Credits to Lydia Hann: logbook cover (BlackBook2, 2022). Location: theory room at KHiO.

When diary-work is done regularly, and extends in time, clarity on the *field* that is surveyed, the repeated return to certain *topics*—acquiring more depth at each instance—the relation between field & topics gain in *accuracy* and *precision,* with the work of time. Which means that in T2, it is under *specific* environmentally immersive conditions that *theory development* takes place.

In 2022 (T2), the *crystallisation* of the diary/logbook as a *specific* immersive environment took place in a *concentrated* situation designed for *individual* presentations <u>and</u> *crowdsourcing*: a floor, two walls—a camera placed over a table at one end and a projection surface at the other—and 4 rows of seats facing each other two-by-two, in the goss pattern of the <u>House of Commons</u>.

The seat-rows cover the full stretch between the camera and the projection surface. With the MA1s (2021/22) we arrived at this *seating pattern* having tried out a alternative seatings—e.g. diagonal and frontal patterns—but always based on the principle that *physical items* brought to class (books and a variety of objects) and the *projection surface* should be separate/removed.

The decision to separate the two elements—physical item and projection— came from a performance/installation with PhD fellows Petrine Vinje, Lisa Lie, Bjørn Blikstad and myself in a contribution prepared for the artistic research week in 2020 (<u>Progressive Interaction | Receptive Intra-action</u>). The seating pattern was similar to the above, but not the camera/projector split.

In 2020, we recorded that some of the audience felt confused & queasy about the proximity of the object-camera and the projection surface: suggesting that when the *object-* and *image*-modes of perception are too close to one another, the relation between the two can be experienced as unwieldy and <u>uncanny</u>. Some expressed feeling *nauseous* from this proximal arrangement.

In the MA1 class (21/22), however, we found that the *proximal* relation betwe-en presenter and logbook, and a frontal view of a *remote* projection surface at the other end of the room—with the distance between the two walls, flanked by the facing seat-rows—worked for the presenters. The facing audiences had to *turn* their heads to look at the presenter and the projection surface.

Which means that the audience—members themselves—decided when to turn their heads: this *interactive* setup provided a setup for a *generative* process to aggregate and landslide during two days of presentations (10:00-15:30) with 24 presentations: 12 presentations/day w/3 breaks. During the two days, the presentations started to aggregate, generating a landslide of connections.

That is, a *crystallisation* process—similar to the one produced the logbooks themselves—was produced in *space*, as a community journey. The *body-space cartography* that evolved and hatched, during the two days, moved the individual contributions unto a *transpersonal* process, in which the instru-mental changes created by the setup affected the body/object relation.

In this sense the *collectivisation* of *each* contribution was very real, and inherent in this theoretical interior design. In preparation for the spatial *materialisation* of the logbooks, the students were asked to create a map—or, visual summary—of their logbooks. The ethos of the course was that of <u>inves-tigative aesthetics</u>, and the arrangement an instance of a *learning theatre*.