



The organisational concept of the next 6 weeks—one flyer for each week—is ‘the strength of weak ties’. It is a concept developed by Marc Granovetter for networks in the 1970s. So, it is definitively not new. In the present setting it is the principle of multiplication of artist Paul Ryan’s notion of *threeing*.

The nodes of the network, in the weeks to come, are not individuals but groups of 3 (called *studios*). Needs and necessities are negotiated in these groups. They relate to another three-score resource, which is 1) a theory course leader; 2) a specialised staff; 3) a resource in design methodology.

The organisation of the 6-week process aims at giving everyone the chance of discovering the virtues and potential of communication beyond the *first and second person* tense (I/You) in the tense of the *third person* (S/HE). Moving *from* the dialogue to the *network* as a communicative premise.



Looking at the detail of *entering*—going in—as a continuation of an activity that has been *completed* in one phase and *continued* in another, is a recurrent aspect of *precisation*. In the present framework this is done by assuring that all communicative interaction includes the *third person*.

In the big picture, the third person is someone having a *stake* in what is currently going on—in an activity and its transactions—who is either *absent*, or is somehow *counted on*. Taking the third persons into account (counting them in) is one important aspect of ethics, of course. But how, exactly?

The third person constitutes a point of view: the third point of view. The sign of a good tutorial—one that spots the *unseen* in our day-to-day work and effort—is not to provide an expertise that you lack, but one that shows and opens a new door, that can bring you to a new level if you walk through it.

A new level of clarity and precision. What is the role of the third point of view in developing *care*—as a critical asset—in processes involving making, study and performance? What exactly is it that we are learning when someone is entering a door to engage with work? A door we didn't see.

It appears to be inherent to human cognition that we need to be prompted—or, invited—to enter, or to *go in*. Take a dinner-party: a guest, of course, must be invited. But the guest also allows the *hosts* to *go into* aspects of their lives, opening up through the presence of a guest. Beyond day-to-day.

Without the guest, this sort of introspection simply will not happen, and private life becomes something that we are closed into, rather than something we can enter in ever new depths. It is the same with study (to research...), making (...to exhibit...) and writing (... to perform).

What does the 3<sup>rd</sup> person—the visitor—do? At a minimum, s/he enters a *door unseen* to engage sensorially. *If s/he can do that, I can do that*. We need that permission. We look past the work and process, and see the achievement, what is obtained and what is needed. This is the principle.

However, there are also tighter role-structures that work in this way. For instance: **1)** the stage director; **2)** the producer; **3)** the dramaturg. The latter is the 3<sup>rd</sup> person. But here in the sense of an *in-house* critic and *-researcher*. One whose work holds the testimonial value of *documentation*.

A good example of the 3<sup>rd</sup> point of view rising to prominence features in the movie [Lost in La Mancha](#) in which Fuller and Pepe were engaged to document the work of Terry Gilliam—and his set—in making the movie *The man that killed Don Quixote*. The movie was a disaster, and didn't happen.

Not for many years. In effect, *the documentary became the movie*. And it is a prominent example of what can be learned by failure: it was—and still is—a state of the art movie about film-making, in every thinkable aspect that involves the *entire film-set*. Working with Zoom sometimes can be like this.