ENTER—

I make flyers. They come in sets of 6—a unit of information called HEX, numbered from #01-#06. Together they form an effective procedure (what Marvin Minski called an algorithm), to come up with a backdrop for something that I am working on and relates specifically to the subject matter. This aspect is rather technical. But 'specificity' is a platform for something else. Which is to reach a level of precision: if I manage to be specific, I can be as precise as needed/desired.

Which is why the operations that lead to a flyer-set are not only technical—since they are made and involve experience: they feature an 'effective procedure', but also an 'affective procedure'. To Norwegian philosopher Arne Næss the idea of precisation (a term also used in English translation) results from the work of their combination: starting with the walk, building the cabin, and ending with the decision to live/stay in the cabin for a certain amount of time.

These are levels of precisation derived from the basic fact of the walk, and is one of the main tenets of Arne Næss' 'deep ecology': the broader framework within which we develop personal philosophies (or, ecosophies). I will present a reading of Andrez Bednarcyzk's text "The shape of graphic art" seeking this sort of specificity, that hopefully will constitute a starting-point for you, in reaching any degree of desired/needed precisation (a 'good enough' theory).

SCAN—

The backdrop I need to determine a workable angle on Bednarcyzk's text. I will not share whether/not I agree with him, but seek to establish a framework allowing us to take on this specific text. But there are a number of tensions in it that I will mention immediately. These run between: a) logical empiricism and postmodernism; b) identity and deconstrution; c) his his idea of logical proof and his own artistic practice; d) his modern references and Latin etymologies.

These are tensions that determine the theoretical trail of his reflection through this text: in my reading this trail is a kind of 'walk'. The landscape that he walks through features an analytical portrayal of the dimensions of printmaking, that determine the 'shape' of graphic art. Here he proposes a number of ideas and concepts that are likely to engage a readership with a certain experience/comprehension of the graphic art & craft. A specific crowd of readers, for sure.

There may be a difference between what he says he is interested in, and what he is trying to do. He says that he is addressing the loss of identity in graphic art. The factors that contribute to this situation are identified and attributed to the convoluted language of postmodernism (psychoanalysis), and the ones required to reconstruct and identity for the art are lined up. In his headline, however, and I think as an artist he is actually interested in 'the shape of graphic art'.

STALK—

The trail: requirement of falsifiability. The walk that he recommends—proceeding by construction, deconstruction and reconstruction—the shape of graphic art relates both to what it is and how it changes; if it relates primarily to surfaces (the matrix and the screen/sheet), Andrez Bednarcyzk aims at reconstructing graphic art in space and time. Specifying that he operates with 6-dimensions—two time dimensions—on 1) the discipline, 2) the technique and 3) the work.

The cabin: though expanding the field of printmaking, his reconstruction hinges on not including just anything, which is where he leans on Karl Poppers logical empiricist criterion of falsifiability. Graphic art should include the functions of a) the trace carrier, b) the function of the matrix, and c) the automatism of marking. If it doesn't it is not graphics. What provides these with an identity with hypostases is what he calls an algorithm of variation (in the series/edition).

The decision to stay on: the defining problem of graphic art is that the idea that the projection is the original, and the matrix is an intermediary form. Which is why the repetitious and automatic relation between the two constitutes a defining problem for the field. As a writing person, I sense that his theoretical practice defines by looking into a complex practice from a 'secret place'. My own assumptions are more 'nomadic' relating to expounding the 'walk'.

EXIT—

As an anthropologist I am bound to ask how graphic art as a discipline, a technique an the output of works, relates to people. Turning to the diagram we will be discussing later today: how does the making of the artist, the execution of the technician and the appreciation of the public relate differently to the production and reception—in all stages—of printmaking: 1) the matrix [trace-carrier], 2) the process [-translator], 3) surface [-receptor], 4) imprint [-projection].

Are these segmented as technical entities with sharp temporal boundaries? Or, should they rather be conceived as overlapping layers? Since Andrez Bednarcyzk defines two time-dimensions, I am incline to think that this is where they apply. Because human being—as maker and perceiver—is a moving shape-shifter: s/he is the matrix, the process, the surface and the imprint (in phases). So, the one time-dimension is the technical time, the other is the human time.

Or, if your will, a) the 'effective [technical] time' and b) the 'affective [human] time'. In the lingo of postmodernism, affect (Deleuze) is neither subjective nor objective; but a reactive trace-carrier producing & receiving shapes (and can determine a shape as a body [embodiment]). This embodiment of the different aspects of the art is essential to Andrez Bednarcyzk's query on identity, though it is implied (just as the readability of the matrix is implied in the original print).