



Though the objective the BlackBookII—the research portfolio that we are going to work on this term—is still to remain responsive to what happens in your work, it also is tasked to respond to a task at the *collective* level of the class. The question is how this is possible without non-creative compliance?

This is the starting point in going into the area of [investigative aesthetics](#) this term (Fuller & Weizman, 2021). Aesthetics is here understood by what we can learn through our senses: where the *sensorial* entry to what we can understand and know, is key. Their *aesthetics chapter* will be copied/shared.

In brief, we are moving from caring for the *work* individually (BlackBookI), to caring for the *field* as a collective (BlackBookII). The one does surely not exclude the other. For example: although the curator of [DOCUMENTA](#) this year is an [Indonesian collective](#), the exhibit is sure to feature individual work.



## F—Theory 1

[theodor.barth@khio.no](mailto:theodor.barth@khio.no)

This flyer synthesises some impressions from the BlackBooks and the Design Comments at a class-level. First some broad observations: while the BBs this year contained *more* writing and less visual references than usual, the Design Comments were unusually layered, elaborate and *tactile* in their address.

So, the sum of the two—in a period which we might call the *long tail* of the pandemic—differs quite substantially from my previous experience. This is *neither* a praise *nor* critique, but rather a matter of fact warehousing of what we have to build on this term. There is never a dull moment with this class.

In other words, we have an experimental output from MDE 504 | Theory 2—Theory in Design Practice, with unique contributions from each of you—emphasising writing and tactility—which I relate to, from my end, as a kind of *biosphere*: that is, a *diversity* of *living* knowledges making up an *ecosphere*.

I am *not* observing this from the outside, since I have received your BBs and responded to them: and I would expect that you appreciated the diversity of design-comments as we shared them one-by-one in the Zoom gallery we made up in the auditorium. It also displayed the *expanded field* of the class.

That is, the small group of *people* that you had interviewed. By responding individually—you in the design comments, me to your BBs—we have some materials that need a different level of *care*: which is to warehouse what we have got, and see where it might be going. This will continue in the QUADs.

You will be bringing your BBs there, to share and progress: making hands-on decisions of where you are going next working with BBII. Most of you will have observed that the template I used to comment on your BBI, was quite generic: in fact, it relates directly to the course *modules* we are having now.

However, as with any generic approach we use in our work, the problem is to choose a *specific* access: which relates to your work from some *recognisable detail*, so that the point with the modules is *not* to *do* the modules, but to facilitate communication in a professional relation *in progress/development*.

That is, the relation between you and me. There is not only *one* way of doing that. In fact, the way you were thinking of the relationship to your interview-subjects in *hindsight*—during the presentation of the design comments in the auditorium—was quite *variable*: from a *memory prompt* to an *early prototype*.

My question is: what is *this* diversity that we have in class *capable* of, if seen as a complex *collective* asset? Is there a *variety* required to respond to a given task? Not rotely by reproducing the task but explore the *propositions* that come out of it when allowed to *surface* from the *detail* of your work.