

Gemma Carbó

Good morning, and thank you very much. Let's continue. I'll be using two languages. I'll switch to Spanish later, but I wanted to begin this introduction in Catalan, as we had agreed.

For me, it is a pleasure to be here with two outstanding figures in what we might consider another language which, as Powell said at the beginning, can either break relationships or, on the contrary, make social relationships possible. So far, we have seen how urban planning and architecture can function as one of these languages. It has been a very inspiring conversation. But now we are moving on to a language that our young people probably know very well, one that surrounds us today, permeates our lives whether we like it or not, and is present everywhere around us — yet, unfortunately, perhaps still has too little presence when it comes to decoding this language within our educational systems.

We are talking about the language of screens, the language of images, which, as John Berger said, we probably learn long before we learn to read and write, and which shapes — and has shaped — our history as human beings in every possible way: from painting to the present day, with artificial intelligence.

It is a pleasure to be able to discuss this with two extraordinary people such as Joan Fontcuberta, an artist, photographer and one of the great experts in the language of images, winner of the Hasselblad Award for photography — essentially the Nobel Prize of photography. He enjoys enormous international recognition, but is especially well known here in Granollers, where he has his own space at Roca Umbert and has worked with many of the people here, both on artistic processes and creative projects.

And opposite him is someone who has been recovering and defending the slow, artistic, creative and contemplative language of photography: our colleague from Rosario, Argentina, Horacio Ríos, an audiovisual producer and director, and the founder and driving force behind a film festival in Rosario that has now been running for 31 years. He works every day with some of the most advanced aspects of audiovisual language in television, the media and artificial intelligence.

I think it is particularly interesting for those of you here today — and you surely have a great deal to contribute to this debate — to move beyond the perennial question of whether we are apocalyptic or integrated when it comes to these languages. We need to begin a more serious discussion about the real educational and creative power of images, their capacity to educate in the broadest sense, and how we might frame the debate so that it does not simply come down to deciding whether we should put screens in classrooms or take them out, but rather to learning how to read and write critically, creatively and imaginatively through these media.

And to begin, I think there is nothing better than giving them the floor directly and letting them open the debate with images, because that is what this is about now. I have asked them to start by telling us what they are currently working on, what projects they are involved in and how they are approaching them.

And I would like to begin with Joan, if that is all right, Horacio, by giving him the floor. Over to you, Joan.

Joan Fontcuberta

Hello, and very good morning.

I'll speak in Spanish to make the interaction with Horacio easier. We live in a world of images. We inhabit images, and we need to learn how to survive in them. In fact, much of what I do has to do with formulating a kind of survival kit for a world saturated with images, a world of mediation with reality. In other words, images no longer simply represent reality; they create another reality.

A large part of our experience takes place within that reality, on screens. We probably became fully aware of this during the pandemic, when those physical windows onto the world ceased to be openings in walls and became, precisely, the rectangles of our mobile phones, tablets and computers. Our work, our communication, our entertainment — everything took place through those digital windows.

For me, therefore, the image has become the substance, the very fabric of the world. And I would like to explain this very briefly through four images. Let's see if I can manage it.

We are celebrating the bicentenary of photography.

The first image that has survived to us was made by Niépce in late 1826 or early 1827. Historians cannot quite agree. This original piece, this incunabulum, is held in an American museum, the Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas in Austin.

A month ago I travelled through the United States for another reason, and I wanted to go there, almost as a pilgrimage, to pay tribute to this monumental form, to what might be called kilometre zero of our contemporary visual culture.

I visited the centre, and the first thing you discover is that, already in the museum lobby, there is a display case presenting this original that we can now see on the screen. Next to it is another display case containing one of the twenty original Gutenberg Bibles that survive.

Essentially, the visitor is being given a message: these are two beginnings that represent a qualitative leap in culture. On the one hand, the democratisation of reading; on the other, the democratisation of the image.

But when you confront this image, it is ultimately disappointing, even frustrating, because you cannot really see anything. In the end, you find yourself looking at yourself.

The image therefore functions as a metaphor for the fact that the first thing a photograph does is show us ourselves and demand an act of faith from us. We have to believe that on that surface there is something represented that we must somehow be able to discern.

And there is a second conclusion: it forces us to become aware of our own observing eye, in Lacanian terms, as a condition for being able to see external reality. I look through this image as if it were a screen, a window opening onto the world.

So, right there at the founding moment of the entire visual culture in which we are immersed today, we already find, in latent form, that seed, that promise that images would not simply be literal transcriptions of reality, but would require us to read, construct and interpret them.

And that is perhaps the subject we will be discussing today.

In 1927, a century after the birth of photography, one of the great professors at the Bauhaus uttered a lapidary statement: the illiterate people of the future would be those who did not know how to use photographic cameras.

We have reached that future and, essentially, perhaps we should reformulate the statement and say that the illiterate people of today — and especially those of the immediate future — will be those who do not know how to use algorithms.

Algorithms that will also produce images and turn the entire heritage of photographic visual culture into another form of heritage in which we will have to learn to navigate.

But this is the ghostly image one encounters when one really wants to acknowledge that what Niépce photographed was the view he had of the landscape from his window.

We want to believe that we can really see rooftops, a dovecote, the landscape of Burgundy. This was in Chalon-sur-Saône, in Burgundy, France.

In other words, that photograph which would unleash the visual tsunami in which we now live was actually an ambiguous, equivocal image, completely removed from what we would later understand as the photographic concept.

But all of this has generated a gigantic flow of images. We are immersed in this visual saturation, and perhaps what this saturation forces us to do is learn how to manage abundance intelligently.

This is a work that can be visited very close to here, at Roca Umbert Fàbrica de les Arts, here in Granollers, a centre dedicated precisely to image, culture and creativity, and a reference point for this area, the Vallès Oriental region.

In this case, and I would like to explain it before I finish, it represents the antithesis of that single image by Niépce.

So, what are we looking at? We are looking at the eye of the first baby born in Granollers in 2024, Martí.

It is an eye that we look at and that looks back at us. And when we observe it and move closer, we discover that it is made up of 7,000 photographs contributed by citizens of Granollers from their family albums.

They are photographs —portraits, selfies, but also images of places they love, places in Granollers with which the people who decided to participate in the project feel some kind of emotional connection.

All these images form a mosaic that we see from a distance, through a far-sighted gaze. We still see Martí's eye, but when we move closer, that texture appears, that social fabric of the mosaic.

The mosaic is a metaphor for society. Society contains a collective entity that needs a fabric, a texture of individuals, of citizens, each of them absolutely indispensable and important. As in a mosaic, every tessera, every image that makes up the overall grid, is essential in order to construct the whole.

This piece, made up of around 7,000 images, is for me a kind of counterpoint: the situation we find ourselves in today, and it also allows us to think about how an image is not only a language that enables us to talk about the world, but, in this particular case, an example of how it can create community.

The fact that all these people wanted to contribute to the project — in other words, the artist, myself, has simply been a catalyst, a conductor — means that the work belongs to everyone.

What it does is bring different experiences into relation with one another.

Each photograph carries a memory, an experience, a moment. And when we bring them together and place them side by side, we are ultimately also bringing experiences together, bringing lives together.

In some way, we create community through participation in a project that will remain permanently, like a kind of reset point in history. We will be able to return to this sort of open-air Facebook wall and say: “Look, this was the day of the Granollers Festival”, or “Look, this was my grandmother, who unfortunately is no longer with us”, or “Look...”.

And in this way, we connect, we merge, we feel that we are sharing experiences, sharing life, creating community.

I think the leap between that first image and this last one can be a good starting point for our dialogue with Horacio.

Gemma Carbó

This is the great power of artists: making simple something that we see as very complex. And I think it is a wonderful image with which to close what Powell was saying and what we were discussing earlier.

Horacio, where do we go from here today?

Horacio Ríos

Well, first of all, I would like to thank you for the invitation, express my admiration for Joan and thank you for moderating this discussion. You’ve been given a difficult task.

My case is quite particular. Audiovisual production is, in a sense, a continuation of many of our journeys through photography. And I think that, in the reality in which we live today, it is impossible not to talk about multiple screens and the multiplicity of uses that a still image can have: turning it into a moving image through its own soundtrack, through fragmentation, through editing.

Something very similar to this: moving from a complete image to fragments that generate identity, identification and all kinds of emotions.

I imagine that girl seeing herself and her dog twenty years from now, there, with her own family. I think that is very important.

I work for a public television channel, at a time when, in Argentina, I can assure you that public institutions are not having an easy time. There is a completely reduced state that has managed to fragment many things, but we depend on a provincial state with a very strong relationship with municipalities and the region. We are trying to fight that battle and build precisely this: identity, a sense of recognition in which people can see their own stories, while also introducing challenges through plurality, through the discussions that audiovisual media deserve today.

I have brought a short one-minute video that portrays the complexity of many Latin American countries through their own history.

The Republic of Argentina does not have a great deal of audiovisual heritage. There is somewhat more photographic heritage thanks to the graphic media that documented the twentieth century and the beginnings of the graphic press in Argentina, but beyond that, very little remains.

Not even one hundred hours of audiovisual material from the last 120 years have made it into the National General Archive of Argentina.

That cannot be.

It can.

Governments have never been particularly interested. Public television channels went through a privatisation process during the military dictatorship. Some archives were burned, others sold and others recycled.

When I say “burned”, I mean that one of the officials of the dictatorship thought it would be much better to collect the insurance money from the fire that destroyed the studios containing that material than to preserve it.

Rosario, my city, was not far removed from this problem. And we had a challenge: whenever we connected the educational sphere specifically with a channel that had an obligation to raise awareness about its own history, we had to recycle perhaps ten old photographs, create a contemporary narrative dynamic and give them movement using very simple systems, some of the earliest forms of artificial intelligence.

You will not see anything extraordinary, but you will see something that allowed children and young people in our city to recognise the places they walk through every day, using this movement applied to old photographs that were often in very poor condition.

Can we see the first video?

For reference, these are some of the city’s main landmarks: the cathedral, the most important square, the port...

We can already see the evolution from the horse-drawn carriage to another means of transport: the car appears.

This is the city’s most iconic shop, and when someone has to arrange to meet another person, they say, “I’ll meet you at La Favorita.”

This takes us into the 1960s, and here there is a little trick. We used artificial intelligence to cheat a little: the city has a drawing and animation school, whose professionals created intermediate images to reduce the differences in movement — very crude and violent differences — generated by artificial intelligence, making the final result much more credible.

In a school, a young child once asked what it was like to live in black and white. For him, it was a complete surprise. He said, “Well, poor people lived then; they lived in black and white, and you ask me what it was like.”

This is one of the examples I have brought with me. I am convinced that technologies and advances constantly pose new challenges, and that these challenges involve recycling the kind of responsibility we have as people who try to be storytellers and creators: finding our audiences and adapting to the times we live in.

Because of my age and the life I have led, I grew up inside a cinema and took part, during the 1980s, in the debate about the disappearance of cinema.

Then I took part in the debate about the disappearance of radio. Then the disappearance of video rental stores, where you went to pick up a film. Later, the debate about the disappearance of DVDs. And now we will probably be taking part in the debate about the disappearance of television.

All of this forces us to rethink how we create multiple screens and how we generate attraction around programmes that people are no longer watching in the traditional way.

Even you: most of the people here probably do not even have a television set to watch, but consume content through platforms.

And we have to use the possibilities that technology offers us today to segment and appropriate what we consider relevant, at whatever time we want and under whatever conditions we want.

Sometimes this forces us to go back because we have not seen something directly, because we have fallen asleep or because we have not even paid attention to what we were watching.

So we will continue discussing these challenges. I will try to exchange ideas. I think they are connected to the need to discuss the use of these possibilities both within formal education and within non-formal education.

Are they really useful tools when used in this way? Yes, of course they are.

In a little while we will see that some of these issues are somewhat more difficult to manage and also more dangerous, and they have to do with our level of tolerance. And I include myself, because I have already become quite nervous about this.

How long will we watch a platform? How long will we spend looking at our phones at a story within the various social possibilities we have for sharing other people's lives, our own lives, or even for getting information?

This vertigo has reached a point where we are beginning to debate something that we still do not fully know how to address.

Gemma Carbó

And it has a lot to do with what we were discussing just now. If we had a group of educators, teachers, professors, parents and others here who were opposed to these languages and these screens, how could we begin this debate, this conversation about how we can turn all of this around?

In other words, where is the educational power of the image?

And we should return to much of what we have been discussing: to time, to slower time, to the ability not to focus so much on technology, but on who is telling you what, from where, for what purpose and through which medium.

Asking ourselves these questions requires time. And I think that is precisely what the artist always does, isn't it?

How do you see it, Joan?

Joan Fontcuberta

We are in a situation where the image is no longer simply writing. For example, etymologically we know that photography means "writing with light", right?

We have moved from writing to language. In other words, today we all speak in images, and we do so naturally, without even realising it.

We learn to communicate through images, whether they are emojis or photographs we take and send to someone else. The content of that image is about saying something.

The receiver understands it: they read the image and react according to the information they receive.

So we have become — and I say this somewhat jokingly — *homo photographicus*. In other words, after *Homo sapiens* comes the stage of *homo photographicus*, the human being capable of simultaneously handling two forms of language: words and images.

This language of images is more overwhelming than language made of words because it arrived suddenly and without warning, and it caught us unprepared.

We consume more images than we are capable of reading critically. So we are facing a gap that needs to be addressed.

We therefore need a major effort from educational policy, teaching programmes and so on to integrate the image, not merely as those visual-art activities sometimes carried out in schools, but at the same level at which grammar, syntax, literature and so on are taught in formal curricula.

Very often, in certain school programmes, it seems sufficient for artists to come in and develop creativity. But, for me, that is only the first stone, the first step.

Images are dangerous and involve risks, whether we produce them optically, with cameras, or generate them through artificial intelligence and algorithms.

But every form of progress involves risks. Every advance in humanity entails losses and gains.

For example, I really like a phrase by Virilio, one of the great theorists of the last century, who said that every form of technological innovation contains an implicit negativity. He said: inventing the ship means inventing the shipwreck; inventing the train means inventing the derailment; inventing the aeroplane means inventing the plane crash.

There are always dangers. What we have to do is manage those dangers intelligently and minimise them as much as possible. In other words, make sure that the gains far outweigh what we are losing.

So, if I had to convince sceptical parents or teachers, I would tell them to become aware of the world they live in and of the fact that images are not simply things that shape minds.

Someone like Bill Gates once said that anyone who wanted to control people's minds had to control images. And then he bought the largest photographic agency in the world at the time.

Ultimately, then, this is not simply a question of expression or creativity: it is political.

Today wars are not won solely with tanks and missiles; they are won with images. Control of the narrative, control of the image, is what ultimately tips the balance.

So be careful: we are not making handicrafts. We are playing for our future, our democracies and our economies. And the image is part of all of this.

It seems to me that, with this argument, anyone who is even minimally responsible has to take into account the role that images play in our lives today.

Gemma Carbó

And how do we manage the risks, Horacio?

Horacio Ríos

I have a little experiment I would like to propose.

Audiovisual conception initially begins with framing. For those of you who are not photographers or specialists, framing is that small decision we make when we are about to take a photograph.

So I suggest that you take out your phone. If you do not participate, this will be very difficult. Please, take out your phone.

The young people are complaining that they were not allowed to bring theirs. Young people, take out your phones!

They did not let you come with phones? Very bad decision. This was a talk you were supposed to attend with your phones.

So we take out our phones and take whatever photograph we want. Let us see how our principle of framing works.

Have you taken the photograph?

I haven't.

Good.

Probably, if you look at the photograph taken by the person next to you, they will not have taken the same photograph. The principle of framing has worked. The decision about where to draw the boundaries of the image each person wants to present has worked perfectly.

Let's move on to another aspect of framing.

How many of you took the photograph horizontally?

And those of you who took it vertically, did you also record? No.

All of you who took it vertically and horizontally will probably end up with a publication in a Reel or in the Feed. We will record through Instagram. Is that all right?

The framing has done its job.

Now comes the writing part, as I was saying earlier. What are we going to say about this photograph?

Here is the second challenge: publish this photograph and write whatever you want.

But let me give you some advice. If you write: "A disappointing talk has taken place at the Congress, disappointing, about a major reality, with two disappointing panellists and a woman who has done everything possible to make this worthwhile", the algorithm will probably help us attract between 60 and 70% of followers we do not currently have, simply through controversy.

From there, Instagram's relationship with Facebook will mean that there will be comments not only on one network but also on Facebook.

With more than fifteen controversial comments, someone might say: “I know Joan, I’ve never understood anything he says”, or “Horacio is a liar”, and that will generate another series of comments.

And once those fifteen comments have been exceeded, the algorithm will begin generating another kind of response, with another kind of impact.

Remember that we started by talking about framing. We were talking about framing. Nobody will remember the framing. Probably nobody will even look at the photograph.

Some of you may have taken the trouble to make the edge look good, to have Joan on one side, me on the other, to show the scale of the room.

Others may simply write “Granollers”. Others will write “Granollers Congress”.

You will fail, forgive me. You will not get many views and it probably will not perform very well.

This is what we are experiencing today as a result of a principle as simple as the one that, long ago, when Zoom did not exist and there was nothing other than a device that allowed you to move a camera closer or further away, enabled us to approach the world.

That primary photograph was reality.

Joan Fontcuberta

But that was, above all, a belief.

It was an act of faith, wasn’t it?

Horacio Ríos

That is what cinema was.

Joan Fontcuberta

Yes, yes.

Horacio Ríos

The first film screening caused people — and the lower classes were seated upstairs — to jump. They were afraid that the train would actually come out of the station, that it was not simply an image projected onto a screen.

These developments mean that today...

How many of you do not have any kind of technology connected to your mobile phone? Raise your hand.

Wow! There are very few.

Joan Fontcuberta

Well, excuse me. You have said something that I think deserves further attention.

We often set reality against fiction. But, fundamentally, they are not opposites.

Language, words and images are fictions.

But they are fictions that allow us to talk about the world. So if fiction disappears, our point of access to reality, our bridge to it, disappears as well.

Therefore, what we need to do is not reject fiction because it deceives us, but manage it critically and use it as a mechanism for understanding the world.

We use fictions — cinema, photography, images, texts — to think about the world.

That is why I believe that, when it comes to images, we have to think about images and think with images.

We have to teach people to think about images and teach them to think with images.

Horacio Ríos

Exactly.

From a more apocalyptic perspective, I do not believe that we cannot extract something important and positive from any of these communication situations.

Basically because the pandemic taught us many terrible things, but it also put us to the test and showed whether we were capable of continuing to communicate and reflect some of what was happening to us.

And I think that sensitivity, creative thinking and expression, whatever form we choose to communicate through, will continue to depend on us.

That is why deciding when to use it and how to use it will obviously be related to the responsibility of the person using it and how it is used, but it is also connected to something interesting that already moves us away from an apocalyptic perspective and towards a much more positive reading: technologies have equalised the possibilities of communication for many people.

It used to be impossible for many of us to own a camera.

So this equality, this democratisation, this possibility of sharing, or simply picking up a phone right now and showing that perhaps mine is terrible and looks bad, but that I am very proud of having done this and shown my photograph to the person next to me... That did not exist before.

So we also have to try to make the most of it.

I think this is a language that we all have to adapt to, because today, when you talk to someone under seventeen...

I have a sixteen-year-old daughter and sometimes I ask her how she is doing when she is in another room.

Gemma Carbó

Yes, I think it has a lot to do with what we were discussing.

If we talk about risks, it has a lot to do precisely with what you were saying just now and with what Paola said at the beginning. In other words, in this reading of the image, in this visual literacy, in the democratic participation that these media make possible, we are all involved.

In other words, is this image really democratic? Are we seeing it from every possible perspective, from every place from which it can be viewed?

Because I think this is also where we are deciding whether these languages are really languages of *building*, rather than *breaking*, as we were discussing in relation to diversity of access and...

Joan Fontcuberta

You go first.

Horacio Ríos

No, no. I want him to explain something I read from him and which I found incredible. He talks about the process of post-photography, about a kind of photography that does not tell us everything, that does not necessarily contain the truth or the falsehood of the photograph.

Joan Fontcuberta

That is not exactly what I mean.

Look, when photography was born, that image by Niépce that I showed earlier embodied, essentially, an entire cultural, ideological and political heritage rooted in the Enlightenment, in the desire for empirical knowledge, rationality and so on. But above all, it was based on the technoscientific culture of the nineteenth century, the Industrial Revolution and so forth.

Photography then became a kind of orthopaedic system that allowed us to synthesise an idea of visual truth, to memorise and to archive.

Photography could represent a kind of visual encyclopaedia of the things in the world. In other words, it came to fulfil a whole series of functions.

But that happened in the nineteenth century and we are now in the twenty-first.

Does photography continue to fulfil the same functions?

Obviously not.

It has accompanied us for centuries and helped us solve many problems, but today our problems are different. We are living through globalisation, digitisation, artificial intelligence and so on.

What is the role today of what we have traditionally considered photography?

Obviously, it is metamorphosing, transforming and changing.

Let us remember that photography no longer maintains that commitment to truth which was its essence for so long.

Today all young people know that, with Instagram filters, Photoshop and so on, you can manipulate an image and it can still legitimately look photographic.

Memory.

In the family albums of previous generations, the family album was the *sancta sanctorum* of a family chronicle that explained the genealogy of several generations.

By contrast, that solemnity, that value we attached to those images, has completely disappeared.

Today we take a photograph, send it, and the person who receives it deletes it, destroys it.

Destroying a photographic image would once have been a sin, a sacrilege.

Photographs were sacred objects that had to be preserved.

There is a whole series of values that we have lost.

But what are we gaining?

We are gaining connectivity, communication.

Today, very often, photographs are not taken because of what they contain, but because of the very act of taking the photograph.

For example, I raise my camera at a concert and take a photograph. The photograph will probably be useless, but the act of the flash going off works in much the same way as when I was young: at a concert we would light a candle or use other forms of recognition and identification, to feel that we were part of a celebration.

In other words, the uses of images are changing.

We can say that the bodywork remains the same, but we are using completely different social functions.

For me, this is a post-photographic stage.

Photography is no longer limited to a few foundational values; it has to share this space with many other functions.

This richness leads us into a new stage in which images fulfil different requirements.

Horacio Ríos

It becomes much more complex when it turns into video.

In communication, for example, algorithms tell us that the first four seconds are crucial.

Four seconds.

When experiments began to measure how long a person needed, in the 1960s, at the Gestalt School, for the human eye to fully perceive an image, the measurements were between four and six seconds.

Today, sometimes we have to publish a news item and assess the impact of the first four seconds so as not to lose the viewer, because we have already lost them on television.

We have to move them to a computer or mobile phone in order to generate that tension.

And then the vertigo has reached a point where — and here I become a little more critical and also more concerned — everything starts from a comment related to a campaign that took place in my city.

Earlier I said that there is no audiovisual heritage.

At a certain point, the city began asking citizens to bring in film reels, Super 8, 16mm film, photographs, whatever they had, so that we could start recovering the city's past.

And weddings, fifteenth birthday celebrations, baptisms began to appear... We started gathering everything because it was the only way to see the past, even if only from an almost anthropological perspective.

How people dressed, what they did... Something.

Because there was nothing else.

And a city museum began collecting these photographs because they could otherwise be lost.

Joan Fontcuberta

But you are actually making a kind of prescription within the attention economy.

Exactly.

But then shouldn't we, especially when speaking to an audience of educators, prescribe a resistance to these techniques of seduction, to these techniques that work so well in advertising and propaganda?

If we are trying to educate responsible, critical citizens, we should teach them — in other words, turn the tables — to recognise the techniques being used to capture our attention and, in some way, make us more submissive.

Gemma Carbó

I'm sorry to interrupt you, but we have a schedule and we are running out of time. I would like to summarise some of what has been said.

It seems to me that, ultimately, we all agree that we need to understand that throughout history there have been many moments when it seemed that cinema, radio or television were going to disappear, and that has never really happened.

Perhaps photography will not disappear either. These different times and realities will always coexist. And this is perhaps the great opportunity: without giving up everything innovation can offer us, to continue defending and preserving, through resistance, spaces for analogue photography, reading novels and viewing historical documents.

Because that is also where the key to innovation, invention and the creation of new forms lies.

I have found this conversation wonderful. Thank you very much.

I would like to finish by giving each of you one final minute for a closing thought.

Horacio Ríos

I want to close with a video.

Starting with six thousand photographs, we thought about creating something that would attract attention. Because who would go to an exhibition of press photographs of a football player?

Perhaps many people, because that football player is Messi.

But who would go based on a static image?

That is why one of the things we did in the laboratory, in relation to the screens accompanying the photographic exhibition, was this video, which in some way portrays the coexistence of all these genres.

So, if we can see the video...

Gemma Carbó

You know that Sergio Lavert created a dance performance based on Messi.

Horacio Ríos

Yes.

It seemed to me like the right place to associate photography with all of this.

And we really must not lose it. I completely agree that the contrasts created by the market are what make artists much stronger.

The best photographs, for those of us who consume this kind of concept within an artistic exhibition, are the ones that break the axes, that move away from the points of attraction, that create imbalance through light.

And I think that depends on us.

It will continue to depend on us.

Joan Fontcuberta

As an epilogue, while preparing what I would have liked to say, I came across a quotation from a French writer and essayist called Marco Olivier Caffier which, I think, perfectly sums up what I wanted to explain about images, while transferring it to a much broader context.

I'll read it exactly as I have it. I have it in Catalan.

“Every awakened consciousness remains a victory over darkness. Every reader who rejects immediate certainties. Every teacher who passes on a taste for doubt. Every citizen who takes the necessary time to understand before reacting takes part in this slow inner conquest we call freedom. Because true freedom is not the absence of restrictions. It is the ability to see clearly, to distinguish reality from stage scenery. Truth from noise. Knowledge from illusion. And perhaps this is the essential struggle of our century: learning to relight streetlamps in a world saturated with artificial light.”