

Philosophical-Political
Hecate-isms

Philosophical-Political *Hecate*-isms:

The Rule of Three

By

Viorella Manolache

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Philosophical-Political *Hecate*-isms: The Rule of Three

By Viorella Manolache

Translation: Ian Browne; Am Browne

Romanian Revision of the Text: Doina Manolache

This book first published 2016

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2016 by Viorella Manolache

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-8540-1

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-8540-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Triple Hecate and the Spectres of Politics.....	vii
Angelo Mitchievici	
Philosophical—Political <i>Hecate</i> -isms: Arguments of the Three	xi
Ian Browne	
Chapter One.....	1
Antaia—or Welcoming Desire	
1.1. Third-Degree Technicalities	
1.2. Fragmentary Micro-Narratives: the Third Way	
1.3. Tri-phased Intersections: Pro-jects,—grams,—sections	
Chapter Two	35
Theoretical <i>Trinocular</i> Recaptures	
2.1. <i>Societas</i> Starts with <i>the Third</i>	
2.2. One+One=Three	
2.3. From One to Three	
Chapter Three	52
Hecate-isms	
3.1. Distance	
3.2. Power as Folding and Unfolding	
3.3. Security	
3.4. Postmodernitarism and (Other) Three Alternative Technicisms	
3.5. Three Ecological Registries	
Chapter Four.....	84
Visual Representation of the Three	
4.1 Between Two and Three: Intermediation	
4.2. <i>The Three Faces of Eve</i> (1957)	
4.3. <i>Three Survival Island</i> (2005)	
4.4. <i>Thr3e</i> (2006)	
4.5. Media Culture: a Televisual Technicism	
4.6. From Language to 3D Vocables	

Chapter Five	114
Parallaxes Perspectives: From the Three to the Multiple	
5.1. Oedipus–Ante-Oedipus–Post-Oedipus	
5.2. A Particular(izing) Case: Fighting the Three-Headed Dragon	
Chapter Six	129
Annotations and Brief Conclusions	
6.1. The Deceiving/Enigmatic Faces of Hecate	
6.2. Concluding Notes–or the Way in which Hecate-isms become Philosophical–Political Arguments	
6.3. Hecate and New Categories of the Monstrous	
Some Afterword Notes: On the Stairs of the Triad’s Theatrical Temple.....	177
François Bréda	
General Bibliography	179
About the Author	196

THE TRIPLE HEcate AND THE SPECTRES OF POLITICS

ANGELO MITCHIEVICI

A monstrosly Chthonian deity living inside a phantom nocturnal universe, the triple Hecate is used as a symbolic figure by Viorella Manolache—a key-concept, a philosophical-political platform for both the divergent and convergent tendencies animating Western society. This appeal to Greek mythology reminds us of Sloterdijk's endeavour in revaluing the *thymos*, or fury, a reclaimed term for analysing (post)modern society. As such, what does tricephalous Hecate have to offer? The derived concept, *technicism*, represents the results obtained after decanting mythological, teratological and contextual impurities, simultaneously absorbed and neutralized.

At the same time, although not avoiding the pejoratively-malefic dimension of chthonian deities, another—beneficent and apotropaic—dimension of all the symbols belonging to the goddess is brought to the fore, in order to integrate a positive dimension into the concept. Its integrity reveals, as is the case for other terms borrowed from Greek culture—such as *pharmakon*—a territorial ambiguity.

The concept elaborated upon by Viorella Manolache configures an anthropological structure presiding over the apparition of *homo triplex* by integrating a series of necessary characteristics; thus simultaneously defining postmodern society and constituting a device, *apparatus* in Foucaultian terms, able to create and offer a trinocular perspective. Hecatism is an operator inside a vast semantic field: an anthropological, political, social, ideological operator that is vectorializing a whole field of socio-political forces. In this sense, it indicates a crossroads of senses, an inflexion point, a disjunction, an amphibology. We have here a vast playground for the conceptual relevance of the proposed term, a space which, in a wider sense, can be called political. Lastly, Hecatisms configure a metaphor of the political inside post-modernity, or inside a certain type of Utopia—projected society placing us all in post-humanity. Society develops using a series of redundancies, growths, proliferations—

what Georges Bataille called, in one of his remarkable essays, “The damned side”: but it also accepts series of challenges which a superposed, multifaceted, multicultural, almost metastatic replicating system presents to that *homo novus* already anticipated by Theo Bell.

In the vast area of the monstrous, Hecatisms appropriate for themselves, inside an interstitial, generically political area, any exorbitant principles such as those Jean Baudrillard offers in his *Fatal Strategies*—consumerism and all its redundancies, Russian neo imperialist expansionism, the re-emergence of Islamic fanaticism, etc. Hecatisms configure a *monstrous* belonging to post-modernity’s metabolism but not needing a visibly monstrous syntax or any attention-demanding deformities.

From this point of view, *Philosophical–Political Hecate-isms: The Rule of Three* is also a book about the monstrous transposed at the level of political philosophy.

But this concept needs also a new form, a new body, an existence beyond the frontiers of mythology. Its tri-phased character generates its dynamism and constitutes this figure’s representational force, in the attempt to identify a *third way* paradoxically placed between the faces of the coin, on the edge, in the interstice. Viorella Manolache’s perspective targets both a *saving third* seen as a mediation instance or an alternative, a possible solution for dismantling any blockages through referring to a crisis which proves to be global—and also the presence of *the three* as a way of bringing order to the real—as seen in the triads formed by social-political components—*prosperity–security–liberty*, *distance–power–security*.

In a way, this book’s endeavour offers a rethinking of the Hecatean monstrous within a geopolitical scale using an analogy system that functions on the principle of communicating vessels and allowing transitions from within the corporeal towards the political and the cultural. In the first instance, *the third* subsumes the qualities of non-generality, non-generic and non-particular presents a neutral appearance, represents a vacated position available for any kind of association. As in the case of a jury, parity is avoided and the included third becomes a deciding party, representing the solution to any blockage.

After all, Viorella Manolache’s work targets just this free position seen as a geometrical place for different contextual possibilities. In this sense, *The Third* functions as a non-person, a verbal form, for Robert Esposito; in the same way, Alexandre Kojève theorizes the intervention of the *third person* in a binary dialectics, an impartial, disinterested *three* able to nullify the reactions of *one* and *two*. Alexandre Kojève translates on the

political level the third's relevance, materialized in the existence of a third party ensuring objectivity and neutrality. The second use Viorella Manolache bestows upon triadic ordering-role Hecatistisms is that of illustrating Kojève's theory about the three types of justice as illustrated by the categories of *Master–Slave–Citizen*.

This problematic, mediating-role third is actualized in some instances. Thus, it appears as perfectly integrated in the concept of a Third Europe, Mitteleuropa, placed between Western and Eastern Europe, an interference zone, *buffer-zone*, part of the binary political logic of cold war reloaded now in new geopolitical contexts as West vs. East, capitalism vs. communism, market economy vs. centralized economy, etc.

Hecatistism constitutes an inflexion point and a tension-releasing space even in this instance. Mitteleuropa accepts a mediating role in the conflict between the EU and Russian autocracy–Putin's expansionist politics—a role which can be also played by the whole of Eastern Europe, already an expert in left-wing totalitarian political regimes. In this sense, the political relevance of Hecatistisms finds an expression in re-evaluating *the third* capable of dissolving incompatible dichotomies, and repossessing a communicative basis.

Hecatistisms are distributed in three categories, configuring an ontology characteristic for both consumer societies and the hyper-technological societies of the not-so-distant future: *the cyborg, the recycler and the algosophical*.

The cyborg demands a monstrous syntax through an alloy between the organic and inorganic offered by its structure or through prosthetic mechanisms associated with the organic. What is of interest here is the model of a cyborg society in the acceptance given by Donna Haraway to the term *communitas*.

Beyond the utopian postulates of such a society, Hecatistism explores possibilities and connections that allow civilization to evolve exponentially. Thus, it becomes a form of percipience using the vehicle of worlds projected in the futuristic screenplays of Ray Kurzweil who follows the *identity cyborgization* process and that of *fluid identities* in a post-human dimension. A whole corpus of SF literature, starting with the cyberpunk current, illustrates the theories of Paul Virilio, Donna Haraway etc. Hecatistism gets inside this interstitial fold where tradition is considered monstrous and becomes just another dimension of a post-human society. Viorella Manolache politically reappraises Hecatistism's dimensions, following that divergent-convergent tendency of dismemberment-reunification where *distance becomes proxemics* in the acceptance Edward T. Hall bestows upon the term as a disciplining mode in which

civilization uses body-centric spaces, *power—a reflex*, and *security—a warning assemblage*. The investigated, Hecatized body is a political body and any Hecatism also has an expression in direct accord with the dimension of the political.

Consumer communities reclaim the second category of Hecatic manifestations, *the recycler*.

The recycler appears within redundancies belonging to residual regimes, what is left after excessive consuming. Needs are overtaken by market offers, and the surplus is not directed towards consuming *per se* but becomes an exhibition space of public abundance. The amorphous mass, global nomadism, thematic entertainment, the spectacular character of consumerism inside large commercial centres, the advertised image with kitsch potentialities are already appropriating a form of excess at the limits of the monstrous. This hyper-consumerist society, as Gilles Lipovetsky calls it, with its engendered shows of welfare and generalized abundance, generates its own spaces, and new forms of socialization such as Baumanian neotribalism or a politically-cultural metabolism targeting the recycling of a vast residual area.

The algosophic aims at attaining and overtaking bearability thresholds, administering tensions and intensities starting from a social organism's capacity to absorb challenges, difficulties, and tensions. In its tolerated pacifist instance, the algosophic offers the solution for defusing crisis states. In this case too, the metaphor of the political functions by sliding from provocations offered by the presence of pandemic-potential diseases and their handling, to tragedies such as that of flight MH17, seen as “a European 9-11, and a pivotal element in strategic thinking”. Both situations represent not just the appraisal of bear-ability thresholds, of frontiers, but also new opportunities of testing the efficiency and pertinence of new European security politics.

Hecatisms target and configure possible crisis screenplays for postmodern society, revalue the dimension of the monstrous in new contexts and in new forms, and at the same time offer possible solutions which evolve from the almost-magical gesture of *the three figure*, which organizes tension fields by detaching mediation instances and offering alternatives to the binary logic of confronting and facing adversities.

PHILOSOPHICAL—POLITICAL *HECATE*-ISMS: ARGUMENTS OF THE THREE

IAN BROWNE

I still remember the excitement with which I read Claude Levi-Strauss in the 1970s. He seemed to be offering a framework that could be used to analyse and understand a whole range of phenomena, from the cultural to the political. Levi-Strauss identified the core elements of conceptual structures, not simply by what was included within a concept, but, just as significantly, by what was excluded, thereby using concepts which operated according to a logic of binary oppositions—things being either one thing or the other. One of Levi-Strauss's intentions, as a theorist and structural anthropologist, was to examine the ways in which myth provided a form of reconciliation between the apparently irreconcilable opposites found within this binary structure.

In this book, *Philosophical–Political Hecate-isms: The Rule of Three*, Viorella Manolache echoes Levi-Strauss's use of the idea of myth, in this case the mythological figure of Hecate, but she seeks to go beyond a set of binary oppositions, and to map out what could be called, with apologies to Anthony Giddens, a third way.

Her intention is not so much the Levi-Straussian one of finding a way of reconciling opposites, as finding a conceptual space that exists both between and beyond apparently polar opposites. The mythological figure of the goddess Hecate is offered as the incarnation of this framework of a third possibility, where in place of the familiar conceptual and theoretical landmarks of oppositional and binary structures, a pattern of third degree multiplications is offered.

Hecate is the goddess of changing and unstable forms, of the monstrous—the goddess of the place where roads intersect, and where a new direction becomes possible; the place where journeys neither begin nor end, but where they continue in ways not provisioned. Hecate is offered, like Derrida's spectre of Marx, as the spectre haunting the place where paths cross—in short, as a third option interposing itself between the poles of binary conceptualisation.

Viorella Manolache offers the image of Hecate as a cure for diplopia, the double vision induced by a schematic of binary oppositions. Like Wittgenstein she believes that “A picture held us captive. And we could not get outside it, for it lay in our language and language seemed to repeat it to us inexorably”. Her remedy for this diplopia is to offer Hecate both as a metaphor and as a tool of thought, because when pictures hold us captive, metaphors cease to be aids to thinking and become instead structures that mark out the range of possibilities of thought. Hecate-ism is, in this Wittgensteinian sense, a new picture, a picture of the 'monstrous' Goddess, the Goddess of nightmare, misfortune and frightening visions.

What is 'monstrous' about Hecate-ism is that it offers as a possibility, a conceptualisation that is neither one thing nor the other, and yet at the same time contains both the one and the other within itself. The monstrous falls outside the received concepts, unsettling our ideas of what things are or are not. It represents, as Foucault noted, a sort of “confusion (which) comes up against, overturns, or disturbs civil, canon, or religious law”, it is “the kind of irregularity that calls law into question and disables it”, and is at the very bottom, something that falls outside the scope of binary oppositions, it is unclassifiable, and represents “the transgression of natural limits”.

This third space opens up possibilities rather than closing them down, but the possibilities it opens up are, seen from the perspective of diplopia, a confusion of categories, and a 'monstrous' mixing of opposites. From the Hecatian perspective, it is the journey, not the arrival that matters. It is the process not the conclusion. So in this book we see Viorella Manolache steer a course away from any meta-narrative, from any theory offering a golden road to understanding, any one of the countless isms on offer to the theorist.

Citing Felix Nicolau, she warns postmodernity's descendants of the impossibility of “sitting on the father's throne”. In the context of the tri-phased conceptual structure of Hecate-ism, the throne will inevitably remain vacant, as a Hecatian possibility will be there to provide a third possibility where binary structures intersect and vie for hegemonic status. As Viorella Manolache says, “What is lost in two is gained in three”.

This avoidance of meta-narrative, of arriving at an end point, is not a flaw, but rather a virtue, and in a variety of ways, citing Jerome K Jerome's idea that neither the start nor the end of the journey is the point of travelling, but rather it is the journey itself which is the point of the journey. Against Fukuyama's idea of the end of history and the Last Man, Hecate-ism denies the finality of an achieved telos, asserting as Flaubert did in one of his letters from Egypt to his friend Bouilhet, that “Stupidity

consists in wanting to conclude. We are a thread and we want to know the pattern... Now one spends one's time telling oneself we are completely finished, here we are at the very end, etc. But what mind of any strength—beginning with Homer—has ever come to a conclusion”. Like Baumanian sociability, enquiry, in this Hecatian tri-phased sense, serves as its own end, and by denying a telos, it shares that characteristic of sociability in that it has no fixed destination, it “does not know where it is heading”. It is linked to the spirit of enquiry, to finding new ways of thinking, not to arriving at a preordained conclusion.

It can be seen from this that Viorella Manolache's purposes are abstract, complex and highly political. She wants to offer us something at the conceptual and metaphorical level, “a new picture”, one which does not foreclose on possibilities but opens them up. Her book is both a practical exercise in this and an exhortation to look for the interstices, the space between or the space beyond those diplopia options that would seem to foreclose on conceptual possibilities.

She seeks to steer a course between any ideological straightjackets and offers as one possible picture, in the Wittgensteinian sense of an image, the image of the Möbius strip, where twisted upon itself, the binary distinction between inside and outside vanishes as the inside and outside become one - a union of contraries which in a Lyotardian note draws attention to the ever present tendency towards oppositional thinking reflexes, which are perhaps at their most prevalent when political analysis is in question, where the distinctions of left/right, contemporary post-Enlightenment/medieval obscurantism, capitalist/statist and so on, still shape our ways of thinking. The value of *Philosophical–Political Hecateisms: The Rule of Three* is that it enables us to transcend such reflexes and look for a way forward that enables us to escape from this kind of oppositional approach.

The focus of the book is to employ a tri-phased Hecatian analysis to engage in a wider, sustained political analysis of a variety of contemporary phenomena, political and cultural.

It is impossible in a brief introduction to do justice to the complexity and depth of this analysis. But the real value of Viorella Manolache's books lies not just in going well beyond the bipolar approach that has its origins in Levi-Strauss and structuralism, but in laying out the structure of the tripartite framework which is used to undertake the analysis and then demonstrating through the employment of that framework how a penetrating and insightful analysis can be conducted by employing this tri-phased Hecatian framework.

CHAPTER ONE

ANTAIA—OR WELCOMING DESIRE

The present book's introductory chapter re-values the descriptive/interpretative trajectory which the goddess Hecate's mythological profile has to travel before being invested with novel significations, expressed in a new concept—*Hecate-isms*—which we propose as a dynamic, transporting way of shifting tri-phased theoretical re-evaluations through a theoretically innovative formulation which does not implicate the status of either an alternative or an interference, but asserts itself as a theoretical redistributive experiment in the service of tertiary multiplication networks.

In this sense, the present endeavour intends to articulate the arguments and to engage in all the necessary rewritings in order to define the specific properties of third-degree technicalities, to reposition a theory of the third way/dimension/perspective/direction within the open segment of fragmented micro-narratives, with an accent upon tri-phased intersections already inherent in pro-jects,—grams,—spections.

In the same theoretical registry, we suggest three political-philosophical remedies for diplopia, not forgetting permanent references to the contemporary world's compelling problems, which can be subsumed under the generous limits of these useful concepts, and thus can become hermetic.

While debating basic subject ideas, we also activate the recourse to interdisciplinarity and interconnectivity, both accepting multiple connections impossible to separate or isolate from either imaginary or utopian projections.

Re-discussing goddess Hecate's mythological profile—considered by Homer as a chthonian symbol of Asia Minor, and also known as *Antaia—the welcoming one*—and imbued with the pertinence of crossroads/junctions as a new *third-order option* (*Trioditis*—the goddess with three heads: a dog head, a snake head and a horse head) the present book proposes to launch the *soldering concept* of *Hecate-ism* as a possible technical(izing) pact signalling an(other) physiognomic change (either philosophical-political or cultural).

A first controversial, functioning statement refers to the erroneous perception positioning Hecate exclusively under the sign of magic/witchcraft and evil; afflictions belonging to the monstrous domain.

From Umberto Eco's *On Ugliness* (2007) one can infer the idea that even if the monstrous cannot be considered a model of beauty, not all its manifestations should be perceived and labelled as dangerous and reprehensible.

Hecate is the product of religious fantasy (with the necessary addenda stating that Homeric poems almost never dwell upon her presence or existence¹) but is also identified with the female spirits of popular Infernos (Gorgyra, Gorgo, Mormo, Lamila, Gelo, Empusa, the midday spectre), as both appearances and metamorphosing entities of the same Hecate; while for Erwin Rohde (1985) the goddess is a marginal apparition, incapable of overtaking the limits of a domestic-particularized cult.

Short-changed figurehead of an ancient rite once practised next to the home hearth (and living "deep inside the hearth" together with underground-Hermes, her male equivalent), Hecate remains a chthonic *numen* who, by betraying an unpredictable, free, voluntary and unchained spirit "finds much easier than other chthonian gods a way towards people's hearts" by creating a familiar relationships with earth dwellers and yet not allowing itself to be affected by any discomfort or fear which might be generated by such impure actions (initially a beneficent, well-meaning, success, prosperity and victory-giving deity).

The cultural practices/"Hecate's banquets" are maintained by a whole armoury of horrors, acknowledging and accepting the pattern of the savage hunter and his accompanying wild pack; Hecate resides in the subterranean world, and she also is the patron of souls still attached to the telluric; an altogether nocturnal spectre, but also prone to appear as "the overwhelming loneliness of midday heat", with terrifyingly changing and unstable forms, capturing restless souls inside its flying whirlwind and juxtaposing them to her retinue of demoniacal hounds (hence a terrifying imaginary tableau including apostrophic sacrifices-throwing the remains of lustra sacrifices at the crossroads while turning one's face away; symptoms of delirium, epilepsy, nightmare, misfortune, frightening visions).

Within Eco's perspective of a contextual repossession of the monstrous, the latter has to be accepted as just a design of the subterranean

¹The second Homeric hymn, narrating Persephone's return to Demeter, remembers Hecate (en-lightener of the searcher's path with the help of her torches) as embracing Demeter's daughter and thus forever remaining in Persephone's proximity/court.

area, close to the “accessorizing model of nice imitations of ugly things”—an Aristotelian import.

By establishing the judicial-biological registry as a domain/field of theoretical proof, the monster (as postulated by Foucault, 2001) is defined as the uncomfortably rebellious element encouraging contempt for and disrespect of both nature and laws, and represents a *tri-phased germinated category of [triple] elements* particularized and dissociated in the 18th century, in order to be re-joined in the 19th -*three* circles, *three* figures: the human monster, the behaviourally-deviant or mentally/physiologically handicapped individual in need of a “cure”, and the masturbating child.

The monster substitutes for a spontaneously-brute form, and is seen as an anti-natural attitude: he is identified with a territory of small irregularities, a growing model and a background of deviance, while being disputed by both nature and society, the cosmological and anti-cosmological models (Andrei Oișteanu proposes the term *chaosmos*); with an absolutely needed mention of the fact that a monster stays subsumed to a politically-judicial generalizing frame, belonging to natural history as it focuses upon a *tri-phased distinction* between species, genders and reigns².

Two metamorphisms myths definitely state Hecate’s preference for the animal kingdom—the dog and the polecat (possibly as Hecuba and Galinthis) while at the same time complicating its confused descent as a mysterious divinity (Hecate is believed to be either the daughter of Perses and Asteria, or Zeus and Demeter/Pheraea as Hera, or even Leto’s or Tartar’s child; sometimes she surfaces as one of the titans, involved in defeating the giants—by killing Clytius).

With no intention of reloading (by deepening) an already-consecrated rift between godly signs/symbols³ or repeating any allusions or literary—

²This perspective is not left adrift within the grounds of political philosophy; clearly separating itself from Leviathan's terrifying attributes, the monstrous becomes, for Hobbes, a pretext for reviewing the artifice of the state's sovereignty, in order to decree the occurrence of a mortal God or, in a Nietzschean perspective, to analyze the coldest monster of all—the state.

³See in this context the following selections: Tara Sanchez, *The Temple of Hecate—Exploring the Goddess Hecate through Ritual, Meditation and Divination*, London: Avalonia, 2011; Joy Reichard, *Hecate: Queen of the Witches or Wise Crone? (Celebrate the Divine Feminine; Reclaim Your Power with Ancient Goddess Wisdom)*, San Francisco: Bush Street Press, 2011; Sorita d'Este and David Rankine, *Hecate Liminal Rites: A Study of the Rituals, Magic and Symbols of the Torch-Bearing, Triple Goddess of the Crossroads*, London: Avalonia, 2009.

especially dramatic⁴—comments regarding it, and willingly limiting itself to the method of concept transportation/welding/ juxtaposing, the present book rebuilds Hesiod’s theory signalling (when referring to Hecate’s tridimensional powers/actions) the *triad of privilege* bequeathed upon the goddess on earth, on/in the sea and in the air, a trump card which she converts into a tri-phased dynamic (philosophical-political) relationship as *distance–power–security*.

Metamorphosing (mentioning the inspiration Ovid the poet invested it with) the proposed way of approaching the subject cannot avoid a large array of beneficial symbols displayed as different forms of *hekataia*, either for protection outside habitations, or demonising crossroads through sacrifices (food for the poor, dogs, black kids or honey).

Crumbling earth, dancing trees, howling dogs—these are some of the premonitions Virgil poetically expressed in the verse *Ere Hecate venit!*

Attaching the *-ism* suffix to a crossroads deity’s name can only imbue it with an abstract(izing), generalizing tendency while at the same time allowing the referent to be imbued with the statute of an organized system (and not of chronological divisions) [McHale, 1987], of overbid but not, in Dan Mănuacă’s terms, of “subjective intransigence”.

As suffix–affixed interventions, the “-isms” (*here*, completely detached from any framing of the *-ism* within an ideological straitjacket) question both the signifying and the carrying mode for the vehicle to which it attaches itself, taking into account the fact that they do not articulate a language of facts, do not answer to any real-order ideate need, and are not considered effective transcendences or/and intentional correlations (Marica, 2009).

Not at all by chance, Felix Nicolau (2013) notes that today’s world is saturated by *-isms*, and warns postmodernity’s descendants about the impossibility of “sitting on the father’s throne” while certifying the existence of a hiatus at the top and announcing that, for the moment, “the throne will remain vacant”.

Thus we can explain the impossibility of sedimenting any crossroads formulations–*technicisms*⁵–which, far from clarifying the fate of currents/movements, complicate them by involvement in false *alternative options*—nothing more than non-synthesizing detours confirming, in a

⁴See, for example, Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, the plays of Shakespeare or the eroticizing efforts of Pierre Jean Jouve or Paul Morand.

⁵See, in this sense, for instance *performatism*, *postmortemism*, *digimodernism*, *globalism*, *planetarism*, *hypermodernism*, *altermodernism*, or the receptivity of postmodernism’s esthetic operations towards a generously alternative prefixoidal arsenal (*hyper-*, *meta-*, *trans-*, *cos-*, *para-*, etc).

Hassanian (1987) way the (lexical) *in-determinant* sense (in the case of postmodernism, an interaction in close proximity to its own contradictions).

These assaulting concepts essentially process an ambilectic, all-encompassing aspect by re-launching the *vice canon*⁶ as a transitional norm, a rule guaranteeing the dynamics of post-alternatives and stating that the *unconditional* transgression of one's own condition/state of fact (even if sometimes acknowledging mixed states) only manages to create a *jamming interference* with the only avowed purpose of producing *parasitical signals of identical wavelengths, but with specific differences*.

Such evidence only serves to confirm the fact that no conceptual combination can definitely affix itself either inside the *core of space* to which it offers identity, or on *its skin*—but will simultaneously entertain a crossroads identity—an inside and an outside, a verdict defining *interference* as a reflex/tendency of dissolution/amalgamation for/in the category of the new.

Based on previous observations one has to mention another aspect/state of the *Hecate-an* profile, that of a shadow/ghost haunting the place where three roads cross, with each of its heads⁷ looking towards *another (certain) direction*, and an admission of *Hecate-ism* as a transporting, dynamic mode of starting *tri-phased theoretical re-evaluations* through the use of a formulation implying neither an alternative status nor a jamming interferential one, but affirming itself as an experiment of replacing theoretical landmarks within a pattern of *third degree multiplications*.

It is from this perspective that one can justify the volitional analytic eludings of any religious signals emanating from the *three*, of any re-irrigating numerology or triumvir(ate) formulas, through re-planting the crossroads concept within the fertile soil of *post-postmodernism*—a sense transporter (but not in any elucidating sense) which, in a philosophically-political registry, could offer a certain direction to those crossroads already fuelled by misappropriated multiplications operating within the frame of contemporaneity.

⁶The *vice canon's* local secondary-order causality does not imply fragmentation, diversifying mechanics or de-canonizations of aseptically modernist theories or totalizing mediation—but rather a *transitional recourse to re-signification*.

⁷The imaginary cookbook of monstrous presences cannot avoid the Romanian mythological profile of the three-faced dragon—water (fountain), earth (“from the Armenian country”) or air (a type of dragon controlled by the *solomonari*—a variety of Romanian warlock) offering the image of a mixture between snake, crocodile and lion, a creature able to *hypnotize with its stare*.

The option of starting from a few texts already submitted for publication or signalled as interventions in national or/and international communication sessions is subsumed to the obstinacy with which (any) daily press releases of our old continent unite the three European principles—*prosperity–security–freedom*—under the ever-changing designs of *tri-phased Europe*, marked by the limits of its performing—unified euro-zone, by the unstable landmarks of the forwards-backwards reflex or by being placed outside-the-circle; hence, the lack of perspective for any horizon of synchronizing real chances mindful of its imposed horizons.

Under the same symbol of *three*, *three* years after its creation, the European *troika* (metaphorically represented in the European press as a *three-headed organism*) estimates (in advance) its crossroad options (by launching, in Brussels, a debate about any problems which might arise in an after-troika period) although its guidance/piloting is ensured, as a formulation, by a solidly-productive relationship in the innovating spirit of a too-serious adventure.

About the destiny of *post-Lisbon Europe* (Leparmentier, 2009) *Le Monde* states that any reorganization included in the Lisbon Treaty will not simplify the functioning of the Union: it will just create a *three-headed-monster*, making Europe even less amenable to control.

Such comments actualize and decode the monstrous symbols already offered by Voltaire (2000) in a projectively philosophical screenplay identifying in/through the gigantic nature (a geographically dependent and dimensionally disproportionate earthly globe, deficiently built, irregular and ridiculously geometrized) a term of comparison (physical-mathematical, a measure of the inefficiency already attributed to the multiplication by three—Saturn possesses 30 substances and 300 properties) and relativity/efficacy in deepening the Swiftian dichotomy between *large-small*.

Hence an equivalation of the monstrous, as a report, with an inadequacy of ethics/aesthetics for the examining person, with an incapacity to relate or deepen inherent capacities, with an illusion of absolute size and dimensional relativities, inadequacy of pattern (the real cannot always adapt to different modes of perception, senses evolve, and a maximization of nature can seem a Sisyphus solution).

Accepting the immanence of any imperative—corners/crossroads has to be reinvented—or the unusual way of artistic resettlement for signals *from one corner to another* (Polgár, 2003), the crossroads can be particularizing and prophetically invested with Walter Benjamin's reflex of places with projective powers (facilitators of looking-into-the-future) registering, as a *tri-phased impact* within attitude—strategy—reporting, in fact correcting the

accidental vision/solution (in Voltaire's acceptance) for globalism (and all its *isms*).

This way of dealing with the problem endangers the bridge between *geopolitics* and *geopoetics* (Holmes, 2011), by applying a simultaneous, non-synthesizing double question, while operating within neo-liberalism, of the modes of forming and disappearing the world, and of its opportunities for resettlement within a fragile/neutral balance of discrepancies between Central and New Europe.

From a project of consolidated regional blocks as a globalization-territorial stability compromise formula, “civilization shock” borrows the metamorphosing contour of phase changes for any cultural-political neo-conservative profile, with the avowed intention of actively preserving any neo-liberal principles.

Brian Holmes (2011) suggests as an alternative solution the social science–type of *tri-operational interferences* (already emancipated from within their own neutrality)—economic geography (as a reaction to precarity)—research (in the domain of technology-sociology), and organizational and social psychology (meant to deal with observations about the functioning system of power or the structure of actual hegemonies).

Hence the necessity of overtaking any simple statute of discipline, through “dissolving in the experiment” an almost cartographic endeavor which, through recourse to social self-elaboration, has to keep the narrative—metanarrative and real-aesthetic proportions equal at all costs.

In Holmes' note, “geopolitical tides cross through living bodies and become an integral part of the haptic conscience, entering what some of us have already dubbed “the felt public space” or “geopolitics is more and more often felt in the flesh and the imaginary is traced upon the collective skin. Geopoetics becomes a vital activity, a promise of release” (Holmes, 2011).

Therefore, a concept such as the *cartography of sensation* must perforce be rewritten through experimentation.

The natural consequence of this type of comment resides in a return to *poiesis*, a proposal implying an analysis of the contemporary phenomenon, as a *real absolute* repositioned within post-dialectic spaces; in this way, a need to operate certain methodological-terminological clarifications arises, and will be dealt with by the present book.

One must acknowledge the fact that any conceptual assault is perceived more from the *perspective of two*: a statement which, on the grounds of political philosophy, has already built an entirely misleading functional system (*see left vs. right*) mostly on metaphorical grounds. If

one considers metaphor as defined in an Aristotelian sense—as transferring the name of one object upon another object—then one can easily accept that any registry of philosophical-political interventions notes the precedence of mental, scientifically-expressive operations.

If such a perspective is dependent upon the act/process of prolonging modernism into postmodernism, any option for the alternative of *technicism* has to take into account *third-degree multiplications*, renouncing the *rule of versus* and choosing the “and...and” mode, with a transporting effect upon the pressure of an object upon itself, by applying the primacy of the experimental and its provisos.

In a Sloterdijkian sense (Sloterdijk, 2004) as a *double citizen*, man needs both *proportion and the monstrous, the un-synthesizing melange of metaidentities within the paradigms of ecstasy—construct/restraint, measure, monitoring, control—unlimited/unmeasured, non-censorship, freeing/unchaining, domination/authority—subordination/submission, poiesis—panic*.

Conferring an alternate statute upon *Hecate-isms* will reclaim their commitment and not any remedy for presentism’s identifications, confirming once more the fact that *distance—space* abandons its orientating check-ups, becoming an un-clarifying opening, vacuum, exposure, filling of its own elements/containers: *power* absorbs old techniques/mechanisms, and places them within the economy of proportion in order to annihilate/calibrate a counter-force; and *security* constitutes one type of reaction to imminent risks.

In a (casual) interpretation of motivational nihilism’s horizon, with an interest in actual philosophy’s penchant for the non-given and the dis-founded, Sloterdijk (2004, 75-76) admits the existence of *tri-phased directions* as expressed by the crossroads option (present/palpable nothingness has its own intersections!) – the one which, paradoxically, seems to re-circulate metaphor whilst weighing it against technicisms, by a recourse to the scientifically-expressive registry.

In the direction of metaphorical images pushed to the extreme, Michael Ende’s (1995: 55-57) *The Never-Ending Story* projects Atréiu’s encounter with *three* more-than-strange gnomes/sylvan in/upon the monstrous *Hecate-ian* effect scene: over-excited Atréiu is warned about the forward extension of the nothingness. The first gnome lacked legs and lower body, and had to walk upon his hands; the second one had a hole in his chest, and the third was cut in two across the middle (anticipating, in a philosophical-political way, the Giddensian development of the third way!) and was missing (exactly!) the left side.

Monstrosity imposes its plagues during sleep, when nothingness and instants grow, in the afterglow of surprising affirmations and as an impossibility of running towards any refuge points/zones. *Tri-phased* monstrosity does not hurt (this is not a metaphor anymore, but passes into experimental and provisional technicism)—it does not feel anything, but acknowledges the fact that some segments are missing, deepening their absence with every passing moment: an occurrence causing/provoking (even) the irreversible disappearance of its parts.

On visually architectural coordinates, the concept of monstrosity is explained by Émile Gallé in terms similar to Roger Marx's critical formulations of *homo triplex* (a metaphoric profile already involved in perfect harmony/resonance with *homo sapiens*) symbolizing the reunion of *three artistic endeavours*—carpentry, pottery and glass works—through the appropriation of the *three essential elements*—earth, glass and wood, seen also as *three essential modes of controlling raw matter* and objectifying *threefold aggregates*, finalized by tracing a perfectible interaction model.

Homo triplex represents in this context the unified marginal syntagm of liminal amalgamation for these *three* different techniques (Gabriel-Loizeau, 2012).

Thus one can trace a first analogy and evidence: *the distance between power and security* can be accepted as formulations, construction instruments, raw matter, pre-casts, compulsory bench-marks for the creation of *homo triplex*, detached from his own architectural vocation and becoming a construct upon himself, by uniting *noble art—liberal art—art and craft*.

Connected to the idea of double loss (an allusion to the *Deux fois perdue* paper) *homo triplex*'s attributes target the game of re-irrigation—a loss of distance and territory, but a gain in the right to access another language, able to sustain the superiority of a threefold relationship by affirming that *all that is lost in two, is gained in three*. Thus the revaluation of *homo triplex* can be justified as the craftsman-artist inside romantic popular imagery, himself seen as an artisan product, as both the industrial and post-industrial builder, in demand for creating “new/other interiorities”.

Perceived from an analytical Freudian and Galléian perspective, the *homo triplex* concept outweighs the Durkheimian import of the *homo duplex*, the one with two levels of consciousness—an organic, animalistic one, dedicated to satisfying personal needs and characterized by limited appetite, an inclination towards disorganization which is only able to react in an instinctually imperfect way; and a superior one, collective, morally-

intellectual, focused upon a collective elaboration of the norm program and objectification of society's norms seen as regulating elements.

We can now discuss the problem of cohabitation of two beings inside-the-one; the individual (representative of psychological states referencing both themselves and personal events) and the social being (made of a system of ideas, feelings, habits which determine its belonging to a group of moral-religious beliefs and practices, of collective traditions and opinions).

From "genus homo" to private society, social conditioning imprints the rhythm, the formation and the modelling of any individual, flaunting the uniqueness of each person without avoiding a separation of the one from its double formulation "because each being is an infinity, and infinity cannot be measured" (Durkheim, 2002), but also the constant referencing through an appeal to the middle way (via Hobbes–Rousseau–Spencer), the social factor (naturally-external constraints) and its own independent existence.

Acknowledging the prevalence of *homo duplex* within European space, Serge Moscovici (1999) does not hesitate to underline the fact that this concept has a dynamic-type significance, hard and well-funded, with a tendency to enlarge its own affirmation sphere, in the sense of a double that is marked not only by a doubling of identity, but also by estimated differences between lived-in society and conceived society, which means more than just having an individual conscience.

If for Joseph Conrad the condition of *homo duplex* is multiply significant, in the acceptance of Mead and Tarde, the self is involved in individual tensions; or, in a psycho-analytically Freudian note, *the two multiplies the one into three*, for Serge Moscovici (1999), the concept's new semantic value states that any cultural tensions arise from live syntheses between symbolic and normal life.

Any treatment prescribed for European space with clear references to *homo duplex*'s profile would imply, on Moscovici's channel, a (positive) redirection upon fragmentary representations–nation, linguistic entity, ethnic minority–placed within a network of cultural connections/matrices as an expression of complex, not entirely accessible psyché but within whose intimacy Europe is asked to intervene, by proposing a link between individuals and society, between the future and the past.

Any technique applied during present interventions that is easy-to-note, will be an objective-changing one through abandoning the duality high beam–low beam and the binocular and favouring a *triocular perspective* applied to the contrasting effect of a third-degree *Zoom-Objektiv*.

The *trioocular concept* cannot ignore a visualizing of utopias that is volitionally interrupting any reality-connected theories, by decreeing in a *Hecate-ian* predisposition (changing delirium, unstable, nightmare or vision) a receptivity for (im)possibly accepted methods [seen here as mental exercises with an impact upon lateral possibilities of construction/deconstruction for any possible worlds].

This option partakes its arguments from the domain of political philosophy, confirming what R. Nozick (1997) presented as a subtraction tactic for any utopian influences and a detour upon its own finality, triggering a break in integrity; some worlds can become stabilizing, an occurrence Nozick identifies as an atomizing process for stable (associated) communitary worlds at a micro-social level. Utopia subsumes therefore all the different, diverging communitary utopias, constituting a *metautopia/transutopia* (we note)—a laboratory environment for utopia experiments.

Our conviction, acknowledged from the initial phase of the present book's endeavour, is that *Hecate-ism* can be accepted as a remedy for diplopic, facilitating the translation from the *double* (already pathological) towards a *tri-phased* punctum of observation.

1.1. Third-Degree Technicalities

Clifford A. Pickover (2013) uses a technicizing proof in order to underline the fact that, if the surface of a sphere is bidimensional, topological categories accept an unlimited number of dimensions, in the sense in which the *second-degree variation* borrows the local topology of a plan, and the *third-dimensional* one represents the multiple characteristics of tridimensional space.

Seen from this perspective, the *space of the third* is a model/plan availing itself of an imperfect dimensional variety, which comprises superior intersectional areas and can be considered a third-dimensional torus—a border-less object, joining together frontal and dorsal faces, a mirror–inverted image.

Reactivating the *paenultimus* in its *clutch–like incarnation* suggests an image similar to a Möbius strip, in which points from the inner surface and those from the outer surface belong to the same *bidimensional pattern*, a frame-model allowing us to reach from one end to the other while travelling upon the strip’s surface, but without over passing its edges.

Clifford A. Pickover (2013) explores varieties of Möbius strip forms, with an accent upon forms of chemical *chirality*—molecules which cannot be superimposed over their mirror image—and stating the impossibility of establishing any perfect correspondence between them, through translation or rotation movements. From the perspective of non-ambidexterity, Möbius type molecules are topologically non-equivalent: through deformation, none of them is reduced to identity with the others.

With an interest for the present theme, and under the sign of homomorphism, the first can be transformed into the second through establishing correspondences between/in adjoining points; or, the translation of one sphere into the fourth dimension would imply its readmission to the third state.

Surfaces can be knotted or knot-free, and their margins, either linked or unlinked. In the case of a Möbius strip, if the “paper side” in the centre disappears, and the edge is visualized as a string, through its stretching/elastic effect, the edge becomes a circle.

Visually, in the case of a thrice-twisted strip, even if the surface itself vanishes and the edge turns into a string, the latter will be knotted.

Introduced as white and black triangles—left-hand or right-hand triangles—the Möbius type barycentre coordinates constitute indications related to a reference triangle, actualized through three-number sets which could relate to any mass placed at the triangle’s points.

In order to verify the already-enunciated theories, and in a fictionally-utopian note, Clifford A. Pickover (2013) offers the image of Möbius' extra-terrestrial beings included in and inhabiting the surface of the Suibom universe, a bidimensional stake chosen in order to underline the disproportion between the two factors, by stating that the universe is too big compared to the dimension of its inhabitants' bodies.

One of the planet's scientists—Einsteinoid—considers space as both finite and curved in the direction of a third dimension, “up” and “down” representing inventions for executing movement in the invisible third-order dimension. The story of Einsteinoid's journey underlines the fact that space covered accepts shortcuts also, and Suibom is just one of many curved worlds floating in three-dimensional space.

A product such as a Klein bottle, selected from a series of inventions that is fundamentally and theoretically based on the philosophy/geometry of the *three*, is a one-side surface, with no edges and with a twisted neck—and illustrates an imperfect model of architecture in/through tridimensional space, suggestive of introspection, the ego's return to its own universe, self-reconciliation, and being tagged as a frontier-less construct.

Considering both the Klein bottle and the Möbius strip as topological variations, Clifford A. Pickover's (2013) conclusion is that *a third-dimension variation displays the local topology of a three-dimensional space*.

If one applies this to the experiment of a solid cube—a third- dimension topological variation—with an edge on all its sides, one can prove that through stretching the cube and gluing the right wall to the left wall, or by gluing the front wall to the back wall, or the upper wall to the lower wall, a ball thrown to the right would roll towards the left (on condition that the distance between the walls is not too great).

Such a rolling launches a new type of topological variation—the *third-dimension torus*—or, in the context of a cellular simulation, an experiment confirming the fact that a cell is activated/born if *three* of its neighbours are activated; or a cell stays active (lives) if *two or three* of its neighbours are active.

In the same spirit of innovation pushed to the edge—at the crossroads—in a politically-undertone magical show, the “Ljubljana Ribbon” experiment offers the idea of *three* half-turns: cut in/through the middle, it turns into a clover-like node, with *three* dimensions/ undercrossing. The trick (close to a *Hecate-ian* vision) is meant to recount the benefits European countries enjoy after their unification and the creation of the European Union (Pickover, 2013: 38).

Close to magical tricks and/or mathematical ones at the same time, the *perspective of the three*, half-twisting the ribbon towards actual theories acknowledging a *third-way Europe*, any formulated suggestion would certainly reference the recommendations stating that European solutions should disengage themselves from the *two*—one cannot choose between technocracy and utopia—because these dual entities have already closed the possible solutions available for European space inside blocking, unbalanced structures (an inter-governmental union will never become a political union, and a federal union is not the same thing as a federal state).

One has to deal with the acute problem of reclaiming Europe's future, a projection with certain echoes in expected intersections between/ for political negotiations/involvements/reassessments of integration, which accepts *compromise* as a *third-degree option*.

The alternative would maintain an affirmation of traditional federal Europe united through a Central European Parliament, with a European Commission - an expression of political majority - considered to be an actively (re)knotted factor *already*—(a reference to the present book's completion, 2014) presenting a finished list of candidates for the European Commission presidency.

This option triggers a whole set of questions regarding the measure in which EU technicisms, applied to 28 states with demographic asymmetries and linguistic-cultural differences as well as economic-political ones, can sustain a transformation trick turning them from a transnational union into a conglomerate of national type parliamentary states.

Jürgen Habermas' interventions in the European press (signalled between 2011-2012) do not seem so far off the mark when one notes they presciently warned about the fact that we are witnessing *a collision between functional and systemic landmarks*, and stated that, under the “pressures of the crisis” a strategic separation from those objectives which can generically be classified as “European ideals” is bound to occur.

The crossroads—intersected proposals target a re-positioning of Europe between the open strata of the *three—to reverse, to advance or to stop—a third-order oscillating situation* emphasizing the accidental result related to an ambidextrous observation: the first banks upon the fact that none of its members will either accept or opt for an abandonment of its own democratic sovereignty—expressed in the power of taxation and spending—and the second states that, in a situation of *burn-out diagnosis*, only two (three or four) states are still able to sustain the rhythm, the capacity and the resistance needed for *progress* (Josef Joffe, 2013).

European stagnation (i.e. *blockage*) in an “extremely unfavourable moment” and is caused by the general hostile/contaminating context of the

economic and institutional crisis, by the division between a “virtuous North” (with an exhausted solidarity capital) and a “defective South”, by the stalemate of integration processes already conditioned by crossed vetoes, by an antagonistic double sense of the *rule of versus pressures—to fall back—to confront*—or by a refusal of affective involvement from its citizens (Accardo, 2013).

The problem of European crossroads is apparently stagnating in/on a *tri-cephalic option—the third Europe*—which, on analytical Romanian and East-European ground, anticipates the construct of Central Europe, perceived as too hypothetical, and defines a *third Europe* as geo-political topos, a mentally-affective matrix and cultural model, an area of intersection for collaborations/confrontations and multiple creativities, without giving up the exercise of centre-edge relationships [Babeți, Ungureanu, 1997] (akin to a Klein bottle whose surface is reunited with itself as a frontier-less construct).

The differences between Central Europe—Mitteleuropa—Ostmitteleuropa—Eastern Europe are pertinent, and contribute to a particularizing definition of limiting stages in the concept’s evolution.

A compact, anticipative program of research approximated interrogations about the existence of (yet) another Central Europe, of *when, since when and how* an intellectual discourse about Central Europe can be articulated, involving a series of specific modulations for possibly technicizing inventories.

Under the sign of European dilemmas—there are *two or three Europes*—, Lucian Boia (2013) notes a variety of continental landscapes, unaligned geographical forms, many seas and varied climate areas for European countries—and concludes by finally abandoning a search for perfectly homogeneous spaces, taking into account the fact that Western cells energized this region unequally and in-consequently, with the West flaunting its self-assumed role of area/regional/territorial/state uniformization in this way.

In the same sense, *the West and the rest* of Europe are non-rigorously separated by an elasticized transition zone—Central Europe—a unifying, but also separating concept increasing the number of Europes from *two to three*.

Europe was forced to opt for unification (under the pressure of modified realities after WW2, and availing itself of NATO support for its defence policies) a unification originally meant, in its pacifist-unifying variations, to be a communitary—economic and political gathering tolerant

of all exceptions⁸ which might ensure progress for an unified Europe (a unified corpus) with inherent temporary constructive pauses.

The extension of the European project towards the East means the unification of two parts, which implies a positioning of successive circles (Western Europe, Central Europe, Eastern Europe, and Turkey) around and under the influence of the Western nucleus. This perspective reflects and proves the model of cellular simulation, by maintaining an active (live) cell if two or three of its neighbours are activated (welded/united).

At the moment of this chapter's writing (March, 2014) Europe was constrained to opt at the crossroads of delicate situations allowing it to regain lost ground—see recent Ukraine developments—as a consequence of weakened forces of attraction from the centre towards the orbit.

The prompt and excessively critical US reaction towards Western attitudes was expressed in acknowledging the West's incapacity to offer prizes or to punish, to sacrifice anything or to rely on economic solidarity principles; all these accusations being justified, up to a point, by the non-existence of instruments for measuring the quality of European democracies.

In this context, a triple pressure arose upon the EU, through: the Ukrainian crisis—dysfunctional European constructs favouring perturbed economics—Switzerland's alarming vote in the referendum against immigration threatening to collapse the whole bilateral accord structure between Switzerland and the EU—and, last but not least, to compromise every European ideal.

Connected to the dynamic tableau of European events, Barack Obama stated that Europe is not at present either the trigger or the manifestation field for any new East-West conflict, with reference to Europe's moderate reactions towards Ukraine crisis (political support for Kiev, signing political chapters of the accord for Ukraine's admission to the EU), and to cautious attitudes seemingly reflecting the signs of a division inside the Western nucleus; and underlined that one must insist upon the idea of reconsidering the Eastern front as a priority, for both Europeans and Americans.

Adding possible solutions to *tri-phased arguments*, Zbigniew Brzezinski underlines that Ukraine needs *three* compromise points in order to stabilize its situation: the political compromise/pact between political parties; the regional geopolitical compromise/pact between the European Union, Ukraine and the Russian Federation; and the global

⁸Switzerland and Norway—as exceptions to a common political and economic space; Great Britain, Denmark and Sweden, as parts able to resist the adoption of a unified European monetary system.