

WRITTEN RESPONSE

Methods of iterating

Draft1

For this project, I chose screen printing because I had a simple question: why does this method remain when there are cheaper and easier ways of printing, such as regular printers and Risographs? Through Methods of iterating, I hope not only to clarify the original purpose of screen printing, but also to discover new values.

My first experience of screen printing allowed me to see a process that has been rendered almost invisible by digitalisation. Screen printing is based on chemical knowledge, for instance, darkroom processing, drying, paint and media compatibility. I realised that even though similar processes take place in the machines of normal printers, I can not see it anymore. Moreover, the attention to detail in the process by the technicians reminded me again of the original purpose of screen printing: to produce a large quantity of images of identical quality.

Then the critical question emerged: what if I were to change that original purpose and produce the same image, but with "different qualities"? As for future plans, I want to focus on this question. In the next step, I will observe how the image changes by changing the way the ink is applied, the force and speed of the technique, and the material being printed, in line with this new objective. (214words)

Draft2

In this project, I aimed to change the original purpose of screen printing “to produce a number of the same image in the same quality” and iterated to produce a number of the same image in “different” qualities.

According to *Pulled: A catalog of screen printing* (Perry, 2011), the screen printing process can be divided into five main parts. These are the creation of film positives, screen production, registration, printing and drying. Among these, the experiment focused on the printing part of the process. This is because, as stated in *Conditional Design Manifesto* (Edo et al. 2013), “Constraints sharpen the perspective on the process and stimulate play within the limitations”, I wanted to test how much creativity I could develop within the already defined frame of the screen. What I did was to change the amount of ink on the screen, the location of the ink, the application of pressure, the practice of masking, combining different materials, and adding the texture on images immediately after printing.

Through these process changes, I experimented with how the image changed from the originally planned image. As a result, changing the speed of printing or the amount of ink alone did not change the image that much, but changing the way the ink was applied and combining it with different materials produced the most different impressions. Just as Jencks (2013) created *Madonna of the Future* from things around him, I brought my own paper and yarn to iteration, which led to an understanding of ad hoc methods that allowed me to create beyond one framework.

By analysing these whole processes, I found similarities with the perspectives described in *Conditional Design: Workbook* (Edo et al. 2013). In Sol LeWitt’s *The wall drawings*, the artist creates the idea and system, and the actual production is done by others. This makes each work a reproduction, but at the same time an original work of art. This is a clear indication that the open systemic nature of *Conditional Design* transforms the work into a biological one. Whereas LeWitt controlled the first half of the production stage - the creation of the idea, the design of the system - and gave up control over the second half, in the case of my current project I had no control over the first half, from image to screen production, but over the process after printing I did. Although in a different order, the redesign of the process allowed me to create a different image of the final work as a “living organism” (Edo et al. 2013, p. v), embodying what *Conditional Design* suggests.

As for future plans, I will focus on the methods of Adhocism that I found particularly interesting and explore in depth why I found them interesting for further iteration. I will also continue to examine the question of how it differs from other printing tools, as I have yet to answer it. (483words)

Draft3

In this project, I subverted the original purpose of screen printing “to print the same image with the same quality” and proceeded with the critical question of how to “create something different from the same screen image every time”. Ultimately, I found a function in screen printing as a design machine that “produces typefaces with a variety of textures”.

There are five main screen printing processes (Perry, 2011), and I focused on the “printing” process in my experiments. I wanted to test how much creativity could be enhanced within the constraints of the screen, as described in Conditional Design Manifesto (Edo et al. 2013). As Jencks (2013) created Madonna of the Future from everyday objects, I have done iterations with my own paper and yarn, which have produced some particularly interesting images. From this process, I saw new possibilities in the inversion of negative and positive space by the placement of objects, and where the texture of the material can be expressed. Therefore, I decided to experiment with the placement of different materials in the final week and found by placing thicker objects and materials with different textures this did not result in significant image changes.

I then researched screen printing again and learned that silkscreen originated in China and Japan (Cossu, 2012, p. 10), finding that it was mainly used for dyeing kimonos using a stencil technique called Katazome (Made, 2015). As the strength of screen printing compared to digital printing is that it can be printed on a variety of materials such as wood and fabric (Borney, 2018). I tried to print on textiles, a material that is particularly compatible with screen printing. However, I had a critical question in mind that how to explain the difference between the stencil method and screen printing. I found the answer after I attended a type design workshop. Whereas stencils require a design that does not completely hollow out the edges of the lettering, screen printing does. I decided to experiment with screen printing to see what changes in the printed letters. As well as printing on different materials, I iterated on the ad hoc method, placing some materials to add more texture and saw unique images emerged. Questioning what I could see when I combine this analogue printing method the digital technique and I found that the typefaces created by capturing them digitally gave the impression of a “living organism” (Edo et al. 2013, p. v).

Analysing these overall processes, I noticed that they shared similarities with the perspectives described in Conditional Design: Workbook (Edo et al. 2013). Whereas Sol LeWitt’s The wall drawing controlled the first half of the production phase and then released control over the second half, I intervened and took control of one part of the process. Despite the different approaches, I discovered that by redesigning the process, the final work became biological. As it is said that objects with multiple functions are not specifically designed but discovered in already existing technologies (Jencks, 2013, p. 67), I was able to discover a new type design function from the original function of screen printing. In the future, I can explore the possibility of designing countless types by changing the combination of materials to be printed and objects to be placed in between. (547words)

Bibliography

- Benjamin, W. (2008) *The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction*. Translated by J. A. Underwood. Harlow: Penguin Books.
- Borney (2018) *Digital printing vs screen printing - advantages & disadvantages*, Borney. Borney UK Ltd. Available at: <https://www.borney-branding.co.uk/digital-printing-versus-screen-printing/> (Accessed: 30 January 2023).
- Cossu, M. (2012) *Silkscreen Basics*. Corte Madera, CA, USA: Gingko Press.
- Edo Paulus, Luna Maurer, Jonathan Puckey, Roel Wouters (2013) *Conditional Design: Workbook*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Valiz.
- Firth, R. (2017) *Printmaking ideas: Experimental printmaking at home*. North Charleston, SC, USA: Createspace Independent Publishing Platform.
- Jencks, C. and Silver, N. (2013) *Adhocism: The Case for Improvisation*. Mit Press.
- Jennings, M. (2015) *Fine Art Screenprinting*. Ramsbury: Crowood Press.
- Made, K. (2015) 'Katazome', Kiriko Made, 3 October. Available at: <https://kirikomade.com/blogs/our-fabrics/15314847-katazome> (Accessed: 30 January 2023).
- Perry, M. (2011) *Pulled: A catalog of screen printing*. New York, NY, USA: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Print Club London (2017) *Screenprinting: The ultimate studio guide from sketchbook to squeegee*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Rundgang 2021 'Hands On' — Laura Hilbert (no date) Laurahilbert.de. Available at: <https://laurahilbert.de/Rundgang-2021-Hands-On> (Accessed: 16 January 2023).
- Saunders, G. and Miles, R. (2006) *Prints now: Directions and definitions*. London: V & A Publications.
- Tina Touli (no date) Tinatouli.com. Available at: <https://tinatouli.com/> (Accessed: 29 January 2023).
- What Is Printmaking? (no date) Metmuseum.org. Available at: <https://www.metmuseum.org/about-the-met/collection-areas/drawings-and-prints/materials-and-techniques/printmaking> (Accessed: 30 January 2023).