



What would the above sample of graphic elements be, if sampled from the woods outside of Oslo? It is an obvious question to ask at the upcoming occasion of the IMACLA gathering (IV) in Oslo, since we are going for a walk in this specific errand. My question is: how is the graphic matrix populated?

A corollary question: do we conceive theorising as looking into the graphic 1) matrix (trace carrier), 2) process; 3) surface; 4) surface; 5) imprint in a temporally linear sequence, or can they extend and overlap? If so, what are the operations needed to convert in the overlaps between the 5 phases above?



How to read the text by Andrez Bednarczyk that we have been asked to read and comment for the IMACLA IV gathering here in Oslo? In my classes with the MA students in design, I always teach that we should read given text sources with **respect**: which means—literally—that we should **look twice**.

Re-spect. Which means that with my specialisation—which is **writing**—texts that I read professionally are considered as a kind of **material**. So, I always give texts written by others a **second look**: which means that I start by reading and then go **analytically** through my own reading. This is a **technical** process.

In the **first reading**, I **scan** the text in **almost** a graphic sense: simply trying to get to the **detail** of what is **there** in the text. In the **second**, I start to **stalk** the contents of **the first** reading, to see if it is possible to **individualise** the situation in which the **writing** is taking place: in other words **how** it communicates.

By proceeding in this way, I hope to extract **information** from the text: that is, to acquire a **seed** or a **catalyst** that will **hatch form** somewhere else—in formation—and that I can refer e.g. to Andrez Bednarczyk. So, in an attempt to individualise the material in front of me, I will start by state **what it is not**.

For instance, with its attempt to combine logical-empiricism (Karl Popper) with postmodernism (Jacques Derrida), it is not likely to have been written by someone deeply ingrained in the American intellectually cultural scene. Think of the **diatribe** between Derrida and American analytical philosophy (Searle).

So, in my attempts to **categorise** the materials, the way it communicates locates it on a **different** intellectual scene. The **core** of his **inventive** combination is the identification of something misunderstood in the post-industrial world: the categorisation through construction-deconstruction-reconstruction.

Which, after all, is quite similar to my own method of working with his text, even though his focus of attention is different from mine: being concerned, as he is, with the **graphic art**. But then I think that **text** would qualify under his multiple and generous definitions of what a **matrix** can be held to be.

Proceeding from this assumption, I would have to put my **own** position into question: how do I **situate** myself as one of the links around the core of his argument? Here I have to be a bit **inventive**, because he doesn't really attend the question of what graphic art is in the **making, execution and reception**.

What is graphics to **the** artist, **the** printmaker and **the** public/audience? I am **not** an artist nor a printmaker, so I am part of the **art-public**: what will I make of a text in which the Latin etymology of words is used to **clarify**, add **depth** or **prove** a point? Why is a reference to Einstein supportive of **deconstruction**?

I must admit that—as a theoretician—I have trouble with Bednarczyk's concept of 'identity' in relation to deconstruction. But, on the other hand, he is **not** a theoretician: he is an artist. So, his intervention raises the question of 'the good enough' theory, as a **sequel** to the good enough mother (Winnicott).