THEORY DEVELOPMENT

Backdrop: *aquatint screen* (Jan Pettersson, 2007). Foreground: *random print* (Enrique Guadarrama Solis (2021).

theodor.barth@khio.no [*do something else*] **02.06.2022**

Screening agency, as an aid to *hatching* agency, moves beyond the *ritual* framework (1/7) to a *generative* framework, which we will attempt to outline here. It therefore features a proposition on how *flat media*—in human development—enter into building up *action*, through the emergence of *intention*, as a momentum of explanation and/or *directive* clarification: i.e. *design* practice.

In his Nuffield lecture in 1965 (1966, p.15) Fredrik Barth stated that: "Human behaviour is 'explained' if we show (a) the utility of its consequences in terms of values held by the actor, and (b) the awareness on the part of the actor of the connection between an act and its specific results." What is remarkable in this passage is possibility it opens to *connect* ongoing work *with* current uses.

What is truly remarkable is that the statement—formulated within the scope of economic models—connects directly to the *situationist* concept of *détournement*. That is, the ongoing connection between (a) the *work* and (b) its *use* and the generative *looping* of the utility-connection between *performance* and *usership*; and the working-connection between *usership* and *ongoing* work.

Furthermore, the above statement also connects to the trope of *investigative aesthetics*: that is, what can be found, clarified and enacted through *sensorial* investigation. In Fuller & Weizman (2021) there are two determinations of the *sensorial* that are looped in a fashion that echoes the above passage: on the one hand, the sensorial as *sensing*; on the other, the technological *sensors*.

The latter, inventing of *players* accessed and assessed from screen surfaces. This range of surfaces—in the human realm—are in some aspects the *same* from *ancient* archaeological- to contemporary equipment. Therefore the theoretical interest of photogravure (leaflets II & IV) lies in the layering of technologies that are brought all to the same level, articulated by a marked surface.

A challenge, at this juncture, is to conjure the problem of *representation* in such a way that it may be truly revealed: that is, the reduction of a *remote* entity that *appear* to be *first hand* on the screen. A kind of *repetition* of the entity: its re-presentation. Also the *appropriation* of the remote entity, through its *manipulation* on the screen: *substitution* and *erasure* of the remote entity.

In economic terms: *reducing* the value of work to its use. The other pitfall: *opposing* the value of work to its use. The third alternative explored here—the looping of work and use—*maintains* the difference between the two, and champions a *cybernetic* relation between the two: which brings in an intermediary entity which is immersive, and *re-effects* work, use and their relation.

That is, the relation between work and use is *somehow* transactional—as Ida Falck explores in her doctoral work on transactional aesthetics (2022)—but on terms that are not *only* interactive: they are first and foremost *intra-active*: that is, the work and use are resident of a single process, that may/not involve more than one person. What she reveals is the *trope* of design/the designer.

The scope of transaction when resident of intra-action, is to gather the artistic (*situationist*) and economic (*situational*) sense of work and use, as outlined above. It is located at the *crossroads* between current-, post- and preproduction. The locus which—at the level of screenware—features in the white noise of old school TV-sets. Before/after the show, waiting: troubled—a test image.