

## **What**

My aim is to make a short film located in Rotterdam. In the winter break I went to Schiermonnikoog. After I shot several images on Schiermonnikoog with my girlfriend and myself as actors, I started editing these shots without the sense of a clear narrative. However the edit created from these shots began to develop into a ghost narrative of two lovers hunting each other. My plan now is to re-shoot the basic narrative of this film, but then located in a city environment. My working methodology with regard to cinematography will be similar as used on the island, however now I would like to work with dancers as actors. Together with the dancers I hope to expand the narrative and I expect their input to help me on a more direct interaction between the two main characters. The city of Rotterdam will play an active roll in the story, because the main characters will be alienated in a big city by the use of cinematography. The cinematography in this city décor thus emphasizes the fact that they only have each other in a seeming less deserted city.

## **How**

### **Working methodology**

To gain a better insight in my own motivations, I started to analyse my own work. After analysing a selection of 127 of my own photos I found the following facets as a lead pattern in my work:

#### **Depersonalisation:**

In the majority of the photos which entail people, the people are depersonalised. In most photos the people in the photo are framed in such a way that they are singled out from their environment, which makes the subject look alienated. Another important aspect is that, for the viewer, there is almost no facial recognition possible with the people in the photos. I distinguish three forms where there is hardly any facial recognition possible at all; the people in the photos stand with their back towards the lens, they are too far away from the lens for the viewer to see their faces or their faces are out of focus. This creates an image which feels more like a reference of a human being than as a portrait of a person. Because of this depersonalised facet, the people photographed, become unreachable. The photographer, me, can only observe them from a distance, but is not able to make contact with them.

There are situations when there are two people singled out of their environment. Although it is clear that they have a relationship and therefore appear less alienated than a single person singled out does, they still appear as depersonalised

figures. In the 127 photos, six obvious couples are to be distinguished. In the six photos the viewer sees four of the couples on the back (Image 1-4), one couple on the side (Image 5) and one couple in front (Image 6). Even in the photo of the couple seen from front, the viewer cannot see their faces. This is because the sun behind the duo casts a shadow over the identity of the persons photographed. The role of light and the position of the source of light is important in all my photographs. In five out of six couple photos, the source of light is behind the couples and in the one where there is also a source of light between the couple and the lens, the source of light behind the couple is the most important for the photo. Light travelling to the lens of my camera is thus interrupted by depersonalised couples. Even if they form a clear entity together, the light creates impersonal shadows out of them.

The role of light:

I am enormously interested in the journey of light from its source towards my lens. When there is no strong source of light, say for instance on a cloudy day, I hardly make any photographs at all. When there is a strong source of light I nearly always shoot directly towards the source of light. However there always has to be something breaking the journey of the light towards my lens, because the objects (a person or a tree) that break the journey of the light make the journey worthwhile. The light behind the object creates a stage for the object, but the object also creates a stage for the light. This is evident with people photographed on the back. Because the source of light is almost always behind the people photographed, the people photographed on the back immediately obtain an aura of self-determinism. They look like people who choose their own path with confidence. It is as if the lens serves as a guide to point into the right direction and the source of light attracts the people. The photos of people who walk towards or who look in the direction of the camera, walk or look towards an empty world. As if there is nothing behind the camera. The people seen on the back walk towards the light, towards a better future.

Objects:

Besides people being singled out in many of my photos, there is also an amount of singled out objects to be distinguished. Most of the time, this object is a lamppost. In these photos the lens is pointed from the bottom of the lamppost upwards directly towards the light of the lamppost. In the background we see the sky or a tree around the lamppost, but we do not see other lampposts or other sources of light. This gives the objects shot a strong form of autonomy, yet simultaneously a feeling of alienation. They are strong enough to survive on their own, but they are not part of the rest of the world.

When I make a photo where there is both a singled out object and a depersonalised person in the frame, the person becomes as autonomic and as alienated as the object.

The photos on the escalators are a good example of this. One is shot in the subway of NY (Image 7), the other in Utrecht Central Station (Image 8). Both photos are forthwith framed in the same way, shot from the top of the escalator the lens pointing downwards and shot from the centre which makes the space is symmetrical. The way of framing turns both spaces into a closed space, only available to the object, the person and the photographer. It is like the person is been captivated for a moment by me in that space. The one in NY, we see him on the back, the one in Utrecht we see him on front, yet we cannot see his face. They are impersonal bodies, trapped in a closed space that is just as autonomic and alienated as they are.

#### The Moment:

I have a great desire to become a part of the moments I photograph. However I can only function as a distant observant, instead as a participant. I am conscious of this and therefore I hardly come close enough to capture an image of a sharp face, and if I do come close enough I make sure there is a strong source of light behind the person which makes his/her face ambiguous. The distance of the photographer with the subject enables the viewer to observe the moment of someone else without intruding. That is why in so many photos people are seen on the back; the photographer can only capture their moment, walk behind them in their road towards the future and can never become an active participant. The light behind the people creates a special atmosphere around the moment, as if it amplifies the importance of the moment. The framing, the source of light all create something extra, as if the photographer is present of a turning point of his subject without interrupting.

#### Conclusion:

The light that shines from the sun or lamppost can be seen as a spotlight for the people or object to make their moment seen by the world, yet the people or object are also a stage for the source of light, because they break the journey towards the lens. The use of light by me changes the person or object from an unseen person to a reference of a human being captured in, which seems, an imported moment of their life; the light creates depersonalised figures in a phantasm environment or creates shadows in an alienated space out of them. However the role of light is ambivalent, because although light presents the people a stage to be seen by the world, light also makes them depersonalised. The photographer of these images, me, can only be a distant observer of people who I have no facial recognition of, I can never become an active participant of the world of my subject. I can only capture as a

depersonalised subject in a closed alienated space.

### **Connection with previous practice**

When I made the above analysis of my own work, it was at the end of my week vacation on Schiermonnikoog. The first two days my girlfriend was with me and we shot the short film, with ourselves as only actors in the film. After writing the above mentioned analysis, I realised that all these aspects present in my photography, are present in this film. Most of the shots made of my girlfriend are of her back (Image 9), and the ones that our in front, I use light in a way that you cannot see her face clearly. The role of light is again very important, it makes the main character depersonalised and unclear to the audience, the light is most of the time behind the actor and the lens points directly towards it (Image 10-11). The framing creates an autonomic, alienated person out of my main character. Thus I believe that these trademarks I got are part of my instinct as a photographer and as a filmmaker, I will always use this, and thus this will also be my approach in my project. I also noticed that going out shooting without preparation feels liberating to me. I always find interesting images, yet now I need to connect a small story line to it and go out and shoot.

### **Why**

#### **Annotation; relation to project.**

Tarkovsky's Solaris is an important inspiration for this project. What I find intriguing about his Solaris is the calmness in the relationship between Kelvin and Hari. There seems not to be any urgency in their acts. Kelvin seems unable to become upset about seeing his wife again who killed herself because he left her, maybe because he suffered so much he has lost all emotions. However deep down as a viewer you sense the awareness within Kevin that he has to make a decision if he is going to erase her for good or not? There is one conversation that stands out for me. Hari asks Kelvin when they speak about her suicide: 'Did you think about me?' He replies: 'Yeah, but not always.' I find this intriguing because normally when people ask someone who mourns a loved one they want him to stop thinking about him/her all the time. But when you are directly confronted with the one you mourned for you would be eager to say that you thought about him/her all the time. Thus I find this nuance in Kelvin' sentence interesting.

I think the scenery in Tarkovsky's Solaris for the effect of alienation works better than in Sodenberghs Solaris, because the form of the spaceship is round opposed to the stretched out one in Sodenberghs. This circle form creates a form of repetition and stagnation. It feels as if they don't progress at all on this ship. This makes their feeling of being

captivated in a repetitive relationship with no solution stronger. As I plan to do with the city décor of Rotterdam. By framing my characters as singled out from the other citizens but in a city décor will create an alienated effect.

Steven Soderbergh's *Solaris* is interesting in its more in depth experience of the interaction between Kelvin and Rheya. Their relationship is much more intense, Kelvin seems to fall in love again with her, while in Tarkovsky's *Solaris*, Kelvin seems to immediately understand that erasing her is inevitable. By re-falling in love with Rheya, Kelvin allows his own earthly rationale to be replaced with a new *Solaris* rationale. This is extremely interesting for my project, because my main character has to be convinced that there lies a certain life form in the character he is chasing. We also see scenes from the past of how their relationship on earth was. This sketches a better image of how their relationship evolved, yet it also makes it a bit too explanatory which I don't find completely necessary.

The relationship of my characters in the *Schiermonnikoog* film is similar to that of the relationship of Kelvin and Hari. The woman in the red jacket has committed suicide, and the boy is confronted with her in a different reality. Although there are several differences in my film. In my film it's not clear if her presence he is confronted with is a reflection of his own imagination, or she is a new version of her, or if this is his new reality. In the *Solaris* films she committed suicide, because he left her. In my film the girl committed suicide, because she felt she did not live up to the expectations of her outside world, yet this thought was constructed in her own head. Thus the reason for suicide is not because someone inflicted something bad upon her, but she feels that she inflicts harm upon her beloved ones. The boy in the film wants to be with her, to tell her there is no need to feel sorry forever. She is unreachable to him, which is evident in the fact that he can only see her on the back, because she is not able to accept the fact yet that people are not mad at her and that this thought is created in her own mind. In his search to see her face, he finally meets her on the beach, where they reconcile.

The book *Impro* by Keith Johnstone has been an eye-opener. The book focuses mainly on improvisational theatre, but the content spreads across wider areas as social behaviour, science, education and anthropology. He discusses four topics: statuses, spontaneity, narrative skills and masks and trance. In all four chapters he presents a new perspective on these subjects. He is convinced that our educational systems suppresses our fantasy and creativity, he also believes that everybody is able to come up with a story, he tells about

tests that he did with people and they all could tell a story as long as they were convinced they were not responsible for it. He sees the world as a constant display of status power. He believes that actors only have to know their status in a way to create theatre. This is very helpful for me, because in the book he describes how different statuses and status changes is all we need for drama. Thus if I can work with actors/dancers and understand what their status is in relation to each other and where/when this changes than I can create drama, even without dialogue. The book has presented me a different perspective on how to create drama, in working with actors, but also in working with narrative.

*The Catcher in the Rye* is an important book for me. The endless stroll through New York of main character Holden is very recognisable to me. He distances himself from his direct surrounding and has problems to relate to anyone, besides to people who are far away (sister Phoebe who is at his parents house which he can't visit). By distancing himself from his direct surrounding he alienates himself in big city. New York becomes the personification of all his problems. The phoniness of the people, their concerns with their statuses and their concerns about how one should act. I hope to portray a similar form of alienation in a big city in my film. Except in my film they are alienated by the way of framing and by the fact no other recognisable figures will appear on screen. Rotterdam will serve the same function as New York in the book does. Cold, disharmonic, desolated and filled with emptiness.

In his essay *The Thing from Inner Space*, Žižek analysis several Tarkovsky's films, among others *Solaris*. There is one passage I find particularly interesting:

'One is even tempted here to formulate this Tarkovskian logic of the meaningless sacrifice in the terms of a Heideggerian inversion: the ultimate Meaning of sacrifice is the sacrifice of Meaning itself. The crucial point here is that the object sacrificed (burned) at the end of *Sacrifice* is the ultimate object of Tarkovskian fantasmatic space, the wooden dacha standing for the safety and the authentic rural roots of the Home [...] Does this mean that we encounter here nonetheless a kind of Tarkovskian "traversing of the fantasy", the renunciation to the central element whose magic appearance in the midst of the strange countryside at the end of *Solaris* and *Nostalgia* provided the very formula of the final fantasmatic unity? No, because this renunciation is functionalized in the service of the big Other, as the redemptive act destined to restore spiritual Meaning to Life.'

As I understand the above written quote is that Tarkovsky's main characters end up sacrificing their most treasured

Object; the Object that serves as a base for security, love and harmony. By sacrificing this Object to the big Other, this sacrifice becomes the ultimate sacrifice to the big Other enabling the big Other to allow everyone else to keep their most treasured Objects, in a way to allow the world to keep spinning. I find this analysis from Zizek very interesting because when I analyse my Schiermonnikoog film, there is no sacrifice for the boy. He finally finds her and is allowed to be with her again without losing her again. If their meeting would have happened earlier in the film, there would be room for him losing her again and there would be room for him to make a resolute decision of forgetting her/letting her go (sacrifice, as happens in Tarkovsky's Solaris) or to pursue in a new reality to stay together (as happens in Sodenberghs Solaris).

## **Bibliography**

### Literature

- Johnstone, K. *Impro. Improvisation and Theatre*, 1979.
- Salinger, J.D. *The Catcher in the Rye*, 1951.
- Zizek, S. *The Thing from Inner Space*, 1991.

### Film

- Sodenbergh, S. *Solaris*, 2002.
- Tarkovsky, A. *Solaris*, 1972.

## **Images**

The images are to be found in the previous pdf. They remain in the wright order, because the working methodology as mentioned above is directly copied and paste from the previous file.