I-leaflet (5/7)

DIARIES

coordinates-		JOBS TODAY				
date:	1.	5.	9.	13.	13.	
time:	2.	6.	10.	14.		
phone/@/GPS:	2	7		15.		
address:	3.	8.	10	16.		
	4.	8.	12.	10.		
Spanning planned Sustainability Site	activities (falls, electi Survey (design 1):	on for WORK (prestart) ricity, asbestos, biological,		diation, chemicals, plant, f	echno-/bio-mass):	
A—Logbook/'	'BlackBook": s	panning/surveying a	FIELD	-PITCH: 3rd party	readability	
B-ESSAY, D	efining and acc	uiring a TOPIC				
	0	0				
Y_KEV photos	(project cartogr	anhy)				
	(p. 0)001 001 10g1					

DIARIES

The schema on the front page [*recto*] is an adapted version of the one found on the internet (1&7): a diary for apprentices created by <u>Butler diary</u> publishers. The adapted version would not satisfy the requirements of a diary for *in field* survey situations, but rather would work as an overview (or, index). First and foremost, it makes sense of the 3 assignments in Theory2/T2 as a *whole*.

That is, i makes a claim on a part-to-whole relation between the *logbook*, the essay and the *third* element devoted to 3rd party readability; which, this year, is pitch for the *Greenwasher of the year* submitted by the MA1 students. What the form does—if seen as a diagram—is to state that although the *logbook* is strictly the only diary-format, the essay & pitch are expanded diary-functions.

The form on display in this leaflet therefore constitutes a *design proposition* in which the following proposition is made: if a diary is to be professional it needs to have an assignable accuracy. If the essay is a key to individuation in the logbook (4/7), then the pitch is a key to 3rd party readability. That is, it is public in that it is readable to someone without prior relation to the author.

That is, to someone with a professional relation *only*. Which means that with the appropriate expertise the diary will be readable if it is **a**) regular [standard *logbook* requirement]; **b**) profiling [trailing *this* professional]; **c**) readable [to a *third*]. The claim made in T2 is that all 3 are subject to learning, and that the logbook, essay and pitch all provide *learning opportunities*.

As to whether/not the *actual* learning—in process and outcome—has 3 yields, that are deeply connected or separate, is a question that brings us to the pitch the students were asked to submit this year: relating specifically to greenwashing. *Greenwashing* being a particular case of what *symbolic accuracy* (1/7). That is, where information is accurate, but unassignable.

For instance, if statements of advertised/declared steps to an ecology of good environmental practice—in a corporation like Patagonia, IKEA or Google—are proportional to the problem and capable of enabling the a declared needed change. If *neither* the purpose *nor* the extent are accurate and assignable, but cater to the structural *self-erasure* of ads, is is symbolic.

As long as we rely on advertisements to be *viewed* and then *forgotten*, the claims they make are symbolic: signs of recognition. *Only* there to be corroborated, and *never* to be falsified. Take the form on the front page [recto]: it made in such a way that it yields a greener version of the diary-page than the Butler *Tradie-diary* that we started with (1/7). But is it?

Here we clearly have to make a difference *between* a prompt *and* a pitch. If the diary *prompts* behavioural change in hatching sustainable work-practices, then it has earned its keep. However, if what it does is to *pitch* an idea of a greener world simply projected unto the work-sphere, it will affect *percepts* more than practices. That is, it feeds a sensorial-symbolic imagination.

The realm of advertisement is typically where *patterns* of -perception and of -behaviour overlap. Which means that perception can substitute behaviour— we loose ourselves to dreams—or summon a correspondence with behaviour of a more ethical kind, that enables *consumers* to behave adequately in response to the environmental crisis. But what of *corporate* responsibility?