

Annotated Bibliography

Spoerri, D., Filliou, R., Williams, E. & Topor, R., 1966. *An Anecdoted Topography of Chance (re-anecdoted)*. New York: Something Else Press.

This project has helped me think differently about how structure, chance, and authorship operate within my project. Rather than positioning interpretation as something to be refined or resolved, *An Anecdoted Topography of Chance* frames accumulation and contingency as meaningful in themselves. Reading this work encouraged me to see my growing archive of participant interpretations not as material to be edited down, but as a system that can hold variation without needing to stabilise it into a single narrative or outcome.

It has also prompted me to reconsider my role within the work. Instead of acting as an author who determines hierarchy or emphasis, I am increasingly interested in organising conditions under which meaning can surface. Spoerri's method of mapping everyday objects through anecdote resonates with my approach to perception: each response to the haiku is shaped by context, memory, and position, and none can claim priority over another. This way of thinking supports my interest in mediation, where coherence emerges through relational organisation rather than aesthetic control.

Most importantly, this reference has helped me understand how chance can be designed for. By treating interpretation as data and structuring it through visual rules, captioning, and archives, I can allow unpredictability to exist without collapsing into disorder. This perspective continues to inform how I build systems that remain open, iterative, and responsive.

Anadol, R., 2019. *Machine Hallucinations*. Various installations.

This project has helped me clarify what I am resisting in dominant uses of AI-generated imagery. Anadol's work positions AI as a spectacle-producing entity, where vast datasets are processed to create immersive, overwhelming visual fields. While visually compelling, this approach tends to erase individual perception, replacing it with an averaged, algorithmic imagination. Reflecting on this in relation to my own practice made me more aware of how scale, speed, and automation can flatten nuance.

In contrast, my work insists on slowness, specificity, and attribution. Where *Machine Hallucinations* absorbs thousands of images into a seamless whole, my project preserves difference and friction between interpretations. Anadol's invisibilisation of the dataset and its contributors also prompted me to foreground process and authorship more clearly. Rather than presenting generated images as autonomous or neutral, I aim to expose how images are mediated (by people, by systems, and by design decisions).

This reference challenges me to articulate why I reject AI as an authorial force, while still engaging with generative logic. It strengthens my position that not all forms of visual generation are equal, and that intimacy, context, and responsibility matter as much as output.

Steyerl, H., 2009. *In Defense of the Poor Image*. e-flux journal, 10.

This essay has helped me rethink image quality, fidelity, and degradation as meaningful rather than problematic. Steyerl's framing of the "poor image" as something that gains value through circulation, compression, and translation aligns with how I understand memory and perception in my project. The images I generate are intentionally imprecise; they function as residues of interpretation rather than accurate representations. This reference affirmed that loss and distortion can be productive modes of meaning-making.

At the same time, Steyerl's emphasis on speed and mass circulation complicates my approach. Her poor images move quickly through networks, while my work deliberately slows down engagement through print, sequencing, and close reading. This contrast has helped me situate my project as a quieter counterpoint within digital image culture, one that resists endless circulation in favour of attentive encounter.

Steyerl's writing also sharpened my understanding of mediation. Images are never neutral; they carry the conditions of their production and movement. This insight reinforces my role as mediator, making visible the systems, constraints, and translations that shape how perception becomes image.

LeWitt, S., 1999. *Sentences on Conceptual Art*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

LeWitt's writing has helped me frame my project as a system rather than a collection of individual outcomes. His insistence that the idea functions as the machine that makes the art resonates with my shift toward rule-based processes, where participant input generates variation within a defined structure. This encouraged me to focus less on refining singular images and more on designing the conditions under which images are produced.

However, LeWitt's removal of subjectivity and emotion presents a clear tension with my work. While his systems aim for neutrality, my project centres memory, interpretation, and personal context. Engaging with this contrast helped me articulate that my system is not objective but intentionally porous, shaped by human difference rather than erasing it.

This reference has allowed me to position my practice as a hybrid: structured but affective, procedural yet intimate. It reinforces my interest in coherence without uniformity, where a consistent framework allows multiplicity to emerge without collapsing into chaos.

Crawford, K. & Paglen, T., 2019. *Excavating AI*. AI Now Institute.

This research has been crucial in shaping my critical position toward AI-generated imagery. Crawford and Paglen expose how AI systems depend on hidden datasets, labour, and classification structures that are often presented as neutral or intelligent. This has helped me articulate why I am wary of automated image generation as a tool for representing perception.

Reflecting on this work pushed me to consider my own dataset ethically and transparently. Unlike AI systems that obscure their sources, my project makes its inputs visible: names, ages, written descriptions, and contextual information remain attached to each visual outcome. This reinforces my role as mediator rather than extractor.

The reference also strengthened my decision to work at a small scale. Instead of aiming for efficiency or scale, my system prioritises legibility and accountability. Engaging with *Excavating AI* clarified that my project is not anti-technology, but anti-opacity. It positions my work as a critical alternative that values human perception as complex, situated, and irreducible.

https://monoskop.org/images/7/77/Spoerri_Daniel_An_Anecdoted_Topography_of_Chance_1966.pdf

<https://refikanadol.com/works/machine-hallucination/>

http://worker01.e-flux.com/pdf/article_94.pdf

https://monoskop.org/images/3/3d/LeWitt_Sol_1969_1999_Sentences_on_Conceptual_Art.pdf

<https://excavating.ai/>

Thwaites, T. (2011) *The Toaster Project*. Princeton Architectural Press.

Although materially distant from my work, *The Toaster Project* has helped me think about systems, mediation, and intentional inefficiency. Thwaites attempts to build a toaster from raw materials, exposing the absurd complexity behind an everyday object. This mirrors my own attempt to rebuild image generation from the ground up, outside of AI automation. The project has encouraged me to value friction as a method: difficulty becomes a way of revealing hidden assumptions about technology and convenience. In my platform, the labour of writing, reading, and translating perception replaces instant image generation. Thwaites' work supports my position that understanding emerges through process rather than outcome. It also validates my choice to design a system that is deliberately limited, slow, and human-scaled. Rather than producing perfect images, my project exposes how meaning is constructed, negotiated, and never fully resolved.

Zylinska, J. (2017) *Nonhuman Photography*. MIT Press.

Zylinska's writing has helped me critically situate my resistance to AI image generation without relying on a binary rejection of technology. Her discussion of posthuman image-making prompted me to clarify that my project is not anti-digital, but anti-automation without accountability. This distinction has been crucial in shaping my platform, which is coded and digital, yet firmly human-authored. Zylinska's emphasis on ethics and responsibility in image production aligns with my role as mediator: I remain present in the translation process rather than outsourcing it to an algorithm. Her work also encouraged me to think about images as events rather than objects, reinforcing my focus on perception, memory, and interpretation over representation. This has influenced how my images function less as illustrations and more as traces of human seeing, resisting the illusion of objectivity often promised by AI systems.

Ingold, T. (2011) *Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description*. Routledge.

This text helped me rethink description as an active, generative practice rather than a secondary act. Ingold's emphasis on describing as a way of knowing resonated strongly with my decision to collect written perceptions rather than spoken ones. It clarified why language, when slowed down and committed to text, becomes a tool for attention rather than explanation. This has influenced how I frame participant prompts, encouraging sensory, spatial, and temporal detail. Ingold's thinking supports my belief that perception is not captured instantly but unfolds through articulation. This aligns with my aim to make translation visible as a process, where writing, image-making, and reading are interconnected acts of knowing.

Bishop, C. (2012) *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*. Verso.

This text helped me think critically about participation without romanticising it. Bishop's writing challenged me to ask what kind of participation my project actually enables, and what the audience gains beyond interaction for its own sake. It encouraged me to consider participation as a form of authorship that must still be framed, edited, and contextualised. This has influenced how I design prompts and constraints within my platform: participants are not free to generate anything, but are guided to produce reflective, descriptive responses. Bishop's critique also helped me justify my intervention as mediator - participation does not mean absence of structure. Instead, meaning emerges through carefully designed conditions that allow difference to remain legible rather than chaotic.

Weiner, L. (1968) *Statements*

This project helped me think more rigorously about how language alone can function as both instruction and image, without requiring visual completion. Weiner's *Statements* positions text as a set of conditions rather than descriptions of finished works, allowing meaning to exist in a suspended, speculative state. This resonated strongly with my interest in perception as something that unfolds internally, rather than

something that must be visually resolved. In relation to my practice, *Statements* supports my decision to foreground participant-written descriptions as primary material rather than treating them as supplementary captions. The work also reinforced my understanding of mediation: Weiner does not illustrate or resolve his statements, but instead creates a framework in which readers generate their own mental images. This has challenged me to consider how much visual information is actually necessary in my own project, and whether restraint can increase interpretive openness. It also strengthened my confidence in designing a system where meaning remains distributed between text, image, and viewer, rather than being fixed by the artist. The project ultimately affirmed that coherence does not require visual completeness, but can emerge through shared structures and agreed constraints.

<https://www.thomasthwaites.com/the-toaster-project/>

<https://opus.lib.uts.edu.au/bitstream/10453/133540/4/F448E07F-48EF-4937-B22A-DB093A64F3F4.pdf>

<https://selforganizedseminar.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/bishop-claire-artificial-hells-participatory-art-and-politics-spectatorship.pdf>

https://monoskop.org/images/4/4b/Weiner_Lawrence_Statements_1968.pdf