



Arguably, being succinct without having resorted to “megaphone language” is simply what it means to be *specific* in what is proposed and stated. That is, acting and speaking to the point: with good timing (*kairos*) based on a *deeper* practical and informed understanding of the subject matter.

Clarifying without becoming doctrinal, while feeding the ambition of attaining a threshold level of precision, is needed for design to *catch on*. In that aspect that Bourdieu phrased as “what communicates from body to body, before words and concepts.” Designers are making their bids here.

To succeed in writing—in this broader climate of achievement—an awareness of what is surfacing in the creative environment is needed. This awareness is not a resident of writing, as a techno-cultural device, but in the context of *writing*: the hatching of new *repertoires* in the *learning theatre*.



The *learning theatre*—a designed infrastructure for pushing walls—hosted a major push, within KHIO's design department, when the the heads of specialisation said in unison that they perceived the need for emphasising a *written output* from the final theory-course. Students also wish to write more.

Among the students, however, there is a considerably more pronounced variation on this subject matter. The challenge was therefore to determine how more weight on the written output, could be combined with a oral delivery, such as is common in all higher education in general.

At art school, the oral presentations have always been *part of* the delivery: in this case, *how* a reflective work—emphasising the written output—could be delivered orally, so as to add generatively to the written output (*rather than* merely summarise argue, demonstrate, sell or illustrate the written delivery).

This has been the pedagogic framework of higher education, in general. The orals are *not* there to reiterate what has been submitted—or, limited to discuss and clarify some points—but to *triangulate* more productively with what has been submitted in writing, and thereby assert itself with *autonomy*.

As a *techno-cultural device*, writing has a very specific way of operating a *shift* in language, by **1**) bringing it to *silence* [aural]; **2**) bringing it into the visual-manual *intelligence* of the handwriting [though a different sort of mark-making than drawing]; **3**) moving unto type-sets, text-blocks, layout, *volume*.

Correspondingly, writing constitutes a *backside* of sensorially led styles of learning. But if understood as *passive* affordance, the written work will also have a potential to hatch new repertoires if [transposed](#). This would be the kind of oral delivery hosted by the *learning theatre*: hatching new *repertoires*.

Moving from passive affordances to active learning. The writing will be successfully transposed if it is indigenous on *non-mimetic* terms. That is, we will catch that the two are about the *same thing*—or, converge to the point of prompting anticipation—yet, in a way that we *couldn't see* coming/predict.

This set-up would be contrived *if* it was imposed as a *standard*, in and for itself. However, the pedagogical point—seen from a more *holistic* point of view than at present—is to bring the students' research, practice and theorising to a point of *synthesis*, in which their interest is obvious and *specific*.

And that this *specificity* is the child of the passive affordances (backside) and active assets (frontal) *squared*. This squaring of the *intuitive* (passive) and *intentional* (active) prompts the development and awareness of a complex process, with emergent *systemic* properties (that can be gardened).

Looking for the *specific*—when initiating the harvest from an impending two years' work—will prepare the students to work on what Arne Næss called *precision*: on the one hand, taking on the task of *making*; on the other hand, being prepared to [inhabit](#) the implications of has been achieved.