



During the C19 pandemic the *memory* of places emerged in the wake of a *craving for location*: to locate operations at work *and* in life, in transactions between our home *and* the computer-screen that has attracted a lot of attention. While our movements *outdoors* receded into the background.

For instance, watching a dance performance on vimeo (#02) my *memory* of the black box, where the performance took place, helped making the video *contents* readable. It was costume designer and scenographer Pinelopi Spanou who attached an importance to this naive observation of mine.

And, thinking about it, the fairly extant [bike-tours](#) that I—and many others—have embarked on, at leisure, during the lockdown. For one, it facilitates the safety precautions preventing viral contamination. But the bicycle also works as a gramophone *needle* in picking up sites and embodying location.



Initially, the idea of repair/re-pair appeared simple and straightforward: adapting to the C19 pandemic, we *re-paired* our life-spaces— analog and digital—in *new* ways: with the *video* as an emergent conceptual framework for what a computer *does*, displacing other applications as *context*.

The homes have become staged for public work-related functions. And the gregarious needs have been displaced into the open: outdoors. In other words a spatiotemporal reconfiguration of society has been taking place. A global displacement within the local, to invent life anew, in different ways.

So, the simple question is: what have we learned—at a collective, even global, scale—about local displacement, changing the way that we live, when we had to. Since it came about in response to an event in our natural environment (sars COVID-19), we may wonder: *when do we have to?*

Of course, the *virus* quickly acquired a considerable *fame* (#02), but this alone did not bring about the displacement. The dissemination and enforcement of *restrictions*, as well as the compliance to these, sprung from our social and historical repertoire of mobilisation: a war-response of sorts.

That is, attempting to forestall an impact, by attempting to eliminate it. Or at least, to control/reduce its impact. The regime of *vaccination* differs from this since it does *not* seek control at distance, but a *proximal* response. The first paradoxically *accentuating* the presence of the virus, the second *not*.

Vaccinated we can—individually and collectively—remain *oblivious* to the virus: that is, think and act as though it was not there. Perhaps the transition can be facilitated, or interfaced, by a [micro-phenomenological approach](#). Given the link of *presence* to *threat*. And *absence* to the sense of *safety*.

Jim feels *safe*. Carol has *knowledge* that gives him reason to feel safe. Gary is *critical* to this knowledge. Jenny opts for caution and *sustains* preparing for crises/threats. We can readily imagine the kind of *underlying* process manifested by this kind of calibration-and-dissent in a *unified* social swirl.

In other words, though clearly featuring a variety of *different* positions, they are *one* in *substance*: we expect this *variety* to exist at any time, under *normal* conditions. Under states of *exception*, the threat becomes generalised. And, although the other positions exist, they are *contained*.

The foursquare clustering of views and statement is from Bruno Latour: **1)** take a free-floating statement; **2)** find one supporting it based on knowledge; **3)** home in a sceptical/critical position; **4)** establish a *resilient position* provisionally aloof to the floating statement, and sticking to current practice.

The beauty of this model is that it begins **1)** and ends **4)** with *doxa*—assumption—and not from diverse positions of knowledge [that is **2)** and **3)** in the *middle*] which thereby are conceived as mediators, or in terms of mediations of **1)** and **4)**. Mediating the whole (**1-4**) by containing a *local* swirl.