



Theorising over-and-above the world—what Donna Haraway called the ‘god trick’—and conceiving a *secret place* from where reflective manoeuvres are conducted, are inflections of the *same* and basic issue: whether we can make a *difference* between operating *on* the world, and operating *in* it.

An alternative to encrypting the place from where the theorising is going on, is to position and situate it. The *flyer*, in this regard, being the *meremost minimum* (to use one of Beckett’s turns). So, moving *from* operating on the world, to *operating* in the world. As a condition for working with form.

Working with form from *without*—operating *on* the world—is the project of *anthropometry*: the dark cousin of anthropometrics in design, which seems rather innocuous. Anthropology appears to us at the other end of the pool. It operates from *within*, but has abandoned form (as external as norm).

A third, alternative, path is to work with form—and norms—from within. Considering form from the *immersive conditions* of its making. And, under these conditions, the deeper level of material intercepted as *weak signals*. This problem is not established today in any named professional discipline.

The Friuli art-critic, archaeologist and architect Igory Mansotti has suggested name *anthroponomy* (and its practical counterpart, anthroponomics). It stands to anthropology as astronomy stands to astrology. Which means that it claims a more scientific robustness, in exploring human life-ways.

Be that as it may. The fruitfulness of this approach will have to stand the test of time. The crux of the matter being that form is not an aim in itself, but a vehicle of a search. It is environmental in the sense that it seeks to *excavate* what is adjacent, and takes place *alongside* work of form-giving.

Here it is not the success at *imposing* form on *matter* which is the chief concern, but what *emerges* and is known in the *attempt*. Not the least whether the *means* that are put into the attempt are *proportional* to the learning-outcomes reaped from it. As a way of working with design.

Anthroponomy, therefore, neither extends from anthropometrics nor anthropology but from design: *interested in art for scientific purposes, interested in knowledge for artistic reasons*. Anthroponomics will be a more practical venture: keeping up with what is intrinsically valuable, and gardening it.

In *design*, the alliance with *astronomy* has already been explored by Karl Gerstner, in his extant application of the *morphological analysis* that Fritz Zwicky for astronomical purposes: featuring the Zwicky box, where the *morphological query* serves the purposes of discovering *material fact*.

One of the material facts being the human query in the world of matter, though the intermedium of form. This query is archaeological in its approach but contemporary in its domain of application: *anthroponomy*, therefore, is a domain of *design*. Aiming at/proceeding to develop theory as a practice.