

ARON BLOM

'SAM'

---

SALKA ARDAL

ROSE WIGREN

&

MIKKO HYVÖNEN

'TRASH TALK'

---

2:ND EDITION

1. Pieter Ampe & Guilherme Garrido "Still Difficult Duet" & "Still Standing You" (8-10.3 2011)
2. TIR Performance "Kartläggare DEL 1" (15-16.3 2011)
3. Robin Jonsson "Simulations" (19-21.3 2011)
4. Mette Edvardsen "Black" (26-27.3 2011)
- 5. Aron Blom "SAM", Salka Ardal Rosengren & Mikko Hyvönen "Trash Talk" (30.3-1.4 2011)

The MDT program texts is a series of unedited fanzine-style magazines available on the MDT website and in a limited cost price edition, printed, folded and stapled on a Konica Minolta All-in-one Copier.

MDT is an international co-production platform and a leading venue for contemporary choreography and performance situated in a reconstructed torpedo workshop in the Stockholm city center. MDT has since 1986 supported and collaborated with Swedish and international emerging artists. MDT is supported by Kulturrådet, Kulturförvaltningen Stockholm stad and Kulturförvaltningen Stockholms läns landsting.

MDT  
Slupskjulsvägen 30  
11149 Stockholm, Sweden  
T: +46 (0)8-611 14 56  
E: [info@mdtsthlm.se](mailto:info@mdtsthlm.se) / [www.mdtsthlm.se](http://www.mdtsthlm.se)

Author: Rudi Laermans (2007). The politics of collective attention. In: Gehm S., Husemann P., von Wilcke K. (Eds.), Knowledge in motion: perspectives of artistic and scientific research in dance (pp. 235-241). Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.

## The politics of collective attention

Imagine we are in a small theatre venue somewhere in Western Europe. It's 8.30 pm, the lights are dimmed, the performer steps in the direction of the proscenium, takes his or her place behind a lectern and starts talking. That's all that seems to happen in the eyes of all those present. Yet, something different also happens, and it is most of the time overlooked by those who are looking at a stage. Precisely because their sensory attention is absorbed by the action on the stage, those present do not notice that the attention of every single spectator disappears in a collective gaze (which of course includes 'a collective ear' when text or music is used). How to understand this gaze or, more generally, this *condensation of collective sensory attention*? As an autonomous social medium that fundamental for every sort of live performing art, besides for instance the medium of text in the theatre or the body-as-medium in dance. This medium is per definition a temporary and contingent product that emerges again and again - or not! - during a performance. Dance or theatre makers do of course anticipate public attention during the preparation and the rehearsals of a piece. They try to direct or steer this simultaneously desired and feared medium by means of the timing of a performance and all kinds of rhetorical devices (such as joking, insulting the public or just going on stage naked) . Yet the simultaneously constitutive and contingent nature of the collective attention during a live performance cannot be stimulated or controlled: the risk of 'going live' is the risk of being confronted with the black hole of scattered attention or a distracted audience. A proverbial attention cloud does or does not emerge, and when it does, it has only partially foreseen effects, Although this attention is anything but unmediated (a point to which I will return at the end of this essay), the condensation of the different individual perceptions into an autonomous quasi-reality is a temporal event in the strict sense: a passing moment in time. During a particular performance, this often happens several times, always with different outcomes, so that it is probably more appropriate to speak of a series of events and, consequently, of an inherently instable medium.

The social medium of collective sensory attention is not just the passive sum of the different individual perceptions, but an active, even transformative, quasi-reality. Evidently, the individual attention of every single member of the audience contributes to the emergence of a collective gaze (and/or a collective ear). The elements of the medium do indeed consist of individual perceptions, but their mutual couplings generate an autonomous surplus effect. It is reminiscent of the productivity of interaction effects in so-called complex systems, but one could as well refer to the semantic and rhetorical autonomy of a simple phrase in relation to the words that are its constituent elements. The media autonomy of collective attention is confirmed by its capacity to transform, for instance, some simple steps on a stage into meaningful movements, or to change a relatively long-lasting silence of the performers into a profound statement. Also, as every spectator knows, the momentary collective attention may greatly influence individual perception. Simultaneously, it is itself largely influenced by the overall way the audience behaves. Indeed, neither individual concentration nor the emergence of a collective attention is possible without the silence and adequate behaviour of those attending a performance.

We take it for granted that, once the lights are dimmed, the spectators become silent and attentive, thus transforming themselves into an audience. Actually, this crucial pact between performance and audience is a historical and social construct. At least in the West, it is the outcome - briefly speaking - of the bourgeois redefinition of the arts. Historical research indeed shows that during the first half of the 19th century silence and self-restraint did not yet predominate in theatre venues or during music performances. The expectation of genuine bodily self-control and a distanced, primarily mindful attention was only gradually imposed within artistic spaces, first and foremost by the new urban bourgeois elite. They did this because (partly coinciding with the first generations of new artistic professionals) they 'sacralised' those segments of theatre, music, sculpture or literature that were considered to embody "the best of mankind" - to use a famous phrase of the British poet and critic Matthew Arnold in "Culture and Anarchy"(1) (originally published in 1869). In this view, participation in the arts became synonymous with "the study of perfection". The net outcome was a thorough purification of several cultural genres, resulting in the well-known distinction between high (or 'sacred') culture and low (or 'popular') culture. Thus an all too direct bodily or emotional involvement, for instance booing or interim applause and loudly ventilated encouragements, became taboo during artistic events. In order to contemplate the deeper meanings of a work of art, silence and concentration were a must: only in this way could Immanuel Kant's famous "interesseloses Wohlbehagen"(2) (disinterested pleasure) - the 'hallmark' of every aesthetic experience - be realised. This mode of participation generalised within the new sphere of high culture the modern way of reading a text as the basic model in encounters with works of art. The new bourgeois model initiated equivalence between the arts, silence and self-control, contemplation, and 'reading the meaning (or decoding the message)'. In contrast a more unrestrained involvement was allowed, even expected, during the attendance of the various forms of popular entertainment, such as the new genre of cabaret or of all kinds of sports events. From a broader historical point of view, much can be said for the thesis that the 19th century redefinition of culture continued a much longer process in which first the aristocracy, then the bourgeoisie tried to distinguish itself from 'the people' by means of a high level of physical and affective self-control. Or, to paraphrase the famous study by sociologist Norbert Elias(3), the so-called process of civilisation that accelerated during the early-modern period within court circles was continued by the new social elite that took over economic and political power by the end of the 18th century. Yet, with becoming bourgeois in the civilisation process, the primary locus of self-restraint also shifted from the demonstrative showing off of good manners and a refined, highly elaborated public behaviour to the silent participation in the sphere of high culture. The well-known German notion of *Bildung* legitimised this shift; it was also in Germany that the new religion of Art achieved its first momentum with the *Gesamtkunstwerk* of Richard Wagner and the Festspiele in Bayreuth. What happened to the bourgeois model of arts participation? Notwithstanding the discourse on post-modernity and the relative 'erosion' of the distinction between high and low culture, silence and self-restraint still the rule in museums or during public artistic events. At a first glance, the basic parameters of this model are also respected by performance artists who joyously appropriate expressions of popular culture. To just one example: in the first version of Jérôme Bel's much discussed *The Show Must Go On*, the performers illustrate in a very literal way the content of well-known pop songs. Although the number of public laughs elicited, to say nothing of their collective intensity, was much higher than during a regular theatre play or a straightforward choreography, the audience remained seated and did not start to yell along with the songs, let alone start up a party. Like many other artists, Bel crosses the symbolic distinction between high and low culture in his work, yet he conceives and presents this cross-over according to the overall lines of the dominant participation model of

emotional self-control and a primarily text-oriented modus of perception and appreciation. One may therefore argue that the performing arts remain modern (not modernist!) as long as they rely on the medium of collective attention as the conditioning frame for the production and the reception of individual works. Bel's performance work is often associated, and rightly so, with that of Marcel Duchamp, the doyen of avant-gardism. To a large extent, the history of the 20th century avant-garde has been an extended play with, sometimes even a fierce battle against, the passivity of the audience within the different artistic disciplines. This comes as no surprise in the light of Peter Bürger's influential account of avant-gardism.(4) For according to the literary theorist Bürger, who tries to create a common framework for Futurism, Dadaism, Surrealism and Constructivism in an overall way, the historical avant-garde questioned the autonomy of the arts in the name of the possibility of an emancipating merger of the arts and daily life. It is highly instructive that within the traditions of Dadaism and Surrealism, the various attempts to create more direct forms of public involvement again and again drew on popular culture genres, particularly cabaret and comedy. After their renewal during the 1960s and the early 70s, with the work of Living Theatre, which is probably still known best, both traditions went underground and made room within the sphere of the performing arts for more subtle forms of involvement with the overall passivity of the audience (witness Bel's *The Show Must Go On* and many other examples).

Within contemporary art, the avant-garde dream of the politically liberating potential of a direct merger of art and daily life has become a marginal bet. Yet within the realm of the performing arts, contemporary dance has recently developed a striking reflexivity regarding audience participation and the medium of collective attention. Some artists still question the overall model of passive participation and aim at a more direct bodily involvement. Prototypical examples are the Highway project by Meg Stuart, the various excursions into the field of installation art by Boris Charmatz, or the performances within unusual public settings by Patricia Portela and the Deep Blue collective. In general, these and related projects try to punctuate the so-called fourth wall that distances the spectators from the performers and allows the audience to hide away in the dark. Thus, Thomas Lehmen in *Stationen* and Meg Stuart *Auf den Tisch!* placed the audience around a table. Lehmen even completely reversed the roles and asked members of the audience to talk about their professions. Yet the examples of a more direct involvement of the audience are relatively rare and do not illustrate the more general interest within contemporary dance in the medium of collective attention. Does this interest also have a wider political and societal relevance?

In order to answer this question, I loosely rely on the recent writings of the French philosopher Jacques Rancière.(5) In his view, every political order implies an always specific distribution of visibility and perceptivity. Some social groups can, others cannot, raise public issues in a legitimate way. This power relationship implies the literal invisibility within the public sphere of various collective and discursive subjects that are not considered to be part of 'the community'. In contemporary society, this imposition of a particular order of visibility, and even of public attention as such, is first and foremost the work of the mass media in their broadest sense (including advertising, for instance). Mass media communication constructs and reproduces a highly selective representation of life. What is primarily left out of the picture, literally and figuratively, ...is the heterogeneity and autonomy of daily life. Both are precisely the subject of many contemporary dance performances, which tackle issues ordinarily unseen or 'made invisible' via various appropriations of daily movements and postures. Mass media communication negates the sheer anonymity of the body naked and clothed at the same time, of the complex feedback between the body as a nameless biological entity and its various articulations according to gender-specific,

class-defined or ethnic cultural codes. Contemporary dance takes up this simultaneously generic and mediated body as its primary material, knowing that it is always already colonised, even in the ways it is looked at. This reflexivity necessarily involves specific concepts of representation and participation. *Looking at manifestations of the body overlooked within the spectacle society*, this is how one could summarise the subject of those contemporary dance performances that take a more reflexive stance. Indeed, a quite important part of contemporary dance is the general concern to appropriate concepts of visibility or perceptivity and it regards itself, implicitly or explicitly, as belonging to a counter-public. Many contemporary dance productions do not just rely on the medium of collective attention but try to re-articulate it because it is inevitably 'infected' by the dominant ways that contemporary mass media communication uses to raise and direct sensory perception. A contemporary dance performance that takes into account this simple fact therefore develops various necessarily risky tactics to re-negotiate the socialised nature of sensory attention. Some of the better known procedures are the use of video cameras and digital images, the slowing down or - on the contrary - the speeding up of movements, the sheer repetition of poses or gestures, and the performance of nearly unperceivable micro-movements. These and related forms of 'public body work' try to destabilise the dominant modes of perception, which all of us are familiar with through contact with contemporary mass media. They do not question the bourgeois model of arts participation, but take it up as a possibility to create forms of collective attention that differ from the ones generated by television, Hollywood film, or glamour photography.

Contemporary mass media communication, in the broad sense, has become the primary societal frame for the production of public attention in all societal domains, including politics. This is not surprising, since to raise public attention and to create social visibility is the principal commodity of the mass media system. As such, this system equals an attention regime, a capturing machine that tries to raise, fix and frame sensory perception. The performing arts cannot avoid reproducing or disputing the dominance of the mass media since they work with the very same medium of sensory attention, albeit in a collective and so-called live situation. Yet it is not this "live" character as such matters, but the way one deals with the collectivisation of sensory perception - that is: with the principal medium of the performing arts. The decisive point is to take up, or not, the at once contingent and conditional collective attention during a live performance as the possible foreshadowing of a community yet to come - of a togetherness that may allude to *the shared visibility within a community without secrets*.

**References** Arnold, Matthew: *Culture and Anarchy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2006. Bürger, Peter: *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1984. Elias, Norbert: *The Civilizing Process*, Oxford: Blackwell 2000. Kant, Immanuel: *The Critique of Judgment*, London: Dover Publications 2005. Levine, Lawrence (1988): *Highbrow/lowbrow. The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America*, Boston: Harvard University Press. Luhmann, Niklas (1990): "The Medium of Art", in: idem: *Essays on Self-Reference*, New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 215-227. Luhmann, Niklas (2000): *The Reality of the Mass Media*, Oxford: Polity Press. Rancière, Jacques: *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1998. Rancière, Jacques: *The Politics of Aesthetics*, London/New York: Continuum 2006. Smithuijsen, Cas (2001): *Een verbazende stilte. Klassieke muziek, gedragsregels en sociale controle in de concertzaal*, Amsterdam: BoekmanI stichting.

**Notes** 1 | Matthew Arnold: *Culture and Anarchy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2006. 2 | Cf. Immanuel Kant: *The Critique of Judgment*, London: Dover Publications 2005. 3 | Cf. Norbert Elias: *The Civilizing Process*, Oxford: Blackwell 2000. 4 | Cf. Peter Bürger: *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1984. 5 | Cf. Jacques Rancière: *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1998, and idem: *The Politics of Aesthetics*, London/New York: Continuum 2006.

- In the time of working, what kind of methods of working do you plan to employ?

So I would like. This is also how I. How I say like.... I would like to have uhmm.... so not ending up in this kind of ok have a vague idea and we go into studio and like eh it's hard to grasp on to things or it's hard to start uhmm a work process so I would like to have that's why this training thing that I talked before I ... I would it could be nice to have ehmm some routines or we maybe it's also just for us to kind of warm up or get eh get to know each other better somehow. That could be included in the in the what we create later but, ehmm... Sorry what was the question again like if...

So I would . This is how I. How I say like.... I would like to have uhmm.... so not ending up in kind of ok a vague idea and we go into and like eh it's to grasp on to things or it's hard to start uhmm a work process so I would like to have that's why this training thing that I talked I ... I would it could be nice to have ehmm some routines or we maybe it's also just for us to kind of warm up or get eh get to know other somehow. That could be included in the in the what we later but, ehmm... Sorry what was the question like if...

So I . is how . How say like.... I like to uhmm.... so ending in of ok a idea and we into and eh it's to on to or it's hard to uhmm a so I like to that's why this thing that I talked I ... would could be to ehmm some or maybe also just for to of warm or get eh get to in the in the what but, ehmm... was the question if...

if...

uhmm....

ehh

uhmm

...

ehmm

ehmm...

...

.

.

....

...

.

, ...

...

Aron Blom was born 1986 in Stockholm, Sweden. He studied at The Royal Swedish Ballet School in Stockholm from 2004 to 2006. In 2006 he was accepted to P.A.R.T.S. (Performing Arts Research and Training Studios) and graduated in the spring of 2010. In 2009 he created "Aron & Mikko Thinking duet" in collaboration with Mikko Hyvönen. He has also been performing in "Paper Plane" by Veli Lehtovaara and "Trio Lio Lei" by Mikko Hyvönen. For the moment he is working in the new creation with Rosas/Anne Teresa De Keersmaeker.

Special thanks to: Bo Arenander, Robert Malmborg och MDT.

Self-interview by Aron Blom on the performance "SAM"

Q;How should we do this?

A;Well ask me some questions and I will try to answer, no?

Q;Ok. Do you want to start from the beginning? When did you start to work on "SAM"?

A;Ok. I think it started at P.A.R.T.S. somehow. I began working on a solo there in the end of 2010 but then I broke my arm and I was working in two other pieces at the time so the solo had to wait.

Q;You broke your arm?

A;It was a stupid thing.

Q;Ok, well. And then?

A;So I decided to work on it later.

Q;And when was later?

A;Well, I was thinking about it a bit during the summer but thinking didn't do me much good. And then I started to do it in the middle of October last year.

Q;Why didn't the thinking do any good?

A;Well, I don't know. I think I felt like it's often misleading or distracting and I didn't know how to think about it. But in the end it gave me an idea on how to start that I wanted to try so... actually maybe it's a bit stupid to talk about it like thinking in general because there are many different kinds of thinking and maybe what I call thinking that isn't doing me good isn't even thinking, but it's a different topic. Lets go on.

Q;This could be good to talk about though?

A;Maybe, but not now.

Q;You said that it gave you an idea on how to start, what was that?

A;Well I didn't have a studio to work in at the time cause I got in to MDT later so I started to dance on the street kind of.

Q;Ok, well. What did you do?

A;I was performing on public places.

Q;How was that?

A;I don't know. It felt a bit weird.

Q;And why did you do that?

A;Well, I remember thinking that It would be nice to practice performing with a possibility of having an audience every time and being in places that are not like a dance studio.

Q;But even if you would be watched its not the same thing as in a performance, right?

A;Yes, it was all in my head. Anyway it was fun to do but not so interesting when it came to making the work. I mean I think its fun to spontaneously move sometimes and not feel restricted because of where I am but I didn't feel like I wanted to make a solo from that situation even if it might have influenced what I did later in the studio.

Q;So did it influence the solo?

A;Like I said, it might have but it doesn't matter so much. I only did it a few times.

Q;And then you started to work in the studio at MDT?

A;Yes.

Q;And how would you describe that process?

A;I don't know. Well I kind of called it that I do what I do and then I make a solo out of it but that's not really what I am working on. Or maybe the I do what I do part of it is a part of what I work on.

Q;What is that, "I do what I do"? What do you mean?

A;Jag vet inte. I think it sounds good. I think saying that came from how it felt to do what I was doing at the time. There you go (laugh). No, but I think that in this work I have been working or guiding the work from the inside of my experience which is the only thing I/we have. But that also includes things like my sense of empathy. And other things that I'm not sure what to call them that puts me in places outside of my self. Hm, its a pain in the neck...

Q;What do you mean by inside of my experience and that being the only thing I/we have?

A;Well I guess... Or no, it's not a guess, it's how I feel/think about it. Anyway, what was the question?

Q;What do you mean by inside of my experience and that being the only thing I/we have?

A;For example, when my sense of empathy is at work it is working inside me, it is happening in my body. But empathy is something that is working on people or maybe things that are kind of outside or at least they are not me to me, or maybe the people or things are working on me... what was the question again?

Q;What do you mean by inside of my experience and that being the only thing I/we have?

A;I don't know any more.

Q;Ok... It seems like this formulation "do what I do" is something that

loops?

A;When I go in to the studio and do what I do which could be called moving or dancing I perceive things and I do things and that's like a loop, sometimes.

Q;How is that a loop?

A;It doesn't matter. I am bored of talking about this kind of things.

Q;You seem to be a bit afraid of naming things. Are you?

A;Maybe I am, I don't like to feel obliged to.

Q;Are you obliged?

A;I don't know. I kind of chose to not go there in this processes.

A;I need to go so we have to finish now.

Q;Ok.

A;This was a bit strange, we didn't really get any where.

Q;Not really.

A;Well. Ok.

Self interview with salka

Q - What is this practice that you and mikko have been doing?

S - I don't remember why and how, but we started to invite people to our studio, and we would practice being together with them.

Q - Why did you want to sit in front of an audience, without knowing what to do?

S - ehh, I think I was looking to get closer to people, or to meet them in a non-protective manner. It's like sometimes it feels that when you walk outside the door you have this shield of attitude. Why is it so hard sometimes to face other people? How can we share thoughts and communicate? Only via words and language? And if we fail? I think I try to share my own feelings in order to get closer to the people outside of me. I cannot know what they are thinking about, yet I can have an idea, somehow I sometimes have the feeling that I share a moment with someone, on the subway or in any other public space, that feeling of sharing the same time. Like you tune in to the timing of another person, and become a bit closer to each other.

hm.

Q - aha, you seem very emotional about this, and now you want to tune your timing with the audience?

S - well, maybe. I mean we propose a situation and it's a theatrical set-up, and that's exactly what I like about this meeting in the theatre, or while performing, you don't have to follow those conventional social rules, or at least not in the same way as out here.

Q - Because normally you follow these social rules in your daily life?

S - ehh... well, no, yes, or sometimes... sometimes I realize I do it to make myself comfortable in a situation, or even make other people comfortable.

Those rules makes it easier in many ways, easier to make fast conversation and communicate with each other. But sometimes

it's not good, as if the worst thing that could happen is to have nothing to talk about. The s i l e n c e .

Q - So what would you like to achieve with this performance?

S - What interest me with this thing, is how it's being perceived for a public; if they enter our thoughts, how the mind travel (and body-gesture) when do you get bored? Do you place what is going on? What do you see? I want to put peoples attention to their position as an individual, group or collective watching the performance. We're not traveling much in space, but imagination can travel and fantasy and ideas...

I know it makes me very aware of how hard it is to look people in the eyes for example, and why that is hard.

Q - Why is it hard to look people in the eyes?

S - Because it's a bit like looking right into the person, and there's a lot going on; fear, happiness, embarrassment, longing... well, sometimes you don't see anything. Some people are really good at hiding what they go through inside, it's like there full-time activity.

Q - Fine, but don't you think it would be a hell of a mess if everybody all the time would express every little thing they feel or go through? Does everything have to be on display all the time?

S - It probably would be a mess, yes and no, I'm not saying that we shouldn't have privacy, but there are so many ways of being with each other, and sometimes we forget that and bla bla bla bla bla bla

## Self-interview, Mikko

- Q: So how come did you start to work with Salka and what were your expectations about the work?

- A: Hmm, I think that one interest or an idea that came to my mind when we first spoke about collaboration was that we would do something expressive. I think I had this view because Salka has so expressive personality and I like to be expressive sometimes too if I go for it.. It's nice to use that in performances too. So I guess one question was how to find ways to work with expressions or expressivity in some consistent enough manner and I thought this would be good collaboration to try to go for that.

- Q: And what happened?

- A: Well, the other interest that we had about copying people came actually first. We were thinking about copying sequences from videos, from people in the streets or from movies. And we ended up copying videos about ourselves, so there is expressivity involved for sure, but mostly in a quite subtle, everyday manner.

-Q: Would you call that expressivity, like are we then expressing something all the time?

- A: Yea, I would say so, even if we're not conscious about that. And I think in this piece we are trying to highlight this kind of everyday expressivity, nothing special, but still very special if looked closely. There's lots of stupid gestures and small expressions when we're trying to speak about things or explain something. I wanted to look at those materials as a dance and choreography, like as a subtle and complex choreography that includes the thoughts and emotions and speech at some level too. Other way to look at those materials would be that they are acting work where you have to learn the script, with certain intentions and movements. I don't know actually what's the difference there between acting or just learning movement materials with expressions.... It's somehow nice to blur those lines when performing, like if it's something that we have learned before, or something done more spontaneously in the situation.

- Q: Maybe it's more interesting to talk about how it's seen from outside. I don't know if it matters for people who come to see it in the end if you call it acting or dancing. What did or what do you actually wanna do with those materials or make from them?

- A: That's a good one, a tough one. I think it's nice to perform something that looks not so special but that can become special at moments. Maybe something that is there everyday when we speak to each other and that we can look as rich thing that is happening all the time and choose to look at it as a performance if we want to. Like then if you observe around, there are great performances happening all the time, every day and you can be part of them or just stay observing.

- Q: So you want to mix or blur art and everyday life in this case or what?

- A: I guess they're always mixed, it's just matter of degrees for me more, like

going towards one or other...

- Q: Ok, last question, stay sharp, I will give you ten letters randomly and you have to make a short answer from everyone of them, Ready?

- A: Yes.. what the fuck?

- Q: Ok,

g Going great!

H having to think or to adapt to the situation.

D days passing fast in the last week

b But are you sure you wanna talk about this with audience?

R right feeling

e E.T.

3 3 nights in a row!

b becoming a monkey-cat

j jesus can you repeat that?

f **F\*\*\*\*\*** .







