Notwithstanding whether disagreement can be contained and define collective agency, and whether exchanges like the present one are a form of work, I want to ask this question: what good can we do in society.

This is pertaining to ethics as the aspiration and key to a good life, in a community. Ethics may arguably come from a day and age where you could and had to work from where you are. You are in this community, not all over.

Today we know that this is precisely one of the things that puts us under challenge. If asked from where do we work, what could we answer? Where are we during this session. Are we on zoom, are we in each our homes?

Obviously, this is not an either/or question. However, for not so long time ago it would have. Zoom is a kind of *non-site*, to borrow a term from Robert Smithson, but it is local: we can locate ourselves/the discussion on Zoom.

We only have to accept that the audio-visual input we receive from the screen, is from real people with a voice and a vote, sitting somewhere else. From this point of view like being inside a book: a generic sense of place.

Zmeeting—meeting on Zoom—is not site-specific. Yet, like reading a book, it is takes place somewhere. So, we become like Pirandello's six characters in search of an author. Each of us being one the characters, but each of us also being an author.

So, then the question is: if we are equal on Zoom, how do with differ in life? And how does this *differing-from-the-equal—while maintaining equality*—take place in real time, as something ongoing right now?

What does this opening-by-the-question have to do with urgency? In some ways, zmeeting embodies the state of exception: we agree on meeting in this way, exceptionally. When the pandemic is over will be go back to normal.

But then, what happens if the state of exception becomes permanent (the new normal)? The internet works like this all the time: the daily updates establish a new normal for us. And so we adapt. *But what to?*

What happens if we transpose the *moving logic* of the *new normal* to our *behaviour, in daily life*—whether online or unplugged? Do we accept that people's standards change all the time? And are standards "standards"?

To me the hit-and-run logic of wannabe activist postings on social media are problematic here. How can we stand up for what we express—in the name of freedom—if our standards are changing all the time?

What does freedom of expression mean if we are not really accountable? And, if we are accountable, how do we proceed to make up for our *debts to reality*, as our views evolve when we have more experience and knowledge? Is the role of documentation?

Instead of finishing by just lining up a series of questions, I would like to propose the idea that documentation of artistic process is the equivalent of *provenance* in artistic research. The knowledge of how a project has moved.

Is it possible to see this as a *gain*, rather than simply covering the said debt to reality. Keeping track of how we move. Easy said, but difficult to do. But maybe it is a critical care of depth in what we do. Potentially worth it.