strip   *infrathin*   *orb*

Box 1—the two model-views above—the strip to the right and the orb to the left—the elements are the same, but feature different concepts of montage: one implying the shape of a motion as the strip is mounted into an orb, and the between space moving from 2D to 3D (infrathin) where the enskilment of the *maker* marks the the relation between strip & orb.

The strip-version of the dodecahedron is not in/of itself a Möbius-strip: it indicates the M-strip as the mounting of the strip into an orb features a rotation as one moves from one extremity—gluing edge to edge—till one arrives at the other extremity. The M-strip lies in the motion, and a 180˚ turn mid-way: it is a 360˚ rotation—like peeling a citrus-fruit in spiral—with a 180˚ twist in the middle. So, the gesture of mounting it indicates or contains an M-strip. However, the interception of the M-strip is similar to a montage-effect… from moving frame-by-frame. It is *topologically* an M-strip.

But there is an *other* montage at work, which is less an effect than an actual transformation. At the difference from the M-strip which is indicated in the first montage—which indeed makes it a mon-tage-effect in the cinematic sense—the second montage is indigenous to the form: the hyper-dimensional rotation featuring the passage from a 2D surface to a 3D shape. As the last pentagon seals into the shape, we are *no longer* in 2D. Of course, the 3D shape has been building up for a while already, but the multi-directional navigation which the orb invites requires it to be complete.

When a certain *rhythm* is acquired in joining and gluing the edges, however, a *third* way the relation between the strip and orb appears. This is the problematic of the infrathin (fr. *inframince*): it is indicated by the cusp above, with the idea that, at some point, the mounting *crosses* a threshold at which it tends *more* towards the orb in completion, *than* the strip it originates from. My guess is that basket-makers will have this sense as well: we can imagine that the cusp is crossed early/late according to the skill and experience of the maker, but also the individual in the making.

These variables make up the *micro-rhythmic pattern* that makes each individual differently assign-ed. It is what makes a batch of polyhedra, baskets or pottery into *editions* rather than a product batches. So, even though the cusp that *separates* the beginning *and* completion of the work would appear to be genuinely *void*, it still is *not* completely empty. It was what made it possible for Marcel Duchamp to select and sign certain individuals (readymade) from a product batch: as an artist he saw & treated them as editions. His training as a printer during WWI made him thus predisposed.

In the area of typography/type-design, variations of this kind are incorporated into the letter-type

Box 2. If you record this pattern of peeling a mandarins, and play it backwards you will get a sense of the spiralling motion in the montage from polygon-strip to -orb.

itself. Which means that, in print-making language we are not only talking about variations in the edition, but variations in the matrix. In the sense that the micro-rhythm of variations on how the emptiness (the white) that holds the type, is taken actively into the design of a letter-type, and actively into consideration by the typographer. To most people this is below the threshold of perception, but not of interception. It is felt. The professional choices of the designer come as aesthetic qualities to the public.

Type-design and typography make the variables of manufacture available to the public in industrial editions. It brings a fun challenge to

other design areas: since clothing and furniture feature the di/vision between crafted and industrial manufacture (at least, arguably). However, if we look at such manufacture where they *verge unto* invisible detail, this kind of attention can maybe resemble the principle of typographic care. That is, areas where the form writ large—in clearly visible gestures—has a *counter-point* in details that are difficult to define, but clearly interceptible. Some are better at intercepting than others.

As though the heat of care threw different hues. In clothing, the sartorial care of *haute couture* off-set a palette of care for detail in the *prêt-à-porter* (which was never sartorial, and so similar in principle to type/design). It held its ground after WWII through the 70s. In furniture and architecture, the post-war reconstruction appears to have more brutally cut down simplicity to rationalise industrial production, whereby simplicity came to respond to quantitative rather *than* qualitative parameters. I suspect that there is more to be understood about this than the great acceleration post WWII.

Moreover, I suspect that there are few other places than certain art-schools where this task can be realistically taken on (Oslo National Academy of the Arts/KHiO being *perhaps* one of those schools). Because what we are talking about—returning to the language of printmaking—is how certain *distributed* qualities of a printed edition (no two prints being exactly equal) is transferred unto the *operative* qualities of the matrix. It is similar to the transition I made, in the beginning of this handout, from the two-tiered work of montage, to qualities appearing from within the manufacture.

The work of Enrique Guadarrama Solis (MA) is important at this point, because it explores the contingencies of manufacture and print: manufacture of a press and rollers, and the print of editions. This was presented as a compound installation work at Norske Grafikere/Norwegian Printmakers (title: Welcome to the machine). During my short apprenticeship in photogravure—w/ Prof. Jan Pettersson assisted by Enrique Guadarrama Solis—I discovered a similarly intensive relationship between manufacture and edition of prints. Featuring what I call the *cusp* (**Box 1**).

That is, if the step-by-step protocol of the really complex process of photogravure is modelled by the *strip* (**Box 1**) and the print is the *orb*—transforming the previous process into a mesh of multidirectional intersections—then the *cusp* is the threshold across which, depending on the *maturity* of the practitioner and the *individual* being worked on, the *completion* of the print starts to appear on the "radar" of the practitioner, even as s/he is working with the positive, the exposure of the plate or ferro-chloride etching. That is, the enskilment at anticipating possible alternative outcomes.

What I am interested in here is how the wealth of what comes to inhabit the cusp—or, what Marcel Duchamp called the *inframince*—will in turn (somehow) be transferable. This is the larger context within which Bjørn Blikstad's work *Level up!* might become duly appreciated: since it features the transition from where **(1)** an act of portraiture is held by an ornamental grid [Peacock Cabinet], to

(2) an ornamental grid is held in a act of portraiture [*Taweret/Sentinel Cabinet*]. A reversal in the relation between matter and pattern, which is arguably absent from e.g. Ettore Sotsass' Memphis-group.

In his work, this macro-transition from **(1)** to **(2)** is interceptible in the micro-detail of *hypo*- and *hyper*-finished elements that respond to each other in his work **(2)**, featuring a quality that I would call *resonance*. That is, on the one hand **(a)** a step-by-step convergence between the different parts of his work *unto* this point [strip]. On the other hand, **(b)** the *reverberation* of his entire (extant) work *from* this point [orb]. Thereby demonstrating the potential importance of a certain kind of pattern-breaking in hatching a correspondence between *process* and *result* in design, which can be articulated from the micro-*level up*.

Box 3—Basket-maker Peter Dibble working in Halesworth. From branches to basket.