On a stone sits a person A, absorbed. Somewhat off, away a person B observes A. What is this situation about? One way of considering it is to state: "This is what communication is about." A is thinking of something. B works at intercepting what it is. Together they approach a not yet disclosed target.

They do not compete, but triangulate by virtue of having two different approaches: the target will eventually emerge between them. This happens in the following way. A emits a signal A' that releases B's ability B' to intercept what moves A. Moves in the sense of prime/first mover—or, emotion.

In one aspect, B's imagination is only second to what s/he observes. While A's main approach is imagination. However, when A emits A' and—as a consequence B' is released from B—the relation is reversed: now it is B who primarily imagines, and A who intercepts B' in the form of an image.

Imagination is endogenous. The image is exogenous. All this happens between bodies that generate behaviour. So much more when they start to speak. If A's state is immersive, B's operates in a locating mode: their modes relate to different attributes—the ambient and the readable. Author and reader modes.

This sort of asymmetric communication is much more common than we are commonly aware of. With regard to gaining clarity on intentions it is a kind of transaction. The obliteration of this asymmetry is consequential. On the next page [verso], I am exploring what these consequences are. The Argus mode.

My research question is: what does it take to transform a video-conferencing tool (such as Zoom) into a **spatial workstation**? A 'spacial workstation' is here understood in three determinations: **a)** a technology that makes up for spatial access to other facilities; **b)** working together with them; **c)** a software [FB].

The common determination: a spatial workstation is a platform for transform digital usership into a spatial skill-set. That is, a virtual training-camp for hat-ching depth in our idea & concept of information and communication, based on an analysis of currently existing technology and what is does/not do.

Background. We have come to a point in the technological development at which our hand-held devices share a certain property with the global access of the Internet: that of being 'everywhere at once'. The multi-lens cameras on our mobiles cover the visual field, as the Internet covers the entire world.

I call this the Argus-principle, after the Greek multi-eyed god: always on the watch, and never sleeping more than with a few eyes. It is present in our culture of watching—of being watched, and watching others. The problem that I wish to explore here is the cause of the Argus techno-culture.

The way I will explore it is through the lens of VR. What happens if we use and consider our smart-phones as VR-technology. The aspect ratio—length and breadth—of a smart-phone is about the same as the surface of VR-goggles. So, why then not substitute VR-goggles with our mobiles?

We did this implicitly when we discovered that we could add our mobile phones to Zoom-meetings and use them as auxiliary cameras. We could pane larger spaces and we could home in on objects on display. However, a problem started to emerge as we started to walk about with them? What?

The first is that if the mobile does not have a movement equaliser, then the image comes through in a jumpy way to the Zoom-audience. Another problem posed by the Argus-mode (the watch) becomes obvious when moving it around: the optics of the camera doesn't allow immersion nor location.

So, it lacks the ambient definition of immersion. And it lacks the readability of the local. In the research and practice of VR this problem is defined, in these exact terms. And it also clearly expresses that, in order to exist, both these attributes—ambient and readable—need to be defined.

The shortcomings of the existing technology—or, perhaps we should call it an 'ideology'—can be counterbalanced with the use of sound: if supported by 3D sound recording, which is created both to support immersion and location, the mind will to some extent be equipped to make up for the Argus-effect.

The cost of being 'all-seeing' is the loss of perspective along with the ability to participate and engage. The attribute of Argus—in Greek—is exactly that: **panoptes**. We know it from Bentham's Jail and Michel Foucault. But we also know it in a new generation of the same: internet and the mobile camera.