



The ACTOR-model was developed to study the activity of a humanitarian organisation in Sarajevo (1992-95). The photo shows the facilities of a local daily news paper (Oslobodjenje). During the war the citizens had contact with the world outside with a two-way radio.

ACTOR is a model designed to reveal *process*: where it falls apart, and how it comes together (whether it is with a designer, or on its own). It features a step-by-step approach to investigation. ACTOR = **A**ctors, **C**ontact-points, **T**ransactions, **O**pportunities and **R**esults (*short-/long term*). To help *learning*.

In an activity: who are the *actors*? What are their *contact-points* (location, terms and assets)? Which are their *transactions* (win-win)? What are the *opportunities* emerging from this exchange? What are the *results* (immediate and longterm)? People claim that things are *fine*. Process may tell different.

We know this from the pandemic: when asked how they were, people often replied "I am fine". But how were they really? In the lockdown period work-organisation *on location*, fell apart. Is it time for an *environmental* ACTOR-mapping, and might that help activities to come together in *new ways*?



During the war Sarajevo went out as little as possible. In the aftermath, they organised a city marathon. It has been organised regularly ever since, in memory of peace and owning the streets. The pandemic was not a war, but the work ahead could bear some resemblance.

In this flyer, we will explore an *alternative* potential of *narrative* than the one exposed in **flyer C**: serving the purpose of going *from* blur *to* pattern in our understanding of *investigation*. There is no trick. If investigation is to serve a theory-development that enables design, it needs to be *specific & precise*.

What is *specific*? Specific is when we see the picture and text in an add—or, corporate profile—making *environmental claims* while communicating *something else*. As you have looked through a number of adds/profiles, you know that *this* is the one you need to investigate. You select it because it is *specific*.

Precise, we need to think about in two ways, in: **1)** care of the *detail* in image and text as we investigate the add/profile, as it constitutes a foundation of *premises* of the theory we want to develop; **2)** care of a crisp *conclusion* from our description and analysis, when making a statement on Greenwashing.

The *investigation* is what takes place *between* the premise and conclusion. At this point it useful to look at the 10 commands formulated by the Consumer Council (**flyer #01**): *who* are they directed to? have you noticed? They are *not* directed to the consumer, but are directed to the *companies* selling to us.

So, in taking the initiative to award the *Greenwashers of the year*, we should be weary of our *intention*. When investigating we will therefore move from **a)** to whom do I point my finger? to **b)** how can I/we help? This is implicit in the commission from the Consumer Council. It doesn't award *one* Greenwasher.

Peter Løchstør (fashion & costume) made a comment along a *similar* vein: "perhaps greenwashing is good!". Perhaps we can help companies improve their standards by **a)** *starting* with a critical review of Greenwashing and *moving* on to **b)** help the company to gain awareness and raise its standards.

An example of an entity making this attempt is [Futurebuilt](#). During an experimental activity with *Studio ^O^* (22.02), I met an architect working there. He related briefly how Futurebuilt was working to raise the environmental standard of companies that seek their assistance, and want to be at the front.

I asked him: "How do you deal with *greenwashing* in your line of work?" He answered—of course, there is always *an element of greenwashing* in the end, since the companies want to look good. In sum, what we can hope to do, with *artistic methods* and *3rd sector collaboration*, is to critique *and* help.

Critiquing is *not* to accuse. It *can* be an act of generosity. Say you start with an add/profile: *who* are the *actors* before and behind the camera? *Who* has written *and* *who* for? *Who* has been involved in hatching the ad/profile? What are their *contact-points*? Their *transactions*? *Opportunities*? *Results*?

These are the point of the ACTOR model of investigation: **i)** *Actors*; **ii)** *Contact points*; **iii)** *Transactions*; **iv)** *Opportunities*; **v)** *Results* [*short/long term*]. It allows for an investigation *from* the premises *up to* a conclusion. It reveals a process: *where* it falls apart and *how* it can come together. *Critique*—> *Help*.