

[-empyre-] Micromissive 1: Craft and Maquettes

- *To:* "soft_skinned_space" <empyre@lists.cofa.unsw.edu.au>
 - *Subject:* [-empyre-] Micromissive 1: Craft and Maquettes
 - *From:* "patrick lichty" <voyd@voyd.com>
 - *Date:* Wed, 22 Aug 2007 18:39:51 -0500
 - *Delivered-to:* empyre@gamera.cofa.unsw.edu.au
 - *Importance:* Normal
 - *In-reply-to:* <BA64B26C-F87F-40E6-8F69-6D71E4081C41@thing.net>
 - *Reply-to:* soft_skinned_space <empyre@lists.cofa.unsw.edu.au>
-

MAQUETTES

Beyond economics, what we're talking about are virtual maquettes. I've been doing thin in 3D programs since the mid-90's for museum installations with various collectives. I find making 3D maquettes highly useful for the development of installations, but there are a few rubs. First, a lot of curators are not extremely technologically experienced. SL is fine for someone like a Christiane Paul, Steve Dietz, or Ben Weil, but you may risk losing the chance if you approach someone outside of the field who does not know about Second Life.

Secondly, most curators I know have about five to thirty seconds to do an initial evaluation of a work (seriously). Unless you have something really spectacular, or something specifically of interest to them in SL, I usually assume that the time to log in and teleport is too long. Therefore, the image of the piece (which could be from SL) on your description sheet/PDF is probably more important.

In my opinion, I feel that doing a prototype of an installation is most likely for the artist and the SL community unless the work is everged off-server through what I've called here as "tiering"; multiple representations/iterations of the work in multiple media, tangible and intangible.

CRAFT AND HAND

In regards to the argument that something that is not fashioned by hand is enslaved to the agenda of the toolmaker is only partially true, but it tends not to hold water. The same argument has been used for Albierti's Drafting Grid, the Pantograph, and the Camera Lucida, and even the great masters used aids in their work. This is much like the time when a curator commented my using a computer to make work, but then I asked what brand and weight of brush made the oil on his wall.

Of course, there are programs that are very specific, like the landscape creator Bryce, or the old Kai's Power Tools plugins. With these special purpose programs, it's hard not to make a vista. But, with oils and a paintbrush (and this may be a bad analogy) it's hard not to make a painting.

But on the other hand, I'm glad that GH has realized that his digital video rants are the product of a few judicious bits of code and a little

clever engineering.

That, my friends, I seriously doubt.

Patrick Lichty

- Interactive Arts & Media
Columbia College, Chicago
- Editor-In-Chief
Intelligent Agent Magazine
<http://www.intelligentagent.com>
225 288 5813

FAX 312 344-8021
voyd@voyd.com

"It is better to die on your feet
than to live on your knees."

-----Original Message-----

From: empyre-bounces@lists.cofa.unsw.edu.au
[<mailto:empyre-bounces@lists.cofa.unsw.edu.au>] On Behalf Of G.H.
Hovagimyan
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2007 8:38 AM
To: soft_skinned_space
Subject: Re: [-empyre-] Prototyping

On Aug 21, 2007, at 11:39 PM, Christy Dena wrote:

> Would other artists/curators be comfortable working in this
> fashion? What do
> people think of this mimeses?

There are two salient issues in your discussion. One is using your hands to fashion something and the other is the exact reproduction of something visually (mimesis).

Using your hands to fashion something is primal. It is the beginning point for art. It is also the starting point of engineering. The difference between the two disciplines can be highlighted. Let me start with cave painting from 30,000 years ago. The ones in France were done by using a spray painting technique. The artists chewed up berries and then using a hollow reed, he would spit the paint. The images on the wall are are. The tools and techniques are engineering. The learning how to use the tools are the process of physical learning. Something akin to a kinaesthetic learning process. Trying to fashion something without using your hands puts the creative process in the hands of an engineer or in this case it would be a logician who would figure out algorithm to describe the process in the physical world. Within this rule set one can only operate as the programming dictates. One cannot discover forms through the sense of touch. One cannot alter the programming with one's hands and movements. There is no intuition sense of the body.

Mimesis or fool-the-eye is the most simplistic notion of art. the sensation is "gee that look so real I can't tell the difference from reality." Art history starts in the caves with glyphs and narratives. Mimetics is simply a trick. Look at photography. Within the supposed

trompe l'oeil of the camera lense there is a world of abstract ideas.
The nature of art is to deal with these levels of ideas. Mimesis is
once again a trick of engineering.

empyre forum
empyre@lists.cofa.unsw.edu.au
<http://www.subtle.net/empyre>

--

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG Free Edition.
Version: 7.5.484 / Virus Database: 269.12.2/966 - Release Date:
8/22/2007 9:05 AM

-
- **Follow-Ups:**
 - [Re: \[-empyre-\] Micromissive 1: Craft and Maquettes](#)
 - *From:* "hugh davies" <huedavies@gmail.com>
 - **References:**
 - [Re: \[-empyre-\] Prototyping](#)
 - *From:* "G.H. Hovagimyan" <ghh@thing.net>
 - Previous by Date: [\[-empyre-\] potentially virtual](#)
 - Next by Date: [Re: \[-empyre-\] Prototyping](#)
 - Previous by Thread: [Re: \[-empyre-\] Prototyping](#)
 - Next by Thread: [Re: \[-empyre-\] Micromissive 1: Craft and Maquettes](#)
 - empyre August 2007 archives indexes sorted by: [\[thread \]](#) [\[subject \]](#) [\[author \]](#) [\[date \]](#)
 - empyre list archive [Table of Contents](#)
 - [More information about the empyre mailing list](#)

This archive was generated by a fusion of Pipermail 0.09 (Mailman edition) and [MHonArc](#) 2.6.8.