Draft One

My chosen software for this project is Blender; a tool to build outside the parameters of physical space while replicating three-dimensional physical qualities within our 2D screens. It, therefore, does not have certain constraints that physical space, material and resources may impose; but has a set of its own parameters and computational limitations.

With a basic understanding of the software, I experimented with shapes, textures, material and light as a starting point.

3D software is complex. Blender is no exception. It includes a multiplicity of tools and features with complicated names that don't necessarily fully explain their resulting functions. And unlike its 2D counterparts, 3D rendering requires more computational power to accurately preview changes and adjustments applied. This makes intuitive use on a basic laptop tedious.

This constraint led me to systematically explore the results from using a particular tool in varying intensities. For my first set of iterations, I chose a set of 'texture and material' functions to successively adjust and iterate to create abstract sequences that document this exploration.

Draft Two

What results can unfamiliarity yield? How can I document and visualise the process of overcoming unfamiliarity with a particular tool?

My chosen software for this project is Blender; a tool to build outside the parameters of physical space while replicating three-dimensional physical qualities within our 2D screens. It, therefore, does not have certain constraints that physical space, material and resources may impose; but has a set of its own parameters and computational limitations.

With a basic understanding of the software, I experimented with shapes, textures, material and light as a starting point.

3D software is complex. Blender is no exception. It includes a multiplicity of tools and features with complicated names that don't necessarily fully explain their resulting functions. And unlike its 2D counterparts, 3D rendering requires more computational power to accurately preview changes and adjustments applied. This makes intuitive use on a basic laptop tedious.

This reminded me of working with a film camera for the first time in a photography studio; however, without the worry of wasting film. This approach made using the software much less intimidating; helping me overcome my unfamiliarity with the tool.

Re-thinking the process as a method to create and photograph digital materiality was a way to improvise. To combine 'readily available subsystems *ad hoc*, since it is always easier to work with what is familiar and at hand than what is removed in space and time,' (Jencks and Silver, 2013: p. 16). In my case, I applied my familiarity with photography to the unfamiliarity of 3D digital space. So, while I can't immediately see the results of a render, with time I could start to guess and fulfil a purpose more accurately.

References:

Jencks, C. and Silver, N. (2013) [1972] *Adhocism: The Case for Improvisation.* Cambridge: The MIT Press

Draft Three

My chosen software for this project is Blender; a tool to build outside the parameters of physical space while replicating three-dimensional physical qualities within our 2D screens. It, therefore, does not have certain constraints that physical space, material and resources may impose; but has a set of its own parameters and computational limitations. Due to my lack of knowledge of the software I started this project by asking myself; what results can unfamiliarity yield? How can I document and visualise the process of overcoming unfamiliarity with a particular tool?

3D software is complex. Blender is no exception. It includes a multiplicity of tools and features with complicated names that don't necessarily fully explain their resulting functions. And unlike its 2D counterparts, 3D rendering requires more computational power to accurately preview changes and adjustments applied. This makes intuitive use on a basic laptop tedious.

This reminded me of working with a film camera for the first time in a photography studio; however, without the worry of wasting film. This approach made using the software much less intimidating; helping me overcome my unfamiliarity with the tool.

Re-thinking the process as a method to create and photograph digital materiality was a way for me to improvise. To combine 'readily available subsystems ad hoc, since it is always easier to work with what is familiar and at hand than what is removed in space and time,' (Jencks and Silver, 2013: p. 16). In this case, I applied my familiarity with the skills required in studio photography to the unfamiliar process of rendering within 3D digital space. This led me to enquire; how might 3D rendering on Blender parallel a photographic practice? What are the potentials of digital space that might not be possible in a physical studio?

These iterations lead me to think of the process of 3D of image-making on Blender as analogous to studio film photography. Nathan Jurgenson, in his book *The Social Photo* (2019; p. 20), argues that in the digital age of photographs, there has been a shift in what a 'camera is understood to be.' He emphasised the role of software in the evolution of photography; to create beyond what 'hardware could do before.' (ibid.). Applying this thinking to the virtual camera that captures and renders that which is created on Blender, I have begun to think of these iterations as part of a photographic practice, as much as a practice of familiarising with 3D design.

References:

Jencks, C. and Silver, N. (2013) [1972] *Adhocism: The Case for Improvisation.* Cambridge: The MIT Press.
Jurgenson, N (2019) *The Social Photo: On Photography and Social Media.* London: Verso.