

2012

## Editorial

Noel Fitzpatrick

*Technological University Dublin*, [noel.fitzpatrick@tudublin.ie](mailto:noel.fitzpatrick@tudublin.ie)

Tim Stott

*Technological University Dublin*, [tim.stott@tudublin.ie](mailto:tim.stott@tudublin.ie)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/inp>



Part of the Arts and Humanities Commons

---

### Recommended Citation

Fitzpatrick, Noel and Stott, Tim (2012) "Editorial," *InPrint*. Vol. 1: Iss. 1, Article 1.

Available at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/inp/vol1/iss1/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Ceased publication at ARROW@TU Dublin. It has been accepted for inclusion in InPrint by an authorized administrator of ARROW@TU Dublin. For more information, please contact [arrow.admin@tudublin.ie](mailto:arrow.admin@tudublin.ie), [aisling.coyne@tudublin.ie](mailto:aisling.coyne@tudublin.ie).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/)

This is the first issue of In/Print, an in-house peer-reviewed bi-annual publication based in the School of Applied Arts at Dublin Institute of Technology. In/Print is one of a number of initiatives within the School to promote research and reflection. Other initiatives are Radicul, a group established in 2010 to explore the research and professional activities of members of the School, and In/Discussion, a public lecture series linked to the BA in Visual and Critical Studies programme (see [www.radicul.org](http://www.radicul.org)). Our ambition is to foster critical discourse across our different disciplines, firstly by consolidating the research of an academic community of practice and criticism and, secondly, by integrating the efforts of that community with broader debates and problems.

The School supports research at various levels of completion across a number of areas of knowledge, including typography, art and design history, material culture, critical theory, pedagogy, arts and design practice, and the philosophy of art. It is hoped that this diversity will lead us to take a more undisciplined

approach to each of our disciplines, and to pursue unforeseen relations across common problems within and outwith the academy. The essays gathered in this first edition of *In/Print* necessarily represent diverse interests, then, covering photography, typography, the history of design, design practice and theatrical study.

With *In/Print*, we wish to prompt critical discourse grounded in ‘theory’, taken in the broadest sense of the term: theory as an insistence upon a certain way of looking, of contemplation, *theoria*, and, from this, to both speculation, *theorein*, and to spectator, *theoros*. This brief etymological digression is necessary because we are all inheritors — regrettably so, in our view, and we are by no means the only ones who see it this way — of a historical distinction that has become an opposition, a grudge, a badge of distinction and possession (professional, pedagogical, psychological, institutional, and otherwise); a distinction and an evaluation of those who do, on the one hand, and those who speculate, on the other, current even in our everyday speech — ‘*That sounds great in theory, but in practice...*’. This is to identify our theories with a ‘merely’ or ‘if only’; hypothetical, ungrounded, capable of being otherwise or not the case, distinct from that which we do, the readily-felt fact and consequence of our action in the world.

Yet whatever we might say of what we do, our research and enquiry is always in pursuit of one phantasm or another, something barely glimpsed, perhaps, or faced directly, something dreamed, an apprehension, alluring us, implicating itself into our methods and our desires. If this is the case, then the way we do becomes rather more theoretical, more speculative than we might ordinarily imagine. In *Moby Dick*, Melville begins the eighty-second chapter, devoted to ‘The Honour and Glory of Whaling,’ with the following remark: ‘There are some enterprises in which a careful disorderliness is the true method.’ As Melville suggests, describing the methods both of whaling and of his own, literary narration, there is no clear distinction between, on the one hand, order, rigour, the abstraction of principles and explanatory

models, and on the other hand, contingency, disorderliness, and the practicalities of a process under way. A practice, however disorderly, is thought through, systematic, theorised. It does not thereby exclude contingency, surprise, risk, fantasy.

We are not whalers, nor novelists for that matter, yet still, perhaps it is better to think of method more generously, not in terms of procedural or disciplinary correctness but as a way of speaking about a path followed and a care employed to negotiate the difficulty and peculiarity of its terrain. And if we are to care for those methods, then we must be both attentive to them, watching over their progress, and ready to speculate as to their future state, ready to foresee how what we do might be otherwise. This means, on the one hand, not to be satisfied merely with narratives of procedure, as though a disclosure of theory were only the description of technique, as though ideas were only instruments. On the other hand, it is to be aware of the epistemic contingencies of our speculations and, as a consequence, to be wary of the persuasive rhetoric of foundation and of discipline.

A last etymological digression. When we think of method as a path followed, we would do well to remember that the prefix *meta-* (Gk. *methodos*; *meta* + *hodos*: lit. 'after' + 'way' or 'path') denotes a road after, a road changed and a road beyond, not yet given—and hence, the uncertainty of what is to come. Precisely because the path is unknown, our way along it cannot yet be methodical. This is where our theory, our speculation begins. It is how we care for the disorderliness of what we do.

We have a modest opportunity, not so much to propose proper methods but to gather an audience to our speculations, to invite others to look again with us, to point out to us what they see and what we overlook and to share how they go about looking. Our editorial ambition must be equally modest—to gather 'more eyes', as Nietzsche once demanded (*On the Genealogy of Morality*, III.12), and to refrain from the banal heroics of making a scene, of seeking to have the last word.

There are four categories under which submissions can be made to In / Print: 1. Academic Papers of standard format, up to 6,000 words in length; 2. Occasional Papers, allowing for more speculative and incomplete proposals, up to 2,500 words; 3. Design Problems: a text used for the working through and presentation of certain design problems, graphic or otherwise; and 4. Page as Medium, consisting of two pages given over experimental visual and textual combinations.

Our first call for papers was made internal to the School. Our second call will be made more widely in the near future.

Editors

Dr. Noel Fitzpatrick & Tim Stott

