



By Originally uploaded to en.wikipedia on 12:11, 10 August 2007 by en:User:Citynoise - Own work, CC BY-SA 2.5, <https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=4343579>

The word *antipode*—literally, ‘opposite foot’ (from Ancient Greek)—is used here to determine aspects of human psycho-biological organisation, subject to various spatial designs to *hold* it. For instance, *activity* and *perception* co-habit with difficulty. Or, at the cost of some training, invested in *models* and managed through this intermediary. Hence the emergence of an *interface*.

Interfaces result from the design and usership, derived from models that make the tendencies *manageable* but also a bit *blind* to their scale of application. They tend to communicating to their users that they are more applicable than they are, if the scale is changed. The adaptation to the new scale is hazardous: one false step, a piece missing and it all fails—or, it *fragments*.

Thus, interfaces are often *not* seen as specific, but are considered as generic *plug-ins* with a broad (unspecified) range of application. An example. The seating-pattern aiming at the development of the *learning theatre*, originated with the negative objective of avoiding to confuse/superpower object- and image-perception, based on comments from an audience after a test (2020).

A document-camera was used to project a silver-clad *potato* unto a screen. Since the *object* itself was unusual/intriguing and attractive, its presence in the same room as the projection had an traction on *some* of the audience. Since it was obvious that the item was moved somewhere in the *same* room, they started to look for it, only to find it in a spot competing with the canvas.

To some, this resulted in a sense of queasiness and confusion, similar to what is described, in the literature, as the valley of the *uncanny*. From this experience a seating pattern was developed, described in I **Leaflet (1/7)**. Here, the document-camera was replaced with an iPad with a goose-neck, using the *camera* app and the *lens* on the rear side of the digital surface.

Now, the item and its projection were placed at the opposite ends of the room—with the camera and item at one end, the canvas at the other end—with the same/similar seating pattern as in the above-mentioned test. In a first round of the new arrangement, the audience (who were also presented) had been through a QUAD-group drill with a track record of 7 sessions.

In a *second* learning theatre—during e book presentation with Arnd Schneider (**Panel IV**)—the members of the audience were *new* to each other. They felt more *exposed* than usual: not having the stage border to enact the anonymity of a crowd-membership. The concept used to give the now unusual *staging* of the event to the audience, is that we were seated to *watch TV together*.

The projection-canvas was indeed replaced by a digital large flat-screen, with high resolution. In effect, the broadcasted views originated from the *screen* and not from a projector. So there are two things that made the seating work differently: the history of relationships in the audience, and the perception of where the image came from, owing to the change of the display-technology.

So, within the *antipode*—featuring opposite ends of the room for *object-* and *image-display*—there are significant variations. Which means that a seating pattern similar to the one used in the British parliament/or the lineup on the mounts Gerizim and Ebal in the Bible, is not generic; but dependent on the group-history of the audience, along with how the extremities are defined.