$$f (1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + 6 + 7 + 8 + 9 + 10 + 11 + 12)$$

$$f (1) \oplus f (2) \oplus f (3) \oplus$$
$$f (4) \oplus f (5) \oplus f (6) \oplus$$
$$f (7) \oplus f (8) \oplus f (9) \oplus$$
$$f (10) \oplus f (11) \oplus f (12)$$

Box 1—the two model-views above—the strip to the right and the orb to the left—the elements are the same, but add differently. In the strip the elements add in an ordered sequence (ordinal number 12), but in the orb they connect in 5 different directions (cardinal number 30). This gives rise to what one might call the peak-illusion.

There are two principal modes of active models: **(1)** the first mode proceeds by simulation, substitution and erasure; **(2)** the second mode proceeds by screening, interception and framing. Both models resemble each other ontologically in that they are unlike theory: they are not eternal, as theory has an inner drive at, but are located somewhere between eternity and the garbage bin. This is particularly evident with paper-models (**Box 1**). Models, as those above, that are hom(e)morphic, feature *ordinal* and *cardinal* sums, which is how/why the alternation as adaptive to *contingencies*.

In Adorno and Benjamin's sense, they are negatively dialectic, in that they to not feature as synthesis—moving left to right—but articulate what Adorno and Benjamin understood as mediations. While the left *polygon strip* features communicative steps (the Leachian *ritual* xiv), the right *polygon orb* is a multiple: while the left is nomadic, the right is monadic. Today we need to take into account the existence of such models: the first mode **(1)** is currently found in apparently different areas: the proliferation of AI/machine learning, alt right populism, and deep sea mining. Principle: lock-in.

The first phase of lock-in is nomadic: it proceeds stepwise, often with small steps; when reaching a certain threshold of bringing us within and beyond where we were—following the principle of simulation, substitution and erasure—it shifts into the monadic mode. The way of being in the monadic phase-shift is that it appears to be irreversible. Evidently, calling the same technology artificial intelligence (AI), rather than machine learning (ML), has two different ideological impact: the quasi-religious expectation of singularity (AI) versus a reversible alternating principle (ML).

Following the logic of *lock-in* in IT, the contingent mobilisation of Steve Bannon (USA) in the ranks of gamers, comes to mind. One, among several examples, of the migrational potential of the model in question. Publicity follows a similar *pattern*: from seeking to calm consumers in the wake of progress (from the 1960s) by telling them that *it's gonna be OK*, to a pattern of warning about an impending *crisis*: often by the same people who created the problem (as with AI). So, from years of apparently trivial steps, aggregate till the monadic shift/break is warranted in the wake of *lock-in*. The Sante Fe Institute meets Wall Street.

What is currently going on with deep sea mining follows the same logic: it is to develop the activity by small nomadic steps (*exploration*), and shift unto the monadic phase, when dependencies and thereby the activity have been established (*exploitation*). In a way, this is completely trivial and we need not wonder about it. By virtue of sharing into a *modus operandi*—that resemble each other to a point—capitalism, AI (as a made up avatar of the *invisible hand*) and alt-right populism/fascism, are becoming difficult to distinguish. What they do have in common is that the model exists to make operations more

Box 2. "This workshop explores the manifold manifestations of spirals and spiraling motion in our body, in particular the movement possibilities of the spine" Opening: the spiral as conceived in the body-text is a material for the spine.

efficient. But what about of the critical *modus operandi*? Is it sustainable? Can it be developed?

Because the nomadic/monadic model can be set to work in a more (*negative*) dialectical mode: the mode of mediations. Here we leave the panache of moving from covert actions (nomadic) to peak with public monadic manifestations—the general pattern of *going public*, discussed above—but instead alternating between the nomadic and monadic phases, rather than subscribing to a unidirectional shift: the famous Tatcherian, *there is no alternative*. To which we may respond with the practice of *alternating*. Which I believe is the gist of present developments in performing arts.

That is, developing a practice of *shifting* between nomadism *and* monadism: focussing on the between-space—Marcel Duchamp's *inframince*—rather than on the unidirectional/progressive alternative (cf, the Manifest Destiny in the USA). That is, focussing on the mediations of the *infra-mince* (Eng. infrathin): which Marcel Duchamp as the transitions between 2D and 3D. He conce-ived the sound of someone walking with a *corduroy* pant as an example of the infrathin. But in moving back and forth between the strip and the orb, what is revealed is a *rotational* movement.

That is, a hyper-dimensional rotation—moving from 2D to 3D—and a hypo-dimensional rotation; moving *from* 3D *to* 2D and *back*: the winding/unwinding of the spiral featuring in a Möbius strip. The equivalent in *motion* to pneuma. The dialectic of contraction/release in movement grants it a two-way efficiency (e.g. as between choreography and dance-movement): proceeding by reversals and upheavals. Constructive arrogance and humble activism mediated. What's the yield? For the time being let us call it *anaptúxis.* Flowering, growth, development and explanation in Greek.

The three-step of screening, interception and framing could be exemplified by Otto Ramstad's dance-archaeological work in finding his way to Ramstad (in Sjåk, upper Gudbrandsdalen). Work-ing his way back and forth between the steps of his inquiry into the site and the kaleidoscope of its archives: the spirals of nomadic/monadic relayed in dance movement. Building and deconstructing memory. We may also think of the Laurie Anderson exhibition in Stockholm, at Moderna Museet. Experiments in living *intra-acting* with learning from it: that is, learning to live finally (Derrida).

So, within this realm of exploration in mind let me return to the between-eternity-and-garbage-bin models: while the strip is locked to an ordinal sequence of steps (i.e., in *ordinal* number 12), the orb links in multiple directions counting connections (i.e., in *cardinal* number 30). And: while one is invited to think of what comes *before* and *after* the strip, while the orb closes on a *single* formation. Which means that the strip and the orb restrict/exceed distinctively: while *discretely* in this mode— featuring Laurie Anderson's viophonograph (**Box 3**)—*discreetly* in the other (fascist) mode.

Let us call them the *discrete* vs. *discreet* modes of nomadic (strip)/monadic (orb) models. What is achieved in the discrete mode is that the model is part of the equation: it is visible and declared.

What the discreet mode does is to operate under the cover of business confidentiality, underground movements, or hiding in plain sight within tools we use on our computers every day. Clearly, these are not two equival-ent options. Since they bring humanity and the terrestrial habitat in two directions that may have nothing in common whatsoever.

If we are to continue to have democracy as a founding political principle, the discreet mode has to be abandoned. In other words that we take a decisive step from efficiently to critical-ity: to focus on hatching *and* harvesting new *repertoires*, rather than doing what we already do—which is not going well—only more effici-ently (as if speeding would solve anything). *Anaptúxis* is the generative process from lear-ning to live/evolve in the *between-space*.

Box 3—Laurie Anderson with her viophonograph (1977) invented by her. To listen to go to video Songs for lines/songs for waves (1977).