



2 reductions

If I tell you that our walk on the 24th February starts at 469m a.s.l., descends to 402m—at the level of the cabin shown here—then ascends slightly to 419m, and finally plunges to 197m a.s.l., you will have a different idea of the walk, than if I tell you that the walk is about 4,2 kms. The order I tell it in also counts.

The sum between the information plotted on horizontally and vertically is **vectorial**. You can choose the **vertical** bias and you will perceive the length of the walk **integrated**. Alternatively, you can choose an **horizontal** bias (4,2 km) and perceive the vertical information as **added**. Walking you will struggle more.

2 rotations



In Derrida's short text Feu la cendre—where **feu** means both 'fire' and 'departed'—the term **ash (cendre)** is the author's point of entry. Derrida was reputed as a notoriously difficult thinker. I will attempt to show here that behind this difficulty there is an important agenda and a broad relevance.

Derrida queries the sentence "Il y a la cendre"—there is ash. We can read it either as there is **ash**, or **there** is ash. In the first reading we are concerned with the general **existence** of ash. In the second reading we are concerned with the fact that is **there**: that is, right in from of us (e.g. as a **trace** of fire).

When we stop—about midways during our walk today—at a cabin built by the Snøhetta architects, we first arrive on site receptive to what is **there**: the **location**, in a non-cartographic sense, the place. Somewhere where to **arrive**. Then we cross the threshold: inside we eat our meal and enjoy the view.

We are **here** together and the space that surrounds us opens to a relatively **generic** view. It is more like a post-card that we could send off than arrival. So, the **place** where we arrive—Fuglemyra—and the **space** from which we view the Oslo fjord. A unique trace in the woods, a generic view of the fjord.

A + BI = C

My question is what **we're at** when he are thinking that there must be a **third** vantage-point from where the **sum** between **place** (A) and the **space** (B), becomes something **specific** (C). I am placing my money on the **walk**—this day we spend together walking, talking and collecting—which is **specific**.

Where we get in **trouble** and come back to Derrida's query in Feu la cendre is when we consider a **difference** between the idea people are coming to experience the cabin and its view, considering the walk and the site as more accidental: a cabin has to be built somewhere and one has to walk to see it.

But we can also proceed the **opposite** way: we can consider the space **inside** as **derived** from the place **outside**. That is, we subscribe to the fundamental **reality** of the **place**—that it strictly does **not** need the cabin. And that the cabin is architecturally successful if it succeeds of drawing the place **into** the cabin.

Think now that we have returned to school at KHiO. We are **here** to work and learn under the aegis of IMACLA: the graphic matrix as a trace-carrier. We may have a **memory** in our **bodies** of the **walk** to the **cabin**. Though **vivid** and **present** it is longer **here**. It is up **there** in hills towering over Oslo.

The question is then what is the relationship **between** the walk **and** our work: what is it? Well, if people have **collected** fern-roots (polypod), or something else, it works as a **trace-carrier** of the **walk**: which means that it is **not** there-and-then, but **there-and-now**. The items carry the **contingencies** of the walk.

These are the **variables** of printmaking **writ** large and distributed in **time**. The **walk** is first and foremost a **time-scape**. The question is—retrospectively—whether working with **printmaking**, the graphic matrix as a trace-carrier, will make us **incline** to let the place **prime** reality and the space **derive** from it?