My photographic research inevitably is always about the comparison between man and landscape. In all my work I try to emphasize two main factors: empirical studies and imaginative skill. Every habitat in which man behaves inevitably becomes artificial. Bare lands are seen as areas to be conquered, principally for asserting one's economic and political power (redevelopment of the suburbs, public and private buildings, abusive election campaigns...are just some possible examples).

Looking at landscapes as a particular thing or as a sight means also that we share a close connection with a greater totality of symbols, in which we play a role. How much does nature act with a leading role or as a figurehead in the urban surroundings? In which proportion in our cities are there hedges, parks, gardens, flower boxes and pot holders, flower beds, tree-lined avenues, not to mention floral decoration fittings? And what about the relationship between man and nature? Has the power of nature been given to man or, instead, has it been subjugated by man?

We see more and more feeble and suffocating human settlements. It seems as if the "horror vacui" is filled up with the grey cement. Is man still able to relate to primeval and wild landscapes? Thanks to technology and to more in-depth studies people control and dominate nature. They don't care about the laws of earth, which are so different from the human laws in terms of spaces, means and times: they seems to be even indifferent. Which limits/boundaries must people consider today? More and more we aim to a relentless anthropic occupation and invasion of the soil (and not that one only). There is a progressive tolerance in this matter. Ugly things seem to become agreeable (impossible not to mention also "the big unfinished" works).

To make up for all this we need the cooperation and participation of various figures: photographers, architects, town planners, anthropologists, sociologists, geologists, historians, geographers. They should get together aiming at the same purpose, a common acting philosophy and awareness: the civil duty to save territory and people. With the digital revolution, which makes everything more automatic and intuitive and then more accessible and feasible, the role of a photographer is fundamental as regards the report between a snapped image and the evidence which it brings in the collective memory. A roomy and even a hard discussion can follow about the photographic credibility of that product, yet never forgetting that there are different versions of the same matter.

Photos give back effective truths just only for a minimum part of that they depict and the photographer provides only his own interpretation. Sometimes it is necessary for him to propose an imitation of imaginary worlds, that is new realities, in order to leave the audience in a situation of possibility and doubt. The final result should involve not only the sight, but all the five senses and trigger a very close net of links and emotions, revelations at times not so clearly understandable. The purpose in fact is to disquiet and disturb, but, at the same time, also to brighten up and reassure, through enchantment and attraction, the ones who are observing.

The individual must be able to feel himself an integral part of everything, so that the daily microcosm has to be cast on the timeless macrocosm. Little revelations can carry out great achievements.

www.mattiamorelli.com

mette mill