

When *content* is coming through under the conditions of *poor* transmission there is a danger of developing a "megaphone" language: that is, a kind of publicising language beyond conversation, that addresses the audience in a poster-like fashion. Loud language: augmentation through reduction.

Designers are already experts at this, and constitutes a valuable repertoire in some areas. But what I am talking about here is the danger that a kind of discourse develops, in which *substance* systematically escapes conversation. If it primes professional respect, artistic trust—probably not.

Artistic trust, arguably and perhaps demonstrably, comes from a *fluid third person* perspective. Receiving it from others and eventually—as a student—producing it oneself. But how does this relate to *gender* (cf, **#01**)? Well it can if we consider that the *third person* is somehow connected to *nature*.



In attending a <u>ballet performance</u>—routed by the sculptures distributed in the landscape around *Henie Onstad Art Centre*—I was at first aware of the resilience of the public: people who have found their way, to this resort about 12km outside of Oslo; they stuck to the group for 3 full hours.

When I did the count—about midways when we had reached a geometric colourful sculpture by the seaside on our way back to the centre—there was an audience of 71. Crowding without crowding on each other. An archetype/catalyst accompanied each sculpture: this one was *Silens*. Image top *recto*.

I myself sought out spots that were propitious in a cat-like way, as Georges Perec wrote in *Species of Spaces*. One to *withness* (**#01**) the sculptures, the performance, the audience and nature *together*. The 3 hour effort put the traditional split space of the theatre—floor and stage unified—in motion.

But two other modes of partaking of the compound space emerged: the sample of the 256 symbols (Tots) of the molecular ballet, selected online by the audience, and the emergent *sweet-spots* offered gratuitously by the natural surroundings. Reception points revealing holistic affordances.

In the aspects that relate to the *Learning Theatre*—a perambulatory variant of Cedric Price's and Joan Littlewood's *Fun Palace*—the function of the performance is to *broadcast* space. However, another function is revealed by the *sweet-spots* surveying the whole: holding space and sending it back.

So, the natural surroundings of the *perambulatory event* deconstructs the theatre-space and reveals a foursquare structure: the stage, the floor, the *contraption* (the black box of symbols), the *sweet-spots* where a Tadeusz Kantor like creature, still remains although he is *not* the stage-director.

The reason why I am elaborating this point here is to bring to attention the multiplicity of the third person *withness* in a concrete way, and also to understand some structural aspects of the *gender-fluid mode*, available to all humans, that come with a way of engaging with nature: a surveyor mode.

This latter point came to me through engaging with Ludvig Uhlbors' Walk for Engebø fjellet—a 453km walk that took him 9 days—with a sapling Birch, and hand it over to the Minister of Environment, as a protest against the permission given to a mining company to discharge waste in the fjord.

The Minister didn't turn up outside the parliament, so the end of the journey was for Ludvig to plant the almost invisible Birch sapling in the park in front of the Parliament. There was no disappointment to be traced in him as he stood before a closed gate, instead he planted the sapling: this is *fluidity*.

Other traces are the video-diary (9 entries) of a stage-director walking alone in the woods, about 50km/day. In a diary-group with designers from KHiO we have been discussing similar issues. Questioning the nature of the materials we end up with after 22 weeks. Ludvig speaks of (a 3rd) *flow*.