



The datum is a *mark* that categorises *choice* and operates *within* it, as a game-changer. It marks the ‘ground zero’ *organising* everything around it—determining *where* we are, as we organise the rest of what is happening, to our best ability—it determines the relations of parts-to-whole which is *not* simply subjective or objective, but structures the *affectivity* between them.

For instance, if we adopt as our *datum* the *re-effecting* of *chance* and coincidence, the exchanges between human and technical registers—owing to their doing the same things but in very different ways—the artistic *choices* that EGS made, expanding the field of his graphic practice unto the field of artistic reflection, follow logically from that. Bringing reason to the madness.

While when Jan Pettersson adopts his *research* on the photogravure technique as his *datum*, this has an organising impact on how the larger field of his practice as an artist—with a background in painting and sculpture—becomes organised. His historical approach to the subject matter borrows both from archaeology and anthropology. His testing and goal-seeking is “designerly”.

The difference shows clearly in how they relate their work in *book volumes*: while Jan Pettersson and I found each other in how a small-format set of flyers (similar to the leaflets) established the *conference* ‘Printmaking in the expanded field’ as the *datum* of the *book-volume* with the same name (‘a pocket book for the future’). EGS and I interfaced in a particular kind of *story*.

Relating chains of events that appear as *illusory* as they happen, are radically transformed as they are *told*; in the sense that the *optical illusion*—when told—testifies to the *reality of the image*. And, in effect, alliances between the *image* and written mark-making start cropping: the image becomes a passenger in the acts of knowing, or taking knowledge. This reflects my interest.

So, while Jan Pettersson is interested in *real* photography, one might say that his student EGS is interested in the *real* diary: the book with his MFA thesis successfully gathers the miscellany of materials that make up his artistic query, into a cogent/readable whole. While my interest—as this leaflet-series will serve to testify—lies in exploring the possibility of a *real* first science.

It relates to *photography* and *diary* as a vectorial sum. On the one hand, the way it combines selected knowledges from different areas, this interest has some points in common with the assemblage of heterogeneous technologies—or, machine parts—which characterises the photogravure process. The learning style is designerly in that it *joins* testing with *goal seeking re-effects*.

Likewise, it is also sensitive to dynamics of *erosion*—as one is sure to find in etching—in combination with the *sobriety*, required by the job, manifesting itself in the *awareness* and the *cycles* inherent in each step (1-7/7), so as to give the *acts of knowing* a fair chance in previously uncharted territory, which the three levels studied here—technique, design and art—are *re-effecting*.

It hopefully will serve as an example of how the statutory research *through*, that currently defines *artistic research*, is complemented a the kind of research *with*; guided by an idea of *participatory re-effecting*—which goes way beyond the classical *participant observation* that defined modern anthropology. It seeks to narrow and extend M. Fuller & E. Weizman’s *Investigative aesthetics*.