



Fig. 1 — Here the two diagrams used by our Rector to pitch the mapping-game that she proposed as an assignment to all employees at KHIO. The diagrams are superposed in order to prompt the idea of the desired outcome: that the two diagrams might combine. The *pentagon*-combined *pyramidal* chart and Carlos Moreno's *user-centred* diagram.

In my contribution to Rector Marianne Skjulhaug's mapping-game I ended up *distributing* the £-pentagons as capitalising *operators* at the junctures between entities in *transaction*. The question is how the pentagons that I brought into the game could do *three* jobs at once: **1)** supplement the pieces in the mapping-game; **2)** supply a new element in the pyramidal KHIO-chart; **3)** help to combine the pyramidal chart with Carlos Moreno's diagram. Above, the pentagons are used for *stitching* together the chart and the diagram: to prompt the idea that a *joint map* can even exist.

If our **(1)** workshops were defined as *squares*—units linked to *material media* and *machines* that readily are considered as *capital*—and **(2)** theory (which is a less obvious capitalising agent but most certainly a real one) as the *rabbit holes* between the studios and the workshops, then the *pentagon* comes out as a kind of *sum* between theory and workshop. The advantage of *not* singling out the work-shops (places) and theory (rabbit holes), be it as an integrated *pentagon* or separately as *squares* and *tunnels*, is that *expanding* the notion of 'workshop' might be preferable.

This is because the notion of 'workshop' has already been *expanded* in modern art history, resulting in a variety of contemporary practices, and also because *theory* and *workshops* (in the narrow sense) are likely to *loose from* being conceived as bounded units (rather than relations, or relational operators). In the parlance of the art-world from the 60s onwards, *workshops* (expanded) are intermittent, provisional and relational: what is new in the proposal that I have forwarded to our Rector, is that a concept of 'workshop' is included in a mapping-experiment of our organisation.



Fig. 2—KHIO's fashion show is a candidate example of capitalising in real time: mustering a potential for value creation in real time. Giving importance to work and a reputation for the school. Making the school work to the advantage of the profession.

Someone may have already done this elsewhere, but in my record it is new idea. In the context of the PPT shapes disseminated by our Rector along with the concentric circles from Carlos Moreno's circles of urbanism, intended for the use of city-planning (based on an idea of improvement), the *pentagon*-shape features a combined **container** and **arrow**. Its affordance thereby is to *accumulate* and *hold* information, while at the same time *connect* adjacent elements in the diagram. As a currency its value is accordingly *not* monetary but cartographic and collective.

Which means that the situations that we call *meetings*, engaging more than one entity in the organisation (e.g. the departments and the administration), could be redefined and re-structured as *workshops*: that is, we *abolish* meetings and *replace* them with workshops. Which goes beyond the prepared work-meeting,

and seeks to achieve that *all parties involved leave the meeting with some work done* (in each their different/separate sense of the term), instead of providing/supplying work to objectives that are allegedly collective and neutral—which they never are. All meetings are variously interested: a meeting features a conglomerate of interests; featuring mastery, hysteria, analysis & point-making.

There are e.g. meetings that are *styled* collective and neutral, that are *in fact* administrative. The replacement of meetings with workshops therefore could hallmark a level up on the rungs of *maturity* in the life and history of an art-school, based on the very first paragraphs of the law on universities and colleges (§ 1-1c): “The objective of universities and colleges is to... (c) spread knowledge of the institution and promote understandings of *the principle of professional freedom and the application of scientific and artistic methods, both when teaching classes, in one’s own institution generally and in public management, the cultural field and business.*” (our ital.& trnsl.).

Hence the question: how will artistic and scientific methods leave their seal—in the present case—when diagramming the organisational structure *and* its principles? At face value, there is a contradiction between the *pyramidal* hierarchy of organisational charts, and the diagramming based on *user-centric* assumptions (such as Carlos Moreno’s circular diagram, placing the user at the centre). Since hierarchy is present in both cases, but differently vectored: the former featuring the *lines of command*, the latter featuring a found hierarchy of assumed *localised human functions*.

While the first can *alienate* individuals at KHiO, the second can place the individual in a *gilded cage*. I am assuming that our present Rector—based on her practice—would want to *avoid* both these effects. Hence the question of how we need to conceive a map in order for it to be useful *both* at an institutional and individual level: and at all intermediary levels contained by the diagram. Hence the need for some reflection on the *uses* of a map, and *what a map is*. Given that we start out with *one* diagram extending from the KHiO top, and *another* telescoping toward the individual.

If we place ourselves in our Rector’s shoes we may want two different things: for people to define and assume their responsibilities—in each their tasks and roles—and thereby granting a certain *autonomy* at defining and taking this responsibility (thus the pyramid chart with the top-down hierarchy), the remainder being left to define the lines of command (extent and scope). The other diagram (Moreno’s) similarly allows her to see *each* of the school’s employees within the school’s scope. The question is then what a diagram would look like that maps both at once (cf Fig. 1).

*On the one hand* such a map would convey what we perceive as *lines* (of authority or command) unto a *distribution* (of roles and tasks). *On the other hand* it would need to gather, telescope and home-in-on factors that are fragmented in our daily field of perception (and thereby enabling us to better *operate* in that space). A *map* is expected to gather and spread in a different way than we can do in a *building*: and likely too in *complementary* ways. What we ask of a map are distributive and operative functions *combined*, and reversible enough for us to move between the map and terrain.



Fig. 3—As befitting an art-school the unit of capital value is the Lacan (£) the modes of *mastery, hysteria, analysis* and *point-making* are rotated configurations of the Signifier  $S_1$ , the signifier of the signifier  $S_2$ , the unconscious  $S$  and the object little  $a$ . A deeper understanding hinges on more experimenting

The pentagon not only proposes a mediation between the *distributive* and *operative* functions of a map, but also scopes the making of a map *tick*, in relation to a work-environment. Since a good *map* is one that partly reverses what is distributed/operative in the KHiO space, partly *overlaps* with the way things are *spread* and *gathered* in that space (KHiO). In other words, the elements will be the same, similar, different and *other*. And this is what defines a map in relation to a terrain.

If a map can help keep *track* of capital value, and contribute to *stage* it, then the point of this experiment is made. If it is possible to show how the mapping of the capital value—that is, an economic potential for value creation—is conducive to increase it, and not mapping it results a decrease in capital value (say, from 2010-2024) then it should be part of KHiO’s narrative.