

RubyEye

in

Conversation

with

Janie

Trollope

THE TRANSCRIPT OF A BRIEF SKYPE INTERVIEW FOR RUBYEYE

Jorgan Ki (for RubyEye ): So, Janie, your current project, FRUIT. These are not paintings.

Janie Trollope: Ooops! No.

JK: I've seen your other work but these are computer art and so a wholly different media.

JT: Vector art is the category, I'm informed.

JK: What do you use?

JT: I use an ipad and draw with my finger. It's fast and fun.

JK: You like the speed of the computer?

JT: I discard a great deal, so it's not that fast.

JK: Have you seen Hockney's work created on ipad?

JT: I have. I saw it at The Mac in Belfast. I enjoyed it for the technique but it wasn't vivid enough for me. Hockney can be very vivid, he can smack you in the face with colour, but not for me that time.

JK: Vivid is certainly true of FRUIT. Was colour then what you most wanted people to see?

JT: I wanted to share what I sense when I see, touch, think of and eat fruit. Its production and its vitality and beauty and its aftermath. I used two colours in each representation and that was a challenge because through instinct I felt I could have used one colour or many colours. But I knew two colours would deliver what I wanted.

JK: OK it's fruit, but the images need interpretation. Some are quite obvious while some I don't quite understand. It's not always possible to see immediately what you represent. It might be ripeness, or the harvest, or a specific point of decay?

JT: It's obvious to me, Jorgan. I'm the wrong person to ask.

JK: Who shall I ask?

JT: Someone who's seen them.

JK: For example, one is a canvas of dots, most red, some black. I find the simplicity there rewarding and invigorating. I think these are blackberries among redberries. Or redberries where a few have perished.

JT: As long as it made you hungry.

JK: You created and then you burnt these images. Is that depriving people of seeing them?

JT: The originals, of course. But how often do people see original art?

JK: Very often.

JT: They don't. But burning is not something that needs justified. Some people hang their work in galleries and some people sell it. Some people stick it under the stairs and some people give it away. The video exists and the images are on it so the images do still exist.

JK: Did you burn them yourself?

JT: I was the priestess who torched the pyre.

JK: It was a sacred moment?

JT: Of course. I threw a piece of the sun at them. They shrivelled and dried as the sun would have done reclaiming them. They came from the sun and it took them back, by my hand. But because they are not here, they are more real.

JK: Can I probe a little?

JT: We'll see ...

JK: Is there any question that you entered into an act of self-mutilation when you torched your own work?

JT: Do I look mutilated to you? I ironed a blouse specially for this interview.

JK: No offence.

JT: People destroy all the time. Their creations, their bodies, their world and it's beauty, but in my case you're seeing the full cycle. Far more than simple destruction, it's the full replication of one cycle on God's Earth.

JK: I remember in a previous interview you told me you were an atheist.

JT: Don't get cute.

JK: Is Amanda Coogan still an influence?

JT: Amanda Coogan is physically near where I work, and emotionally and intellectually Amanda Coogan is near Marina Abramovic. Therefore I feel I am being fuelled by Marina Abramovic.

JK: Have you met or worked with Amanda?

JT: I spend a time studying her work, which is creation of a transitory nature, but yet something still exists. Mine's like that, particularly this time, so she's fed me. But no, I've never met her. We'd have nothing to talk about.

JK: Except art.

JT: You said it.

JK: Janie, I admire your art. Destroy some more of it for us soon.

JT: I have another pyre and on top is an art critic.

RubyEye