Draft 01 Written Response

My tool of choice is the photocopier. Artist Pati Hill often uses common objects in life as objects and then through the output of a photocopier, some of the objects become 'distorted and disproportionate'. The piece I wanted to reproduce, 'Pear', is to give the impression that it is in motion. During the photocopying process, I needed to go ahead and consider the trajectory of the pear's movement. Given that photocopiers scan from left to right, there are multiple 'rules' that can be formed for the orientation of the pear itself and the direction it moves. But I realised that I would never be able to reproduce the piece exactly the same. From the machine's point of view, it was nothing like the 'click of a button' photocopiers of that era. The biggest technical challenge was controlling the unpredictability of the machine - the slightest hesitation could dramatically change the outcome in terms of position. If the object is far from the machine, the scanned background will be black. If the machine is half off when scanning, the finished background will be grey. So the multiple 'layers' that an object can be placed on top of the machine can also be the key to controlling the texture, contour and resolution of the finished product.

The photocopier gives objects a sense of movement, a blurred and distorted sense of space, and gives more scope for the imagination. Next I consider continuing to develop about some of the illusions that photocopying 'fake and real' objects gives when they are photocopied. Are we seeing a real object? It could also be a fake one (e.g. there are many pears in a space, can the viewer identify the real one?) . Shouldn't it exist at a certain time, angle, or in a specific context? If I keep stacking layers on top of each other during the photocopying process, does it look like it's going to start growing, start mutating?