

Danielle Jalotjot
Professor Durie
Art 101 Sec 3
September 2, 2022

Reading 1

Q1. Based on the Verostko article, what would be a good working definition of how any kind of artist can use an algorithm in their art.

An algorithm, as stated in paragraph 10, "cannot exist isolated from a method of implementation any more than a drawing can exist without a surface for the drawing and an instrument for drawing." From how a proficient algorithm artist describes it, any kind of artist can use an algorithm in their art as our automatic movements and way of creating are our versions of an algorithm. I see algorithms as the execution of a concept through a medium and a manual/set of instructions.

Q2. Give 3 specific examples of how you might already use algorithms in your own art work. Describe whether they are formal behaviors or more abstract.

As someone who digitally illustrates, I know how much that medium depends on the accuracy of a computer that, for example, creates flowing smooth lines over shaky lines. Another example may be using a symmetry tool, where your illustration is mirrored automatically for you to create perfect symmetry in your work. Lastly, a program like Adobe Photoshop, which is built by countless algorithms, is able to detect specific pixels that are included in a selection, taking off a large amount of work for you (I believe these are more formal behaviors).

Q3. At the end of the Verostko article there is the example of the 'automatic' drawing being described as something that could be coded. They then describe this as in essence defining a working style. An artist's style. Do you think that algorithms can be defined in such a way to define an artist's style? Please explain your answer with an example of an artist you are familiar with.

I do think that algorithms can help define an artist's style. Using the 'automatic drawing' as a reference, I think every artist has their own specific way or process of completing a task that seems automatic to them. So, if ten artists were asked to draw a line on paper as their only instructions, so many existent factors between the ten artists would result in ten different lines, specific to each artist. With this foundation of their way of completing the task, each style develops. One example of an artist that has a distinct style is Joyce Lee (@joyceartworks on Instagram), whose work is characterized by whimsical, fantasy, colored pencil drawings that highlight erotic subject matter. Her process and techniques are her algorithm, defining her style.

Q4. Look at the 8 artists/examples above and pick 4 or more of them that you can comment on. Specifically describe for each of the chosen 4, 'where' do you think the art 'is' and how would you talk about the process or tool of making the 'art' vs the art 'artifact' itself. For example, If an artist is using computers to generate art, where is the art? Is it in the software program or the product it makes? Please label each one, then elaborate on the question using complete sentences.

Superfichie (Miguel Nóbrega) | Pentametrón | "Hurt" done in Songsmith | Jon McCormack, Fifty Sisters

In a broader sense, I believe art can be found within the process itself as well as the outcome. However, I feel like the outcome of the works done by these four artists are what they would ultimately consider their artwork, and what most people would probably consider "art."

For Superfichie/Miguel Nóbrega, his tool or technique is often a permanent marker on plotter print, creating these colorful geometric lines and shapes that resemble environments and forms. In this case, I would consider the result, which beautifully captures space and representational forms, as the 'art.'

Constructing poetry instead of visual art, @Pentametrón on Twitter is a pretty comical algorithm that tweets and retweets iambic poetry. For this example, I feel the 'art' is the final poem, but the process seems to be more randomized and follows a

specific yet simpler set of instructions. I'm not sure how the poems are formed, but the random flow of thought and topics act as a reminder that it is based on algorithms, dehumanizing this form of art for me.

I think my favorite example is "Hurt" done through Songsmith. Both comical and impressive as algorithmic art, the 'art' is again, the final song. Because I'm not familiar with and don't understand much of how Songsmith works, generating a song using the voice of a specific musical artist seems pretty challenging to me.

I found Fifty Sisters by Jon McCormack to be incredibly stunning and intricate, where the final work, the 'art,' is a series of "computer-grown" plant forms that seem to have neverending detail as you zoom in. To me, this form of algorithmic art reminds me of traditional art the most, as they resemble flowers and plants, a classic motif in art.

To reiterate, I believe that each outcome of each algorithm in these four works is the 'art,' and the process, technique, and set of instructions/code act as the foundation and bridge to creating the actual 'art.' However, as I mentioned before, I would also understand that there is art within these steps, which definitely deserves acknowledgment and respect as an essential part of creating generative/algorithmic art.