**Part 1: Line of Enquiry**

**1：**

**Reference：**

Drucker, J. (2014) *Graphesis: Visual Forms of Knowledge Production*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp.180–192.

Johanna Drucker proposes that visual forms are not neutral displays of information but active sites of interpretation. Her concept of “graphic interpretation” reframes the act of reading images as a spatial and compositional process, where layout, structure, and visual logic construct meaning in non-linear, often tactile ways. As she writes, “spatializing arguments through graphical means” (Drucker, 2014, p.180) is not a supplement to linguistic thought but a primary method of knowledge-making.

What stands out in this text is Drucker’s challenge to the traditional hierarchy between text and image. She emphasizes that design is not just a vessel for content, but a thinking tool — an epistemological system. Her articulation of visual knowledge as “compositional reasoning” resonates with my interest in using 3D structure as a language of analysis. The idea that form, rhythm, and tension can perform critical argument opens up new modes of practice-led research.

This text offers a lens through which I begin to see my modeling not as construction, but as interpretation through visual form, situating design as both medium and method.

**2：**

**Reference：**

Tenen, D. (2017) *Literature Down to a Pixel*. In: *Plain Text: The Poetics of Computation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp.187–202.

Dennis Tenen challenges the binary between digital and analog, arguing that digitality is not a property of machines, but a **method of structuring experience**. His central claim is that digital and analog are not opposites but **interwoven modes**, constantly translated and formatted within each other. As he notes, “the property of being digital indicates the systematic ability to impose structure” (Tenen, 2017, p.191). This resonates with his example of the “soap opera effect,” where technically improved frame rates disrupt familiar visual rhythms, showing how format alters perception itself.

This insight profoundly shaped my thinking. Tenen helped me understand that working with 3D modeling is not merely a visual act, but a **structural and cognitive one**. The process of breaking down motion into micro-sculptures becomes a kind of **nonverbal decoding and re-encoding** — not just of form, but of perception and embodied logic. I now see my practice less as representation, and more as a system of spatial formatting that organizes, interprets, and performs visual information.

Through this lens, form becomes thought — and modeling becomes a way of thinking structurally through matter.

3：

**Reference：**

Atkins, E. and Obrist, H.U. (2015) ‘Ed Atkins in conversation with Hans Ulrich Obrist’, *Frieze*, 23 April. Available at: https://www.frieze.com/article/ed-atkins-hans-ulrich-obrist-250 (Accessed: 29 April 2025).

“I’m interested in how digital images can insinuate themselves into physical space — how they might propose a kind of prosthetic corporeality, a ghost limb.” (Atkins and Obrist, 2015)

In this interview, Ed Atkins discusses the idea that digital images are not passive representations but **active extensions of the body**, proposing “a kind of prosthetic corporeality” (Atkins and Obrist, 2015). Rather than treating digital surfaces as merely visual, Atkins sees them as affective, spatial, and material phenomena capable of insinuating themselves into physical experience.

I have been inspired by this, and my project reinterprets the photographic image through three-dimensional modelling, exploring how static images can be transformed into spatial structures of embodied perception. Atkins' notion of the digital as a ghostly limb - something that is both absent and felt - coincides with my attempts to translate the intangible tensions of biological movement into material sculptural fragments.

Through this lens, 3D modeling is not a representational tool but a **formatting system for bodily knowledge**, where motion, tension, and spatial sequence generate new ways of sensing and narrating an event beyond language. Atkins’ framing deepens my understanding of digital modeling as an embodied, affective, and structural method of interpretation.

**4:**

**Reference：**

Studio Moniker (2019) ‘Neuhaus’, *Het Nieuwe Instituut*. Available at: https://studiomoniker.com/projects/neuhaus (Accessed: 1 May 2025).

Steyerl, H. (2009) ‘In Defence of the Poor Image’, *e-flux journal*, (10), November. Available at: https://www.e-flux.com/journal/10/61362/in-defense-of-the-poor-image/ (Accessed: 1 May 2025).

The Neuhaus project and Hito Steyerl’s essay *In Defence of the Poor Image* together reframe the role of fragmented imagery within digital spatial construction. Neuhaus proposes “an academy for multisensory knowledge” and creates “a new world of experience beyond the visual” (Studio Moniker, 2019), suggesting that images, when fractured and spatialized, can structure embodied experiences rather than simply represent objects. Similarly, Steyerl defends the degraded image, stating that “the poor image is a copy in motion. Its quality is bad, its resolution substandard. As it accelerates, it deteriorates” (Steyerl, 2009).

Both works reject the pursuit of visual perfection, instead emphasizing motion, fragmentation, and reassembly as new forms of meaning-making. In my project, this informs the process of decomposing photographic motion into a series of micro-sculptures. Rather than treating images as static surfaces, I approach them as material for constructing spatial narratives — using mesh distortion, UV shifts, and surface ruptures to animate perception through incompleteness.

Through Neuhaus and Steyerl, I understand fragmented digital imagery not as a loss of fidelity, but as a creative method to **format embodied, non-linear experience** — where perception, motion, and structure intertwine.

**5:**

**Reference：**

Peeled Maps (no date) ‘Peeled Maps Project’, *Peeled Maps*. Available at: https://peeledmaps.com/ (Accessed: 1 May 2025).

Peeled Maps presents a fragmented, interactive exploration of the human body through digital spatialization. Rather than reconstructing a man’s body through full 3D modeling, the project layers two-dimensional surface fragments in a staggered, collage-like configuration. Visitors navigate through shifting views, assembling a bodily perception from disjointed surfaces.

This method resonates with my own project’s approach to spatializing biological motion through fragmented micro-sculptures. Peeled Maps demonstrates how **fragmentation does not signify loss, but offers new modes of bodily engagement**, where multiplicity, discontinuity, and movement become key to perception.

The project highlights that a body need not be “whole” to be understood spatially; fractured surfaces, layered and shifted, can still evoke volume, tactility, and presence. This supports my understanding of 3D modeling not as the pursuit of mimetic realism, but as a **spatial formatting of sensory experience**, where incompleteness and distortion invite active interpretation. Peeled Maps offers a valuable precedent for constructing perceptual environments from fragmented digital images.

**6:**

**Reference：**

Mitchell, W.J.T. (2005) *What Do Pictures Want? The Lives and Loves of Images*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

“Pictures are things that have been marked with all the stigmata of personhood and animation.” (Mitchell, 2005, p.11)

In What Do Pictures Want?, W.J.T. Mitchell challenges the traditional view of images as passive carriers of meaning. Instead, he proposes that we think of pictures as possessing a kind of agency — they are not inert objects, but dynamic presences marked by the “stigmata of personhood and animation” (Mitchell, 2005, p.11). Mitchell suggests that images interact with viewers, solicit emotions, demands, and bodily engagement, thus behaving like semi-autonomous actors in social life.

Mitchell’s notion of the image as an active agent supports my attempt to create spatial experiences where fractured forms evoke tension, movement, and interaction beyond surface reading.This theoretical framework resonates with my project’s exploration of spatialized image fragments. By transforming a photographic record of biological motion into micro-sculptures, I approach visual material not as static representation, but as something that “wants” to be felt, embodied, and navigated.

Through this lens, my work frames motion fragments as entities that participate in reordering perception. Modeling becomes not just a reconstructive act, but an attempt to engage with the affective and performative dimensions of visual information, echoing Mitchell’s rethinking of what pictures desire.

**Part 2: Line of Enquiry**

This project began with a photograph of a hen laying an egg — a strange yet fundamental image, containing subject, action, object, and context. In the first week, I explored how a still image could be interpreted through 3D modeling by simplifying the form, reducing mesh density, distorting UVs, and restructuring angles. These experiments raised a key question:

**How can we spatially reinterpret the narrative embedded in a single PNG image?**

This led me to shift focus from the image itself to the biological motion it implies — the internal action of laying an egg. I broke down this process into phases: bulging, sliding, and recovery. Through iterative modeling, each moment became a micro-sculpture — a frozen fragment of tension, not animation, but space.

This project investigates how motion can be spatialized and how form becomes a carrier of time and pressure. It also expands image interpretation through practice — using mesh, material, and form as tools to explore a new visual language where motion, structure, and perspective work together to reconstruct meaning.