

The self in the *expanded* sense—or, the self writ *large*—may be a core proposition in *environmental humanities*. It would be an invitation to conceive, for instance, the act of *reading* as a *multiplication* of *vantage points*. The multiplication of the eyes in the magnanimous feathering of a peacock's tail.

A more *humble path* is for the *formats* to multiply—in place of the eyes—in a more *disseminated* mode of the expanded self: the multiplication would take place in the form of small movements (or, *rumours*) in materials such as we may find in archives, that are readable only through visual-tactile metaphors.

While the archives would then operate as the *wardrobe* of the self, the emergence of understandings from multiple readings would operate more like a *cabinet* of that self: that is, the vantage point of great syntheses. Pairs and re-pairs; original-reproduction; record-replay; tetracluster and autocluster.



The difference between tetraclusters and autoclusters has now been established. As we alternate between them change will be generated, but drifting or moving sideways: change will happen in both. Change can not only be difficult to achieve—even as it is desired—it can also be difficult to detect.

There is *no* intermediary position between *the two*, from where change can be initiated and monitored. They have *nothing* in common whatsoever. Not even, strictly speaking, *difference*. That is, they differ from each other differently. Oddly, there is a difference in how difference maps in the two of them.

Zero (0) elements of the tetracluster belong to the autocluster. And the set corresponding to the tetracluster in the autocluster is the empty set (Ø). So, the difference between the tetracluster and the autocluster, and the difference between the autocluster and tetracluster are not of the same order.

For instance, there is nothing (0) to indicate in the rule-sets of drawing and of folding—used by B.M. Keilhau on his mountain journey (#04)—that the *reproduction* should use the *creases* of the folds to determine the *selection* of reproduction (that were based on what was indicated as the record).

In other words, there was *nothing* in the *record* to *indicate* the selection used in the reproduction. The reproduction *did refer* to the original as a *record* (of such and such date). So, the selection was based on an *artistic proposition*: 'we will follow the creases in the original to make the selection'.

Conversely, the *rules of drawing and folding* affected by the artistic proposition is an empty set (Ø) since the artistic proposition is not bound by the restriction that it should set a rule by its example: it is *the rule of that case*—the definition of an autocluster—but is *not* a more broadly applicable rule.

The rule of the case is its singular readability: it was makes the reproduction an *opus operatum*. The rules of drawing and folding, on the other hand, are *trade-rules*: one that accommodates *opinion*, *knowledge*, *critique* and certain *ways*—the originals in the collection were *annotated* in the aftermath.

By alternating between the records and how they became replayed in the reproductions, the movement back and forth between record and replay spurs a generative process, whereby the two clusters bleed into each other over time: with a lateral drift, or sideways motion, as a result. Crabwise.

For instance, the inclusion into the *modus operandi* of drawing and folding the kinds of information in a drawing, lending itself to reproduction at a later stage, should be concentrated in *middle* of a sheet where they should be no folding-creases (from *experience* of drawing and folding over time).

This can surely happen, but from years of *practise* (and not from the rule of the case, or the artistic proposition *per se*). Which makes the change difficult to pinpoint, and also to determine whether evidence of change indicates that it was desired; or, *obtained* from the self in an *expanded* sense.