

The main idea that drawn my attention in this course, is the importance to collect, identify, study and understand the countless and non measurable elements :

- those which encourage people to ride a bike (shifting their transport mode, or keeping this kind of mobility)
- those which bring positive effect to a human person, a city, or a society.

In the article by Ruth Oldenziel, I noticed this quote : « the importance of encouraging everyday utility cycling by involving diverse social groups ». It's a way to fight the preconception that the bicycle is for the poor people, it's important to show that by the contrary, bike is universal. It's important to understand that the bike is not a choice based on the income, but a choice based on the relevance.

I found funny in *Why we cycle*, the section explaining that the bicyclists didn't use the wonderful bikepath that the engineers built for them : because they were too boring. In France we have an other and opposite reason : it's because they are too narrow, or dented, when they are not occupied by cars... or both for all of these reasons. So in our point of view it's the bike path that is an adventure ! A friend of me, a cyclist campaigner, explained me that while he managed almost every time to content pedestrians in advising itineraries, he failed nearly systematically for bikers : as if the criteria to content a bicyclist were too abundant, elusive, unpredictable.

I discovered the expression « Open modes » (for walking and cycling) as modes than « increase faces in the street », increasing « liveliness of public space », improving « perceptions of urban space as safer and more attractive » and then, increasing « a feeling of belonging ». It's a very important point to work on : it has positive effects, as we see, but it also can be an impediment for people who are uncomfortable with their body : walking and cycling make you visible, and engage your body, if it's not your habit, it can be one more difficulty to adopt this way of transport. That's why the normalization of being a cyclist or a pedestrian is important.

When I rode a bike for the first time on a bikepath in the Netherlands, I was a little bit nervous : will I do things wrong, will I bother the Dutch that are so used to in this practice ? I was used to... but in France, where we can't say there is a bike culture, where you have never direction arrows painted on your bike path, where overtaking between bikes never occurs... because we aren't enough to do that !

So if it was impressive for me while I ride a bike since I'm 5 years old, I never stopped since then, and I supervised rides of 100 cyclists in a car aggressive city like Lyon... imagine the mental gap that would have to break through a person with little experience in cycling who would try to bike for the first time.

To ride a bicycle is in fact a way to be recognize as a human being : we say and we see « the bicyclists » and « the cars ». I picked up this sentence from Robert Weetman text about the cycle highways : « Cyclists should feel like the are part of the traffic picture ». I take this in two ways : first cyclists are taken into account in building infrastructures, and then cyclists are a part of the landscape as we say in french. This recognition of the cyclists is also a way to encourage modal shift.

To finish with, I was left hungry with more concrete exemples of using pattern language and embodied making to describe the « bikeness » and be able to build it. I would like to be able to use this langage.

Reading the Road Safety Strategic Plan 2030 from Netherlands, I was horrified by this sentence : « Vision of the future: vulnerable road users protect themselves and others / Wearing a helmet has become the norm, especially for children and senior citizens ». I understand especially why **it's crucial to insist / research on securing infrastructure, practice and material to avoid the threat of hindering the liberty of cycling.** What stunned me is the fear that Netherlands could lost his characteristic of a biking nation. My question is how could we definitively guarantee the bike as the main way of transport each time it is relevant. **Why it's so difficult to maintain something that is so evident (efficiency, health, cheapness, pleasure...) ?**