



Fig. 1—the *disdyakis triacontahedron* as a memorial geodesic grid. Here superposed to river-stone armed concrete, similar to the kind used in a number of public edifices from the 60s and 70s in Oslo. Featuring in the government's building complex—including the Y block (1970) demolished in 2020, during the first year of the C19 pandemic.

Anaptúxis is a term developed to a participatory understanding belonging to class of learning running across different generations of media. The antecedents of the concept in psychoanalysis thus becomes more intuitive. It results from the change (historically the shortening) of the radius of accessibility of modern media—or, the symbolic corpus—to users; with the mobile digital media presenting us with the challenge of a *paradigm shift*: the radical change in human spatiotemporal orientation after *docking* of the contemporary archival media in the *proximal zone* (record and replay).

There are two layers to this understanding of media that may bring us out of trouble: 1) the navigational layer; 2) the record/replay layer. The navigational layer is the one bringing us from navigating with the stars, varieties of the Good Book, the great libraries, the modern archives, the PC and the mobile. The sidereal has become handheld. The record/replay layer has to do with the progress of media in *memory-processing*: from the ritual communication of symbolic marks made by specialists, via common graphic media-access (drawing, writing, photo, sound- and video tape), to recording and replaying in real time (remembrance as an ongoing performance).



Fig. 2—superposition of a starry nocturnal sky (S₁) and a digital replica (S₂) the camera. But where do we take it from there? What *content* comes out if the interplay of signifiers?

The broad tendency in the West is that when a new media becomes ubiquitous, earlier media are either left to die or have to be actively preserved. On a trip to Japan in 2016, I experienced that connections that were initiated by e-mail, quickly passed unto fax, hand-written protocols, and calligraphy at the other end. An example of a society where media and proxemics correspond, an enter into a complex ensemble in urban life. The media correspond to different demeanours. So, we are clearly dealing with a cultural variable, with very different outcomes.

In the West older media-layers tend to survive through resilience of smaller/larger groups of users (to a degree *aficionados*) in different camps with specialised concerns. A different

approach is consider information on different terms than a) as a quantifiable notion determining the clarity of signal [independent of what the contents might be]; and b) as a way of conceiving messages as transmitted by media; and instead to take interest in both content and containers as *signifiers*. That is, one as an *operative* signifier (content) and other as a *distributive* signifier (container).

The advantage of this model—which is the Lacanian model of the signifier S_1 and the signifier of the signifier S_2 —the point being that the one is not really contained by the other, but are connected by a triangulating a divided subject $\$$ in need of making ends meet! Moreover $\$$ does not contain the cause of this desire. The cause of desire is the **object little a**, **object a**, or *simply a*. This relieves us from adhering religiously to media. With the emergence of handheld connective devices (mobiles) the advantage of this gross approach is that digital media are always secondary signifiers S_2 .

That is, to the extent that they are replicas of something. When studying ancient manuscripts/panels online we are locked to two signifiers— S_1 the manuscript and S_2 the replica—that we readily conflate/confuse as *one*. Moreover, it seems that this conflation/confusion is invited: featuring simulation, substitution and erasure as its principle. It also is quite clear that while the *operative* signifier is the manuscript (S_1), the distributive signifier is the *digital* replica (S_2). But being to such a degree evident, we must ask: why they still tend to be confused/conflated in our techno-culture?

How should we understand the cause of *wanting* them to be the same? This puzzle is as intriguing as it is potentially damaging. A way of shifting the odds is to move from thinking about S_1/S_2 as a remote connection, to thinking about it in the proximal zone where the digital screen is docked. That is, precisely as a *screening*-device enhancing the possibility to *intercept* things we have not intercepted up to this point, and frame such findings in a way that allows us to act on them. That is, to let digital implements be second (S_2) to *tasks*, *occasions* and *encounters* involving $\$$.

So, screening, intercepting and framing become an alternative to simulating, substituting and erasing. Which means that we do *not* accept the conflation of tasks, occasions and encounters invited by the present designs—and usership—but instead invite the docking of digital equipment in the proximal zone: this is the basic bid and move of the *learning theatre*. While the current usership invites illusion (a world unto itself that contains its own reality) the learning theatre cultivates fiction (which defines by its disposition to be marked by the real) in form of the logbook.

The logbook is simply constitutes the accumulation and documentation of such marks. It is differentiated in terms of its tasks, the variety of its occasions, and the durability of its encounters. It is a lever to develop a design community from the learning theatre, and create an educational frame for teamwork. In the present context, however, it is a vehicle to foster and develop the possibility of a media-archaeology of digital media. That is, where digital media constitute the subject-matter of archaeological inquiry, the logbook features the media of this inquiry. In other words we are conducting an inquiry on digital usership through the intermedium of a logbook.



Fig. 3—The motif sandblasted into the wall by Carl Nesjar is based on a drawing by Picasso. If the work is viewed as a flowering of the building through the Picasso drawing, then Nesjar's work is a mapping of the building unto the drawing. Otherwise it is work by Picasso.

It is a draconian measure to assess a digital usership that will otherwise remain hidden in plain sight, owing to the partial blindness and -paralysis of the divided subject $\$$. The logbook materialises the hidden half: that is the **agent** → **other encounter** as determined by **the truth and impact** acquired by each one, through a variety of *tasks* and *occasions*.