





**Tere Recarens, *Water*, 1999.**

The person in this image is being pushed forward. First he was walking, but when he got hit by the power of the water it was suddenly as if he attempted to fly. From the way the picture is taken, it seems like the person is an airplane gliding through clouds.

**You say you are interested in the perception of photography. Could you provide more detail on this interest of yours?**

I see the analog processes of photography as an important part of my subject matter. There is something magical about analog photography. Something I don't find in pixels. I am very much taken with the technical aspects of the process as they are in extreme contrast with the 'magical' element. I make work that deals with the technical qualities of the medium. But at the same time tries to escape from them, and destroy them. Therefore, most of my work is a form of meta-photography; photographs about taking photographs. It is all about looking at photography, seeing photography, and experiencing your own perception at the same time. The way I see and feel about the "magic" of photography is apparent in my work, and will hopefully evoke similar reactions from my viewers.

**In many pieces you use photography as a language of research, rather than as a media for registry. Is photography an experimental medium for you?**

In my view, photography operates on different levels, it can bend reality into many directions, sometimes without the control of the photographer. My work is experimental in nature. My approach could be seen as a pseudo science, as a romantic form of mathematics. Analog photography has many clear and defined rules; there is a given standard to work with that is not subject to change. To me, this system functions as a grid that I am constantly challenging. I work meticulously and research based, using a scientific and experimental approach, an approach that also includes the poetry of trying and failing. This is an essential part of my work. Intuitive things often happen while I am working. I need to be surprised by my medium, like a scientist experimenting with out having a clear idea about the possible outcome of a test.

**Subjects such as light, time and colour appear constantly in your production, but they appear surrounded by a certain enigma, a certain mystery. Do you see it in the same way?**

This is partly because of my intention to visualize the intangible character of photography. As I see it, Human perception and the photographic medium are

like two shapes with overlapping areas. The person looking at a photograph can choose to bypass the frame, due to the strong suggestion of transparency, and look straight through it into a registration of reality. But these two shapes are very different, and there are large areas where the two do not overlap, in which photography behaves nothing like the human eye. These are the areas where different rules apply. This is a magnificent part of the medium that remains mostly unrecognized and 'underexposed'. I intend to make this part visible. In it, the moments and space constitute qualities that are specific for analogue photography. They offer a better view on the medium as it is, and a focus on photography as a creating medium rather than a documenting medium. I think that this is where the enigma lays. These images are similar, but different from what we expect to experience with our own eyes. It may feel like a mysterious moment, but only because of how we expect the medium to behave.

**For example, in "The Dancers" series, you exhibit the dancers' bodies as a mist, but in the credits for each image you note down the sound source that makes them dance, for example, "...So by Soft Cell (T=3:49)". This contrast between showing and imagining seems to be one of the major subject matters of your work. Is that so?**

Some of my images extend themselves to point outside of their frames, and so become hyper-medial. Referring sometimes to things outside the photographic frame, and sometimes to a relationship between different moments in time. The construction of my images is often visible, and therefore self-reflective. I leave traces of the making, referring to the process and to myself on the other side of the camera. A viewer can't look at the images without seeing these reflections of the process and the making of the images. It is as if I wave at you. As to the "The Dancers", in addition to mentioning the specific songs that made them dance, I also let you know how long it took to create this image. This makes the work also a recording of time. The title informs you that this is an image of precisely 3 minutes and 49 seconds.

**In a variety of works, you take care of presenting different materials through a certain fuzzy, undefined form, in which light and the thickness it provides to elements, plays an important role. Could you tell me more about what do the mist or the volumes visible through it mean to you?**

To me, this is the way photography breaks down its subject matter, deconstructs, obscures and makes it ambiguous. I create stretched exposures

that lead to a slowed down process of photography. The emphasis no longer lies on catching a specific moment, but on the construction of an image during the open shutter time. When objects move in front of the open shutter, they begin to blur and lose their definitions, boundaries and dimensions. The subject breaks down and sheds its form, becoming disembodied colour, floating in the context of a 3D space.

**You work in photography, installation, the moving image and volume with very similar themes. But what you exhibit is always a photograph. This is an immensely attractive point. What determines this decision?**

I have made several video installations and have also shown my photographs in installations. My video works have themes and subjects similar to those of my photographs. These works have no narrative evolving in time. The way a work is presented depends on its content, but in itself, as a physical object, the form of presentation is very important to me, as is the relationship of the object with its surroundings, and spectators. Presently, I am working on what I call 'Density Drawings'. I 'draw with the camera', as if it was a pencil. I construct an image on a negative by layering multiple moments in time: while I make a drawing, I shoot exposures of different moments in the process on the same negative. I literally build up an image on the negative, while in reality the drawing blacks out. It is a cross-exchange of the visual information, between the marker on paper, and the film in the camera. I exhibit both the drawing and the photograph, and thereby show the space between the work and its process.

**These decisions might seem to hold the key to a kind of highly specific reflection on the conditions under which spectators witness your work. Could you comment on part of these reflections?**

The work is so much about perception that I feel it is only finished when it is being looked at and experienced by a spectator, who then becomes a part of the work. Ideally, I want my works to relate to the viewer in a physical way. I would like my audience, while looking at my photographs and video installations, to become part of them, in the same way a person occupying a room becomes part of the scene.

**I like to think of your images as if they were a series of mysterious apparitions. Many of them seem to focus somewhere beyond volume. A sensitive hors champ. What do you think?**

My aim is to create work that will extend beyond the flat surface, beyond the two dimensions of the image. I think a work is successful when it manages to exceed the medium, and at the same time to concern that medium, so that something new and unexpected happens.

**Have you ever hidden something within a work? I mean objects hidden inside them, which might appear imperceptible at first glance.**

:) In the series "Paintings in Darkness", I have tried to take photographs with as little light as possible. I photographed paintings during the night, and printed them so dark, that when you looked at the prints, your eyes would need time to adjust to the dark. At first glance, you see only a black surface, but a second glance would reveal a new frame within the frame of the photograph, and finally after a third glance you could possibly distinguish what was on the painting.

**Is there any particular kind of literature that you consult when engaging in your work? What do you find there, and how much of it do you transfer to your projects?**

I like popular science books and books on photography, they are a source of inspiration. I have dyslexia, so from an early age I have had a strong need to translate theoretical information into images, either in my head or on paper. Mastering abstract information by translating it into visual shapes is much easier to me. So in order to memorize information, I used to make drawings of math, science and geography. This is how I presently use photography.

**Let's talk about 1) "Density Triangle" and 2) "Pythagoras Tree", the two pieces you present here. How do these works establish a mutual dialogue?**

Both images are based on mathematical structures set in reality, translated from the theoretical flatness of books. Both have a certain abstraction to them, in which you can see how the shape coincides with the surface of the print. At the same time they actually are, and are not, dealing with their own depth. You find yourself both inside and outside. It is a play between depth and flatness, which takes you gradually from the surface down towards the back of the image.

