



Summary—Thank you for your presentation! I will use this occasion to summarise your theory-piece titled *The scenographic space of a moving costume*. I am using a course-standard to address your piece in 3 aspects: **1)** your field of inquiry; **2)** your discussion; **3)** your conclusions. 1 page.

Specifically—your theory-piece is developed in the *composite genre* of the essay, in which costume design and architecture are joined by dance. All the elements interacting in your essay are *in performance*. None of them are developed from an external point view. All are immersed modes of costume.

Your broader concerns with picking a side when reality starts flicking between dystopia and utopia, started with the pandemic: the lockdown and the makeshift faces of the city as a potential event-space, that—with the work of time—drifted into a sense of place as an orchestral assemblage.

The path of your journey is at once systematic in its search for intermittent closure and meticulous in its keep of detail. You repeat and differ in a mode of search such that this reader has a sense that you are going somewhere. Which becomes particularly evident in your collaboration with Anu Laiho.

Precision 1—the journey starts with a correspondence addressed to yourself in the present real-time of an earlier version of you. You are sending messages to your earlier self on the BlackBook that you logged during your first term. You thereby launch your use of fiction in inquiry of the real.

The references you bring up to the effect of developing this idea, serves you well: Bernard Tschumi, Michel Foucault, Peter Brooks and Antonin Artaud.

The other space—or heterotopia—as a key to theatricality, is also found to effect the turns of the real when we pick sides. As you perform you observe.

The reskilling that occurs in the traffic between the black box and the white cube—pointed out by Claire Bishop—allows a *broader* inquiry into the city as an event space on the *same* terms. Which is how your artistic research for this project, keeps transposing artistic ideas to epistemic claims.

Precision 2—by this I mean that you manage to build a theorising performance that does the job of a philosophic inquiry—where your references to Merleau-Ponty and Pallasmaa are conjured *before* they are argued—driven by a urge to know, rather than making a profession of philosophy.

If theorising—in your case—develops a performance through a series of *transpositions*, then drawing lines no longer has to do with border control, but with the traffic of reskilling between you and Anu Laiho. *Drawing with lines* is something you and her have developed together: repurposing lines.

Your lines are thick, quilted and multicoloured. As they tangle with the dancer in studio 10, we hear the sound of the waterfalls outside. We take in the light conditions at the time recorded. We are present with you outdoors as the lines extend as tentacles draw in the powerful rhizome of the site.