

In the mathematics of attributes is it possible to say that /ambient + legible i = embodied/? That in the perimeter of a 'incarnate body'—that extends to the degree that something returns to it (but never further)—is the hatching ground for 'phenomenological bodies', that somehow are empty and available?

Phenomenological bodies result from 'embodiment': it is a particular class of attribution that an incarnate body can pass on to inanimate objects, and thereby make up/develop a world. Embodiment does not make a dead thing live. But makes it a subject of consideration, available for more than one person.

A body is an object allowed into the **œcumene** of humans. Often we forget to question whether **incarnate bodies**—somehow—have been **similarly** constituted. That is, that the mode of constitution of an incarnate body is in the flesh. Alternatively, the human corporeal embodier is one suited to take to the flesh.



bauhaus digital

If divested from its reference to a technological platform, the **spatial workstation** is a programme—or, a strategy—for inquiring into and cultivating a particular human spatial competence linked to **embodiment**. The generation, multiplication and inhabitation of **bodies** that make up **our life-worlds**,

Bodies are sign-posts and vessels of a conglomerate space that I have called the Edgeland(s). As bodies they are neither ambient nor readable: rather, they are 'worlds unto themselves'. In this sense, to lose a body is to lose a world. Bodies are elements of a life-world that make up its dwelling qualities.

So, if I have made an attempt of making digital technology local it is not a normative position for technology. Just as the Bauhaus' position on industrial manufacture—and the simplicity of its geometric forms—was not a normative position for industry. But rather for the human lifeworlds in an industrial age.

My engagement with digital technology is similar (and similarly critical of digital deployments). My engagement with Google StreetView is the development of a functional technology based on a cartographic project conceived on an industrial scale for planet earth. It is also mainstreamed.

Which means that the viewing devices created for it are available to everyone with a mobile. It is directly relevant to the way we live, which is also why the involvement of technology in strategies of embodiment, is a suitable one for design. In other words, to those **not content** to leave impact to its own means.

The interest in the conjoint hit-and-impact of technology is not technology: it is design formulated under the strategic investment in spatial competence (embodiment). People who think that engaging with technology must be driven by a special interest for technology are simply not in sync with our day.

Moreover, the conjoint interest in hit-and-impact is **ecological** both in the sense of **a)** informational depth [hit]; **b)** metabolic information [impact]. An updated version of 'deep ecology' needs to be heedful of embodiment as an environmental factor which is deeply **entangled** with natural processes.

So, there is no technological frenzy in my proposal for a **spatial workstation**. It simply takes stock of the world we live in, which today includes a large share of digital platforms and their use; the existence of which are unaccounted for in environmental terms: that is, its hit-and-impact.

That is, techno-cultural processes that add to the mining of materials needed to build a mobile. These **two processes** need to be considered **conjointly** for the whole enterprise—a civilisational enterprise beyond democratic control—to become accountable. The manufacture and use as a disordered system.

Probably, the greatest resistance to the strategy of embodiment—as a spatial competence—is likely to be *horror vacui*: the abhorrence of empty space. In the strategy of embodiment lies a programme for the proliferation of empty/ available space. That is, the idea of the **common** as an environmental form.