

# Thousand Words Are Worth A Million Images

Karthikesh Raju

June 11, 2002

*An Image is worth a thousand words.* A statement that aptly describes the power of visualization. An image in just two dimensions transforms all that is written in elegant prose, described in affluent style into a form, giving it a shape, that makes understanding easier.

The power of images is further enhanced by the use of graphical tools in science to uncover interesting phenomenon in data. Correlational properties, structural sparsity in data and various trends can be immediately seen when the data under question is represented in a two dimensional form, which is usually - irrespective of the intuitive names different fields come up with - an image.

By compressing thousand or more words, spanning pages of prose, an images enhances perception, and brings clarity to the thought process, and above all, by virtue of appealing directly to our cognition removes the handicap that prose poses by enforcing the audience to understand language before understanding the idea. An image appeals to the illiterate as much as it does to the literate. The extended two dimensional representation of the image is a movie: an attempt to adapt running prose into two dimensions. Movies have given the same preceptual thought that static images have and have brought forward excellent literary work to enable understanding among a larger mass of people. The power of this form of representation is unquestionably great, but .....

What if someone said

*Thousand words are worth a million images*

On the face of it, this statement is absurd, it questions all that has been achieved so far with the help of visualization. It says the rational of using pictures to explain prose is completely inadequate at best and deficient at worst. Giving a serious thought to this statement, opens up exactly what has to be opened: *One's imagination.*

Images often have a concept of templating things. It gives a face to a character. It bridges association, enhancing perception, but the downside of it is that it arrests imagination. As long as one had the liberty to read the original prose, he had the freedom to be liberal in his association and visualization of the character he associates with. He can give it a form, a pseudoname, a shape, a color, a height, and even more, can himself be that character if he wanted to. With everyone reading literature with a different mind-set you have millions of interpretations to a single statement/character/activity described in prose, and every interpretation is a two dimensional representation, and with every representation worth is value, one has a million images for a thousand words.

Take for instance the famous wizard: Harry Potter, a name that any child can associate with, now. Long before Hollywood, took that name, and gave it a face, Harry Potter could be fat, lean, short, tall, dark, brown, fair, blond, brown haired, he could talk Spanish, Swedish, Russia, Greek, German, Hindi, Tamil, Korean, Japanese or ..... well, the limit is your imagination. Every child could be Harry Potter, he could associate himself with that character, why we could have seen even girl-Harry Potters. A single character, drawn out from a fantasy story could create thousands of images. For everyone who has read the book, there is his own, self created image, that he can affiliate with. Children learn to talk to their self created images, adore them, and at times become them. When a face was given to it, that was it! All the thousands of Harry Potters' are gone. Whenever someone says Potter, one can just remember Daniel Radcliffe's nice face with that artificial scar. Harry Potter talks - Daniel Radcliffe's style, walks his style, so much so that the very imagination that spawned thousands of Potters now fails to bring up even one other than this. The world has been high jacked by one person's adaptation and imagination of a word that, we have imprisoned that character for ever. It would now be impossible for Potter to redeem himself from the face of Radcliffe. So much for our love of two-dimensions.

Occasionally, now and more often before, my friends and i had the habit of taking the names of characters wise and foolish, while we corresponded with emails. A bright idea from him who christen him Gandalf, and at-times, i would be Bilbo for a day, sometimes people we could just be a 'he who must not be named' or a 'you know who'. The very dynamic nature of our naming process, confirmed the fact that character were usually limited by our imagination, and nothing else stopped them. A 'you know who' could be another friend of us today, or just the ice-cream vendor down the street tomorrow.

Every time one takes up the book, Potter, Hogwards, Voldermort are all etched in ones memory, that it is rather difficult to shred off the image that

has been locked. We have in-effect curtailed our ability to imagine these characters, and Potter is not the only one, with more and more popular stories getting framed (The Lord of the Rings to name another phenomenal book), all we'll have after a few years time is an image for every thousand words. How good it would be if we had a million images for every word.