



How do we conceive of precision that not only reflects the subject matter but moves it, affects it and cares for it? The Learning Theatre is a contraption rigged to support the learning body to develop in this direction. It extends from Kurt Lewin's idea of: unfreeze, move, re-freeze etc.

It therefore features a different kind of crisis-response than "megaphone language". And for Lewin it was since it was developed to have people move on, in the wake of WWII. It will not isolate the *island*, but will cultivate the smaller *ponds* of flow that exist. And work for any kind of *passage*.

In some sense, the 'passage' is a name for reflective work in the *edgeland* (articulating presently *between* virtual contamination and digital connection). The point is that it features reflection as real work. In this sense, it will belong to the standard baggage of artistic research. Changing-understanding.



The Learning Theatre could be defined as ‘the audio-visual scenography of *reception*’ as a core challenge of artistic research, as a necessity emerging in the wake of developing art-work. My meandering through the SALT biennale, the Molecular Ballet and Amphibious Trilogies pays tribute to this.

But there is a paradox, because the work of reception—as conceived in the Learning Theatre—is a tributary to the development of art-work. It is a paradox because a tributary (which is used in ordinary parlance for a ‘river’) comes before the art-work: a minor contribution to something bigger.

As in magic, it is done with mirrors—yes!—but with asynchronous mirrors. That is, mirrors that do not reflect in a mechanical but in an emergent ways. As in a deterministic chaos we know that a reflection will *eventually* occur, but we *cannot* predict *exactly* when. It leans on *occasional cause* (Laruelle).

The strategy of the Learning Theatre is to repeat this reflective turn to occur within itself. The workings of which we have seen in some detail with the Molecular Ballet. The tributary logic is also clearest here, since I wrote a flyer-series dedicated to the ballet, on the topic of automation, *before* HOK.

The mode of approach of the present flyer-series is *immersive*. Which means that nothing is discussed outside working with something specific that has happened. This specificity is the point of entry of the Learning Theatre. The reflective device is rigged between two types of *precisation*.

Precisation is a Norwegian term transposed to English by David Rothenberg (Arne Næss’ translator, who worked in close dialogue with him). It is a way of squaring the specific, as a point of departure and return. And it is an arrangement to forestall “megaphone language”: insubstantial language.

If an island is a ‘wicked problem’, the pond is an attempt at containing it, then the passage is the reflective arrangement which—in order to be adequate/work—must be congenial with flow. This is what I take on from the Amphibious Trilogies Project, combined with Ludvig Uhlbors insights.

The flow is concrete, in both cases, in the sense that both the trilogies and Uhlbors are embarked on a real journey, so that the passage—like the flow in the Bosphorus straight—is concrete. They are in what they talk about: this is one level of precisation: reaching clarity under immersive conditions.

In the Molecular Ballet project there are a number of micro-journeys: inviting 256 contributions to the axis game (all contributions conceived as moves in the game). Using found materials to manufacture the contributions (symbols called Tots). Distilling them in Illustrator. Animating them in GIF and video.

Then inviting people to download them prior to the dance performance at HOK. Then dancing them. And in the end returning the Tots to the black box where they are brought to rest, and shipped to the Seed Bank on Svalbard. How I would have liked to know my grand aunt who did a survey there!