

Choreographing Coexistence – A Laboratory of Political Awakeningⁱ

Jean-Marc Matosⁱⁱ

Abstract

Choreographing Coexistence – A Laboratory of Political Awakening explores how choreography, dance, and embodied practices can open new pathways for political and ethical imagination in an era dominated by algorithmic systems, artificial intelligence, and ecological fragility. This paper positions dance not as a form of representation but as an epistemological and ontological practice—a way of thinking, sensing, and existing in relation. Through a constellation of philosophical references (Barad, Chatonsky, Snyder, Del Val), personal artistic practice, and reflections from projects developed within K. Danse, it argues that choreography constitutes a living laboratory in which new modalities of coexistence between human, non-human, and technological agents can be rehearsed, felt, and reconfigured.

The paper critically addresses the rise of algorithmic governance and what Grégory Chatonsky calls *vectofascism* (Chatonsky “*What is Vectofascism?*”)—forms of power that operate through prediction, normalization, and desire modulation rather than overt repression. In response, the paper proposes an aesthetic and political practice rooted in embodied vulnerability, failure, and unpredictability. Drawing from posthumanist and quantum ontologies, it maintains that meaning does not emerge from isolated individuals but from relations, rhythms, and intra-actions. Dance becomes a method for reclaiming uncertainty, expanding perception, and resisting the commodification and optimization of life.

The body is approached not as a stable identity but as a living, relational field—an organism of metamorphosis. Influenced by Jaym* del Val’s radical *metahumanist* critique, the paper challenges both transhumanist fantasies of perfection and anthropocentric hierarchies, arguing instead for an understanding of the body as a process of continual becoming—unstable, porous, and fully embedded within ecological and technological systems. In this framework, intelligence is distributed—not solely human nor artificial, but emergent from interdependence, micro perception, and shared vulnerability.

Keywords: choreography, coexistence, political awakening, care, fragility, excentration

Part I - Introduction: Dance in times of Vectofascism

We live in a time when technology and politics are no longer separate territories but intertwined forces, shaping each other continuously. Algorithms do not merely calculate; they modulate attention, affect, and desire. They anticipate our movements, not only in the physical sense but in the realm of imagination—what we think, what we want, what we fear. Artificial intelligence has ceased to be a mere external instrument; it has become a new agent of choreography, participating—whether consciously or not—in the movement of bodies and societies.

In such a landscape, dance becomes more than performance: it becomes a laboratory for relational existence, a space where bodies, machines, and environments negotiate their ways of being together.

To choreograph today is to move within architectures we do not see—data infrastructures, predictive models, invisible surveillance. Every gesture leaves a trace in the digital sediment of our world. Yet within this pervasive abstraction, dance insists on the tangible, the trembling, the breath. It reclaims the body as an unpredictable field of relations that resists full translation into code. It insists that life is not reducible to information. Here, choreography is not only an aesthetic practice but an ontological proposition: it asks how we can inhabit the world differently, how we can resist the reduction of existence to efficiency and surveillance.

Grégory Chatonsky calls this pervasive system *vectofascism*: a form of power based not on explicit violence, but on the seduction of convenience, personalization, and flow. Control seeps softly through interfaces; domination is replaced by predictive care. Under such conditions, resistance cannot rely only on slogans or manifestos—it must be felt, embodied, and rehearsed. Dance becomes an act of civil disobedience performed through flesh. The smallest deviation—a pause, a tremor, a fall—becomes a gesture of freedom against the tyranny of smoothness.

This is why error, failure, and uncertainty are central to my artistic practice. They form the cracks through which freedom breathes. In works such as *F_AI_L*, *Myselfes*, or *Eternity*, I do not treat artificial intelligence as a sovereign entity or as a perfect mirror of human capacity. Instead, I approach it as an unstable partner, capable of misunderstanding, mistranslation, and poetic misalignment. When an AI fails to recognize a body or misinterprets a movement, a new relational space emerges—neither human nor machinic, but metahuman: a shared field of becoming, where identity is no longer fixed but relational and transient.

This idea of the body as a process, not an object, resonates deeply with quantum thought and with the philosophy of Karen Barad (*Meeting the Universe Halfway*). Being is not the property of isolated entities; it is produced in *intra-action*, in the constant co-emergence of bodies, environments, and technologies.

A movement is never singular. It exists only because gravity, breath, attention, and atmospheric pressure collaborate to make it possible. The body is not a closed system but an ecosystem of relations, an unstable constellation of forces perpetually negotiating balance. In this sense, choreography is not imposed upon the body; it emerges from the ongoing conversation between the body and the world.

The ritual dimension of dance is important here—not as nostalgia for a past, but as a structure that holds space for transformation. In many of my participatory performances (see specially the *RCO* performance), the audience is not merely watching but moving, entering the ritual. Gestures circulate, bodies resonate, decisions are shared. Technology becomes part of this ritual apparatus—sensors, cameras, projections—but not to dominate. Rather, it listens.

It misinterprets. It reveals. The performance becomes a living organism in which agency is distributed: no single body, human or machine, controls the outcome.

This is also why I often speak of *eutopia* rather than utopia. Not the perfect world, but the good world—the world in process, where harmony is not imposed but continually negotiated. Dance offers a model of this possible world: fragile, precarious, but alive. A dancer on stage is always in danger of falling; it is this constant proximity to imbalance that gives meaning to movement. Coexistence works the same way—it is not stability but the art of falling together without collapsing.

The body, in this light, becomes a site of political awakening. Not through slogans or declarations, but through its capacity to feel, to relate, to be affected. Every movement asks a silent question: How can I be here, with others, without dominating? How can I exist without closing myself off from what is not me? This is where choreography becomes ethics. This is where dance becomes a way of thinking—not with concepts, but with skin, with weight, with silence.

It is here, in this fragile field of relation, that the metahuman begins—not as a superior version of the human, but as the dissolution of its rigid borders. Not a flight into transcendence, but a dive into entanglement. The metahuman is not the posthuman fantasy of invincibility; it is the recognition that identity is movement, not monument. In every rehearsal, in every improvisation, we practice this truth: we are not fixed beings. We are choreographies.

Metahumanism and the Dissolution of the Stable Body – Resonances with Jaime del Val

To speak of coexistence today requires that we confront not only the transformations brought by artificial intelligence and algorithmic control, but also the very idea of what a human body is—and whether the notion of a stable, clearly defined “human” still serves us. In this sense, my approach to choreography resonates deeply with the radical critique developed by Jaym*/Jaime del Val, whose metahumanist philosophy rejects both the transcendental ambitions of transhumanism and the passive optimism sometimes present in posthumanism. Del Val insists that the future is not about surpassing the human through technological enhancement, but about dissolving the idea of the human as a fixed, centralized, hierarchical entity (*Ontohackers, Part 2*).

Transhumanism imagines bodies freed from vulnerability—uploaded consciousness, mechanized immortality, frictionless communication. It celebrates control, mastery, and the erasure of limits. Yet this fantasy conceals a profound violence: it reduces life to information, embodiment to data, and the world to a platform for optimized performance. This dream mirrors the logic of a society governed by predictive algorithms, where error is treated as a flaw to be eliminated rather than a space for invention. What I call the choreographic body stands in direct opposition to such narratives. It speaks through tremors, fatigue, imbalance, and sweat. It refuses to disappear.

Del Val’s metahumanism proposes an alternative: the body not as a machine to perfect or a vessel to transcend, but as a *field of microperceptions*—unstable, shifting, in continuous metamorphosis (*Ontohackers, Part 1*). This is what Del Val describes as *metahuman becoming*: identity as a fluid, vibrating surface rather than a static core. The body is not an object but a process. It is experienced from within as movement before it is ever seen from outside as form. There is no final human to defend or improve—only relational intensities unfolding in time.

In addition, I see one striking concept, *anti-faciality*: a refusal of the face as the dominant organ of identity, representation, and social control. The face is what surveillance systems recognize; it is where power seeks to locate individuality for classification. In much of my choreographic work, the body is fragmented, multiplied, obscured: cameras distort it, AI misinterprets it, projections stretch it across walls and floors. The face ceases to be the centre of meaning. Movement migrates to the back, the breath, the trembling of a shoulder, the

vibration of a knee. In that displacement, a new form of perception appears—what Del Val would maybe call a *metahuman sensorium*.

This perspective does not reject technology; it repositions it. Technology becomes a medium that can destabilize identity rather than reinforce it. In performances such as *F_A_I_L* or *Myself*, AI does not serve as a mirror of human perfection, but as a mirror of misunderstanding. Its errors are fertile. When a system fails to recognize a gesture or misreads a human form, the choreography does not collapse—it begins. A new relation arises in the gap between expectation and interpretation. The machine, like the body, becomes porous, vulnerable, uncertain.

Metahumanism, therefore aligns with my insistence that dance is not about expressing a pre-existing self, but about composing oneself in relation—human, digital, ecological. The metahuman body is an *ecological body*: it does not end at the skin. It includes the rhythm of a crowd, the latency of a sensor, the humidity of the air, and the pressure of time. It is transindividual, trans-sensorial, trans-material. And because it is constantly dissolving and reconfiguring itself, its ethics is not that of purity or perfection, but of care, negotiation, and attentiveness.

This is where metahumanism meets choreography as a political act. To choreograph is to create the conditions within which bodies may transform without being destroyed. It is to allow identity to loosen—not into chaos, but into relation. It is to say that existence does not require dominance to have meaning; it requires connection. Against the transhuman fantasy of invulnerability, choreography and metahuman philosophy both affirm vulnerability as the source of invention. Against the cult of the face, they affirm the intelligence of the skin, the foot, the peripheral, the unseen.

To choreograph coexistence from a metahuman perspective is not to design perfect harmony. It is to engage with the tensions, asymmetries, and fractures of being-together. It is to accept that coexistence is not a definitive state, but a continuous practice—like breath, like balance, like life itself. In this way, metahumanism does not weaken the body; it multiplies it. It opens it toward other bodies, other agencies, other forms of life and non-life. It refuses to ask what the human is, and instead asks: *with whom, and how, do we become?*

Part II – Care, Error, and the Politics of Shared Fragility

The 21st century teaches us that power now resides in invisible networks—financial systems, data flows, predictive algorithms. These are no longer external machines; they are woven into our gestures, decisions, and desires. Yet it would be naive to declare technology an enemy. Technology is not a monolith; it is a field of potential—capable of surveillance or of emancipation, depending on how it is choreographed into life.

The pandemic, ecological collapse, and algorithmic governance have exposed the illusion of independence. Nobody survives alone. Timothy Snyder reminds us that *freedom is not the absence of constraints but the presence of supporting structures* (Snyder, *On Freedom*) an echo of the stage, where balance is only possible because weight is shared. This is why I insist: choreography is not merely spatial organization, but an ethics of coexistence. It proposes that survival is relational, that care is not sentimental but structural.

Care is resistance to abstraction. In a world that measures value through productivity and visibility, care operates in hidden gestures: the hand that lifts another, the breath held in unison, the silent waiting. Dance trains us in this ethics—because a duet is only possible when one body listens to the other. Care is not softness; it is risk. It demands that we stay vulnerable in a world that worships invulnerability.

Technology can either reinforce isolation or amplify empathy. The question is not whether machines think like us, but whether we are willing to *feel with them*. In my work, AI does not replace the human; it challenges it, fragments it, multiplies it. The machine's failure to perfectly recognize the body becomes an invitation to rethink recognition itself. What if understanding does not require accuracy, but attention? What if care includes listening to the machine's error?

Here, Del Val's metahumanism becomes essential. They warn that both transhumanism and certain forms of posthumanism risk repeating the same trap: the desire to escape the body, to freeze identity into data, to transform life into a replicable template. Against this, del Val argues for a *metahuman condition*—a state in which the body is understood as movement, not object; as micro perception, not spectacle; as process, not identity.

This is not far from the rehearsal studio. In a rehearsal, no movement is final. Every sequence is provisional, porous, open to change. There is no perfect version—only the version that exists in relation to the moment. I see the metahuman in the dancer's trembling knee, in the breath that catches, in the foot that touches the floor just a fraction too late. These are not mistakes; they are beginnings. They rupture the illusion of control and open space for relation.

In participatory installations and performances, I often invite the audience to move, to touch, to be seen—not as spectators but as co-composers. The choreography becomes a temporary society, fragile but real. Here, the politics of care are not spoken; they are danced. No one dominates the rhythm. Nobody is erased. Imperfection becomes the architecture of connection.

Failure, in this context, is not the opposite of success; it is the condition of a relationship. To fail together is to discover that existence is not a solitary act. Every balance begins as a fall. Every harmony begins as noise. Every community begins as an unknown movement toward another.

Part III – Quantum Relationality, Excentration, and the Ethics of Incompletion

Modern science speaks in a language that dance has always known: that nothing exists independently. Quantum physics tells us that particles are not things, but relationships. Karen Barad calls this *intra-action*—a world in which entities do not precede their relations but emerge through them. In choreography, this is not theory but daily practice. A step is not mine until the floor answers it. Perception does not belong to one body; it travels between bodies, screens, machines, and memories.

This dissolves the idea of the self as a stable centre. Grégory Chatonsky uses the term *excentration* (Chatonsky, *La double finitude*): to exist is to be already outside oneself, shared among images, data, histories. We are never only here. We are also in the memory of those who saw us, in the algorithm that tracks us, in the echo of our voice in someone else's body.

Dance embraces this dispersion—not to erase the self, but to multiply it. The stage becomes a prism that breaks the singular body into a spectrum of possible selves.

Yet this fragmentation is often met with fear. Transhumanism tries to conquer it by promising control: a perfected body, a stabilized identity, a mind uploaded to silicon. But metahumanism—and choreography—answer differently: *identity is not lost in movement; identity is movement*. We do not need to escape the body; we need to learn to inhabit it more subtly, more openly, more relationally.

Louise Bourgeois once said, “*Space does not exist; it is only a metaphor for the structure of our relationships.*” (Bourgeois, *Destruction of the Father*, 220) I believe the same of choreography. The stage is not a place; it is a conversation. Space is not neutral; it is sculpted by attention, gaze, pressure, and code. Just as in quantum physics, where observation changes what is observed, in dance, presence changes what is possible.

Reality, as Holly Childs (Childs & Żygus, *Hydrangea*), suggests, is the most resilient fiction we share. But fiction is not deception—it is creation. Each performance writes a world, even if only for an hour. This is why art is political—not because it gives answers, but because it expands the spectrum of possible futures.

In this world of collapsing certainties, I do not propose utopia. I propose *eutopia*—the good place, the place of careful becoming. A place always unfinished, always vulnerable. A choreography.

Ultimately, *Choreographing Coexistence* presents dance as a fragile yet essential site of political awakening. It is a place where freedom is not defined as independence but as responsiveness to others; where care becomes an architectural principle; where ritual, error, and collective improvisation perform alternative futures. Rather than offering utopian closure, the essay proposes a eutopian ethics—an ethics of the “good place” that is necessarily unfinished, imperfect, and yet profoundly necessary. Coexistence is choreographed not in abstract ideals, but through the trembling of bodies, the unpredictability of relations, and the continuous rehearsal of being together in an uncertain world.

And so I return to the beginning: to coexist is not to agree; it is to move together without erasing difference. It is to accept that we are not complete. That identity is porous. That technology is not destiny. That bodies think. That machines can feel—if we let them fail. That the future is not a program to execute, but a rhythm to inhabit.

To choreograph coexistence is to affirm this:
We are not monuments. We are movements.
Not answers, but rehearsals.
Not isolated beings—but entangled, trembling, metahuman lives

References:

Barad, Karen. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Duke University Press, 2007.

Bourgeois, Louise. *Destruction of the Father / Reconstruction of the Father: Writings and Interviews, 1923–1997*. Marie-Laure Bernadac Ed. MIT Press, 1998.

Chatonsky, Grégory. "La double finitude: le remplacement et l'excentration." *Chatonsky*, 2025a. Online : <https://chatonsky.net/double-finitude/> .

———. "What is Vectofascism?" *Dans les algorithmes*, 2025b. Online : <https://danslesalgorithmes.net/2025/03/25/vectofascisme/>

Childs, Holly, Gediminas Žygyus & Metahaven. "Formless." *Youtube*, 2020a. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tmDKzrJtCeQ&list=PLgR5igPU1AMRg72-clWEjc-aEMk153Dsz>

Childs, Holly & Gediminas Žygyus. "Hydrangea." *Youtube*, 2020b. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=izMfoAh0dSc&t=111s>

Del Val, Jaym*/Jaime. *Ontohackers: Radical Movement Philosophy in the Age of Extinctions and Algorithms. Part I: Radical Movement Philosophy and the Body Intelligence R/evolution*. punctum books, 2024

———. *Ontohackers: Radical Movement Philosophy in the Age of Extinctions and Algorithms. Part II: R/evolution Technologies*. punctum books, 2025

Snyder, Timothy. *On Freedom*. Penguin Random House, 2024

Artistic Projects by K. Danse referenced, project details accessible in <https://www.k-danse.net/en/>:

- *MYSELVES*. Dance and Pre-AI project
- *FAIL*. Dance and AI project exploring technological failure and dance.
- *ETERNITY*. Project investigating immortality, embodied epistemology, and temporality.
- *RCO (Radical Choreographic Object)*. Project involving audience participation.

ⁱAn extension to this paper will be available in <https://www.k-danse.net/en/portfolio/textes-theoriques/> including lists of examples of related artworks and other resources.

ⁱⁱChoreographer, K. Danse, email: kdmatos@orange.fr