

The Same Intention, a Different Image: A Refractist Experiment

Introduction

An observation made during discussion of Beyond the Brush: Art, Intention and the Means of Making suggested a simple experiment.

If a Refractist artist gave essentially the same interpretative directions used to create a painterly image, but required the resulting work to retain the appearance of a photograph, would the artistic process be materially different? And, perhaps more provocatively, would viewers who were uncomfortable with the painterly result find the photographically rendered interpretation easier to accept as art?

The question arose because Refractist images are likely to invite comparison with painting. Their colour, atmosphere, simplification and surface may employ visual languages familiar from painting. Such comparison is natural. The more interesting question is whether the appearance of the finished image affects judgement of the artistic process that produced it.

We decided to test the proposition.

Beginning again with the Anchor

The experiment used an existing Anchor Photograph of three swans grouped beside a fallen tree at Byfield Hall.

The requirements were unusually strict because only one variable was intended to change: the visual form of the interpretation.

The three swans had to remain three swans. Their poses, relative positions and relationship to one another had to remain unchanged. The fallen tree across the foreground, the surrounding foliage, the opening onto the water, viewpoint, framing, geometry and aspect ratio were all locked.

No object could be invented. Nothing could be removed. Nothing could be repositioned merely to improve the composition.

These are not special conditions invented for this experiment. They reflect the established Refractist requirement that transformation must not destroy the identity of the originating photograph.

The intended changes were confined principally to light, colour, atmosphere and emotional tone.

Two photographic interpretations were sought: Quiet River Mist and Dusk Gathering.

Failure proved unexpectedly useful

The first attempts failed badly.

They were attractive photographs. They contained swans, water, vegetation and an appropriate atmosphere. But they were not transformations of the Anchor Photograph.

The scene had effectively been reconstructed.

This was precisely the kind of generic drift that the Refractist methodology is intended to prevent. Most revealingly, one version introduced a large house and an open lake that simply did not exist in the Anchor. Even the number and disposition of the swans initially drifted.

The results were aesthetically plausible and methodologically useless.

That failure was instructive because it demonstrated something easily obscured when discussing generative technology abstractly. A successful Refractist image is not simply an attractive image generated from a description of what the original photograph contained.

Identity matters.

Once the actual Anchor was restored as the governing reference and its structural elements were explicitly locked, the experiment succeeded.

The photographic variants

The resulting Quiet River Mist and Dusk Gathering remained recognisably photographic.

More importantly, they remained recognisably the same place, the same three swans, the same fallen tree and the same originating encounter.

Yet they communicated substantially different moods.

Mist softened depth, suppressed colour and produced quietness and uncertainty. Dusk altered illumination, warmth and tonal relationships, giving the scene a different emotional weight.

The experiment therefore established a point that had not previously been obvious: Affective transformation does not require painterly rendering.

A photograph can be refracted while remaining photographically plausible.

This also suggests a practical extension of the Refractist method. There may be occasions when the intended outcome is not a visibly painterly transformation at all, but a photograph that remains faithful to its Anchor while expressing a different remembered or desired atmosphere. Achieving such a result through conventional photographic software may demand considerable technical skill and patient manipulation, particularly from an amateur photographer. Refractist practice allows the artist instead to concentrate on intention, direction, selection and judgement. The means of execution change; the responsibility for deciding what the image should communicate does not.

Photographic example: direct comparison

The Anchor is shown first. The photographic interpretations are then placed directly beside the existing more visibly transformed interpretations so that the effect of changing visual language can be judged without losing sight of the originating scene.



Anchor Photograph - Swans at Byfield Hall

Quiet River Mist



Photographic interpretation



Existing Refractism interpretation

The photographic version remains within an optically plausible register. The existing Refractism interpretation travels further from literal photographic appearance while retaining the three swans and the essential encounter as its subject.

Dusk Gathering



Photographic interpretation



Existing Refractism interpretation

Again, the intended emotional direction can be expressed photographically or through a more visibly transformed language. The comparison does not decide which is better; it makes the difference in expressive distance visible.

Photography and memory

The result nevertheless revealed an important difference between photographic and more visibly transformed Refractist interpretations.

A photographic variant tends to remain within the realm of the optically possible. *Quiet River Mist* can readily be understood as representing what the scene might have looked like had the photographer returned on a misty morning. *Dusk Gathering* might similarly be mistaken for the same encounter photographed at another time of day.

The more painterly Refractist interpretation need make no such claim.

It can move further from what might literally have appeared before the camera and towards what the place has subsequently become in memory, accumulated experience and present emotional response.

This does not make one approach superior to the other. It identifies different expressive distances from the same empirical starting point.

A continuum rather than a boundary

The experiment therefore suggests that describing Refractism simply as occupying a position between photography and painting may be unnecessarily restrictive.

A more useful conception may be a continuum of expressive distance from the Anchor Photograph.

At one end lies the Anchor itself: the empirical record of the encounter.

Close to it may lie photographic interpretations in which atmosphere, light and emotional character have changed while photographic plausibility remains.

Further away may lie increasingly transformed Refractist works in which the visual language becomes overtly non-photographic.

There need be no predetermined point at which a work becomes sufficiently painterly to qualify as Refractism.

The more important constraint is different: How far can interpretation travel while the identity of the originating reality remains intact?

This places the Anchor, rather than painting, at the centre of the methodology.

The same artistic decisions

The experiment also raises an interesting question about authorship and artistic judgement.

Consider the two possible outputs.

In one, the artist begins with an Anchor, recalls or conceives a different emotional atmosphere, directs computational technology towards that intention, rejects unsuitable results and selects the final image. The result looks like a photograph.

In the other, the same sequence occurs, but the chosen visual language produces an image that looks more like a painting.

The human contribution may be essentially the same.

The difference lies substantially in the means by which the intention has been rendered visible.

If the first is readily accepted as photographic art while the second encounters resistance because it appears to trespass upon painting, the difference in response may tell us something about the categories through which viewers judge images rather than about the presence or absence of artistic intention.

That is a question, not a conclusion.

Which belongs on the wall?

There is, however, a much simpler test.

Having established that both photographic and more painterly interpretations can satisfy the methodological requirements of Refractism, there is little value in choosing between them according to which is easier to defend theoretically.

The question becomes: Which image would I rather live with?

That question is more demanding than it initially appears.

A successful wall image must survive familiarity. Immediate visual impact matters, particularly when images are first encountered on a screen or in an exhibition. But an image that remains on a wall enters a continuing relationship with its viewer. The strongest works may be those that continue to disclose something after novelty has disappeared.

A restrained photographic refraction may sometimes achieve that better than a strongly transformed interpretation. On another occasion, the photographic version may remain merely beautiful while the more radical interpretation communicates something that the photograph cannot.

There is no methodological reason to predetermine the answer.

What the experiment did - and did not - show

The exercise did not establish that photographic interpretations are superior to painterly ones, or that Refractism should retreat towards photography. Nor did it establish how viewers will classify either kind of image.

It showed something more useful. The affective intention can survive a change in visual language. The same Anchor, the same constraints and substantially the same human decisions can produce interpretations that remain photographic or move further into visibly transformed territory.

The experiment therefore shifts attention away from the superficial question of whether an image looks like a photograph or a painting. The more durable questions concern the originating encounter, the artist's intention, the integrity of the Anchor, the decisions made during transformation and the experience of the finished work.

For present purposes, that is enough. The Working Paper and Beyond the Brush need not be altered. This experiment is better retained as a separate observation: evidence that may become useful if questions about painterly appearance, photographic legitimacy or the role of computational execution arise in future discussion.

And after all of that, the practical judgement remains disarmingly simple: does the image reward looking, and could someone live with it on their wall?

Dr V Paul Gerskowitch
August 2026

