



Figure 3.3 [The Ambassadors](#), Hans Holbein the younger, Schneider, p. 60



Figure 8.1 *Statues also die*, Alain Resnais and Chris Marker, Schneider, p. 153

If we take experimentally the screen as our *datum*, everything else organises according to it: for instance, it organises our *gaze*. We can then alternate between *technical arrangements* that are made in such a way that they will be activated as we move into position (*anamorphosis*)—see e.f. [Felice Varini](#)—and empirical distribution of gazes coming together in a *pattern* [*recto*].

That is, we can alternate between using the screen to *organise* the *gaze*, and to *study* ways-of-seeing (in some variety): when we do this *conjointly*, it is called *design*. It is *not* regular enough to be something that can be learned through apprenticeship—as a trade, or a craft. At the same time, it is also *too* regular/common to be called art. It is *occasional* in a commonly human way.

The testing grounds and search processes that may require professional experience but are nevertheless intelligible given the access to and support of professional experience. That is, terrains where you can navigate cogently and autonomously, given the presence and assistance of a *guide*. For instance, a distribution of gazes may be difficult to perceive if not pointed out.

Once they are pointed out there is really no trick to it, and they can appear as *obvious* to us. The lower image on the cover [*recto*]*—sampled from Marker’s and Resnais’ movie Statues also die* (Schneider 2021, p. 153)—is a case in point: describing the photo with a bit of drawing applied to it, is enough. These are things that happen all the time, but buried in sensorial depths.

Here the technological access—writing and drawing—is commonly *simple*, and auxiliary to observation. On the other hand, the technological terms can play the *main* role, and it is we who will access these. This is the case of *anamorphosis* (Schneider 2021, p. 60 [the *Ambassadors*]). Hence we come to a different [precision](#) than in *leaflet 6/7: the terms on which the problem is set*.

In both of the cover-images [*recto*] the problem is *political*, and the terms setting the problem are *related*. They both feature structural evidence of how *access* and *exclusion* are organised: Marker & Resnais’ *screen-shot* captures a window shopping woman of perhaps African origin—looking at what could be African art—being submitted to the gaze of a passing woman *and* a statue.

One from the street, the other in the shop on display: from where we too are looking. Again, the 3 alternative candidate vantage points featuring in the photo are gazes that implicate us with alternative viewing angles that are *readable* to us, we can place ourselves as viewers, in a situation that we know from our own lives, allowing us to intercept what is going on: *adjacently*.

Not everyone can read a photo—or, a situation—in this way, but it belongs to the common and is *not* specialised. However, to understand and access the elliptical shape in the painting with the *Ambassadors*, we need knowledge and experience of *anamorphosis*. Here the access and exclusion relies on special knowledge. It does take training to see the image of the skull.

The painting, in the latter example, is *colonial*: both in terms of the technological achievement on display, and how it is put to use. The photo-shoot from *Statues also die*, however, is *Euro-provincial*. The Euro-centric assumptions are built on shaky grounds, and are *time-local*—“When men perish, they enter into history, when statues perish, they enter into art.” Which is called [culture](#).