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Research Part II

Notes from reading week 1:

* + Art is the basis of invention
  + Artist are experts in the awareness of the changes in sense perception
  + Electronics exponentially increased in portability the fact that art hasn’t at the same rate in crazy
  + Artist finding the poetic significance in the mundane – humanizing electronic media
  + Light
  + Electronics help in the making of durational experiences
  + Surprised physics isn’t being spoken on more
  + Kinetics
  + I disagree fire is the human mind light is the control we wish we could have on it
    - We as humans are uncontrollable and utterly naked no matter how comprehendible we try to make ourselves
    - Light I believe is more appealing to people because we have such a high desire to control like how people prefer dogs they want the control and don’t respect boundaries as much etc humans do not have to respect light for it to bend at our will. In contrast fire you have to show respect to control it is simply not given but is possible
  + Even art has feedback loops not just science I argue feedback loops are seen in art more but go more undocumented
  + Shift from self preservation to self destruction
  + Ironically I believe we have shifted farther from tactile interactive art and focusing on more visual interactions
  + The line between science experiments and art are being blurred
  + I don’t think financial success has anything to do with the success of the art

Starting with the paragraph of how id innovate motion:

One thing that I believe is missing in the current obsession with motion, light, time-based art is the tactile interaction. Modern displays, everything is so clean and smooth, nothing is messy and raw. When a user interacts with these displays there is no real tactile feedback which I believe is greatly important. We hover around the light and yes that then triggers something else but without us feeling something back did we really do anything at all? With interactives being more prevalent why not forcefully make the audience feel something. Hardware already exists that provides haptic feedback often seen in game controllers. Simple modifications can be made to allow that with art forms. I would utilize light in a destructive way along with glass compared to the cleanliness we have now. If glass and light can be used to help correct sight using it to worsen sight mixed with physical feedback, I believe it can create a new experience. Not everyone can see but a lot more being can feel and seeing isn’t believing anymore like how touch is.

Summary paragraph (these are so hard to do):

Art has typically been the root cause of innovation. It has been the driving force to create more and more. Then a shift happened, and machinery and inventing carried on passed the artist. Now artists have caught up and are utilizing these tools to create and work on new meanings of art through new mediums prioritizing light, reflections, and duration of work. The line between artist and mathematician for these works are starting to blur as the definition of art also shifts.

Notes from reading week 2

* With rapid production value and appreciation decreases
* When does art stop becoming art with the influx of distribution technics
* Generative art is just a bunch of math that has not had the emotional and human touch applied yet
* “To create unimaginable images” don’t really make sense especially since its from algorithms and also nuances
* Feels more and more like it’s a bunch of scientist and mathematicians trying to play artist bypassing human emotion but emotion is dirty and these type of people don’t like dirty so they fall to machines
* What IS art?
* Doing this to make it more available to the public backfired

Same as before doing the how would I innovate Coded Form:

I am personally not a fan of electronic production, especially generated art. Environmentally it is horrible, and I would like to explore that aspect of it and showing it to people. A big part of art is having the recipient feel something and having it being accessible to more groups. Because is it really art if no one can see it? Also a big part of art is an artist vision that the artist tries to recreate given the tools of life, puts out into the world and then its gone. The piece is then identified by the perception of the recipients. Generative media takes in the desire and removes the perception and mistakes of humans which creates that personal touch. I think for generative media to do better prompts should be removed. Let it generate within its own free will and let it create until it creates something raw until its raw and see how people see it. Let the machine go through the same pain as the artist.

If I can make any XR project and had 120 hours of free time spread out amongst 10 weeks I have no idea what hardware I would use. Knowing myself it would take me about that long to decide what I wanted to do and the hardware to accomplish that. I am leaning towards VR because that is a bit more accessible and wide spread but I also love the looking glass and want to find more ways to manipulate that. I think making a device that works with the looking glass to accentuate the features would be a very fun project but I haven’t work with any type of XR devices to know for certain.