

ERTUĞ UÇAR You work with two-dimensional representations. For instance, for the series titled *Stasis* (2011), you built real models, played with their texture and then photographed them. The models are also very impressive. What is the difference between exhibiting the models themselves—for instance, the bicycle you froze—and their photographs?

KEREM OZAN BAYRAKTAR I am interested in constructing the photograph and a quasi-historicity rather than taking photographs. To exhibit the photographs rather than the models is like making sculptures only for their photograph to be taken. The main reason for taking photographs of the models was about time. Photograph is, in actual fact, a momentary section of a three-dimensional object, which changes constantly in space and presents different particles of data to us according to our reciprocal position. In my work, often there is the infinite suspension of a moment of change (in a representational sense). The other reason is that photography adds a further layer to the fact that models are mass-produced objects that are copies of copies—thus the problem of originality is completely eliminated. It is a bit like constantly covering up something with earth. Yet there is always some residue, or a trace.

EU I understand. Nevertheless, I was impressed when after having visited the exhibition I saw the photographs on your web site. It is precisely the matter of layers you mention. The making-of photographs helped me discover the historical layers of the single image at the end. But I must also add: For instance, after seeing the photograph of the frozen bicycle model, it is possible to get the wrong idea as to what it is and how it was produced. It is also possible for the viewers to debate whether it is a digital image, or a photograph. Therefore, as long as you do not provide information about the production process, that single image remains shrouded in a mystical aura. This is how your works form an atmosphere in the space. It is an impressive atmosphere.

The bed mattress is a departure point for you in this exhibition. It features scenes that are constructed on allusions and are open to many different readings. In my opinion, your works require more than the regular viewer participation. Is this an issue you take into consideration?

KOB A work can be read in countless different ways, depending on the period it is produced in. I find a viewpoint based on direct narrative quite problematic. We often confuse the field we are conducting readings in with the work itself. I think there isn't anything at all to be read or to be understood in art. Meaning should be derived not from what the signs represent, but from the work's principles of construction. And I don't think we need any information to do this. A thing is whatever it is. It is the relations between things that form art. The analysis of these relations, and to derive, if necessary, meaning from this, is often much more exciting for me than a direct, semiotic reading. To use the old term for it, my works are quite figurative. But I do not aim to illustrate a topic. In contrast, I aim to treat even the narrative itself as a single abstract element, and to form a language where only the relations are emphasized.



Ada / Island, 2013

Yüksek çözünürlüklü 3b bilgisayar animasyonu, duvara monte edilmiş 3 adet 42" LED ekran üzerine 1 dakikalık döngüler

High-Definition 3d computer animation on 3 42" LED screens mounted on wall, 1 min. loop