuna sta!
L'ho lanciato al giuoco!...
Vincerà!

Manon
Per me tu lotti,
per me, vile, che ti lasciai!
che tanto duol
ti costai!...
Ah! Vieni! Il passato
mi rendi,
l'ore fugaci...
le tue carezze ardenti!
Ah! Rendimi i baci,
i baci tuoi cocenti,
quell'ebbrezza che
un di mi beò!
Ah! Vieni! Son bella?
Ah! Vien, resister
più non so!

Lescaut
È il vecchio tavolier
per noi tal quale
la cassa del
danaro universale!
Da me lanciato e istrutto
pelerà tutti e tutto!...
Ma nel martirio
delle lunghe lotte
intanto il dì e la notte
vive incosciente della

sua follia,
e chiede al giuoco
ove tu sia!
Ei vincerà!

Manon
Davver che a meraviglia
questa veste mi sta?

Lescaut
Ti sta a pennello!

Manon
E il tupé?

Lescaut
Portentoso!

Manon
E il busto?

Lescaut
Bello! Che ceffi son costor?
Ciarlatani o speziali?

Manon
Son musicì! É Geronte che
fa dei madrigali!

Coro
Sulla vetta tu del monte
erri, o Clori:
hai per labbra due fiori,
e l'occhio é un fonte.
Ohimè! Ohimè!
Filen spira ai tuoi piè!
Di tue chiome sciogli
al vento il portento,
ed é un giglio il
tuo petto bianco, ignudetto.
Clori sei tu, Manon,
ed in Filen,
Geronte si mutò!
Filen suonando sta;
la sua zampogna
va sussurrando: pietà!
Il eco sospira: pietà!
Piange Filen:
"Cuor non hai Clori
in sen?
Ve'... già... Filen...
vien... men!"
No! Clori a zampogna
che soave plorò
non disse mai no!

Manon
Paga costor!

Lescaut
Oibò!...
Offender l'arte?

Io v'accomiato in nome
della Gloria!

Manon
I madrigali!...
Il ballo!...
E poi la musica!
Son tutte belle cose!...
Pur...
m'annoio!

Lescaut
Una donnina che
s'annoia é cosa
da fur paura!
Andiam da Des Grieux!
É da maestro
preparar gli eventi!

Maestro di ballo
Vi prego, signorina,
un po'elevato il busto...
indi... Ma brava,
così mi piace! Tutta la
vostra personcina,
or s'avanzi! Così!...
Io vi scongiuro... a tempo!

Geronte
Oh vaga danzatrice!
Manon
Un po' inesperta.

Maestro di ballo
Vi prego, non badate
a lodi sussurrate...
É cosa seria il ballo!

Coro
Tacete!
Vi frenate,
come si fa da noi;
ammirate in silenzio,
in silenzio adorate.
É cosa seria.

Maestro di ballo
A manca! ... Brava!...
... A destra! ... Un saluto!
Attenta! L'occhialeto...

Geronte
Minuetto perfetto.

Coro
Che languore nello sguardo!
Che dolcezza! Che carezza!
Troppo é bella!
Pare stella!
Che candori! Che tesori!
Quella bocca baci scocca!

Se sorride
stella pare!

Geronte
Troppo é bella! Si ribella
la parola e canta
e vanta!

Manon
Lodi aurate, mormorate
or mi vibrano
d'intorno;
Vostri cori adulatori,
su, frenate! Ah!
Lodi aurate, sussurrate
or mi vibrano
d'intorno;
Vostri cori adulatori,
su, frenate!

Geronte
Voi mi fate spasimare...
delirare!

Coro
La deità siete del giorno!
Della notte ell'è regina!

Manon
Il buon maestro
non vuol parole.
Se m'adulate non
diverrò
la diva danzatrice
ch'ora già si figura
la vostra fantasia
troppo felice.

Maestro di ballo
Un cavalier...
Geronte
Son qua!

Coro
Bravi! Che coppia!
Evviva i fortunati
innamorati!
Ve' Mercurio e Ciprigna!
Con amore e dovizia...
Oh! Qui letizia
con amore e dovizia
leggiadramente alligna!

Manon
L'ora, o Tirsi,
é vaga e bella.
Ride il giorno,
ride intorno
la fida pastorella.
Te sospira,
per te spira.
Ma tu giungi e in

un baleno viva e lieta,
é dessa allor!
Ah! Vedi il ciel
com'è sereno
sul miracolo d'amor!

Coro
Voi siete il miracolo,
siete l'amore!
Siete il miracolo d'amor!

Geronte
Galanteria sta bene;
ma obliate che é tardi.
Allegra folla
ondeggia pei baluardi.

Coro
Qui il tempo vola!

Geronte
É cosa ch'io so per prova...
Voi, mia fulgida letizia,
esser compagna a noi
promettete: di poco vi
precediamo...

Manon
Un breve istante sol vi chiedo;
attendermi fia lieve
fra il bel mondo dorato.

Coro
Grave é sempre l'attesa.

Geronte
Dell'anima sospesa
non sian lunghe le pene.
Ordino la lettiga...
Addio, bell'idol mio...

Manon
Oh, sarò la più bella!
Dunque questa lettiga?
Tu, tu, amore? Tu?
Tu? Ah! mio immenso
amore?... Dio!

Des Grieux
Ah, Manon!

Manon
Tu non m'ami dunque più?
M'amavi tanto!
Oh, i lunghi baci!
Oh, il lungo incanto!
La dolce amica d'un tempo
aspetta la tua vendetta.
Oh, non guardarmi così
non era la tua pupilla
tanto severa!

Des Grieux

SI, sciagurata,
la mia vendetta...

Manon

Ah! La mia colpa!
É vero!

Des Grieux

Ah! Sciagurata,
la mia vendetta...

Manon

Ah! É vero!
Non m'ami più...
Ah! É vero! Non m'ami
dunque più?
M'amavi tanto;
Non m'ami più!

Des Grieux

Taci... tu il cor
mi frangi!
Tu non sai le giornate
che buie, desolate
son piombate su me!

Manon

Io voglio il tuo perdono.
Vedi? Son ricca.

Des Grieux

Taci!

Manon

Questa non ti sembra una
festa d'ori
e di colori?
Tutto é per te.

Des Grieux

Deh! Taci!

Manon

Pensavo a un avvenir
di luce;
Amor qui ti conduce...
T'ho tradito,
é ver!
Ai tuoi piedi son!
T'ho tradito!
Sciagurata dimmi,
ai tuoi piedi son!
Ah! Voglio il tuo perdono.
Non lo negar! Son forse
della Manon d'un giorno
meno piacente e bella?
Des Grieux
O tentatrice! É questo
l'antico fascino
che m'accieca!

Manon

É fascino d'amor;
cedi, son tua!

Des Grieux

Più non posso lottar!
Son vinto!

Manon

Cedi, son tua...
Ah! Vieni! Colle
tue braccia
stringi Manon che t'ama...

Des Grieux

Non posso lottar,
o tentatrice!

Manon

... stretta al tuo
sen m'allaccia!
Manon te solo brama!

Des Grieux

Più non posso lottar!

Manon

Cedi, son tua!

Des Grieux

Son vinto; io t'amo!
Più non posso lottar!

Manon

Ah vien!
Manon te solo brama!
Vieni, colle tue
braccia stringi Manon
che t'ama!

Des Grieux

Nel l'occhio tuo profondo
io leggo il mio destin;
tutti i tesori del mondo
ha il tuo labbro divin!

Manon

Ah! Manon te solo brama,
stretta al tuo sen
m'allaccia!
Alle mie brame torna
deh! torna ancor!
I baci miei son questi!
Questo é il mio amor!
Vivi e t'inebria
sovra il mio cor!
Deh, torna ancor!
Ah! Vivi e t'inebria
sovra il mio cor...
La bocca mia é un altare
dove il bacio é Dio!

Des Grieux

I baci tuoi son questi!
Questo é il tuo amor!
M'arde il tuo bacio,
dolce tesoro!
In te m'inebrio ancor,
dolce tesoro!
Nelle tue braccia care
v'è l'ebbrezza, l'oblio!

Manon

Labbra adorate e care!

Des Grieux

Manon, mi fai morire!

Manon

Labbra dolci a baciare!

Manon, Des Grieux

Dolcissimo soffrir!

Manon

Ah!

Geronte

Affè, madamigella,
or comprendo il perché
di nostr'attesa!
Giungo in mal punto.
Errore involontario!
Chi non erra
quaggiù?
Anche voi,
credo, ad esempio,
obliaste
dèssere in casa mia.

Des Grieux

Signore!

Manon

Taci!

Geronte

Gratitudine, sia oggi
il tuo dì di festa!
Dove vi trassi,
le prove che v'ho date
d'un vero amore,
come rammentate!

Manon

Amore? Amore?
Mio buon signore,
ecco!.... Guardatevi!...
Se errai,
leale ditelo!
E poi guardate noi!

Geronte

Io son leale, mia bella

donnina.
Conosco il mio dovere...
deggio partir di qui!
O gentil cavaliere,
o vaga signorina,
arrivederci... e presto!

Manon

Ah! Ah!... Liberi!
Liberi come l'aria!
Che gioia, cavaliere,
amor mio bello!

Des Grieux

Senti, di qui partiamo:
un solo istante, questo tetto
del vecchio maledetto
non t'abbia più!

Manon

Peccato! Tutti questi
splendori!
Tutti questi tesori!
Ahimè!... Dobbiam partir!

Des Grieux

Ah! Manon, mi tradisce
il tuo folle pensier:
Sempre la stessa!
Trepida divinamente,
nell'abbandono ardente...
Buona e gentile come
la vaghezza di quella
tua carezza;
sempre novella ebbrezza;
indi, d'un tratto,
vinta, abbacinata
dai raggi
della vita dorata!
Io? Tuo schiavo,
e tua vittima discendo
la scala dell'infamia...
Fango nel fango io sono
e turpe eroe
da bisca
m'insozzo, mi vendo...
L'onta più vile
m'avvicina a te!
Nell'oscuro futuro
dì, che farai di me?

Manon

Un'altra volta,
un'altra volta ancora,
deh, mi perdona!
Sarò fedele e buona,
lo giuro, lo giuro...

Des Grieux

Lescaut!

Manon
Tu qui?

Des Grioux
Che avvenne?

Manon
Che avvenne?

Des Grioux
Di'!

Manon
Di'!

Manon, Des Grioux
O ciel!
Che é stato?
Ci fa tremar!

Lescaut
Ch'io prenda
flato...

Manon, Des Grioux
Ci fa tremar!

Lescaut
...onde
parlar...

Manon, Des Grioux
O ciel! Che é stato?

Des Grioux
Di'!

Manon
Di'!

Lescaut
V'ha denunziato!

Manon
Chi?

Des Grioux
Il vecchio?

Lescaut
Sì!

Manon
Ohimè!

Lescaut
Già vengon qui
e guardie e arcier!

Manon
Ohimè!

Des Grioux
O ciel!

Lescaut
Su, cavalier,
e per le scale,
spiegate l'ale!...

Manon
Ohimè!

Lescaut
Da un granatiere
ch'era in quartiere
tutto ho saputo...
Per le scale,
cavalier,
spiegate l'ale,
già vengon qui
e guardie e arcier!
Via, l'ali
ai piè!

Des Grioux
Maledetto il vecchio astuto!

Manon
Ohimè, ohimè! M'affretto,
ohimè!
Des Grioux
Sì Bada a te!

Lescaut
Ah, non sapete...
voi la perdetes...
ah, non sapete...
l'attende crudele
sorte spietata;
l'esilio!

Manon
Ohimè! La morte!

Lescaut
Or v'affrettate!
Non esitate! Pochi
minuti, siete perduti!
Già dal quartier
uscian gli arcier!

Manon
Ohimè! M'affretto!...
Un istante! Questo
smagliante
smeraldo...

Des Grioux
Sì, bada a te!
Vecchio vil!
Andiam, andiam!
Affrettiam! Orsù!

Manon
Ma sì! Mio Dio!
Mi sbrigo!
E tu m'aiuta.

Des Grioux
A far?

Manon
Ad involtar...

Lescaut
Il vecchio vile morrà
di bile, se trova vuota
la gabbia e ignota gli
sia l'altra dimora!
Manon! Suvvia...
son già per vial

Des Grioux
Andiam, andiam!

Manon
Ma sì. E tu m'aiuta ad
involtar cotesti oggetti!
Vuota i cassetti!

Des Grioux
Orsù affrettiam!
Andiam, Manon!

Lescaut
Oh il bel forzier!
Peccato inver!
Nostro cammino sarà
il giardino. In un istante
dell'alte piante sotto l'ombria
siam sulla via.
Buon chi ci piglia!

Manon
E quest'incanto
che adoro tanto
dovrò lasciare,
abbandonare?

Des Grioux
O mia diletta Manon,
t'affretta!
D'uopo é partir...
tosto fuggir!
Torturar mi vuoi ancor!

Manon
Saria imprudenza
lasciar quest'oro,
o mio tesoro!

Des Grioux
Con te portar dei
sol il cor! Ah!
Io vo'salvar solo

il tuo amor.

Lescaut
Maledizion!

Manon
Ah!

Lescaut
Eccoli, accerchian la casa!

Des Grioux
Manon!

Manon
Des Grioux!
Di qua! Di là!
Fuggiam! Ebben di là!

Des Grioux
Fuggiam! Fuggiam! No! No!
Di là! Presto! Presto!

Lescaut
Il vecchio ordina, sbraita,
le guardie sfilano...

Manon
Ohimè!

Des Grioux
Fuggiam!

Lescaut
... gli arcier s'appostano!
Entrano, salgono! Eccoli!

Des Grioux
Dimmi, qui v'è un'uscita?

Manon
Sì! Aggiù all'alcova!

Lescaut
Eccoli, eccoli,
salgono, salgono!

Manon
Ah!... Ah!...

Sergente
Nessun sì muova!,

Geronte
Ah! Ah! Ah! Ah! Ah!

Lescaut
Se v'arrestan, cavalier,
chi potrà Manon salvar?

Des Grioux
O Manon! O mia Manon!

INTERMEZZO

Des Grieux

"...Gli é che io l'amo!
La mia passione è così forte
che io mi sento
la più sfortunata creatura
che viva.
Quello che non ho
io tentato a Parigi
per ottenere
la sua libertà!...
Ho implorato i potenti!...
Ho picchiato e supplicato
a tutte le porte!...
Persino alla violenza
ho ricorso!...
Tutto fu inutile.
Una sol via mi rimaneva:
seguirla!
Ed io la seguo! Dovunque
ella vada!...
Fosse pure in
capo al mondo!..."

ATTO III

Des Grieux

Ansia eterna, crudel...

Lescaut

Pazienza ancora...
La guardia là fra poco monterà l'arcier che ho
compro...

Des Grieux

L'attesa m'accora!
La vita mia, l'anima tutta è là!

Lescaut

Manon sa già, e attende il mio segnale e a noi
verrà.
Io intanto cogli amici il colpo tenderò.
Manon all'alba libera farò.

Des Grieux

Dietro al destino mi traggo livido,
e notte e dì cammino.
E un miraggio m'angoscia e m'esalta!
Vicino or m'è, poi fugge se l'avvinghio!
Parigi ed Havre... fiera, triste agonia!
Oh, lungo strazio della vita mia!

Lescaut

Vengono.

Des Grieux

Alfin!

Lescaut

Ecco là l'uomo. È quello!
È l'Havre addormentata. L'ora è giunta.

Des Grieux

Manon!

Manon

Des Grieux!

Lescaut

Al diavolo l'America! Manon non partirà!

Manon

Tu, amore? Nell'onta non mi abbandoni?

Des Grieux

Abbandonarti? Mai!
Se t'ho seguita per la lunga via
fu perché fede mi regnava in core.
Fra poco mia sarai.

Manon

Fra poco! Tua... fra poco...

Des Grieux

Taci!

Il Lampionaio

E Kate rispose al Re:
D'una zitella perché tentare il cor?
Per un marito mi fe' bella il Signor.
Rise il Re, poi le die' gemme ed or
e un marito... e n'ebbe il cor.

Des Grieux

È l'alba! O mia Manon,
pronta alla porta del cortile sii tu!
V'è là Lescaut con uomini devoti.
Là vanne, e tu sei salva!

Manon

Tremo per te! Tremo! Pavento!
Tremo e m'angoscio, né so il perché!
Ah, una minaccia funebre io sento!
Tremo a un periglio che ignoto m'è...

Des Grieux

Ah, Manon, disperato è il mio prego!
L'affanno la parola mi spezza...
Vuoi che m'uccida qui?
Ti scongiuro, Manon, ah vieni! Salviamoci!

Manon

E sia! Chiedimi tutto,
sol tutto chiedi, amore...

Lescaut

Perduta è la partita!
Cavalier, salviam la vita!

Des Grieux

Che avvenne?

Lescaut

Udite come strillano!
Fallito è il colpo!

Des Grieux

Venga la morte!
Fuggir? Giammai!

Lescaut

Ah, pazzo inver!

Manon

Se m'ami, in nome di Dio,
t'invola, amor mio!

Des Grieux

Ah, Manon!

Lescaut

Cattivo affare!

Voci diverse

Udiste! Che avvenne? Fu un ratto?
Rivolta? Fuggiva una donna! Più d'una!
La folta tenebra protesse laggiù i rapitori!

Sergente

Il passo m'apprite!

Comandante

È pronta la nave. L'appello affrettate!

Persone del popolo

Silenzio! L'appello cominciano già.

Il Sergente

Rosetta!

Giovanotti

Eh, che aria!

Altri

È un amore.

Il Sergente

Madelón!

Altri

Ah, qui sei ridotta!

Alcune donne

Che riso insolente!

Il Sergente

Manon!

Alcuni vecchi

Chissà? Una sedotta.

Donne

Madonna è dolente!

Borghesi

È bella davvero!

Lescaut

Costei? V'è un mistero!

Borghesi

Sedotta? Tradita?

Lescaut

Costei fu rapita fanciulla all'amore d'un vago
garzone.

Borghesi

Che infamie, che orrore!

Lescaut

Rapita alle nozze e all'orgia
ed a sozze carezze gittata!

Manon

Des Grieux, fra poco lungi sarò...
questo è il destino mio.
E te perduto per sempre avrò!
Ultimo bene! Addio! Alla tua casa riedi!

Un giorno potrai ancor amar!
Ora a tuo padre dèi far ritorno...

Lescaut
Pel gaudio d'un dì di vecchio signore...
poi... sazio... cacciata!
Vedete quel pallido che presso le sta?
Lo sposo è quel misero.

Manon
Devi Manon scordar!
Forse abbastanza non fosti amato...
questo è il rimorso mio!
Mio desolato amore immenso... addio!

Des Grieux
Guardami e vedi com'io soggiacio e questa
angoscia amara,
ché una tortura crudel m'è il bacio della tua
bocca cara.
Ogni pensiero si scioglie in pianto! È pianto
anche il desio!
Ah, m'ho nell'animo l'odio soltanto degli
uomini di Dio!

Lescaut
Così, fra catene, nel fango e avvilita,
rivede e rinviene la sposa rapita!

Sergente
Presto! In fila! Marciate!
Costui qui ancor? Finiamola!

Des Grieux
Indietro!

Sergente
Via!

Borghesi
Coraggio!

Des Grieux
Ah, guai a chi la tocca!
Manon, ti stringi a me!

Borghesi
Così! Bravo!

Comandante
Che avvien?

Des Grieux
Ah, non vi avvicinate!
Ché, vivo me, costei nessun strappar potrà!
No! Pazzo son!
Guardate come io piango ed imploro...
come io chiedo pietà!
Udite!
M'accettate qual mozzo od a più vile
mestiere...

ed io verrò felice!
Vi pigliate il mio sangue, la vita!
Ah, ingrato non sarò!

Comandante
Ah, popolar le Americhe, giovinotto, desiate?
Ebben... sia pure!
Via! Mozzo, v'affrettate!

ATTO IV

Des Grieux
Tutta su me ti posa, o mia stanca diletta.
La strada polverosa,
la strada maledetta al termine s'avanza.

Manon
Innanzi ancor!
L'aria d'intorno or si fa scura.
Erra la brezza nella gran pianura e muore il
giorno.
Innanzi! No...

Des Grieux
Manon!

Manon
Son vinta! Mi perdona! Tu sei forte... t'invidio.
Donna e debole, cedo...

Des Grieux
Tu soffri?

Manon
Orribilmente! No! Che dissi?
Una vana, una stolta parola... Deh, ti consola!
Chieggo breve rispo, un solo istante...
Mio dolce amante, a me t'appressa... a me!

Des Grieux
Manon, senti, amor mio... Non mi rispondi,
amore?
Vedi, son io che piango, io che imploro,
io che carezza e bacio i tuoi capelli d'oro!
Ah, Manon! Rispondi a me! Tace!?
Maledizione! Crudel febbre l'avvince!
Disperato mi vince un senso di sventura,
un senso di tenebre e di paura!
Rispondimi, amor mio! Tace!?
Manon, non mi rispondi?

Manon
Sei tu, sei tu che piangi?
Sei tu, sei tu che implori?
I tuoi singulti ascolto
e mi bagnano il volto le tue lagrime ardenti.
La sete mi divora... O amore, aita!

Des Grieux
O amor, tutto il mio sangue per la tua vita!
E nulla! Arida landa... non un filo d'acqua.
O immoto cielo!
O Dio, a cui fanciullo anch'io levai
la mia preghiera, un soccorso!

Manon
Sì, un soccorso!
Tu puoi salvarmi. Senti, qui poserò.
E tu scruta il mister dell'orizzonte,
e cerca monte o casolar.
Oltre ti spingi e con lieta favella!

Lieta novella poi vieni a recar.
Sola, perduta, abbandonata in landa
desolata... Orrore!
Intorno a me s'oscura il ciel.
Ahimè, son sola!
E nel profondo deserto io cado, strazio crudel,
ah sola, abbandonata, io, la deserta donna.
Ah, non voglio morire!
Tutto dunque è finito.
Terra di pace mi sembrava questa...
Ahi, mia beltà funesta, ire novelle accende!
Strappar da lui mi si voleva,
or tutto il mio passato orribile risorge
e vivo innanzi al guardo mio si posa.
Ah, di sangue ei s'è macchiato! Ah, tutto è
finito!
Asil di pace ora la tomba invoco...
No, non voglio morire! Amore... aita!
Fra le tue braccia, amore...
L'ultima volta! Apporti tu novella lieta?

Des Grieux
Nulla rinvenni... l'orizzonte nulla mi rivelò...
lontano spinsi lo sguardo invano.

Manon
Muoi, scendon le tenebre.
Su me la notte scende.

Des Grieux
Un funesto delirio ti percuote, t'offende!
Posa qui dove palpito, in me ritorna ancor.

Manon
Oh, t'amo tanto e muoi...
Già la parola manca al mio voler...
Ma posso dirti che t'amo tanto! Oh, amore!
Ultimo incanto, ineffabile ebbrezza,
o mio estremo desir!

Des Grieux
Gelo di morte! Dio, l'ultima speme infrangi!

Manon
Mio dolce amor, tu piangi...
Ora non è di lagrime, ora di baci è questa.
Il tempo vola, baciami!

Des Grieux
O immensa delizia mia, tu fiamma d'amore
eterna...

Manon
La fiamma si spegne... Parla, deh, parla...
ahimè, più non t'ascolto...
Qui, vicino a me, voglio il tuo volto...
Così... mi baci... ancor ti sento...

Des Grieux
Senza di te... perduto... ti seguirò...

Manon

Non voglio! Addio... cupa è la notte... ho freddo...

Era amorosa la tua Manon?

Rammenti? Dimmi... la luminosa mia giovinezza?

Il sole più non vedrò...

Des Grieux

Mio Dio!

Manon

Le mie colpe... travolgerà l'oblio,
ma l'amor mio... non muore...

FINE

Monadology

Gottfried Leibnitz

1. The monad, of which we will speak here, is nothing else than a simple substance, which goes to make up compounds; by simple, we mean without parts.

2. There must be simple substances because there are compound substances; for the compound is nothing else than a collection or aggregatum of simple substances.

3. Now, where there are no constituent parts there is possible neither extension, nor form, nor divisibility. These monads are the true atoms of nature, and, in a word, the elements of things.

4. Their dissolution, therefore, is not to be feared and there is no way conceivable by which a simple substance can perish through natural means.

5. For the same reason there is no way conceivable by which a simple substance might, through natural means, come into existence, since it can not be formed by composition.

6. We may say then, that the existence of monads can begin or end only all at once, that is to say, the monad can begin only through creation and end only through annihilation. Compounds, however, begin or end by parts.

7. There is also no way of explaining how a monad can be altered or changed in its inner being by any other created thing, since there is no possibility of transposition within it, nor can we conceive of any internal movement which can be produced, directed, increased or diminished within it, such as can take place in the case of compounds where a change can occur among the parts. The monads have no windows through which anything may come in or go out. The Attributes cannot detach themselves or go forth from the substances, as could sensible species of the Schoolmen. In the same way neither substance nor attribute can enter from without into a monad.

8. Still monads need to have some qualities, otherwise they would not even be existences. And if simple substances did not differ at all in their qualities, there would be no means of perceiving any change in things. Whatever is in a compound can come into it only through its simple elements and the monads, if they were without qualities (since they do not differ at all in quantity) would be indistinguishable one from another. For instance, if we imagine a plenum or completely filled space, where each part receives only the equivalent of its own previous motion, one state of things would not be distinguishable from another.

9. Each monad, indeed, must be different from every other monad. For there are never in nature two beings which are exactly alike, and in which it is not possible to find a difference either internal or based on an intrinsic property.

10. I assume it as admitted that every created being, and consequently the created monad, is subject to change, and indeed that this change is continuous in each.

11. It follows from what has just been said, that the natural changes of the monad come from an internal principle, because an external cause can have no influence on its inner being.

12. Now besides this principle of change there must also be in the monad a variety which changes. This variety constitutes, so to speak, the specific nature and the variety of the simple substances.

13. This variety must involve a multiplicity in the unity or in that which is simple. For since every natural change takes place by degrees, there must be something which changes and something which remains unchanged, and consequently there must be in the simple substance a plurality of conditions and relations, even though it has no parts.

14. The passing condition which involves and represents a multiplicity in the unity, or in the simple substance, is nothing else than what is called perception. This should be carefully distinguished from apperception or consciousness, as will appear in what follows. In this matter the Cartesians have fallen into a serious error, in that they deny the existence of those perceptions of which we are not conscious. It is this also which has led them to believe that spirits alone are monads and that there are no souls of animals or other entelechies, and it has led them to make the common confusion between a protracted period of unconsciousness and actual death. They have thus adopted the Scholastic error that souls can exist entirely separated from bodies, and have even confirmed ill-balanced minds in the belief that souls are mortal.

15. The action of the internal principle which brings about the change or the passing from one perception to another may be called appetite. It is true that the desire (l'appetit) is not always able to attain to the whole of the perception which it strives for, but it always attains a portion of it and reaches new perceptions.

16. We, ourselves, experience a multiplicity in a simple substance, when we find that the most trifling thought of which we are conscious involves a variety in the object. Therefore all those who acknowledge that the soul is a simple substance ought to grant this multiplicity in the monad, and Monsieur Bayle should have found no difficulty in it, as he has done in his Dictionary, article Rorarius.

17. It must be confessed, however, that perception, and that which depends upon it, are inexplicable by mechanical causes, that is to say, by figures and motions. Supposing that there were a machine whose structure produced thought, sensation, and perception, we could conceive of it as increased in size with the same proportions until one was able to enter into its interior, as he would into a mill. Now, on going into it he would find only pieces working upon one another, but never would he find anything to explain perception. It is accordingly in the simple substance, and not in the compound nor in a machine that the perception is to be sought. Furthermore, there is nothing besides perceptions and their changes to be found in the simple substance. And it is in these alone that all the internal activities of the simple substance can consist.

18. All simple substances or created monads may be called entelechies, because they have in themselves a certain perfection. There is in them a sufficiency which makes them the source of their internal activities, and renders them, so to speak, incorporeal Automaton.

19. If we wish to designate as soul everything which has perceptions and desires in the general sense that I have just explained, all simple substances or created monads could be called souls. But since feeling is something more than a mere perception I think that the general name of monad or entelechy should suffice for simple substances which have only perception, while we may reserve the term Soul for those whose perception is more distinct and is accompanied by memory.

20. We experience in ourselves a state where we remember nothing and where we have no distinct perception, as in periods of fainting, or when we are overcome by a profound, dreamless sleep. In such a state the soul does not sensibly differ at all from a simple monad. As this state, however, is not permanent and the soul can recover from it, the soul

is something more.

21. Nevertheless it does not follow at all that the simple substance is in such a state without perception. This is so because of the reasons given above; for it cannot perish, nor on the other hand would it exist without some affection and the affection is nothing else than its perception. When, however, there are a great number of weak perceptions where nothing stands out distinctively, we are stunned; as when one turns around and around in the same direction, a dizziness comes on, which makes him swoon and makes him able to distinguish nothing. Among animals, death can occasion this state for quite a period.

22. Every present state of a simple substance is a natural consequence of its preceding state, in such a way that its present is big with its future.

23. Therefore, since on awakening after a period of unconsciousness we become conscious of our perceptions, we must, without having been conscious of them, have had perceptions immediately before; for one perception can come in a natural way only from another perception, just as a motion can come in a natural way only from a motion.

24. It is evident from this that if we were to have nothing distinctive, or so to speak prominent, and of a higher flavour in our perceptions, we should be in a continual state of stupor. This is the condition of monads which are wholly bare.

25. We see that nature has given to animals heightened perception, s, having provided them with organs which collect numerous rays of light or numerous waves of air and thus make them more effective in their combination. Something similar to this takes place in the case of smell, in that of taste and of touch, and perhaps in many other senses which are unknown to us. I shall have occasion very soon to explain how that which occurs in the soul represents that which goes on in the sense organs.

26. The memory furnishes a sort of consecutiveness which imitates reason but is to be distinguished from it. We see that animals when they have the perception of something which they notice and of which they have had a similar previous perception, are led by the representation of their memory to expect that which was associated in the preceding perception, and they come to have feelings like those which they had before. For instance, if a stick be shown to a dog, he remembers the pain which it has caused him and he whines or runs away.

27. The vividness of the picture, which comes to him or moves him, is derived either from the magnitude or from the number of the previous perceptions. For, oftentimes, a strong impression brings about, all at once, the same effect as a long-continued habit or as a great many reiterated, moderate perceptions.

28. Men act in like manner as animals, in so far as the sequence of their perceptions is determined only by the law of memory, resembling the empirical physicians who practice simply, without any theory, and we are empiricists in three-fourths of our actions. For instance, when we expect that there will be daylight tomorrow, we do so empirically, because it has always happened so up to the present time. It is only the astronomer who uses his reason in making such an affirmation.

29. But the knowledge of eternal and necessary truths is that which distinguishes us from mere animals and gives us reason and the sciences, thus raising us to a knowledge of ourselves and of God. This is what is called in us the Rational Soul or the Mind.

30. It is also through the knowledge of necessary truths and through abstractions from

them that we come to perform Reflective Acts, which cause us to think of what is called the I, and to decide that this or that is within us. it is thus, that in thinking upon ourselves we think of being, of substance, of the simple and compound, of a material thing and of God himself, conceiving that what is limited in us is in him without limits. These reflective acts furnish the principal objects of our reasonings.

31. Our reasoning is based upon two great principles: first, that of contradiction, by means of which we decide that to be false which involves contradiction and that to be true which contradicts or is opposed to the false.

32. And second, the principle of sufficient reason, in virtue of which we believe that no fact can be real or existing and no statement true unless it has a sufficient reason why it should be thus and not otherwise. Most frequently, however, these reasons cannot be known by us.

33. There are also two kinds of truths: those of reasoning and those of fact. The truths of reasoning are necessary, and their opposite is impossible. Those of fact, however, are contingent, and their opposite is possible. When a truth is necessary, the reason can be found by analysis in resolving it into simpler ideas and into simpler truths until we reach those which are primary.

34. It is thus that with mathematicians the speculative theorems and the practical canons are reduced by analysis to definitions, axioms, and postulates.

35. There are finally simple ideas of which no definition can be given. There are also the axioms and postulates or, in a word, the primary principles which cannot be proved and, indeed, have no need of proof. These are identical propositions whose opposites involve express contradictions.

36. But there must be also a sufficient reason for contingent truths or truths of fact; that is to say, for the sequence of the things which extend throughout the universe of created beings, where the analysis into more particular reasons can be continued into greater detail without limit because of the immense variety of the things in nature and because of the infinite division of bodies. There is an infinity of figures and of movements, present and past, which enter into the efficient cause of my present writing, and in its final cause there are an infinity of slight tendencies and dispositions of my soul, present and past.

37. And as all this detail again involves other and more detailed contingencies, each of which again has need of a similar analysis in order to find its explanation, no real advance has been made. Therefore, the sufficient or ultimate reason must needs be outside of the sequence or series of these details of contingencies, however infinite they may be.

38. It is thus that the ultimate reason for things must be a necessary substance, in which the detail of the changes shall be present merely potentially, as in the fountainhead, and this substance we call God.

39. Now, since this substance is a sufficient reason for all the above mentioned details, which are linked together throughout, there is but one God, and this God is sufficient.

40. We may hold that the supreme substance, which is unique, universal and necessary with nothing independent outside of it, which is further a pure sequence of possible being, must be incapable of limitation and must contain as much reality as possible.

41. Whence it follows that God is absolutely perfect, perfection being understood as the

magnitude of positive reality in the strict sense, when the limitations or the bounds of those things which have them are removed. There where there are no limits, that is to say, in God, perfection is absolutely infinite.

42. It follows also that created things derive their perfections through the influence of God, but their imperfections come from their own natures, which cannot exist without limits. It is in this latter that they are distinguished from God. An example of this original imperfection of created things is to be found in the natural inertia of bodies.

43. It is true, furthermore, that in God is found not only the source of existences, but also that of essences, in so far as they are real. In other words, he is the source of whatever there is real in the possible. This is because the Understanding of God is in the region of eternal truths or of the ideas upon which they depend, and because without him there would be nothing real in the possibilities of things, and not only would nothing be existent, nothing would be even possible.

44. For it must needs be that if there is a reality in essences or in possibilities or indeed in the eternal truths, this reality is based upon something existent and actual, and, consequently, in the existence of the necessary Being in whom essence includes existence or in whom possibility is sufficient to produce actuality.

45. Therefore God alone (or the Necessary Being) has this prerogative that if he be possible he must necessarily exist, and, as nothing is able to prevent the possibility of that which involves no bounds, no negation and consequently, no contradiction, this alone is sufficient to establish a priori his existence. We have, therefore, proved his existence through the reality of eternal truths. But a little while ago we also proved it a posteriori, because contingent beings exist which can have their ultimate and sufficient reason only in the necessary being which, in turn, has the reason for existence in itself.

46. Yet we must not think that the eternal truths being dependent upon God are therefore arbitrary and depend upon his will, as Descartes seems to have held, and after him M. Poiret. This is the case only with contingent truths which depend upon fitness or the choice of the greatest good; necessarily truths on the other hand depend solely upon his understanding and are the inner objects of it.

47. God alone is the ultimate unity or the original simple substance, of which all created or derivative monads are the products, and arise, so to speak, through the continual outflashings (fulgurations) of the divinity from moment to moment, limited by the receptivity of the creature to whom limitation is an essential.

48. In God are present: power, which is the source of everything; knowledge, which contains the details of the ideas; and, finally, will, which changes or produces things in accordance with the principle of the greatest good. To these correspond in the created monad, the subject or basis, the faculty of perception, and the faculty of appetite. In God these attributes are absolutely infinite or perfect, while in the created monads or in the entelechies (perfectihabies, as Hermolaus Barbarus translates this word), they are imitations approaching him in proportion to the perfection.

49. A created thing is said to act outwardly in so far as it has perfection, and to be acted upon by another in so far as it is imperfect. Thus action is attributed to the monad in so far as it has distinct perceptions, and passion or passivity is attributed in so far as it has confused perceptions.

50. One created thing is more perfect than another when we find in the first that which

gives an a priori reason for what occurs in the second. This why we say that one acts upon the other.

51. In the case of simple substances, the influence which one monad has upon another is only ideal. It can have its effect only through the mediation of God, in so far as in the ideas of God each monad can rightly demand that God, in regulating the others from the beginning of things, should have regarded it also. For since one created monad cannot have a physical influence upon the inner being of another, it is only through the primal regulation that one can have dependence upon another.

52. It is thus that among created things action and passivity are reciprocal. For God, in comparing two simple substances, finds in each one reasons obliging him to adapt the other to it; and consequently what is active in certain respects is passive from another point of view, active in so far as what we distinctly know in it serves to give a reason for what occurs in another, and passive in so far as the reason for what occurs in it is found in what is distinctly known in another.

53. Now as there are an infinity of possible universes in the ideas of God, and but one of them can exist, there must be a sufficient reason' for the choice of God which determines him to select one rather than another.

54. And this reason is to be found only in the fitness or in the degree of perfection which these worlds possess, each possible thing having the right to claim existence in proportion to the perfection which it involves.

55. This is the cause for the existence of the greatest good; namely, that the wisdom of God permits him to know it, his goodness causes him to choose it, and his power enables him to produce it.

56. Now this interconnection, relationship, or this adaptation of all things to each particular one, and of each one to all the rest, brings it about that every simple substance has relations which express all the others and that it is consequently a perpetual living mirror of the universe.

57. And as the same city regarded from different sides appears entirely different, and is, as it were multiplied respectively, so, because of the infinite number of simple substances, there are a similar infinite number of universes which are, nevertheless, only the aspects of a single one as seen from the special point of view of each monad.

58. Through this means has been obtained the greatest possible variety, together with the greatest order that may be; that is to say, through this means has been obtained the greatest possible perfection.

59. This hypothesis, moreover, which I venture to call demonstrated, is the only one which fittingly gives proper prominence to the greatness of God. M. Bayle recognised this when in his dictionary (article Rorarius) he raised objections to it; indeed, he was inclined to believe that I attributed too much to God, and more than it is possible to attribute to him: But he was unable to bring forward any reason why this universal harmony which causes every substance to express exactly all others through the relation which it has with them is impossible.

60. Besides, in what has just been said can be seen the a priori reasons why things cannot be otherwise than they are. It is because God, in ordering the whole, has had regard to every part and in particular to each monad; and since the monad is by its very nature

representative, nothing can limit it to represent merely a part of things. It is nevertheless true that this representation is, as regards the details of the whole universe, only a confused representation, and is distinct only as regards a small part of them, that is to say, as regards those things which are nearest or greatest in relation to each monad. If the representation were distinct as to the details of the entire Universe, each monad would be a Deity. It is not in the object represented that the monads are limited, but in the modifications of their knowledge of the object. In a confused way they reach out to infinity or to the whole, but are limited and differentiated in the degree of their distinct perceptions.

61. In this respect compounds are like simple substances, for all space is filled up; therefore, all matter is connected. And in a plenum or filled space every movement has an effect upon bodies in proportion to this distance, so that not only is every body affected by those which are in contact with it and responds in some way to whatever happens to them, but also by means of them the body responds to, those bodies adjoining them, and their intercommunication reaches to any distance whatsoever. Consequently every body responds to all that happens in the universe, so that he who saw all could read in each one what is happening everywhere, and even what has happened and what will happen. He can discover in the present what is distant both as regards space and as regards time; "all things conspire" as Hippocrates said. A soul can, however, read in itself only what is there represented distinctly. It cannot all at once open up all its folds, because they extend to infinity.

62. Thus although each created monad represents the whole universe, it represents more distinctly the body which specially pertains to it and of which it constitutes the entelechy. And as this body expresses all the universe through the interconnection of all matter in the plenum, the soul also represents the whole universe in representing this body, which belongs to it in a particular way.

63. The body belonging to a monad, which is its entelechy or soul, constitutes together with the entelechy what may be called a rising being, and with a soul what is called an animal. Now this body of a living being or of an animal is always organic, because every monad is a mirror of the universe is regulated with perfect order there must needs be order also in what represents it, that is to say in the perceptions of the soul and consequently in the body through which the, universe is represented in the soul.

64. Therefore every organic body of a living being is a kind of divine machine or natural automaton, infinitely surpassing all artificial automatons. Because a machine constructed by man's skill is not a machine in each of its parts; for instance, the teeth of a brass wheel have parts or bits which to us are not artificial products and contain nothing in themselves to show the use to which the wheel was destined in the machine. The machines of nature, however, that is to say, living bodies, are still machines in their smallest parts ad infinitum. Such is the difference between nature and art, that is to say, between divine art and ours.

65. The author of nature has been able to employ this divine and infinitely marvellous artifice, because each portion of matter is not only, as the ancients recognised, infinitely divisible, but also because it is really divided without end, every part into other parts, each one of which has its own proper motion. Otherwise it would be impossible for each portion of matter to express all the universe.

66. Whence we see that there is a world of created things, of living beings, of animals, of entelechies, of souls, in the minutest particle of matter.

67. Every portion of matter may be conceived as like a garden full of plants and like a pond

full of fish. But every branch of a plant, every member of an animal, and every drop of the fluids within it, is also such a garden or such a pond.

68. And although the ground and air which lies between the plants of the garden, and the water which is between the fish in the pond, are not themselves plants or fish, yet they nevertheless contain these, usually so small however as to be imperceptible to us.

69. There is, therefore, nothing uncultivated, or sterile or dead in the universe, no chaos, no confusion, save in appearance; somewhat as a pond would appear at a distance when we could see in it a confused movement, and so to speak, a swarming of the fish, without however discerning the fish themselves.

70. It is evident, then, that every living body has a dominating entelechy, which in animals is the soul. The parts, however, of this living body are full of other living beings, plants and animals, which in turn have each one its entelechy or dominating soul.

71. This does not mean, as some who have misunderstood my thought have imagined, that each soul has a quantity or portion of matter appropriated to it or attached to itself for ever, and that it consequently owns other inferior living beings destined to serve it always; because all bodies are in a state of perpetual flux like rivers, and the parts are continually entering in or passing out.

72. The soul, therefore, changes its body only gradually and by degrees, so that it is never deprived all at once of all its organs. There is frequently a metamorphosis in animals, but never metempsychosis or a transmigration of souls. Neither are there souls wholly separate from bodies, nor bodiless spirits. God alone is without body.

73. This is also why there is never absolute generation or perfect death in the strict sense, consisting in the separation of the soul from the body. What we call generation is development and growth, and what we call death is envelopment and diminution.

74. Philosophers have been much perplexed in accounting for the origin of forms, entelechies, or souls. Today, however, when it has been learned through careful investigations made in plant, insect and animal life, that the organic bodies of nature are never the product of chaos or putrefaction, but always come from seeds in which there was without doubt some preformation, it has been decided that not only is the organic body already present before conception, but also a soul in this body, in a word, the animal itself; and it has been decided that, by means of conception the animal is merely made ready for a great transformation, so as to become an animal of another sort. We can see cases somewhat similar outside of generation when grubs become flies and caterpillars butterflies.

75. These little animals, some of which by conception become large animals' may be called spermatoc. Those among them which remain in their species, that is to say, the greater part, are born, multiply, and are destroyed, like the larger animals. There are only a few chosen ones which come out upon a greater stage.

76. This, however, is only half the truth. I believe, therefore, that if the animal never actually commences by natural means, no more does it by natural means come to an end. Not only is there no generation, but also there is no entire destruction or absolute death. These reasonings, carried on a posteriori and drawn from experience, accord perfectly with the principles which I have above deduced a priori.

77. Therefore we may say that not only the soul (the mirror of the indestructible universe)

is indestructible, but also the animal itself is, although its mechanism is frequently destroyed in parts and although it puts off and takes on organic coatings.

78. These principles have furnished me the means of explaining on natural grounds the union, or rather the conformity between the soul and the organic body. The soul follows its own laws, and the body likewise follows its own laws. They are fitted to each other in virtue of the preestablished harmony between all substances since they are all representations of one and the same universe.

79. Souls act in accordance with the laws of final causes through their desires, ends and means. Bodies act in accordance with the laws of efficient causes or of motion. The two realms, that of efficient causes and that of final causes, are in harmony, each with the other.

80. Descartes saw that souls cannot at all impart force to bodies, because there is always the same quantity of force in matter. Yet he thought that the soul could change the direction of bodies. This was, however, because at that time the law of nature which affirms also that conservation of the same total direction in the motion of matter was not known. If he had known that law, he would have fallen upon my system of preestablished harmony.

81. According to this system bodies act as if (to suppose the impossible) there were no souls at all, and souls act as if there were no bodies, and yet both body and soul act as if the one were influencing the other.

82. Although I find that essentially the same thing is true of all living things and animals, which we have just said (namely, that animals and souls begin from the very commencement of the world and that they no more come to an end than does the world) nevertheless, rational animals have this peculiarity, that their little spermatoc animals, as long as they remain such, have only ordinary or sensuous souls, but those of them which are, so to speak, elected, attain by actual conception to human nature, and their sensuous souls are raised to the rank of reason and to the prerogative of spirits.

83. Among the differences that there are between ordinary souls and spirits, some of which I have already instanced, there is also this, that while souls in general are living mirrors or images of the universe of created things, spirits are also images of the Deity himself or of the author of nature. They are capable of knowing the system of the universe, and of imitating some features of it by means of artificial models, each spirit being like a small divinity in its own sphere.

84. Therefore, spirits are able to enter into a sort of social relationship with God, and with respect to them he is not only what an inventor is to his machine (as in his relation to the other created things), but he is also what a prince is to his subjects, and even what a father is to his children.

85. Whence it is easy to conclude that the totality of all spirits must compose the city of God, that is to say, the most perfect state that is possible under the most perfect monarch.

86. This city of God, this truly universal monarchy, is a moral world within the natural world. It is what is noblest and most divine among the works of God. And in it consists in reality the glory of God, because he would have no glory were not his greatness and goodness known and wondered at by spirits. It is also in relation to this divine city that God properly has goodness. His wisdom and his power are shown everywhere.

87. As we established above that there is a perfect harmony between the two natural realms of efficient and final causes, it will be in place here to point out another harmony which appears between the physical realm of nature and the moral realm of grace, that is to say, between God considered as the architect of the mechanism of the world and God considered as the monarch of the divine city of spirits.

88. This harmony brings it about that things progress of themselves toward grace along natural lines, and that this earth, for example, must be destroyed and restored by natural means at those times when the proper government of spirits demands it, for chastisement in the one case and for a reward in the other.

89. We can say also that God, the Architect, satisfies in all respects God the Law Giver, that therefore sins will bring their own penalty with them through the order of nature, and because of the very structure of things, mechanical though it is. And in the same way the good actions will attain their rewards in mechanical way through their relation to bodies, although this cannot and ought not always to take place without delay.

90. Finally, under this perfect government, there will be no good action unrewarded and no evil action unpunished; everything must turn out for the well-being of the good; that is to say, of those who are not disaffected in this great state, who, after having done their duty, trust in Providence and who love and imitate, as is meet, the Author of all Good, delighting in the contemplation of his perfections according to the nature of that genuine, pure love which finds pleasure in the happiness of those who are loved. It is for this reason that wise and virtuous persons work in behalf of everything which seems conformable to presumptive or antecedent will of God, and are, nevertheless, content with what God actually brings to pass through his secret, consequent and determining will, recognising that if we were able to understand sufficiently well the order of the universe, we should find that it surpasses all the desires of the wisest of us, and that it is impossible to render it better than it is, not only for all in general, but also for each one of us in particular, provided that we have the proper attachment for the author of all, not only as the Architect and the efficient cause of our being, but also as our Lord and the Final Cause, who ought to be the whole goal of our will, and who alone can make us happy.

Mothman

Mothman was the name given to a strange creature sighted many times in the Charleston and Point Pleasant areas of West Virginia between November 1966 and December 1967. Some observers described the creature as a man-sized beast with wings and large reflective red eyes, while others claimed that the creature possessed luminous eyes. A number of hypotheses have been put forward to explain what people reported, ranging from paranormal phenomena to owls.

History

A plaque on the Roach statue gives a version of the original legend: "On a chilly fall night in November 1966, two young couples drove into the TNT area north of Point Pleasant, West Virginia, when they realized they were not alone."

The Mothman creature, named in parallel to the Batman TV series that was popular at the time, was first sighted November 12, 1966. A group of five men were preparing a grave in a cemetery close to Clendenin, West Virginia when what they described as a "brown human shape with wings" lifted off from behind nearby trees and flew over their heads. However, this sighting was not made public until later, and the first sighting described in the media took place three days later.

Late at night on November 15, two young married couples from Point Pleasant, Roger and Linda Scarberry and Steve and Mary Mallette, were out for a drive in the Scarberrys' car. They were passing a World War II TNT factory about seven miles outside of Point Pleasant, in the 2,500 acre (10 km²) McClintic Wildlife Station, when they noticed two red lights in the shadow by an old generator plant near the gate of the factory. They stopped the car and were startled to see that the lights were the glowing red eyes of a large animal, "shaped like a man, but bigger, maybe six and a half or seven feet tall, with big wings folded against its back," according to Roger Scarberry. Terrified, the couples drove off in their car, heading for Route 62. Going down the exit road, they saw the creature again, standing on a ridge near the road. It spread its wings and took off, following their car to the city limits. They went to the Mason County courthouse and told their story to Deputy Millard Halstead, who later said "I've known these kids all their lives. They'd never been in any trouble and they were really scared that night. I took them seriously." He followed Roger Scarberry's car back to the TNT factory, but found no sign of the strange creature. According to the book *Alien Animals*, by Janet Board, a poltergeist attack on the Scarberry home took place later that night, in which the creature was seen several times.

The next night, November 16, local townspeople, armed, went searching the area around the old TNT plant for signs of Mothman. Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Wamsley and Mrs. Marcella Bennett with her baby daughter Teena were in a car on their way to visit their friends, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Thomas, who lived in a bungalow among the "igloos" (concrete dome-shaped structures erected for explosives storage during WWII) close to the TNT plant. The igloos were now empty, some owned by the county, some by companies intending to use them for storage. They were headed back to their car when a figure appeared behind their parked car. Mrs. Bennett said it seemed like it had been lying down, slowly rising up from the ground, large and gray, with glowing red eyes. While Wamsley phoned the police, the creature walked onto the porch and peered in through the window at them.



An eyewitness's sketch of Mothman.

On November 24, four people saw it flying through the air over the TNT area. On the morning of November 25, Thomas Ury, who was driving along Route 62 north of the TNT, who said he saw the creature standing in a field by the road, then spread its wings and took off, following his car as he sped into Point Pleasant to report it to the sheriff.

On November 26, Mrs. Ruth Foster of Charleston, West Virginia saw Mothman standing on her front lawn, but it was gone when her brother-in-law went out to look. On the morning of November 27, it pursued a young woman near Mason, West Virginia, and was reported again in St. Albans the same night, by two children.

The Mothman was seen again January 11, 1967, and several times during 1967. Fewer sightings of the Mothman were reported after the collapse of the Silver Bridge, when 46 people died. The Silver Bridge, so named for its aluminum paint, was an eyebar chain suspension bridge that connected the cities of Point Pleasant, West Virginia and Gallipolis, Ohio over the Ohio River. It was built in 1928 and collapsed on December 15, 1967; investigation of the wreckage pointed to the failure of a single eye-bar in a suspension chain due to a small flaw when it was made.

Analysis

There are several theories for what the Mothman phenomena involved.

A large collection of first-hand material about Mothman is found in John Keel's 1975 book *The Mothman Prophecies*, in which Keel lays out the chronology of Mothman and what he claims to be related parapsychological events in the area, including UFO activity, Men in Black encounters, poltergeist activity, Bigfoot and black panther sightings, animal and human mutilations, precognitions by witnesses, and the December 15, 1967 collapse of the Silver Bridge across the Ohio River. The book was the basis of a 2002 movie starring Richard Gere, Laura Linney and Debra Messing, directed by Mark Pellington. A companion book called *"The Eighth Tower"* was also released in 1975, built on material edited from *The Mothman Prophecies* by the publishers. Together, the two books laid the basis for our current understanding of the phenomena surrounding Mothman.

Author Jeff Wamsley has compiled two books on the Mothman phenomenon. In his 2002 book *Mothman: The Facts Behind the Legend* (with Donnie Sergeant, Jr.), Wamsley presents old press clippings, local history, and eyewitness interviews. In his second book, *Mothman: Behind the Red Eyes* (2005), Wamsley interviews nearly a dozen eyewitnesses, allowing them to describe what they saw sometimes in contrast to what was reported earlier in the news and in other books.

A.B. Colvin, a photojournalist and cine-ethnographer who saw the creature in 1967, has produced a 32-hour DVD news series on Mothman called *The Mothman's Photographer*.

Colvin's sister apparently took a photo of Mothman in 1973. Colvin took a picture of an MIB in 1979 that he feels could be either his deceased father (who was at the infamous Philadelphia Experiment in 1943) or Indrid Cold, the spaceman who contacted Woody Derenberger. *The Mothman's Photographer* (2006) has recent interviews with over 40 eyewitnesses and experts such as John Keel, Marcella Bennett, Tom Ury, Faye DeWitt, and Sharon Moore. Many of the witnesses are from Mound, WV, where Colvin (as well as Charles Manson and Sara Jane Moore) grew up. After studying Buddhist monks and various Native tribes, Colvin seems to have reached the conclusion that both the Garuda of the Far East and the Thunderbird of the Native Americans are synonymous with Mothman, and that the Mothman was fulfilling a pre-ordained, archetypal role that involves stopping heinous crimes at pivotal moments in mankind's cyclical existence by sending visions, dreams, and messages to ordinary humans.

Loren Coleman, in the 2002 book *Mothman and Other Curious Encounters* focusing on the details of cryptozoology investigations, acknowledges Keel's "ultraterrestrial" approach.

Skeptics have argued (notably in the March/April 2002 issue of the magazine *Skeptical Inquirer*) that the most likely explanation of the sightings is excited eyewitnesses mistaking a barn owl for a winged monster. Others have argued that the most likely candidate is the Great Horned Owl, the largest owl known to breed in West Virginia. The Great Grey Owl, a rare winter visitor to the lower forty-eight states, is the largest owl in North America, and could possibly have been the figure behind some of the Mothman sightings. Another possibility is the misidentification of a sandhill crane. The sandhill crane grows up to six feet and has red patches around its eyes.

Mark A. Hall in his book *Thunderbirds* suggests a giant cryptid owl species, allegedly seen in the area for over 100 years.

Games

□ The Mothmen sightings were used as the basis for an interdimensional alien race in the conspiracy roleplaying game *DarkMatter*, a campaign setting for TSR's *Alternity* SciFi RPG. They subsequently played a major role in the plot of the adventure supplement titled *The Killing Jar*. They also appear as a monster in the d20 *Menace Manual*, known as the "Mothfolk".

□ A less menacing version of the Mothman appears in *Shin Megami Tensei III: Nocturne* for the Playstation 2.

□ In *Castlevania: Dawn of Sorrow* for the Nintendo DS, Mothman is one of three hidden cryptozoology-based monsters, appearing as a furry black heart-shaped creature with wings and large eyes (mostly resembling the eyewitness sketch). Mothman only appears if the player activates a powerful spotlight using a lightning bolt, which is a play on moths' tendency to be attracted to light.

□ The White Wolf storytelling game *Vampire: The Masquerade* included the Mothman in its sourcebook, *Clanbook: Gangrel*, where the Mothman was identified as a highly-deformed member of Clan Gangrel, which predicted a number of future events, including the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy.

Figurines/Toys/Collectibles

□ The Mothmen Vinyl line has been created by renowned artist David Horvath, the co-creator of Uglydolls. He has created a line of Japanese Vinyl figurines that currently numbers at 7. The figurines include Eye Witness, TNT Area, Silver Bridge, Point Pleasant, Ingird Cold, Prophecy and Chernobyl types. The figurines were produced in editions of 50 or 100, depending on the version. They have also earned a place at the Mothman Museum in Point Pleasant and a complete set will be on permanent display there.

TV

□ In an episode of The X-Files called "Detour", Agent Mulder refers to sightings of red-eyed creatures called "Mothmen" in Point Pleasant. Agent Scully sarcastically asks him if this is filed next to "The Cockroach That Ate Cincinnati" (a novelty song of the 1960s).

On the Problem of Practice

Predrag Vranicki

Productive life is, however, species-life. It is life creating life. In the type of life activity resides the whole character of a species, its species character; and free, conscious activity is the species character of human beings.

Karl Marx

It is quite natural and understandable that each epoch of human thought is constricted by corresponding historical and thought traditions. Just as the traditions of the generations that have gone are imprinted upon the consciousness of the living in all fields of life, so are they too in all branches of thought. When we consider our existence, and its meaning, the whole intelligent effort of mankind seems spread before us as a very complex, often somewhat opaque, history of man's consciousness, of his theories concerning himself and concerning being in general.

His consciousness, thought and theory seem at first to be something separate from man's historical and material being. This is expressed in various theses concerning, an assessment of, problems such as: the relation of theory and practice, the reflection of practice in theory, the lagging of theory behind practice, the primacy of one rather than the other.

Certain differentiations of thought also fall into certain traditions. Though further analysis may show this to be conditional or untenable.

Thus, for example, the distinction between being and thought is a historical distinction. If the category of being should by etymology and philosophical use denote something that is, or that something is, then that categorial designation belongs as much to reality in the sense of nature or history, as to thought. To identify nature or reality "outside myself" with the category of being, to place it in opposition to the categories consciousness, thought is utterly inadequate.

It is quite understandable that the category of "being" can be, as indeed it has been, very variously determined, given very different content and even confined, for example, to the natural or the historical. But if only this last is acknowledged as being, then it is a logical inference that thought and consciousness do not exist. This faces us with a problem which is, it seems to me, insoluble on this basis.

The problem we are here trying to consider from this angle, the problem of practice or praxis is also greatly burdened by tradition. Even the formulation of the problem given above shows the partial position from which many proceed. Just as a whole series of limited, partial occurrences of a simple "practical" action, seem to us quite devoid of any theory, so too do many theoretical preoccupations seem to be unconnected with "practice," seem even to be severed from, or opposed to it.

This is how things appear if we simplify this complex material which we are investigating the history of mankind, man's historical life. In single, simplified examples there seem to be many cases when we have practice without theory, when these two seem to be disconnected or in a one-way relationship. Historical reality is, however, much more complex, and the category "practice" also shows very great complexity.

What then we wish here to examine is not any particular practical activity but practice as the basis of humanity, the philosophical characteristic of man.

In this sense, following Marx, we see man as par excellence a being of practice, a being who freely and consciously transforms his own life. Practice is an eo ipso, polyvalent

Category for it embraces all sides of man's being. We do not need here to repeat what has been said so many times since Marx, and what it is the precondition of all speculation: that man exists and develops only by transforming his natural and social reality and that in this way he transforms himself also.

What interests us here is the structure of the concept of practice in relation to theory, and the structure of the real relations of man as expressed by the category practice.

"Practice" is something which essentially determines the character of man's existence. Here lies his ontological-anthropological meaning. If we did not consider history as a lasting laborious conscious-unconscious process, sometimes with, sometimes without perspective in each epoch more radically and deeply transforming natural and historical being then we should deny any possible rational approach to an explanation of our origins, of the mainstream and the tributaries of life.

Animals too "change" the world, but only in proportion to their relatively un-changeable structure. That is, unconsciously, unfreely. without aiming at development, in a fixed, unplanned, unconsidered, non-revolutionary way. In such "change" there is no historical process, there is a propensity to repetition, "temporality" is seen only as biological growth and ageing, as biological changes, not as historical actions creations.

Man changes the world, in conformity with his own structure, however not only in conformity with his physical and biological structure, but also with the historical. His transformation of reality means at the same time the transformation of his power over individual and historical structure. His changing of the world is not a circle but a process.

And just for this reason man is the only creative being. So much is he a creature being that his very being and essence are subject to his creation.

If we embrace the whole of this creativity of man by the concept of practice, then we must conclude that man creates his own history, his historical life, according to the possibilities of his own practice.

And these possibilities are always and only historically given: as the real instruments of production, as the level of technical and scientific development, of social organization, of the technical and cultural profile of individuals, of international relations and influences, etc. Thus, if we turn to the existentialist formula that existence precedes essence, we can perfectly easily reverse it, and say that at the same time essence precedes existence. For man is not just an individual being creating himself independently of the historical structures and processes of which he is a component part. He is to just as great an extent created by all those relations which are historically given.

Practice involves all sides of a man's life so that man is essentially a "practical being." In his childish games, at work, in family relations, in scientific experiments, in artistic creation, or in his historical acts, man is always in a practical, immediately sensuous relationship to his object (nature, other men, etc.), and not simply in a contemplative relationship.

If practice is essentially conscious, to a greater or lesser extent free, and planned, creation, transformation of a reality which is not only reality of thought, but above all reality of the medium of man's being, that is, natural historical reality then, we repeat, this concept embraces man in his totality: in his family, as a producer, in his political, artistic and scholarly work etc.

In all these practical relations men conduct themselves more or less explicitly, and consci -

ously also in a theoretical way. Man cannot be in any kind of practical relationship towards the world, not even on a very primary and simple level, without some kind of "theory," without certain purposes, attitudes, concepts, ideas.

However practical man's life may in essence be it shows itself as such only by being at the same time theoretical. The concept of practice shows in this way its three essential sides: the sensuous-concrete the theoretical-abstract, and the emotional-experiencing. Practice is not possible without some definite, emotional attitude in the sense that it must satisfy some kind of need; nor is it possible if it does not sensuously change and create objects and reality; and finally sensuous changing of objects is not possible if it is not conscious, planned, theoretical and free.

"A spider conducts operations that resemble those of a weaver, and a bee in the construction of her cells puts to shame many an architect. But what distinguishes the worst architects from the best of bees is this, that the architect arises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality. At the end of every labour process we get a result that already existed in the imagination of the labourer at its commencement. He does not only effect a change of form in the material in which he works, but also realizes a purpose of his own that gives the law to his modus operandi, and to which he must subordinate his will." (Marx, Capital, vol. I, ch. 5)

The defining of man as a practical being is only possible if practice is understood as a unity of the sensuous and the theoretical activity. The functioning of a machine, (and, even of the simplest tool) is theory put into operation, or the realization of theory. Just as theory (even the simplest) is the sublimation of a certain human creativity, sensuous and theoretical.

In practice the relationship of these two elements is mutual, functional, they condition each other. The relative independence of abstract thought makes it possible for it to lag behind or to anticipate concrete-sensuous activity. In the same way the complexity and spontaneity of man's sensuous activity (in the first place his productive and historical activity) make it very difficult to produce a simultaneous theoretical view of all these processes.

As the concept of practice embraces the sensuous and the theoretical it is inadequate to oppose theory and practice, as if they were two things which should be a unity; practice itself, understood as a fundamental function of man, contains both in itself.

To separate them would be to allow the possibility of a kind of practice which did not include consciousness, hypotheses and theory: as if a theory were possible which did not involve the total experience of man's sensuous activity.

Practice of this kind would be animal practice, and such a theory would be nonsense. It is understandable that there will be nuances of degree here. There may be various discrepancies of level in what, in the supreme creative moment of practice, is a basic unity. In the same way theoretical activity may be separated out, if we consider individuals who engage in it (in connection with the historical division of labour) but not in reference to history as a totality, in reference to the creation of history as a unified and total act or process.

To consider the two side by side would mean that man was not a total being, nor was his history a total creation, but that he created various independent and parallel histories, of technics, physics, science, law, philosophy etc. Although there is relative independence in all these fields of activity because of division of

labour as it has existed up to now, the above mentioned division would destroy the dialectical unity of man as a being of practice, as an individual- and a historical being.

History as the unified life of man, is thus a unified history of the way man has changed the world and created new historical structures: if by this we understand also natural-historical reality, man himself and his highly varied creations (artistic, philosophic etc.).

From this it follows, as more detailed investigation of various epochs would show, that any great discrepancy between man's sensuous and theoretical activity (which is what discrepancy between theory and practice is usually called) never existed nor can possibly exist.

Every one of man's historically determined levels, every level of his practice, is constructed then of a corresponding level of sensuous, and theoretical action. Man's material, social and theoretical practice are found to have indivisible relations with and effects upon one another.

History is the unified work of man. Not one of man's activities exists by itself and for itself alone. Not one can be understood without taking into account whole historical epochs, man's historical existence as a whole, the integrity and polyvalence of his fundamental existence as a being of praxis.

Marx gave plastic expression not only to the thesis of the existence of one single science history, but also to the thesis that fetish consciousness is an expression of a definite, low level of sensuous existence. "The extent to which the solution of a theoretical problem is a task of practice, and is accomplished through practice, and the extent to which correct practice is the condition of a true and positive theory is shown, for example, in the case of fetishism. The sense perception of a fetishist differs from that of a Greek because his sensuous existence is different. The abstract hostility between sense and spirit is inevitable so long as the human sense, for nature, or the human meaning of nature, and consequently the natural sense of man has not been produced through man's own labor" (E. Fromm,, Marx's Concept of Man. With a Translation from Marx's Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts by T. B. Bottomore, New York 1961, pp. 148-149).

This thesis concerning the united character of human "practicality" or concerning history as the development of human practice regardless of whether, in the social division of labour, some function more as "theoreticians" and others as "manual workers" should be adopted as fundamental to analyses and explanations of history.

If the fetishism of primitive people can be explained by the low level of development of their sensuous transformation of reality which only tells us that, including this fetish consciousness, the level of their practice is low one can demonstrate the same for every other consciousness and historical being.

In the Europe of antiquity the development of crafts, navigation, warfare and other actions which mean some kind of transformation had reached a level which, in consideration of the sensuous-transformatory and theoretical-explanatory was much higher than that of the fetish conscious society. But even this level of historical practice in antiquity had its very clearly defined limits: in the whole development of productivity and technique, in social structure and organization and also in conceptions. The level of man's transformation of the world at that time and his practical experience could only result in the conception of laws, of various kinds of causality and in abstract thought which made itself the object of investigation and which evokes permanent wonder at the great intellect of antiquity. But the level of control of natural processes (which is the counterpart of trans-

formation of reality) was still low, still largely conditioned by an exterior-perceptive relationship towards the problems of reality. That is why their principles have a sense character: air, fire, water etc., atoms and molecules being also given on the basis of perception and thus conceived in the same way their social thinking is only an expression of one kind of social existence which is that of the polis, and the structure of polis and tribes have clearly defined bounds.

There is no need here to repeat the example of modern history with its development of concepts of mechanics and mechanisation. We shall only call attention here to this: that only on that historical level of the development of practice where the working class started becoming not only a conscious subject, but also the real creator of history and this meant that the development of human practice had reached a point where hired labour, that is the proletariat, was possible was the rounding off of a conception of history made possible in which the sensuous-transformative, economic-productive moment in human practice got its proper place.

As long as the main creators of history were classes or groups which were not closely bound up with production the economic moment and economic production could not essentially enter into theoretical calculations. The given consciousness of given historical being, of given historical practice had to lay emphasis mainly on what formed the existence of "higher" forms of human activity. Overestimation of ideas, of consciousness and other spiritual demiurges was the inevitable consequence of a given practical-historical existence.

Contemporary historical practice, with its very high level of transformation of reality, and with it a high level of technics and science is increasingly creating a hitherto unknown unity in our world, and with it mutual dependence, and thus also on the theoretical, and social level concepts which correspond to this level of our "sensuous existence." Concepts of substance, teleology, various other mystic and pragmatic ideas are disappearing. New conceptions of laws and objects take their place, new ideas of interpersonal relationships, of coexistence etc.

Regardless, then, of to what extent and how the historical division of labour leads one group of people more to sensuous and another more to theoretical activity a certain level of historical practice includes a certain realization of sensuous and theoretical action. And the most abstract philosophical thought basically contains in itself the complete natural-historical transformatory and creative activity of man. Man's practice, that is his own history, his work has these two main sides which are the correlatives of each other.

The opposite of practice is not therefore theory, since practice in fact includes theory. The opposite of practice is only "theory" which has no connection with practice, the simple imaginings of a limited consciousness.

In the same way, in so far as the essence of man's existence and development is practice, that is, constant, tireless, laborious, free and creative transformation of the reality in which man is moored the verification of man's hypotheses cannot be anything else than that practice, that work, that human life which is an endless confrontation of his thoughts and actions, a unity of the sensuous and the theoretical activity.

Wherever we have creativity, free production we have practice. If theory were unilaterally determined by sensuous action and reduced to being simply a reflection then man would not be a free, creative being, a being of practice. For practice involves the directive moment, foresight, projecting, planning, control etc. Just because theoretical thinking is both a creation and a material and sensuous transformation of things we find in it only the

other side of the unified practice of man.

It is here that we have the most profound definition of consciousness as conscious being. Consciousness is the moment of man's sensuous transformation of the world, and that transformation is only made possible by consciousness. One proceeds from the other, one conditions the other. That is why the level of human practice basically corresponds to the level of his given historical consciousness and vice versa. That is why essentially historical consciousness, the consciousness of definite historical generations, can never be in advance of their existence, their historical being. The consciousness of each generation is the consciousness of its historical being, for if this were not so historical practice would be impossible. A certain contradiction, disagreement etc. between historical consciousness and sensuous existence may and must always occur in given epochs. This is for the simple reason that man will never be content with his existence, that the development of new forces (material and spiritual) gives rise to new views, desires, and efforts. But this cannot lead to complete discrepancy, for if it did it would mean the dissolution of man's practice itself. In such a situation there would be no perspective, no way out. Up to now there have only been isolated examples of this historically it is unimaginable.

If we have seen that man's generic life is free, conscious action which is synonymous with practice, then the wholeness, the totality of man is to be found in the unity of all these moments.

In other words man is a "physical" and a "spiritual" being, and it is only the necessary, and up to a certain level, progressive historical division of labour that has led individuals or groups to one activity or the other.

SU

The fragmentation and crippling of the personality and a whole series of other consequences which result from this division of labour are well known phenomena in man's development.

The situation in which men find themselves be they tethered to a machine or absorbed in advanced specialisation means that they lose some of their important characteristics as beings of practice, width, versatility, theoretical powers, and also some of their sensitivity in a multifaceted relationship not only towards history but towards other men.

Such fragmentation of personality has always been, and always will be the best instrument for various inhuman deeds in the interests of various situations which are to be forced on man.

That is why today, along with the essential task of transforming human practice as it has been up to now, the practice of class domination and of domination over man in general priority must simultaneously be given to the reintegration of man as a being of practice.

Overwhelming, The Doing of Research Mårten Spångberg

Over the last ten or so years new sets of terminology has flourished within the circles of performing arts. Some of them picked up from visual art, others from various horizons between entertainment and scientific discourses. Revisiting the period of time, during which I myself has been active in the field it seems that the terminology machine used tend to updated more in respect of market strategies, including applications, public talks, reviews, presentation text etc. than through an explicit need to formulate different or alternative modes of production and representation. I should not try to escape the attraction of such strategies as I myself has been sitting on various seats in respect of our landscape and have been quick in adopting terms that I hardly knew, or know, what they actually implied. But I must confess that I have developed a certain desire to clean up in the use, not so much in respect of definitions and epistemology, however I have been a spokesperson for such, but in respect of a users positions. What I mean here, is that I believe that the terms used and in use as often, as not, tries to implement different and alternative strategies in ways that are oblique to the major strategies applied by the field and its markets. And if we in the field are not cautious with its use they might be recuperated if not obliterated by market forces. A significant example is research that was (as far as I can remember the term showed up in this shape around 1997) issued by makers mostly with good intentions. After just short to ten years of use the term seem to have lost its capacity as an alternative grounds for production, as well as its etymology from scientific use, namely to research, as a matter of coming in terms with one or other site of difficulties, and with it is particular capacity of knowledge production. Several of the terms addressed by this glossary are weak in respect of capitalist notions of production as well as due representational strategies, which makes it even more important that makers and curators use them in ways that are proper in order not to be inscribed in such modes of production and representation. It is also important that makers are conscious to what strategies lie behind the use of certain terminologies due curators and funding systems. For example the term research was first issued by makers but was quickly picked up by curators and presenters. Why? I can see two main reasons, 1. when the markets economy and audience were failing in the mid 90s it was important to issue new arguments to gain public support. One of them was to address the importance of research in order not to have to have a large-scale audience, or said in a less direct way, it was a means of deviating away from a spectacularisation of the fields representations proper. 2. Continuing on the notion of spectacularisation, it could also be seen as a way for market forces to localize and fasten productions that were, either dangerous due its critical potentiality, or in order to maintain a certain kind of productions within a particular size of economies of circulation, distribution and language, in respect of support, infrastructure, logistics, visibility and mediation. In short, by issuing a research framework in e.g. a festival it implied to announce certain productions as something that a regular public should not see, but that they were for a 'special' kind of audience made up by connoisseurs. Hence to issue a research program as part of e.g. a festival was a means to maintain for the large scale audience an entertainment based program and at the same time satisfying the critical implementations of the makers and doers in the field. On the other side what kind of ambitions was it that the fields makers and doers needed to satisfy when baptizing their proposals research. Most of them were probably relevant but several were indeed addressed as research not only due the fashion but also through an ignorant use, due that one were incapable of creating works that were so to say finished, or in other cases, due that makers and doers where incapable of producing a coherent method of work. However, at the end of the day, are we actually capable of addressing an artistic work without some sort of research procedure? Isn't it a contradiction in terms to think that one is not researching, or in some or other way experimenting when going to work, in the studio, in the study or other places. It is my belief that research economies normally are weaker than economies of production and it is therefore important to be cautious with how the small economies for research are being used. It would be a shame if they at some point would be consider as similar to economies of production due a misuse of them, in respect of e.g. a use which is understood as simple preparation for a conventional production. I will not here address the dangerous fields of what the terminologies in this glossary implies in respect of representation. Isn't it so that e.g. research lately also has developed into more orless a style, with proposals for light, style of performance, set and/or kind of dramaturgy (normally flat and fragmented)? If so this can only be of negative values for the field in its entirety.

Laboratory

Even more peculiar is how performing arts have used the term, or label laboratory. It occurs that the field has mixed the term up, considering it something more than a site, or confinement, where certain systematic, or not, activities can be executed. It seems that performing arts regard laboratory, or in the worst of cases 'lab', as being a per definition creative environment in which inventions take place. I don't want to be general about what laboratory can impose, but it is factual that its very condition is to be a neutral site that does not intervene in, or preferably alters specific and sensitive experimentations to a minimum extent. It is only in our fantasy that innovators spend day and night in the laboratory, and it is indeed naïve to assume a laboratory, in any discipline and any part of the world, to be hold any innocence. In fact I believe that the notion of laboratory in performing arts most of all is influenced by popular culture. A research and laboratory concept derived from Jules Verne coupled with Merry Shelley, mixed with black and white movies where the genius change the world, or engage in alchemic or life giving success stories that of course end up in hell. This is of certainly an as good as any other image and construction of a laboratory, but what our field should keep in mind is what laboratory propose or do in respect of the field. What is the lack that needs to be fulfilled by laboratory, and what is this lack nourished by? Is it possibly so that such romantic notions of laboratory in fact obtain the opposite of its intention, which, I assume, to be a deterritorialisation of the field in order for a more progressive future? I believe that laboratory, as used in performing arts, to a large extent is a means of recreating an artist genius, but formulated external to artistic production which long ago shook the sticky clown 'The Genius' of its back through modernism, as well as giving priority to intuitive processes in which the methodology favored is one which end up with the researchers hair standing straight up, being completely black in the face, with a disorientated smile of methodological ignorance shining form within the soot. The critical voices of certain groups within the performing arts environment that laboratory and research emphasize is in other words, correct if the concept of research and laboratory used would coincide with proper definitions due an academic or scientific agenda, but as this is not the situation the same terminology is in fact promoting intuitive processes which methodologies often is mediated as obscure or even as something which would lose its magic if articulated, when in fact any standard definition would emphasize that it is not a site with a priority for research and experimentation, but that the aim is to provide fast and reliable results. Recapitulating the exhibition 'Laboratorium' curated by Hans Ulrich Obrist and Barbara Vanderlinden, it is imperative to note that it was not an attempt to forefront research and experimentation, however neither to provide fast reliable and fast result, but to provide a specific framework within the field of visual art that negotiated the work of art as process, as knowledge production, conversation or dialogue. The exhibition was not a site for experimentation; it was a site of presentations of processes that rigorously applied laboratorial strategies. It is indeed remarkable how performing arts over ten last years has nourished research and laboratory, close to, unconditionally, when in other art-forms similar attempt has had no, or little, significance. Whether this is an ignorance in respect of modes or production from other art-forms, or an evidence for how performing arts again has been trapped by capitalist strategies, as a vain attempt to reinvent the body as a site of experimentation or even worse provocation, is not to be unfolded here, but it is evident that performance through the ontological discussions issued in the early 90s due gender, ethnicity, sexuality etc. has been kept as a mascot of some pretty conventional narratives.

SS

Collaboration/Collectivity

In respect of this it is also important to properly negotiate for example the differentiation between more or less conventional management models and terms such as collaboration and/or collective/collectivity. It seems to me to be a bad omen when simple teamwork and collaboration is intermixed and confused. It is my belief that collaboration and collective/collectivity needs to be the topography of a work or works to qualify as relevant, in front of groups and constellations that announce their method as collaborative. As far as I know even the most demonic director or choreographer is in some or other way collaborating. A conductor in front of a symphonic orchestra is still inscribed in a collaboration, moreover one with very specific features. If a group or constellation wish to address collaboration as an important feature of its work or its being some kind of community, it is at least in its place to know and to be able to articulate what specific features a collaboration or collective want to emphasize. If what one wants is to push the importance to work together, that the result can become different or that it deviates models of authorship, it is my belief that one should stop talking immediately as I hardly can imagine any work situation that is not constructed due these or similar issues, understood as positive or negative. There seems to be a political paradox inscribed in any collaboration or collective that does not pose its very existence as the work, and its socio-political nexus. Isn't politics motored by these very operations between equality and liberty, and thus become the only realm necessarily to invest in respect of intra- and extra-structural notions of domination? It is further interesting to note that within the field of performing arts the production of collaborations and collectives is generated in respect of processes and appearance through strong spatio temporal coordinations, i.e. collaboration and collectivity is hardly ever addressed under any other circumstances than superficial deviations of authorship, through which the instigator, the delegating unit, receive an even stronger position, not far from the co-ownership raised by e.g. consultant companies in the 90s, which without further difficulties could be reduced to a redistribution of loyalty from the community of workers to the community of owners.

Form process to ownership

As much as collaboration doesn't start in the studio and ends in the dressing room. Nor does process have any particular relation to site or duration. Three decades later performing arts has returned to process; quoting, doubling, honoring and deviating through a complete mismatching heroes of the neo avant-garde, recycling aesthetics to make collaboration etc. recognizable, resurrecting ideology in an easy way in order to disguise the fact that we have nothing to voice, but it seems less in a manner of emphasizing heterogeneity as clumsy means of escaping malign capitalism + la late 90s. Isn't it just magic that collaboration and process goes rocket to the sky in the moment performing arts buys itself a mobile phone, or as soon as soon as performance constellations got themselves an e-mail addresses starting info? What artistic work is not issued through one or other process? Hardcore conceptual work, yes. But that is something that we haven't seen in performing arts since the late 60s, considering that a conceptual work, at least as inscribed in art history, is protocol based and can therefore, on a display level, not involve any process, or collection of experience due the works representation. Hence, it is not enough to speak about process but it necessarily has to be conceptualized, or preferably speak its conceptualization in its representation. Never mind any interdisciplinary attempts which often sound great on the level of application but seldom offer any further production of ideology or knowledge in its presentation. With both process and interdisciplinarity it awkward to realize that its manifestation, as with collaboration, seems to have been formalized to include only a process just prior to a finished product, but is rarely considered to include any other frame of time or space. What process-orientated work in performing arts needs to look further into are matters of ownership. To what extent, and in respect of what mechanisms are, or are not, also processes owned by somebody, or some entity? An activity, whatever process is involved, necessarily will be represented by or through somebody, or some entity, and it is therefore important to address, not what process is implied, but what differentiation of ownership a given process provokes, due what market or environment. It has become common that e.g. performers are inscribed in credit lists as co-creators but it is rarely common to consider what it would imply to issues matters of co-ownership. Even though I risk becoming tedious I still want to raise these questions on responsibility that necessarily occur in respect of process and production. It is not evident that co-authorship implies a wider range of transparency, nor into legacy of a work, not in respect of laterality of procedure. On the contrary it seems that co-authorship decreases opportunities of resistance, doubt or failure due that each individual, or institution, involved run the risk of losing its face, a feature that democracy necessarily carries with it. Its regime of cowardice is exponential to any legitimized consensus. In fact, the process-orientated work that has flourished in performing arts over the last ten years has been an important factor relating to the currently conservative climate. Is it perhaps so that an autonomous author instead could venture into a greater degree of radicality due that a collaborator is familiar with exactly what responsibility is issued? Something that must, at least for the capacity for critique be true. The entire range of collaboration, process, co-production, co-authorship etc. is performing arts own opportunistic response to a society of control. What is then the solution? I believe, to use an extensive amount of terminology and to change its meaning continuously, as a means of deterritorialisation and in order to create further recognition to any user that an assembly of terminology not only establishes markets, but also is an important instigator of history and historicity. A discourse indeed has, or issues, the terminology it deserves, and as seen in Gilles Deleuze two books on cinema, any assembly of terminology is also what produces paradigm and territory. But this is not enough. It is important to observe and inquire what terminology can be of use, which etymology can not be derived from academic or scientific backgrounds. Can performing arts instead conceptualize terminology from pop culture, everyday language, sports, cooking or management in order to produce autonomy, something which certainly has produced resistance because an appropriated use naturally is a means of establishing e.g. dance as an art-form proper. This is the trap in which Doris Humphrey had to step into with her *The Art of Making Dances*, or in its form almost classical treatise, and is it not precisely here that Yvonne Rainer's *No Manifesto* is most valuable, and provocative, namely as a matter of defining dance, choreography, or performing arts, as radically different to any conventional aggregate of commodification? This is certainly not a matter of diminishing or questioning the role or capacity of though, theory, academic procedures or any abstract models available, through e.g. esoteric parallax, commercial value, availability or didactic purposes, neither to favor properties of any foreign assemblages, but simply a matter of destabilizing circulations of language within the field of performing arts in order to not exclude any utterance or production. The intensity with which academic practices has been invaded by performativity over the last ten years has brought with it an increase of theoretical-academic surplus also into the practical and productive field. The increase of terminology with an etymology in these mentioned discourses is evident, and however positive their influence have been, they are productive precisely because they are specific and territorial. With the recent depression of performativity and its thinkers, it is clear that academic discourses will leave the field, and especially its practical applications, as soon as it possibly can. Following canonical theories of research the likely hood that performance studies will sustain its position in the academic marketplace. At that moment it will be important for the field to not end up in the cold due assemblages of terminology that are not compatible with other productive fields. I therefore my conviction that the production and establishment of terminology have to evacuate the fatherly control of certain academic, and especially systems promoting master/disciple relations. Instead each participant and constellation in the field need, 1. To identify the limits; what is the realm that an assemblage of terminology can, should or need to configure, change or otherwise shift? 2. What possible external demands can be identified; in respect of what interests are the understood limits viable. With these two conditions in mind create a third; to establish a *dynamique d'enfer*, a dynamic from hell so complex that all interconnections, mutual dependencies, the proliferation of interfaces, the superimposition of users and providers all together form a group of capacities, shackled together by mutual obligations, exacerbated by the very complexity offered by the concept unwittingly. It is today instead opinions, but also other participants in order to create a shared criticality through which can be produced not multiplicity, but a multitude. Performing arts

today need to create terminology, which differentiates its participants instead of, brings them together all in order to necessitate a livelier discussion on all levels. It is first through a shared interest in accuracy of use of terminology that the field for instance can initiate discussion on curatorial practices and economical circumstances. Flexibility and mobility must be conceptualized, precisely as a means to not be positioned due a given. The Performing arts have to understand what a critical position is, and has to announce itself as mobile, but not in respect of the market but in respect of other and different coherences. As long as performing arts associate with, and refer to, existing assemblages of terminology, however general, performing arts will never be given a voice, i.e., will not be accounted for. To produce a voice it is, of course, not enough to appropriate another voice, but it is first when an autonomous site can be established that a voice can be established, when something that does not exist can be given a name. Only something with a name can have a voice, and it is in this act of naming that speech can pass from one period, or age, to another, and this is not a matter of a uprising that can be put down; it is a question of some kind of progressive revelation that can be recognized by its own signs and against which there is no point in fighting.

Yet within this work, we participants of the field, are subject to a responsibility which is extremely complex to handle in its multiplicity of directionality, which operability is to expand the conclusive concept of performing arts in order to give a multitude of processes, productions and products, discourses and intuitions, amateurs and professionals, collaboration and collectives the opportunity to create performing arts so far unthinkable.

II

The complexity of the establishment of research and related discourses into the field of performing arts has taken the course of an avalanche. From the product and image intensive period of the 1980s, following a period of politically orientated work, the 1990s and early 2000s will most probably be remembered as the era of research. Overnight, research was established around 1997 and already consolidated with the now legendary exhibition "Laboratorium" in 1999, which also included a small number of contributions from the performing arts. The reasons for this development would need a thorough analysis addressing the phenomena also from perspectives of economy, ownership and social/political justification, as it is my belief that the actual interest in the community of makers and programmers was and is rather exaggerated. It is fascinating to return to the mid-late 1990s and experience how dancers, choreographers, set designers and even the production manager in a microsecond grew an obsessive passion for research. Artists who had never shown interest in process orientated investigatory strategies transformed into first-rate researchers and with production phases of more or less a year the laboratorial rat had found its place in the performing arts. With the introduction of the r-word, a truckload of firmly established terminology exited the stage. Somebody defining his work as experimental was looked upon as the plague, and even only a vague hint towards avant-garde equalled immediate banishment from the entrescene. As much as research caught performing arts with the intensity of a hurricane, it was and is also far too often superficial in content and consistency. The lack of frames made whatever one called research into research. The difficulty however is to what extent this is a positive or negative quality? Any field of research carries out the research it deserves, and it is always necessary with a super-contextual shift to manifest a change in a field of research. Epistemologists have examined how paradigms emerge, consolidate and dissolve as regularly as the sun rises, but since we know this we must conclude that, e.g., performing arts executes the research it desires. But it is also possible that what performing arts consider research in fact is something entirely different, something that will become apparent within the next few years when the flood of research turns tide and another current is building up. To initiate a crusade against the inconsistency of research in the field would therefore be to shoot one's own leg, independently of the ambitions of the field. The engaged believes in research and will continue to do so until he doesn't believe anymore, and at that moment it will seem as impossible to have believed, as it is natural today. A critique configured in this manner would inevitably position itself outside the field, which would propose a new or other fundament, or institution, which in its turn would need a thorough investigation. Addressing the field through negotiations vis-à-vis governmentality however could offer interesting observations about what research, so to say, has done, or produced in respect of the performing arts. Before starting, a brief detour into the state of the belief in research. Ten years after I first heard the word in the performing arts context, it is clear that the believers are already doubting, if for no other reason than the very fact that research today is as trendy as Dixieland jazz or t-shirts manufactured in sweatshops. What once was a close to hysterical migration into has over the last couple of years turned into a slow but unstoppable stream of defectors returning to more classical templates of production. Moreover, the belief structure has changed; it is no longer the creators or programmers that praise research, but rather a mixed group of theoreticians, who in addition are late converts who have moved in rather than initiated the field's topology. The high-end ambitions of research platforms have too often, in accord with academic writing on the development of a field of research, turned into a retreat for individuals that either can't reach or are prohibited a position in a conventional frame of production, or are considered a threat to a common frame of production. The orientation of research in performing arts initiated an expansion through a series of politically correct tactics that emphasised inter-disciplinarity and culturalism, quite in the same way as performance studies, and it didn't take long before research was hijacked by enthusiasts with the only mission to find themselves a place to belong to. The third step in the development of research in performing arts, after establishment and expansion, implies redefining the field and rehabilitating its symbolic value. This process is inevitably painful as it implies exclusion and closing doors; but it is necessary in order to define, not only a territory, but most of all topological and methodological consistency. What research in this sense has done to the field of performing arts is in fact not an auxiliary elaboration of its intra- or inter-relationships, but has rather undermined its status and exclusivity in general. The field's resistance and even aversion against methodology is strong evidence to the state of research being considerably weak, similar to the phenomenon that anti-intellectualism normally indicates stasis or the decline of a field. Research in performing arts has yet to establish an accurate set of tools and a thorough methodological protocol in order not to perish in the climate of late capitalist research production. Tools and protocols that cannot be appropriated from other fields but neither can be autonomously produced from within the field, as both would result in a corrupt discipline due to personal, relational, economical and image reasons. Tools and methodology should be created in consensus with well-established ethical checkpoints combined with a thorough analysis of the field's specific conditions, in this case, e.g., notions of temporality and the impossibility of, or not, repetition. The common consideration is that methodology is an obstacle to creative and artistic potentiality, or with another wording: freedom. But if that is the argumentation, we have made a fundamental mistake in making artistic work or processes synonymous with research, when in fact those protocols are oppositional, and in so being to no extent competitive. It is urgent that the field make distinctions between engaging in artistic processes and research, hence a thorough apparatus of definition also would clear up any hierarchical misunderstandings. There is no higher or lower value in engagement in research processes; it is simply another practice whose aim is to produce other kinds of knowledge and artifacts. Without methodological accuracy and consistency, it is impossible to evaluate the quality and importance of a certain work and keep processing outside the domains of taste and individual desire, which in the case of research implies that its knowledge economy remains passive and consolidating instead of active and potential. Instead of producing restriction, a thorough methodological framework would enable the field to validate work for what it is, and moreover produce a platform for an active criticality that would grant a critical reciprocity between providers of research platforms, economical frames and researchers, creators and users of research results. It is important, too, that methodology under no circumstances here is related to science or academia but simply is a set tool and protocols that offers opportunities to identify, compare and differentiate a territory of research and hence produce autonomy based on production rather than heritage or charisma.

The lack of accurate methodological protocols manifests power in the provider of research and platforms to the extent where research, instead of expanding and emancipating the field's knowledge production, consolidates it and furthermore places an

unacceptable emphasis on success, especially in respect of representation and efficiency. Only through the establishment of an accurate methodological frame can research free itself from the superficial demands of capitalist economy. What research has produced relative to the field up until today, instead of a surplus and hence a lateralisation of knowledge, is a hierarchisation of processes and practices that in a larger perspective homogenises the momentum of the field's endeavours. At the time when research first appeared, it was due to a need to change the strong product orientation of the market and its subsidy systems. Questions were asked to what extent, e.g., a choreographer could, so to say, update his or her practice when there were no economical or physical frames for other kinds of work than production. Only in rare educational frames could research activity be considered, and a dominant part of workshop opportunities were at that time directed towards the passing on of established skills such as release technique, or a choreographer's individual perspective into dance and performance. Research related activity at that moment appeared as a means to shortcut those manifestations especially in relation to result and representation. A number of projects and processes were initiated by individuals or small communities on an often idealistic basis, but with the institutionalisation of research in performing arts an opposing momentum occurred. Everybody engaged in research practices at that time was of course enthusiastic to all expansive opportunities that appeared, as the formulation of a field is precisely when and where active and vivid knowledge production is most potential. The field's territory also stakes out a grid for what kind of research and activity it can muster, but as the distance between creators and managers is distinct in the field of performing arts, this development was rather soon appropriated by venues and festivals and taken out of the hands of the researchers. Instead of releasing performing art practices, the introduction of institutional research frames resulted in further consolidation, and today it is clear that rather than an emancipating movement, research has institutionalised the practice even more. When an autonomous artist in the performing arts field today receives a research grant, he or she actually is not at all free to engage in an open process but is instead inscribed to the extent where individual creativity is being institutionalised. Prior to the institutionalisation of research every individual was free to engage in whatever process of thinking, practicing and experimenting, whilst today those activities have also been mapped and applied to a, however vague, protocol of authorisation. In this respect what research has done to the field of performing arts is not to emancipate it from the circulation of exchangeable commodities, but has instead also commodified work, understood as engagement in some kind of research process. Research was implemented in a mode of production due to proprietary licensing which stratified its discourses and immobilised its capacity of any deterritorialising radical knowledge production. It is telling to return briefly to the recent history of performing arts in Europe. The circulation of what is conventionally called contemporary dance, performance and theatre takes place in institutions and venues that, at least as a model, were established around and just after 1980. At that time, a young generation of artists and managers detected and worked for a new system for presentations of a new kind of work. For a period of 10 to 15 years, these venues were established and consolidated as sustainable economies. Systems of exchange, networking and production were elaborated, and often quite clear hierarchies of circulation grew strong, something which a 'general' audience reacted to and favored in respect of expectations and reliability. When research appeared in the mid-1990s, it could generally be understood as a counter-reaction to known of frames, initially as a creator- and doer-based initiative. A heterogeneous group of independent new players appeared on the market with new needs and desires, players that to a higher or lesser degree did not wish to be inscribed in the established market or simply were not welcome. Process orientation, research and a kind of ad hoc production basis appeared to be an attractive mode of production, but with the incorporation of the mentioned modes of work in venues and festivals modeled in the 1980s, research instantaneously turned into precisely the opposite. Instead of opening for a new platform of circulation and ownership, research-based work became inscribed as a means of maintaining the power of established venues, festivals, companies and makers. A choreographer or group identified with research was instead of being a potential, and I would argue, positive threat, or opportunity disarmed and classified in a way where it could never grow out of the, so to speak, small format. There certainly are exceptions but it is easy to detect what kind of artists is identified with research and it certainly aren't those who are engaged in larger institutional frames, even though these are perhaps the ones that most of all could need a break from the obsession of production. What research has done to the field of performing arts is not to open for the elaboration of new and alternative modes of production, of new and alternative kinds of work. It has actually made it largely impossible for young and progressive initiatives to elaborate and obtain sustainable economies and audiences. In other word, research has been incorporated in 'conventional' models of the performing arts field in order to maintain the hierarchies created already in the 1980s. This consolidation of power has increased the identity of the artist over a romantic set of protocols purporting individuality, oeuvre and calling on the one hand, and precariousness on the other. The unique opportunity and complexity of performing arts that the expressed and the expressing often, if not as a rule, coincide, offers a minimal distance between invention and expression. The choreographer dancing has always been a hands-on researcher, or in other words, his/her own guinea pig, his own frame of experience and sensation. Such relations, implementing their own, individual and common-sense methodologies which to the same extent intensify regressive strands, which enter realms of execution for the simple sake of pleasure or economical winning and inventive capacities that, often using intuition as methodology, encourage differentiation in the field. A strong example is Alexander technique, but these inventive practices more often take place in informal settings over years of hard work, and rarely in unorthodox circumstances. With the introduction of research, the relation between creator and executor has changed where the formal awareness of the process has been institutionalised. Research has, spoken with a light hand, made it difficult simply to go and dance, to use one's imagination and make it happen. Research proposes certain hierarchies of process and production, individual and group processes and work, and most of all formalises relations between the validity of a process and work-relative sets of discourses active in the contexts at a certain moment. With the introduction of research, performing arts has not been offered enlarged opportunities for inefficiency or processes dealing with extreme topics; on the contrary what research has done to the performing arts is to make it trend- (who today would make an image-based work with an extremely elaborated light design?), format- (collaboration is everything and a pseudo-lateral working process imperative), discourse- (bring some books without pictures like S, M, L, XL to the studio and work as you always did), media- (show a video at the end of the piece where you are instructed in doing something you can't really manage and speak about knowledge production on a personal level) sensitive, and hence has homogenised its expressions. This litany could go on forever engaging in what we thought was doing well but turned out to be doing exactly the opposite. But has research then only been negative to performing arts? Certainly not. On the contrary, the expansion of the field of performing arts with the realm of research has been imperative for the field's survival and as performance and performativity in the 1990s became a buzzword for any intellectual with dignity, it is rather encouraging how open the field has been to the engagement of, and in, other kinds of knowledge production.

In fact, initially there are only two issues that need to be raised in respect of how to change a possibly negative development. But there is of course a slight problem with those two which is that they both demand the format of a PhD to be thoroughly discussed. What follows here is in a sense comprehensive but tries to formulate, in brief, some perspectives.

1. What adjustments are necessary to approach after ten years of working under the criteria of research?
2. With the institutionalisation of research, what has occurred in respect of distribution of responsibility?

It is today ten years ago since Hotmail was globally released. In 2006, Hotmail has approximately one billion hits a month. It is also ten years since SMS appeared in conventional private-user mobile phones. The world-wide volume of SMS was in 2005 estimated to be more than three hundred billion messages. Amazon and Ebay similarly were created in 1995. Google was released in September 1999 from a garage in Palo Alto. In the Spring of 2006, Google CEO's mention 150 million queries per day, or more than 50 billion per year. Skype was registered as a domain name exactly three years ago, on April 23, 2003. At this very moment there are 5.5 million users on line, out of more than a 100 million downloads.

Considering that research in the performing arts has the same ten years long history, and that Skype was invented two-thirds into that brief history, it is quite easy to conclude that adjustments might be small in perspective but enormous in proliferation. There is of course the danger of rushing to the next base while forgetting the kids in the shopping mall, but new modes of communication and production do not imply a homogenisation of results nor an arrogant relation to the history of research; but there certainly are no reasons to evaluate research that jump over classical resources as less prominent. On the contrary, if research in the performing arts nourishes a desire to be something more than a tiny field for the already engaged, it is obvious that all opportunities must be explored. Generally speaking, the field can choose to confirm research as it is established in and through strong and historically prominent fields, or bring forth the specificity of the field and explore it as something that other fields could gain momentum from. Good examples are Doris Humphrey's book "The Art of Making Dances" that largely is a defense of dance in regard of the classical treatise producing an expression as specific due to its universality, and on the other hand Yvonne Rainer's No-manifesto and adjoining texts, where instead the art of making dances dissociates itself from expressions constituting sustainable artifacts. Humphrey is easy to cancel out and to be asked to get a grip on and start painting or writing poetry, as she also necessarily confirms classical, male representational orders. Yvonne Rainer instead differentiates and potentialises dance in respect of all other expressions, and in this act, at least announces that dance and performance only can be "inscribed" in representational orders we are familiar with, but, precisely in this "forced" translation produces itself as ontologically critical. The setup of research in performing arts is based on modes of distribution and circulation that today are largely outdated. Ten years ago is basically closer to J.S. Bach walking to Lübeck to listen to Buxtehude in 1705 than to the ease with which we move over Europe today. So why is it still important to work on research on the basis of discussion, exchange and same-room-organisation, when time and economy allow us to meet in the sushi bar of the Ryan air terminal somewhere? And that's only for those of us who don't communicate over digital platforms or group chats. The communicational tools that the field utilises naturally influence the result of its endeavours, and it is precisely in producing distance between, e.g., new communicational tools and the position of the body and movement that conventional dialectics are maintained and further consolidated. If the body and its movement are in one or another way fundamental to human life and consciousness, it is not likely that Skype, PDF or P2P (peer-to-peer networks) will affect it any more than central perspective, combustion engines or moving images, but on the contrary could offer the potentiality to understand and utilise the body and its movements in new and alternative ways. These are certainly issues that directly concern research in the field; also this publication which I hope will be available on the net to download for free, so that interested persons who have different opportunities of accessibility can take part of our research and thinking.

Is it a good or a bad sign that there are almost no video clips of contemporary dance and performance work available on the internet, when on the other end of the line it is obligatory to send videos to venues and festivals? It is surprising that however the performing arts has been engaged in collaboration, collectivity, processes of orientation and research, that material is not made available on the Internet, as it is a platform that would increase, e.g., the possibilities for visibility in a decentralised way, give individuals and groups living and functioning outside urban contexts the opportunity to familiarise with contemporary dance, and open the quite homogeneous formats especially of dance performances. And most of all, give a larger group of researchers access to material produced here and now: not only performances, but interviews, lectures, presentations, rehearsals which would not only be extremely vital for the scene, but furthermore would increase mobility and a decentralised, lateralised, user-innovative climate. As Erik von Hippel has shown in his recent "Democratizing Innovation" (Cambridge, 2005) economies that stimulate user innovation obtain significantly enhanced heterogeneity and versatility in product development. It is not as often believed that users are keen on keeping their innovations to themselves but an allowing climate where sharing is stimulated instead creates responsibility for the situation's or product's quality, status and place on its market. Open source like licensing increases a client's identification with a product; responsibility increases and abuse decreases. When Ebay experienced a need for prohibition due to abuse of the platform the company, instead of creating complex sets of legislation turned to the community of users that subsequently innovated self-regulatory monitoring systems. The common mode of engaging in research in performing arts is behind a closed door and without an attached web page, live streaming, wiki or blog. Why does research in performing arts that wishes to place itself inside the contemporary urban mosaic desire to be closed off, locked away instead of in the middle where it happens and where today's movement practices are communicated and produced?

The body always moves. Blood pumps through the veins, stimuli flow into the brain and responses shoot back to keep whatever is going on, going on. At some moment, quite often, the body starts moving through space, or its spatio-temporal co-ordination changes. Sometimes we recognise these changes as dance, at other times as walking or being hit by a car. Still, these movements are recognisable precisely as movements framed by a context which is continuous. Is the body actually moving, or does it remain immobile? Its domain has been enlarged but it is still under control. With a glance back into the 20th century we might find that the body perhaps only moved a handful of times. That it passed out of co-ordination without anybody noticing, and moved into the light, into the recognisable again with for those who were willing to see and sense an enormous power, and on second thought had always been there, always already. Only when expanding or exterritorialising itself and its conditioning has the body really moved. It is not the exterritorialisation that is the movement but the reterritorialisation, recoordination or recoding. One could say that the body moves without traces, imperceptibly, and that movement is representation catching up. Those movements that are moments, however always on the move, are the rare instances when the body is truly mobile. Research functions in quite the same way: intrinsically it is always moving, or better yet is remixed and re-recorded. Sometimes, it is set in motion, shifting its co-ordination, but it is still a matter of repetition, or better seriality. The known moves, but how often is it that the unknown moves into the known? Always however imperceptibly. It is only in those instances when the known catches up that the unknown appears. Those moments are the rare cases when research is truly mobile.

Space is striated. Its continuity is dividable, and its parts are consistent. It is this consistency that provides us with the opportunity for orientation in time and space. The striation of space, literally and metaphorically, produces a sensation of security but when enhanced turns into some or other kind of prison. In an early film by George Lucas, THX 1138 (1971), a futuristic world is shown in which the humans are inscribed in an absolute control society. Their lives and environments have been turned into an inescapable striation. A small number of individuals however rebel against the situation and are imprisoned; but instead of putting the prisoner behind steel bars, George Lucas offers a brilliant solution: the prison is represented as an endless absolutely white space, without beginning or end. Space has become smooth, without horizon and therefore deprived of co-ordination or orientation. Simplified, one could say that striated space equals knowledge or reproduction and that smooth space constitutes the unknown, i.e., territorial and exterritorialised, respectively. In the extremes of both versions, one is imprisoned. Brian Massumi developed the concept of phaspace, which is a space composed by incompatible entities. It is discontinuous but undivided, i.e., it consists of incompatible superimposed phenomena that offer an orientation, however unreliable. Or better yet, a multiplicity of becoming orientation. Phaspace is those instances of true mobility where knowledge appears and the body really moves. Translated into frames of research, striated space equals a set-up where the co-ordination between research and institution or production is static and immobile. Smooth space, on the other hand, could be identified as a situation where the division between researcher and institution or production has been completely abandoned. What the two set-ups have in common is that neither research nor the body can move. On an abstract level, a research set-up aiming to make knowledge move is one that offers itself as phaspace. Such research frames thus are those where the engaged is continuously shifting from being a researcher and representing an institution or product, a receiver and producer, a staff member and guest. Where a multiplicity of orientation is possible as long as the engaged

is willing to negotiate the validity and ontology of each and every decision and its process of emergence, i.e., according to what mode of production a decision can be taken. Therefore, the question is not if we need positions such as researcher and institution or product, but how it is possible to produce a frame in which engagement in any position is the result of a particular negotiation.

Needless to say, the downside of a phasespaced research platform is one of sustainability and initiative, but on the other hand, the upside is the opportunity for a radical heterogenisation of knowledge, ability and desire. Is it possible to rethink research not in the sense of what it needs but, on the contrary, through what it doesn't need? What are the fundamental needs of research in performing arts? Secured needs and allocated resources inevitably produce striation and decrease the opportunity for the mobility of knowledge and its agents. Research in performing arts is not in need of further stability, grants, institutions, structures and labs, but of mobility and versatility. It is in the cracks between the implicit striation of methodology and epistemological accuracy, and the smooth terrain of radical mobility that research can intensify prosperity in the field. How does research in performing arts identify its user? Does the field itself actually need users, and if so, how can it be its own client without becoming a self-indulgent territory which produces closer and closer family relations? Since there are very few traces in respect of publications, video material and ongoing discussions (I have, e.g., not found any blogs related to the field) it is not evident whether the field wants to have users at all. It is not easy in this field to detect the user but thorough methodological consistency will certainly give the opportunity to clarify who he or she can be, which when the basis of research is individual and, in a negative sense, project-to-project based, will be far more complex, and it will therefore be difficult and energy intensive to create a community of interest. If the field identifies the user as already initiated and active in the field, the current climate is quite effective and productive in the sense of creating a clan-like circle, or better a small number of competing circles whose opposition is based on negative critique and exclusion which in the long run only can create a vicious circle. If research projects would be evaluated not only due to the topic but perhaps also due to what presentation format in respect of which user group, it would be possible to measure the success of a research project from a multiplicity of perspectives. In contrast to how today it often is connected with how "cool" the topic is estimated to be, and how inspiring, i.e., successful and understandable the presentation of the project is with regard to a general user who is always supposed to be satisfied within ninety minutes. Such an approach could also open opportunities for complex and mature research into a wider field of performing arts practices, such as work related to children, reception, learning processes or disability, and for more conventional approaches it would similarly expand the capacities to relate to larger frames than what has been made popular by other fields of research in relation to different performatives such as gender, colonialism or identity politics.

In the initial phase when research in the performing arts was first established, it was important to make many and different individuals participate. Research, as we have seen earlier, needed to grow as a field and it soon became connected to participatory activities especially in relation to inter-disciplinary and cultural practices. But however much somebody participates it implies that one leave one position and engage in another. When participation, when the research period was over in our field normally spanning from a couple up to 2030 days but very rarely longer, it was easy to change the costume and forget about research. It is not the activity of researching that is important but how processes activate individuals, and how many. An example from history could be Dr. Ignaz Semmelweis, who in 1847 through empirical research found out that it was a good idea to wash one's hands after handling dead bodies. The factors were many but Semmelweis, even though he managed to convince other doctors to participate in his experiments, did not manage to activate in them the results of his research. Consequently, Semmelweis' research was forgotten and he died in a mental hospital at the age of 47. In the same year, Joseph Lister started a series of related experiments, and it was through his research that medics were first activated to start disinfecting hands and instruments when passing from department to department. This anecdote brought together with the communication technology we today can use easily and at a cheap price, can perhaps assist research in performing arts instead of working on participation to emphasise how its research is distributed, circulated, and to activate individuals and groups to be involved and use research results in their daily practices.

In order to activate a larger group of users and doers, it is also important to look further into how research results are being licensed, something which is complex in our field as most creators earn their living by transforming their research into circulating products. However, it is clear that proprietary interests often, on a long-term basis, tend to create much less feedback and innovation, as well as responsibility. Open-source-like licensing instead tends to increase responsibility and grass-root initiatives.

Internet publishing, e.g., will not only create activation but also a faster and cheaper mode of publishing where material output is less stable and therefore can be rewritten and updated continuously. Furthermore, open-source-like licensing is an opportunity for not striating the field of research but can instead of how research conventionally has functioned via permanent membership, often via an oath allow for more fluctuant concepts of ad hoc association where a differentiation of expertise can lead to higher specification rather than suffer under the concessional regime of inter-disciplinary practices. I would like to mention a related issue in respect of institutional organisation connected to research. In any academic, medical or other public research it is unconditional that the head of an institution has merits in research. A professor is assessed on the basis of his/her research rather than on the basis of being a good boss, even though that isn't a bad thing. This construction places the head of an institution in a healthy paradox where the research and the infrastructure, or economical basis balance each other as the head of institution has to keep up negotiation in two directions. Corporate research, on the other hand, is naturally dependant on economic expansion, placing the researcher under the oath of efficiency. Looking into the performing arts field there exists an unclear framing in respect of leadership. It is not the current situation that directors of research platforms are themselves engaged in research or have the necessary knowledge in the field to evaluate the projects together with the research teams. In scientific research it is also common that a research project should be further evaluated by, e.g., an ethical board. The lack of such procedures can easily lead to confusion of interest and consequently to less accurate research projects. This leads over to our second question concerning responsibility. It is very easy to blame institutional frames and their inherent inefficiency, but we also know that no institution is better than its researchers and it is only when the two resonate together that the result can be innovative. In the case of research in performing arts it is my experience that researchers rely to a large degree on the capacities of institutions and platforms, and often act in passive and demanding ways. As research has no market outside itself, has no or very few engaged users, it is often understood as something doers and creators engage in between production periods. If this would be the case in, e.g., medical research, doctors would be surgeons during the week and do research in the weekends. It is clear that such a division will not win anybody a Nobel Prize, nor innovate medicine. If an executing doctor takes an interest in engaging in his work also in the weekends, this is all positive but we shall perhaps, also in our field, make a difference between being interested and proper research processes. When it come to research in performing arts, this problem is not easy to solve due to the market share for research being relatively small. But it is only if the researchers produce a demand and argumentation for its share in the budget that it can grow. It is, however, also interesting to consider that in corporate business the conventional amount of money spent on research is approximately 3.5 % of the total budget, and in high-end fields up to 78 %. Since performing arts considers itself a high-end field, it is surprising to notice how few the institutions, venues and festivals are that allocate any budget at all to research and development. It is therefore my belief that only if the researchers themselves devote time and economy to research we can experience a renaissance in quality. In short: it is today, and in the near future, time to look into what responsibility the field's creators and researchers claim. Only through a collective engagement in a consistent methodology and specific epistemology, a thorough and ongoing analysis of what research has produced in respect of the field both when it comes to its aims and its users (and due to that, elaborate proper licenses), in combination with an individual responsibility with regard to what processes we are actually engaged in that we can look forward to a research climate that will enable the field to expand and create research, as well as performances that add something radically different to our expression and the world.

Paris Hilton

 <div>Paris Whitney Hilton</div>
Born: February 17, 1981 <div> New York City, NY, USA</div>
Occupation: Actress , fashion model , singer , author
Website: ParisHilton.com

Paris Whitney Hilton (born February 17, 1981) is an American socialite, singer, actress, fashion model, and author. She is an heiress to the Hilton Hotel fortune, as well as her father, Richard Hilton's, real estate fortune. A videotape of her having sex with her boyfriend helped skyrocket her into the public eye, and that drew attention to her then-new participation in a reality series, *The Simple Life*.

Hilton is a socialite in both Manhattan and Los Angeles and she has been described as a "celebutante", a portmanteau of "celebrity" and "debutante".^[1] However, in August 2006 she launched a serious bid at a music career, with her debut pop album *Paris*.

Hilton is the oldest of four children of Richard Hilton and Kathy Richards. Her younger sister is Nicky Hilton, and her younger brothers are Barron Hilton II and Conrad Hilton II.

On the maternal side of her family, Hilton is a niece of two popular child stars of the 1970sKim Richards and Kyle Richards, who appeared in the motion picture *Escape to Witch Mountain* and TV shows such as *Nanny* and the Professor, *Little House on the Prairie*, and later, *ER*. By marriage, she also is related to Zsa Zsa Gabor (the Hungarian-born actress married Paris Hilton's great-grandfather Conrad Hilton), as well as Elizabeth Taylor (the actress's first husband was Paris Hilton's great-uncle, Conrad Nicholson Hilton Jr.).

Her paternal grandparents are hotel chairman Barron Hilton and his wife, the former Marilyn Hawley, and her paternal great-grandparents were Hilton Hotel founder Conrad Hilton and his first wife, Mary Barron. When Conrad Hilton died in 1979, he left nothing in his will to his children or other descendants. Barron Hilton contested this decision and won in 1988.

Hilton moved between several exclusive homes in her youth, including a suite in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in Manhattan, Beverly Hills, and the Hamptons. Currently, her parents own a \$30.5 million mansion in Bel Air, a \$12.3 million estate in the Hamptons, and a \$10 million house in the Hollywood Hills in which she and her sister stay to give them privacy and for easy access to clubs in Los Angeles.

She attended high school at the Dwight School in New York, but dropped out and eventually earned a GED. Hilton did not attend college.

Hilton first came into the public eye as one of the more famous New York socialites and heirs. Along with her sister, she has made countless appearances in the party section of New York society magazines.

Personal life

Hilton has been widely discussed by tabloids. In 2000, the National Enquirer reported a casual friendship with Leonardo DiCaprio as something far more intimate. She has also been linked/had flings with other celebrities, including professional skateboarder Chad Muska, filmmaker Vincent Gallo, actor Edward Furlong, boxer Oscar De La Hoya, Chicago Bears football player Brian Urlacher, singers Deryck Whibley and Backstreet Boy Nick Carter, former University of Southern California quarterback Matt Leinart, UK rap artist Joe Buckton, Australian tennis player Mark Philippoussis (whose girlfriend at the time, Australian singer/actress Delta Goodrem, had cancer), Australian Idol contestant Robert 'Millsy' Mills, oil heir Brandon Davis, fashion model Lucas Bain, New York Giants quarterback Eli Manning, NHL Montreal Canadiens goaltender Jose Theodore, English cricketer Kevin Pietersen and ex-MTV VJ Simon Rex.

Hilton was engaged to model Jason Shaw from mid-2002 to early 2003. On May 29, 2005, she announced her engagement to Paris Latsis, a Greek shipping heir. However, on October 1, 2005, Hilton announced that the five-month engagement had been called off. Soon thereafter, she began dating another Greek shipping heir, Stavros Niarchos III, but as of May 2, 2006, Hilton publicist Elliot Mintz told the press of the reported breakup.

On Monday, March 6th 2006, a court commissioner signed off on an unusual keep-away order that prevents the hotel heiress from coming within 100 yards of event planner Brian Quintana. Quintana testified last month that his relationship with Hilton turned nasty after she overheard him informing her beau, Stavros Niarchos, that she might have a sexually transmitted disease. "I wanted him to be aware of it--that she had herpes. To make sure he didn't catch anything. He informed me that he was [aware]," Quintana said. He also said Hilton interrupted his conversation with Niarchos and became "furious." She said, "This is between the three of us; if this gets out you're a fucking dead man," Quintana said. He claimed that after the exchange, he began receiving suspicious phone calls and started to believe his life was in "imminent danger." Quintana further alleged Hilton "has a drug and alcohol problem, some rather shady associates and is known for erratic behavior."

Sources: <http://www.eonline.com/News/Items/0,1,18523,00.html>
<http://nosysnoop.wordpress.com/2006/03/09/paris-hilton-has-herpes/>
http://www.courttv.com/people/2006/0207/hilton_quintana_ctv.html
http://cbs2.com/topstories/local_story_038174442.html

In an attempt to "rediscover herself", Hilton imposed a ban on sexual activity for one year. She told Regis and Kelly, "I'm doing it just because I want to. I feel I'm becoming stronger as a person. Every time I have a boyfriend, I'm just so romantic, and I'll put all my energy into the guy, and I don't really pay attention to myself. One-night stands are not for me. I think it's gross when you just give it up. Guys want you more if you don't just hand it to them on a platter. If they want you, then they will wait. You have to make them work for it. I think that's the only way you know if they really want you or just want to be able to brag that they've been with you." [1] Despite her comments of a single life, Paris was photographed kissing Brandon Davis on July 16, 2006 in West Hollywood. [2] Hilton was also photographed making out with Stavros Niarchos III in Saint-Tropez on July 30, 2006. [3] On July 31, 2006, Paris told People that she and Stavros are together again. The couple split in May after seven months of dating. "We're together now here. We love each other," Hilton says. [4]

In 2006, Hilton told HX Magazine the reasons for her split with ex-best friend Nicole Richie. She claims that she and Nicole, "grew apart because of fame." [5] On 20 April 2005, amid media reports that their friendship was in trouble, Paris Hilton released a statement saying

"It's no big secret that Nicole and I are no longer friends," and "Nicole knows what she did, and that's all I'm ever going to say about it."

On September 7, 2006 Hilton was arrested for investigation of driving under the influence, even though she claimed that she had just one margarita, and the high alcohol content in her blood was a result of having no time to eat during a long day while making a music video. Hilton was arrested shortly before 12:30 a.m. in Hollywood. "The officers observed that Hilton exhibited the symptoms of intoxication. A field sobriety test was conducted at scene, and the officers determined she was driving under the influence," Officer Isabella. Hilton's blood alcohol content was .08, California's limit. Hilton was booked on suspicion of misdemeanor DUI and released almost immediately due to the flood of photographers outside. She stated she was speeding to get food at the In-N-Out Burger restaurant.[6] Video of the arrest and subsequent departure from police custody available at [7].

Paris Hilton Statistics	
Height	1.73 m (5 ft 8 in)
Measurements	34B-25-35
Shoe size	11 (Women-U.S.)
Hair color	Blonde [8]
Nationality	American / German
Ethnicity	German / Norwegian [9]

In recent years Hilton has gained recognition by appearing in television, movies, television commercials, and modeling photographs. According to Forbes, in 20032004 she earned approximately US \$2 million for her television and movie roles, but in 20042005 her earnings from television, movies, modeling, and personal appearances have earned her an additional \$6.5 million.

Fashion model

Hilton has signed with top modeling agencies: Ford Models Management in New York, Models 1 Agency in London, Nous Model Management in Los Angeles, and Premier Model Management in London.

Hilton has walked for top fashion designers such as Philippe Treacy, Jasper Conran, Heatherette, and Julien MacDonald. She has appeared in numerous advertisements, including Iceberg, GUESS, Tommy Hilfiger, Christian Dior, [[]], and Marciano.

She has been featured in several television commercials, including a T-Mobile commercial for which she was paid \$250,000 and her Carl's Jr. commercial for which she was paid \$400,000 according to Forbes Magazine.

Actress

Film

Hilton has appeared in the short subjects QIK2JDG and L.A. Knights, as well as minor and supporting roles in the feature movies House of Wax, The Hillz, Wonderland, Raising Helen, and Nine Lives. Hilton won the 2005 Worst Supporting Actress Razzie for House of

Wax. She landed her first lead roles in 2006 with the straight-to-DVD releases National Lampoon's Pledge This! and Bottom's Up with Jason Mewes. She also appeared in cameo roles in Zoolander (2001), The Cat in the Hat (2003), and Win a Date with Tad Hamilton! (2004).

Paris also starred in the unauthorized sex video 1 Night in Paris (2004) produced by Red Light District where she received directorial credit. The film earned three AVN Awards in 2005.

Hilton also has several upcoming theatrical releases in which she is the lead role, including The Hottie and the Nottie (2008) and an untitled superhero movie involving Stan Lee.

Television

Hilton and Nicole Richie (adopted daughter of Lionel) starred in the 2003 FOX hit reality series The Simple Life, in which they lived with a family on their farm in rural Altus, Arkansas. Highlights of the show included the girls performing poorly at various jobs, making out with the local boys, and numerous instances of them shown as "fish out of water". It was followed by two more seasons on FOX: The Simple Life 2: Road Trip and The Simple Life 3: Interns, and another on E!: The Simple Life 4: 'Til Death Do Us Part. A fifth season to be aired on E! is currently in development stages. [10]

Plans for Hilton to lend her name and also star in a cartoon series which follows the animated life of herself, her sister Nicky, and her dog Tinkerbelle are in production. [11]

Hilton has also guest starred in episodes of The OC, The George Lopez Show, Las Vegas, American Dreams and Veronica Mars.

64 Hilton's voice was used in See Paris Die! a viral animation promoting House of Wax and appeared on The Late Show with David Letterman, when she claimed to have trademarked the words "that's hot", thereby forbidding other persons to use them.

Recording artist

Hilton is the founder of Heiress Records, a sub-label of Warner Brothers Records, which she created in 2004. Though Heiress Records' only release as of yet has been Paris, Hilton has said that she plans to sign new artists in the future.

Hilton began work on an album in 2004, whose title was earlier rumored to be Paris Hilton, Paris Is Burning, 1 Crazy Party, and Screwed. It was confirmed in 2006 that the album would simply be called Paris. Before release, Hilton hinted that her album would feature a number of genres, such as pop, reggae, and hip-hop.[12] Producers for Paris include Greg Wells, Kara DioGuardi, Jane Wiedlin and Scott Storch. Hilton collaborated with Fat Joe and Jadakiss on the song "Fighting Over Me". Paris was released on August 22, 2006.

The first single from Paris "Stars Are Blind", produced by Fernando Garibay, was released for download on June 20, 2006 and was a success on the Billboard Hot 100, peaking at #18. "Turn It Up" , which was premiered on AOL First Listen on June 30, 2006, and "Nothing In This World" are scheduled to follow "Stars Are Blind" as her next singles.

The video for Nothing In This World premiered August 22nd, 2006 on E! News. Hilton is already planning and recording tracks for her second album, including a new song called "Daddy's Little Girl".[13]

Reaction to debut

Some influential sources have bestowed the album with positive reviews. All Music Guide

stated, "...it's more fun than anything released by Britney Spears or Jessica Simpson, and a lot fresher, too." [14]

In August/September 2006, it was revealed that underground artists Banksy and Danger Mouse replaced 500 copies of Hilton's debut album in various UK record stores with their own parodical remixes and cover art. Along with completely reworked liner notes that included topless photos of Paris slathered with slogans like "Every CD you buy puts me even further out of your league", Danger Mouse has replaced Hilton's original songs with his own remixes and given them titles such as "Why am I Famous?", "What Have I Done?" and "What Am I For?" Banksy has doctored pictures of her on the CD sleeve to show Hilton topless and with a dog's head. [15] [16]

Discography

Singles

Year	Title	Album	Chart positions														
			US	UK	CA	IRL	GER	FR	SPN	SWI	NZ	AUS	ITA	FIN	SWE	BEL	EU
	"Stars Are Blind"		6	7	3	4	5	1	8	7	9	7	1	6	12	93	6
2006	"Turn It Up"	Paris	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	"Nothing In This World"		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Albums

Album cover	Album information
	<div>Paris</div> <div>Released: August 22, 2006</div> <div>U.S. Peak Postion: #6</div> <div>U.S. Sales: 130,040</div> <div>RIAA Certification: -</div> <div>Peak chart positions:</div> <div>#1 (BEL)</div> <div>#4 (CAN)</div> <div>#6 (US)</div> <div>#18 (GER)</div> <div>#24 (AUS)</div> <div>#27 (IR)</div> <div>#29 (UK)</div> <div>#98 (SPN)</div> <div>Certifications: -</div> <div>World Sales: 350,000</div> <div>Singles:</div> <div>2006 "Stars Are Blind" — (June 11)</div> <div>2006 "Turn It Up" — (August 15)</div> <div>2006 "Nothing In This World" — (September 12)</div>

Author

In the fall of 2004, Hilton released a book, Confessions of an Heiress: A Tongue-in-Chic Peek Behind the Pose co-written by Merle Ginsberg, which has full color photographs of her and gives her tips on the do's and don'ts of living as an heiress. Hilton was reportedly given \$100,000 in advanced payment for this book. Some in the media panned the writing as amateurish, and the book was parodied by Robert Mundell on The Late Show with David Letterman. Nonetheless, the book became a New York Times bestseller.

Hilton followed it up with a designer-diary, also with GinsbergYour Heiress Diary: Confess It All To Me. Aimed at her young fans, it contained pages encouraging fans to write about their goals, their friends and family, boys, celebrities they admire, etc. Hilton plans to release another book in 2007.

Designer

Hilton has helped design a collection of purses for Tokyo label Samantha Thavasa [17] and has also been involved in the design of a jewelry line, The Paris Hilton Collection, for Amazon.com. [18]

Hilton launched the Paris Hilton Limited Edition Watch Collection brand during a news conference at the Tourneau store in New York November 30, 2005. Hilton's 18kt white gold and diamond encrusted watches that she helped design [19] start at \$100,000. [20] Hilton also has plans to launch fashion and cosmetics lines.

Non-profit

In November 2004, Hilton participated in Sean "Diddy" Combs' Citizen Change campaign to encourage youths to vote in the presidential election. She drew criticism after it was revealed she had neither voted, nor even registered to do so [21][22].

Brand

Screenshot of Paris Hilton's Diamond Quest

Hilton began her own chain of nightclubs known as Club Paris in 2005. The first of which in Orlando, Florida has been a major success. The second located in Jacksonville, Florida opened July 1, 2006. Hilton is in talks to develop further clubs in Las Vegas, New York City, Los Angeles, Miami, and Cancun, Mexico. She also hopes to take the clubs to overseas markets and to expand the clubs to become five-star hotels featuring accommodation and casinos. Gameloft, a developer and publisher of mobile games, previewed Paris-branded mobile at the 2006 Electronic Entertainment Expo (E3). At E3, the game was called "Paris Hilton's Jewel Jam", the name present on all of Gameloft's signage [23]. Hilton was to appear at Gameloft's E3 booth to unveil the product, though she appeared an hour late, saying, "Sorry I'm late. I'm really excited to have my new video game, Diamondquest. Thank you all for coming, and you can download the game." (emphasis added) [24]

As of May 26, 2006, Gameloft's press release states that the game's name is Paris Hilton's Diamond Quest, stating "With a previous working title of Jewel Jam, the company decided on a final title to better reflect the fresh, dynamic and sexy appeal of the heiress extraordinaire." [25]

Perfume and cologne

In early May of 2004, Hilton was involved in the creation of a fragrance line by Parlux Fragrances. The perfume would be aptly named "Paris Hilton".

Hilton said, "It's really hot. I mixed all these scents together...it smells so good" [26].

The perfume launch was a success. Originally set to be a small release, demand was high and necessitated a wider release before Christmas of 2004. The launch was followed by a 47% increase in sales for Parlux, which was predominantly due to sales of the Hilton-branded perfume. [27]

After the success of Hilton's perfume, Parlux Fragrances released "Paris Hilton for Men", a cologne for Hilton's male admirers, as well as another fragrance called "Just Me by Paris Hilton", which is available for both women and men.

Another perfume titled "Paris Hilton: Heiress" is due for release in October 2006 [28]. A counterpart for men, "Paris Hilton: Heir", is also due by the end of the year, along with a new line of color cosmetics. [29]

Media spotlight

The cover of the March 2005 issue of Playboy

In the March 2005 issue of Playboy, she was named the "Sex Star of the Year" in their list of the 25 Sexiest Celebrities. Someone appearing to be her, allegedly a look-a-like and not Hilton herself, was on the cover of the issue. Hilton's spokeswoman said she did not know where the picture came from.[2]

On March 8, 2006, Brian Quintana, an event producer, was granted a three-year restraining order against Hilton after he testified that she harassed and threatened him. Quintana claimed their relationship soured after he urged Stavros Niarchos III to reconsider dating Hilton.[3]

In May of 2006, Maxim magazine ranked Hilton #38 on its annual Hot 100 list.

In an interview with TMZ.com's Harvey Levin, Hilton read thousands of comments by TMZ users. The comments were, for the most part, negative and focused on her public image as a partying rich girl. Hilton referred to the comments as "mean and sadistic". The comments included, "Paris is just an oversized human condom", "Paris is like a fart in a mitten. You know it's there, you can't stand it, but you can't get rid of it", and "Would you please drop over dead or commit suicide you damn slut." Hilton defended herself by noting that she is "far less promiscuous than any of [her] friends". Hilton also commented on her famous sex tape, saying that she is "judged because of something that an ex-boyfriend did" and that she is "not a slut at all". Hilton said some of the comments made her cry. "They think I don't have any feelings." [30]

In 2006, Hilton told news media that she practiced sexual abstinence. In fact, she told news media that "people think I sleep with everyone, but I'm not like that". The hotel heiress revealed her vow of sexual abstinence as one of the most exciting things she has ever strived for, "I like the way guys go crazy when they can't have sex with you. If he can't have you, he stays interested. The moment he has you, he's gone." Paris told media she had various boyfriends because, "guys are like, 'Hey, what's going on? It's been like four months and I'm only getting a kiss here.'" [31]

While Hilton has been quoted as saying that she is the iconic blonde of the decade and comparing herself to Princess Diana and Marilyn Monroe,[32] she will reportedly appear in the 2007 Guinness World Records as the world's "Most Overrated Celebrity". [33]

On August 29, 2006, the mayor of Las Vegas proclaimed the day, "Paris Hilton Day" and gave Hilton a key to the city. Hilton says Vegas is her "favorite place in the world to come to party." [34]

Antoine François Prévost

Antoine François Prévost (Antoine Francois Prevost d'Exiles) (April 1, 1697 - December 23, 1763), usually known simply as the Abbé Prévost, was a French author and novelist.

He was born at Hesdin, Artois, and first appears with the full name of Prévost d'Exiles, in a letter to the booksellers of Amsterdam in 1731. His father, Lievin Prévost, was a lawyer, and several members of the family had embraced the ecclesiastical estate. Prévost was educated at the Jesuit school of Hesdin, and in 1713 became a novice of the order in Paris, pursuing his studies at the same time at the college of La Flèche.

At the end of 1716 he left the Jesuits to join the army, but soon tired of military life, and returned to Paris in 1719, apparently with the idea of resuming his novitiate. He is said to have travelled in the Netherlands about this time; in any case he returned to the army, this time with a commission. Some biographers have assumed that he suffered some of the misfortunes assigned to his hero Des Grieux. Whatever the truth, he joined the learned community of the Benedictines of St Maur, with whom he found refuge, he himself says, after the unlucky termination of a love affair. He took his vows at Jumièges in 1721 after a year's novitiate, and in 1726 took priest's orders at St Germer de Flaix. He spent seven years in various houses of the order, teaching, preaching and studying. In 1728 he was at the abbey of St Germain-des-Prés, Paris, where he was engaged on the *Gallia Christiana*, the learned work undertaken by the monks in continuation of the works of Denys de Sainte-Marthe, who had been a member of their order. His restless spirit made him seek from the Pope a transfer to the easier rule of Cluny; but he left the abbey without leave (1728), and, learning that his superiors had obtained a lettre de cachet against him, fled to England.

In London he acquired a wide knowledge of English history and literature, as can be seen in his writings. Before leaving the Benedictines Prévost had begun perhaps his most famous novel, *Mémoires et aventures d'un homme de qualité* qui s'est retiré du monde, the first four volumes of which were published in Paris in 1728, and two years later at Amsterdam. In 1729 he left England for the Netherlands, where he began to publish (Utrecht, 1731) a novel, the material of which, at least, had been gathered in London *Le Philosophe anglais*, ou *Histoire de Monsieur Cleveland*, fils naturel de Cromwell, écrite par lui-même, et traduite de l'anglais (Paris 1731-1739, 8 vols., but most of the existing sets are partly Paris and partly Utrecht). A spurious fifth volume (Utrecht, 1734) contained attacks on the Jesuits, and an English translation of the whole appeared in 1734.

Meanwhile, during his residence at the Hague, he engaged on a translation of De Thou's *Historia*, and, relying on the popularity of his first book, published at Amsterdam a *Suite* in three volumes, forming volumes v, vi, and vii of the original *Mémoires et aventures d'un homme de qualité*. The seventh volume contained the famous *Manon Lescaut*, separately published in Paris in 1731 as *Histoire du Chevalier des Grieux et de Manon Lescaut*. The book was eagerly read, chiefly in pirated copies, being forbidden in France. In 1733 he left the Hague for London in company with a lady whose character, according to Prévost's enemies, was doubtful. In London he edited a weekly gazette on the model of Joseph Addison's *Spectator*, *Le Pour et contre*, which he continued to produce, with short intervals, until 1740.

In the autumn of 1734 Prévost was reconciled with the Benedictines, and, returning to France, was received in the Benedictine monastery of La Croix-Saint-Leufroy in the diocese of Evreux to pass through a new, though brief, novitiate. In 1735 he was dispensed from residence in a monastery by becoming almoner to the prince de Conti, and in 1754 obtained the priory of St Georges de Gesnes. He continued to produce novels and

translations from the English, and, with the exception of a brief exile (1741-1742) spent in Brussels and Frankfurt, he resided for the most part at Chantilly until his death, which took place suddenly while he was walking in the neighbouring woods. The cause of his death, the rupture of an aneurism, is all that is definitely known. Stories of crime and disaster were related of Prévost by his enemies, and diligently repeated, but appear to be apocryphal.

Prévost's other works include:

- ☐ Le Doyen de Killerine, Killerine, histoire morale composée sur les mémoires d'une illustre famille d'Irlande (Paris, 1735; 2nd part, the Hague, 1739, 3rd, 4th and 5th parts, 1740)
- ☐ Tout pour l'amour (1735), a translation of Dryden's tragedy
- ☐ Histoire d'une Grecque moderne (Amsterdam [Paris] 2 vols., 1740)
- ☐ l'Histoire de Marguerite d'Anjou (Amsterdam [Paris] 2 vols., 1740)
- ☐ Mémoires pour servir a l'histoire de Malte (Amsterdam, 1741)
- ☐ Campagnes philosophiques, ou mémoires ... contenant l'histoire de la guerre d'Irlande (Amsterdam, 1741)
- ☐ Histoire de Guillaume le Conquérant (Paris, 1742)
- ☐ Histoire générale des voyages (15 vols., Paris, 1746-1759), continued by other writers
- ☐ translations from Samuel Richardson: Lettres anglaises ou Histoire de Miss Clarisse Harlowie (1751), from Richardson's *Clarissa*, and *Nouvelles lettres anglaises*, ou *Histoire du chevalier Grandisson* (Sir Charles Grandison, 1755).
- ☐ Mémoires pour servir a l'histoire de la vertu (1762), from Mrs Sheridan's *Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph*
- ☐ Histoire de la maison de Stuart (3 vols., 1740) from Hume's *History of England* to 1688
- ☐ Le Monde moral, ou Mémoires pour servir a l'histoire du coeur humain (2 vols., Geneva, 1760)

survival of the fattest

mikael askergren

learn why rupert pupkin/robert de niro in martin scorsese's wonderful film "the king of comedy" by no means is a loser, but the closest thing to the nietzschean übermensch. read the true story of how the fat and ungraceful martin melin became the slim and fit heartthrob adonis of all swedish mainstream womanhood: by winning the first swedish television edition of the international reality show hit "survivor" ("expedition: robinson").

"i have worked so very hard, i have kissed asses when called for, i have been politically correct. to no avail. as a last resort i have appealed to charities, to patrons of the arts, to the media, and even to politicians to acknowledge and champion my cause. but my life and my career are still going nowhere. what am i doing wrong? what path to the emancipation and empowerment of the individual will save me now that democracy won't?"

if you fit the description above, take a lesson in how to turn your life around from two case studies - one from the world of fiction, the other from the real world - and discover that to you and your sorry kind, paradoxically, the recipe for social and professional success will never be to submit or to try even harder to go by the book, but to be audaciously anti-social and unprofessional.

fiction: rupert pupkin

american director martin scorsese claims he was more or less talked into doing "the king of comedy" (1983) by others. robert de niro, for one, was very keen on playing the protagonist. in interviews scorsese does not go so far as to call the film a total failiure, but he seems unconvinced of its qualities to this day. one wonders why, because - with the exception of having to listen to van morrison during the closing credits - everything about the film is perfect.

of course, "the king of comedy" owes much of its success to the screenplay by paul d. zimmerman. it tells the story of rupert pupkin, a 34-year old bachelor (played by de niro) who wants to be a comic. he still lives with his mother and he practices his stand-up comedy routine in a mock television studio in the depressing basement of his mother's house. in his daydreams he is world famous and best friends with his idol, jerry langford (played by jerry lewis), the host of a popular television comedy show. pupkin is convinced that langford would offer him an appearance on the show if they could only meet. rupert has no references or experience from comedy clubs, so understandably langford's secretary turns him away, time after time. after a number of fruitless attempts to get past security, pupkin is thrown out on his ear. in a final, desperate attempt to break into show business rupert kidnaps (!) langford. but he asks no ransom. all pupkin wants in exchange for langford's life is ten minutes for a stand-up monologue on his show. the television network concedes (!), and pupkin gets his ten minutes nationwide.

after the performance, langford escapes and pupkin is immediately arrested and sent to jail. at this point, the film is almost over, and the moral of the story is, everyone assumes, "crime does not pay." no one in the audience is surprised or sorry by the outcome: pupkin had it coming to him. the sentiments of the audience have all along been against pupkin. when pupkin pesters langford's secretary not once or twice, but again and again, we are on her side and we suffer along with her. when pupkin later gate-crashes langford's country estate, the audience is again not on pupkin's, but on langford's side when rupert once again is thrown out on his ear. as the plot unfolds, pupkin reveals a bad case of social dyslexia. he is obnoxious, ridiculous, tactless, and pathetic. his attempts to swoon the girl he loves, rita, are ungraceful, nerdy, and conceited. the people in the movie want nothing

to do with him and the movie's audience cannot help sympethizing with them. rupert is not likeable. he does not "deserve" and has not "earned" success. (rupert's meticulously groomed hair and moustache, and his neat but slightly surreal wardrobe establish a visual metaphor for his social dyslexia.)

but - and this is the genius of the movie - one has, as it turns out, jumped to conclusions about the film's purpose. the story does not end when rupert pupkin is sent to jail. only seconds remain of the film's running time, and yet a complete reversal of the plot - the peripeteia - is yet to come. in less than a minute we, the audience, are told the following: pupkin spends his time in jail writing his memoirs. because pupkin's ten minute monologue was seen by an estimated 87 million american households, and because pupkin made headlines and magazine covers everywhere when the media learned of the spectacular celebrity kidnapping, pupkin already is a household name, and his book becomes a best

seller. he is released from prison after less than 3 years, with hundreds of dedicated fans greeting him at the prison gates. in the last image of the movie, pupkin greets the ecstatic studio audience of his very own nationwide television comedy show.

everyone who used to put him down now sucks up to him, simply because his notoriory and fame has made him bankable. this sudden and unexpected turn of events prove that the biggest joke of the king of comedy all along was never on pupkin but on us, the audience.

if you can't get what you want by going by the book, you have to bend the rules. given the right circumstances, crime does pay very well indeed. "the king of comedy" is, however, not at all a film about decadence or moral decay in modern american society. the maxim "crime does not pay" is not challenged per se. after all, rupert pupkin is sent to jail. the film does, however, suggest the option of considering crime nihilistically as investment and commodity: rupert pupkin purchases the benefits in breaking the law, and invests for the future by doing time (just like nelson mandela - morals, motives, and goals aside). once the price is paid and the debt to society is settled, pupkin is free to conquer the very society he has trespassed against, going on to become an american hero and super star. in many countries (those with no capital punishment or life-long imprisonment), someone like pupkin could even have use for murder - in full view of society and the judicial system - as a nihilist vehicle through which to achieve, in time, greatness and success.

this message is indeed subversive, but it would have been lost on the audience, had not 99 % of the film's running time been invested in establishing and insisting on rupert's impossible character. it would have been just another american dream success story, in which the talented and good-hearted hero - "undeservingly" held back by society and envious colleagues - refuses to give up, works even harder, and in the end, "deservingly," gets what he wants. rupert pupkin indeed "deserves" nothing. as a comic he is mediocre. he is not funnier than any other wannabe comic, and he certainly does not possess the character and good nature of a person who the public "feels" has "deserved" success. pupkin's personality ensures that neither idle chance nor luck, nor hard work and diligence, will win him any favors or privilege - not in america nor anywhere else. the normal path to a career in comedy - via stand-up comedy clubs, television, and film - is thus never an option open to rupert. charitable or philanthropic organizations could not assist him in his repeated attempts to escape his social and professional predicament. not even a brilliant piece on him by a pulitzer-prize winning reporter could help him. nor could, discouragingly enough, the institutions of democracy. no one will ever come to the rescue of a schmuck. in the minds of the public, there is no greater crime than to be, like rupert pupkin, a loser. the american dream is not for the rupert pupkins of the world.

historically, neglected and disrespected groups in society have, through legislation or revolution, worked themselves into political arenas, making society more responsive to their needs. for the rupert pupkins of the world joining such a group is no option. nobody wants them to join. to transcend the society and, not least, the personality in which he is a prisoner, rupert pupkin has to fight alone.

fighting all your battles alone is hard, of course, but at least you do not have to submit to a group manifesto or simplistic common denominator compromises. he who conquers alone does not have to settle for membership in a society already defined and upheld by others. he can create a brave, all new world for himself, just as jesus, napoleon and stalin did. who would have thought: rupert pupkin - the nietzschean, nihilist transgressor of democracy; rupert pupkin - der übermensch.

fact: martin melin

september 1997. the swedish media is going berserk. details about a new television game show - yet to be aired - have leaked to the media, and so enraged and appalled journalists that a nation-wide campaign to ban the show is started by the sensationalist evening tabloids. the show that has created such commotion, "expedition: robinson" (as in robinson crusoe), is based on a format by a british production company, planet 24 (original title of the format: "survive." note added in 2000: the same format on american tv is called "survivor"), in which sixteen contestants - adults of both sexes, of different ages, and from different walks of life - have been selected by a casting committee to spend six weeks during the summer of 1997 on an uninhabited island in the south china sea. everyone helps and shares in finding food and building shelters. a passive tv-crew is registering every step and every conversation, much like "the real world," mtv's popular show from a few years back. the object of the game and the program is to select one contestant as a modern-day robinson crusoe. he or she wins a substantial cash prize. in each weekly one-hour episode the television audience is invited to watch not only how the participants deal with their daily trials to find food (which turns out to be the contestant's biggest problem), but also to deal with damp clothes that never dry, shelters that fall apart, and of course the requisite social frictions that emerge. there are also typical game show competitions, intentionally silly and tongue-in-cheek, including tropical island-style games such as bowling with coconuts. but the dramatic high point of each episode is the vote to send one contestant home. each contestant explains why he or she thinks so-and-so should be sent home. the majority rules. like ten little indians, they grow fewer with each passing program. in the months between the pre-recording of the show and the actual broadcasting, something unexpected happens. the first contestant to be voted out and sent home, a young man, unfortunately commits suicide. the man's family blames the darwinian process of selective survival, the vote to punish (rather than to reward) a member of the collective. columnists and opinion makers join forces with the family of the deceased to stop the show.

in spite of everything, the first episode of "expedition: robinson" is aired as planned on 13 september 1997. to lessen the attention around the young man who took his life, and in an attempt to muffle the expected outcry in the media, the provocative element of each contestant spelling out his or her reasons for wanting to get rid of a certain contestant is not shown. to no avail. the reviews are, as expected, devastating. the broadcasting schedule for the remaining episodes is halted and the television executive responsible is left with no choice but to "resign." still, six weeks on location in the south china sea costs money. not to broadcast all episodes would be a waste. presumably, each contestant has made a mature and conscious choice between the advantages (money, exhibitionism) and disadvantages (humiliation) of participation. this mitigates against the media's original accusations of darwinian exploitation. after things have cooled off, the remaining episodes are finally aired, beginning 4 october 1997. at first there is some grunting in the media about this, but over time the aggressiveness dies down as the ratings for the series go up. as public opinion sways in favor of the show, the same sensationalist tabloids that cried wolf the loudest start doing phone-ins, interviews and biographical portraits on the contestants.

the reason for the show's popularity is the intriguing sociological perspective: in the first episodes, those voted out are not those who are the least successful at fishing or hunting or building huts, but

those who are least liked, the misfits. over time, voting patterns change, and the swedish television audience is stupified when the majority - the mediocre players - start to conspire against the strongest and best liked players. for example, the young man whom everyone expects to win because of his good nature, method, temperament and strength, is cast out at an early stage of the game. scheming and intricate survival tactics lead to unexpected results; the fewer the contestants, the less predictable each vote gets. fabulous entertainment.

13 december 1997: the last episode of "expedition: robinson" is broadcast. martin melin, a thirty-something chubby police officer from stockholm wins the game and sek 250,000 (\$ 30,000). he has lost some 40 pounds (20 kilos) in six weeks. he is no longer fat. on the contrary, he flaunts an impressive torso. he is not anorexic-looking like the rest, he looks just right. investing six weeks in starvation and total loss of privacy on a game show whose format has challenged every public notion of decency, good taste and political correctness, turned out to be an excellent choice for flabby martin melin. he is not only the champion, but he has completely reinvented himself. no longer the bloated lard-ass cop he once was, his life will never be the same again.

martin melin, overweight cop turned sex symbol of swedish mainstream womanhood

the tabloids back home write about his victory and homecoming, about the break-up with his girlfriend, about what he is going to do with the money, as well as about the fact that he will leave the police force (so much for the calling to serve the public) to become co-host of another, equally popular game show. and by january 1998, editors and agents have had time to work martin melin into the schedules of every newspaper weekend supplement, and every television celebrity game and chat show. melin is giving sex tips on tv and taking his shirt off in ladies magazines. he invites photographers to his new downtown bachelor pad. he is seen at every opening and celebrity function. he dumps his nice but ordinary girlfriend once he gets to rub shoulders with stars and media moguls. he is soon seen with a new, more glamorous girlfriend at his side. this is indeed the high life. the buzz does not die down. journalists do some investigative reporting and reveal unknown things about the young martin melin. it turns out that he was once a slim, not yet overweight, long-haired, permed, self-conscious looking teenage model who posed occasionally for covers of teenage romance magazines. while these news seem on the surface to be merely anecdotal, such revelations shed light on the nature of this survival pro. he was never "just" a cop who for a laugh happened to audition for a show. he had a taste for public exposure and glamour in him long before "expedition: robinson" came along.

it is no accident that it is the "survive" format which propels martin melin out of the cul-de-sac of the sub-middle class career prospects of the police force and into a totally new existence. because the media perceived "expedition: robinson" to be ruthlessly darwinian and a politically incorrect challenge to every notion of decency and good form, there was much at stake and much to loose: the show cost one television executive her job, and some would claim that it cost the life of one of the contestants. it had become snuff television; it had literally become a matter of life or death. but because there was so much at risk, there was also much more to gain. like the triumph of rupert pupkin, the fate of ex-cop martin melin suggests, that if the price is right (pardon the pun) - if the social and political risk taken is high enough - the sky is the limit for what a television show might produce for the participants. martin might very well have made more money on some other game show, but he would not have lost 40 pounds and reinvented himself in the process, and he would not have become the adonis of mainstream swedish womanhood that he is today.

many people win cars and kitchen appliances and mind-boggling cash prizes on game shows every day, but their names or faces never linger in anyone's memory. they are replaced the very next day by new names and faces. the jeopardy champion who dreams that his victory will not only pay off in cash, but also in his private life and career, will always be disappointed. this is equally true for the contestants in shows like the gladiators who will never enjoy an off-screen triumph comparable to that of martin melin.

there is no social or intellectual risk-taking involved in subscribing to formats such as "education is good" (jeopardy) or "physical fitness is good" (the gladiators). the public shows little interest in those who excel, if all they do is excel in subscribing to values already praised by the establishments (and purveyed through the universities, gyms and sports clubs). such submissive scholars or athletes will do as entertainment (on jeopardy or the gladiators), but the public will never reward playing it safe with great admiration or worship. no pain, no gain.

postscript

(some post-deadline news:) swedish tabloid aftonbladet reports (august 1998) that martin melin's official taxable income in 1997 was sek 812,000 (not counting the sek 250,000 cash prize from "expedition: robinson") compared to a taxable income of sek 246,600 in 1996. since the final episode of the show was aired on 13 december 1997, with only two weeks to the new year 1998, this means that he made some sek 566,200 (again, not counting the cash prize) in the first two weeks immediately following the competition alone! the figures of 1998 are not yet official.

sweden is recording its second edition, and denmark its first edition of "survive" this summer (germany, holland, united kingdom and united states are expected to follow suit in the future). however, according to some sources, the format and rules have been changed, to make this year's and future editions less provocative, less darwinian as it were. this means that in the future there will certainly be fewer deaths and casualties associated with the format. but, this also means that the media springboard effect simply from being a contestant on the show disappears. if the contestants of this year's editions hope to repeat martin melin's off-screen success, they will be disappointed.

THE HOLOGRAPHIC BRAIN

With KARL PRIBRAM, Ph.D.

THINKING ALLOWED Conversations On The Leading Edge Of Knowledge and Discovery
With Dr. Jeffrey Mishlove

JEFFREY MISHLOVE, Ph.D.: Hello and welcome. Our topic today is the mind-brain relationship, and my guest is Dr. Karl Pribram, professor of neuropsychology at Stanford University, in the Department of Psychology and in the medical school. Dr. Pribram is the author of Languages of the Brain and hundreds of articles about the mind-brain relationship. In fact I would say fairly that Dr. Pribram is probably one of the most influential scholars alive today in probing the mysteries of the mind-brain relationship.

MISHLOVE: It's a pleasure to have you here. You know, many academic psychologists -- and perhaps you have some sympathy for this point of view -- over the years have taken a perspective which laymen tend to laugh at, at times. They claim that the mind doesn't exist. I wonder if you can explain that perspective -- talk about what we mean, or what you mean, by the mind.

PRIBRAM: Well, I don't like the term the mind, because it reifies -- that means it makes a thing of -- something that's a process. We pay attention, we see, we hear. Those are all mental processes, mental activities. But there isn't a thing called the mind. There might be something you want to call yourself, but the mind sort of makes something concrete out of something that's very multifaceted.

MISHLOVE: Yet somehow when I'm aware of myself being aware, I think, "Well, that's my mind that does that."

PRIBRAM: That does that; that your mind does it. I'd have to think about that.

MISHLOVE: You're very well known in psychology and in neuropsychology as the developer of the holographic or holonomic model of the brain. Can you talk about that a little bit, and how it relates to the mind -- or rather, to the mind-body process? I have to be on my toes with you today.

PRIBRAM: Yes. The holonomic brain theory is based on some insights that Dennis Gabor had. He was the inventor of the hologram, and he obtained the Nobel Prize for his many contributions. He was a mathematician, and what he was trying to do was develop a better way of making electron micrographs, improve the resolution of the micrographs. And so for electron microscopy he suggested that instead of making a photograph -- essentially, with electron microscopes we make photographs using electrons instead of photons. He thought maybe instead of making ordinary photographs, that what he would do is get the interference patterns. Now what is an interference pattern? When light strikes, or when electrons strike any object, they scatter. But the scatter is a funny kind of scatter. It's a very well regulated scatter. For instance, if you defocus the lens on a camera so that you don't get the image falling on the image plane and you have a blur, that blur essentially is a hologram, because all you have to do is refocus it.

MISHLOVE: Contained in the blur is the actual image.

PRIBRAM: That's right. But you don't see it as such. So one of the main principles of holonomic brain theory, which gets us into quantum mechanics also, is that there is a relationship here between what we ordinarily experience, and some other process or some other order, which David Bohm calls the implicate, or enfolded, order, in which things are all distributed or spread -- in fact the mathematical formulations are often called spread functions -- that spread this out.

MISHLOVE: Now what you're talking about here is the deep structure of the universe, in a way. Beneath the subatomic level of matter itself are these quantum wave functions, so to speak, and they form interference patterns. Would I be wrong in saying it would be like dropping two stones in a pond, the way the ripples overlap? Is that like an interference pattern?

PRIBRAM: That's certainly the way interference patterns work, yes.

MISHLOVE: And you're suggesting that at that very deep level of reality, something is operating in the brain itself.

PRIBRAM: Well, no. In a way, that's possible, but that's not where the situation is at the moment. All we know is that the mathematical descriptions that we make of, let's say, single-cell processes, and the branches from the single cells, and how they interact with each other -- not only anatomically, but actually functional interactions -- that when we map those, we get a description that is very similar to the description of quantum events.

MISHLOVE: When you take into account that there are billions of these single cells operating in the brain.

PRIBRAM: That's right. And the connections between them, so there are even more; there are trillions of connections between them. They operate on the basic principles that have been found to also operate at the quantum level. Actually, it was the other way around. The mathematics that Gabor used, he borrowed from Heisenberg and Hilbert. Hilbert developed them first in mathematics, and then Heisenberg used them in quantum mechanics, and Gabor used them in psychophysics, and we've used it in modeling how brain networks work.

MISHLOVE: So in other words, in the brain, when we look at the electrical impulses traveling through the neurons, and the patterns as these billions of neurons interact, you would say that that is analogous, I suppose, or isomorphic to the processes that are going on at the deeper quantum level.

PRIBRAM: Yes. But we don't know that it's a deeper quantum level in the brain.

MISHLOVE: That may or may not be the case.

PRIBRAM: Analogous isn't quite the right word; they obey the same rules. It's not just an analogy, because the work that described these came independently. An analogy would be that you take the quantum ideas, and see how they fit to the data we have on the brain. That's not the way it happened. We got the brain data first, and then we see, look, it fits the same mathematics. So the people who were gathering these data, including myself, weren't out to look for an analogous process. I think it's a very important point, because otherwise you could be biased, and there are lots of different models that fit how the brain works. But this is more based on how the brain was found to work, independent of these conceptions.

MISHLOVE: Independent of any model.

PRIBRAM: Yes, essentially independent of any model.

MISHLOVE: So you've got a mathematical structure that parallels the mathematical structures of quantum physics. Now what does that tell us about the mind?

PRIBRAM: What it tells me is that the problems that have been faced in quantum mechanics for the whole century -- well, since the twenties --

MISHLOVE: Many paradoxes.

PRIBRAM: And very many paradoxes -- that those paradoxes also apply at the psychophysical level and at the neuronal level, and therefore we have to face the same sets of problems. At the same time, I think what David Bohm is doing is showing that some of the classical conceptions which were thought not to apply at the quantum level, really do apply at the quantum level. Now, I'm interpreting Bohm; I'm not sure he would want to agree to my interpretation of what he's doing. But to me that seems to be what is going on. So that the schism between levels -- between the quantum level, the submicroscopic almost, subatomic level and what goes on there, and the classical, so-called uncertainty principle and all of that -- that all applies all the way along; but you've got to be very careful in -- how should I put it? You've got to apply it to the actual data, and not just sort of run it over.

MISHLOVE: To the average layman, why would they be interested in this? Is there some significance to people in their everyday lives, or in their workaday worlds, in the business of life?

PRIBRAM: Sure, and this is the critical thing -- that if indeed we're right that these quantum-like phenomena, or the rules of quantum mechanics, apply all the way through to our psychological processes, to what's going on in the nervous system -- then we have an explanation perhaps, certainly we have a parallel, to the kind of experiences that people have called spiritual experiences. Because the

descriptions you get with spiritual experiences seem to parallel the descriptions of quantum physics. That's why Fritjof Capra wrote The Tao of Physics, why we have The Dancing Wu Li Masters, and all of this sort of thing that's come along. And in fact Bohr and Heisenberg already knew; Schroedinger talked about the Upanishads, and Bohr used the yin and yang as his symbol. Because the conceptions that grew out of watching the quantum level -- and therefore now the neurological and psychophysical level, now that it's a psychological level as well -- seem to have a great deal in common with our spiritual experience. Now what do I mean by spiritual experience? You talked about mental activity, calling it the mind. That aspect of mental activity, which is very human -- it may be true of other species as well, but we don't know -- but in human endeavor many of us at least seem to need to get in contact with larger issues, whether they're cosmology, or some kind of biological larger issue, or a social one, or it's formalized in some kind of religious activity. But we want to belong. And that is what I define as the spiritual aspects of man's nature.

MISHLOVE: Some sense of relationship to the larger cosmos, to the world about us.

PRIBRAM: And that part has this implicate order. It has the explicate order, too -- you know, the ordinary space-time order.

MISHLOVE: I want to stop for a second, because you're using Bohm's term implicate order, and we haven't really quite defined that.

PRIBRAM: It's the holographic. You described it very well, with the pebbles. It's a set of relationships which --

MISHLOVE: It's a fuzzy picture.

PRIBRAM: Well, yes, and you can talk about it in terms of waves, or you can talk about it in terms of mathematical matrices which have vectors in them, and so on. You can have continuous vectors, or you can have continuous matrices. You can have all kinds of relationships between. When you look at a photographic plate that has a hologram on it, you can either look at some of the swirls in there, or you can look at the individual grains of silver. So there are lots of kinds of mathematics, but they all fit together, whether it be Schroedinger's equation, which is a wave equation, or Heisenberg's more matrix kind. These are not relevant to the ordinary person, but I just want to say it here, because otherwise we get stuck in the wave, as if it were all waves, and that's too simple.

MISHLOVE: But what you're saying, if I can try and simplify it, is that there's a level of reality at which things are what they appear to be. I look at you and I see a body and a face. That would be the explicate level, where things are what they appear to be. Then there's an implicate level, which is just as real, but if you were to look at it, it doesn't look at all like the other.

PRIBRAM: We experience it entirely differently -- as a spiritual aspect of our being. This implicate order is also a potential order; we're not in it most of the time. We had for years this whole idea of the human potential, and I think that's what we're talking about.

MISHLOVE: Human potential may be embodied somehow in the implicate structure.

PRIBRAM: That's very nice, yes. Good way to say it.

MISHLOVE: Prior to the development of quantum physics and the holonomic model of the brain, people based their notion of who they were and how their minds worked more on the Newtonian classical models of physics, and perhaps in some sense, if they bought into those models, would tend to deny their spiritual experiences, or not really feel connected with that part of themselves. Would you say so?

PRIBRAM: Very definitely, and that recalls something that De Tocqueville said. After writing his histories, he said, "Maybe I've been interpreting it the wrong way, because I've been doing it in terms of classical mechanics, with cause-and-effect relationships. But when the human being acts, this is not a cause; this is a challenge."

MISHLOVE: He wrote the books on capitalism and democracy.

PRIBRAM: Democracy in America, and all. When we act it's a challenge, and that's very much a quantum-type, holographic, implicate-order type idea. Rather than having causality --

MISHLOVE: It's moving towards a goal.

PRIBRAM: No, it isn't. It's a challenge, it's different. Moving toward a goal would still be causal. See, we don't even have a good language to talk about all this. It's a challenge. The whole system can reorganize on the basis of this challenge, and you never find out where the cause is. When we were talking earlier, you said, "Where does the will start?" Well, it's a challenge. The whole system does it. There isn't a start and a midst and so on, because time and space are enfolded, and therefore there's no causality.

MISHLOVE: It's all just emerging.

PRIBRAM: It's emerging, and you can challenge the system, and it will respond in an unpredictable way.

MISHLOVE: You know, I must say I'm a little bit surprised, because you described yourself earlier to me as a positivist of sorts, and a behaviorist, and in a way the language that you're using seems very much like the language of the Buddhists, who talk about no self, and just process.

PRIBRAM: No thing. One of the chapters I wrote once was "The Non-sense of No-thing," -- the nonsense of nothing. But it's nonsensory, because senses are lenses, and as David Bohm has said so well, if you take the lenses away you've got a hologram. Lenses tend to reify, to objectify and articulate particles. Take the lenses away and you've got this distributed.

MISHLOVE: So part of our mind-brain process functions as a lens, then.

PRIBRAM: Well, certainly the senses do, right.

MISHLOVE: What about the other functions of the mind -- memory, learning?

PRIBRAM: The what?

MISHLOVE: You caught me again. It's such a habit.

PRIBRAM: Other mental functions. It's easy to say it without reifying it, especially if you want to be holistic about this. In answer to your previous question -- just a second if I may interrupt -- you said I'm a positivist. You know, the hard-nosed kind of scientist, in my experience, which was the stimulus-response scientists, became very soft after awhile. That was the hardest, hard-nosed kind of science, and the cognitive, which was soft, became the hard-nosed one. And I'm quite sure that the kind of definitions I'm giving are just as hard as anything that ever was in stimulus-response psychology.

MISHLOVE: In other words, at some point it will come to be seen that if you talk about spiritual experiences -- if you refer to Buddhists and mystical concepts -- that can be taken in terms of very hard core.

PRIBRAM: Well, it's up to scientists to do this. It doesn't come automatically.

MISHLOVE: Very rigorous.

PRIBRAM: Well, you don't want to get into rigor mortis, but yes. You see, the beauty of science is that it's basically based on sharing. Now, the more carefully and clearly I can define something -- and the reason we want to quantify is not because we're interested in quantities, but because then you can communicate and share much more clearly than if you can't have quantities. So all of science is based on the notion of sharing, and we need to define things. If some Buddhist tells me, "I've just had a high experience," or "I've just seen the light," and I don't know what the hell he's talking about, then I can't share that. But if he gets me to have the same experience, that begins to be science. And if I can make definitions so I can describe to you what is going on -- let's say the pineal is secreting some substance that makes you suddenly flash, or something of that kind -- then we have some way of sharing this experience, which goes deeper than when we're sort of just stunned by somebody saying, "Yes, I've seen the light." I mean, that may be just metaphorical, or it may actually be that they did produce a reaction akin to stimulation of the visual system. And so on and so forth.

MISHLOVE: You're raising many issues here. I don't want to get too off track, though.

PRIBRAM: Well, my point is simply that this business of what's soft and what's hard keeps changing.

MISHLOVE: That's a very important point.

PRIBRAM: My prediction is that the kind of thing we're dealing with here will be seen as as solid and as scientific. In the twenty-first century we'll look back at some of the fuzzy stuff that was done in the name of behaviorism.

MISHLOVE: Many neuroscientists today -- it's almost axiomatic, when they talk about the mind, which they sometimes do -- they say the mind is sort of located in the brain. I gather that that way of putting it is totally discordant with your own view of things.

PRIBRAM: Yes. There are lots of different ways of phrasing this. One is that mental phenomena are emergent properties of how the brain works, and so it's almost like the brain is secreting vision and mind and all that. But maybe a better way of talking about it would be to say that mental phenomena arise through the interaction between brain and body and the environment and -- this is what Karl Popper says -- that whole interactive thing produces an emergent, which we call mind and spirit, and so on. I think that's a better way than just thinking of the brain secreting it.

MISHLOVE: Now how does this model relate to human potential? If I want to cultivate my various potentialities, my skills, reach into the implicate order and make some of it more explicate, do you have notions about that, for learning, for human development?

PRIBRAM: Well, you said it yourself just now. You reach into the implicate order. You allow yourself -- Freud called it regression in the service of the ego, primary process kinds of things, which are more holonomic, more holographic-like. Yes, I think that's the general way that I would say that this is different. The other is imitation, and the kind of thing where we have role models and we take care of ourselves, model ourselves on someone -- the kind of thing you do in sports, you watch a videotape or something.

MISHLOVE: Would you say creativity works the same way?

PRIBRAM: Well, creativity works the same way in the following sense: that we allow ourselves to get -- let's just be very crude here -- into this wave form, you know, in a distributed system. And this then allows the fluctuations that take place there to create new forms, which in space-time we can't really do too well. I mean, things are already formed. But if we get back into this potential, of distributed, implicate-type order, then these fluctuations have a chance to reorganize this way, or to organize new foci of activity.

MISHLOVE: And these would take the shape of mental images in our mind?

PRIBRAM: By the time they get to be mental images, it's already pretty well set into space-time form.

MISHLOVE: What is a mental image, in space-time? How would you describe that, as a neuroscientist?

PRIBRAM: Well, let's see. I've got my image of your face right now, and I also have an image of a person sitting in a chair over there, and a big eye looking at me in front, a television eye, with my eyes closed. That's mental imagery.

MISHLOVE: You wouldn't try and tie that to resonant neural patterns?

PRIBRAM: Oh sure, I'll be happy to do that. There are two kinds of mechanism -- I mean, you can sort of divide things up into twos and threes and so on. But if you divide neural activity, you can divide it into propagative nerve impulses on the one hand, and then these slow potentials -- hyperpolarizations, steep polarizations -- that don't go anywhere. And they form this holographic-like pattern, and it's those that I feel -- and I have some evidence to support this -- are what we experience as images.

MISHLOVE: Would these sort of be like standing waves in the mind? Am I reaching too far here?

PRIBRAM: You said it -- "in the mind" -- again. The waves aren't in the mind.

MISHLOVE: Standing waves in the brain.

PRIBRAM: In the brain. They could be thought of that way. Again, I use the matrix analogy as well, just so we don't get too far into the waves. But sure, some kind of standing wave forms that are there temporarily. Sometimes they last longer, and sometimes they are very brief and we are not even aware of them. But the longer they last -- Sherrington had this idea, and he said there seems to be a reciprocal relationship between reflex and mind; the more reflex the less mental, and vice versa.

MISHLOVE: OK. That relates somehow to free will also, I gather.

PRIBRAM: Well, there we get into a different set of problems, now. Sure, to some extent if you get into your potential mode, then new things can happen. But usually free will is conceived of in terms of how many constraints are operating, and we have in statistics a notion of degrees of freedom. I think our will essentially is constrained, more or less. We have so many degrees of freedom, and the more degrees of freedom we have, the more we feel free, and we have freedom of choice.

MISHLOVE: What can we say, in wrapping the program up, given all these aspects of the mind-brain system that you've described, how does that relate to, say, the ultimate or the farther reaches of human potential?

PRIBRAM: Well, I think in the twenty-first century we're going to be able to do an awful lot that we weren't able to do up to now, simply because science will be admitted to the spiritual aspects of mankind, and vice versa -- what has been segregated for at least three hundred years, since Galileo, where the spiritual aspects, in Western culture at least, have been sort of relegated over here. People have split this, you know. We build buildings, and we do surgery, and do all of these things. Then we have a spiritual aspect to ourselves; we go do that somewhere else. Whereas now I think these things will come together, and it will be perfectly all right for what we today call "faith healers" to come and help with reduction of pain and to ease all kinds of things. So it'll be a different world. I wouldn't even be surprised if preventative therapies could be instituted, that deal with controls of ourselves, so we aren't as prone to get cancers and so on.

MISHLOVE: That's very optimistic. Well, Karl Pribram, it's been a pleasure having you with me. Thank you very much.

Transcendental cinema:

Deleuze, time and modernity

Christian Kerslake

In the preface to the English edition of *Cinema 2*, Deleuze claims that cinema is a repetition, in speeded-up form, of an experience that has already occurred in the history of philosophy.¹ This notion of repetition recalls the biological notion of the 'recapitulation' of phylogeny in ontogeny: individual development recapitulates, or replays in speeded-up form, the development of the species. Haeckel noted that this recapitulation was strongly in evidence at the embryonic stage, so that one can see the human embryo at a certain point appearing to be on the verge of developing a tail that subsequently disappears as the embryo develops. So, on this metaphor, cinema, an apparently new and unprecedented phenomenon in the modern world, nevertheless only develops through recapitulating an arduous development already undergone elsewhere. Now Deleuze's claim is that cinema recapitulates a movement already undergone in philosophy. Why philosophy, and not visual art, or some other discourse, or perhaps the history of civilization in general? Why does cinema recapitulate a historical passage in the life of the mind?

Deleuze says that the development in philosophy that cinema recapitulates concerns the nature of the notion of time from the Greeks to Kant. Whereas philosophy before Kant thinks of time in relation to movement, Kant subordinates movement to time.² Before Kant, the world was seen as made up of changing, moving bodies, and time referred to our way of measuring rates of change in the physical world. The notion of time was thus subordinated to the demand for measurement of moving bodies. For instance, in the Aristotelian world-view, time is secondary to the general cosmic movement from potentiality to actuality. In the Christian world-view, there is an eternal order opposed to a temporal realm, where time is fundamentally referred to the end of the world, or apocalypse. Deleuze also has in mind cyclical conceptions of time based on the passage of the seasons. In all these cases, time is subordinated to an already given movement of the physical world. Kant, on the other hand, inaugurates modern thinking about time. Kant makes time the transcendental condition of all of our experience, so that it is the structure of time itself, as stretched out, projected and synthesized by a human subject, that in the first place conditions our experience of moving bodies, and not vice versa. So time conditions movement. As we will see, however, Deleuze has an unusual reading of Kant's conception of time, and his ultimate aim is to bring to light 'a precise moment within Kantianism, a furtive and explosive moment which is not even continued by Kant, much less by post-Kantianism',³ the consequences of which nevertheless reverberate within modern philosophy as well as outside it, in domains such as the cinema.

Deleuze's contention is that we have still not fully realized the consequences for our conceptions of subjectivity and selfhood of the endless, merciless line of time uncovered in its purity by transcendental philosophy. How might this relate to cinema? What is the simplest definition we can give to cinema? We can say at least that the fundamental unit of cinema is the moving image. Cinema is composed of images which move, or self-moving images.⁴ Deleuze is suggesting with his 'recapitulation thesis' that cinema develops in two main phases. In a first phase, time is subordinated to movement. Cinema thus operates with movement-images, and recapitulates traditional ideas about time. Deleuze's privileged example here is Eisenstein, who develops a form of montage able to express the dialectical totality of the world. In the second phase, cinema arrives in philosophical modernity and comes to terms with time itself, not just with movement. Deleuze's privileged examples here are Welles, Resnais and Robbe-Grillet (*Last Year in Marienbad* is the film Deleuze constantly returns to when expounding the dimensions of the time

-image) and Godard. The development of cinema thus recapitulates in image form the path leading up to a fundamental moment in philosophical modernity the realization that time is the condition of the world, that it has no beginning and end, and we are at the mercy of it. Cinema for Deleuze is possessed of a singular power in that not only is it a fundamentally temporal art form, but it is always potentially a mass art form as well, and thus is in a perfect position to crystallize a nascent human coming-to-consciousness of the fundamental character of time in the post-Kantian world.

We should comment on the justice of this apparently entirely philosophy-centric view of the cinema. Is Deleuze's claim, then, that cinema is a kind of spatio-temporal incarnation of ideas that have their pure form in philosophy? What would it mean to answer 'yes' to this question? On the plus side, if cinema is the spatio-temporal incarnation of a set of ideas about space and time, doesn't that mean that cinema, rather than being parasitic upon philosophy, assumes a powerful autonomy as a realization of philosophy? It would complete philosophy's speculation by realizing it in practice. So what philosophy gives to cinema, it gets back by realizing itself in more concrete form. However, this may seem to many to give philosophy a ridiculously exaggerated role in the internal logic of the development of cinema. So Deleuze qualifies this idea a little. If cinema in its second phase confronts time in all its purity, and overcomes the traditional ideas about time as movement that were holding it back, this moment is triggered by a specific set of socio-historical conditions. Specifically, cinema only enters its second phase after the Second World War.

The new cinema records the ruins of the old world, and depicts characters who can no longer rely on traditional, habitual ways of life, who can no longer react in the way they used to. The period after the Second World War is also marked by a new phase of capitalist development: not only are people uprooted or deterritorialized from their traditional forms of life (as in the first phase of capitalism), but their desires are now manipulated and deterritorialized by the new consumer society. Not only are old ways of living and working abolished, but people's interior lives, their very desires, are deterritorialized. Western societies become radically cut off from their past. We enter a new phase of history, governed by the tendency towards absolute deterritorialization. It is these social conditions that allow the Kantian theory of time to become relevant for everybody. And cinema is the privileged place where we can become spectators of the process of this transformation. The darkened space of the cinema auditorium, populated by bodies whose sensory-motor life is suspended along with their social being, provides the ideal space for the unfolding of what Deleuze calls 'the pure form of time', a form of time in which the temporal syntheses of memory and anticipation are permitted to detach themselves from their ballast in everyday active social experience.

This is the strong central thesis that undergirds Deleuze's Cinema. It implies an evaluation, as it implies that films which remain caught up in mere movement-images must be seen as outmoded. It also has an ethical component in that it shows that the great modern directors were attempting to come to terms with, and imagine ways of dealing with, life in a world with a profoundly new temporal structure. Deleuze's Cinema is thus a great progressive work of aesthetics. But we must note it was written in the early 1980s that is, in what perhaps now looks like the twilight of the great age of European cinema. So perhaps here as well the owl of Minerva only flies at dusk.

Concept/author/choreography: Marjana Krajač

Dramaturgy: Oliver Frljić

Performed by: Tamara Curić, Larisa Lipovac, Roberta Milevoj, Andreja Široki

Performance support: Selma Banich

Video support: Rodion

Light design: Miljenko Bengez

Graphic design: Dinko Uglešić

Produced by: Croatian Institute for Movement and Dance

Supported by: The Adventure of Impulstanz Vienna 2006

Realized through the working platform of EkS-Scena

Supported by "Culture of Change" of SC

We thank to: Mirna Žagar, Selma Banich, Maja Marjančić, Nataša Rajković, dance center TALA, working platform and team of EkS-scena, dance studio Liberdance, CeKaO „Zagreb“, Mårten Spångberg, Tor Lindstrand and the team of The Adventure, Agrest3D, College of Business and Management "Baltazar Adam Krčelić", Tomislav Krajač, Ivana Bago, Marija Mrđenović and Sanja Kocon.

Content

-A question of desire (Humberto Maturana)	1
-Champagne supernova (Oasis)	3
-French grammar (Wikipedia)	4
-Junkspace (Rem Koolhaas)	9
-Manon Lescaut Libretto (Giacomo Puccini)	18
-Monadology Gottfried (Leibnitz)	35
-Mothman (Wikipedia)	45
-On the Problem of Practice (Predrag Vranicki)	49
-Overwhelming, The Doing of Research (Mårten Spångberg)	55
-Paris Hilton (Wikipedia)	61
-Antoine François Prévost (Wikipedia)	68
-Survival of the fattest (Mikael Askergren)	70
-The Holographic Brain (with Karl Pribram, Ph.D.)	75
-Transcendental cinema (Christian Kerslake)	81