theodor.barth@khio.no

The schema above comes from research on approaches to *modelling* the factors that impinge on the *human sense* that a topic is being addressed: different takes on what is called *precisation*, in this model. One seeks to remove granularity (deduction) the other adds granularity (perception).

The image below, features a clapper-board used in film-takes: it was suggested by Mori Vaseghi as an equivalent of print-*signatures* in film-making. That is, a parallel to segments in the manufacture of books, that we can trail and study in movies. They are both marginal elements visible behind the scenes.

Our discussion of whether/not to keep these can be marked by a contemporary nostalgic trend (Frode Helland). But if they are conceived as elements in how we built and manage *information*, they can be conceived in a framework of what currently interests us: how we identify an *individual* (book or movie).

Clapperboard

Human beings are shape-shifters and shape-makers: by enacting shapes they can *contain* them, and can also *make* them. So, when operating in this mode, we do not have trouble thinking of forms as *actors*: whether they feature in humans, or in artefacts. In this aspect, things and humans are *both* agents.

Animals are involved in this sort of agency as well: cephalopods—squids, octopuses, cuttlefish— are animals that have this capability, in that they can shape themselves (in texture, colour and form) to the environment. Humans share this ability, to a certain degree, but they do *not* themselves change.

They share the ability to assimilate a shape in their bodies, but then they have to make the shape: either to wear it—as a costume/mask—or to contemplate it, as an external object, while continuing to "borrow" from it (its strength, dynamics, materiality, colour and form). It animates them in certain ways.

Evidently, the capacity of learning as shape-shifters/-makers can be cultivated and developed: for instance, by seeking education at an art school. As cephalopods humans will be *individual* learners, along this particular trail of the human potential to develop. But there are alternative/competing paths.

Learning in relations of dependency—maturing and growing from childhood onwards: socialising, locking in and also excluding. Learning the code. Knowing the trade. Mastering the rules. Knowing when and how to break them. Featuring a common human propensity to make cultural distinctions.

This kind of knowledge is shared and distributed, but *not* equally. It is the basis for social mobility: rising or falling. So, when we use the word 'code'— as in, s/he's got code—it is a mark of distinction *within* the collective. The question, then, is how we drive this onwards into *individuation* (Simondon).

When we bring the two together—the agentic and codified—we are in the realm of panels/lineups. And when outlined in the above terms, it becomes clear we are not talking about an easy coexistence. It is troubled. It has both the potential for driving us *crazy* with frustration, and hatch an *attitude*.

Hatching an attitude is but *one* extension of individuation (above). Any com-pound of form and matter that individuates—whether as a process or as an outcome—will also yield information. This is how we can "borrow" from something that is not us, strictly speaking, but re/act as though it were.

In this line of thought, aesthetic is *not* about enjoyment/pleasure—or, not *only* —but a way of being receptive/available to *information*: obviously, here information is not defined as noise/entropy as in communication theory, nor as "wired content" of some sort, travelling from one point A to another B.

Rather, information is linked to individuation of matter/form compounds that communicates beyond itself through hit-and-impact. Causing "crystalisation", of sorts, through *transduction*. Information is here a *third* entity that is neither living nor dead matter: individuation is the process hatching information.