



As digital **citizens**, many of us live under the spell that we extend **endlessly** in all directions, and with a global **connectivity** that transforms **planet earth** into a **village**. This is our **extensive** mode: we extend **ourselves** and **shrink** the world. In our **intensive** mode we develop **paths** between **limited** Internet resources.

When we work **intensively**, many of us develop “ant-roads” between relatively **few** Internet-portals, that reflect our **needs** and/or our **way** of working. These ant-roads—digital working-**habits**—could be mapped as we do when drawing **activity**-diagrams in space: how people **move** and **operate** during a day.

If we define the **contours** of a **professional** person by what **returns** to her—like an ‘echo-chamber’ allow to gauge the **range** of how **far** s/he extends—we are **no longer** talking about an endless extension: and are thereby into **profiling** the professional person. People with **special** knowledge **do not** extend endlessly.

This is **why** we, for instance, would bring them in as **experts**. We can think of this professional **contour** of a **person** as a **space**; and that, doing so, we will develop a kind of spatial **competence**. If we succeed, we will have something similar to a **portfolio** but made available for **real-time** staging of knowledge.

That is, a **support structure** that is portfolio-like in concept, but made **available** as an **active** spatial repertoire (with a potential to integrate digital culture into that repertoire); featuring the ‘learning theatre’ as a broader concept, while the ‘spatial workstation’ could be linked to this **criticality** in the **digital sphere**.



At the difference between our two earlier theory-courses, **MDE 551 | Theory 3—Synthesis** is an intensive course. The two previous courses **MDE 504 | Theory 1—theory in design practice**, and **MDE 545 | Theory2—theory development**, were extensive courses: interspersed with other courses.

In the two previous courses, you learned to locate and develop a theory, in your broader MA curriculum: as an auxiliary resource or support structure, in developing your design practice. In the present course, theory is **not** placed to serve in an auxiliary function, but is the **core** of your activity/delivery.

Which is your opportunity to **devote** yourself to it. In the aftermath, this will in turn have an **impact** on how your work with your **specialised** project in the spring. Not only as a support structure, but a **groundwork** for how you come out—or, get across—as a **professional** person. **Your** professional person.

Can we **define** the professional person? The persona in Jungian psychology is a kind of **mask**: as it was in ancient Roman tradition—your **face** toward the world. When we today can play with **digital face**-filters we are **playing** with our **persona**. For Jung the persona is the target of **criticism** from the **shadow**.

The Shadow is deeper than the Persona: it's the voice in our psyche telling you—after the dinner party—that we did poorly, that the others didn't like us, and this/that other person is devious etc. But what again is deeper than the Shadow (Jung asks)? It is the Soul: **animus** for women, **anima** for men.

Be that as it may. But in the roots of our **notion** of the persona—the **person**—is our **contour**: what is interesting from the design point of view, is that the persona extends—not only to facial filters, but to clothing, costume, tools and to some degree **matter**. As K. Barad says we 'meet the universe **half-way**'.

To McLuhan the notion of **media** can capture all this. But to him media **extend** endlessly, it transforms the world into a **village**, and confines us to small **tribal** groups that translate this 'small-world' percept. Looking at the world today he appears to be have been right: small opinionated groups **clustering**.

Not around the entire Internet—for sure—but a sample of sites, connected by the ant-roads of our daily use, and reflecting more/less our world-view. But the same could be held up against the developments in the basic strategies determining our techno-culture. Which is Jaron Lanier's point.

All of this is known to you by now. Jaron Lanier's objection boils down to this: the contour of our persona—which makes it professional—is determined by degrees of **maturity** in how the world **comes back** to us: it is only a limited range of the world that does this; it is a product of **specialised** experience.

More specifically, how **extensive** and **intensive** aspects of our professional **education** combine in **substantial** ways—for instance, in the theory curriculum as a whole—depends on our ability and skill at **intercepting** what comes back to us at the **edge** of our personal contour: as we meet the universe **half-way**.