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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the evolution of my work in graduate school. Upon entering into this course of study my artistic expression was polarized into realms of 2 and 3-Dimensional tactile works and experiments in 4-Dimensions (time) in the form of animations and short films. The content and context of these works have interwoven but their presentations remained polarized. In my master’s studies I have attempted to synergize the mediums of my artworks in order to achieve more realized and formal presentations. Following this course, I hope for my work to further evolve.
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INTRODUCTION

My work is video based in the digital realm, but remains anchored to objects, both fabricated and found. The utilization of projected light to interact with various shapes and surfaces, constructed and appropriated, enables me to reinvent environments, thus re-assigning perception and sensation for the viewer. My experiments are rooted in the optical and physical thrill of changed environments but are best realized when this aesthetic thrill combines with social and personal commentary and critique.

My work seeks to enliven physical experiments within 4-Dimensional presentations. Using time to activate elaborate sets, props, costumes, and choreography, I analyze and explore perception, illusion, identity, history, and memory. In an attempt to build complex yet cohesive dialogues between the handmade and the temporal, I rely on the recorded history of the mark and the eye’s persistence of vision. These dialogues attempt to simultaneously liberate and complicate perception by fragmenting perspectives and stacking meanings. Employing a changing variety of materials placed into time, this work constructs bridges between objects and perception to convey emotional, ecstatic and subjective realms of the self.
FEMININE IDENTITY AND CRITICAL REPRESENTATIONS OF SELF

My work is rooted in self-critique. My identity as a female and as an artist depends on a stringent dialogue about what art and gender represent within the media and what I’d like for them to represent. Knowing my own physical capacities for ugliness, beauty, tenderness, and terror, I attempt to test/push these representations by using versions of myself in much of my work. Employing costumes, special effects, gender-masking devices, and prosthesis enables me to create several different selves or an ever-changing self, trusting the idea that a shape-shifter or something in perpetual motion remains harder to catch and define.

In the video BEHIND BARS I play a character essentially made of and dressed in black and white bars, both in barcode and simple stripe form. I wear an amalgamte hand-sewn costume, referencing early 20th century nurse uniforms and French maid attire, with a bit of ‘Harajuku girl’ obsessive exaggeration thrown in. The walls, floors, props, and makeup are likewise striped to make my character indistinguishable from her surroundings. Yayoi Kusama’s obsessive polka dot patterns come to mind here. Shifting black and white stripes of various width and density interact and clash with one another, creating familiar contours out of a maddening collage of pattern. The effect is at once optical illusionary and unsettling.
Figure 1. BEHIND BARS 2009 – video still

Figure 2. Yayoi Kusama: DOTS OBSESSION-NEW CENTURY, 2000 Installation View
Slow, drone-heavy music plays in the background revealing lyrics: “You spend half of the morning…just trying to wake up…half the evening, just trying to calm down…etc.” (Smog) that begin to illuminate the context of the scenario: my character is a bartender. As my character goes through the simple motions of straightening herself, guzzling what appears to be alcohol from black & white striped bottles, peering at the viewer through striped glasses, recoiling, stumbling, and recovering this scenario is further described. The title of the piece is a pun-- my character is literally and figuratively ‘behind bars’.

BEHIND BARS is a critique of the service industry and my place, as a female bartender, within it. It addresses the gaze artistically to reference the complex “gaze” a female bartender receives while tending bar. Bartenders, while behind a bar specifically, perform on a strange stage, and work physically barred in by their customers while remaining relentlessly exposed. They can be subtly and blatantly objectified as the alcoholic gaze becomes fuzzier… the theatrical bar lights might begin to reveal an illusion of power coming from the bartender, of maternity, or even dimly lit beauty. This character is literally scanned in the work, alluding to the consumptive act of scanning a barcode to retrieve a price for something desired or purchased. Yet, we don’t see a service bar in this piece.

Edouard Manet’s barmaid from The Bar at the Folies-Bergere (1881-1882)\(^1\) has

---

\(^1\) Manet’s painting sympathetically portrays a female bartender from the viewpoint of a bar patron. She appears fatigued, bored, and distant. Her stare almost engages the viewer but falls a hair shy…as if she is staring through the viewer, at something in her own mind. Manet complicates the standard notion of portraiture by painting the reflection of the patron into the corner of the composition, thereby
left the public sphere and her gaze is turned back on herself. We see what might be the character in her own environment—after hours, but still behind the bars of her own coping mechanisms: suspicion, boozing, fading with fatigue. Which gaze is worse, this piece asks, one of external paid objectification or one’s own in which the bartender is her own worst enemy?

In this piece, visual and temporal repetition is essential (the video loops continuously almost as if the character is living the same day over and over) to evoke a sense of self-entrapment, or the cyclical prison of a warped mind. The bartender character seems to have become not only a product of her environment, but wholly immersed within that space. BEHIND BARS addresses the stagnancy of high-energy, long hour jobs, the uncertainty of self-medication, and the Sisyphean nature of addiction. The gaze goes back and forth, the bars blur with the scans, and intention is compromised with the reality that we are all providers and customers, gaze givers and receivers, and internal and external critics simultaneously.

I imbue my work with several signifiers in an attempt to remain indefinable and un-catchable…thus free, as both an artist and a woman. I pull the gaze away from the viewer, subjectify it, and then offer it back for a shared critique. Drawing reference from the artists Claude Cahun, Cindy Sherman, and Matthew Barney, I seek to make problematic and thus hopefully eradicate stereotypes of critiquing the proponent of the gaze. We read the painting more so as an indictment of the gaze than as an objectification. We subtly identify the patron and turn the critique onto ourselves.
the female gender. To achieve this critique I employ media (video, photography, projections), itself, as the only worthy contender for “big” media (television, the film industry, and magazines) in attempt to turn the media fist back onto itself. In essence, I hope to subvert objectification by critiquing myself.  

2 “By holding up mirrors to their own inner identities, they force the viewer into a visual and mental multiplicity of his/her own self-guided gaze. It therefore remains the relative perception of the viewer that determines the true substance of the work and inevitably leads to various interpretations and/or misconceptions.” INVERTED ODYSSEYS, pg. 31.
MAKING AND WEARING OBJECTS / IMBUING OBJECTS WITH LIFE

My work has been rooted in object making and shape shifting since I began expressing myself visually. I spent my formidable years drawing, painting, making puppets, sculpting, sewing, and taking pictures. Never much of a practitioner, I attended Catholic school from grade school through high school and was forced to wear uniforms and abide by dress codes. This process of concealment of identity and fashion amalgamation affected my visual sensibility deeply. I would dress up every chance I got and would lash out in school by secretly and not always subtly breaking dress code. I’d wear clashing hats, pins, scarves, and mismatched shoes, and would meticulously color in all the white, then the red, and then the blue of my plaid, pleated, bibbed skirts…anything to demonstrate that I was of a different mind. To survive this uniformity, it was essential for me to tactiley fabricate, then adorn myself with, the often abstract ideas in my head—to express what I felt I was really about, maybe even to prove to myself who I was. I was a show-er, never so comfortable with the ‘telling’ part of sharing. I would adorn my body and environments with personal objects as a means to make the world more mine, rather than mine its. To this day, I abhor the strictures of ‘proper attire’ and employ my art objects to follow suit.
In life and in artworks particularly, wardrobe can be utilized as a manifestation of personality in which the self is literally and symbolically revealed. At the risk of sounding superficial, appearance, while operating only on the surface, does give clues to a character’s inner traits. Color, pattern, texture, comfort-level, and the silhouettes of clothing all play pastiches of identity. What we, or our characters, adorn ourselves with often says a lot about who we are and who we want to become. As formal devices, these adornments remain powerful tools for conceptual composition. Personally, my costumes/objects reference the abundance of the Baroque, the obsessive detailing of haute couture, and what might be called feminine realms of decoration and patterning.

Poets are instructed to use concrete nouns, avoid adjectives, and to anchor their impressions in specific objects, places, and spaces. As a visual artist, I’ve operated under the same instruction. Props, costumes, and environments become my concrete nouns. They serve as the objects through which I convey concepts and states of mind. Often these objects, especially of costume and puppet nature, begin to reveal their own inner world. They hint at the potential of even having a sort of consciousness or destiny…not so much in an anthropomorphic sense, but in terms of expressing and reflecting abstract states of mind. In this way, they become symbolic of virtual states both emotionally and concretely.³

³ “How a person sees the things that surround him usually tells us more than an explicit description of his mood. The things carry the feeling. They do not when our emotions are placid, but when our emotions are violent, they must. In an age
COMPARISON OF GONE VIRAL AND JEWEL SPEW

Consider a comparison between 2 recent works: GONE VIRAL, a sculptural, light-reflecting installation, JEWEL SPEW, a projected digital video loop.

of violent emotions, objects become as expressive as the people who live among them. They take on a weird, uncanny life, the life of a fetish. I think of Daisy Buchanan here, getting into a weepy state over Gatsby’s shirts. Objects in that book (THE GREAT GATSBY) reward the careless hysteria with which they’re treated by gazing back, smoldering in waste piles, and then running down innocent bystanders.”-Charles Baxter-TALKING FORKS: FICTION AND THE INNER LIFE OF OBJECTS”
Figure 3. GONE VIRAL 2010 – Installation view

Figure 4. GONE VIRAL 2010 – detail
Figure 5. Lee Bul: UNTITLED (After Bruno Taut series)
2008
Figure 6. JEWEL SPEW 2010 – single-channel video still

Figure 7. JEWEL SPEW 2010 – giclee print
GONE VIRAL and JEWEL SPEW employ light as a concrete medium. The sculptural elements in GONE VIRAL bounce, reflect, and warp light to create a fragmented but contoured outer orbit, whereas light is activated by the digital elements in the video JEWEL SPEW as its subject spews highly reflective cut jewels out of her mouth and eyes. By compounding the luminosity of these elements, both works critique light as concealer, revealer, and environment shaper. While remaining grounded in the realms of sculpture and video, respectively, these two works demonstrate an analysis of image/light/stimulation overload within tactile spaces and times.

Formally, the obsessive construction of GONE VIRAL refers to haute couture fashion in that the objects are opulent—unwearable/touchable, but imbued with tactily ornate and seductive surfaces. The sculptures’ contoured skins of broken mirrors introduce issues of vanity and warped self-perception—opulence turned back on itself. Marilyn Minter’s viscously grotesque photos come to mind, but it’s Lee Bul’s sensuous, yet foreboding, chandelier-like sculptures that become true touch stones here, mainly because the way she presents the chandelier (an iconic object owned only by the wealthiest people) as a gorgeous but obese display of privilege. Bul’s constructions are extremely heavy, low-hanging monoliths assembled from a meriad of shiny things, but mostly appropriated industrial metals. They are seductive, but one cannot walk
under them and appreciate their soft diffused light. They take up the whole room, serving as gorgeous, non-functional obstructions.

Conceptually, the three sharp, fragmented mirror-ball sculptures in GONE VIRAL allude to disease and its organic, haphazard and intricate growth patterns. I constructed these objects to appear as if they were formed (and potentially continue to form themselves) through a wild, organic logic. Thus, they might be more than objects...capable of spreading a kind of viral will. I initially referred to the sculptural work as BLING CANCER’ because the materials used to veneer the structures are highly reflective, multi-faceted and sparkling and their growth patterns seem to spread without logic, creating clusters of infection. Crystals are embedded next to miniscule disco balls, next to jagged mirror fragments—each element absorbing/reflecting light differently to demonstrate a cancerous calidoscope of luminous bling.

Likewise, the subject of JEWEL SPEW seems literally saturated with light...so much so that it endlessly sprays out of her in the form of light beams and jewel plumes. Formally, her environment is saturated with jewels. Conceptually, she is choking on them. In the futile act of trying to shake them off, she activates the possibility that her predicament is terminal. The opening bars of the pop song, “BLINDED BY THE LIGHT” (written by Bruce Springsteen and made popular by Manfred Mann’s Earth Band in 1977) plays at ½ speed repeatedly under the video placing her in a pseudo-contemporary context. Is she inured to the words? Or could it be an addiction to bling that put her in this state?
Largely, the installation GONE VIRAL and the video JEWEL SPEW are metaphors for overstimulation and visual overindulgence. In Paul Verilio’s essay, “War and Cinema: The Logistics of Perception” he discusses the simultaneous evolution of optics and the ever-growing war machine. Light itself has become a weapon in the form of: radar blips, long distant enemy surveillance, satellite controlled predator drones and infrared photography (to name a few methods) which barrage our eyes and compound our perspectives. Essentially he is saying that if we can see something (and we can see more and more from greater and greater distances) we have the means to destroy that thing. GONE VIRAL operates similarly as a kind of light battlefield. In order to demonstrate how something unchecked can develop out of control, these highly adorned objects spin endlessly on turn tables, their reflected light breaking apart even further when it collides with oncoming light from the other objects in the group. They demonstrate a literal display of fragmented perception, like a disco ball with no true orbit and too many light sources. Here, reflected light becomes the symbolic catalyst for the spread of this ‘dangerous’ overload of reflection and refraction. Similarly, the subject of JEWEL SPEW is caught in a hypnotic video loop of spewing bling. She is not only surrounded by what is afflicting her, but appears contagious.

---

4 Paul Verilio, WAR AND CINEMA: THE LOGISTICS OF PERCEPTION.
5 The placement of the JEWEL SPEW projection screen diagonal to the GONE VIRAL installation in my actual thesis show, LUMENSECITY, was not accidental. When analyzed from a wider perspective, it becomes apparent that the video
Ultimately, GONE VIRAL remains strangely beautiful as a set of objects that showcases a mesmerising and whimsical light show of reflected spinning shapes and shards. Likewise, JEWEL SPEW encorporates alluring and infectious qualities. Its subject seems entranced and her environment almost fluid—as if she were peacefully drowning in a bath of floating jewels. So, are we drawn in by bling ourselves only to become more critical? Perhaps this is the essence of the critique.

loop itself is “infecting” the sculptures from across the gallery space with a viral, light-disease. A virtual cross-contamination is consciously implied.
THE NEED FOR 4 DIMENSIONS / CASTING THE TACTILE INTO TIME

Submerging myself within a world of tactile objects satisfied my artistic and communicative needs for a long while. Media was always powerful and alluring to me, but seemed out of my league. I was enthralled by television (especially music videos) but I approached it as something to view and critique but not to control. Cinema was gigantic in scope, budget and form. I adored films but the thought of making them was wasn’t within a realm my mind could grasp. Simply, I stuck with what I felt I could control and purported to be content and protected in this land of symbolic but truly stagnant sensuality. With no access to computers and or film/video equipment I had convinced myself that I was a luddite—an artistic purist/traditionalist, if you will—who made things by her own hand and accepted the boundaries of viewer/creator/creation relationships. However, my limited world/art view would change completely when I was turned on to Eastern European animation.

Turning ideas and concepts into things manifest and tactile remains at the root of all art making. The need to solidify-in the 3-D / “real” world, the life of the mind, is both a cathartic and essential communication tool for the artist. Yet, something still felt stagnant about my tactile expressions. I was missing the synergistic satisfaction that would only come by casting my objects into a realm where they could change, grow, shift and distort. I needed time. It was Jan
Svankmajer, Czech animator and sculptor, who first captured my imagination and shaped my realization my objects and images could move, literally. Utilizing stop-motion animation, I began to imbue my sculptures and their environments with personality, “character” development, and will—in motion. I was not seeking to tell narrative stories, simple or epic, but simply wanted to transform matter over time as a means to mirror how an idea or concept transforms. In this way, elaborate and/or fantastical costumes, props, and environments could truly have lives and purposes of their own. The essence of Svankmajer’s filmic world is that it remains visceral and object-driven, though dependent on technological manipulation.6 He grounds himself in tactility, but uses illusionism and meticulous staging techniques to place his viewers deep inside his “impossible” worlds. Likewise, he juxtaposes subjective sounds and sound effects with his imagery, thus accentuating the ‘life’ exuding from his objects. Using combinations of found, manipulated, and fabricated elements placed into time; Svankmajer creates wholly new elements and original scenarios.

6“Animation cannot be done without technology, without special effects. Our time has degenerated...That is why one has to work all the more consistently on making the resulting illusion as real as possible, thus making the technology necessary for creating this illusion dissolve away in the final result.” –Jan Svankmajer
Figure 8. Film Still from Jan Svankmajer: The Complete Short Films 1964-1992
Midway through my graduate course of study in fine arts I came to an impasse. I had been producing many new works of a refreshingly tactile nature but they felt deadlocked, moored by a self-imposed conviction that my final products had to be just that--products. I was randomly and unsatisfactorily revisiting the art object (works existing solely in the realms of 2 and 3-Dimensions) and I wasn’t incorporating enough time. Having recently completed my undergraduate studies at Pratt Institute with a concentration in media studies (mainly experimental video and animation), my mind was awash with 4-Dimensional ideas, but these were being held subcutaneously beneath a veneer of duty to the object. Time-based presentations were nagging at me as I struggled with obtaining cohesion in my work. I needed to find a way to represent the vast repertoire of interests I had, while avoiding chaos. After much frustration, experimentation, and searching the contemporary landscape for artists that inspired me (namely Tony Oursler, Raphael Lozano Hemmer and Courtney Egan, who’s angled projection of flower pedals falling to the floor touched me with it’s elegant sophistication), I experienced a kind of revelation. WAITLESS was conceived.
WAITLESS is a video on object installation in which a single-channel video loop is projected onto a smoky grey feather. The subject of the video is a white silhouette of a female form performing handstand after handstand, but meticulously edited so that only the apex of each handstand (the moments of true physical equilibrium) are left in the video loop. The resulting movie has a slightly choppy effect, in that the edits are apparent, but each time, as the subject’s hands and legs approach a vertical apex, an overall feeling of seamless balance is achieved. In WAITLESS another layer of content is introduced via the shape and nature of the found feather projection screen. The shape of the female handstander fits surprisingly well into the dimensions of the feather (bird species of origin unknown) and the contours of the body in motion mimic its undulating contours. Ironically, this feather, the lightest of objects, bears the projected weight of the human body as it challenges the gravitational pull of the earth by attempting to stand upside down. The feather is an almost weightless object (light as a feather…) and, due to editing’s ability to compress time, the human doesn’t have to wait to feel the weightless sensation that occurs when perfect balance is achieved. The looped action seems effortless, almost ethereal, and the feather appears sturdy. Thus the title WAITLESS is appropriate.

A soft soundtrack accompanies WAITLESS in the form of sweet, rough guitar chords being practiced over and over. The song being learned is “Dream On” by Aerosmith (from their 1st, self-titled album) and the musician seems to only get so far as the first 2 chords, then starts over, … & over…practicing again
and again, almost always getting it right as the loop continues. The theme of practice as a means to perfection resounds in both the sonic and visual elements of the piece. It is almost as if the gymnast is performing to the music and the music is being played to encourage the continued balance of the performer.

In WAITLESS, for the first time in my work’s evolution, a synergy of dimensions was achieved. Possibly, by not controlling every aspect of this piece (the feather is a found object and the electronics are store bought, yet both gain vitality from the movement and light play projected on one by the others) I was able to attain an elegant balance between content and presentation while leaving the technology needed to form the piece exposed. The mini-projector, DVD player and jeweler’s hand (holding the feather erect) ground the delicate weight of the feather and accentuate the humble content of the piece.

There is a singularity at work amongst the simple but disparate elements in WAITLESS: a stagnant/natural/found object, a digital light projection, human gymnastics, raw sounds of music, and repetitive time. These diverse mediums operate together in pared-down harmony. I believe that WAITLESS remains elegant as an artwork because I took a hands-off approach to the presentation, letting the projection tell its own story.

7 TONY OURSLER: “First, I just have to say that I’ve never given up painting. My interest in video certainly came from a deep belief that an artist should try to work with the images of the moment, for lack of a better word. Or, in the medium of the moment. And it did dawn on me early on, as it did many people, that still images did not really carry the cultural current that the moving image does. This is still true today. Alas, video no longer exists. Its really digital activity that I’m involved with now. Video is really just an appendage of some sort of digital system, which is being defined and redefined all the time.”
Figure 9. WAITLESS 2009 - detail

Figure 10. WAITLESS 2009 – video loop projection on feather
**DRIVE IN EVITABLE BACK STORY:**

I live 2 blocks from a dangerous train yard that intersects a busy, cross-town street. Commuters go psycho when the train comes: speeding up to beat it, flying down one-way streets the wrong way to beat it, lumbering over the neutral ground to beat it, etc. It gets scary...and loud. The dings, bells, and frantic, atonal whistles are with us 24 hours. I thought it would be nice to alleviate some of the chaos by turning the train into an impromptu drive-in theater. Since we were/are all stuck there waiting, why not be entertained? Thus the DRIVE-IN-EVITABLE began.

The first ‘screening’ for the DRIVE-IN-EVITABLE happened in April, 2009 and involved projecting videos of friends, neighbors, and myself singing karaoke songs about trains, waiting, being stuck in the middle, etc. I put up handmade silk screened posters to advertise, ran 100s of feet of extension cord from my house to the tracks, plugged in my computer and projector and waited. When the train finally came, what happened was funny, thrilling, clumsy, and absolutely cathartic. The notion of literally projecting one’s frustrations onto our object of torment gave us release. We tried to turn the waiting into fun, and it worked. People in their cars asked us questions, laughed, and maybe even forgot about being stuck for a second or two.

Since the 1st “screening”, I have gone back to project onto the trains about 10 more times--each time with a new video loop to test on the trains. Instead of employing classic, filmic entertainment as a mode of projection, I began to
recognize the communicative potential of more formal, iconic imagery. Using high contrast white silhouettes of the human body in motion as subject matter has allowed the videos to become more singular, more about analytical motion. These projections were engineered to focus more so on formal aesthetic qualities achieved by projecting movements onto something moving in a way I can predict, but not control. These trains move linearly but sporadically, sometimes slow, sometimes fast, sometimes to the right, sometimes to the left. The resulting happenstance is what I’m after in this case.

Many principles of frame-by-frame manipulation come into play with what I’ve been projecting. The train cars themselves become like frames of film through a gate, or like a zoetrope, and often the simple and/or complex movement of the figures light up the cars in beautiful, unexpected ways.

Figure 11. DRIVE-IN-EVITABLE 2010 – single-channel video
The DRIVE IN EVITABLE project represents a culmination in my artistic presentation. To produce it, I shot, edited and effected time-based digital media, incorporated actors and gymnasts to demonstrate skilled and mundane human expressions, waited, recorded, and revisited each of these elements several times, with new perspectives. The pertinent question remained—How do I go about presenting this documentation in an engaging way. I’ve been influenced deeply by Karolina Sobecka’s work. She projects videos of animals such as animated running tigers and sniffing CGI dogs onto buildings from her moving car and from the interiors of commercial spaces in which the virtual animals react with their environments via sensors and programming. Her documents of these
artworks are straightforward in that they exist online in the form of art-video
documentary. They don’t need to be object based because the thrust of her work
is meant to be felt in real time. My goal for the DRIVE IN EVITABLE was to
make a more tactile documentary. The incessant bells and horns accompanying
the trains remain essential elements of the experience, so does the moving
graffiti of the multi-textured surfaces of the train cars. Rather than simply show
footage of these projection events, I attempted to recreate the essence of the
happenings within a gallery context.

First I isolated the best sections from my straight video documentation—the
moments in which the moving figures played out surreptitiously in rhythm with the
alternatingly fluid and jolty movements of the train. I turned these selections into
video loops that played on a row of digital memory frames, arranged to reference
a rectilinear sequence of train cars. This was meant to concentrate the special
moments of the (often dull and expectant) projection experience. Next to this
presentation, I placed an o-gauge model train set led by an authentic Norfolk
Southern engine, meant to mimic minimally the particular train yard and cars
upon which I executed my projection events. Speakers installed in the gallery
were spewing a relentless cacophony of train horns and bells. Finally, I placed a
Pico projector in front of the model train. It projected a small-scale video loop of
the same footage I had projected onto the trains. Overall, a condensed, but
tangible experience was what I strived for.
At this time, THE DRIVE IN EVITABLE exists as a multi-format documentation project. While projecting my last video loop of silhouetted human motions onto the train, I was approached by a federal agent who found it suspicious that I was so close to the train with a projector and computer. He urged me not to project again, blamed “the orange alert”, and effectively put an end to my increasingly private and formal public-installation events.
CONCLUSION

Animation and the principles of frame-by-frame manipulation have influenced my work intensely. I remain rooted within the object world but rather than simply make objects move, I’ve begun to explore the properties of projected light onto the surfaces of objects both found and fabricated, kinetic and stationary. As I’ve shown in my current work, I’m exploring different methods of projection and presentation-- effectively turning my work inside out-- in an attempt to extract more complex layers of meaning from it.

I am a video and object maker, but, unlike Jan Svankmajer, the tactile work of my hand is employed early in my process and then is subjected to rounds of digital manipulation and object/projection layering. My intention is to then re-introduce these handmade elements back into final presentations of my work. This results in object based artworks and light environments that don’t hide the hand nor the technology used to make them.
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