



The comments and rumination in this flyer responds to more than one ARW sessions, true to the idea in this flyer-series that the 6th wall is between the boxes. It relates to the Crisis & Care panel (01.26.21), the Map Ethics! workshop (01.28), the Object Enactive in the context of Urban Ecologies (idem.).

If the 6th wall idea is not to be dismissed as a hotchpotch it has to be specific: it cannot combine any non-same element, and hence most likely not fruitfully conceived in terms of joinery. Hence it does not provide a solution or a synthesis, but proposes an ethnography of how topics disjoin.

Once this idea is stable—it brings us from the comfort zone to the contact zone—it can become a candidate source of information: one with a shaping impact rather than constituting a delimited field of knowledge. It intervenes at the level where AR activities go beyond the scope of individual projects.



	Delimitation	Contextualisation	Sources	Power
Delimitation				
Contextualisation				
Sources				
Power				



The question of how Actor Network Theory (ANT) links to power-critique in the broader scope of STS (Science Technology Studies) is one that I bring with me—as an outcome—from the ARW 21. This has come up for two different sessions: the #15-panel (*crisis & care*), the *Map ethics!* workshop.

In #15-panel the session blurb included a reference to Maria Puig de la Bella Casa's book *Matters of care*. The subtitle being *Speculative Ethics in More than Human Worlds*. The book belongs to the STS-field, which may be seen as critical theory development extending from ANT. Her's is feminist.

So, this might be a response to the question put forward in the *Map ethics!* workshop (28.01.21), concerning STS and its connection to ANT. The other reason, which builds on this foundation, is the implication of Henk Borgdorff along with Peter Peters and Trevor Pinch's [volume](#) (eds.) on AR and STS.

The possibility—queried in this volume—on whether AR overlaps with STS in ways that could be fruitfully expanded, and then what AR could bring to STS. This question is asked on the basis that AR proceeds by aesthetic to epistemic operations. So, how do we query speculative ethics in AR.

One possibility, featuring in the *Map ethics!* initiative, is to map out the multiple and concrete elements in an AR project conceived as an actor network (Latour). Another possibility—which of course may overlap—is to query the speculative competence that AR may bring to ethics in STS.

Here I will use 'speculative' in the its etymological sense relating to mirrors ([speculum](#); also a medical term used for examining cavities in the body). For instance the idea that art can be reflected in knowledge through an operation, suggests the existence of a mirror (with a *rear view* and a *blind spot*).

Agency, conceived in this way—possibly what may Petrine Vinje intend by the concept of *enaction*—is corrective before it is goal-directed, and that the incorporation of enaction (making up for a glitch which is inherent in human neuro-cognitive apparatus) into goal directed action, and projects.

Responsibility also writes the *ability to respond*—and hence responsiveness in a broad and differentiated sense, can bring interesting breakdowns which can be conceived in the ANT framework (as *map ethics!*): featuring Petrine's discussion of object enactive in the framework of Urban Ecologies at ARW.

Thus, the question: can we conceive the breakdown as a '**crab list**'—the *art of moving sideways* (Ida Falck)—with a better chance of identifying the ethics of AR activities (a wider category than AR projects, that are defined by a funding relationship): experiences earned and a system conjoined.

The lateral drift—which is then a resource more than a problem—may reveal itself important as the application of an ethical framework acquires some mileage, and move us to certain positions as concerned citizens: e.g., research as part of the network-state, vs. research as vehicle of criticality.