

Oihana Altube (2019)

When I practice I am moving and recognising very clearly the kinetic paths that are continuously happening in the body. I acknowledge them because I know them. I know the timing they have, their intensity, where they direct me, what their weight is and what they weigh on me. I acknowledge their contours when expanding or contracting, I acknowledge their kinesphere and above all I appreciate and move their resonances. It is *a conversation* [...]. It is not relevant if it is outside or inside because it is not binary, because it does not happen in opposition to or to the detriment of one or the other. [...] This practice offers me a list (a score?) of possible conversations, something like concrete ways of doing and perceiving, which generate a unique contextualization (location) and phenomenology (attention), a concrete sensory-motor framework that in this case we have called: *surface, articulation, texture, volume and density* among other possible nuances. [...] I insist, this practice is not binary. There is no passive or active. In fact, I would say that it is always an active practice, in the sense that it is something that "I am/is being done" all the time.

This is a practice that affects and is established within *the tacit*. That is to say: in the structures of *knowing*, in the pre-verbal or primary sensory-motor structures that our corporealities host. These pre-verbal structures (the invisible) ground and support our ability "to *make world*". Therefore, this is a radical practice (radical referred to the animal/human evolutionary development), which has the ability to plunge into what is normally not visible and thereby not reaching the subject.

The thing is that these structures are not usually accessible to "ordinary conscience" and much less to a witness (here, we could include the people who attend Eclipse: Mundo, and ourselves as practitioners / dancers). This practice

allows just the invisible to become visible. I mean, understanding the visible, as the perceivable. To do of the unnoticed, the perceived: To perceive the most sensitive structures, meaning by it: the corporeal, the affective, the motor, the structures of thought and knowledge. Potentialities or "intensities" that have not yet reached specific forms, directions, times. Potentialities that have not fully reached verbal language, although they are already oral. That is, the potentials that house and are the root and the potentiality of verbal language but have not yet been constituted as choreography, so their logic is something else, and their possibilities too. At least, what this practice offers is to play that other possibilities are possible: as if. That is, playing with these primary or tacit structures, allows the ranges of understanding and dialogue with "the world" to be above all not "normative," that is, they occur in different paradigms. They occur in the pre-conceptual.

An absolutely rich and fascinating world, which does not just operate in a clear, linear, binary or hierarchical way. So to speak, without settling in constructed cultural, social, political systems etc.

In my opinion this practice belongs to an "inactive paradigm": Here, something fascinating happens: I, as Oihana, (someone who lives and has introjected absolutely all the dominant logics of the XX and XXI century), do not practice amnesia. I don't forget, nor omit, that I am here and now within the dominant structures. What I do is to totally open myself up to the unspoken unformed structures, thanks to, and in consistent conversation with everything I have already introjected. I use the introjected to reach the unspoken. This corporeal practice is my strategy. It could be said that I actually use the introjected in another direction, with other objectives. This is something difficult to understand and explain, but it would be something similar to making the previously unnoticed perceptible; this is something I do not do in contrast with something else, and neither do I cease to perceive the predominant perceptions. It is not a game of

contrasts; it is rather a question of juggling, of uses and decisions. I shift the ordinary. But I am in the ordinary.

References:

Stolorow, D. R. Y Atwood, E. G. (2004: 37) Los contextos del ser; las bases intersubjetivas de la vida psíquica. Barcelona: Herder Editorial.

Damasio, A. (2001). La sensación de lo que ocurre. Debate: Barcelona.

Johson, M. (1991). El cuerpo en la mente: fundamentos corporales del significado, la imaginación y la razón. Debate: Madrid.

Moustakas, C. (1990). Heuristic research: Design, methodology, and applications. London: Sage.

Sela-smith, S. (2002). Heuristic Research: A Review and critique of Moustaka's Method. Journal of Humanistic Psychology. Vol.42, 53-88.