



Our comprehension of a *triangular* relation between communication as *transportation*, *forces* and *messages* is intuitive in the sense that it becomes understood *as it is* practiced, and the practice provides a *foundation* for comprehension. To define *progress* in these terms we need to be *analytical*.

Movement and messages are incorporated into the discussion of the [alter-nation](#) between the *tetra-cluster*—Bruno Latour’s analytical scheme for working with and understanding *doxa*—and *auto-cluster*, reflecting *doxa* in a *different* mode: one that is more explicitly relating to/dealing with *forces*.

Under which conditions are the borders defining in natural processes the same—or, consistent with—borders defined by humans, as co-constructors of the terrestrial artefact? To what degree does acting/being *with* the earth’s terrestrials, *comprehend* the borders of human environmental existence?



In Bruno Latour's perspective it appears that if we *accept* metamorphosis—a complete transformation—and *refuse* that the 'economic dimension' is something that can be added to anything/everything, **then** our walls and passage-ways *add* to the terrestrial artefacts created by the living on earth.

Adding the 'economic dimension' both extends to extra-terrestrial locations where we cannot go (but yet plan to go [Musk]), and ones where we have no intent of going: the *anus mundi* we depend on to live clean/untouched lives elsewhere. Which is either a *full stop*, or *refusing* the economic *a priori*.

Letting the 'economic dimension' methodically come *second*, amounts to the latter. It is consistent with anamorphosis—*partial* change resulting from the checks and balances of shifts in the *operational* and *social* circle—as well as giving a priority to synecdoche *before* metonym, sign *before* speech.

The phenomenon we call **language-exchange** is seen as the *vectorial sum* of *sign* and *speech*. And *writing* could be an instance of such a *sum*: having a *silent* mode in book-volumes, and a *spoken* mode in reading. Depending on how they are designed both modes will feature/reveal different attributes.

In other words, it is *not* the end of metaphysics but of anchoring of *theoria* in the *finite* (with a share of *common notions* with the infinite, of which Spinoza's project in *Ethica* is a case in point). Given the infinity of *attributes*, human life-ways will be determining which ones are brought up/to bear.

There are two faces of *Ethica*: one in which *substance* is (infinitely) *rare* and *distant*; another in which substance is (*infinitely*) interested/ubiquitous. Both may be *absurd* in the scope of a human life, even human history. *Neither* are absurd in the scope of *geological* time. But what of the antinomy (#04)?

Does the term entail that we set foot where we cannot/will not go? Does the metamorphosis of Gregor Samza—even as a simile—do the same? To which degree do we face the paradox that in order to apply/live by the terrestrial, we have to deconstruct it: what is revealed by its "blind spots".

That is, if to be linked to causal terms required to *monitor* and *manage* progress we have to take a 'variable geometry' into account, where the gradient of the *real* is linked to whether/not our notion affords *activity*. Where notions that arrest action—and foster impotence—are affectively *less* real.

Different *geometries* are *diversely* ethical, in this sense, but also feature the alternatives of muffling or accentuating the transformation of natural forces and mobilisation of *resident* forces (linked to the state of human activity).

Question: does Latour *arrest* mobilisation as he *hypes* transformation?

The synecdoche can *either* be seen as a *rhetorical* trope, or as a model of *semiosis* (i.e., of sign production). As a *rhetorical trope* it becomes labelled by the metonym in the economic framework. As a model of *semiosis*, it features the vectorial affordance for intercepting terrestrial [signatures](#).