

18 Paragraphs for A Metaphysics of Dance

1. Movement is. It or they exist. Movements are equally in the world as any other objects may that be a battery, a horse, a soap, some smoke, springtime or a romantic comedy. Movement's participation in this equality, however is not equal to the participation of for example that of a battery, a horse, some smoke, springtime, a romantic comedy or humans.

2. Movement, singular or plural remains and disappears no more or less than snow, a Ford model T, meatballs, eternity, a grandmother, a financial crises or a magical trick.

3. Movement must be saved from memory, presence (and its obverse absence), trace and, especially metaphor, from the condescending position the postmodern predicament forced upon it in collaboration with psychoanalysis and identity-politics, and must instead be considered as something that exists equally in the past, the present and the future.

Movement as such is an indivisible monster, definitely not a divided monstrosity inspired by psychoanalysis and is never, never ever, a ghost. Movement is everything else than a specter. Movement fucks hauntology and is materialist and *weird*.

Movement in respect of epistemology might be subject to certain volatilities and even disappearance but ontologically movement remains however engaged in a constant process of withdrawal.

Movement is an object, and movements are disconnected assemblages of objects. Only a movement that exists carries the possibility of "avenir".

4. From the perspective of consciousness movement as anything else is metaphoric. Over the last many hundred years movement has been abused by and through metaphor. From the perspective of movement metaphor, however is not the case or in charge, from the perspective of movement, movement is movement. The task of the moving is to contest the forced enslavement of movement to consciousness (metaphor), in favour of movement that is itself and as such. Our responsibility as moving, independent of subjectivity, is to free movement not our selves. The first rule of the moving is to give itself up, to really move implies to betray ones belongings.

5. Movement knows nothing about Euclidean geometry, Fibonacci or Da Vinci and thank God for that. Any kind of geometry is a construction in and through consciousness. Geometry implies a more or less complex representation of reality, but it is always a representation, and of reality. Geometry is a finite consistency providing a sustainable perspective, something that confirms identity and subjectivity. Movement obeys its own geometries, geometries of human consciousness, or epistemology has no access. Those geometries are contingently familiar or not with diagonals, triangles and 360 degrees. Movement doesn't care about choreographic structures, it minds its own business and isn't listed or reachable.

6. Movement is in the world as much as any other entity animate or inanimate. Hence movement is equally aware of its being in the world. Movement has subjectivity however it is a subjectivity that is incompatible to ours' or others'.

REPORT THIS AD

7. Movement is not more or less complex than a boy, an airplane, a wetsuit or graphic design, but it's complexity is incompatible with those and others.

8. Movement is in the world although it is engaged in a constant process of withdrawal. Movement withdraws from processes of subjectification in order to preserve its autonomy, to remaining movement. It withdraws from the desire of other subjectivities to locate it spatio-temporally – to subjectify it.

Engaged in a process of withdrawal, movement resides in a dynamic realm between existence and potentiality. A movement that is given to withdraw is a dark-precursor.

9. Movement does not form semiotic consistencies. Other subjectivities strive to import movement into contained semiotic systematics. *If* – which is contingent – movement is implicated in semiotic coagulations those further are contingently compatible to semiotic systems acknowledged by human and other forms of subjectivity. Movement inscribed in semiotic consistencies can be subject to translation, a process that as such disarms, or robs movement of its possible potentiality. Faithfulness to movement implies to insist on its in-translatability. Movement can and must be categorized and inscribed into consciousness but that does not mean it becomes identical to meaning production or signification. Movement is language as much or little as a stone, a café, fucking or you and me.

10. Human subjectivity cannot access movement nor can movement access human subjectivity, what a human subject can access is a certain consciousness's relation to movement. Movement – singular or plural – cannot and will never be understood in itself, what can be inscribed in or located by knowledge is always only the subject's relation to movement. Movement doesn't need us.

11. Movement in itself is in no respect identical with its representations. This is neither good or bad, but needs to be acknowledged and engaged with.

12. Movement in respect of representation is by definition probabilistic. Movement in itself and as such, on the contrary, is contingent to representation.

13. Movement vis-à-vis representation is always general and special, which implies the possibility of participation in the circulation of property. Movement in itself and as such is by necessity generic and specific, which makes it incompatible with such circulation, because as generic it assumes an endless supply and as specific it can only be interchanged with itself, and thus is rendered useless in respect of any market.

14. Movement as we know it, through whatever forms of knowledge – cognition, emotion, sensation, physicality or intuition, is always local, contextual, measurable and the expression of a determined perspective, Movement in itself and as such on the other hand is always universal, non-contextual, immeasurable or indivisible and the non-expression of an open, full-circle horizon.

15. Movement escapes any known structural consistencies and obeys only its own, for subjectivity inaccessible, organizational capacities.

16. If an architect is an individual that fears disorder and devotes life to the structuring, to the stabilization of space. Choreographer is the name of somebody that fears movement.

A dancer is also fear ridden, but most often does not know he fears movement, a dancer experience pure fear.

Improvisation is largely a denial, a denial of movement, or a liberal conception that always negotiates and preserves and never produces. Improvisation cherishes difference and renounces the emergence of anything different. Contrary to its self-conception, paradoxically improvisation consolidates already established relations between consciousness and movement. Improvisation is itself a defense mechanism, a way of obfuscating the real withdrawal of movement, of not taking movement seriously. The true target of the improviser, thus is not the liberation of movement from consciousness or semiotics, but from his own non-belief in movement.

A serious approach to movement by necessity implies engagement with fear, engagement with the very process of withdrawal, a process that contests or endangers subjectivity. A serious engagement with movement, the dark-precursor implies an engagement with the risk of losing everything.

The problem with improvisation is not that it is improvisation but that it isn't improvisation enough, it is not that it is free but that it is not free enough. True improvisation, a serious relation to movement ready to betray all sides, must necessarily be formed out of a systematic imagination (choreography), whose

foundational three components are: the readiness to forsake one's life for the sake of movement, the bringing of creativity and readiness to take risk, and to find within the engagement in movement, in withdrawal, an innocent joy in the activity, and hence clear all traces of self-sacrifice.

In other words choreography is a necessary prime mover in the pursuit of a movement that is itself and as such.

17. As dark-precursor movement engages in the world through forms of excessive sensuality. Movement in itself is not reflexive, divisible or economical. It engages in the world through specific kinds of orgasmic oscillation.

18. To dance does not imply to engage with something, to form relations, to merge. On the contrary to dance, with its relation to choreography, is like dictating a love letter to someone one knows one can never have. To really dance implies to acknowledge and celebrate that movement is and must remain radically alien