

To Plurality and Synthesis — Tradition, Objects, and Body: An Anthropological Design Didactic Principle

Dr Aleksa Bijelovic

Senior Lecturer, School of Design and the Built Environment, Curtin University, Perth WA, Australia

Abstract: A fragment of a broader enquiry on flexibility, this piece is an appreciation of the plurality of actors and dispersed factors of human conditions within the design practice. A primary mark is the academic learning domain of the so-called Western rites and their contemporary derivatives. Anthropological perspectives of this heritage, incited by the Maussian thoughts on techniques, are the conceptual framework for considering the major themes of interest.

With that in mind, while understanding inherited incompetency to apprehend varied accounts, thinking, and sources beyond one's own cultural milieu and similar contexts — the concepts looked into here are employed to confront boundaries of cultural and societal and to shift focus to the realm of the individual as a premise of plurality. This notion of envisioned plurality is mainly examined through distinct human features isolated from the known structures of shared traditions and heritage while acknowledging the formative effects of their social origins.

Contrasted to the process of blending (of elements like behaviours, ideas, and experiences) that usually lead to modern ethical commonalities, social cohesion, historical traditions, and symbolic bonds — the synthesis issue discussed here is a divergent procedure. It is a revelation of the obvious. Individual traits (elements) reserve their primary form and join into a loose network of heterogeneous experiences of others, synthesising new appreciation, not decorum. Inevitably, this sort of synthesis also leads to potential structural formations, the nature of which is yet to be speculated.

Other sub-themes and fine points of interest are — tools of knowledge, material aspects and products of cognition, physical objects as didacts, and knowing-through-making.

An overarching dialectical umbrella will operate as a conveyance of comprehension to yield relevant practical points of academic learning.

Keywords: flexibility, learning, cognition, techniques

Objects

Discovering exciting ties between humans and material objects is to start facing and understanding the intimate self and one's complex relation to the surrounding environment, common histories, and immediate cultural contexts. Then, imagine a glimpse of the sum of realities of countless others and be surprised at the quantity of opportunities emerging from the idea. It might be terrifying simply to regard the variety of the histories of all and everything that exists and has existed, but the intention of doing so is worth the thought. It is also worth trying because of the potential to learn from seemingly dull issues of daily practices, habits, sceneries, chance occurrences, or cordial conversations. Without considering these, the flowing change of conditions in time, spanning generations, would have made the dense, disparate mixture of elaborate personal habits into a blended haze of standardised memories. Whereas it mostly looks like we occupy generic everyday realities, when imagining prospects arising from mundane personal experiences of self and others, regardless of the group identity, there is a track to the discovery of new knowledge. In this case, it would be about humans and the material things, inanimate objects we appropriate and create, with which we bond in unconventional ways.

Before delving into the specifics, it is essential to illustrate a central features framework to discuss the type of objects of concern. These objects are human-ideated, produced, operated, and owned. They are material (physical). They may be of functional service, although it is sometimes problematic to recognise the practicality clearly. Optical impressions and aesthetic attributes are important and usually implied, being formative of the objects' presence. They have social value and represent and generate culture. There could be a particular property distinctly loaded into them that may not be aligned with the intended or declared role of the object. When this property is biased, an object may become divisive, representing a group or individual status as pre-eminent, implicitly intent on contrasting the owner/handler/keeper, or their class, from the general or target surroundings. With it comes exclusivity, which does not need to suppose scarcity; it could be mass-produced, available, affordable, and within anyone's reach but still unique, suggesting meaning beyond general knowledge and comprehension. Here, symbolic communication plays a role in idea transfer, be it only within the small audience of a close-knit community or outwards the generalised public.

Broadly along the lines of the proposed features, these objects may be conceptually interpreted as fetishes. They are of a specific kind and character and possibly sit within the distinct historical realm of fetish. Yet, the use of the term here is twofold; it is also a part of the reasoning procedure, a provocative and targeted appropriation of the term for interpretive purposes to prompt the thinking process in a certain direction.

The body of work of William Pietz on the topic of fetish can be critical in positioning the base notion of the idea.¹ This particular outlook, alongside adjoining commentaries and complementing thoughts on the issue, is constructive in removing oneself from a colloquial terminology of the day-to-day and instilling historical awareness, if not the complete understanding of the roots and formation of the modern-day image of fetish. Also, it helps to curb the assessment of the concept per se as something to embrace, reject, or scale the affinity in any way so as to achieve an uninhibited explorative practice and acknowledge all variations surrounding objects acting as fetishes. In its numerous shapes and interpretations, the term itself evolved to become so many different things with so many different meanings, shape-shifting from discourse to discourse, and the primary purpose here is to create a particular connotation by which to play and comprehend the nature of the fetish.

From these illuminative interpretations, readings and lessons based on documented accounts, without going into an in-depth breakdown of the relations and historical consequences, it could be contemplated that a long-run, unstructured dialogue of unlike forces may bring unfamiliar concepts to life. Complex social traffic between parties of diverse cosmological outlooks and life experiences will yield unexpected results on its own. It is about the specific mechanisms of cultural production that create new ideas and ways of understanding one's surroundings — a dialogue of revealed social experiences synthesising new knowledge (Graeber 2005). How these processes occur is a separate matter, but the awareness and quality of change that happens are of interest. In each personal contemplation and deliberate creative attempt, the cognition of the inevitable change occurring in distinctive social processes allows circumstances for new knowledge to set in. It is not separated incidents, a learned skill of any type, or any human effort alone that can drive the change isolated from a contextual umbrella of endless social associations. Any carry minimal significance if their essence is not revealed as being a dependent structural part of the continual community-based transition, which is, in turn, inherently resulting from an unstructured dialogue of diverse actors — a balanced dichotomy that evokes tradition.

The particularity of individuals observing and conceptualising everyday sensations, specifically in the form of material objects, comes as a perfect play tool for a speculative exercise aiming to reimagine the object appreciation approach. Let's imply that it is evident that the current environment we populate is saturated with human-devised and fabricated things, and in whatever form they are, even digital, they are material and occupy a measurable quantity of space and consume some energy. A significant part of that energy is our allocated attention and our time invested in handling and caring for them. Even when these things are being discarded, they keep consuming new energy from various sources, still occupying physical space and existing in a perhaps different form.

The interesting part here is the energy we emit through attention. In essence, this kind of energy is complex to define, but it is also material and sourced from typical biological processes, including the superficial survival by using raw fuels our bodies burn to subsist and the more intricate ones, like neural responses to the surrounding impulses and our inner instincts. All this is organic in that we are used to it and that these processes are familiar to us from the early days. Furthermore, interconnections between humans are almost exclusively organic by the same account, the levels of which depend on multiple factors, with shared attention being a common occurrence, but it becomes especially different and intriguing when primarily inanimate phenomena come into play. The energy spent through attention towards the biologically non-living material objects is fascinating. This is more so if one envisions the same complex processes happening in the human-to-living and human-to-inanimate phenomena relationships. The point of curiosity and fascination in this instance is solely related to the attention to non-living objects in the distinctive human-to-inanimate phenomena relationship and the imagination of value and attachment to objects this condition brings with itself.

Generic Body

A different kind of attention, the one towards ordinary daily practices, is of great interest when discussing the issue of human-(fetish)object relationships. As our focus drifts, these practices are mostly unnoticed, granted within the usual attention span, but they are in big part what makes a difference when it comes to the variety of habits and their physical manifestations. These habits are material occurrences and images of society projected through the individual. Engraved in everyone's behaviour, closely linked to the group but highly subjective at the

¹ Pietz on Fetish — "In this discussion of the problem of the fetish I have tried only to delineate the most basic themes that recur throughout the history of fetish discourse: irreducible materiality; a fixed power to repeat an original event of singular synthesis or ordering; the institutional construction of consciousness of the social value of things; and the material fetish as an object established in an intense relation to and with power over the desires, actions, health, and self-identity of individuals whose personhood is conceived as inseparable from their bodies. These themes might now be used to guide an investigation of the history of fetish theory that would try to understand in what way these ideas form a unity and why this unique 'problem-idea' emerged out of this particular historical situation — a mercantile cross-cultural space of transvaluation between material objects of radically different social orders." (Pietz 1985, p. 10)

same time, these are the reflexes of personal histories in the larger social environment, a space where personalised actions develop as a mixture of biological traits and societal norms.

Leaning onto the anthropological perspectives as by nature observational, interpretative, and innately speculative by intent, the engaging thought of Marcel Mauss, especially on the subject of techniques of the body, offer provocation of further arrangements, and they are an inspiring framework to work with.² The issue is to explore creative options and how physical actions of the body, inherited by learning and social training via upbringing, affect us and our relationship with material objects.

Unlike in Mauss, the concept of society used here is not a communal one, of a group of associated individuals forming culture, but a specially constructed instrument for managing habits and actions bonded in controlled tradition throughout generations. A well-trained system that runs with minimal effort and adjustment. It is, of course, a speculative term and somewhat fictional concept that is difficult to define and possibly overly simplified for the sake of making a point. It is not factual but is true to life. Its image is formed to look like an evolutionary outcome shaped by group efforts, where, in fact, it works more or less the same way throughout history, only to modify in appearance. Efficient and wicked, it is created and run by a few who pass it on to the next line of administrators.

An act of intimate acknowledgement and earned knowledge as a personal value is disruptive to a forced dogmatic organisational system. To reach any form of knowledge starts with recognising phenomena that are granted and invisible or unappreciated as common and dull. Within the stretch of material objects in relation to people, common and dull are critical. This is where socially trained and retained ways of physical movement and interactions with space come into focus as one of the ways culture manifests itself through people. A mundane occurrence as it may be, human physical actions are shaped by societal norms and biology. Biology is a universal factor and, by definition, usually inherited; norms are pushed, planted, and practised. The slightest bodily gesture embodies cultural norms wherever they sit in the spectrum of etiquette. The way we occupy space with our bodies also comes from norms borne out of tradition. The intensity of touch, sense of the suitable spatial situation, sensitivity to the perception of others, and handling of items — are all cultural.

Being a cultural product is being general, a group circumstance that follows the logic of default modes of thinking; being a person is being distinct by sheer material logic. As such, even as a cultural product, the actions and habits are purely intimate and singular. Physical actions still reproduce tradition, but the subjective visions of the actor who employs them are vital to liberation from the norms and reappropriation of one's own material space. The process of emancipation starts with the revelation of singularity within the seemingly general context and physical manifestations.

Anthropometric Alternative

Similar to fetish, which is, as habits and their physical manifestations, fundamentally intimate and singular with particular experiences being organically read into the public memories — by investing attention to the ordinary physicality of the body, the illumination of individual subjectivity is the emancipatory change itself. If there is an understanding that a bodily form is never just a chance incident and a movement is driven not only by biological practicality, the routes for assembling an anthropometric alternative to the conventional concepts of the body in space are cleared. The alternative does not entail any radical revelation. What is revealed is just a part of the omnipresent universal human nature understood through the study of self in the broader cultural and historical sense.

In the Maussian spectrum, body techniques and technical actions are social rather than individual and other than the pure practicality of solving life tasks, they are used to pass on tradition and produce common knowledge as created via collective effort. They belong to the social group and are symbolically representative of the values the group breeds (Mauss, James & Allen 1998).

The new knowledge discussed here is different because it is emancipatory from the collective (yet devised of it), and of itself, it is purely individual and singular. Their particularity lies not in the material aspects as the observed techniques, gestures and movements, body forms, and their practical outputs are still all the same, and their origin is in the tradition and culture. The material nature of the process does not differ in any way. What is new is the attitude and added attention. It is about uncovering the obvious. The critical perspective of this procedure is to apprehend the mechanisms so as to understand the societal bonds that nourish the progressive

² Mauss on Techniques — "Previously we were taught to dive after having learnt to swim. And when we were learning to dive, we were taught to close our eyes and then to open them under water. Today the technique is the other way round. The whole training begins by getting the children used to keeping their eyes open under water. Thus, even before they can swim, particular care is taken to get the children to control their dangerous but instinctive ocular reflexes, before all else they are familiarised with the water, their fears are suppressed, a certain confidence is created, suspensions and movements are selected." (Mauss 1973, p. 71)

development of the techniques, tradition, culture, and monitoring and evaluation of collective habits in individuals. With this comes the gradual awareness of the nature of society and culture, how they develop, and what they are for. The new knowledge is embodied in the emancipation itself.

The main piece of the complex cultural system to tackle first is the realm of personal histories and experience. The topic is intimate and clearly open for study. As it is not about the documentation but mostly the experience of self-investigation, the process, it is strategically wise to isolate an intriguing but also typical sensation of a physical gesture a person exhibits to propel the interest and keep the investigation going. Through an in-depth self-study and reflection, a selected component, a specific physical act of curiosity, is dismantled thoroughly piece by piece and tracked back to its origins. The main goal is to exercise the intent of travelling back to the origins and untangling further factors, whatever may be, spending time flowing through the reflection and filling out the memory gaps, reimagining and recreating the thread of life events freely. It is not necessarily about finding considerable facts but devising a subjective narrative of an apparently generic habit.

One of the objectives of this introspective process is to devise an anthropometric alternative to the standardised procedures of measuring the human body. To devise such a tool to promote plurality and perspectives of unique individual varieties of shared culture, not only the bodily variations as a biological aspect of life but mostly the particular meanings behind every move each body makes. Besides, typically accepted metrics of the physical form and actions are inadequate to clarify the nature of the movement. What it does is generalise the human condition via socially measured standards with the pursuit of cultivating the industrial production of objects as commodities.

Body, Space

One of the main draws of the alternative anthropometrics study is experimenting with the bodily form ignited by the specific physical act to achieve the objective of earning experience by the relative physical position in the environment — the body in space. Complementary to the singular condition of any human action, regardless of the point in history or situation, a spatial context is vital to any bodily experience, and the physical space, like bodily manifestations, is never generic either. Just as physical movements of the body are images of culture, so is the space. Both body and space are ultimately autonomous categories but are also interdependent, as only together are they able to generate cultural assets. No bodily activity or gesture can be socially productive outside of the physical space as an envelope for action. It cannot display any message without being present in and occupying a physical volume, and along with it, in the symbiosis, the actual movements of the body become real and singular. If closely explored, the symbiotic situation is what creates culture and, on its own, should be able to inform the societal narrative, including the meanings and symbolic languages of culture. Within it, there is a cue of how society assembles habits to shape individual actions through the construction of spaces to achieve agendas. So, body form, physical spaces, and the body-space symbiosis are all cultural, and all have a clear social purpose.

Space as a built environment is simple and crude. By its character, it bears nothing as long as it is not employed as a social tool by inhabiting people as subjects to work with. When employed, a simple space morphs into a powerful social concept that can play with distinctive segments of human behaviour. The space becomes an establishment of society, and its material form is indistinguishable from its role. There may be some symbolic messaging emitting via the physical form and optical presence, but the norm is mainly to work with bodily forms and actions. By that, space signals the individuals how to engage with it and how to engage with each other, physically and emotionally. Sometimes, the spatial volume with physical boundaries correlates to human physicality and directly works with it, and sometimes, it is only the nominal, assigned function of the space that serves the purpose. Either way, it is mostly an instrument that affects and changes people. With all this, the symbiotic relationship of space and body then is profoundly imbalanced, and the conversation is primarily one-way. This is a valuable feature when considering anthropometric alternative methods.

The body does not follow the physical boundaries of space but rather the tradition and societal norms imaged in the material spatial elements stuck together in a tactile and emotional construct. As the spatial form is not primarily about appearance, its normative function is the leading social driver that moves and shapes the body in space and programs the actions, particular motions and gestures with which comes habits and culture. It all comes down to formal aspects of society and the mechanisms of control. Body, space, and objects work together in a complex system, imbalanced and biased. They create the culture and the tradition, and they are the culture and the tradition by themselves in an environment in which they seemingly exist independently yet precisely programmed by society. The anthropometric alternative then not only challenges the normative metrics and standards nominally but emancipates the individual from given conditions of the prescribed actions. To erase the concepts of proper and flawed when considering particular bodily actions and individual material creations is to rewire the meticulous value system to promote true plurality in any human creative efforts.

By adding the third element, the objects, to the body-space symbiosis, the body-space-objects system is conceived as a higher and more complex mode of culture production and reflection, as well as habit construction, management, and conditioning. The system confines much more than is evident from first-hand experience and, without deeper contemplation, looks simple and natural. With the complicated but meticulous relationships between the three elements, usually, the systemic practices are instilled into social groups early on, becoming formally organic by appearance yet very programmed and trained, aiming to develop deep habits. It displays as a reflection of tradition. On the contrary, the mentioned plurality does not reflect tradition. It does not entail or abide by any kind of assessment or critique from biased positions and places of authority, specifically regarding form, structure, or bodily conditions, where any traditional evaluative practice is biased by nature, and any such practice lies in the core of the tradition and systemic habits, primarily considering the physicality and material manifestations of an individual. There are no value scales in genuine plurality, and that is the critical attribute to keep stress. The significant dichotomy of plurality and tradition is denoted by the appearance of value, i.e. proper and flawed, and the in-between, and can be easily used as a qualitative marker in the pursuit towards emancipation, including the revision of bodily metrics relating to space, the metrics of objects relating to body, and relative positions of objects in space responding to distinct bodily actions.

To untangle any of it is a tremendous task. The complexity with which society conceives rule-based environments is immense, and it may be very difficult to go onto it with enthusiasm or to try to inform oneself thoroughly enough to become proficient and attain a confident action stature considering the numbing effects of mass external evaluation and a learned pattern of self-assessment and criticism. That is a measure of a highly developed societal framework — a bubble to break and generate new metrics to reconfigure the conventional nodes of the body-space-objects system.

Practical Procedures

A reference spot to look for stimulus and studious appeal may be the legacy of Oskar Schlemmer and the explorations of bodily restrictions, actions, and conscious movement in direct relation to objects (costume) in a tendentious constructed space (stage).³ The early 20th-century opus offers a multitude of perspectives to delve into with curiosity. Radical at the time and in line with the mood of the era and the 'avant-garde' contemporaries, it stayed within the limits of the fringe and odd to this day, notwithstanding the seemingly ever-changing public focus, mainstream or otherwise. This is where one can find enough material density to rouse motivation and start doing something. A safe place to initiate the practical emancipatory methods exercise.

Theatre, Schlemmer's primary subject of innovation, is a concept of many shapes and working with it may create a powerful learning place in which to study personal physicality. In a traditional sense of how society arranges the interpretation of real-world issues, theatre is, by nature, a place detached from the ordinary daily societal productive cycle, although it does belong to the colloquial cultural space, and it also serves as a real culture generator having a unique role in the tradition-making. Even so, within the typical boundaries of permitted performative actions, information transfer procedures (propaganda), and performer-audience dynamics, there is a reservoir of hope to freely enjoy the experimentation without the overwhelming reluctance and typical attitudes of ordinary cultural prescriptions. Practice-wise, the issue is not about replicating the conditions of theatre but reinterpreting the methods of play, the revelation of self through subjective body-play performance excluding the public eye and monitoring, hence eliminating the burden of external evaluation and with it also the act of self-assessment. To perform for awareness (of self, space, and objects) and to play to learn without competition, approval, or critique.

³ Schlemmer on Stage — "*Stage (Bühne)*, taken in its general sense, is what we may call the entire realm lying between religious cult and naive popular entertainment. Neither of these things, however, is really the same thing as stage. Stage is *representation* abstracted from the natural and directing its effect at the human being. This confrontation of passive spectator and animate actor preconditions also the form of the stage, at its most monumental as the antique arena and at its most primitive as the scaffold in the market place. The need for concentration resulted in the peep show or 'picture frame,' today the 'universal' form of the stage. The term *theater* designates the most basic nature of the stage: make-believe, mummery, metamorphosis. Between cult and theater lies 'the stage seen as a moral institution'; between theater and popular entertainment lie variety (vaudeville) and circus: the stage as an institution for the artiste." (eds Gropius and Wensinger 1971, p. 18)

Schlemmer on Costume — "The transformation of the human body, its metamorphosis, is made possible by the *costume*, the disguise. Costume and mask emphasize the body's identity or they change it; they express its nature or they are purposely misleading about it; they stress its conformity to organic or mechanical laws or they invalidate this conformity. The native costume, as produced by the conventions of religion, state, and society, is different from the theatrical stage costume. Yet the two are generally confused. Great as has been the variety of native costumes developed during the course of human history, the number of genuine stage costumes has stayed very small." (eds Gropius and Wensinger 1971, p. 25)

In this setting, all elements of the system are observable and up for inquiry. Theatre can serve as an utmost metaphor for all relationships needing to be reconsidered. By open interpretation, any personal interest is able to become a subject of play. Modal states of the human body, space, and objects, in lieu of performative actions of a public play, substitute an experience of viewing and being watched with the experience of the revelation of the existing but hidden essentials of a body.

The immediate technique is to envisage a ready-made theatrical situation, a play, intellectually take over the imagined outcomes and experiences and shape the exercise to replicate familiar personal circumstances as if it has already been there in the first place, already practised throughout ordinary daily existence day in and day out. It would be like picking the random segments of a larger whole and assembling them into peculiar constructs so that the general state and storyline of performance are now irrelevant. To intentionally create a meaningless, non-narrative line of events, a situation without a resolution, to avoid making the point, conclusion, transfer of a message, or any kind of dialogue. With a liberated perspective, to relieve from the attachments to fitting demeanour and expectations that all worldly phenomena have predefined cause-effect, beginning-end, and time-space restrictions.

One can start by figuring out the restrictions of the biological structure in a contextual vacuum, without the specific spatial circumstances, and then move on to exploring similar physical manners, noting the formal range of movements, using external physical prop-objects in different relational modes, from fully detached to close contact with the body. This method of differentiation of objects by the grade of physical connection to the body is a significant asset for learning. An in-depth recognition of how the body as a social generator assigns a function to objects and fundamentally defines their contextual nature on a societal level, i.e. a costume, backdrop, or a prop. Similar to how space receives a ceremonial function to host people in a specific way to operate them.

Initially, the exercise's focal intent should be on the inherited cultural aspects of ingrained learned habits. The first part of understanding the bodily structure by actively observing motions and kinetic limits is a segment of the exercise where selecting one or more habitual gestures, whatever the range of activity is, and replicating the action in varying portions and intensity according to the liking and mood may provide at least some self-awareness regarding the state of a basic physical form. Putting in the strenuous effort in repetitive motions is what feeds the practical procedure. With it, the form mellows and changes in curious ways to be explored and scrutinised. What was a typical and known physical quality now becomes something alien and unmet, with new clues arising from pure doing. Further, when put to the test to re-examine the act of the original form and the habitual gesture, the laborious physical repetition intuitively recalls sensations from a memory pool of prior life instances. It is how the rooted abstract tradition is unsealed and when the produced culture becomes real and materialised using one's own body form. Taken from generic to personal, recovered and owned.

With motions and actions comes stature and posture. These are also gestural, sometimes static and idle by function and sometimes only representing key transitional frames of a longer kinetic physical sequence. Either way, both variants are essentially functional as cultural expressions and very useful for examination alongside basic kinetic actions. The same principle of the exercise applies as previously with the motions, but this time, the repetitive iterations will differ in the dynamics of frequency. The cycle to repeat lasts longer and is usually stationary. After identifying and selecting an effective habitual form, it starts with coming into the particular posture from any relative position, then statically keeping it, spending prolonged time in the posture, and finally, moving out of it to the initial stance. Similar is to be observed as previously; after several cycles, the point to follow is the postural changes as the player goes in and out of it and the forced repetitions with the energy spent morph the programmed activity so that personalised bodily variations come to the surface, replacing the initial form.

The exercise can move further to engage and synthesise experiences of both fundamental and extended performances of the routine — the short kinetic gestures and the static postures — that are combined in varying mixtures in which new physical actions contain multiple habitual modes fused into one prolonged practice sequence to produce new findings and even additional divergences of the same activities. By performing on different motion patterns, each with distinct dynamics, the combinations grow into a catalogue of now newly constructed series of bodily expressions with which to work. Depending on anyone's preference and what is best suited for an individual's circumstances, it may be a detailed material recording or just a mental image, but it is vital that an intentional record of new physical arrangements exists as they emerge from the routine. There is no need to systemise or structure. The catalogue is a concept, a processual trace of the routine and, on its own, constitutes new knowledge.

Autodidact

The whole procedure resembles some aspects of the learning-plays (*Lehrstücke*) of Bertolt Brecht, at least concerning the conceptual level of intended long-term outcomes.⁴ Primarily by the nature of the exercise, the bodily routines are developed as didactic and, accordingly, are determined to be primarily introspective. Where it differs from Brecht but still keeps the attitude of actions is that the individual involved is the one who creates, transmits, and then receives knowledge in looping cycles, the sole active subject of the method. There is no one else to see or engage in any way, no public, no opinions nor critique. Everything is internal. Ways of formatting, sequencing, diverging, recalling; all invested energy is meant to combust within a single entity to produce results for the sake of personal gain. A unique change through awareness and knowledge gain but by own means, new attitudes that are brought to light internally by intent to spend time, energy, and motivation in own performance, and not as a result of societal programmatic arrangements.

Reintroducing objects to envision their role in the exercise as props (prop-objects). However, it is not the usual theatrical part as expected on a stage plan. In the learning-play exercise, their purpose has changed to become a self-learning tool, the new metric device of cultural measures to help develop alternative anthropometrics of the individual. As devices, their function is to describe a measure that is intrinsic to anyone's unique cultural ground, so in order to be intrinsic, a measure has to be universal but not generic.

A typical unit of measure presenting plain data, usually in a numerical form, even though being materialistic by conception, wanting to convey the material entity, for instance, the human body, cannot do more than describe abstract information worth little when someone looks to uncover a physical self as a distinct cultural derivative. Like any similar data, it is only helpful if contextualised and directly compared to other matching information or evaluated against standardised typology using the same dataset. It has been established historically as practical, largely within the industrial mode of production and especially in the mass output of utility consumer objects of domestic life and commerce; it proved to be highly efficient regarding the use of labour and production, and it still is the dominant method of the production practice. With that, it also automatically razes every possible trace of cultural individuality, specific bodily characteristics, and oddities of human nature, inevitably sealing the subjective attributes back to the generic social conditions and prescribed cultural grid. Therefore, typical metric devices, unit measures, and numerical datasets cannot be universal. As standardised, they are exclusive to most actors and do not imply plurality.

The problem with conceiving a singular proposal of prop-objects as new universal metric devices promoting plurality is that such devices have to be extremely functionally flexible to the extent of materially impossible. Aligning with the idea that typologies and standardisation contradict the diversity of human conditions, especially the cultural body, the very idea of prop-object tools is paradoxical, implying the effort is purely theoretical beyond any practice. Presenting any definitive and formal material resolution may then be complacent, regardless of the potential flexibility levels.

The additional perspective to consider the problem, following the logic of the learning-plays and kinetic body exercises, is that the only authority able to contemplate and exert any solution is the sole individual who is curious about self-learning and the revelation of their own material cultural reality. Along with this comes the uncertainty of outcomes, the technological complexity of the operation, the limits of personal resources, and the motivation for practice. But also, if engaged and committed, aware, there is a plenitude of attention and energy to infuse in self-exploration, object appreciation, and, in addition to that, a nourishing foundation to build personalised, intimate, and unconventional associations with inanimate entities, ready-made and appropriated or else. The multiple ways and gradients of arrangements with objects, investigating the levels of bodily physical fitting, how kinetic gestures or static postures meet the inanimate matter playing the roles of vestments or furnishings, chattels of different kinds, how several of these could be assembled and joined, their physical quality and stability in meeting the body, all of it may be restorative, emancipative, and relevant to acquiring new knowledge, devising new fetish-objects that would bypass the current boundaries of standards and consumption, transcend the cultural levelling.

⁴ Brecht on *Lehrstücke* — "Briefly, the Aristotelian play is essentially static; its task is to show the world as it is. The learning-play is essentially dynamic; its task is to show the world as it changes (and also how it may be changed). It is a common truism among the producers and writers of the former type of play that the audience, once it is in the theatre, is not a number of individuals but a collective individual, a mob, which must be and can be reached only through its emotions; that it has the mental immaturity and the high emotional suggestibility of a mob... The latter theatre holds that the audience is a collection of individuals, capable of thinking and of reasoning, of making judgements even in the theatre; it treats it as individuals of mental and emotional maturity, and believes it wishes to be so regarded... With the learning-play, then, the stage begins to be didactic. (A word of which I, as a man of many years of experience in the theatre, am not afraid.) The theatre becomes a place for philosophers, and for such philosophers as not only wish to explain the world but wish to change it." (eds Silberman, Giles and Kuhn 2015, p. 123)

References

- Bertolt Brecht, Silberman, M, Giles, S & Kuhn, T 2014, *Brecht On Theatre*, Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Graeber, D 2005, 'Fetishism as social creativity', *Anthropological Theory*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 407–438.
- Gropius, W & Wensinger, AS 1971, *The Theater of the Bauhaus*, Wesleyan University Press.
- Mauss, M 1973, 'Techniques of the Body', *Economy and Society*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 70–88.
- Mauss, M, James, W & Allen, NJ 1998, *Marcel Mauss : a centenary tribute*, Berghahn Books, New York.
- Pietz, W 1985, 'The Problem of the Fetish, I', *Res: Anthropology and Aesthetics*, vol. 9, pp. 5–17.