



When exactly does a work cease to be determined by the *metrics* of a precision-demanding performance? How can we spot and relay the critical threshold at which the work becomes *dimensional*, leaving the technique behind to emerge and claim *its own scale*? How will it be accommodated?

Or, perhaps we should ask *who* will accommodate it? For a work to emerge, and appear to others, as dimensional—in the above sense—it depends on the conditions of *reception*: for the simple reason that a work is dimensional iff. it effectively constitutes a *measure* (precept) of spatiotemporal *percepts*.

Which means that whoever has this capacity—systematically or occasionally—is the one to constitute that affordance that allow a work to be discussed reflectively on its own terms. Sometimes this is part of the work's affordances, and provides a *psychological* ecosphere with a *variety* of positions.



Regarding achievements in design at KHiO, there are two extreme models: the one argues that work *qualifies* from the personal *effect* it has had on the *practitioner*—the *validity* and *worth*, *truth* and *proof* lie here. At the *other* end: *deep material knowledge* and *precision-requirements* are called for.

The ones who swear by the *one* or the *other* tend to constitute *two* different crowds. The self-reflective designers tend to spend more time in the *studio*—or, socialising in the *cafe*—while the hands-on people tend to teem in the *workshop*-spaces: both to work *and* to socialise. But not necessarily.

There are ones that work at combining the two “schools” of achievement—which is rather the school’s declared objective—but they have been, in my experience, relatively rare. These attempts can be convoluted/contrived. But the impact of the performing arts may be to guide us into the ‘middle’.

That is, to work on the re-pair of skills and reflection in a mode which is *not* blindly speculative, *nor* merely appealing to the strong but vague vision of synergy between the two. That is, one that really is within the landing-zone of repair. A zone where the reflective and technical are *not* cleft by division.

But rather articulate a *di-vision*: a *vectorial* relation between *reflection* and *skill*, between which there are *no* syntheses—certainly—but mediations. They become *local* as they are juxtaposed: that is, through their mediation are imparted the sense of a realm where one can find one’s way.

It is the *situation* between skill and reflection opening this *realm*. As we are *differently* positioned, we can also *multiply* our positions. The professional at this is the *intellectual*. Not the intellectual in the sense of an academic, but one like Bracha Ettinger (#01) who can string/layer *hyphenated* positions.

*Painter-feminist-psychoanalyst-philosopher*. The intellectual is here someone who finds a way of letting her multiplied positions act as *mediations* enhancing one-another, to reach that threshold quality where *each* indeed may be claimed. It is not the Jack of all trades, but the true polyglot.

Or, perhaps we should call her a *polyhistor*. People who can *multiply* their *positions* in a *situation*, thereby also become *guardians* of a *realm*. It is *not* a comfortable position, but a radically generous one. Because whoever can bring a sense of location—when we are lost in *atopia*—are redeemers.

*Not* in a saintly way. Rather, they are workers who come to pay the price when someone is taken prisoner, or hostage. They do not seek moral reward, but are there when someone else is lost. Such intellectuals may be scintillating, but also ones who see that the *other* could have been them.

They do *not* have to *try* because they *live* by mediating other knowledges, they end up also mediating people. While the situation is *interactive*, the realm is *transpersonal*. It is a disposition more than a vocation. But one that our educational institutions certainly should cultivate, and facilitate.