“PHOTOGRAPHY INTO SCULPTURE”: PETER BUNNELL, ROBERT HEINECKEN AND EXPERIMENTAL FORMS OF PHOTOGRAPHY CIRCA 1970

by

Mary Kathryn Statzer

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

SCHOOL OF ART

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
WITH A MAJOR IN HISTORY AND THEORY OF ART

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2015

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Dissertation Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation prepared by Mary Statzer, titled *Photography into Sculpture*: Peter Bunnell, Robert Heinecken and Experimental Forms of Photography circa 1970 and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____Date: April 1, 2015
Sarah Moore

_____Date: April 1, 2015
Kate Palmer Albers

_____Date: April 1, 2015
Larry Busbea

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copies of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

_____ Date: April 1, 2015
Dissertation Director: Sarah Moore

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

SIGNED: Mary Kathryn Statzer

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many people to thank for the help and support that enabled me to complete my graduate studies and this dissertation.

The staff of the Center for Creative Photography's Laura Volkerding Study Center has been indispensible to my work. Leslie Squyres, David Benjamin, Krista Niles and James Uhrig made it all happen. University of Arizona librarian Paula Wolfe was especially supportive early on, putting in my hands small catalogues and journals from the 1960s and 70s that fed my growing interests. I am grateful to the staff of the Museum of Modern Art and its Archives as well as Drew Sawyer, the Beaumont and Nancy Newhall Curatorial Fellow, who facilitated my research there. Thanks also go to Eva Respini at MoMA who included me in their Heinecken Scholars Day in 2013, which shaped my thoughts about Robert Heinecken.

My heartfelt appreciation goes out to my committee: Sarah Moore, Kate Palmer Albers, and Larry Busbea. Britt Salvesen, Douglas Nickel and William Jenkins were also committee members over the years. A special note of appreciation goes to Kate, Britt, and Doug for reading early drafts and offering astute comments that advanced my ideas.

So many good friends and capable colleagues made this long process possible and bearable. Thank you to Emily Morgan, Sherry Harlacher, Deborah Sussman, Becky Senf, Shana Lopes, and Judy Zuber, who were always willing to listen, encourage, and advise. Particular thanks go to Erin O'Toole, who helped me to keep the big picture in mind and acted as my writing coach and editor on numerous occasions; Daphne Srinivasan, who listened to ideas whether half baked or fully formed, and made my countless research trips to Tucson fun and relaxing; Philip Martin, whose enthusiasm for the material and insight resulted in thought provoking conversations; and Beverly Adams, who offered invaluable critiques of my work and would never let me think of quitting. I am grateful to all of you for keeping me going and seeing me through to the end.

Peter Bunnell was a constant source of inspiration, not only his exhibition, *Photography into Sculpture,* which is at the core of my work, but also the prime example he provides as a photo historian. I also thank him for graciously sitting through interviews, reading early drafts of my texts, and providing me with the crucial mantra: "Don't forget that there is a dissertation in there. Whatever you do, finish it." The artists were also patient and generous during the interview process. Our conversations were delightful and gave my work momentum when I needed it most.

I want to thank my family, whose support never wavered and who were always happy to celebrate small victories along the way: my mom and dad, Lynn and Neil Statzer; my sister Misty McGlynn and her family Tim, Andy, and Kate; Zach Kadish; Maria Dawson; as well as Wendy, Tom, Aiden and Noah Grace.

I never would have started or finished this endeavor without the unerring love and encouragement of my husband Gene Kadish, to whom this dissertation is dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

Despite present day attitudes and practices in which combinations of photography and other mediums of art are readily accepted, this was rarely the case during the 1960s and 1970s. The pioneering 1970 Museum of Modern Art exhibition *Photography into Sculpture*, which is the focus of this dissertation, is a compelling exception. Organized by Peter Bunnell, the exhibition highlighted work by twenty-three artists that mixed photographic imagery with three-dimensional forms. The resulting objects often dislocated "straight" photography's reliance on the image and optical description as its primary source of meaning, characteristics presumed to be fundamental and fixed by many at the time. Bunnell argued that the physicality of the works in *Photography into Sculpture* made the medium visible and available for critique. This dissertation establishes the archival record and an oral history for the exhibition. It also finds that Bunnell prepared this unorthodox exhibition with John Szarkowski's endorsement, therefore contradicting enduring views that Szarkowski's photography program at the Modern promoted a monolithic ideology that did not include experimental modes.

Peter Bunnell and Robert Heinecken are the principal figures in *Photography into Sculpture.* Bunnell, as curator and historian, and Heinecken, as artist and professor of photography at University of California, Los Angeles, were both committed to the idea that the photograph was not only an image but also an object. In public statements they argued that the attention placed on straight photography by many critics and educators discouraged experimentation and excluded an emerging generation of photographers eager to challenge lingering modernist traditions that emphasized the integrity of the

image and conventions of display. Both men and their contemporary Nathan Lyons worked from within photography's established institutions and organizations – including the Museum of Modern Art, George Eastman House, and The Society for Photographic Education – to advocate for alternatives. This dissertation demonstrates that the revolutionary ideas of Bunnell and Heinecken were part of a long rebellion against photographic modernism.

INTRODUCTION TO PART I

Prior to beginning my current research, Ed Ruscha's photography books *Twentysix Gasoline Stations* and *Every Building on the Sunset Strip* were a primary interest of mine. I was attracted to the rebellious nature of these objects. Ruscha's photo books took aim at traditional barriers between mediums as well as high and low forms, and at the same time offered a pointed attack on traditional modes of museum display. I quickly came to realize that Ruscha and artists like Robert Rauschenberg and Andy Warhol – who were using photography in combination with other mediums of art – not only repositioned painting and sculpture but also art photography. As my research continued, I began to wonder: Did photographers instigate their own rebellions? And, if they did, who and what were they rebelling against?

In my reading about 1960s and 1970s American photography, I continually encountered references to *Photography into Sculpture* – an exhibition of three-dimensional photographic objects organized by Peter Bunnell in 1970 at the Museum of Modern Art in New York. Photo historians Robert Hirsch and Charles Desmarais acknowledged the exhibition in their essays and books published in the 1990s and 2000s. I found Bunnell's contemporaneous writing about the exhibition in his 1993 anthology, *Degrees of Guidance: Essays on Twentieth-Century American Photography*. Bunnell also published a short essay describing his trip to Los Angeles to conduct research and select work for *Photography into Sculpture* in the 2006 exhibition catalogue for *The Collectible Moment: The Photography Collection of the Norton Simon Museum*.

I soon unearthed two reviews of *Photography into Sculpture* in the *New York Times* – one penned by the curmudgeonly Hilton Kramer, who panned the work as well as the exhibition, and a favorable one by the photography critic A.D. Coleman titled, "*Photography into Sculpture:* Sheer Anarchy, or a Step Forward?" Coleman's review, which can be found in his anthology *Light Readings: A Photography Critic's Writings 1968-1978*, marks a series of essays in which he pitted Bunnell's interest in mixed medium and other experimental photography against Szarkowski's "exceedingly narrow and limited [aesthetic]… restricted almost entirely to the documentary genre."[1]

Notably, *Photography into Sculpture* was mentioned in a footnote in Christopher Phillips's important essay, "The Judgment Seat of Photography," first published in the art and theory journal *October* in 1982, and then in Richard Bolton's *The Contest of Meaning: Critical Histories of Photography* in 1989. In only a few sentences, Phillips positioned Bunnell's curatorial efforts as a counterpoint to those of his boss, John Szarkowski, the legendary director of MoMA's photography department from 1962-1991. For those who are concerned with photography's historiography, "The Judgment Seat of Photography" is a benchmark. Philips and other scholars including Abigail Solomon Godeau, Rosalind Krauss, and Allan Sekula, offered much-needed, highly critical assessments of Szarkowski's formalism. I contend, however, that a critical reading of Philips's thirty-three-year-old essay is itself overdue as is acceptance of the idea that MoMA's photography program put forth a monolithic ideology.

---

[1] A.D. Coleman, "Photography: Recent Acquisitions," in *Light Readings: A Photography Critic's Writings 1968-1978* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 159. For similar commentary on Bunnell in relationship to Szarkowski at MoMA, see also, "Peter Bunnell: Money, Space, and Time, or the Curator as Juggler," 63; and, "Who Will Be the Replacements," 103.

As a counter to accepted views of Szarkowski's program at MoMA, my dissertation finds Szarkowski to be more broad-minded than Philips, Coleman, and other critics allow. Szarkowski's view of the medium was neither pure nor limited to the straight aesthetic. Key to illustrating this point is the focus of my dissertation: Bunnell's *Photography into Sculpture*. Szarkowski approved and heartily supported Bunnell's exhibition. The two curators were not in conflict. While both identified characteristics of photography, neither curator's medium specific formulations were intended to promote purity or dictate the kinds of photographs that should or should not be made. Rather, their combined efforts at MoMA in the 1960s and 1970s offered multiple views of photography, then an under-theorized medium of art. My assessment concludes that MoMA's photography department of this period should be thought of as a laboratory where Szarkowski performed experiments on straight photography while Bunnell investigated both straight and experimental modes.

My larger goal here is to demonstrate that practitioners of photography *did* instigate their own rebellions, that photographers and photo curators posed challenges to photographic modernism and "straight" photography during the 1960s and 1970s. Bunnell's *Photography into Sculpture* was indeed a rebellion as will be described at length in the following chapters. However, his was not a fight against John Szarkowski. Rather, it was a multi-level assault on the traditional constraints placed on photography as a medium of art.

On April 8, 1970, *Photography into Sculpture* was opened. Bunnell's wall text described the exhibition as "the first comprehensive survey of photographically formed images used in a sculptural or fully dimensional manner."[2] Bunnell brought together fifty-two works by twenty-three artists from across the United States and Vancouver, BC. More than half of the artists were from the West Coast, and the majority of them were between the ages of twenty-two and thirty-five. The objects in *Photography into Sculpture* were made out of all kinds of materials including photo paper, film (both positive and negative), glass and linen coated with light-sensitive emulsion, plastics, Astroturf, wood, pigment, and more. Manipulated in a wide variety of ways that included screen printing and vacuum forming, these objects occupied actual space.

These photographic objects stood in contrast to straight photographs, the dominant mode of art photography at the time. An example would be Garry Winogrand's *Los Angeles* (1964), in which an expressionless couple passes by in an open convertible. The man, sporting a white bandage on his swollen nose, looks out in the general direction of the camera. Straight photographs are two-dimensional, black and white, and unmanipulated. They picture something in the world. The image is, quite logically, of prime importance. Thousands of photographs fit this general description and that was part of Bunnell's point: to rethink long-held notions of what the majority of photographers were while proposing alternatives to what they could be. In the 1960s, most people simply looked past the medium. One could even say that to the vast majority of viewers, the medium of photography was invisible. The physicality of the works in *Photography into Sculpture*,

[2] *Photography into Sculpture* wall text. Curatorial exhibition files, exh. #925. Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

argued Bunnell, made the medium visible and therefore available for critique. It challenged presumptions about scale, materials, the use of color, and, importantly, optical description.

Photography into Sculpture was installed in the same first-floor galleries in which John Szarkowski had presented the work of Garry Winogrand alongside Diane Arbus and Lee Friedlander in the celebrated 1967 exhibition, *New Documents*. Michael de Courcy, an artist from Vancouver, who was included in *Photography into Sculpture*, drew on top of an installation photograph of *New Documents* in order to show Bunnell where he planned to place his proposed installation piece – a stack of cardboard boxes screen printed with images referencing the elements. For me, the drawing came to symbolize the collision of straight and three-dimensional photography in the 1960s and 1970s: de Courcy's drawing symbolizing a hand-made alternative that sat on top of straight photography somewhat aggressively, but would not be fully integrated. In other words, the two did not coexist easily.

While it is unlikely that Bunnell or de Courcy thought of his diagram in this way, it drives home the differences found in photographic objects and their presentation. For example, several of the works, like de Courcy's, far exceeded standard print sizes and involved the added element of audience participation, as the artist had requested that random people install the boxes according to their own preferences. Robert Heinecken's *24 Figure Blocks* similarly engaged the viewer, who was meant to arrange the pieces in whatever configuration they wished. Both artists courted chance operations while also

challenging ideas about the whole or intact photographic image and museum protocol that prohibits the touching of objects on view.

It is difficult to fathom that color photography was not yet considered art in 1970 but the prevalence of color in *Photography into Sculpture* was in fact a rebellion against convention, as well. Sometimes the sculptural materials added color. For example, the artificially green Astroturf used in Ellen Brooks's *Flats: One through Five* plays against the realism of the naked bodies printed on photo sensitized linen, drawing attention to the fact that black and white photography was undeniably artificial and interpretive because it rendered the world absent of color. Other artists like Michael Stone applied pigment to black and white photographs to heighten an emotional or psychological aspect of the work – breaking with conventions concerning color and hand manipulation of photographic source material. In Stone's *Channel 5 News KTLA Los Angeles, California USA*, Tom Reddin, the former LA police chief turned newscaster is satirized by the use of garish, unnatural color. His likeness was then packaged, sealed, and metaphorically offered for sale on a dime store display rack constructed by the artist.

Plexiglas and other plastics were dominant materials in *Photography into Sculpture* whether integrated into the construction of the work or used in the many vitrines that protected small and fragile works. In a wall piece titled *Hill,* the collaborative team Robert E. Brown and James Pennuto transformed the source material – a gelatin silver print taken by Brown, which was a subtle black and white study of allover texture that flattened the picture plane – into a clay-colored, plastic mound. Ted Victoria's *Untitled* is

a *camera obscura* – a precursor to the modern camera – made out of opaque black plastic. Aimed at MoMA's sculpture courtyard, it projected inverted images of traditional sculptures onto the inside of Victoria's sleek box, deftly flattening and miniaturizing, in a sense capturing and containing time-honored three-dimensional art with a simple lens-based apparatus. Victoria transformed the physical mass and material form of sculpture, e.g. bronze and stone, into an image consisting only of light.

Positive sheet film like Kodak's "Kodalith" and pre-coated photo linen were recent photographic innovations that proved essential to this group. Several artists including Robert Heinecken, Giuseppe Pirone, and Michael Stone created multiple images on sheets of positive film and sandwiched them between Plexiglas to form a single complex image. Many of these works had built-in light sources or were installed in illuminated cases, including Douglas Prince's surreal box constructions, emphasizing their ephemeral transparency. Conversely, Lynton Wells created a bulky, life-sized figure on photo linen with hand colored additions, combining photographic portraiture with the scale and color of painting in a three-dimensional soft-sculpture reminiscent of Claes Oldenberg.

In contrast with typical photography exhibitions, not a single work in *Photography into Sculpture* required framing and few pieces were hung in a straight line at eye level – a modernist convention. The prior examples allude to the radicality of *Photography into Sculpture*, which not only challenged photographic conventions of display but also placed new demands on viewers.

Bunnell wrote little about subject matter in *Photography into Sculpture* and instead offered this statement in the official press release: "Along with artists of every persuasion, these photographer/sculptors are seeking a new intricacy of meaning analogous to the complexity of our senses. They are moving from internal meaning or iconography – of sex, the environment, war – to a visual duality in which materials are also incorporated as content and at the same time are used as a way of conceiving actual space." [3]

Statements like these allude to the meaning and significance of *Photography into Sculpture* but still remain cryptic. One of my goals in the dissertation is to articulate more clearly the challenges this exhibition presented. For example, Ellen Brooks's *Flats: One through Five* pictured a nude couple having sex on the lawn that referenced the sexual revolution. While Bunnell was interested in how the work connected to the dynamic climate of cultural, social, and political change in the 1960s, statements like the one in the previous paragraph belie his greater concerns. Rather than challenging conventions of taste and pushing the boundaries of subject matter, photo sculptures proposed a new kind of photographic object where the locus of meaning was not the whole, uninterrupted image but rather the interplay between the image, the materials, and the sculptural form. Spatial concerns were no longer limited to illusion and perspectival depictions of the world but also involved the real space taken up by the photographic object. The combination of photography and sculpture dislocated straight photography's reliance on

[3] *Photography into Sculpture* press release, no. 36, April 8, 1970. Curatorial exhibition files, exh. #925. Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

optical description as its primary source of meaning, a characteristic of the medium presumed by many to be fundamental and fixed.

Moreover, Bunnell included in the exhibition artists who self-identified as photographers and some who did not. Who was using photography and how, was a contentious issue at the time among those committed to making traditional photographs. The exhibition therefore questioned the foundations of the medium asking: Who is a photographer? What is a photograph? And how do photographs convey meaning?

Photography into Sculpture was seen by MoMA's sizable audience, as well as hundreds of museum visitors across the US and Vancouver, BC during its extensive eight-city tour. While critical reviews of the exhibition were mixed, it received a generous amount of media attention during its two-year run. In spite of its extensive exposure, *Photography into Sculpture* did not seem to instigate a trend or stimulate widespread critical thinking among photographers along these same lines. Bunnell lamented this fact. During a lecture at the University of Arizona's Center for Creative Photography in 1979, he expressed his disappointment in the exhibition, saying: "When I look back, the sad thing… is that nothing happened."[4] Perhaps Bunnell wasn't looking at the impact with enough time and distance, because a great deal did, in fact, change in the following decades. The questioning that coincided with this exhibition, in arguably the most important art institution in the US, *did* bring to light the beginnings of a slow rebellion in photography by practitioners like Robert Heinecken.

---

[4] Peter Bunnell lecture, "The Will to Style: Observations on Aspects of Contemporary Photography," February 1979, Oral History Collection, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson.

Heinecken figures prominently in *Photography into Sculpture*. Bunnell included five of his works in the exhibition, consulted him on its conception, and welcomed his introductions to other photographers in Southern California who were working dimensionally. Nine artists from the Los Angeles area were in *Photography into Sculpture*. Five of them were or had been Heinecken's students at UCLA where he founded a groundbreaking photography program in 1963 that focused on experimental forms.

While Bunnell supported Heinecken's work and ideas by including him in exhibitions and engaging him as an advisor, Heinecken's experiences with Bunnell and at MoMA, while significant, did not define his career or shift his practice. This counterintuitive conclusion is based on my archival research and interviews, which finds that Heinecken's contact with Nathan Lyons at George Eastman House, a photography museum hidden away in Rochester, New York, effected a greater impact on his work, career, and teaching philosophy. Lyons, who is only recently receiving the critical attention he deserves, was a curator at Eastman House but his activities there were not confined to organizing exhibitions and acquiring works for the collection. He also instigated conferences and workshops where someone like Heinecken, who had no formal training in photography, could increase his understanding of photo history, theory, and professional practices.

The first teaching conference arranged by Lyons at George Eastman House resulted in the formation of the Society for Photographic Education, an organization in which

Heinecken enthusiastically participated, becoming its chairman in 1970. Importantly, these activities connected him to a community of photographers and photo educators, including Bunnell, alleviating the isolation of being a West Coast photographer and tapping into new opportunities and resources. It also allowed him to present and test his ideas about manipulative photography in front of a concerned and engaged audience.

Lyons exhibited Heinecken's work in three significant exhibitions from 1967-1968. By 1970, Heinecken had also been included in three exhibitions at MoMA organized by Bunnell, and his first New York gallery exhibition was mounted at Witkin Gallery. My dissertation acknowledges that Heinecken recognized early on the important role he could play in the growing field of photography. He took full advantage of the opportunities available to him at Eastman House and MoMA during the initial stages of his career from 1962-1970. As a result he quickly secured a foothold in the East Coast photography establishment where he was not only influenced by his colleagues but also exerted influence as a skilled spokesman promoting manipulated photography -- or as he jokingly put it, "crooked," as opposed to straight photography.[5]

Peter Bunnell and Robert Heinecken are the principal figures of *Photography into Sculpture* and therefore the primary subjects of my dissertation. Bunnell as a curator and historian, and Heinecken as an artist and academician, were both committed to the idea that the photograph was more than the image on its surface. Their work and public statements argued that the overwhelming attention placed on photography's optical

[5] Heinecken wrote an essay titled, "Equal Rights for Crooked Photography (Possibilities and Aims of Manipulation," a version of which would be published with the title, "Manipulative Photography" in *Contemporary Photographer* 5, no. 4, 1967.

description was needlessly limiting and excluded a new generation of practitioners eager to challenge lingering modernist traditions. My dissertation demonstrates that both men worked from within photography's institutions and organizations – MoMA, George Eastman House, and the Society for Photographic Education – in order to broaden perceptions and understanding of the medium.

I also demonstrate that the Museum of Modern Art and the photography program at UCLA – the platforms from which Bunnell and Heinecken launched their critiques – were influenced and enhanced by the unconventional perspectives they promoted. Though MoMA and the academy are commonly depicted as stodgy and conventional, both made space for revolutionary thinking during the 1960s and 70s. Ultimately, my research concludes that Bunnell's and Heinecken's efforts anticipated present-day attitudes and practices in which combinations of photography and other art mediums, including sculpture, are readily accepted.

My dissertation promotes an under-recognized approach to photographic medium specificity described in the literature by scholars Jan Baetens and Heidi Peeters who recognize that combining mediums – they use the term "hybridity" – is not the antithesis of medium specificity. They contend that identifying the characteristics of any medium has been and always will play an important role in aesthetic debates and that such discoveries are not dangerous or limiting as long as they remain working theories. My dissertation finds that Peter Bunnell, Robert Heinecken and John Szarkowski were reacting to the particular time and place in which they lived and worked, making their

statements inherently provisional. Bunnell and Heinecken made claims about what the medium is and does as a means of broadening accepted ideas about photography. While it might seem in retrospect that Szarkowski and, by extension, Bunnell – bearing in mind that they shared the same platform at MoMA – occupied the "judgment seat of photography," both were historians, not critics, who were grappling with the museum's existing collection, new gifts and acquisitions, as well as contemporary production.

In light of all of this, I find myself arguing for a revisionist history of MoMA and yet, in order for that claim to be persuasive, a thorough analysis of the canonical texts on MoMA's photography program would be required. That is neither the purpose of this dissertation nor is it within its scope. A series of smaller claims based on my research and findings, however, is possible. For example, my account of MoMA not only makes room for Bunnell – and by implication, other curators working under Szarkowski who were hired after Bunnell's departure in 1972 – but it also includes the contributions of Nathan Lyons at George Eastman House and the curators who followed him there. I also embrace the philosophy that it is more productive to think of MoMA's presentation of photography across the board than it is to single out just those exhibitions organized under the auspices of the photography department headed by Szarkowski, which is to say that Kynaston McShine's *Information,* which relies heavily on photography, Szarkowski's *New Documents*, and Bunnell's *Photography into Sculpture*, and the many other exhibitions that included photographs at MoMA are all of a piece. Recent historical accounts of MoMA's photography program by MoMA staffers Eva Respini and Drew Sawyer as well as Quentin Bajac, the director of MoMA's photography department

since 2012, are characterizing it in this way.[6] While a far-reaching revisionist history of MoMA is not attainable here, perhaps a smaller claim could be made, which is that Szarkowski's role in photography at MoMA, while no doubt enormous and deserving close scrutiny, has had the effect of downplaying other manifestations of photography at MoMA such as Bunnell's and McShine's. This dissertation offers a close look at Bunnell while recognizing the role of McShine, as well.

A similar shift in the study of objects is currently taking place. Until recently, most museum curators in departments of contemporary art have undertaken surveys of conceptual art in spite of the constant and significant presence of photography in these works. However, divisions regarding photography are breaking down. For example, in 2011, Matthew Witkovsky, the head of the photography department at the Art Institute of Chicago, organized *Light Year: Conceptual Art and the Photography 1964-1977*, thereby claiming conceptual art as the purview of departments of photography as well as departments of contemporary art. In the pages that follow, Bunnell is shown in the late-1960s forward to care little about traditional divisions. He also marshaled some of the same sources used by critics like Susan Sontag in his analysis that was also grounded in a deep understanding of the history of photography. He recognized the value of having a specialist's depth in the medium and projected a kind of authority meant to challenge critics like Sontag. In retrospect, Bunnell is a model of that authority for me, which to my way of thinking, does not discredit Sontag, but argues for the inclusion of Bunnell and other specialists of his generation in the wider discourses of art.

---

[6] Eva Respini and Drew Sawyer, "A 'New Prominence': Photography at MoMA in the 1960s and 1970s," in *The Photographic Object 1970,* ed. Mary Statzer (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, forthcoming); "View from a Judgment Seat: Quentin Bajac in conversation with Philip Gefter," *Aperture,* 213, (Winter, 2013): 56-60.

I. CASE STUDY: *PHOTOGRAPHY INTO SCULPTURE*

In 1979, Peter Bunnell, the David McAlpin Professor of the History of Photography and Modern Art at Princeton University, gave a lecture at the Center for Creative Photography (CCP) titled, "The Will to Style: Observations of Aspects of Contemporary Photography."[7] James Enyeart, the CCP's director, introduced Bunnell and listed his many accomplishments, including his tenure as curator of photography at the Museum of Modern Art (1965-1972), noting in particular his exhibition *Photography into Sculpture* (MoMA, 1970). Enyeart called it "one of the preeminent exhibitions of the decade," but by the end of the talk, the focus of which was not photo sculpture or other experimental forms but straight photography, Bunnell would offer his own assessment of the exhibition that was decidedly less positive than that of his colleague.

In his complex and carefully argued lecture, Bunnell defended Garry Winogrand and Lee Friedlander, whose work had recently come under attack by Janet Malcolm in her essay "Diana and Nikon" for making presumably styleless photographs "indistinguishable" from snapshots and just as unsophisticated and off-hand as those made by amateur photographers.[8] Bunnell argued that Winogrand and Friedlander's photographs were absolutely not snapshots, and demonstrated the point by comparing them to actual snapshots taken by amateurs – specifically, random New Yorkers who were given

---

[7] Peter Bunnell lecture, "The Will to Style: Observations on Aspects of Contemporary Photography," February 1979, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson. Oral History Collection. Bunnell's position at Princeton University was the first endowed professorship in the history of photography in the United States.

[8] Janet Malcolm, "Diana and Nikon," *The New Yorker* (April 23, 1976).

inexpensive cameras to use -- who had participated in Ken Ohara's *Snapshot Project*.[9] Citing Russian formalist Victor Schlovsky and Marxist cultural critic Fredric Jameson, Bunnell asserted that "defamiliarization" was one of the primary strategies deployed by Winogrand and Friedlander, noting that "in their hands, defamiliarization became an attack… a critique" of snapshots.[10] Bunnell claimed that Friedlander threw out the "logical narrative" of photography, resulting not in chaos but an "illogical narrative" similar to that found in the films of Michelangelo Antonioni.

Citing the British conceptual artist and writer Victor Burgin, Bunnell pointed to the inherently political position of Winogrand who photographed the spectator – i.e. the crowd, the majority, and not the event itself – something that amateurs would never do. Summing up, he claimed that the "simplistic notion of the politicization of social reality" and the hope of changing public opinion via images, were no longer viable strategies for American artists who instead sought to understand "the nature of the picture, not the nature of society." Furthermore, Friedlander had "established a politicization of sight, and therefore consciousness," which made him "a collaborator, by no means a follower, with the mainstream of minimalist and structuralist art," citing Robert Irwin as an

---

[9] Ken Ohara, who would become known for his book of tightly cropped portraits titled *One,* had recently completed his *Snapshot Project*. Bunnell explained that Ohara loaded an inexpensive 35-mm camera with film, then asked random people on the streets of New York to make exposures and return it to him along with the name and address of another person who would be willing to do the same. Ohara processed the film and made sixteen by twenty inch contact sheets from the negatives. He mounted them on blue-gray boards and wrote the name of the photographer and his or her address on the front. Ohara planned to display them on the wall, unframed, edge-to-edge, in a single line that circled the gallery. Bunnell articulated questions prompted by Ohara's piece that helped to distinguish amateur photographs from those taken by Garry Winogrand and Lee Freidlander: What do amateurs take pictures of? What do amateurs perceive photography as? What do they perceive relevant subject matter to be? How should the photographs in Ohara's project be presented?

[10] Bunnell cited the Russian formalist Victor Shklovsky's *Art and Technology* (1916) as a significant antecedent for the "defamiliarization of objecthood" in literature, which Bunnell offered as a challenge to be taken up by photographers. Shklovsky coined the term "ostranenie," meaning "defamiliarization."

example of the former and John Baldessari the latter. He then invoked Walter Benjamin's proclamation that photography had transformed the very nature of art, citing Walter de Maria's *Lightning Field* (1977) and Keith Arnatt's *Mirror Lined Hole: Earth Bottom* (1968). These artists, Bunnell claimed, created earthworks "both for the experience of the works themselves and the properties they manifest when they were recorded photographically." Here and throughout his talk, Bunnell recognized the pivotal role photography was playing in contemporary art of all kinds. In his sweeping analysis, he laid claim to the range of photographic activity for photo history, a new academic discipline. What was not new, however, was Bunnell's interest in theorizing photography regardless of who made it. In 1969, when he was curator of photography, and now as a photo historian in 1979, any and all art made of photographs or utilizing photographic ideas, demanded his attention and analysis.

In the final section of his talk Bunnell drew parallels between the painter Frank Stella and the photographer Ray Metzker, both working in the late-1950s and early-1960s, who were trying to break away from expressionism and the constant assertion of individualism it demanded by focusing attention on their respective mediums and away from what Bunnell called "picture making."[11] Stella represented the pioneering act of combining mediums – specifically painting and sculpture – to challenge modernism, serving as a model of sorts and precedent for *Photography into Sculpture*. Bunnell recognized Metzker as an experimental photographer who blurred the boundaries of photography and painting by

[11] Willem De Kooning and Mark Rothko are exemplars of painting's expressionism, and Minor White and Aaron Siskind of photography's.

emphasizing abstraction, pattern, and scale. In closing, Bunnell encouraged the audience to follow the example of photographers like Metzker who understood the medium technically but also knew its history, was sensitive to its distinct characteristics, and used that knowledge and sensibility as the basis for an "indigenous" critique of the medium that would move photography beyond the limitations of its modernist past.[12]

When the house lights came up and the Q & A period commenced, the first audience member to speak took Bunnell to task for dismissing Janet Malcolm's critique of Winogrand and Friedlander. Bunnell listened politely but stuck to his assertion that they were not only challenging snapshot photography in meaningful and sophisticated ways but also strategically attacking conventional views on the optical and realistic basis of straight photography. Bunnell then charged that this aspect of photography had been given too much emphasis by Malcolm, Susan Sontag and others who did not have a firm grasp of the history of photography and made incorrect assumptions as a result. He then pivoted – at once offering an alternative to straight/optical photography and simultaneously recognizing the futility of such a proposition, "dealing with the physicality of some of these things," for example, photographic works that employed handwork or were made into dimensional objects, "has run its course or is waiting for rejuvenation" while

[12] "Indigenous" is used here in the sense of "homegrown," i.e. a critique of the medium coming from photographers as well as photo historians and photo curators. In an era when photography was being analyzed and critiqued by non-photography specialists (e.g. Susan Sontag), Bunnell wanted to encourage photographers -- who understood photography technique and photo history -- to draw upon their expertise to launch meaningful challenges to the medium. In this lecture, Bunnell cited Carl Toth, who is not well known today, but was then a popular photo educator at Cranbrook Academy of Art who used Xerox images in his photomontages. See, Donald Kuspit, "The Epistemophilic Instinct of Carl Toth," foreword in *Carl Toth*, Cranbrook Art Academy, Bloomfield Hills, MI, 2005.

black and white images printed in the darkroom on flat sheets of paper continued to dominate art photography. He continued, "When I look back, the sad thing about the two shows that I did [*Photography as Printmaking* (1968) and *Photography into Sculpture* (1970)], particularly the sculpture show, is that nothing happened."[13]

***

This long anecdote is included for the obvious reason that at its conclusion, Peter Bunnell offers his own assessment of *Photography into Sculpture,* an exhibition he organized a decade earlier at MoMA prior to becoming a photo historian at Princeton University. The fact that his assessment is negative may have been sufficient reason *not* to include it or to at least shorten it. However, I find that it affords opportunities that justify its inclusion just as it is. The first is to prompt the question: why should an exhibition that even its curator found a disappointment verging on failure become the subject of this dissertation? This chapter will provide answers to this question and, at the same time, plot the course for the remaining chapters. Second, Bunnell's lecture has been summarized here at length because it orients the reader to the range of art, photography, and critical thought in circulation throughout the 1960s and 1970s and contextualizes his negative assessment of the public reception of *Photography into Sculpture*.[14]

---

[13] Before closing his talk, Bunnell took one last question about Ohara's *Snapshot Project* and told the story of how Marcel Duchamp sought out Alfred Stieglitz to photograph *The Fountain* upon its rejection from the American Society of Independent Artist's 1917 salon, as an act of legitimacy. In 1979, this was a little known fact about a key moment in the history of avant-garde art that involved photography.

[14] Bunnell cited a dizzying number of references in his talk, far too many to be summarized in the body of this introduction. He also referenced Albert Bisbee, Vorstadt, José Ortega y Gasset, André Bazin and Siegfried Kracauer. Bunnell described the snapshot as a literary subject or style in novels, stories, and plays by Joseph Heller, E.M. Forster, Alain Robbe-Grillet and Sinclair Lewis. He gave a short history lesson on the invention of the Kodak #1 camera in 1889 and the origins of the term "snapshot." John Szarkowski,

Bunnell was thoughtfully considering straight photography in 1979, which had obviously remained the dominant mode of photography regardless of his past efforts to present alternatives. He reveals his extensive education in the history and practice of photography and modern art, as well as his deep interest in contemporary art including minimalism, conceptualism, and earthworks. At the same time, he demonstrates his fluency with theory and philosophy, and articulates what he deemed important about photography as all types of artists were then practicing it. Bunnell used political and literary theory associated with postmodern criticism, which was rapidly gaining momentum. At that moment critics and scholars such as Allan Sekula, Douglas Crimp, and Rosalind Krauss were ramping up their hard-hitting critiques of photography's traditions, classifications, and institutions in the pages of *Artforum* and *October*.[15] The assertive political and theoretical tone used by these writers felt like an attack to some members of photography's communities. Indeed, many who attended Bunnell's lecture at the CCP were likely to remain invested in traditional modes of photography and resist the intellectualism and pluralism that he – an esteemed member of the photography community – was demonstrating.

Nathan Lyons, and Michael Lesy, all inspired by the writings of John Kouwenhouven, were mentioned for their early interest in anonymous and snapshot photographs. Additional artists and photographers discussed by Bunnell include Francis Bedford, Eugène Atget, Frederick Sommer, Walker Evans, Robert Frank, Harry Callahan, Chauncey Hare, Emmet Gowin, Nancy Rexroth, Lewis Baltz, Robert Cumming, Larry Sultan and Mike Mandel, Richard Misrach, and John Pfahl.

[15] Early examples of postmodern approaches to photography include Allan Sekula "The Invention of Photographic Meaning," *Artforum* (January 1975) and at least two shorter versions of Sekula's "Dismantling Modernism: Reinventing Documentary (Notes on the Politics of Representation)," one published in the exhibition catalogue for *Photography and Language*, ed. Lew Thomas (San Francisco, Camerawork Press,1 977) and the other in *Massachusetts Review* (Winter 1978). Douglas Crimp used the term "postmodernism" in his essay for the exhibition *Pictures* in 1977. *October* magazine, founded in 1976, published "Photography: A Special Issue" 5 (Summer 1978), which included essays by Rosalind Krauss, Hollis Frampton, Craig Owens, Douglas Crimp, Jean Clair, and Thierry de Duve. The postmodern critique gained momentum in the 1980s with the addition of Christopher Phillips, "The Judgment Seat of Photography," *October* (Fall 1982); and Abigail Solomon-Godeau, "The Armed Vision Disarmed: Radical Formalism from Weapon to Style," *Afterimage* (January 1983), and many others.

Bunnell's *Photography as Printmaking* and *Photography into Sculpture* had been mounted a decade earlier when the field of photography was under a different set of pressures. The 1960s were a time of transition for the field. There were only four American museums that treated photography as an autonomous medium – the Museum of Modern Art in New York (MoMA), George Eastman House International Museum of Photography (GEH), The Art Institute of Chicago (AIC), and San Francisco Museum of Modern Art (SFMoMA) – while university art departments were establishing photography programs at a steady pace. These programs, in turn, created isolated communities of photographers who were brought together by the Society for Photographic Education's annual national conferences, beginning in 1963.

By the late-1960s, the nascent market for historical photographs was beginning to gain momentum, yet there was no viable market for contemporary art photographs. Photography was an under-theorized medium of art whose history was not well known to its practitioners or a general audience. At the same time, Pop Art, minimal and conceptual artists were using photography and photographic processes to redefine painting, sculpture, and printmaking. This activity had the secondary effects of redefining photography and raising its profile in the mainstream art world while photography's more traditional art forms and practitioners struggled for recognition. Bunnell organized his exhibitions against this background of obscurity and growth while he was assistant curator of photography at MoMA under John Szarkowski, who was then

undertaking an ambitious program to articulate visual problems confronted by photographers and to test complex ideas about the medium.

***

Photography into Sculpture was on view at MoMA from April 8 through July 5, 1970.[16] Bunnell described the exhibition in the original wall text – there was no exhibition catalogue – as "the first comprehensive survey of photographically formed images used in a sculptural or fully dimensional manner." It brought together fifty-two works by twenty-three artists from across the United States and Canada who challenged accepted practices and categories of both photography and sculpture. The West Coast was well represented by Ellen Brooks, Robert E. Brown, Carl Cheng, Darryl Curran, Robert Heinecken, Richard Jackson, Jerry McMillan, Leslie Snyder and Michael Stone all of whom were either natives of southern California or fairly recent transplants. Karl Folsom, Guiseppe (Joe) Pirone, James Pennuto and Charles Roitz were living in and around San Francisco when Bunnell selected their work for the exhibition, and Michael de Courcy and Jack Dale were part of the thriving art community in Vancouver, B.C. The East Coast netted five participants including Andre Haluska, Ed O'Connell, Ted Victoria, Robert Watts, and Lynton Wells. Douglas Prince, Dale Quarterman, and Bea Nettles were temporarily located in between, representing the Midwest. The majority of participants were in their twenties and thirties. In the press release and wall text, Bunnell emphasized the demographics of the exhibition leaving the impression that photo sculpture was new, unproven, and heavily influenced by the West Coast.

---

[16] MoMA press release for *Photography into Sculpture*. Curatorial exhibition files, exh. #925. Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

The checklist did not include dimensions, but judging from photo documentation of the installation at MoMA, some works – including Michael de Courcy's photo serigraph boxes, which were stacked within a few feet from the ceiling and Lynton Wells's life-sized photo linen figure – far exceeded standard print sizes. Color was generated through hand-applied pigments or screen-printed inks in works by Brown and Pennuto, Cheng, Haluska, Nettles, Wells, and Stone.[17] The sculptural materials themselves added color, however, including the fake green grass of Brook's *Flats: One through Five* (1969) and the walnut-colored wooden base of Heinecken's *Light Figure Cube* (1965). Glass, Plexiglas and other plastics were dominant materials whether integrated in the construction of pieces by twelve of the artists, including the vacuum-formed plastics used by Brown and Pennuto and Carl Cheng, or used in the twenty or so vitrines that protected small and fragile works. Positive sheet films like Kodak's "Kodalith," stripping film that could be applied like decals to glass, and pre-coated photo linen were recent photographic innovations that proved essential to this group. Eleven works were installed in illuminated cases or were plugged in, and Ted Victoria's piece – a *camera obscura* made from dark plastic – depended on light from the gallery window looking out into MoMA's sculpture court in order for its image to be seen. In contrast with typical photography

[17] A few points of clarification on the use of color photography are warranted. First, it is helpful to know that *William Eggleston* (May 24 – August 1, 1976) followed by *The Photographs of Stephen Shore* (October 9, 1976 - January 4, 1977), both at MoMA, were the first canonical examples of color photography exhibitions in a major American museum. Therefore, it was unusual and groundbreaking to see color in a photography exhibition prior to 1976. One should bear in mind that none of the photographic elements in *Photography into Sculpture* were color photographs but rather hand-applied pigment to black and white photographs. Therefore, the use of color in *Photography into Sculpture* may be considered conservative in the broader context of contemporary art since conceptual artists were using color photographs in their finished works since the mid-1960s. For example, Dan Graham used chromogenic prints in his *Homes for America* (1966-67), as did Dennis Oppenheim in *Reading Position for 2nd Degree Burn* (1970), and John Baldessari in *California Map Project Part I: California* (1969).

exhibitions, not a single work needed to be framed and few pieces were hung in a straight line at eye level.

Bunnell wrote little about subject matter in *Photography into Sculpture* and instead focused on a group of photographers and artists who "…are moving from internal meaning or iconography – of sex, the environment, war – to a visual duality in which materials are also incorporated as content and at the same time are used as a way of conceiving actual space."[18] It was true enough that Ellen Brooks's *Flats: One through Five* (1969) pictured an embracing nude couple and referenced the sexual revolution, and that Richard Jackson's *Negative Numbers* (1970) did contain the digits of his Social Security and draft numbers referencing the Vietnam War, while Charles Roitz's *Ecological Anagoge* (1968-70) pictured a young African American boy and reflected the artist's concerns about race and the environment. But Bunnell's statement signaled that he was after something beyond what was conveyed solely by the photographic image. The combination of photography and sculpture dislocated straight photography's emphasis on optical description, which was the presumed generator of content in photographs. Photo sculptures proposed a new kind of photographic object where the locus of meaning was not strictly found in the image(s) but rather the interplay between the image, the materials, and the sculptural forms. *Photography into Sculpture,* which included those who identified both as photographers and those who did not, questioned

[18] MoMA press release for *Photography into Sculpture*. Curatorial exhibition files, exh. #925. Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York. Some readers may find it problematic that Bunnell spent relatively little time discussing content. In the interview with Bunnell included in this dissertation, he explained that he had to set priorities, as there was limited time and available space devoted to the exhibition in wall labels, MoMA's members magazine, and other texts. For another perspective on this issue, please see the interviews with the artists in the Appendix. They were asked to comment on Bunnell's decision downplay content and to provide further information about content.

the foundations of the medium asking: Who is a photographer? What is a photograph? And how does photography convey meaning?

***

As if to prove Bunnell's point and suggest that his exhibitions effected no change over the intervening decades, these same questions persist and continue to be asked today. In January 2014, the International Center of Photography in New York mounted an exhibition titled, *What Is a Photograph?*[19] Acknowledging that this question means something vastly different today than it did in 1970 is imperative. For example, the new technologies of the late-1960s, such as plastics and photo linen, have been exchanged for digital scanners and Photoshop, iPhones and Instagram, and 3-D printers. However, when Philip Martin, director of the contemporary gallery Cherry and Martin in Los Angeles, learned of *Photography into Sculpture* while researching Robert Heinecken's work, he found it remarkably relevant to the practices of young artists working today. Martin restaged *Photography into Sculpture* in 2011, bringing together objects original to the MoMA exhibition when available, and substituting similar pieces when they were not. The response to that exhibition was vigorous, attracting the attention of international audiences as well as American curators and practitioners who began seeing it in a new

[19] *What Is a Photograph* was organized by Carol Squires for the International Center of Photography, New York. It was on view there from January 21 through May 4, 2014. Philip Gefter, "The Next Big Picture: With Cameras Optional, New Directions in Photography," *New York Times,* January 23, 2014, Art and Design section, online edition. Published in print as "The Next Big Picture," *New York Times*. January 26, 2014, AR1.

light.[20] Given the retrospective interest it has garnered in the last three years and its relevance to contemporary audiences, the exhibition should not only be better known and better understood but also fully integrated into photography's history. The key to better understanding *Photography into Sculpture* is to treat it as an academic study such as this one, wherein the archival record is established and key arguments are extrapolated and substantiated. Despite all of its foresight and efforts to amass a group of unusual and obscure objects, Cherry and Martin's exhibition was neither strictly historical nor was it arguing a position. This should not be construed as criticism of the gallery's efforts, as it was particularly important for scholars like me to directly experience the materiality and three-dimensionality of these photographic objects. Rather, it is meant to underscore the fact that an extensive analysis of *Photography into Sculpture* has not been undertaken until now.

In order grapple with the question of why *Photography into Sculpture* should be the sole case study of this dissertation, it is helpful to look at a comparable example. In 2009, *New Topographics* – which was originally on view at George Eastman House from October 14, 1975 to February 2, 1976 – was restaged and received extensive analysis in an accompanying exhibition catalogue.[21] Both *New Topographics* and *Photography into*

---

[20] Philip Martin in conversations with the author between September 2011 and July 2014. *Photography into Sculpture / The Evolving Photographic Object* originated at Cherry and Martin gallery, Los Angeles, and was shown September 10 through October 22, 2011, in association with the Getty Museum's *Pacific Standard Time* initiative. Other iterations of Cherry and Martin's restaging were held at Le Consortium, Dijon, France (July 3 – September 28, 2013), and Hauser and Wirth, New York (June 25 – July 26, 2014). Anne Wilkes Tucker, an American photo historian and curator for nearly forty years, recalled the exhibition while serving on a panel about California photography at the Getty Museum in Los Angeles, titled "The View from Here," May 31, 2014. She commented, "It [*Photography into Sculpture*] fell dead. It seemed that people weren't ready for it. Now there seems to be a recognition of where people were trying to go."

[21] The restaging of *New Topographics* and the exhibition catalogue that accompanied it was a joint project of Alison Nordstrom at George Eastman House and Britt Salvesen at the Center for Creative Photography.

Sculpture presented contemporary photography in the 1970s and were organized by young curators trained in the history and practice of photography. William Jenkins, the curator of *New Topographics*, selected nine photographers – Robert Adams, Lewis Baltz, Bernd and Hilla Becher, Joe Deal, Frank Gohlke, Nicholas Nixon, John Schott, Stephen Shore, and Henry Wessel, Jr. – to demonstrate recent developments in landscape photography's subject matter, particularly the ubiquitous built environment of strip malls, gas stations, motels, and suburban homes, and the "seeming stylelessness" of their approach.[22] *New Topographics* was organized at the George Eastman House in Rochester, New York, a remote location attracting a limited number of viewers annually. Because relatively few people saw the exhibition, it cannot be credited with launching or perpetuating the careers of its participating photographers.[23] Nevertheless, by the close of the decade, all of them had achieved a notable level of recognition in photography circles. Baltz and the Bechers were exhibiting in commercial galleries of contemporary art in New York, not photography galleries, an important distinction at the time.[24] As a matter of convenience, the label "New Topographics photographers," however misleading and objectionable it was to some of its participants, became shorthand not only for this group of photographers but also for others who were photographing the built environment in a direct and straightforward style. The exhibition continued to be discussed and debated over the intervening decades. Jenkins had recognized and articulated a durable style

---

[22] Britt Salvesen, "New Topographics," in *New Topographics* (Tucson: Center for Creative Photography, University of Arizona and Göttingen, Germany: Steidl Publishers, 2009), 51.
[23] *New Topographics* traveled to only two venues: Princeton University Art Museum where Peter Bunnell was acting director and Otis Art Institute in Los Angeles. There was one review of the exhibition in a nationally circulating magazine: Carter Ratcliff, "Route 66 Revisited: The New Landscape Photography," *Art in America* 64, no. 1 (January – February 1976): 86-91.
[24] Baltz showed his photographs at Castelli Graphics, and the Bechers at Sonnabend Gallery.

evident in the objectivity of the Dusseldorf School through the 1990's.[25] Notably, *New Topographics* marked a turning point in American culture and the field of photography, internationally, as well.

In contrast, *Photography into Sculpture* is not well known and no aspect of Bunnell's show has achieved the notoriety of *New Topographics*.[26] The import and reputation of artists in *Photography into Sculpture* is best described as uneven or undecided. Ellen Brooks, Carl Cheng, Darryl Curran, Richard Jackson, Jerry McMillan, Douglas Prince, Ted Victoria and Lynton Wells have all shown their work consistently over the years and have been the subject of retrospectives in small and medium-sized museums, yet others in the exhibition have received limited exposure or no critical attention at all. Although Robert Heinecken's work is currently experiencing a resurgence of interest, the recent uptick in his reputation is largely founded on his strategies of appropriation and experimental printmaking, not on the works in this exhibition.[27] Consequently, one

---

[25] The Düsseldorf School referes to the Bechers, who taught at the Düsseldorf Academy and their students, who included Thomas Ruff, Thomas Struth, and Candida Höffer, who have also enjoyed high-profile careers.

[26] *Photography into Sculpture* has been relegated to mentions and footnotes in more recent writings. It appears in a footnote in Christopher Phillips, "The Judgment Seat of Photography," in *The Contest of Meaning: Critical Histories of Photography,* ed. Richard Bolton (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989). Robert Hirsch discusses it in his essay "Flexible Images: Handmade American Photography, 1969-2002" *Exposure* 36, no. 1 (2003): 27-29 and in his books *Seizing the Light: A Social History of Photography* (New York: McGraw Hill, 2000) and *Transformational Imagemaking: Handmade Photography Since 1960* (Focal Press, 2014). Charles Desmarais acknowledges the exhibition and several of the photographers in it in, *Proof: Los Angeles Art and the Photograph 1960-1980* (Laguna, CA: Laguna Art Museum, 1992). A.D. Coleman reviewed *Photography into Sculpture* in the *New York Times* and mentioned it in several other reviews and columns, all of which are anthologized in his *Light Readings: A Photography Critic's Writings 1968-1978* (New York: Oxford University press, 1979). Bunnell's own essay about the show, "*Photography into Sculpture*," appears in his *Degrees of Guidance: Essays on Twentieth-Century American Photography*, (Cambridge, MA and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993). Bunnell also contributes a remembrance of traveling to California to research and select works for *Photography into Sculpture* in *The Collectible Moment: The Photography Collection of the Norton Simon Museum,* ed. Gloria Williams Sander (Pasadena, CA: Norton Simon Foundation, 2006).

[27] For recent scholarship on Robert Heinecken see Matthew Biro, "Reality Effects: Matthew Biro on the Art of Robert Heinecken," *Artforum* (October 2011): 250-59; Kevin Moore, "No Crime Involved—But with

cannot claim that *Photography into Sculpture* affected the trajectory of Heinecken's work or his career. Robert Watts is an acknowledged member of Fluxus but his contribution to the exhibition was limited to a single piece, making *Photography into Sculpture* a footnote to his career. Despite the fact that *Photography into Sculpture* was seen by MoMA's sizable audience, as well as by viewers on its extensive eight-city tour, and even though it received generous albeit mixed critical reviews, photo sculpture did not engender a discernable trend or movement.[28] Moreover, most of the artists in Bunnell's show stopped making objects like those in the exhibition, some even before the tour ended. A notable exception is Douglas Prince, who made his boxes of layered images for about thirty years; consequently they are admired and collected by many in the field of photography but not necessarily by a general art audience.[29] Bunnell's own declaration of failure, recounted at the beginning of this introduction, seems to further complicate the evaluation of *Photography into Sculpture* and its contribution to the history of photography.

Despite Bunnell's negative assessment of *Photography into Sculpture* as well as its persistent obscurity and mixed reception, it merits being the focus of this dissertation

---

That Assumption," in *Robert Heinecken* (London: Ridinghouse, 2012), 184-88; and Eva Respini, ed., *Robert Heinecken: Object Matter* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2014).

[28] *Photography into Sculpture* went on an eight-city tour between October 1970 and March 1972 to the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond; the Krannert Art Museum, University of Illinois, Urbana; Rice University, Houston; Fort Worth Art Center Museum; Vancouver Art Gallery; Phoenix Art Museum; the San Francisco Museum of Art (now SFMoMA); and Otis Art Institute, Los Angeles. Press coverage of *Photography into Sculpture* included two reviews in the *New York Times* (by A.D. Coleman and Hilton Kramer). There was a review in every city newspaper of those institutions that hosted the exhibition. Photography publications included *Photo Methods for Industry, Modern Photography, Popular Photography, Camera 35,* and *Photographic Business and Product News* covered the exhibition with more than a listing. Other publications that covered the exhibition included: *Artweek, Women's Wear Daily, Time,* and *Apartment Ideas*. A handful of European publications reviewed or mentioned the exhibition.

[29] This condition may be in the process of changing as contemporary galleries like Cherry and Martin in Los Angeles and Hauser and Wirth in New York provide the exhibition and the artists in it with greater exposure to new audiences and collectors.

because the work it contains and the curatorial statements it asserts amount to significant challenges to photographic modernism and straight photography in general during the 1960s. That it originated at MoMA is also significant. With its long-standing commitment to photography – MoMA began collecting photographs in 1930 and established a dedicated department a decade later – much of the history of the medium has been and continues to be written there.[30] Recent scholarship demonstrates that there was a broad range of photographic activity in the museum during the period under question, generated not only by the photography department headed by John Szarkowski but other museum departments, as well.[31] Szarkowski, whose curatorial practice has received an enormous amount of scrutiny, is synonymous with MoMA's photography department during the 1960s, 70s and 80s. While he was the clear leader and official public face of the photography department, this dissertation demonstrates Bunnell's significant contribution to the overall project of photography at MoMA during this period, broadening its offerings to include experimental modes.

This dissertation includes an interview with Bunnell that describes the inner workings of MoMA's photography department and the professional relationship he developed with Szarkowski. It demonstrates that the photography department was not acting in isolation at MoMA but instead interacted with other departments in productive ways. Bunnell offers his own recollections of how he and Szarkowski collaborated and split the

[30] Erin K. O'Toole, "No Democracy in Quality: Ansel Adams, Beaumont and Nancy Newhall, and the Founding of the Department of Photographs at the Museum of Modern Art*"* (PhD dissertation, University of Arizona, 2010). See also, Christopher Philips, "The Judgment Seat of Photography."

[31] Eva Respini and Drew Sawyer, "A 'New Prominence': Photography at MoMA in the 1960s and 1970s," in *The Photographic Object 1970,* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, forthcoming. Respini and Sawyer's essay considers well over a dozen exhibitions of photography at MoMA including *The Photographer's Eye, Information, Spaces, Collage and the Photo-Image,* and *Project Series*, only some of which were organized by the photography department or Szarkowski.

workload, as well as argued over and supported each other's ideas about photography. Bunnell's exhibitions did not permanently alter the course of Szarkowski's program at MoMA or his focus on the image, optical description, and traditional two-dimensional prints, but his presence there was impactful. He organized numerous exhibitions that were well considered and grounded in art and photo history while actively participating in the department's acquisitions program. Bunnell also performed much-needed public duties of the department including outreach to photography's communities by attending gallery exhibitions, speaking at conferences, holding leadership roles in photography organizations, conducting print viewings for the public, and participating in a seemingly endless stream of portfolio reviews.

Importantly, photography was not the sole focus at MoMA as it was at George Eastman House, its only true rival at the time, and was under a different set of pressures. The photography department at MoMA was in competition with other museum departments for space and funds therefore Szarkowski and Bunnell was called upon to argue photography's relevance among traditional art mediums. As members of MoMA's curatorial staff, Szarkowski and Bunnell were expected to listen and selectively implement suggestions made by their colleagues in other departments. At the same time, however, they were also in a position to *offer* suggestions to other curators.[32] Bunnell recalls attending exhibition planning meetings, voted on which exhibitions the museum would feature and allocate resources and space, and was part of the management team that negotiated with museum workers during a strike in the 1970s. In other words, he not

[32] Bunnell recalls conversations with Kynaston McShine who was also a young curator at the time. McShine acknowledges Szarkowski by name in the *Information* catalogue.

only participated fully in the photography department's activities but was also an integral member of the Modern's staff.[33]

The goal of Chapter 2 titled, "Peter Bunnell's *Photography as Printmaking* and *Photography into Sculpture*: Challenges to Photographic Medium Specificity at MOMA circa 1970," is to highlight Bunnell's exhibitions and to elaborate on the intentions and strategies used by him and the artists he exhibited, including Robert Heinecken. The stakes for exhibiting photo objects in a field dominated by straight photographs were high. For example, Chapter 2 expands on Bunnell's argument that to look at photography as printmaking or to make a photograph into a sculpture emphasized photography's physicality and diminished the role of the photographic image. To compromise optical description – a characteristic of photography deemed essential – was an important step towards rethinking photographic representation. The chapter also demonstrates that Bunnell was willing to exhibit the work of unproven experimental photographers as well as non-photographers in an effort to provide a more accurate and encompassing account of the how the medium was then being used.

While Chapter 2 demonstrates that Bunnell supported Heinecken's work by including him in his most experimental exhibitions – *Photography as Printmaking* and *Photography into Sculpture* – and treating him as an important advisor while organizing *Photography into Sculpture*, Heinecken's experiences with Bunnell and the work he

[33] This assessment is mostly inferred from conversations between the author and Bunnell, but was also informed by A.D. Coleman's profile of Bunnell titled "Money, Space, and Time: Or the Curator as Juggler," in *Light Readings: A Photography Critic's Writings 1968-1978*, 63-68. First published in the New York Times, June 6, 1971.

exhibited at MoMA, while significant, did not define his career or shift his practice. Rather, Chapter 3 demonstrates that Heinecken's connection to George Eastman House and its curator Nathan Lyons during the years leading up to *Photography into Sculpture* was vital to his career and practice. This chapter explains Heinecken's increasing understanding of photography theory, history, pedagogy and professional practices were enhanced by attending early SPE conferences (beginning in 1964) and especially The Advanced Studies Workshop at Eastman House (1967), all of which Lyons organized.[34] Importantly, these activities connected Heinecken to other photographers and photo educators, including Bunnell, alleviating his isolation as a West Coast photographer. Lyons exhibited Heinecken's work from 1967-1968. By 1970, he had also been included in three exhibitions at MoMA, and his first New York gallery exhibition was mounted at Witkin Gallery. This chapter acknowledges that Heinecken recognized early on that he could play an important role in the growing field of photography, took full advantage of the opportunities available to him at Eastman House and, as a result, quickly achieved close ties and a firm footing in the East Coast photography establishment where he could not only be influenced by the field but also exert his own influence. The implication is that Heinecken, a West Coast photographer, had influence on East Coast photographers, temporarily reversing the axis of influence in American fine art photography.

***

[34] Jessica McDonald, "Centralizing Rochester: A Critical Historiography of American Photography in the 1960s and 1970s" (PhD dissertation, University of Rochester, 2014).

Was *Photography into Sculpture* a success? Perhaps a better question would be: What criteria constituted success for an exhibition of experimental photography in 1970, and did *Photography into Sculpture* meet that criteria? In many ways, just getting the work before an audience, especially one as large as MoMA's, was an accomplishment. This dissertation argues that *Photography into Sculpture* was an important gesture, one with a provocative de-centering effect. Bunnell exhibited photographers alongside non-photographers in the exhibition—a rarity in those years—and the course of influence from East Coast to West Coast was momentarily reversed. Several adventurous propositions about what a photograph is were advanced, perhaps before they could be internalized and fully accepted by the photography community.

In 2003, photo historian Geoffrey Batchen wrote, "…American art photography was in fact continually being ruptured from within, that conceptual practices of various kinds have always been rife within the photography community, and that inside and outside, art and photography, have never been as distinguishable as some might like to imagine."[35] These words would likely resonate for Bunnell and Heinecken, as they describe not only what both men recognized throughout the 1970s and beyond, but also what they practiced and facilitated. Photography has indeed staged its own rebellions. *Photography into Sculpture* is one of them.

[35] Geoffrey Batchen, "Cancellation," in *The Last Picture Show: Artists Using Photography 1960-1982*, ed., Douglas Fogle (Minneapolis: Walker Art Center, 2003).

II. PETER BUNNELL'S *PHOTOGRAPHY AS PRINTMAKING* AND *PHOTOGRAPHY INTO SCULPTURE:* PHOTOGRAPHY AND MEDIUM SPECIFICITY AT MOMA CIRCA 1970

Throughout the 1960s and 70s artists actively challenged the modernist notion of medium specificity, which proposes that each medium of art is distinct, pure, and capable of ideal realization. In an effort to break down traditional barriers between mediums as well as between high and low forms, many practitioners created mixed media artworks that included photography or photographic processes. Robert Rauschenberg's *Combines* (1955-64), Andy Warhol's *Brillo Boxes* (1964), and Ed Ruscha's *Twentysix Gasoline Stations* (1963) are some of the best-known examples of works that capitalized on photography's non-art status and ubiquitous cultural presence in advertising and the media to not only reposition and redefine painting and sculpture but art photography as well.

This chapter demonstrates that photography curator Peter Bunnell and the artists he exhibited at the Museum of Modern Art in New York (MoMA) posed their own challenges to photographic modernism. Bunnell's *Photography into Sculpture* (1970) exhibited mixed media works that combined photographic images with the elements of sculpture. The content of these works is not found solely in the photographic image – as it was understood to be in "straight" photographs – but in the interaction of the image, materials, and form. The unique physicality of these objects that combine two-dimensional and three-dimensional modes, questioned the dominance of optical description, a presumed essential characteristic of the medium. This chapter explains why

Bunnell was in a singular position to take on photography's medium specificity in a museum setting and the stakes for doing so at MoMA. It also purports that Bunnell understood the act of combining photography and sculpture as a method of discerning the unique characteristic of photography not in order to foreclose options for photographers but to expand upon restrictive attitudes already in place.

In the spring and summer of 1970, MoMA curators mounted three exhibitions of contemporary works that challenged medium specificity: *Frank Stella: Paintings and Drawings, Photography into Sculpture,* and *Information*.[36] The most ambitious and highly regarded exhibition of these was Kynaston McShine's *Information*. International in scope and including work by one-hundred-and-fifty artists from fifteen countries the exhibition encompassed many significant artistic developments of the 1960s: minimalism, systems, performance, viewer participation, site specificity, installation, happenings, earthworks, film, video and more. McShine dismissed distinctions between mediums altogether, characterizing the show as an "alternative" meant to "extend the idea of art, to renew its definition, and to think beyond the traditional categories – painting, sculpture, drawing, printmaking, photography, film, theater, music, dance, and poetry."[37] Importantly, McShine put forward the radical stance that the artists included were "interested in ways of rapidly exchanging ideas, rather than embalming the idea in an 'object.'"[38] Many works in the show made use of photography to overcome perceived limitations of painting and sculpture – scale, temporality, geography and the

[36] MoMA exhibitions in Spring 1970 included *Frank Stella: Paintings and Drawings* (March 24 – June 2, 1970), *Photography into Sculpture* (April 8 – July 5, 1970) and *Information* (July 2– September 20, 1970).
[37] "Essay," Kynaston McShine, *Information* exhibition catalogue (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1970), 138.
[38] Ibid., 139.

commodification of the art object. Despite McShine's view that photography had taken its place alongside more traditional mediums and was therefore subject to redefinition, photography was treated as a non-medium or perhaps an every-medium that did many things, served many functions, and was used by nearly everyone. The status of photographs as art objects in the traditional sense was overlooked, dismissed, or both – as was their history – a stance that would have been in line with the show's thesis.[39] McShine instead pointed to the glut of images circulating via mass media as well as photography as documentation. He did not, however, have the inclination to consider how or why photography had assumed these functions or what exactly it contributed to *Information*.[40]

In contrast, John Szarkowski, MoMA's director of the Department of Photography, was keenly aware that it was the role of his department to theorize photography. He was at that moment resolutely engaged in articulating pictorial problems confronted by photographers and writing new installments to photography's history. While the photograph's ability to describe the world – especially its social aspects – was his primary interest, he was not a doctrinaire modernist. Photography for him was neither pure nor limited to the straight aesthetic championed by art photographers such as Alfred

[39] For a helpful discussion of first-generation conceptual artists' use of photography see Lucy Soutter, "The Visual Idea: Photography in Conceptual Art," (PhD diss., Yale University, 2001).

[40] Conversely, photographers, photo curators and photo historians were questioning documentary photography and photographic veracity throughout the 1960s and 1970s. For some examples of how this complex issue was addressed during the period, see John Szarkowski, "Introduction," in *New Documents: Diane Arbus, Lee Friedlander, Garry Winogrand* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1967); and William Jenkins, "The Extended Document: An Investigation of Information and Evidence in Photographs," in *The Extended Document,* exh. cat. (Rochester: George Eastman House, 1975).

Stieglitz, Paul Strand, and Edward Weston.[41] MoMA's photography department of the 1960s and 70s might well be analogized to a laboratory in which both Szarkowski, beginning his long tenure in 1962, and Peter Bunnell, a curator of photography from 1965 to 1972, tested complex ideas about the medium.[42] Szarkowski performed experiments on straight photography while Bunnell investigated both straight and non-straight modes. Their combined efforts offered multiple views of photography, then an under-theorized medium of art.[43]

---

[41] Alfred Stieglitz, Paul Strand and Edward Weston are mentioned here as a way of summarizing efforts to legitimize photography as an art form, largely in a style considered straight or pure, in the United States in the early twentieth-century. Steiglitz promoted photography alongside other forms of art in his New York galleries The Little Galleries of the Photo Secession and 291, as well as *Camera Work*, the journal that he edited. The fine art photographs he made and promoted were mostly in the painterly, soft-focus Pictorialist style. However, the last issue of *Camera Work* (June 1917) featured close-up, unsentimental, nearly abstract photographs by Paul Strand, who wrote an essay to accompany his work. In the essay, he eschewed Pictorialism and handwork and endorsed objectivity and "straight photographic means." In the early 1930s, a group of California photographers including Willard Van Dyke, Imogen Cunningham, Ansel Adams and Edward Weston, formed Group f.64. They dismissed Pictorialism and advocated photography that was sharp-focused and detailed. Edward Weston, who had visited Stieglitz in 1922, had already earned a reputation for his modernist photographs – enigmatic studies of a porcelain toilet, plants, seashells, and green peppers. Group f.64 embraced the notion of purity, titling the group's first exhibition in 1934, "First Salon of Pure Photography."

In 1904, the critic Sadakichi Hartman used the term "straight" and outlined right and wrong uses of the medium in his essay, "A Plea for Straight Photography" (published in *American Amateur Photographer,* March 1904). He provided a functional definition of "straight photography" that persisted: "Rely on your camera, on your eye, on your good taste and your knowledge of composition, consider every fluctuation of color, light and shade, study lines and values and space division, patiently wait until the scene or object of your pictured vision reveals itself in its supremest moment of beauty, in short, compose the picture which you intend to take so well that the negative will be absolutely perfect and in need of no or but slight manipulation." Dodging, burning and slight retouching were OK "as long as they do not interfere with the natural qualities of photographic technique. Brush marks and lines of any sort were deemed unnatural and undesirable.

[42] The original use of the term "laboratory" in reference to the Museum of Modern Art comes from Alfred H. Barr, Jr., the founding director who wrote, "The Museum of Modern Art is a laboratory: in its experiments the public is invited to participate." in *Art in Our Time: An Exhibition to Celebrate the Tenth Anniversary of the Museum of Modern Art and the Opening of Its New Building, Held at the Time of the New York World's Fair* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1939), 15. See also, Russell Lynes, *Good Old Modern: An Intimate Portrait of the Museum of Modern Art* (New York: Antheneum, 1973), 212.

[43] Conversation between the author and the photo historian Douglas Nickel via email, March 30, 2014. The author thanks Nickel for sharing his personal knowledge of Szarkowski and Bunnell, who was Nickel's dissertation advisor at Princeton University, as well as his characterization of MoMA's photography department during Szarkowski's tenure, which has informed this essay. See also Douglas Nickel, "John Szarkowski: An Interview," *History of Photography*, 19, no. 2 (Summer, 1995): 135-42. Here, Szarkowski candidly discusses his tenure at the Museum of Modern Art—the circumstances under which he was hired, his relationship to his predecessors (Beaumont Newhall and Edward Steichen), he compares his curatorial process and philosophy to theirs, describes what exhibitions were possible and why in a practical and self-

Szarkowski supported Bunnell's exhibition *Photography as Printmaking* (1968) and its "sequel," *Photography into Sculpture* (1970), which featured practitioners who created manipulated and mixed media forms of photography while addressing a set of issues and prejudices of particular interest to contemporary photographers and photo curators.[44] With Rauschenberg, Warhol, Ruscha, and many others in mind, but also drawing from his broad knowledge of the practice and history of photography, Bunnell selected photographers and other artists whose work posed such questions as: Why must art photographs be made on paper, their black and white surfaces pristine and untouched? Why were they housed in a mat, framed under glass, and hung on the wall? Why are photographers preoccupied with the medium's connection to reality and its perceived accuracy, rather than its relationship to media and culture or its mutability? Why did photographers seem to know so little about other kinds of art? What did other artistic practices have to offer photographers?[45] The artists in Bunnell's exhibitions – while making no pretense to abolish the art object as did their conceptual counterparts in *Information* – targeted fine art photographic conventions, making photographs that were less concerned with image and subject matter and more concerned with the physicality of the photograph and the operations of the medium itself. Bunnell maintained that purity was a construct that had never readily adhered to such an expansive medium as photography and that thinking of the photograph exclusively as a black and white

---

concsious way, and is generally unassuming and modest about his opinions being informed theories and guesses.

[44] Bunnell used the term "sequel" in the press release for *Photography into Sculpture*. Registrar exhibition files, exh. #853. Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

[45] These questions were gathered and paraphrased from conversations between the author and Peter Bunnell, as well as participants in *Photography into Sculpture,* including Ellen Brooks, Robert E. Brown, Carl Cheng, Richard Jackson, Jerry McMillan, Bea Nettles, Guiseppe Pirone, Michael Stone, and Ted Victoria.

window on the world was a myopic condition that could and should be dispelled with greater knowledge of the medium. Whether or not Szarkowski fully embraced experimental photography himself, he would have agreed with the level of sophistication found in Bunnell's inquiry.[46]

Using Bunnell's exhibitions as case studies, this chapter addresses the context and stakes for displaying experimental photographs at the Museum of Modern Art. While neither of Bunnell's exhibitions garnered the attention he thought they deserved, his beliefs and tastes augmented Szarkowski's program of straight photography so that it represented more fully the breadth of contemporary photography while providing another significant installment to the historical trajectory of photography's non-straight forms. Bunnell attempted to construct a position for the medium and its practitioners that would have countered and diminished the medium specific mindset that aided in photography's separation from and resistance to integration with contemporary art. As the 1970s gave over to the 80s, it became clear that Bunnell's exhibitions failed to upend the dominant discourses of photography or contemporary art. Nevertheless, he demonstrated an open-minded and historical approach, an early model for contemporary curators and artists driven by inquiry and unbounded by divisions among mediums.

The works in *Photography as Printmaking* utilize a range of hand and darkroom manipulations to black and white light sensitive materials and are designated "manipulated photographs" in this chapter, a term also used by Robert Heinecken, the

[46] For more on the working relationship between John Szarkowski and Peter Bunnell, see the interview with Peter Bunnell in this dissertation. In a separate discussion with the author, Bunnell stated: "I left the museum with great reluctance because I really enjoyed Szarkowski."

subject of the following chapter. They provide context for *Photography into Sculpture,* which offers examples of two types of dimensional photographs – those that focus on the intersection of the photographic image and the materials of sculpture and others that take the photographic image apart and use the physical structure of the sculptural object to reassemble it. Up to this point and throughout the analysis that follows, I have used "medium specificity" as a general term encompassing associated ideas of medium purity – the condition of a medium that is unmixed and therefore uncorrupted – and exceptionalism – identifiable characteristics of a medium that are deemed true and permanent and make it what it is. These terms have been used to orient the contemporary reader familiar with them and to contribute to ongoing discussions regarding photographic medium specificity. However, neither Szarkowski nor Bunnell, or for that matter McShine or critics like Hilton Kramer or A.D. Coleman, used the term "medium specificity" or "hybrids." Bunnell used more intuitive phrases like "medium purity" or hyphenated constructs such as "mixed-media mutants," and "multi-media directions." Bunnell and McShine both used the term "alternative(s)." With the exception of the term "medium specificity," period-specific terms are used throughout the chapter in order to avoid confusion.

Scholars since the early 1980s including Christopher Phillips and Douglas Nickel have pointed to Szarkowski's photographic exceptionalism along with its attendant problems and limitations.[47] In Phillips's essay "The Judgment Seat of Photography," he charged Szarkowski with applying a formalist vocabulary to photographs that were never

[47] Douglas R. Nickel, "History of Photography: The State of Research," *The Art Bulletin,* 83, no. 3 (September 2001): 54.

conceived as art, thereby creating a troubling justification for their inclusion in photography's rapidly expanding canon and institutions. In a footnote, Phillips cited Peter Bunnell as an opposing force to Szarkowski's power and bias for "pure photographic description," defined as images with no visible evidence of the photographer's "hand," and identifies Bunnell's *Photography as Printmaking* and *Photography into Sculpture* as important additions to Szarkowski's exhibition program.[48] The primary goal of this chapter, however, is to move Bunnell's exhibitions out of the footnotes, elaborate on and clarify the intentions and strategies used by him and the artists he exhibited, and provide a more nuanced view of the context – shaped only in part by Szarkowski – in which they appeared.

***

Peter Bunnell was exceptionally well trained for the work he would do at MoMA. He studied photography as a commercial and fine art medium at Rochester Institute of Technology (1955-1959) and Ohio University (1959-1961). He attended Yale (1961-1965) where he was a graduate student approaching photography from an art historical perspective, which was not at all common.[49] Between 1956 and 1965, Bunnell had spent periods of time in Rochester, New York working as research assistant to Beaumont and Nancy Newhall at George Eastman House, and with Walter Chappell and Nathan Lyons on exhibitions there, as well as assisting Minor White during the early years of *Aperture.*

[48] Christopher Phillips, "The Judgment Seat of Photography," in *The Contest of Meaning: Critical Histories of Photography*, ed. Richard Bolton (Cambridge, MA, and London: MIT Press, 1989), 45. Phillips's essay was originally published in *October* 22 (Fall 1982).

[49] Bunnell had completed coursework toward his PhD in art history at Yale and was in Europe conducting dissertation research on Alfred Stieglitz when Szarkowski offered him the job at MoMA.

He was initially hired at MoMA to catalogue and mount rotations of the collection but he quickly took on other projects.[50] Bunnell's education and practical experience facilitated his ability to combine historical and contemporary views of photography. Soon after arriving at MoMA, Bunnell noticed that Szarkowski's interests, although varied, exploratory, and pioneering in their own right, nevertheless excluded the experimental photo works he was seeing when he traveled across the country to lecture in museums and university art departments.[51] Bunnell readily took on these works, making them the subject of *Photography as Printmaking* and *Photography into Sculpture.*

When Bunnell joined the staff at MoMA in September 1965, Szarkowksi was already establishing an exhibition program distinct from his predecessor, Edward Steichen, whose decisive efforts – *Road to Victory* (1942), *Power in the Pacific* (1945) and *The Family of Man* (1955) – were large and unprecedentedly popular group exhibitions with openly humanist and political themes, catering to the tastes and interests of general audiences in the choice of images, their subject matter and presentation.[52] In contrast to Steichen's overt populism and his focus on unifying themes and universal content, Szarkowski took a more theoretical and formal approach. In *The Photographer's Eye*

---

[50] Bunnell's initial contract was for only one year. According to him it was extended without hesitation. Over the course of his career at MoMA Bunnell split his time between historical and contemporary projects. In addition to the contemporary exhibitions discussed in this essay, he organized exhibitions of work by Robert Adams and Emmit Gowin (their first museum exhibitions), Ray K. Metzker, Minor White, Paul Caponigro, Max Waldman, and Barbara Morgan. He organized historical exhibitions of Pictorialism, Frederick H. Evans, and Clarence H. White. Conversation between Bunnell and the author.

[51] While at MoMA, Bunnell lectured extensively at colleges and universities across the country and used those trips to discover new work being made by a younger generation of professors and their students. Bunnell began attending Society for Photographic Education conferences in the 1960s, which also provided access to new work by conference attendees and indirectly via word of mouth.

[52] For information about Edward Steichen's career as a curator see Eric J. Sandeen, *Picturing an Exhibition: The Family of Man and 1950s America* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1995); and Todd Brandow and William Ewing, *Edward Steichen: Lives in Photography* (Minneapolis: Foundation for the Exhibition of Photography; and Lausanne: Musée de l'Elysée: in association with New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2007).

(1964) he articulated a set of observations about the medium that proposed how a photograph works on a structural level and examined the tools that were at the photographer's disposal, momentarily minimizing discussions of content. He characterized photography as "a radically new picture-making process and new order of picture making problems," as well as a "special visual language," that had its own "special abilities and limitations" that were ordered into permeable categories of the thing itself, the detail, the frame, time and vantage point.[53]

Szarkowski's formulations, however blatant in their exceptionalism should not be understood as imperatives dictating purity, as were the proclamations of art critic Clement Greenberg,[54] but rather expositions meant to account for and explore a range of practices. In 1963, he applauded photographers who "redefined" art photography and argued for cross-pollination commenting, "an art medium is not like the snake with its tail in its mouth. We [photographers] cannot expect to find all of the nourishment that we need within the works of the tradition."[55] A few years later, Szarkowski radically reconsidered the role of the photojournalist in *The Photo Essay* (1965) highlighting the photographer's subjectivity, which had been there all along but was incorrectly presumed neutralized by the camera's objectivity or ceded to the picture editor. Building on that

---

[53] *The Photographer's Eye* press release, registrar exhibition files, exh. #741, Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York. See Eva Respini and Drew Sawyer's essay "A 'New Prominence': Photography at MoMA in the 1960s and 1970s," in *The Photographic Object 1970* (forthcoming), which offers new research regarding Szarkowksi's formulations in *The Photographer's Eye.*

[54] American essayist and critic Clement Greenberg is most closely associated with Modernism and a style of criticism given to trenchant proclamation and absolutes. His key essays include: "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," (1939); "Towards a Newer Laocoon," (1940), where he discusses medium purity; "The Decline of Cubism," (1948); "Modernist Painting," (1960); and "After Abstract Expressionism," (1962). His writings have been anthologized in *Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism*, four volumes, edited by John O'Brian, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[55] John Szarkowski, "Commitment," in *SPE: The Formative Years*, ed. Nathan Lyons (Rochester, NY: Visual Studies Workshop Press, 2012), 70. Szarkowski presented this text at the Invitational Teaching Conference at George Eastman House in 1962.

idea in *New Documents* (1967), Szarkowski proposed a kind of documentary and street photography in line with New Journalism that no longer aimed to moralize or persuade. In an effort to address the very real condition of mass quantities of photographic images made by non-artists since the medium's inception, Szarkowski gave anonymous photographs unprecedented exposure in *The Photographer's Eye, Looking at Photographs: 100 Pictures from the Collection of the Museum of Modern Art* (1973) and installations of the permanent collection. These exhibitions were hardly statements of photographic purity. Rather, they were radical ideas at the time, provoking irritation among some art photographers.[56] Szarkowski was carrying out a larger project – one in which Bunnell also participated and held a key role – of questioning broadly what was and was not part of photography, a mode of thinking and producing ideas. Furthermore, if Szarkowski's interests were indeed limited to photography's optical description of the world, as Phillips charged, it was something that photography did particularly well, was continuing to evolve in the hands of young photographers, and therefore demanded ongoing explication.

Bunnell would also organize many exhibitions of optically descriptive photographs.[57] However, *Photography as Printmaking* and *Photography into Sculpture* introduced an entirely different group of objects and ideas that resisted the straight paradigm. In his texts, Bunnell identified photography's norms in order to articulate what the practitioners in his exhibitions were working against. Targeting a privileged notion of the

[56] Douglas Nickel via email with the author, March 30, 2014.
[57] In the interview in this dissertation Bunnell recounts organizing exhibitions of contemporary photographers such as Robert Adams, Emmet Gowin, and Paul Caponigro, as well as a historical exhibition of Pictorialism. He would have presented both contemporary and historical works in installations of recent acquisitions and other surveys of the collection.

photographer as "an observer" who "possesses a vision" the photographers in *Photography as Printmaking* were not inclined to simply witness and record but invent and construct their images.[58] Bunnell's follow-up exhibition *Photography into Sculpture* targeted prevailing ideas about the *photograph*: "The current notion of what a photograph looks like is that it is a piece of paper on which there is a more-or-less recognizable image which is interpreted in terms of two dimensions standing for three, picture size representing life size, and a variety of grays representing colors." Since these descriptions fit nearly every other photographer and photograph that Szarkowski and Bunnell put on view at MoMA in the 1960s, it was clear that Bunnell aimed to challenge fundamental aspects of the medium. Bunnell stated his motivations clearly and simply: "All of these conceptions are perfectly adequate as far as they go, but they do not exhaust the complexities of contemporary photography."[59]

***

Photography as Printmaking (on view at MoMA March 19 – May 26, 1968) surveyed photography from its earliest years to the present, including works by Robert Hunt (dated c. 1842), Francis Frith (1858), Edward Steichen (1905), Alfred Stieglitz (1918), Laszló Moholy-Nagy (c. 1926), Man Ray (c. 1936), Aaron Siskind (1952), Naomi Savage (1965-68), Ray Metzker (1967), Jerry Uelsmann (1967) and Robert Heinecken (1968). In just over seventy works by fifty-five photographers, some forty photographic processes were represented.[60] More than half of the checklist was contemporary and was meant to

[58] *Photography as Printmaking* wall label. Curatorial exhibition files, exh. #853. Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.
[59] Ibid.
[60] The processes listed on the *Photography as Printmaking* checklist include: albumen, aristotype, assemblage and collage with various materials, calotype, carbon print, chemical bleaches, stains, toners and dyes, cliché-verre, composite print, cyanotype, daguerreotype, salt print, gum bichromate and pigment prints, hand photogravure, Kodalith paper monoprint, palladium, photo etching, photogram, photo-

"reveal the continuing interrelationship of technology to photographic aesthetics."[61] Here Bunnell readily combined his interest in historical and contemporary photography with his connoisseurship skills.

The sheer number of ways in which photographic materials had been manipulated over the previous one hundred and twenty five years implied that technical innovation was an inexhaustible means of reinventing the medium.[62] Additionally, by including the combination printing of Henry Peach Robinson as a precedent for Jerry Uelsmann who also printed elements from several different negatives on a single sheet of photographic paper to achieve complex compositions, for example, contemporary innovators could be understood as part of photography's existing traditions. Bunnell's approach implied that contemporary photographers should not only know the history of the medium but also feel empowered and validated by past examples of experimentation.

Photography as Printmaking posed a challenge to what Bunnell saw as "the traditional critical separation between 'straight photography,' which seeks to mirror external reality by extending the viewer illusionistically into the picture space, and the aesthetic that emphasizes the distinctive surface quality of the print itself in order to evoke an emotional response to the image, sometimes by dispensing with the camera-made image

---

mechanical halftone, photo-offset, platinotype, platinum print, silver bromide, solarization, video tape photograph, woodburytype print, and Xerograph. *Photography as Printmaking* checklist, curatorial exhibition files, exh. #853. Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

[61] *Photography as Printmaking* press release, registrar exhibition files, exh. #853. Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

[62] While photo sculpture never caught on as a movement per se, historical processes came much closer during the 1970s and 1980s. Gum printing, cyanotype, photograms, solarization, Sabatier effect, platinum and palladium and other processes were recovered, deemed "alternative processes," and re-categorized as having less to do with the past and more to do with expanding photography's expressive potential in opposition to restrictive, exacting darkroom practices.

altogether."[63] He argued that photographers representing both straight and manipulated approaches were printmakers, i.e. makers of photographic prints. Differing only by degree, every photographer made choices about the physical attributes of the print, which had an effect on content. Bunnell claimed that even straight photographers like Alfred Stieglitz and Edward Weston altered the look and meaning of their images by choosing palladium and platinum printing techniques, while Éugene Atget created "a mood" or invoked "a response" by using Aristotype paper and toning his pictures a warm brown color. Contemporary photographers like Naomi Savage, who displayed her photo-etching plates as finished works of art, were more aggressive and obvious about their interventions. Bunnell argued that to look at photography as printmaking in this way emphasized its physicality and made "the medium visible, whereas the so-called 'straight' approach seeks to make it invisible."[64] He inferred that to look through and past the picture plane to perceive the photographic image as somehow automatic or magically occurring without technique, maker, or object was false and misleading. Rather, the result of every photographic process was a photographic object suffused with intentionality that was as much or more a fact than the image on its surface. To proclaim photography's physicality not only made the medium visible, it made the operations of the medium, such as optical description, available for critique.

Bunnell was well aware that photography's status as a physical object had been tenuous in the first half of the twentieth century. In the 1950s, Minor White, whom Bunnell knew well, and other photographers of his generation never expected their work to exist in the

[63] *Photography as Printmaking* press release, p, 1, registrar exhibition files, exh. #853, Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.
[64] Ibid.

world as prints. Instead they would be received by viewers in the pages of newspapers and journals like *Aperture*, then edited by White, as something akin to visual "ideas."[65] Even in the context of exhibitions, MoMA curator Edward Steichen was known for disregarding the creative choices usually retained by photographers about presentation – determinations regarding size, cropping, and framing. He treated photographers as imagemakers, the museum as a publisher, and cast himself in the role of editor and layout artist, together with the architect Paul Rudolph who was the exhibition designer, altering the physical attributes of photographs as they saw fit.[66]

In his review of *Photography as Printmaking* for *Infinity*, the journal of The American Society of Magazine Photographers,[67] Charles Reynolds made the challenge in Bunnell's exhibition explicit: "The Museum of Modern Art's new exhibit *Photography as Printmaking* is dedicated to the proposition that a good photograph is not just a creatively recorded *fact* – a bit of reality before the camera, captured by the photographer and interpreted by means of aperture, shutter speed, camera position and moment of exposure – but also an *artifact* – an object of plastic art." Reynolds critique continued, reflecting his own exceptionalism and preference for optical description:

---

[65] Peter Bunnell interview with William Johnson, Center for Creative Photography, February 24, 1979, Center for Creative Photography Oral History Collection, 79:16.

[66] Christopher Philips called Edward Steichen "MoMA's glorified picture editor," in "The Judgment Seat of Photography," 28. Steichen and his team selected images for *The Family of Man* based on their political and emotional content. They had enlarged, mounted and arranged them in accordance with the "one world" theme of the exhibition as a whole. This meant taking images out of their original contexts -- whether from the pages of *Life* magazine or fine art – and leveling out the quality of the images no matter their source to achieve a unifying effect. This aspect of the exhibition has been criticized. For example, Ansel Adams and John Szarkowski protested the loss of quality in fine prints such as Adams's. For a summary of this and other arguments regarding reproductions and their presentation in *Family of Man*, see the first half of Philips's essay as well as Eric Sandeen, Chapter 2, "Picturing the Exhibition," in *Picturing an Exhibition*, especially 59-61.

[67] Charles Reynolds, "Photography: Fact or Artifact," *Infinity*, 17, no. 5 (May 1968):15-18.

> If photography is 'a mirror with a memory' to what degree is this untampered mirroring of exterior reality the source of its expressive power? How much should the photographer tamper with the surface of that mirror to thus distort and 'dematerialize' the reflected image to present a more subjective view of the world?[68]

Reynolds's review would surely have disappointed Bunnell who sought an expanded view of the medium and a shift in the conversation within the photography community, the majority of which would have agreed with Reynolds. For example, Robert Heinecken's and Naomi Savage's works were often labeled "experimental" by other photographers, which at the time carried negative connotations of being incomplete or unresolved. At the same time, Bunnell was concerned that the term "creative," which was meant to compliment those same works, implied that traditional straight photography was, by extension, uncreative.[69] Neither characterization accurately reflected Bunnell's opinions and was simply too limiting. Instead he sought the condition where pure and impure, straight and manipulated photographs coexisted and were equally valid. The concern over terminology speaks to the sensitivities Bunnell was navigating.

Emily Wasserman, the critic who reviewed *Photography as Printmaking* for *Artforum*, delighted in photographs from the past by Edward Steichen, Clarence White, William

---

[68] Ibid, 15. Reynolds is quoting Bunnell's use of the word "dematerialize," an interesting choice since the notion "the dematerialization of the art object" would be associated with conceptual art practices, not photography. Lucy Lippard and John Chandler first used the term in a 1968 essay titled "The Dematerialization of Art."

[69] *Photography as Printmaking* wall label, curatorial exhibition files, exh. #853, Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York. Nathan Lyons also mentions that the label "experimental," when applied to photography, suggested "something unresolved and decidedly apart from reality" in his introduction to *The Persistence of Vision: Donald Blumberg, Charles Gill, Robert Heinecken, Ray K. Metzker, Jerry N. Uelsmann, John Wood* (New York: Horizon Press, and Rochester, NY: George Eastman House, 1967), n.p. Lyons (*The Persistence of Vision,* 1967*)* and Bunnell *(Photography into Sculpture*, 1970*)* included some of the same types of pieces by Heinecken in their respective exhibitions: multiple-solution puzzles, figure cubes, figure blocks, rotating figure sections.

Southgate Porter, Francis Frith and others as well as contemporary pieces by Robert Heinecken and Jerry Uelsmann. She found most contemporary color work in the show problematic but accepted Bunnell's thesis that all photographers are printmakers, which inspired her to consider the subtleties of the photographic print. Yet, she compelled living photographers to put the medium through more dramatic and fundamental transformations than those observed in the exhibition. She wrote this explanation for why photographers, who possess equal "creative promise" as their painting counterparts, have failed to achieve a radical overhaul of photography:

> …this has to do with the pictorial definition of photography itself. In its far shorter history, photography has not called for the drastic revamping of scale, nor for the rejection of traditional three-dimensional space which so importantly transformed painting in the twentieth century.[70]

Wasserman recognized photography's perceived dependence on illusion, its singular connection to reality and status as window on the world, while acknowledging painting's progression away from these conditions.[71] She seemed convinced that photography would not or could not pose fundamental challenges to optical description and physical attributes such as scale and color. Bunnell's next exhibition, *Photography into Sculpture*, would do just that.

***

[70] Emily Wasserman, "*Photography as Printmaking*, Museum of Modern Art," *Artforum* (Summer 1968): 71.

[71] Wasserman could be referring to the breakdown of mimetic representation engendered by Picasso's primitivism, attacks on perspective launched by Cubism, and the increasing recognition of the flatness of the picture plane and scale shifts found in Abstract Expressionist works by Jackson Pollock and Barnet Newman that had a greater affinity with the wall or floor than the easel. The minimalist painter Frank Stella, much in the consciousness at the time (he had a solo show up at MoMA at the same time as *Photography into Sculpture*), is credited with the dissolution of figure-versus-ground, taking cues from sculpture in increasing scale and challenging illusionistic space.

There were fifty-two objects made by twenty-three artists in *Photography into Sculpture*, which was on view at MoMA from April 8 to July 5, 1970. According to the press release, it was "the first comprehensive survey of photographically formed images used in a sculptural or fully dimensional manner."[72] One glance around the gallery announced to the viewer that it was unique among photography exhibitions. The gallery was filled with vitrines, pedestals, wall shelves, illuminated cases, and stacks of screen-printed boxes on the floor. Bunnell placed Lynton Wells's life-sized figure of a man printed on photo linen – a sort of stitched, stuffed, and hand colored doll – in the sight-lines of the first room so that the viewer's gaze would be met by one as seemingly embodied as their own. The photographic objects in *Photography into Sculpture* were made of all kinds of materials including photo paper, Kodalith and other kinds of film both positive and negative, light bulbs, glass, photo linen, Plexiglas and other plastics, cardboard, craft paper, Astroturf, wood, foam core, and pigment. Manipulated in a wide variety of ways -- cutting, arranging, laminating, screen printing, vacuum forming among them -- they occupied actual space, sometimes only an inch or two, but typically more.[73] *Photography into Sculpture* showcased artists whose "commitment to the physical object" was primary

[72] The 1969 exhibition *Vision and Expression,* organized by Nathan Lyons at George Eastman House, is sometimes cited as an earlier and more innovative effort than *Photography into Sculpture* (1970). Lyons is did embrace and promote experimental photography utilizing Plexiglas, Kodalith, liquid emulsion, applied color, Xerographic prints, assemblage and other techniques, as well as three-dimensional photographic objects. Photo sculpture was not, however, the focus of Lyons' exhibition, which was to be a survey of contemporary photography. Only three out of 154 plates in the *Vision and Expression* catalogue were identified as three-dimensional (by James Fallon, Brian M. Jacobs, and Joyce Neimanas). And while Robert Heinecken, Robert E. Brown, Darryl Curran, and Carl Cheng appeared in both Lyons's and Bunnell's exhibitions, none of them exhibited dimensional work in *Vision and Expression.*

[73] In spite of the fact that artists in the exhibition were manipulating and disrupting the integrity of the whole photographic image, there was still a commitment to craft. In fact, the artists in *Photography into Sculpture* often added to the process of photography and complicated it by cutting up the gelatin silver print and reassembling them (e.g. Dale Quarterman's *Marvella* and Robert Heinecken's *Twenty-four Figure Blocks* in which fragments of photographs are glued to three-dimensional forms). At the same time, contemporary artists were using photography in a simple and direct way in their conceptual work, engaging in "a withdrawl of craft values." See Lucy Soutter, "Expanding Photography circa 1970: Photographic Objects and Conceptual Art," in *The Photographic Object 1970*.

and who rarely left the photograph itself intact.[74] Some had studied the medium and called themselves photographers and others did not, which was an important distinction at the time.[75] Bunnell cared little about background, training, or designation instead recognizing that all of them were non-conformists who were challenging straight photography's conventions.

Bunnell referenced historical examples in his texts but, unlike *Photography as Printmaking,* chose not to include them in *Photography into Sculpture*, which was to be an up-to-the-minute survey of a new kind of photography.[76] For example, Jack Dale's intricate sculptures were constructed out of fractured figurative photographs printed onto small pieces of glass resembling early-twentieth century magic lantern slides. Douglas Prince layered film positives inside small boxes that could be handled by the viewer, recalling the intimacy of cased ambrotypes from 1850s-1860s.[77] Bunnell cited "constructivist philosophy that art is concerned with techniques, not experience observed or remembered," as a guiding principle. In other words, technical experimentation trumped representation in *Photography into Sculpture*, which is a possible explanation for why Bunnell did not emphasize content. "Dada masters," his designation for Man Ray and Marcel Duchamp, were also models and inspiration for *Photography into Sculpture* artists as were more contemporary "assemblagists and illusionists such as [Robert]

---

[74] Peter C. Bunnell, "Photography into Sculpture," *Arts in Virginia* 11 (Spring 1971): 18 – 25.
[75] During the 1960s and 1970s, how photographers self-identified as "artist" or "photographer" was important as it was understood as an indication of one's allegiances, intentions, and career ambitions. Artists and photographers interviewed for this dissertation were asked how they identified themselves then and now.
[76] Memo from Peter Bunnell to William S. Lieberman, then director of painting and sculpture at MoMA, February, 26, 1970 about the *Photography into Sculpture* exhibition. Collection of Peter C. Bunnell.
[77] References to magic lantern slides and ambrotype found appear in Bunnell's essay in *artscanada*.

Rauschenberg, [Gerald] Gooch and [Joseph] Cornell."[78] Rauschenberg's *Revolver* (1967) was reproduced as an antecedent to Robert Heinecken's photographic puzzles such as *Twenty-four Figure Blocks* (1970) and Michael De Courcy's photo-silkscreened cardboard box installation *Untitled* (1970), which were infinitely changeable, participation oriented and concerned with chance.[79]

However inclusive, germane, and interesting Bunnell's historical connections, some participants and observers, like Robert Heinecken whose work was in the exhibition and photography critic Margery Mann who reviewed it, wished that he had given them more emphasis. In December 1971, Heinecken cited François Willème's photo sculptures from the 1860s in a talk surveying new work by the artists in *Photography into Sculpture* when the exhibition was on view at San Francisco Museum of Art (now SFMoMA).[80] Willème used two-dozen cameras and a double pantograph fitted with knives to make a carving of the sitter out of clay, aided by the speed and accuracy of the photographic process. Willème's photographs were never intended to be the end result. Rather, the two-dimensional photographic image was an essential invisible component of the process used to translate the person into their three-dimensional likeness.[81] Neither Mann nor

---

[78] References to Constructivists, Dada masters, Rauschenberg, Gooch, and Cornell made by Bunnell in *Creative Camera*, 72 (June 1970): 190-91.

[79] Rauschenberg's *Revolver* was reproduced in Bunnell's essay in *artscanada*. Bunnell also cited Robert Watts and his *BLT Sandwich* as a historical Pop art precedent in *Arts in Virginia* magazine, even though the piece was included in *Photography into Sculpture*.

[80] Robert Heinecken, hand-written notes for a lecture about *Photography into Sculpture* given at San Francisco Museum of Art on December 1, 1971. Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography, University of Arizona, Tucson. The notes are undated, but an announcement for the lecture titled, "The Photograph as Object," which appeared in the *San Francisco Chronicle* the same day as the lecture – Wednesday, December 1, 1971 – supplies an approximate date. Margery Mann, "Marvella, Is That You?" *Popular Photography,* 67, no. 2 (August 1970): 100-101, 104.

[81] For more information about Willème see Robert A. Sobieszek, "Sculpture as the Sum of Its Profiles: François Willème and Photosculpture in France, 1859 – 1868," *The Art Bulletin*, 62, no. 4 (December, 1980): 617-30. Quoted on 618.

Heinecken connected the work of Willème or others directly to the practices of the artists in *Photography into Sculpture*, which might have made their critique of Bunnell's presumed oversight more productive. However, Dale Quarterman, whose work appeared in *Photography into Sculpture*, was inspired by Willème's work and was cited in his MFA thesis.[82]

In this chapter, the example of Willème helps to articulate an idea fundamental to photo sculpture: how a photographic image is converted into an object. Bearing this in mind, the following examples by Robert Watts, Michael Stone, Ellen Brooks, Lynton Wells, Jerry McMillan, Douglas Prince and Robert Heinecken are connected to disparate antecedents and serve as exemplars of the works and strategies deployed in the exhibition.

Robert Watts's *BLT* (1965), in which flat black and white photo transparencies of bacon, lettuce and tomato are set into or "sandwiched" between clear slices of Lucite shaped like bread, is the most literal piece in *Photography into Sculpture*. The sculptural component, the ersatz bread, allows the flat image of the sandwiches' ingredients, which are pictured on positive film in detail, to exist in shallow three-dimensions. The photographs are wholly transformed into another recognizable object even absent the color of red tomatoes, green lettuce and brown bacon, or the spongy texture of white bread. The humor of the piece depends upon the literalness of the transformation aided by

[82] Dale Quarterman graduated with his MFA from the Illinois Institute of Technology in May 1972. Quarterman's thesis committee included Arthur Siegel, who signed in approval of his thesis.

photography while it also plays on the triviality of the subject matter and its elevation to art, operations associated with Pop art and Fluxus.[83]

Michael Stone's *Channel 5 News KTLA Los Angeles, California USA: Tom Reddin* (1970) utilizes television screen grabs of images of Tom Reddin, the former L.A. police chief turned newscaster. Miniaturized television images are encased in packages and hung on a rack like a cheap dime store display. The sculptural component not only converts the photographic images into objects that resemble television screens but also delivers aspects of the content: public officials could be bought and sold and the viewer is complicit in the transaction. Furthermore, strategies and components labeled here as "sculptural," were also presentational. For example, Stone's packages and racks replace the mattes and picture frames used for displaying straight photographs.

Bunnell might have also cited Pablo Picasso and Georges Braque whose Cubism was concerned with "the necessary fusion of two seemingly irreconcilable opposites: the depicted volumes of 'real' objects and the flatness of the painter's own physical object (just as 'real' as anything in the world before the artist), which is the canvas plane of the

[83] Simon Anderson discusses other *trompe l'oeil* objects made by Watts utilizing photographs, including a tablecloth printed with an image of a woman's legs as if she is sitting at the table and place mats printed with place settings complete with food and utensils. The idea of "fooling the eye" with a photograph, which has a perceived special relationship to the object it depicts, is absurdly humorous, especially when set onto or into a support so obviously related to the subject matter as the bread-shaped plastic of Watts's *BLT*. Simon Anderson, "Fluxus Publicus," in *The Spirit of Fluxus,* 40-41. In his interview in this dissertation, Ted Victoria recalls assisting Watts, his professor, with screen-printing photographs of genitals onto underwear.

picture."[84] In 1912, at the tail end of Analytical Cubism, Picasso created *Still Life with Chair Caning*. The slippage between the fictive and the real, i.e. the visual elements and the tactile ones, is in evidence throughout Picasso's painting, especially in the passages where the photomechanically reproduced chair caning meets the real rope. Similar instances occur in works that appeared in *Photography into Sculpture*.

Ellen Brooks' *Flats: One Through Five* (1969) is a series of five wooden trays resembling garden flats of moss mounted to the wall in succession at hip height. The proportions of the flats, their pristine construction and clean installation, resemble a horizontal version of the minimalist sculptor Donald Judd's stacks. When the viewer peers into the flats, a broad expanse of grass where two small nude figures, caught in an embrace, roll in sequence across the surface of the landscape. Brooks shaped the landscape with foam and covered the gently rolling hills with artificial grass called Leisure Turf.[85] The figures, models that Brooks hired, set up and photographed, are specific bodies rendered on photo-sensitized linen. Brooks cut an opening corresponding to the outer contour of the entwined couple in the turf's surface and seamlessly inserted them. At the edge where the two meet, the viewer must resolve the visual and tactile differences of the "fleshy" bodies rendered precisely in photographic tones of black, white and grey and the verdant artificiality of the "grass."[86]

---

[84] Daniel Henry Kahnweiler, *The Rise of Cubism* (1915 – 16), quoted in "1911: Picasso and Braque Develop Analytical Cubism," in *Art Since 1900*, eds. Hal Foster, Rosalind Krauss, Yve-Alain Bois, and Benjamin H.D. Buchloh (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2004), 107.

[85] Leisure Turf is similar to Astroturf. Brooks recalled that it was used to cover graves during graveside funeral services until the body in its casket was lowered.

[86] Robert E. Brown, whose collaborative work with James Pennuto appeared in *Photography into Sculpture,* created a solo work titled *The Cinder Block Wall* (1974) at the de Young Museum in San Francisco that similarly played on the fictive versus the real. Brown photographed a cinderblock wall and printed a 1:1 reproduction of it on black-and-white photo mural paper. In a small gallery with hardwood

Lynton Wells made *Untitled* (1969) by photographing a friend, both from the front and back, and printing the images life-sized onto photo-sensitized linen. He cut out the figure, roughly, with several inches of blank or stained linen all around, and then stitched the two pieces together and stuffed the entire figure with urethane foam to give it dimension. Wells's friend was clothed in a long sleeved shirt and pants when the photographs were taken. Therefore, on a material level, the photo linen from which the piece was made becomes a transliteration of the original. What remains of the figure, the flesh and hair, were made more believable by hand-applied color. The shape, color, and scale of the piece far exceed the limitations of photographs typical of the time. Wells left the edges of the linen raw and visible calling attention to its condition as a fabricated photographic object.[87]

In 1963-64, Jerry McMillan conducted a series of exercises that lead to the pieces in *Photography into Sculpture*.[88] First McMillan took a photograph of his pregnant wife, whom he thought of as a vessel for their unborn child, and folded it into the form of a box, turning her image into a container. This experiment emphasized the materiality of the photograph – it was a piece of paper that could be manipulated into a three-

---

floors, he covered the walls with the photographic murals and set the lights low and even. Visitors would enter the gallery, assume that they had stumbled into a janitor's closet or some other off-limits space, and leave. Here the gray tones of the photograph corresponded to the color of the actual cinder blocks. Ellen Brooks, who had frequent conversations with Brown when she rented studio space from him in San Francisco, recalled the piece with enthusiasm. In a conversation with the author in March 2012, Brooks reported that the wood floor "just glowed" in the environment of the gelatin silver prints lining the walls.

[87] Wells first tried trimming the extra fabric right up to the stitching. He did not like the way the figure looked and reattached it. Lynton Wells in conversation with the author, June 25, 2014.

[88] Jerry McMillan in conversation with the author, May 8, 2012. Like Bunnell, I am foregrounding McMillan's process of experimentation instead of content in order to tease out Bunnell's concerns and arguments.

dimensional object. Next he took test prints, wrinkled them up, placed them around his studio and photographed them. This brief act of iconoclasm instantly transformed the flat photograph into another kind of photographic object. The image no longer defined its role or status and the photograph now ruined became the subject of yet another photograph, forming a narrative about photography itself. A third exercise began with the question, "If the photograph no longer had to be flat and mounted to a board, then what could it be?" McMillan wrinkled up a piece of craft paper and photographed it, enlarged the results and had it offset printed onto craft paper. He cut, scored, folded, and glued the printed paper into a small grocery bag.[89] He liked the idea that the bag, now a photographic object, was perfect but appeared to have been mutilated – the fictive and real collapsing into a single object. Preoccupied with texture, McMillan did the same thing with black-eyed peas, photographing and printing them onto craft paper. Typically the contents of such a bag, the peas now appeared on the interior and exterior surfaces of the bag and the graphic quality of black-eyed peas themselves, the fact that they are black and white in real life, minimized the dissonance between real and depicted, actual texture and the illusion of texture.

In this context, there is another lesson from Analytical Cubism and the historic break with perspective it represents: it is a reminder that straight, optically descriptive photography is dependent on vision and perspective while photo sculptures have a greater degree of latitude. In the examples cited to this point, the subject, often a human figure, was photographed directly and from the front or removed from its context so that linear

[89] McMillan got a small brown paper bag from the grocery store, took it apart, and used it as a template so that his bags would look just like the real thing.

perspective was de-emphasized. In contrast, Douglas Prince managed to make photographic objects that used a three-dimensional form to construct and heighten two-dimensional illusionistic space. Prince printed disparate photographic fragments on clear sheets of positive film and layered them, creating fantasy composites that followed the rules of perspective.[90] Skillfully orchestrating each layer of the image so that it contained a slice of the picture plane – the foreground, middle ground, background – he ordered them to achieve desired spatial effects. The film was held in place between sheets of Plexiglas that were in turn held in place by a frame, the entire package forming a shallow box. The resulting image – a physical composite occupying space versus those that coalesced on the surface of a single sheet of photographic paper in the darkroom – was sometimes very surreal but the illusion was believable. The simple three-dimensional form of the Plexiglas box that held them was essential to the construction of the image and the defining element that qualified them as sculpture.[91]

The content associated with materials is not an issue in Prince's photo sculptures. Rather, it is the sculptural form in combination with the photographic image that makes his pieces what they are. The same is true of works by Robert Heinecken, Guissepe Pirone, Dale Quarterman, and Leslie Snyder. In general, fragments sourced from one or several photographic images that have been printed straight or manipulated, on paper or on film,

[90] Prince used Kodalith a brand of positive film made by Kodak that was popular among photographers and printmakers. For a first-person illustrated account of Princes' process, see Jain Kelly, ed., *Darkroom 2* (New York: Lustrum Press, 1978), 97-109.

[91] Bunnell recalled in a conversation with the author on August 13, 2014 that Prince's early boxes had clear plastic backs so that they could be viewed from front to back as well as back to front, which reinforced the artificiality of the illusion.

are assembled using the physical structure of the sculptural form to achieve a new uninterrupted image.

Works by Prince, Pirone, Snyder and Heinecken (specifically, *Venus Mirrored* and *Figure Foliage 1* and *Figure Foliage 2*), which are constructed out of Kodalith and Plexiglas, are still dependent on the image for its content. The materials – plastic and film – have little to do with content of the work. In contrast, Richard Jackson's *Negative Numbers*, uses large sheets of exposed film (i.e. negatives) in the final piece. The images are of Jackson, standing in front of the camera, writing his Social Security and draft numbers with a flashlight in the air in front of him. In other words, these numbers bearing negative connotations for the artist, are burned into the negative, and become the image. As a result, there is conceptual alignment between the materials the piece is made out of, the image, and the meaning of the piece as a whole.

In another example, *Twenty-four Figure Blocks* (1970), Robert Heinecken covered wood blocks with fragments of gelatin silver prints of a nude female figure and presented them as a puzzle that could be rearranged endlessly by the viewer who was now reclassified as a participant or a maker on par with the artist. The fact that the blocks were made out of wood had nothing to do with the content of the piece; they could have been made out of cardboard and the effect would have been the same. The piece was about challenging "the traditional sense of a photograph being a two-dimensional, stable or a complete thing." Furthermore, Heinecken constructed the work so that there was no ultimate solution where the fragmented image would reconstitute the original photographic

source. As far as he was concerned "each possible configuration was as good as any other."[92]

These examples allude to the radicality of the work in *Photography into Sculpture* in which the accurate depiction of space in the photograph (its hallmark illusionistic space) is combined with the tangible space (physical space), materiality (real texture and color), and three-dimensional form (actual weight and heft), which are characteristics of sculpture. These innovations placed new demands on the viewer. Instead of viewing photographs hung on the wall at eye level – a modernist convention – where optical description and perspective were most convincing, photo sculptures were placed on a shelf at almost any height or on a pedestal in the middle of the gallery facilitating the circumnavigation that was required to view and comprehend them. Challenging museum protocol and conventions of display, the viewer was meant to touch and activate works by De Courcy, Heinecken, Prince, and Stone.[93]

Photography into Sculpture was an obvious collision of mediums where the primacy of the image was readily traded for the primacy of the object in the broadest sense, each work becoming "not a picture of, but an object about something," to borrow a phrase from Heinecken.[94] This reconfiguration of priorities, where "new materials are

---

[92] Heinecken discussed this piece in a letter to Sondra Albert, editor of the Time-Life book *The Art of Photography* (1971). Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography, University of Arizona, Tucson.

[93] Bunnell lamented that he was unable to display these works in such a way that they could be touched. See interview with Bunnell in this dissertation.

[94] Robert Heinecken, "The Photograph: Not a Picture Of But an Object About Something" (1965), in Eva Respini, *Robert Heinecken: Object Matter* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2014), 155. There were competing views about what made a good photo sculpture among *Photography into Sculpture's* participants. When asked their opinions about the work in the show, Ellen Brooks said that some of the

incorporated as content," as Bunnell wrote, was foreign to most photographers of the straight school but well understood by many sculptors and conceptual artists.[95] Photo sculpture created an unfamiliar condition for photographers where the content of the work was not found solely in the photographic image but in the interaction between the image and the materials of sculpture or the image and the sculptural form. This point was not easily made or readily accepted in an environment where the photographic image was the presumed locus of subject matter, content and meaning.

***

The critical reception of *Photography into Sculpture* reflects the contentious debates over medium purity at the time. Veteran art critic Hilton Kramer and relative newcomer and photography critic A.D. Coleman reviewed it for *The New York Times*. Kramer's review appeared first and reflects his views on photography's purity and exceptionalism. He wrote that the work was lacking in sculptural interest to such a degree that "there is really no sculpture in the show at all." He likened it more to "run-of-the-mill commercial display art than anything intrinsically sculptural in essence or impact" – obliquely and perhaps unintentionally pointing to Pop Art antecedents in works by De Courcy, for example. In defense of traditional notions of photographic integrity he wrote:

---

pieces did not pay enough attention to aspects of sculpture such as form and materials. Douglas Prince felt that there was too little attention paid to the image.

[95] Peter Bunnell, "Photography into Sculpture," Museum of Modern Art Member's Newsletter, Spring 1970): n.p. Collection of Peter C. Bunnell.

> The printed photograph generates its own standards of purity and truth, its own dialectic of form and content, its own peculiar visions and fantasies. To use the printed photographs as mere raw material, then, for some three-dimensional construction is, inevitably, to violate the integrity of the photographic process. And to violate the integrity of photography in the interest of some rather woebegone sculptural clichés – which is what we are being offered here – is doubly deplorable.

Kramer nodded disdainfully at what he considered mere novelty in some of the work, chiding Bunnell for being taken in by it, given his knowledge of the history of photography and his connoisseurship skills. He concluded that the exhibition "leaves photography and sculpture… as separate entities," that the objects were unsuccessful as was the entire prospect of mixing mediums. In the final analysis, Kramer encouraged photography's "esthetic rebellions," but condemned the method, characterizing the work in the show as "facile tricks and vulgar distortions."[96]

Kramer often wrote about sculpture and therefore it was not a surprise that he urged readers to consider the sculptural side of the equation.[97] Robert Heinecken and William Lieberman, then Director of the Department of Painting and Sculpture at MoMA, had urged Bunnell to do the same during preparations for *Photography into Sculpture*. Lieberman and his staff had suggested the title *Three Dimensional Photography*, in an internal MoMA memo, which might have ratcheted down expectations regarding how successfully photography and sculpture were combined.[98] But Bunnell thought it dull and confusing and dismissed it immediately claiming that it would have been mistaken as an

---

[96] Hilton Kramer, "Modern Museum Displays Photography as Sculpture," *New York Times*, April 9, 1970, 50.

[97] Kramer wrote numerous sculpture reviews in the 1960s but was less accustomed to writing photo criticism. His review of *Photography into Sculpture* was only his fifth review about photography for the *New York Times*. His first was "The Classicism of Henri Cartier-Bresson," July 7, 1968.

[98] Memo from William S. Lieberman to Peter Bunnell, March 4,1970, re: "Photography into Sculpture" Exhibition," page 2. Collection of Peter C. Bunnell.

exhibition of stereographs.[99] When Heinecken gave his lecture at SFMoMA in 1971, he recalled a conversation he had with Bunnell about the title:

> I felt that the term "Sculpture" shouldn't be used at all because it called to mind certain traditional qualities of actual volume, a concern for particular illumination, relatively large scale and a tendency for certain materials, none of which I sensed would show up in the work to any extent. However, the specific name of a thing is rather important to institutions, and probably for good reasons, and I suppose most critical people in viewing the work would feel that the middle word of the 3, Photog [sic] into Sculpture best describes it.[100]

Like Kramer, Heinecken implied that the work in the show was deficient as sculpture, no doubt attuned to how his own photo sculptures fell short, but retained the prospect of photography's merger with other mediums. Recognizing Bunnell's framing of the exhibition as purposeful and strategic, Heinecken focused on the word "into," which signaled change, the process of one thing becoming another, or a possible act of hybridization.[101] By naming the mediums "photography" and "sculpture" in that order, Bunnell emphasized the idea that photography would be joined with or acted upon by sculpture, that the form, substance or condition of photography would be changed, which, indeed it was.[102] Furthermore, the viewer versed in contemporary art and criticism could locate *Photography into Sculpture* within the ongoing conversation around the breakdown of traditional art categories and definitions, i.e. medium specificity.

---

[99] See the interview with Bunnell in this dissertation for his recollections about the title.
[100] Robert Heinecken, hand-written notes for a lecture about *Photography into Sculpture* given at the San Francisco Museum of Art, circa December 1, 1971. Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography, University of Arizona, Tucson.
[101] Carl Cheng, whose work appeared in *Photography into Sculpture,* called the title "transitory." In his interview in this dissertation, Cheng calls sculpture a complex and ancient discipline with its own conventions and histories and photography a relatively new discipline that was at the time under-theorized. He implies that any interaction between the two would necessarily be temporary and subject to redefinition over time.
[102] The title *Photography as Printmaking* contrast with *Photography into Sculpture* in tone and meaning, and signals a completely different action. The word "as" can mean "in the role, function, capacity, or sense of," as in, "He poses as a friend." "As" does not suggest transformation.

The photography critic A.D. Coleman's review of *Photography into Sculpture*, "Sheer Anarchy, Or a Step Forward?" appeared in *The New York Times* three days after Kramer's.[103] Coleman found his colleague's call for photographic purity was out of synch with contemporary art where, "boundary lines once thought to be inviolable – those between dance and theater, for instance, or between painting and photography – have been entirely eradicated in certain areas, and it is only a matter of time before other, theoretically clearer distinctions – between dance and painting, say, or music and film – become equally arbitrary." Coleman encouraged his readers to interpret this breakdown of divisions between disciplines as positive, a "redefinition of art/creativity – namely, the elimination of intra-media competition and bigotry."

This last statement holds the promise or at least anticipates the opportunity to move past old debates pitting photography against other mediums, especially painting. Even though photographic modernists like Alfred Stieglitz and Paul Strand had successfully used medium specific arguments to gain respect for the medium in the early part of the twentieth century, it could now be argued that the strategy had outlived its usefulness. Coleman and Bunnell understood that they were operating under a different set of circumstances; it appeared that photography had taken its legitimate place among conventional mediums. It was, after all, very much in evidence in McShine's *Information*. Yet, many photographers lamented that this state of affairs favored artists who used photography over those who identified with and called themselves

[103] A.D. Coleman, "Sheer Anarchy, Or a Step Forward?," *New York Times*, April 12, 1970, D-30.

photographers.[104] This may be attributed to the fact that the vast majority of art photographers were not willing to equate photographs with something as prosaic and reductive as information or data. Most photographers invested in the medium were disinclined to engage with the question that occupied conceptual artists: what if art is just information or an idea? Nor were they interested in photography as a mechanical or technological means of producing industrial components for art like Dan Flavin's fluorescent light installations.[105] To comprehend and use the photograph in this way, as in Ed Ruscha's photo book *Twentysix Gasoline Stations*, meant that the image itself was no longer the special and restricted repository of meaning. Furthermore, the image could be dumb or empty and the photographic object still contained content. To diminish the role of the photographic image was to rethink photographic representation and how photographs generated meaning.

Rather than condemning the work in *Photography into Sculpture* for what it was not as Kramer had, Coleman argued that the viewer should evaluate it on its own terms. He urged viewers to ask: "Does it affect us in some way, intellectual or emotional (or both), profoundly? Does it state its own terms and meet them?" He championed the goals of the exhibition, writing, "The methods are startlingly diverse, and the results are almost always stimulating, since they all force the viewer to examine his preconceptions about the relationship between the various media involved." Although he did not consider

---

[104] The experimental photographer Thomas Barrow, whose own work was concept-driven, pointed to the inequities between the amount of exposure, market share, and respect garnered by artists who used photography versus those who called themselves photographers. Thomas Barrow slide lecture at the Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, September 19, 1979.

[105] Hilton Kramer expressed similar concerns when he wrote that using the "printed photographs as mere raw material" in service to photo sculpture was "inevitably, to violate the integrity of the photographic process."

every piece in the show to be a triumph, Coleman nevertheless applauded the exhibition's overall vitality, recognizing its fundamental challenge to the modernist insistence on the separation of mediums.

Whether each individual work in the exhibition was a complete success did not concern Bunnell, either. In a memo to William Lieberman, he wrote, "I have no illusion that many of the works in the exhibition will be considered truly realized, but I think there will be abundant evidence of substantive creative energy and analysis that it will be a lively and meaningful exhibition."[106] Like many of the works in the exhibition, *Photography into Sculpture* was itself provisional. It was an unresolved proposition, an inquiry in process, and a sample. It was young, awkward and unrefined by design, posing new challenges to the medium as well as reflecting the shifting role of the curator who was not only an art historian and connoisseur but someone who recognized and ushered in new practices and found a place for them in the museum. Bunnell highlighted the inexperience of artists in *Photography into Sculpture* by playing up the student/professor dynamic of Robert Heinecken and his five current and former students also included in the exhibition.[107] These were tricky positions for a photography curator to take in 1970 enabling charges of amateurishness and triviality. The late 1960s saw increasing professionalization in all aspects of art photography including photographers, photo educators, photo dealers and photo curators. Much of that professionalization was facilitated by photography's shift within the universities as it moved out of photojournalism and design departments and

[106] Memo from Peter Bunnell to William S. Lieberman, February, 26, 1970, re: "Photography into Sculpture" exhibition. Collection of Peter C. Bunnell.
[107] Darryl Curran and Carl Cheng were two of Heinecken's earliest students at UCLA. Ellen Brooks, Leslie Snyder, and Michael Stone were in Heinecken's graduate students when Bunnell selected their work for *Photography into Sculpture*.

into fine art departments as a serious and autonomous form of art – a transition based on medium specific arguments about what photography could offer students that was distinct from painting, drawing, and printmaking.

Bunnell, however, was willing and perhaps saw advantages to placing *Photography into Sculpture* in non-medium specific contexts. For example, the June 1970 issue of *artscanada* magazine became the *de facto* exhibition catalogue for *Photography into Sculpture*, and was in many ways an apt substitute for a traditional one because it emphasized the innovation of photo sculpture and its connection to other contemporary practices.[108] Subtitled, "Interactions: photography/painting/sculpture," the issue was concerned with "photography, its documentary aspects and its sculptural affinities." Twelve photographs of Michael de Courcy's boxes from *Photography into Sculpture* appeared on the cover.[109] Bunnell contributed a detailed and well-illustrated article about the exhibition, preceded by critic Barry Lord's assessment of contemporary exhibitions and trends, from life-sized realist sculptures of figures and animals, to the historical relationship between photography and painting, examples of contemporary photo realism, the work of Canadian conceptual artist Michael Snow, and a discussion of several works

---

[108] Letter from George A. Cruger, editor of *Arts in Virginia,* the members' magazine of the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, June 29, 1971, to Goldthwaite H. Dorr, director of Phoenix Art Museum, which presented *Photography into Sculpture* in 1971. Cruger wrote: "Apparently a representative of that magazine [*artscanada*] has been suggesting to museums on the national tour that they use the magazine in place of a catalogue." Phoenix Art Museum exhibition files.

There was a trend toward untraditional catalogue designs and contents during the 1960s and 1970s. The catalogue for *Information* is a good example. McShine asked for contributions from all participating artists and noted in his text that the catalogue itself was an extension of the exhibition.

[109] The photographs on the cover of *artscanada* document collaboration between Michael de Courcy and the photographer Eberhardt Otto, assisted by Kim Andrews, commissioned by the magazine. De Courcy asked Otto to photograph one hundred boxes –the same design as those used in his *Untitled* installation in *Photography into Sculpture* -- in twelve locations around Vancouver. Otto and Andrews chose the locations, stacked them as they wished, and made the photographs without further direction from de Courcy.

in *Photography into Sculpture*. The issue also contained Charlotte Townsend's review, "*Photo Show* at SUB Art Gallery at University of British Columbia," which explored a series of questions about photography. For example, Vito Acconci's work raised the question, "What difference does it make to the image if there is a human eye behind the view-finder?" Ted Lindberg's review titled *"955,000*: An exhibition organized by Lucy Lippard at the Vancouver Art Gallery," analyzed Lippard's innovative curatorial effort, resembling *Information* in its scope and content.

The rich contemporary and conceptual art context provided by *artscanada* continued in the Vancouver Art Gallery's presentation of *Photography into Sculpture* in 1971. It was shown simultaneously with the artists' book, *B.C. Almanac(H) C-B*, a project involving artists from the Vancouver Intermedia Society, among them Iain Baxter as well as Michael de Courcy and Jack Dale, whose work appeared in *Photography into Sculpture*. The Film Board of Canada, whose only apparent requirements were that the images be made by and about Canadians, sponsored it. The hefty newsprint book full of black and white photographs was comprised of fifteen sections made by fifteen artists. A few of the participants were photographers but most were not. There was no text to explain the images, a compelling mash-up of nature, art, and alternative lifestyles. Bunnell commented on "the vitality and uniqueness" of the project, a multiple original, applauding its collaborative nature.[110]

[110] Transcript of Peter Bunnell's remarks at the opening of *B.C. Almanac(H) C-B* at the National Film Board Photo Gallery in Ottawa, November 19, 1970. Vancouver Art Gallery exhibition files.

***

While Bunnell embraced photo sculptures and placed them in non-photography contexts, he consistently upheld a distinct position for photography that amounted to exceptionalism. He wrote several essays about *Photography into Sculpture,* always including some version of the following statement, underscoring its importance. This particular passage was included in an article he wrote for *Art in America* titled "Photographs as Sculpture and Prints," promoting *Photography as Printmaking* and anticipating *Photography into Sculpture,* which was in development. Bunnell's article was included in a thematic issue of the magazine titled, "The Arts Merger."

> By calling attention to the photographic artifact one in no way depreciates the subject of the intrinsic optical image. In fact, to appreciate these multimedia directions one must recognize how distinctly the photographer adheres to the underlying photo-optical basis of his work – as opposed to the printmaker's traditional adherence to drawing or the sculptor's adherence to the manipulation of material.[111]

The act of creating mixed media photographs and photo sculpture was understood by Bunnell as a method of discerning what is distinct, specific, or particular about photography.[112] Bunnell also wrote that the orientation and intentions of a printmaker or sculptor using photography would yield results different from a photographer who combined printmaking techniques or three-dimensional form. Bunnell went on to describe how photographers who combined photography and printmaking juxtaposed the "comparative literalness" and indexicality of photographic images with gestural or hand-drawn imagery. Printmakers, on the other hand, used photography to reference popular

---

[111] Peter C. Bunnell, "Photographs as Sculpture and Prints," *Art in America*, 57, no. 5 (September-October, 1969), 56.

[112] Coleman recognized something similar in his review of *Photography into Sculpture*. He wrote that all of the works in the exhibition "force the viewer to examine his preconceptions about the relationships between the various media involved."

culture "to parallel and even comment on the mass media." In reality, these strategies were not so cleanly attributed to one type of artist or medium. For example, Robert Rauschenberg – a painter, sculpture, assemblagist, and performance artist – juxtaposed photographic imagery and gestural marks in *Buffalo* (1964), a silkscreen painting on canvas that incorporated vernacular and mass media photographs. Robert Heinecken, who was included in both of Bunnell's exhibitions of experimental photography, started out as a printmaker using photography very casually and went on to strongly identify with the medium and its organizations. By the time Bunnell wrote this article, Heinecken had already completed magazine works like *Are You Rea?* (1964-1968) that co-opted mass media in order to critique it.

Like Szarkowski, Bunnell's exceptionalism was not meant to dictate the making of certain kinds of photographs based on ideal uses of the medium, rather he was concerned with bringing attention to photographic objects and theorizing the ones that were already being made. Furthermore, Bunnell did not think of mixed media photo works as antithetical to medium specificity thinking. In a 2007 essay titled, "Hybridity: The Reverse of Photographic Medium Specificity?," photo historians Jan Baetens and Heidi Peeters argue that it is incorrect to assume that "systematic hybridity precludes critical thinking on photography's specificity."[113] They cite the interaction between words and

[113] Jan Baetens and Heidi Peeters, "Hybridity: The Reverse of Photographic Medium Specificity?" *History of Photography*, 31, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 8-9. In surveying the literature that addresses photographic medium specificity, I found Baetens and Peeters unique in their approach because they allow that medium specificity is not always damaging or wrong. They recognize that medium specificity is an idea that is no longer in vogue and articulate the reasons why, including: the postmodern collapse of grand narratives and challenges to teleological beliefs in on-going purification of artistic media; the influence of cultural studies, women's studies, post-colonial studies, queer studies, etc. that challenge the search for purity and essence; semiotic analysis that finds medium specific thinking suffering from "the double handicap of tautology and circularity;" and, the rise of digital culture and the idea that the computer has integrated separate mediums

images as an example: "…how words and images interact in painting is not analogous to how they interact in photography, and the study of these particularities should become part of our views on medium specificity." Bunnell's texts reflect a similar perspective including the examples from the previous paragraph in which he proposes that photographers would combine photographs with other mediums in ways distinct from sculptors or printmakers.

***

Bunnell was not alone in his enthusiasm and promotion of experimental photography. Nathan Lyons and Robert Heinecken championed and implemented mixed media photographs and photo sculpture in their photo curricula and exhibitions, early on. Bunnell was, however, in a singular position to take on the issue of photography's medium specificity in a museum setting. He was grounded in the practice of photography, had an extensive background in the history of art and modernism, a broad command of the history of photography, excellent photography connoisseurship skills (with the fundamental focus on object quality those skills imply), a willingness to engage all aspects of the medium, entrenchment in the photo community, even his employment in a museum that exhibited all mediums versus one that specialized in photography. And yet, even while Bunnell spoke from MoMA's powerful platform the discussion never took off because his ideas ran counter to dominant discourses of both photography and contemporary art. Photo sculptures were considered by many invested in photography to be neither photography nor sculpture but inferior bastardizations of the two. On the other

---

into a single universal medium. In spite of all of this evidence against medium specificity as a viable framework, they contend that identifying the characteristics of a medium has always played a crucial role in aesthetic debates and remains useful because there is nothing inherently wrong with discovering what a medium can do "as long as it remains, by definition, open and provisory." This is what I think Bunnell and Szarkowski were doing.

hand, *Photography into Sculpture* was too concerned with photography's physicality and craft to interest artists preoccupied with ideas, data, and information.

By the mid 1970s, students could be introduced to the medium of photography through conceptual art, circumventing photography's growing canon and history.[114] Still later in the decade, the question of photography's identity was not only bound up in the discussion of mixed media but its institutions and practices came under withering attack by postmodern critics, further solidifying a division between those who held great affection for and dedication to the traditional craft of photography and those who did not.

In his lecture at the Center for Creative Photography in 1979, cited in the Introduction to this dissertation, Bunnell addressed current trends by discussing photographers and non-photographers who engaged with the medium in traditional and conceptual ways.[115] During the question and answer period Bunnell stated that "nothing happened" as a result of *Photography as Printmaking* and *Photography into Sculpture* and issued this direct appeal to the audience, "If we [photographers] are to survive, we are to only make it by reappraising the objecthood of the photograph and not simply finding new subjects to

---

[114] For example, the photographer James Casebere, known for making very large photographs of constructed scenes, was introduced to photography via conceptual art. He learned about the history of photography and its canon later. Casebere recalled this aspect of his education during a lecture at Phoenix Art Museum, March 2014. Marcia Resnick provides an alternative example. Resnick was one of the first photography graduate students at California Institute of the Arts (CalArts) a school known for its conceptual focus. She studied with John Baldessari, whose practice and teaching was not tied to any one medium and utilized photography in a conceptual way. At the same time, she sought out Robert Heinecken at UCLA for critiques and discussions about photography, which she could not find at CalArts. After graduation, she began teaching photography with a deliberate focus on the conceptual potential of the medium, which was uncommon in the mid-1970s. Resnick interviewed by the author June 2014.

[115] Peter Bunnell lecture, "A Will to Style: Observations on Contemporary Photography," February 1979. Center for Creative Photography, Oral History Collection, 79:14 and 79:15. For a full summary of the lecture, please see the first five pages of Chapter 1.

make pictures of."[116] Bunnell would never say that subject matter was unimportant in photography or that the two-dimensional photographic print did not have a future, but in a room full of photographers and other people invested in the medium, he still found it necessary to encourage critical thinking about photography's physicality and methods of producing meaning. Importantly, Bunnell demonstrated a willingness to think critically about photographs and photographic objects made by those who self-identified as photographers and those who did not. He held a commitment to a historically informed view of the present, which to him happily meant a more inclusive and complex view of the future. By seeing beyond the narrow concerns of many photographers and critics at the time he could take seriously the breadth of work that was being made. To Bunnell's way of thinking, staying relevant required the ongoing interrogation of photography's shifting presumptions and conventions.

III. ROBERT HEINECKEN 1962-1970

When Peter Bunnell wrote the press release and other texts about *Photography into Sculpture*, he singled out Robert Heinecken as an exemplar and leader of photo sculpture, a photography movement based on the West Coast. It was true enough that five of Heinecken's current and former students were in the exhibition and that their presence along with Heinecken's accounted for more than a quarter of the checklist. However, as evinced in the previous chapter, Bunnell realized by the late-1970s that photo sculpture might have had an interesting moment in the spotlight – largely due to his own efforts – but failed to shift the field's focus away from "straight" optical description or gain wide acceptance for photo sculpture or other experimental modes.

Regardless of this miscalculation, this chapter asserts that Bunnell identified Heinecken's influence as a maker of experimental photographs and promoter of the ideas surrounding them. It encompasses the years leading up to *Photography into Sculpture*, from 1962-1970, which are revealed to be a boon to Heinecken's career as he transitioned from student to professor, inexperienced and isolated photo educator to chairman of the Society for Photographic Education, and Los Angeles-based artist to one with a presence on the East Coast. All of this activity increased his visibility and contact with other photographers, and supports the claim that he was influential, at least within the photography community. Furthermore, this chapter demonstrates that Heinecken's evolution was largely informed by his contact with Nathan Lyons and his activities at

Eastman House – including symposia, workshops, and exhibitions. These events were pivotal opportunities for Heinecken to advance and share his theories about photography.

Assessments of Heinecken's legacy, especially those written since his death in 2006, characterize him as an under-recognized artist deserving greater attention for having pioneered postmodern strategies of appropriation and mass media critique. There are two main schools of thought about why Heinecken is not better known. The first is his use of pornography, bringing with it charges of misogyny in the form of sexual objectification of women. The other is his close identification with photography, a medium whose practitioners have been overlooked when compared with contemporary artists of the same period. While both positions are compelling – and overlap in important ways – the two together are beyond the scope of this chapter. Since recent scholarship has addressed his use of pornography, this chapter will focus on his association with photography.[117]

Photography scholar and curator Andy Grundberg, writing in Heinecken's obituary for the *New York Times*, compared his work favorably to Robert Rauschenberg's, John Baldessari's, and Ed Ruscha's, but wrote about his legacy: "Perhaps because he was identified closely with photography, Mr. Heinecken never achieved the vast public recognition accorded" to his peers. Photographer, photo historian and close friend of Heinecken's, Carl Chiarenza, echoes this position in a 2006 interview. [118] During the 1960s and 70s, there was indeed a divide between the contemporary art world and the

[117] Eva Respini, "Not a Picture of, but an Object about Something," in *Robert Heinecken*, ed. Eva Respini (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2014), 20.
[118] Andy Grundberg, "Robert Heinecken: Artist Who Juxtaposed Photographs, Is Dead at 74," *New York Times* (May 22, 2006), http://nytimes.com/2006/05/22/arts/heinecken.html. Carl Chiarenza interview with Brooks Jensen, *LensWork* (2008), http://www.carlchiarenza.com.

photography world, and for most photographers the choice of which critics and curators paid attention to their work was made for them by virtue of their engagement with the medium. Heinecken's early work is unique in that there *seems* to have been a choice for him. Because his untraditional use of the medium resulted in three-dimensional objects and works on canvas, one might have expected contemporary commentators to engage with his work. Rather, it was largely photography curators and critics who took an interest in Heinecken, perhaps due to the fact that in the early 1960s his energy and focus was aimed at theorizing and teaching photography, not painting or sculpture. Beyond the fact that he was simply following his interests, Heinecken recognized that every aspect of the field of photography was expanding – photo education, photo history, and museum departments of photography. Never one to sit on the sidelines, Heinecken saw an opportunity to participate and effect change especially in the expanding field of photography education.

Art historians writing during the last five years, including Matthew Biro and Claudia Bohn-Spector, have tended to play down Heinecken's involvement with photography and photographers, approaching his work through the perspective of media studies and cultural history.[119] Neither ignores photography altogether and their scholarship and writing has made significant contributions to understanding Heinecken's complex oeuvre. However, the shift in emphasis implies that if Heinecken can be distanced from photography narratives, he can be written into other accounts. For example, Matthew Biro's 2011 essay, "Reality Effects," picks up on Heinecken's self-appointed role as

[119] This attitude was also in evidence at Heinecken Scholars' Day, convened by curator Eva Respini at Museum of Modern Art, May 17, 2013.

"documentarian" of "manufactured experience." By using phrases such as "interpolation by the culture industry" and "television spectatorship and consumption," Biro reads Heinecken's work through the lens of technology, popular culture and philosophy.[120] At the same time, he weaves discussions of technique – photographic and otherwise – throughout his essay with the nonchalance and specificity befitting Heinecken's practice where technique (no matter how casual) and concept are inextricably linked. Similarly, Claudia Bohn-Spector, who is a photography specialist, writing in the exhibition catalogue for *Speaking in Tongues: Wallace Berman and Robert Heinecken 1961-1976*, takes the position that Heinecken and the Beat generation artist Wallace Berman shared a point of view. Her essay reveals a common engagement with materials and media that situates Heinecken among idea-based art, poetics, and assemblage artists in Los Angeles.

While Heinecken's involvement with these artists and ideas typically considered outside of photography are real and fascinating, this chapter reveals that Heinecken had much to gain from his involvement with photography, which has not yet been fully explored. Heinecken's archive at the Center for Creative Photography (CCP) is replete with documentation of his activities in photography and with photographers on the level of ideas, personal and professional relationships, and materials. The historical record confirms his commitment to photography and supports the claim that he was indeed a photographer even if one readily admits that he was not *only* a photographer and certainly not a traditional one. Like many idea-based artists with Duchampian leanings, Heinecken

[120] Matthew Biro, "Robert Heinecken: Reality Effects," *Artforum* 50, vol. 2 (October 2011), 150-159, 340; Claudia Bohn-Spector and Sam Mellon. *Speaking in Tongues: Wallace Berman and Robert Heinecken 1961-1976.* Pasadena, CA: Armory Center for the Arts, 2011.

disliked labels and resisted being called a "photographer." Instead, he called himself a "paraphotographer," a play on the word "paramedic."[121] Despite his tactical sidestepping, this chapter reveals that Heinecken courted, cultivated, and strove for a de-centering effect on photography through his use of traditional subject matter (i.e. the photographic nude) and mass media sources as well as his practice of freely manipulating them in and out of the darkroom.[122] His work therefore demands to be read through the lens of media studies, cultural history, art history, gender studies, *and* photo history.

This chapter establishes Heinecken's connection to Nathan Lyons and George Eastman House as essential to his development as a professional artists as well as an effective and influential educator. Heinecken enthusiastically participated in the activities of George Eastman House (GEH or Eastman House) and the Society for Photographic Education (SPE) – which are closely linked during this era – whenever he could. He attended and participated in symposia and conferences where he gave lectures, exchanged ideas, discovered who his peers were and intereacted with them, as well as forged professional and personal relationships. He continued his photo education at Eastman House, significantly expanding his knowledge of photo history and museum practices by participating in the 1967 Advanced Studies Workshop. Slides and books produced by

---

[121] Catharine Reeve, "The Paraphotographer: An Interview with Robert Heinecken," *Darkroom Photography* (September 1986):18. The prefix "para" can mean "akin," "beside," "alongside," "beyond," "aside from," "closely resembling," and "almost."

[122] By the mid-1970s, when asked about his relationship to and with photography, Heinecken said: "I just feel I'm probably better off where I am, because I can be more comfortable with photography, than if I were doing this work in a different media context. It would be much more difficult. I mean, I'm comfortable doing it this way. I've taught drawing and printmaking, and it's not nearly as interesting as teaching photography. I really like it. […] I'm saying I prefer being in the context of contemporary people making photographs more than I would people in some other medium…" Charles Hagen interview with Heiencken, *Afterimage*, 9.

Eastman House became part of the materials he used in his teaching. When Heinecken began bringing photography exhibitions to UCLA in the late 1960s, he rented GEH traveling exhibitions and organized shows featuring members of SPE.[123] Nathan Lyons was the driving force behind diverse activities at Eastman House and Heinecken was in many ways the ideal person to be on the receiving end of his efforts – he was young, new to the field, incredibly bright, receptive to new ideas and able to make them his own, and actively developing his pedagogy.[124] Lyons was also an early and important supporter of Heinecken's work, including him in *Contemporary Photography Since 1950* (for the National Gallery of Ottawa, 1967), *The Persistence of Vision* (GEH, 1967), and *Vision and Expression* (GEH, 1969), giving him exposure and momuntum on the East Coast.[125]

A renewed look at Heinecken through his involvement with photography also yields a more nuanced view of the medium and its institutions. This chapter describes Heinecken's involvement with Eastman House, SPE and Lyons, but with the awareness that he also interacted with Peter Bunnell and John Szarkowski from the Museum of Modern Art. In fact, research into the 1964 and 1965 symposiums at GEH where Heinecken delivered papers both years, reveals that Bunnell and Szarkowski were active participants as well, establishing the fact that Eastman House and MoMA staff

---

[123] The first exhibition of photography that Heinecken brought to UCLA came about through his contact with George Eastman House. He reported combining three or four small Eastman House traveling exhibitions into one larger exhibition that included Aaron Siskind, Jacques Henri Lartigue and others. The 1970 UCLA exhibition *Contemporary Photographers* was organized by Heinecken and included many of the colleagues he met at early SPE conferences, including Nathan Lyons and Ray Metzker. Additionally, UCLA acquired all of the work in the show for their collection. Borger interview with Heinecken, 14-15.

[124] In a 1976 interview, Heinecken recognized Nathan Lyons as an important influence. Video Data Bank (Chicago: School of the Art Institute of Chicago, 1976).

[125] Heinecken credits Nathan Lyons as "probably the first person that I ran into that was interested in what I was doing. And later Carl Chiarenza who was been very supportive." Charles Hagen interview with Heinecken, *Afterimage* 3, no. 10 (April 1976): 9. Peter Bunnell also showed Heinecken's work in three group exhibitions at MoMA starting in 1967: *Photography for Collectors* (1967), *Photography as Printmaking* (1968), and *Photography into Sculpture* (1970).

sometimes shared a common stage.[126] Importantly, Heinecken successfully navigated both of these entities, capitalizing on the opportunities each one offered. Eastman House and MoMA were both correctly considered museums because they amassed collections, mounted exhibitions and served a common constituency, but their missions, goals, methods and outcomes, however, were very different. Lyons's holistic, uniquely democratic and participatory programs at Eastman House included symposia and conferences in which many points of view were represented and widely distributed in the form of written conference notes. Lyons's approach to contemporary exhibitions involved soliciting and reviewing thousands of submissions in order to assemble a broad survey of contemporary practices and then publishing photographer's contact information in the publications, creating a directory of working photographers.[127] In contrast, Szarkowski's program at the time included a few major surveys that incorporated contemporary photographers but he focused primarily on one-person exhibitions and monographic catalogues. Many photographers perceived MoMA as top down and exclusive, especially in comparison with Lyons's hands-on and personal approach at Eastman House. Photographers, curators, and scholars of Heinecken's generation – some of whom were trained by Lyons but may have held internships and had other experiences at MoMA, as well – have defended and promoted the efforts of Lyons and Eastman House, at times expressing frustration that Szarkowski and MoMA have garnered an inordinate amount of attention. Indeed, Lyons's efforts are only now receiving the

[126] According to Lyons, Szarkowski's involvement in SPE and other conferences were regrettably limited to these few occasions. Conversation with the author in November 2014. Bunnell, however, continued to be involved with SPE, serving as secretary while Heinecken was chairman from 1970-1973 and as chairman himself from 1974-1977. Society for Photographic Education website, http://www.spenational .org/about/history.

[127] Lyons characterized his own exhibition catalogues as "directories" in a conversation with the author in November 2014.

scholarly attention they deserve.[128] However, this dissertation – through the example of Heinecken – proposes that both Eastman House and MoMA would be better understood if the differences between them were teased out and acknowledged.

Heinecken questioned and rebelled against straight photography yet this chapter asserts that he diligently probed the medium from 1962-1970, striving to understand and theorize what is specific to it. Like Bunnell, Heinecken's medium specific approach proved expansive rather than limiting. For example, he diminished the importance of the photographic image and instead elevated process and tactility – printing at different densities, reversing, solarizing, and hand coloring the print, flipping the negative around and flopping it over, layering and assembling a combination of film and photographic paper. This dissertation argues that his deliberate and deep engagement with photography allowed him to form meaningful challenges to photographic purity. Furthermore, his sensitive and intelligent questioning earned him the trust and respect of many traditional photographers across generations. For example, photographic modernists like Ansel Adams and Minor White were critical of his work but applauded and supported his approach, while his contemporary, Carl Chiarenza, who made formal abstract photographs, was among his closest friends and colleagues.

Chiarenza offered this succinct description of Heinecken's early activities and point of view: "Heinecken is a picturemaker, an object maker, but he is also a teacher, speaker

[128] Jessica S. McDonald, "Centralizing Rochester: A Critical Historiography of American Photography in the 1960s and 1970." PhD diss. (University of Rochester, 2014); and *Nathan Lyons: Selected Essays, Lectures, and Interviews (*Austin: University of Texas Press, 2012).

and writer. In each role he is a disrupter of every status quo he encounters."[129] This chapter will follow Chiarenza's example by analyzing Heinecken's art (specifically, the pieces in *Photography into Sculpture*), his writing (both his published essays and less formal texts including notes for presentations), and pedagogy. It is organized chronologically rather than thematically or by activity in order to demonstrate that his writing, teaching, and work in the studio were interdependent.[130]

***

Heinecken attended UCLA intermittently between 1951-1960, completing his Bachelors degree in 1959 and his Masters of Art degree in graphic design in 1960.[131] His own studies were "sort of a mixed bag of art history and painting, drawing classes, design courses, and printmaking courses."[132] His training in photography is best described as *ad hoc* and merged with other disciplines. He studied art history with John Rosenfield who trained at Harvard and specialized in Asian Art. Heinecken spent a summer developing and printing rolls of film taken by Rosenfield in the field – perhaps the most intense period of traditional darkroom work he experienced in school or elsewhere. He studied

---

[129] Carl Chiarenza, "Carl Chiarenza, from an unpublished article, September, 1976," *Robert Heinecken*, ed. James Enyeart (Carmel, CA: Friends of Photography in association with Light Gallery, 1980).

[130] Lyons could be seen as a model for Heinecken's approach in which writing, speaking, organizing shows, teaching and making photographs were ongoing, simultaneous activities. The fact that Lyons remained a photographer may have added to his approachability as a curator. Contrast this approach with Bunnell and Szarkowski, both of whom started as photographers but stopped making photographs when they became historians/curators. Szarkowski resumed his work as a photographer when he retired from MoMA in 1991.

[131] Heinecken first attended UCLA in 1951 as an undergraduate but did not thrive. He joined the Marines in 1953 and completed his service in 1957. He returned to UCLA the same year and received his bachelors degree in 1959. He then advanced to the graduate level, completing his Masters of Arts in 1960. From 1959-60, he assisted Don Chipperfield with teaching photography courses and in 1960 he began teaching his own courses in drawing and printmaking. In 1962, he initiated the photography curriculum and became an assistant professor. He founded an autonomous photography program within the art department in 1963.

[132] Robert Heinecken, interview by Irene Borger, 1982, interview transcript, San Francisco Museum of Modern Art Archive. Tape 1, p. 3.

printmaking with John Paul Jones, who was building a reputation as both a sculptor and printmaker at the time, and graphic design with Tom Jennings and Don Chipperfield. Heinecken described Chipperfield as "an interesting generalist" whose primary interests were photography and graphic design.[133]

Heinecken recalled being introduced to photography as a graduate student in printmaking where he began to combine the processes in photo etchings. It offered the possibility of combining the gestural mark making of drawing with the indexicality of photography on a single metal plate that could be reproduced in editions. Heinecken was not only pairing a process familiar to him (etching) with something new to him (photography), he was manipulating photography physically and materially – strategies he maintained for his entire working life. Additionally, Heinecken liked the fact that photo printmaking was a new and promising way of working – evidence that he saw himself as a pioneer even at this early stage.[134]

While photo etching was not a method that endured for him, he continued to make prints and in 1969 he began using offset lithography.[135] Additionally, printmaking consistently informed Heinecken's approach. For example, he seemingly adapted the concept of state proofs, which is the practice of printing the etching or lithographic plate at any point in its development and then continuing to further work the image. The resulting prints were understood as one of many possible realizations of an image. In printmaking, the plate could be easily changed – a few lines scratched into the metal or the color of the ink

[133] Ibid., p. 2.
[134] Charles Hagen, "Robert Heinecken: An Interivew." *Afterimage* 3, no. 10 (April 1976): 9.
[135] Heinecken bought an offset press around 1968 or 1969.

altered. Even a slight shift in the wiping of an etching plate could make an enormous difference in the image. The concept of states for Heinecken's work at this time yielded many one-of-a-kind versions, sometimes of increasing complexity, and an attitude that the photographic source material was never exhausted but rather in a constant state of flux. It gave him license to pause and record the piece at one stage, and then to push it further. Heinecken rejected the concept of the edition, i.e. the multiple original, which is commonly shared by printmakers and photographers. An ideal image, for which the making of an edition signaled, was never his goal. He generally resisted the modernist notion that there was a best resolution to any aesthetic or pictorial problem.[136]

In an art history seminar he encountered the question, "In what way does the form of a handmade thing communicate its essence?" The professor who taught the class, probably Rosenfield, suggested that he explore that question in regard to photographs and so he began thinking about "what was the relationship of that kind of image making technique [photography] to a manually formed one?"[137] The key to his approach was the idea of "relationship," or how photography helped to define painting, drawing or printmaking, and vice versa. For Heinecken, who embraced juxtaposition, the association did not have to be harmonious or natural. Discordant, weird, awkward, and ugly was fine, too. While this medium specific approach could have led him to conclude that there were right and

[136] The ideas in this paragraph are interpretations of brief notes Heinecken made for a lecture: "Explain idea of versions as opposed to editions etc and then it will show up as an idea in other work later in the presentation. Increasing complication." Untitled and undated lecture, box 5C, folder 18, notecard #12, Robert Heinekcen Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ.
[137] "Teaching," Interview with Steven Lewis, James McQuaid, and David Tait. *Photograph—Source & Resource: A Source Book for Creative Photography,* 29-34. State College, PA: Turnip Press, 1973.

wrong ways to make a photograph, in actuality, it had the opposite effect, magnifying the potential of each medium separately and together.

This openness and sense of possibility was affirmed by Heinecken's graphic design instructor, Don Chipperfield, who introduced Heinecken to the notion that photography – and for that matter typography, illustration and architecture – was not limited to design functions but should be thought of as a vehicle for art. For example, from his graphic design training, Heinecken learned to carry out an intense analysis of mass media and photography's role in it, which became an enduring element of his fine art production. Each time Heinecken made a piece using pages from popular magazines, he brought his graphic design training and sensibility to it, analyzing what and how it communicated with the viewer.[138] Heinecken also adopted the attitude promoted by Chipperfield that "the potential for art and expression was related to an individual's practiced attitude and belief system, not to a medium or its typical use." This rejection of medium specificity fostered in Heinecken an ability to look beyond boundaries and limitations of any medium or subject matter. Furthermore, Heinecken believed, as a result of Chipperfield's example, that painting in and of itself was not art but an "activity used by certain people to make art."[139] From this point forward, Heinecken adopted the attitude that a medium's

---

[138] Evidence of Heinecken's habit of scrutinizing the use of images and text in the media is found in his master's thesis in graphic design, "A Record of Creative Work in the Field of Graphic Design." Masters thesis, (University of California, Los Angeles, June 8, 1960).

[139] Robert Heinecken, "Introduction," *Celebrating Two Decades in Photography: Recent Work by UCLA/MFA Recipients* (Los Angeles: Grunwald Center for the Graphic Arts, UCLA, 1985): 7.
Some photographers resented artists like Ed Ruscha who freely deployed the medium, demonstrating neither a commitment to it nor respecting boundaries or conventions of fine art photography. While Heinecken challenged the medium in ways similar to Ruscha, he learned photography's history and embraced its communities while Ruscha openly dismissed them. In other words, Heinecken challenged photography as an insider.

position in the art world hierarchy mattered little. Rather, it was the quality of the ideas found in the work that mattered to him.

With only his experience as Chipperfield's teaching assistant to recommend him, Heinecken taught graphic design and photography classes after graduation, from 1960-1962. Chipperfield's bid for tenure failed in 1962 and Heinecken, who was hired as Chipperfield's replacement, proposed a "photography as art" class on a trial basis.[140] In 1963, Heinecken founded an autonomous department of photography as part of a wider effort to restructure UCLA's art department. It is difficult to say how closely Heinecken followed Chipperfield's or anyone else's example in the classroom but is clear from his proposal to create a photography department at UCLA written ca. 1960-1962, that his primary concern was to support students in the pursuit of "artistic expression" via any photographic image including motion pictures and still images, unbounded by restrictions of subject matter or technique.[141] He also envisioned a robust photography program with faculty who were proficient in mediums beyond photography as well as a steady stream of visiting photographers, diverse in their interests.

In 1963, it is likely that Heinecken received a copy of the notes for The Invitational Teaching Conference held at the George Eastman House, November 28-30, 1962, and that they were of great interest to him.[142] Nathan Lyons, then curator of photography at

---

[140] Interview with Irene Borger, 2.
[141] Memorandum by Robert Heinecken, circa 1960-62, box 42, file labeled Justifications for Photography Department. Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ.
[142] Nathan Lyons in conversation with the author, August 21, 2014. Lyons recalls that copies of the conference notes were mailed to about two hundred universities around the country and speculates that Heinecken received them and was affected by them.

Eastman House was the chairman, organizer, and driving force behind the conference, which brought together twenty-eight photo historians and photo educators representing photojournalism, commercial and fine art photography. A series of presentations were given followed by discussion groups that covered a range of topics, including the need for more and better teaching materials, what to teach, and how to teach it. For example, the group called for slide sets made from original photographs, technical texts illustrated with examples of sophisticated photography, study collections of photographs and exhibition programs in universities, as well as new monographs and written histories.[143] The attendees debated whether photo curricula should emphasize subject matter and technical aspects of the camera and darkroom or idea-oriented assignments that reflected the philosophy that photography was more than a set of techniques. They discussed the need for more instruction in the history of the medium and greater exposure to and awareness of living photographers' work and ideas. They debated the advantages of basic versus elaborate darkroom setups and whether professors should share their personal life and work with their students.[144]

Heinecken would have found ideas in the conference notes that resonated with his own, many of which were expressed in UCLA departmental memos and his personal work. For example, Jerry Uelsmann, an assistant professor of photography at University of Florida who was becoming known for his experimental composite imagery, claimed that

---

[143] Ibid. Lyons would fulfill many of these requests by creating slide sets directly from photographs in Eastman House's excellent collection, organizing and circulating historical and contemporary exhibitions, and publishing anthologies of historical texts about the medium– all of which were affordable to students, professors, and photography departments with limited funds.

[144] Ellen Brooks recalls in her interview in this dissertation that Heinecken did not show his work to students. Heinecken stated that as a rule he did not socialize with students. Interview with Irene Borger, 19.

students should be motivated by "non-technical" ways of working and aided by chance or "accident." Heinecken taught only enough photo technique so that his students could realize their ideas.[145] Charles Arnold, who taught photography at Rochester Institute of Technology, claimed that instructors must demonstrate "humility" which "makes it possible to listen and learn" what students need in order to thrive. Arnold advocated for his students' "right to question and to demand new freedoms" as well as "deviate from a set program" in order to advance their work and ideas. Heinecken demonstrated his flexibility and willingness to listen from the start of the new department at UCLA when he admitted to the graduate students that he had only a vague idea about what would transpire in that first semester.[146] Arnold's discussion group also recognized the importance of offering a broad range of influences on the students in the form of visiting instructors and lecturers. Heinecken clearly embraced this idea, regularly inviting photographers whose work differed from his own.[147]

***

Heinecken maintained that throughout his time as a student and into his first years of teaching, he was largely unaware of photography's history or its practitioners, either living or dead. This was probably an exaggeration but it is unlikely that Chipperfield taught his students much if anything about the history of the medium or its current practitioners. In fact, Heinecken recalled his thinking about photography during this time

---

[145] Heinecken delegated the teaching of darkroom and camera technique to his graduate teaching assistants so that most of his time with students was spent discussing ideas and content.

[146] Carl Cheng, one of Heinecken's earliest students, recalls the first day of class in the new photography department in his interview in this dissertation. In 1985, Heinecken wrote that "in the beginning, there was no idea of a future 'program.' … At that time, the activity in photography at UCLA was just a series of stabs at meaning, and for me, it continues to be an organically-evolving process rather than a logically-formulated plan." "Introduction," in *Celebrating Two Decades In Photography*, 7.

[147] Ibid., 9. Visiting faculty in photography at UCLA from 1962-1971 included Edmund Teske (Summer 1965, 1966-67 and 1967-68), Pat O'Neill (1966-67), Keith Smith (1969-1970), Lee Friedlander and Jerry McMillan (1970-1971).

as unencumbered by history or precedent, allowing a certain amount of freedom to combine it with other mediums and to use it unselfconsciously in the pursuit of *art*, not photography or photography as an art form.

The opportunities in Los Angeles for direct experiences with art photography – to see photographs or to meet photographers – were limited. Southern California was known for commercial photography, while fine art photographers were presumed to live and work in San Francisco and other locations in Northern California. There were no galleries or museums that exhibited photography on a regular basis in Los Angeles during the 1950s and 60s. Heinecken claimed that the first exhibition of photography that affected him featured the experimental photographer Frederick Sommer, which was not until "later."[148] Prior to that, Clarence John Laughlin gave a lecture about his work at UCLA while Heinecken was still a student. Heinecken recalled that, "he [Laughlin] stood up there like he still does, with his easel with these bright lights on these pictures, talking about spirituality… and it might have had some effect."[149] Edmund Teske was the first photographer that Heinecken knew personally. They became acquainted when Teske was a nude model in Heinecken's life drawing classes at UCLA in the late-1950s, having conversations "about everything, including photography" and its use "on an expressive level."[150] In the summer of 1964, when Heinecken needed someone to teach in his

[148] Borger interview, 7. Heinecken does not specify when or where he saw Frederick Sommer's work but perhaps he was referring to the Pasadena Art Museum's, *Frederick Sommer*, on view May 25-June 27, 1965, which included seventy-five photographs and drawings from 1943-1965. Heinecken may have seen the exhibition brochure or the review of the exhibition in the (Pasadena) *Independent Star-News*, which ran on May 30, 1965.
[149] Borger interview, 6.
[150] Ibid., 5.

absence, the only person he knew to call was Teske.[151] Moreover, photographic books and periodicals were quite rare in the United States during the 1950s and 60s.[152] Heinecken never mentioned that as a student or new professor, he looked at *Aperture* magazine, one of the very few periodicals dedicated to art photography at the time. Ansel Adams wrote the only books about photography that Heinecken was known to have owned around 1960.[153]

Given his lack of experience and education in the history of the medium, it was a bold move for Heinecken to propose a paper for the 1964 Symposium on the History of Photography at George Eastman House.[154] Nathan Lyons organized the event in conjunction with the annual meeting of the newly formed Society for Photographic Education, which, according to the press release, "was believed to be the first conference of its type to be held anywhere." Heinecken sent a letter to Lyons inquiring whether or

---

[151] Ibid. In Ellen Brooks's interview in this dissertation, she recalls taking her first photography class at UCLA with Teske. She would go on to study closely with Heinecken. The Pasadena Art Museum mounted an exhibition of student work made in Teske's classes titled, *UCLA Photographers*, March 1 - April 2, 1967, which is some indication of the number of students he taught and the quality of the work.

[152] In an interview with the author, photographer Jerry Uelsmann recounted that when he was an undergraduate photography student at Rochester Institute of Technology in the 1950s, it was possible to read all of the available photography books in a weekend with time remaining to do other things.

[153] Borger interview, 7. Heinecken did not specify exactly which books he owned by Ansel Adams but it is likely the *Basic Photo Series*: *Camera and Lens* (written 1948), *The Negative* (1948), *The Print* (1950), *Natural Light Photography* (1952) and *Artificial Light Photography* (1956). The books were a gift from Don Chipperfield.

[154] Heinecken recalls that the announcement for the conference came unsolicited to the UCLA art department and remarked: "I didn't know what it was." Borger interview, 6.

not he could participate.[155] Despite Heinecken's status as a newcomer to the group and a virtual unknown, Lyons accepted his proposed paper titled, "Painters on Photography."[156]

"Painters on Photography" was comprised of quotations about photography made by painters, critics, poets and photographers between 1839 and 1900, and was accompanied by slides of paintings and photographs "intended to contradict, support or clarify the accompanied statements."[157] Heinecken acknowledged that he was not an art historian but rather took on his project to satisfy an ongoing personal interest in "the continuing interaction between these two fields," which had started when he was a student working with John Rosenfield.[158] It was largely about impressions of photography made by painters and critics but occasionally spoke to photography's strengths or capacities in opposition to painting. Heinecken's paper was not the product of systematic research but statements collected from random sources, some of which were written by accomplished photo historians in the audience including Beaumont Newhall – the director of Eastman House, who wrote the first comprehensive history of the medium in 1937 when he was

---

[155] This was likely the second letter between Heinecken and Lyons who corresponded regularly during the 1960s and 1970s. The first letter from Heinecken to Lyons, dated 1963, expressed regrets as he was unable to attend the 1963 meeting in which SPE was formed. Lyons fondly recalls the salutations in Heinecken's letters as an indication of their growing familiarity and friendship. The first was addressed to him as "Dear Sir," the second one as "Dear Mr. Lyons," but by 1965, he wrote, "Dear Nathan." Conversation with the author November 2014.

[156] Nathan Lyons indicated that while interest in the symposium was high, evinced by the three-fold increase in attendance from the 1962 symposium (28 attendees) to the one in 1964 (90 attendees), the field nevertheless "came up short in a lot of different ways." For example, there were only "half-a-dozen photo historians at the time," Lyons recalls, implying that in order to fill out a full schedule for a two-day event, he took a chance on new members like Heinecken who proposed interesting papers. Interview with author, August 21, 2014.

[157] Robert Heinecken, "Painters on Photography," (lecture, Symposium on the History of Photography, co-sponsored by George Eastman House and the Society for Photographic Education, Rochester, NY, November 27, 1964), box 5C, folder 28, Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ; (slides for lecture) AV Materials, Robert Heinecken Archive.

[158] Interview with Irene Borger, 7. Heinecken acknowledges that he did some research in the library at UCLA for the lecture and that his art history professor John Rosenfield had some familiarity with the period and helped him.

curator of photography at MoMA, and Heinrich Schwarz, an art historian, professor and curator at Wesleyan University, who gave the conference's keynote address.[159]

In his forty-five-minute address, Heinecken included quotes by William Henry Fox Talbot, Thomas Cole, Samuel F. B. Morse, Paul Delaroche, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Honore Daumier, Jean August Ingres, Eugene Delacroix, Sir William Newton, Gustave Courbet, Lady Eastlake, Julia Margaret Cameron, James A. McNeill Whistler, Pierre-Auguste Renoir, P. H. Emerson, George Bernard Shaw, Paul Gaugin, Franz Marc, and Alvin Langdon Coburn. He covered a litany of themes that articulated characteristics of photography deemed specific to it: that photography causes nature to "delineate itself" and that it is "mechanical" and "easy," which was deemed both a positive characteristic and negative one in the nineteenth century. Photography was portrayed as the catalyst of a "great revolution," which signaled the end of painting, again, polarizing the public into supporters and detractors. It is capable of recording what the photographer sees as remarkable but also "blind to the world of spirit" and void of discernment because it "puts in everything." Photography is said to have incredible "exactitude" while also being a practical timesaver yet it suffered in the hands of amateurs. His talk concluded with this quote by Alvin Langdon Coburn:

> I do not think that we have begun to realize the possibilities of the camera… with her infinite possibility to do things stranger and more fascinating than the most fantastic dream… I want to see photography

[159] Heinecken cited Beaumont Newhall, Heinrich Schwarz, Helmut Gernsheim and Hyatt Mayor as sources. Schwarz's keynote address was titled, "Before 1839: Symptoms and Trends." Symposium Schedule, Symposium on the History of Photography, co-sponsored by the George Eastman House and the Society for Photographic Education, November 27-28, 1964. Box 1, Society for Photographic Education Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ.

> alive to the spirit of progress; if it is not possible to be modern with the newest of the arts, we had better bury our black boxes.[160]

Simultaneously referencing the past and evoking present day concerns, Heinecken used Coburn's quote to implore the audience to broaden their view of the medium. The slides were pleasant illustrations of the texts but did not offer a counter-narrative or argument. Alternatively, the presentation format and framework seemed to connect something that he knew, i.e. the history of painting and criticism, with the history of photography, which was still rather unfamiliar. It was perhaps a productive strategy for someone new to the medium to understand a wide array of issues surrounding it and to realize that these concerns began with the invention of the medium and, in some cases, continued into the present. Yet, for this audience filled with photographers and historians steeped in the history of the medium and its concerns, Heinecken's paper was not groundbreaking.

Heinecken considered the paper unsuccessful and apologized to Lyons for its shortcomings.[161] The social aspect of the conference also disappointed Heinecken who recalled eating alone, not knowing anyone, and being depressed.[162] Regardless of how disheartened he remembers feeling, Heinecken began to make important connections with photographers, photo educators, and curators of photography across the country –

---

[160] Heinecken hand wrote on a typewritten, working copy of his lecture, that Coburn "sums up rather well the existent attitudes and provides prophetic insight into future possibilities." Robert Heinecken Archive, box 5C, folder 28, Notes from George Eastman House, c. 1974.

[161] The session in which Heinecken gave his paper also included highly trained photo historians Van Deren Coke ("The Use of Brady Portraits by Nineteenth-Century Painters"), Peter Bunnell ("The Photographic Collaboration of Clarence H. White and Alfred Stieglitz in 1907"), and Beaumont Newhall ("Frederick H. Evans"). Lyons recalls that Heinecken's efforts were outclassed in the company of such distinguished scholars. He tried to console Heinecken, replying something to the effect of, "we all have to start somewhere." Phone conversation with the author, August 14, 2014.

[162] The conference was over the Thanksgiving holiday. Heinecken recalled, "eating this chicken with no family or friends." Borger interview, p 6.

often one person was all three at once, as was the case with Nathan Lyons. It is impossible to say exactly who Heinecken met, let alone who he made a personal connection with, but other speakers included: Van Deren Coke who was professor and director of university galleries at University of New Mexico, who would publish one of the first studies of photography's interaction with painting from the nineteenth century to the present titled, "The Painter and the Photograph: From Delacroix to Warhol" in 1972; Walter Rosenblum, associate professor at Brooklyn College; and Peter Bunnell, who was then a PhD student and associate in the Alfred Stieglitz Archives at Yale University. Later in the conference, John Szarkowski and Nathan Lyons gave papers about the "vernacular tradition."[163] A panel on the state of criticism was moderated by Newhall and convened photographers such as Barbara Morgan (Scarsdale, New York), Aaron Siskind (Institute of Design, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago) Arthur Siegel (Chicago), Minor White (Rochester Institute of Technology), Henry Holmes Smith (Indiana University), and Rosenblum. Suddenly, for Heinecken, photography had come to life and was populated by serious photographers and scholars who knew its past and were theorizing the present. This was the moment, Heinecken recalled, when "it really sort of clicked… I began to see that there was more [photography] activity all over the country."[164]

The year 1964 was also a pivotal year in the development of Heinecken's studio practice. He began his iconic series *Are You Rea*, devising a form of photograms in which torn

[163] This discussion of vernacular photography – typically meaning photographs made by anonymous or untrained photographers – is likely one of the earliest on the subject in a formal setting. Lyons and Szarkowski were leading proponents of including vernacular photography in museum exhibitions and collections.
[164] Borger interview, 10.

pages from fashion magazines were put in direct contact with gelatin silver paper and exposed to light.[165] Information from both sides of the page – advertising tag lines, graphics, and images of fashion models and products – merged into a single, layered, reversed (i.e. negative) image. In notes for a talk about his work, Heinecken referenced the notion of photographic document in *Are You Rea*:

> Made initially by contacting [contact printing] magazine pages to photographic paper, I see them very much as documents, very directly seen. Not limited by the reflected image of the camera, but allowing light itself to penetrate and fuse the images together, eliminating the magazine paper which inhibits seeing them correctly. They are in negative because the images are positive. There is superimposition because the light sensitive paper doesn't distinguish between the image on the front and the one on the back.[166]

As the reader turns the pages of a magazine – page after page – the impact of the photograph becomes largely subliminal. Heinecken arrests that operation and documents it, allowing the viewer to apprehend and comprehend his or her own behavior. Marrying technique and content, the photographic image, in Heinecken's hands, has the ability to reveal something about itself to the viewer. The symmetry of using one technique of photography (the photogram) to reveal what another one is doing (photomechanical reproduction) is self referential in the best possible way – as if a star witness has inadvertently incriminated himself. The use of light here can be thought of as metaphoric. It has stripped the image of its paper substrate, has literally and figuratively "seen through it." Heinecken's approach here implies that photographic representation requires excavation. In addition to appropriation, this is what makes his work feel postmodern, recalling French philosopher Michel Foucault, who insisted that meaning is never visible

---

[165] Heinecken began the series *Are You Rea* in 1964 and completed it in 1968. He selected twenty-five images for an editioned portfolio of offset prints.

[166] Robert Heinecken, untitled and undated lecture, box 42, folder labeled Lecture Notes Untitled Lecture #1, notecard #42-43, Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ.

on the surface or readily apparent. The underlying power structures that are always at play, must be excavated.

Are You Rea, when conceived of by Heinecken as a document, is a pointed social commentary but it also has the ability to show the viewer something about the time in which the images were made, not unlike street photography. For example, Winogrand illustrates how Americans in the mid-1960s looked and what they surrounded themselves with. Similarly, Heinecken depicts the fashions and products found in typical households but he also demonstrates how the things of life transition seamlessly into lifestyle through the media and advertising.[167] Artists like Robert Rauschenberg and Andy Warhol alluded to the crowded visual field of popular culture while simultaneously challenging the mediums of painting, photography, and printmaking through materials and scale, but they did not marry the image and the process in a way that reveals the methods of mass media as did Heinecken. Heinecken believed that he had invented the photogram technique used in *Are You Rea* but later learned that it had previously been used by Kurt Schwitters.[168] The notion of the photogram technique as revelatory social document, however, is unique to Heinecken.

***

[167] Matthew Biro, *Artforum*, 255. In a discussion about Heinecken's work made with the Polaroid SX-70 camera, Biro comments: "…the SX-70 snapshot embodied the colonization of social life by the commodity. For Heinecken, it became a way to investigate how this colonization operates, how life becomes lifestyle, how documentary becomes fiction and bodies become clichés." This idea extends to other aspects of Heinecken's work, including *Are You Rea*.

[168] Heinecken on Kurt Schwitters' photograms: "When I began this work, I very much had the idea that I had invented it, which is always a good feeling. It turns out Kurt Schwitters the Dadaist, invented it, but he is good company." Untitled Lecture #1, notecard #44. In 1965, a Kurt Schwitters retrospective was on view in the UCLA art gallery, which Heinecken likely saw.

In 1965, Heinecken published a brochure about the two-year-old photography program at UCLA, illustrating it with graduate student photographs taken by Darryl Curran, Carl Cheng, Pat O'Neill, and others. He wrote the text titled, *Photography: Not a picture of but an object about something*, an early attempt to express something "philosophic" about photography.[169] Heinecken's text alternates between theoretical statements about photography and a summary of the program and facilities at UCLA. Heinecken taught photography as a medium rather than a profession, or a job. The goal was to develop artists, not commercial photographers, photojournalists or even photo educators. Photography technique was understood as a means to facilitate ideas and "personal atistic expression," while acknowledging that "there really is no intelligent separation between technique and content" in photographs – an idea he demonstrated in *Are You Rea*. He anticipated a study and research center that would house a fine print collection of historic and contemporary photographs, a photo library, and exhibitions, focusing on "rather unknown individuals or on untried photographic ideas." Heinecken's students would not only be encouraged to invent new forms of the medium but they would also know the historical precedents for their experimentation as well as other contemporary activity in the field.[170]

The philosophical argument advocated by Heinecken in *The photograph: Not a picture of but an object about something* begins with the assertion that photography is an art form.

---

[169] Borger interview, 16. See full text of *The Photograph: Not a picture of but an object about something* reproduced in *Robert Heinecken: Object Matter*, 155. It was first published in *21st Annual Art Directors Show* (Los Angeles: Art Directors club of Los Angeles, 1965). However, Heinecken's records show that he drafted an earlier version of the text in 1962. Heinecken Archive, bibliographic binders labeled, "Articles, Essays, Reviews which Discuss Art Work or Teaching in Some Depth."

[170] All quotes in this paragraph taken from *The Photograph: Not a picture of but an object about something* unless otherwise noted.

He acknowledged how the ubiquity of photography complicated the task of teaching it because the experience most people had with taking snapshots led them to think of photographs only in terms of what they pictured. *How* photographs pictured something was taken for granted. Heinecken wanted his students to think deeply about what photographs were as well as how and what they communicated. He wrote that fine art photographs, especially those his students would be expected to make, "may be operating on a completely unfamiliar level" where "meaning is probably not on the surface or necessarily associated with the subject matter." He de-emphasized the picturing of "subjects and situations" and instead encouraged the making of "object[s] about something" encouraging experimentation with photographic processes, materials, and form. Sounding a lot like Bunnell at the end of his 1979 lecture (see the last page of Chapter 2), Heinecken states that students will be expected to "transcend the subject matter in some way," adding that, "the ways are numerous and varied." The goal for all photography students at UCLA would be "developing conceptual competence, individuality, and a personal point of view" that was evinced in a cohesive body of work.[171]

In 1965, Heinecken's own work was taking interesting turns regarding materials and form. He continued to make photograms for the series *Are You Rea* but he also made silver gelatin prints like *Typographic Nude* (1965) as well as his first experiments with three-dimensional photographic objects. In *Typographic Nude*, Heinecken superimposed text onto the body of a nude female model and photographed the results. He was aware that "the coincidence of text and photography is not unusual," as he put it, and was

[171] Ibid.

certainly aware of the affinity of text and photography in graphic design and fine art.[172] The photogram technique used in *Are You Rea* heightened that awareness, producing images where bodies and texts did more than sit side by side in mutual commentary but physically merged. The combination of text projected onto the body of a living and breathing woman is fundamentally different. It implies that the body, specifically the female body, is a carrier of messages and meaning, wittingly or unwittingly, by choice, coercion, or force. Heinecken did not elaborate on these points, rather he was attracted to the formal aspects of text breaking down the human form, sometimes merging with the background, not only creating interesting shapes but interrupting the wholeness and purity of the photographic image. Coincidentally, the text was also broken up, its legibility compromised so that the ability of photography and text to clarify the advertising message is turned on its head.

This idea that the integrity of the whole photographic image could be disrupted took another form in Heinecken's earliest photo sculptures. In *Light Figure Cube* (1965), a work that appeared in *Photography into Sculpture*, fragments of gelatin silver prints of female nudes were glued onto the sides of a wooden block and mounted to a base. Indistinct fragments of body parts and stark white negative space meet at the edges of the block to form abstract shapes. The artist experimented with how to mount the cubes on the bases, sometimes hovering squarely above the base and other times perched on its

[172] Heinecken often spoke of his keen interest in Dada – including Marcel Duchamp, John Heartfield, Raoul Hausmann, and Man Ray – and the Bauhaus, especially Laszlo Moholy-Nagy. Berlin Dadaists, Heartfield and Hausmann, combined text and image in their political photomontages as well as text and the human form in a number of sculptural objects (e.g. Hausmann's *Mechanical Head (The Spirit of Our Age)*, c. 1920). Heinecken noted that a 1967 issue of *Camera*, which focused on German photography between the World Wars, as important to him: *Camera*, no. 4, April 1967, Lucerne: Switzerland.

corner, either attached directly to the base or elevated on a slender post. When placed on its corner, the block looks as if it will tumble over, enhancing the disorienting effect of the imagery itself. Movement is crucial to the piece as it continually changes depending on where the viewer stands. The logic of the newly constructed image relies on the viewer's ability to see it as seamless abstract shapes, not as fragmented body parts.

In *Figure in 6 Sections* (1965), a piece resembling *Fractured Figure Sections* (1967) which appeared in *Photography into Sculpture,* four gelatin silver prints of a standing female nude are mounted to the sides of wooden rectangles that are stacked and held in place by a center rod so that each section of the images spin horizontally. The movement in the piece, this time actual instead of implied, is completely different. Literally twisting and turning the component parts, the viewer places sections of the image (hips, breast and shoulder, arm and head, thigh, knees and shins, ankles and feet) in new combinations in the manner of the Surrealist parlor game *exquisite corpse*. The same negative is used in all four of the images but altered by solarization, reversal, and underexposure so that they look very different. Despite the oddity of each new configuration – which Heinecken called "transmogrification" – the resulting images appeared legible and resolved.

The inch-high segments that make up *Figure in 6 Sections* and *Fractured Figure Sections* read like bands, resembling darkroom test strips, a fundamental technique that even Heinecken taught his students. The piece is also reminiscent of an exercise Heinecken gave to his students in which he would have them make several prints of the same size from the same negative in different "tonal scales." The exercise was meant to encourage

students to perceive the negative "as having a large number of possible interpretations." Heinecken championed the belief that "there is no one way to print a negative" and encouraged experimentation that would "reveal the possible shapes and ideas present in the subject matter in a way that you wouldn't have seen in the camera." While the darkroom was for Heinecken a place of invention, not all of the transformation happened there or in postproduction. He also manipulated lighting in the studio to abstract the bodies of his models. In a contact sheet from the same period, images of a nude model photographed in front of a black and white checkered backdrop that end up looking like bands, mimic the effect of *Figure in 6 Sections*.[173]

Refractive Hexagon (1965) represents a group of works Heinecken informally called "puzzles," including *Twenty-four Figure Blocks* (ca. 1965-66), which appeared in *Photography into Sculpture*. It built upon Heinecken's ideas about viewer participation, aleatory or chance occurrences, and the disruption of the pure and whole photographic image. In this example, triangular fragments of gelatin silver prints were extracted from one or more nude photographs, affixed to wood, and placed in a shallow tray. Heinecken described it this way: "No continuous representation can be formed, only constantly altering anatomic configurations are created. Each edge of each piece fits into every other edge in one way or another. It lies flat on a table or pedestal, and one works with it."[174] Hundreds if not thousands of combinations were possible.

---

[173] All quotations in this paragraph are taken from an interview with Robert Heinecken in Steven Lewis, James McQuaid, and David Tait, *Source and Resource: A Source Book for Creative Photography* (State College, PA: Turnip Press, 1973), 33.

[174] Untitled and undated lecture, box 5C, file 18, Robert Heinecken Archive, notecard #57.

At the end of 1965, Heinecken attended the SPE annual meeting and Symposium on the Teaching of Photography in Chicago (December 28 – 29, 1965) where he made his second presentation to the group in as many years. Humorously titled, "Equal Rights for Crooked Photography (Possibilities and Aims of Manipulation)," he argued that manipulated photography had a long history and was again the key to expanding the medium.[175] The word "crooked" set manipulated photography against "straight" photography while challenging those who believed that altering the photograph was cheating or a discreditable way of working. Heinecken and five others spoke on the first evening of the conference in an hour-long session.[176] Innovative Chicago photographers were in the audience included Ray K. Metzker, Arthur Siegel, Aaron Siskind and Harry Callahan from the Institute of Design and Ken Josephson of the School of the Art Institute of Chicago.

Jerry Uelsmann launched the session with his paper titled, "Post-Visualization," a term he invented to mean the "willingness on the part of the photographer to re-visualize the final image at any point in the entire photographic process."[177] Targeting Edward Weston, one

---

[175] Heinecken's lecture was titled, "Equal Rights for Crooked Photography (Possibilities and Aims of Manipulation)," on the symposium schedule, Symposium on the Teaching of Photography, sponsored by the Society for Photographic Education, Chicago, IL, December 28-29, 1965, Society for Photographic Education Archive, box 1, file 3. A copy of his lecture is included in the SPE Archive with the title "Manipulative Photography." This essay would be re-worked and presented at Eastman House during the Advanced Studies in Photography Workshop in 1967. A version of it was also published with the title, "Manipulative Photography" in *Contemporary Photographer* 5, no 4 (1967): np.

[176] Richard Schulze, "Film: Creative Photography's Report on Educational Film Project," (University of Iowa), Richard Peterson, "Achieving a Balance between the Art of the Picture and the Techniques of Photography," (State University College at New Paltz, NY), Jerry Uelsmann, "Post-Visualization," (University of Florida), George Gambsky, "Take Over," (University of Wisconsin), and James Durrell "Photographic Assignments that Teach," (Maryland Institute). Symposium schedule, Symposium on the Teaching of Photography, sponsored by the Society for Photographic Education, Chicago, IL, December 28-29, 1965.

[177] Jerry Uelsmann, "Post-Visualization," (lecture, Symposium on the Teaching of Photography, sponsored by the Society for Photographic Education, Chicago, IL, December 28, 1965), box 1, folder 3, Society for

of photography's modernist icons, he refashioned Weston's own term, "pre-visualization," which involved having the finished print in mind from the moment the shutter was clicked and the requirement of recording everything in the negative, eliminating the need for dodging, burning, cropping or other manipulation in the darkroom. Uelsmann, who constructed his complex images by combining multiple negatives in a single print during the printing process, found this needlessly restrictive. To Uelsmann, the "seemingly scientific nature of the darkroom ritual" a la Weston was false. Instead, he envisioned photography as "a form of alchemy." Citing isolated moments in the history of photography that were experimental – such as the advent of the daguerreotype, Alfred Stieglitz and the photo secessionists, Laszlo Moholy-Nagy and his colleagues at the Bauhaus – he made the argument that these were the exceptions and not the rule, accusing photographers of habitually drifting towards formulaic approaches that yielded predictable results. He pointedly noted that the now revered experimental photographers of the past – Stieglitz, Steichen, Man Ray, Moholy-Nagy, and Fredrick Sommer – were not only concerned with photography but also painting, design, graphics and sculpture. He claimed that all other areas of art except photography had been subjected to "a thorough re-investigation of their means," since the turn of the century. He also challenged Nathan Lyons for giving primacy to sight and for implying that "the eye and the camera see more than the mind knows." He disagreed, countering "Is it not also conceivable that the mind knows more than the eye and the camera see?" Essentially an argument for the role of the mind in the creative process, Uelsmann, like Heinecken, promoted idea- and chance-based approaches to photography. He emphasized

---

Photographic Education Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ. Published in *Contemporary Photographer* V, no. 4 (1967): np.

the importance of the darkroom – an extraordinary and unique place – calling it "a visual research lab; a place for discovery, observation, and meditation." He ended with a rallying cry to "free the teaching of photography from the long-standing dogmas which tend to restrict rather than encourage growth" and to encourage "students of serious photography to challenge continually both their medium and themselves."[178]

Heinecken closed the session, beginning with a brief outline of how photography fit into the art department at UCLA, noting that it functioned in the "autonomous way" that other mediums did. He explained that students in the photography concentration were expected to produce a body of work reflecting their "own unique visual concerns," that were both "personal" and "poetic." Technique was taught on an as needed basis in order to express ideas but never for its own sake as in the acquisition of compulsory skills. Echoing the ideas in *Photography: Not a picture of but an object about something,* Heinecken explained his views on straight forms of photography and indexicality, a presumed fundamental characteristic of the medium:

> We constantly misuse or misunderstand the term reality in reference to photographs. The photograph itself is the only thing that is real, that exists. The elements in the print are simply referents of various kinds which operate on various levels. Obviously no picture, camera made or otherwise, can hope to come close to duplicating or even simulating reality. Unless, of course, one is concerned with making photographs <u>of</u> things rather than photographs <u>about</u> things. I find the differentiation between of and about a useful one. Many pictures turn out to be limp translations of the known world instead of vital objects which create an intrinsic worlds of their own. There is a vast difference between taking a picture and making a photograph; another useful differentiation.[179]

---

[178] Ibid. All quotations in this paragraph taken from the lecture, "Post-Visualization."

[179] Robert Heinecken, "Manipulative Photography," (lecture, Symposium on the Teaching of Photography, sponsored by the Society for Photographic Education, Chicago, IL, December 28, 1965), box 1, folder 3, Society for Photographic Education Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ. All quotations in the previous paragraph were also taken from this lecture.

Heinecken believed that there was a continuum of straight and altered photography that concluded with "complete obliteration of the image." Where the artist stopped on that continuum was to be determined by the individual and not "conditioned (especially in a student) by arbitrary limits of validity." Sounding a lot like Uelsmann, he claimed that in photo education there was too much "propagating the ideas" of photographers Edward Steichen, Edward Weston and Ansel Adams and too little attention paid to conceptual innovators like Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, György Kepes, Man Ray and John Heartfield. He claimed that "manipulative methods" had been in existence since photography began but now they were belittled as tricks with little concern for how or why they might be used in serious art making. Heinecken insisted that technique, whether straight or manipulated, be used to support content. He ended by imploring the audience to "broaden our concept of what a photograph is or can be." He spoke of the "great potential" of manipulation in photography, not the least of which was to combat the unthinking and "automatic use of the camera by the public and commerce," which has desensitized the viewer to expect "a pattern of dull illusionism." He asserted his firm belief in the potential of intentionally ambiguous content and the idea that still photography or film should not be limited to overt subject matter or storytelling.[180]

Uelsmann and Heinecken – as well as Peter Bunnell, who was in the audience – represented a younger generation poised to challenge the medium, though theirs was not entirely an uphill battle. Ralph Hattersley and Henry Holmes Smith, members of the Society for Photographic Education who were innovators in their own right, had trained

[180] Ibid.

Uelsmann at Rochester Institute of Technology and Indiana University, respectively. Interestingly, Heinecken arrived at similar conclusions without the photo pedigree.[181] Lyons recalled that the field was at a tipping point between old approaches that highlighted darkroom technique and new approaches that were concept or idea driven, what he calls "a curriculum-based model." While Uelsmann's and Heinecken's ideas about photo education were not completely new, Lyons claims that "they hadn't surfaced in any arena where they would generate a substantive effect" until the arrival of SPE. For example, Lyons called Henry Holmes Smith "a vanguard figure," who had been trying for years in isolation to bring "a more developed understanding of the potential of the medium." Now it appeared that innovative ideas about photography and photo education would reach a receptive audience where they could gain momentum. Furthermore, the notion of manipulated photography was more widely accepted among members of SPE than in the photography world in general, which continued to regard straight photography as the only kind of photography that mattered. The SPE membership roster in 1966 reflected this reality, including traditional straight photographers like Ansel Adams, Jerome Leibling, and Art Sinsabaugh as well as experimentalists like Ray Metzker, Ken Josephson, Henry Holmes Smith, Jerry Uelsmann, and Todd Walker. Notably absent from the list, however, were street photographers, including Lee Friedlander, Bruce Davidson, and Garry Winogrand.[182]

***

[181] Uelsmann recently recalled that he was the first person in the group to give his paper and was nervous because he was unsure of the response he would receive. Heinecken went last and in Uelsmann's opinion his paper sounded like "west coast jargon." After Heinecken finished, he remembers asking him, "Bob, what the hell was that about?" to which Heinecken replied something like, "I was talking about the same things as you were." Phone conversation between Uelsmann and the author, August 3, 2014.
[182] Nathan Lyons, *SPE: The Formative Years*, ed. Nathan Lyons (Rochester, NY: Visual Studies Workshop in association with the Society for Photographic Education, 2012), 152-58.

In 1966-1967, Heinecken went on his first sabbatical, which culminated in a month-long stay in Rochester where he participated in the Advanced Studies Workshop, another rich opportunity created by Nathan Lyons at George Eastman House. The workshop was "directed toward the development of museum skills and research in the history of photography and the teaching of photography."[183] This is where Heinecken furthered his research on manipulative photography in a more formal way with the goal of creating an exhibition and publication on the subject. Lyons invited Heinecken to participate as a visiting lecturer along with five aspiring fellows from university programs throughout the country who would become leaders in the field, including Robert Sobieszek (who later became the first curator of photography at Los Angeles County Museum of Art) and Harold Jones (founding director of the Center for Creative Photography) and twenty-two other attendees.[184] Eight young members of the Eastman House staff, including Robert Fichter – whom Heinecken would hire to teach photography at UCLA – taught the practical aspects of museum work such as accessioning and cataloguing procedures and exhibition preparation as well as providing sample exhibition contracts and other forms. The month featured weekly lectures by noteworthy speakers such as historian Leo Katz, photographer and filmmaker Robert Frank, MoMA curator Grace Mayer, and historian and Eastman House director Beaumont Newhall, followed by colloquiums, where a

[183] Schedule for the Advanced Studies Workshop, August 3 -31, 1967, George Eastman House. Box 5C, Robert Heinecken Archive.

[184] The five fellows included: Marie Czach (BFA, School of the Art Institute and graduate work in psychology at University of Chicago); Harold Jones (BFA from Maryland Institute, working on MFA in photography at University of New Mexico); Bruce MacDonald (BA Trinity College, MA from Harvard University, working on PhD and Museum Training Course at Fogg Museum, Harvard); Robert Sobieszek (BFA from University of Illinois, working toward MFA from Stanford); and John Ward (BA from Hamilton College, MA from Yale; MFA from UNM, currently teaching art history at University of Florida). Even as late as April 1967, Heinecken was not certain in what capacity he would be participating. He was designated "Visiting Lecturer."

variety of topics including research methods, interpretation, the history of photography and criticism were discussed.[185]

Heinecken and each one of the fellows presented their research and teaching projects to the workshop. Heinecken's essay, "Manipulative Photography," proposed that medium specificity arguments, deemed universal and absolute, were instead driven by the needs of a period or generation, situation and location.[186] He argued that notions of "particular" or "inherent characteristics" of photography, which are meant to delineate proper usage resulting in "limitations of the medium," however false, nevertheless required the attention of artists who had to understand and address them.[187] He offered historical examples such as Henry Peach Robinson, who was compelled to make composite photographs as a way of simulating the composition and themes of nineteenth-century painting in England, and William Henry Fox Talbot's *Pencil of Nature*, which demonstrated a "non-hierarchical" way of thinking about photography. Heinecken mentioned a litany of classification systems in the twentieth century, declaring that none of them would work for each and every photographer at any given point in time. There simply is no ultimate truth of photography or any other medium, he proclaimed, therefore a personal investigation and individual determination of what constitutes the photograhpy

---

[185] The complete list of guest speakers during the workshop and in order of their appearance: Leo Katz ("Social and Cultural Aspects of Photography"), Robert Frank, Grace Mayer ("discussion of research and preparation of *Once Upon A City"*), Paul Vanderbilt ("Sequencing Photographs"), Bartlett Hayes ("Education Through Vision"), and Nancy Newhall (panel discussion with Beaumont Newhall and Nathan Lyons, "Photographic Books"). Schedule for George Eastman House Advanced Studies Workshop, August 3-31, 1967.

[186] Robert Heinecken, "Manipulative Photography," (lecture, George Eastman House Advanced Studies Workshop, Rochester, NY, August 21, 1967), Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ.

[187] Heinecken did not use the term "medium specificity" but rather those phrases noted here that allude to it, which are scattered throughout "Manipulative Photography."

is the only reasonable approach. Drilling down on what he saw as the problem, Heinecken asserted that contemporary photographers were up against the bias for lens-based images bound to the real world and the determination that "this objective looking kind of picture is the right one."[188] Echoing his earlier comments at the 1965 teaching conference, Heinecken argued that "there will always be some confusion about the real world, our perception of it, our pictures of it and our feelings about it," and yet "we have come to believe the photograph" and "associate with the subject matter strongly."[189] Heinecken doubted the truth of the photograph, claiming that, "as soon as the shutter opens on a camera you have made the first manipulative steps towards creating some kind of abstraction."[190] Given that the basis for optical description is on such shaky ground, he reasoned, as had Bunnell, that "in order for the photograph to be significant it is going to have to transcend the subject matter in some effective personal way."[191]

The works that Heinecken devised in response to these ideas were on view in the galleries at Eastman House. The exhibition, *The Persistence of Vision*, featured eight three-dimensional works by Heinecken and twelve wall pieces including eight images from *Are You Rea.*[192] This was the second of three exhibitions organized by Lyons that included Heinecken's work in as many years. The first was *Photography in the Twentieth*

---

[188] Robert Heinecken, "Manipulative Photography," (lecture, George Eastman House Advanced Studies Workshop, Rochester, NY, August 21, 1967), Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ, 3.
[189] Ibid., 9.
[190] Ibid., 4.
[191] Ibid., 9.
[192] The exhibition *The Persistence of Vision*, organized by Nathan Lyons at George Eastman House in 1967, included work by Heinecken, Donald Blumberg and Charles Gill (working collaboratively), Ray K. Metzker, Jerry Uelsmann, and John Wood.

Century, which Lyons organized for the National Gallery of Canada in 1966 and the third would be *Vision and Expression* for George Eastman House in 1968.

The bond between Lyons and Heinecken is particularly strong between 1967-1970. Lyons was a source of ideas and validation via informal conversations as well as formal educational opportunities like the Advanced Studies Workshop. He provided a combination of moral and professional support. For example, while Heinecken was on sabbatical in Europe, his car was broken into while passing through Madrid and a number of his negatives, exhibition and sales records, and artworks were stolen. Heinecken was heartbroken and he wrote to Lyons about the loss. However, similar works were on view at Eastman House in *The Persistence of Vision*, including several puzzles, cubes, and stacks. Heinecken asked Lyons for "copy work" so that images used in the pieces that remained were duplicated and could be used to reconstruct those that were lost.[193] This kind of personal attention as well as technical and hands-on assistance brought Lyons a great deal of loyalty from photographers.[194] For example, when Lyons was required to open his interdisciplinary school of photography, the Visual Studies Workshop, several months ahead of schedule, Heinecken went to Rochester to help build out the former

[193] Letter from Heinecken to Nathan Lyons dated March 17, 1967 provides details about what was stolen from Heinecken's car in Madrid and how he felt about it: "a complete set of original negatives, all data concerning negatives, sales, exhibitions, etc.; all slides of LIFE magazine thing I showed you; several 100 feet of exposed film; all prints from the magazine and the original pages… I tried not to cry but am still carrying a lump in my stomach about the loss." Nathan Lyons Archive.

[194] Lyons offered a summary of some of the differences between John Szarkowski and him. For example, Szarkowski never sat on the board of SPE, while Lyons, at one time, sat on the board of four art/photography organizations. While Lyons endeavored to give contemporary photographers as much recognition as possible, organizing a series of large and thematically diverse group exhibitions in order to do so, Szarkowski occasionally mounted one-person and small group shows of contemporary photographers while his larger exhibitions were largely devoted to a generation of older photographers (who might still be living) and historical surveys. Lyons also recalled making purchases on behalf of the museum from important photographers at key moments when they may have needed money to pay the rent or other expenses. Conversation with the author in November 2014.

furniture factory with darkrooms, classrooms, offices, and other facilities.[195] The relationship tapered off in the early 1970s but Heinecken's interaction with Lyons was critical in this early phase of his career.[196]

***

In October 1969, Heinecken made a series of chapbooks called *Mansmag: Homage to Werkman and Cavalcade* using an offset lithography press, which he had recently purchased. The work combined disparate sources of inspiration. "Werkman" was in reference to Hendrik Nicolaas Werkman, a Dutch experimental designer, artist, and publisher who was executed by the Nazis for creating a group of small magazines in the early 1940s as a form of resistance and protest. "Cavalcade" was the title of a men's magazine in the 1960s and 1970s and a source of images in Heinecken's work. The density of Heinecken's printed color images yielded a saturation not previously seen in his work. The dense layering of image and color compromises legibility, but the sensuality or visual heat of the images is not lost on the viewer. He made eight variations in editions of one hundred each. When viewing a group of these chapbooks, there appear

[195] Visual Studies Workshop is a multi-disciplinary school focusing on photography and book arts founded by Nathan Lyons in 1969. It was supposed to be affiliated with George Eastman House, however, when Lyons was abruptly fired from the museum in 1968, he found an alternative location with only weeks left to ready the space before the first students arrived.

[196] Lyons recalled that his contact with Heinecken decreased in the 1970s, as the latter became more involved in the growing photography scene in Southern California. Lyons was also incredibly busy during the first five to ten years of the Visual Studies Workshop's existence – teaching, establishing the curriculum, hiring teachers, working on publications, and securing funding for the school. Conversation with the author in November 2014. Also, an undated letter hints at signs of strain on the friendship. Heinecken expressed his disappointment in Lyons for not attending his retrospective exhibition at George Eastman House in 1976. Presumbably, Lyons was reluctant to return to GEH, the museum which had fired him. Heinecken wrote, "I understand and empathize but do not agree. You were instrumental in my visibility and it would have pleased me to know that you had seen the manifest evidence of that initial support… I had fantasized a potion in a secret ring to knock you out and that you would wake up in the exhibition, etc – Forget that. Anyway, my best wishes." Nathan Lyons archive.

to be endless variations on the same source material. They are bled to the edge of the page, continuous not only across spreads but from page to page and from one version of the small book to the next. One can imagine Heinecken's sessions at the press, changing the ink color quickly and often, resulting in a fluid layering of images not typically associated with commercial offset printing, the purpose of which is printing hundreds if not thousands of images consistently and cheaply. He was creating something that simulated the quality and quantity of mass production but with endless, artful customizations. A sense of the illicit is obvious – a sort of reconstituted, do-it-yourself pornography – and yet clear views of body parts are obscured and facial expressions are obliterated. Heinecken found it interesting to alter pornography so that it "doesn't "look quite right" and it no longer does "what its supposed to do."[197] *Mansmag* was another component of the overall project of experimentation and merging of photography, printmaking, and design, while achieving a new level of innovation in its color, form, and content. Recognizing this milestone, Heinecken wrote to Lyons, "I finally reached the point, where when it says 'Medium:_____,' I don't know what to write."[198]

The notion of homage in *Mansmag* was not isolated in this work. A few years later, he would make *Erogenous Zone System Exercise* (1972) a work that utilized pornographic source material that referenced, simultaneously and incongruously, not only areas on the body of heightened sensitivity that when touched produce arousal in most people, but also Ansel Adams's Zone system for ensuring a full range of values in all photographs –

---

[197] Stephen K. Lehmer interview with Robert Heinecken, *Photographist: Robert F. Heinecken*, (interview transcript, Oral History Program, University of California Los Angeles, 1998), online version, section 462.
[198] Undated letter from Robert Heinecken to Nathan Lyons. He sent some copies of *Mansmag* to Lyons and the letter likely accompanied them. He indicated that his work on the press had been frenzied, joking that, "it is kind of like a disease. Not terminal, I hope." Nathan Lyons archive.

a principle of photographic modernism. Both aspects of the title referenced a standardized approach: to sex and to the fundamentals of photography. The Zone System was a staple of photography education, a means of teaching the technical aspects of photographic printing that yielded predictable results.[199] Heinecken resisted all formulaic approaches to art and photography including the Zone System and any other technical solutions[200] and yet, he admired and respected Adams. They had a genial rapport and a supportive relationship.[201] They even shared the stage at Occidental College in Los Angeles on a panel vaguely titled, "Photography as a Fine Art," on January 23, 1969, during the run of Heinecken's solo exhibition titled, "20:6."[202] The exhibition featured twenty works by Heinecken "derived from six source negatives."[203] In remarks Heinecken made in conjunction with the exhibition, he identified the negative "entirely as a starting point" and something to be "re-use[d]…at different times, under different attitudes, to different formal ends."[204] While the differences in Adams's and Heinecken's

---

[199] In undated lecture notes, Heinecken commented that he made the piece *Erogenous Zone System Exercise*, "in deference and homage to that whole system." Robert Heinecken, untitled and undated lecture, box 42, folder labeled Lecture Notes Untitled Lecture #1, notecard #55, Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ.

[200] Heinecken's former student, Carl Cheng, names Adams and the Zone System as something they were working against while he was working in photography at UCLA. Conversation with the author in 2012. Jerry Uelsmann commented that photography's technology is much easier to teach than methods for generating ideas that manifest content because there are specific answers to technology questions. He maintained that Heinecken never fell back on technology and was always pushing his students to make ideas primary, thereby making his role as a teacher more challenging. Conversation with the author, August 2014.

[201] The rapport between Adams and Heinecken is evident in the correspondence found in their respective archives, both housed at the Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ. Heinecken asked Adams to write in support of his Guggenheim application and he cheerfully obliged. Adams invited Heinecken to teach in at least one of his workshops.

[202] Letter of confirmation from Robert Hansen, Chairman of the Department of Art at Occidental and moderator of the discussion, to Robert Heinecken, December 18, 1968. Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson.

[203] Exhibition announcement for "20:6," Occidental College, Los Angeles, CA, January 7 – 30, 1969. It featured three-dimensional and two-dimensional works including three versions of *Breast Bomb*, *Figure Flower*, *VN Pin Up*, several *Figure Cubes* and puzzles, *Venus Mirrored*, two or three versions of *Costumes of a Woman*, and *Sectional Figures*. Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography.

[204] Undated notes, Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson.

work are abundant and obvious, on this point concerning the negative, they share a similar point of view. Adams compared the negative to a musical score to be performed. "Image quality," he said, "is not the quality of a machine, but of a person who directs the machine, and there are no limits to imagination and expression."[205]

Starting in 1965, Heinecken used film as a material in the final work, a strategy that continued well into the 1970s.[206] Peter Bunnell included *Costumes of a Woman* (1968) in *Photography as Printmaking* and *Venus Mirrored* (1968) and *Figure/Foliage 1* and *2* (1968) were included in *Photography into Sculpture*.[207] *Costumes of a Woman* utilized collage material from mass media magazines that was synthesized by an overlay of black and white film depicting a female nude in a pin-up pose that was sourced from a mail order pornography distributor in Hollywood. The company sold rolls of unprocessed film by written descriptions such as "WWII pinups – eye contact."[208] Heinecken had considered making his own photographs of nude models in pin up poses but changed his mind when he discovered this authentic source. *Venus Mirrored* and both *Transparent Figure/Foliage 1* and *Transparent Figure/Foliage 2*, involved layering images on photographic film between sheets of Plexiglas to achieve highly abstract, transmogrified figures.[209]

---

[205] Ansel Adams, *Ansel Adams: An Autobiography* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1985). 360.
[206] Some of Heinecken's earliest pieces that used film as a material in the finished work are *As Long as You Are Up* (1965) and *Figure Parts and Hair* (1966).
[207] The latter three works were included in exhibitions organized by Peter Bunnell at MoMA. *Costumes of a Woman* was included in *Photography as Printmaking* (1968) and was the first piece by Heinecken that MoMA acquired. *Venus Mirrored* and both *Figure/Foliage 1* and *2* were included in *Photography into Sculpture.*
[208] Robert Heinecken, untitled and undated lecture, box 42, folder labeled Lecture Notes Untitled Lecture #1, notecard #25, Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ
[209] Ibid, notecard #6. Heinecken ofter used the word "transmogrify" to describe his habit of altering and abstracting a figurative image sometimes with disturbing or humorous results.

These pieces, which were still quite tame, and *Mansmag,* which is more overt, represent Heinecken's incremental shift towards pornographic sources. In November 1969, Heinecken used his offset press to print images sourced from pornography onto the pages of *Time* magazine in a work titled, *Time.* At least one of the dominant images from the cover of *Mansmag* – a woman kneeling, her hand poised suggestively inches away from her body – has been flopped and reproduced on top of ads for Dewar's Scotch and televisions in the venerated weekly news magazine. This was the first in an ongoing engagement with the physical alteration of popular magazines. In 1970, Heinecken continued to alter magazines using increasingly explicit pornographic source material, bluntly printing them on the page in stark black and white ink. At the same time he used the same source material in ways that aestheticized them and muddled their message. In a work like *Different Strokes,* he used serial and sequential images, creating a jumble of bodies, delineated and enhanced by delicately applied colored chalk on photo sensitized canvas. In *Strokes/Dark #2* and others from the period, a single image on photographic paper that begins with a pornographic sourced photogram, is highly worked in the fluid manner of drawing or painting. Each additional process interacted with the previous one which yielded results that the artist could not predict. Bleaching, staining, solarizing and redeveloping were undoubtedly photographic processes yet Heinecken thought of them in terms of painting and drawing, where bleaching mimicked the qualities of erasure and staining resembled washes.[210]

[210] Untitled and undated lecture, box 5C, folder 18, notecard #48-49. "These are prints resulting from ideas of erasure, which is not common to photography as it is to the other visual media." Heinecken classified these works under the term "Process" along with the photo etching *Venice Alley,* projections on models like *WWI Figure*, all of the ink transfers, film placed on top of magazine collages like *UCB Pinup*, the series

Heinecken was intensely interested in the possibilities of erotic and pornographic source material. He claimed that "no other subject area is so charged, and hence interesting in relation to transmogrification."[211] He was very interested in the psychology of erotic art and found it interesting to put the viewer in the uncomfortable position of viewing images made for private viewing in a public setting where their feelings about pornography were unavoidable. Heinecken would soon have the opportunity to put these works before an audience at the Witkin Gallery in his first solo exhibition in New York City.

Just a few months before his show opened at Witkin Gallery in October 1970, Heinecken's work was included in *Photography into Sculpture*. Bunnell displayed three-dimensional and audience participation works including *Twenty-four Figure Blocks* (ca. 1965), *Light Figure Cube* (1965), *Fractured Figure Sections* (1967), and well as newer works utilizing soft-porn source materials in abstracted, transmogrified compositions made from layers of Plexiglas and photographic film titled, *Venus Mirrored* (1968) and *Transparent Figure/Foliage #1* and *#2* (1969). Given the evolution of his work in the previous year, Bunnell's selections must have represented for Heinecken a set of old ideas. As *Photography into Sculpture* opened, he was likely heavily involved in the production on new works for Witkin Gallery, nearly all of which utilized noticeably pornographic source material. Heinecken also held views about the show in general that contrasted with Bunnell's, apparently throughout his preparations for the exhibition and

---

Are You Rea, all versions of *Mansmag*, the offset lithographs from pornographic magazines, and *14 or 15 Buffalo Ladies.* See *Heinecken*, ed/ James Enyeart (Carmel, CA: Friends of Photography and Light Gallery, 1980), 10.

[211] Untitled Lecture #1, notecard #6.

during its run. For example, he critiqued the title *Photography into Sculpture* (see Chapter 2) and cited Nathan Lyons's *Persistence of Vision* (1967) as "an earlier exhibition and book that I feel is equally important" to *Photography into Sculpture* where Lyons's exhibition "pioneered photo sculpture, printmaking, photo manipulation, painting, etc. etc.," and Lyons's essay for the exhibition catalogue "best describes the phenomenon that is now going on."[212]

In December 1971, towards the end of *Photography into Sculpture's* two-year run, Heinecken accepted an invitation to speak about the exhibition at SFMoMA. Despite the fact that he had moved beyond his own work in the show and had some misgivings about the show itself, he used the talk to further expose audiences to examples of experimental forms of photography. In preparation, he solicited slides from all of the artists in the *Photography into Sculpture* – not of works in the exhibition but the work that they had made since it opened. To thank them for their cooperation, Heinecken made duplicate slide sets available to all of the artists who responded, to be used, presumably, in talks given to their own students – another method of promoting experimental photography to increasingly wider audiences.[213] There is no documentation explaining why Heinecken spoke instead of Bunnell, but it does indicate that Heinecken was recognized by his peers in California as a capable spokesman with a voice and presence on both coasts.[214]

---

[212] Robert Heinecken, untitled and undated lecture held in conjunction with the presentation *Photography into Sculpture* at San Francicso Museum of Modern Art, December 1971. box 5C, folder 20A, back of notecard #9, Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ.

[213] Letter from Heinecken to artists in *Photography into Sculpture* dated December 10, 1971. Another set was given to the UCLA Slide Library collection (and retrieved by the author in 2014). Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ.

[214] Heinecken spoke at the invitation of SFMoMA and the Visual Dialogue Foundation – a group of predominately "straight" photographers from the Bay Area that included Leland Rice, Jack Welpott, Judy

In opening remarks to his presentation, Heinecken recalled that "the study of photography as a studio idea" was only introduced to fine arts students about six to eight years earlier, i.e. 1963, the year he started the photography program at UCLA. He claimed that "prior to this time students and their teachers came from other backgrounds and held different interests and motives," implying that there was a moment in the recent past when photography was not thought of in medium specific terms. The focus then, he asserted, was "the free exploration of picture and object ideas" which naturally led to "curious and interesting mutations in all media" and the following experimental tangents: "dimension, printmaking, the materials of photography as finished works of art, the manipulation of the photograph itself, documentation of personal lifestyle." While these concepts were now being presented as new ideas, Heinecken recognized their historical precedents. The problem was, as he saw it, that they were "never taken seriously in comparison to mainstream photographic work." He recognized that photographic modernists had won the battle for the medium as art; nevertheless, it was time to embrace historical and contemporary alternatives. This situation was made more complicated by the growing sense that photography was "being consumed by the environment of art" including new lens-based mediums – film, video and television – which, he claimed, was causing artists working in photography to want to "physically complicate the fixed images which otherwise seems to be a simple act."[215]

Dater and Charles Roitz (whose work was in *Photography into Sculpture*). Box 5C, folder 20A, Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ.

[215] Ibid., notecards #5 and #6, front and back.

These public remarks, made in a general way and meant to describe what was happening in a broader sense, described his experience at UCLA. As an educator, he attempted to preserve the open-minded and mixed-media approach to photography that he had experienced as a student, regardless of the fact that photography was rapidly coming into its own as a medium of fine art in academia whose inclusion was typically based on the specific qualities it could bring to university art departments that differed from painting, sculpture and printmaking. He had engaged in every kind of experimentation mentioned in the past and would continue to do so in the future. For example, at that moment, Heinecken was experimenting with television both as a subject and the key element in an installation titled, *TV/Time Environment* (1970-1972), in which he created a living room environment with a functioning television set fitted with a black and white transparency of a nude female torso on its screen. The viewer was invited to sit in a lounge chair and watch soap operas, commercials, the news, whatever was being broadcast, through the filter of sex and pornography.[216]

Heinecken would be celebrated as a unique and influential photo educator who taught his students to focus on ideation – one of his favorite terms – rather than technique. In this chapter, he is finding his way, quickly and confidently expanding on the example set by the previous generation of photo educators as well as colleagues his own age, while also developing his own instincts and practices. Heinecken made personal and professional connections with many people in the photo establishment rooted in the eastern half of the United States, including Peter Bunnell and Nathan Lyons. By 1970, however, he was in a

[216] Heinecken would merge television and photography in future works. The series *Inaugural Excerpt Videograms* (1981) were photograms of the televised inauguration of Ronald Reagan that were made by holding color photographic paper in contact with the glowing television screen during the broadcast.

position to advise both men and serve as conduit to talented artists in Southern California including his current and former students as well as friends like Wallace Berman.[217] After he made the first trip to Rochester in 1964, Heinecken never stopped traveling the country to teach and speak about his ideas and work. He returned many times to Rochester, New York City, and Chicago to participate in photography conferences and to spend time with close friends. For Heinecken the message remained constant: photography was always just a medium, one that could be paired with other mediums and manipulated into unrecognizable new forms. While his approach demanded careful consideration and argumentation during the 1960s and 1970s, it is now taken for granted and has been adapted to newfound uses and technologies.

[217] Nathan Lyons confirmed that Heinecken introduced him to Wallace Berman and his work. Lyons was developing an exhibition of Berman's work for Eastman House when he left the museum. The exhibition never materialized. Conversation with the author.

INTRODUCTION TO PART II

Part II contains an oral history of *Photography into Sculpture*, which includes an annotated interview with the curator Peter Bunnell and Appendix A containing seventeen interviews with artists in the exhibition.[218] These components personalize and animate the forty-five-year-old exhibition for readers as well as serve as source material for my dissertation and future projects.[219]

The interview with Peter Bunnell provides details about the seven-year period from 1965-1972, when he worked at MoMA as a curator of photography. He describes his curatorial process, focusing especially on the research and selection of work for *Photography into Sculpture*. Importantly, Bunnell offers a first-hand account of his relationship with John Szarkowski, who was the head of the photography department and his direct superior. Commentators have speculated that given the apparent differences in their photographic interests – Szarkowski's emphasis on straight photography and Bunnell's on experimental forms – that there was tension between the two. As Bunnell describes it, however, there was no friction between them. Rather, it was a good working relationship and Szarkowski was supportive of Bunnell's efforts even when they diverged from his own interests. Nevertheless, there was a division of labor in as much as Szarkowski

[218]All of the artists presumed to be living were sought out for interviews. Jack Dale (1928-2002), Robert Heinecken (1931-2006), and Robert Watts (1923-1988) were already deceased at the time that my research began. Karl Folsom, Ed O'Connell, and Leslie Snyder were never found. Sadly, two artists who were interviewed in Summer 2012 have since died: Charles Roitz (December 5, 2012) and Giuseppe Pirone (April 2013).

[219] Julie Ault's *Alternative Art New York, 1965-1985* (New York: The Drawing Center; with Minneapolis, MN and London: University of Minnesota Press), 2002, is an example of book that combines first-hand accounts and archival scholarship. It served as inspiration and informed my decision to include the interviews in my dissertation.

organized most of the larger exhibitions and publications, often travelling abroad to do so, while Bunnell handled smaller exhibitions and rotations of the permanent collection. Bunnell often represented the department at a local and national level, attending and screening gallery exhibitions of photography in New York City for his boss as well as travelling extensively within the US to speak about photography and meet photographers, and becoming an active participant in the Society for Photographic Education, as well. Bunnell also describes the inner workings of the museum and sheds light on interactions between the department of photography and other curatorial departments, which had more give and take than one might expect.

There were no funds available for an exhibition catalogue for *Photography into Sculpture,* and therefore, there is no official document of the exhibition. Bunnell was able to publish some articles about the exhibition in journals and museum member's magazines, providing his view of the exhibition's historical context as well as explanations about the ideas and strategies used in the making of the work. However, profiles or biographies of the artists, even the brief ones typical of the time, are absent. The interviews in this dissertation fill that gap, consciously focusing on what the artists were seeing, thinking, studying, reading, protesting, and creating in their studios, from about 1965-1972. Many of them were very young when Bunnell selected their work for *Photography into Sculpture* – Andre Haluska was only 23, and Ellen Brooks and Bea Netteles were 24 – and their careers stretched out before them unpredictably. The vast majority stopped making photo objects before the end of the exhibition's two-year run, but some remained photographers or used photography in their work, actively exhibiting

and teaching photography, while others became public artists, sculptors, and conceptual artists. Some abandoned fine art altogether for other careers. From these varying perspectives, the artists give their opinions about the work in the show and discuss its legacy. Their impressions are grounded in their recollections of the past and influenced by having recently seen the objects restaged in exhibitions at Cherry and Martin gallery in Los Angeles (2011), Le Consortium in Dijon, France (2013), and Hauser & Wirth gallery in New York (2014).

The Bunnell interview is included in the main text of the dissertation and is annotated, expanding on and contextualizing the valuable information provided by him. The interviews with the artists, however, are not annotated. Capitalizing on the fact that this group of interviewees had the experience of *Photography into Sculpture* in common – as opposed to Bunnell whose experience as its curator was singular – the interviews are read in dialogue with one another and thus form a more complete picture of the time, place, and people described. They can also be read *against* one another, as a form of fact checking to be engaged in by the reader.[220] The interview questions were standardized and ordered so as to facilitate evaluating their responses in this manner. For example, most of the participants were asked whether they called themselves photographers or artists, eliciting a variety of answers that speak to individual identity and professional goals, the collective identity of the photography community, markets, personalities, and generational factors. No one answered unequivocally, "yes" but several indicated a clear, "no." In the latter camp, Richard Jackson, who presents himself as an outsider among

[220] The interviews are also used in Chapters II and III in support of the arguments and analysis presented there, functioning in a way more typical of academic writing and scholarship.

those included in *Photography into Sculpture* who perceives his work as distinct because it was conceptual. Michael deCourcy also stands out for his skepticism about photography as a medium of art and its placement in the museum context, including MoMA. In yet another example, Ted Victoria is clear about not being a photographer – he was a sculptor and installation artist – yet he valued and enjoyed the opportunity to show his work in photography venues. Still others found it advantageous to call themselves whatever seemed to fit their work and thinking at the time. Based on this example alone, it is evident that the interviews, in the aggregate, deliver nuanced, thought provoking information.

Nearly half of the artists who were included in *Photography into Sculpture* were graduate students at the time Bunnell selected their work. The student experience inflects their recounting of the exhibition and affords the reader an opportunity to learn about several academic programs in photography, then on the rise, and the influential professors who directed them.[221] Recollections by Heinecken's former students and colleagues offer a collective portrait of him that would otherwise be absent. Similarly, Ted Victoria, who was Robert Watts's student at Rutgers University, sheds light on his professor's teaching and personality.

All of the interviews were judiciously edited and honed with the help of Bunnell and the artists. The process started with a recorded interview that was transcribed by me. I then excerpted and edited the transcript to include only relevant information. That document

---

[221] The university photography programs discussed in the oral history section of this volume includes University of California Los Angeles, San Francisco Art Institute, San Francisco State University, Institute of Design in Chicago, University of Illinois in Urbana, and Visual Studies Workshop in Rochester, New York.

was then forwarded to the interviewee for comment and refinement. At this stage, some interviewees made significant changes while others did not. The artist or Bunnell and I continued to work together until both of us were satisfied with the results. As the interviewer and editor, I took a liberal perspective on changes, deciding against slavish adherence to the original transcript. Because my goal was always to provide the interviewees the opportunity to present their ideas and concerns in the most clear and effective way possible, I saw no reason to prohibit additions and clarifications to their initial comments.

ANNOTATED INTERVIEW WITH PETER BUNNELL

April 29, 2012

Recorded at his home in Princeton, New Jersey

Mary Statzer:When and how did you first discover dimensional photography? When did you know that it was prevalent enough to be the subject of an exhibition?

Peter Bunnell:It was clear to me then in the mid-1960s, and clear to me now looking back, that when I was on the road doing research for the *Photography as Printmaking* exhibition,[222]I was beginning to see things that were giving me pause. An example would be somebody like Doug Prince and his boxes or Bea Nettles. I remember going to University of Illinois where Nettles went to graduate school. The photography professor there, Art Sinsabaugh, invited me out to give a lecture. I was doing a lot of lecturing then. John Szarkowski was very open minded and let me take two or three days to fly off to some god-forsaken place and give lectures.

[222] Bunnell considered *Photography and Printmaking* and *Photography into Sculpture* to be companion exhibitions. *Photography as Printmaking* came first and was on view at MoMA, March 19 - May 26, 1968. It was an historical survey meant to suggest that photography has maintained this kind of experimentation and broad view of the medium throughout its history. Highlights from the checklist include historical figures such as Eugène Atget, Brassaï, Julia Margaret Cameron, Alvin Langdon Coburn, Francis Frith, Hill and Adamson, Man Ray, Nadar, Henry Peach Robinson, Christian Schad, Edward Steichen, Alfred Stieglitz, Pauls Strand, Edward Weston, and Clarence White, as well as contemporary practitioners including Robert Heinecken, Scott Hyde, Ray Metzker, Naomi Savage, Aaron Siskind, Edmund Teske, Jerry Uelsmann, and Minor White.

The artist behind much of the new work I was seeing was Robert Heinecken. When I finally made a trip to Los Angeles, I encountered his students and alumni from UCLA.[223] On that trip, or maybe another one, I discovered Richard Jackson in the Eugenia Butler Gallery.[224] Coincidentally, after the exhibition closed, I wanted to buy the Richard Jackson piece for MoMA but nobody could figure out if it belonged in the sculpture department or photography department. Everything was compartmentalized in the 1960s so it didn't come to pass.

Statzer: I'm under the impression that John Szarkowski had well defined attitudes about what constituted photography.[225] How did you see your own attitudes fitting with his? How did that dynamic affect your work as a curator of photography at MoMA?

---

[223] According to expense reports and correspondence found in the MoMA archives, Bunnell made at least two trips to the West Coast to work on the exhibition in the Spring/Summer of1969 and December 2 -28, 1970. The latter trip itinerary included: New York, NY to Albuquerque, NM; Albuquerque to Oakland, CA; Los Angeles, CA to Vancouver, BC; Vancouver to Portland, OR; Portland to San Francisco, CA; San Francisco to New York. Bunnell submitted expenses for the trip where "he completed his final research on and the selection of the TOPOGRAPHIC PHOTOGRAPHY exhibition" (as *Photography into Sculpture* was temporarily titled) totaling $993.74.

[224] Bunnell recounted his experiences in Southern California researching the exhibition and meeting Richard Jackson in "Remembering L.A.," in *The Collectible Moment*: *Catalogue of Photographs in the Norton Simon Museum*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 2006, pp. 74-77. Eugenia Butler Gallery was founded by Eugenia Butler in 1968 and was in operation in Los Angeles until 1971. Butler mounted challenging and controversial exhibitions by Michael Asher, George Brecht, James Lee Byars, Paul Cotton, Douglas Huebler, Ed Kienholz, Joseph Kosuth, Dieter Roth, Allen Ruppersberg, William T. Wiley and others.

[225] This impression is due in part to the characterization of Szarkowski offered by Christopher Philips in his essay "The Judgment Seat of Photography," in *The Contest of Meaning: A Critical History of Photography* (Richard Bolton, ed., MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1989). It is standard reading on graduate level photo history lists. One goal of this dissertation is to give a more nuanced account of Szarkowski, Bunnell, and the Photography Department at MoMA as well as offer an expanded view of photography communities and their interaction with other kinds of art and artists. Key texts representing the range of Szarkowski's ideas include *The Photographer's Eye* (Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1966), *New Documents* (Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1967), *Looking at Photography: 100 Pictures from the Collection of the Museum of Modern Art* (Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1973), *William Eggleston's Guide* (Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1976), *Mirrors and Windows: American Photography Since 1960* (Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1978) and *Photographs Until Now* (Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1990).

Bunnell: I think what you say about Szarkowski is correct. He had a very formalist and traditional approach to photography. He liked straightforward, reality-based imagery but I should also make sure that you understand that he was a very broad-minded person. He gave me complete freedom. When he was hired, which was only three years before I arrived he was seen as a kind of volatile young man in the field. He was only thirty-some-odd-years-old. In other words, he was seen as a contemporary photographer and curator and he succeeded Steichen who was ancient.[226] My understanding of what the administration expected from John, from my knowledge of working with him for six years, was that they envisioned him focusing on contemporary photography. When it came time to hire an assistant curator who would not only deal with curatorial matters like cataloging and things like that but also with the history of photography, I was considered in part because I had worked with Beaumont Newhall at the George Eastman House and was coming out of the Yale art history program.[227] I was perceived to be the leveling figure that would do more historical work.

---

[226] John Szarkowski (1925-2007) began making photographs when he was eleven years old. Two books of his photographs were published, *The Idea of Louis Sullivan* (1956) and *The Face of Minnesota* (1958). He had just received a Guggenheim Fellowship for photography when he was offered the job as MoMA's Director of the Department of Photography, a position he held from 1962-1991. He suspended his activity as a photographer for the duration of his career as a curator and resumed when he retired. In 2005, The San Francisco Museum of Modern Art mounted a retrospective of his work including 27 photographs taken later in his life. (Various sources including Szarkowski's obituary in the *New York Times*, "John Szarkowski, Curator of Photography, Dies at 81," Philip Gefter, July 9, 2007.)

[227] Bunnell attended Rochester Institute of Technology from 1955 – 1959 where he studied photography with Ralph Hattersley and photo history with Beaumont Newhall. He received an MFA in photography from Ohio University in 1961. He attended Yale from 1961-1965 where he worked with the 20th-century scholar George Heard Hamilton. Bunnell was in Holland on a Kress Fellowship conducting dissertation research about Alfred Stieglitz when John Szarkowski offered him a job at MoMA. Bunnell spent time in Rochester throughout the decade spanning 1955-1965. He worked closely with Minor White during the early days of *Aperture* magazine. At George Eastman House he was research assistant to Beaumont and Nancy Newhall (working on manuscript preparations for Edward Weston's *Daybooks* among other projects) and assisted Nathan Lyons and Walter Chappell with exhibitions. (Source: Conversation between Bunnell and the author in 2013.)

Well, I wasn't there for six weeks before I realized that John was not interested in this. I realized that John would be doing, just as he did, exhibitions of Dorothea Lange, Cartier-Bresson, Bill Brandt, you know, that line. As a matter of fact, John had a list in his wallet of the photographers that he was going to be looking at in terms of large solo exhibitions. If you look at his exhibition record, by and large, and at the beginning especially, he was doing almost exclusively one-person exhibitions. Part of that was to make up for Steichen who had mostly organized group exhibitions.[228] It became clear rather quickly that if someone was going to be dealing with what photography was right then, and not necessarily imagining that there was going to be something called *Photography into Sculpture*, I realized I was going to have to do that work because John was flying off to Paris to meet with Cartier-Bresson and that kind of thing.

Statzer: What were some of the other ways in which you divided the work of running the department between you?

Bunnell:John did not like to go to the galleries because he didn't like being accosted by people saying, "Oh Mr. Szarkowski, look at my portfolio. Come in the other room," and this kind of thing. I lived in New York in an apartment on the Upper East Side so my whole Saturday was visiting Lee Witkin's gallery and eventually Light Gallery or

[228] Edward Steichen (1879-1973) was the second Director of MoMA's Department of Photography succeeding Beaumont Newhall in 1947 and retiring as Director Emeritus in 1962. He mounted over forty exhibitions including the renowned *The Family of Man* (1955). One of the most popular exhibitions in the history of MoMA, it was seen by an estimated 7.5 million people in 37 countries. 5 million copies of the book were sold. (Source: *Picturing an Exhibition: The Family of Man and 1950s America*, Eric J. Sandeen, ed., University of New Mexico Press, 1995.)

anybody else who was doing anything photographic.[229] I would report back to John that he should sneak in to this or that place some noontime when the gallery crowd wasn't there and take a look. We were also open to portfolio viewing. One day a week John and I would stay until 7:00 or 8:00 at night looking at works submitted by photographers that I had previewed. We worked in tandem in that way.

However, as I say, there were aspects of contemporary photography in which Szarkowski clearly had no interest. Now, at the same time there's an example that is a complete anomaly. The very same year that Nathan Lyons does his show [*The Persistence of Vision*, 1967], Szarkowski gives Jerry Uelsmann a one-man show – of all the people you can imagine.[230] The irony of course is that this photographer is actually believable. Uelsmann is not like Edmund Teske or Val Telberg where the artificiality of the image is very prevalent and obvious. With Uelsmann, until you actually get into it, you say well that tree is just floating out there and it's so real and perfectly done. In a way, it was John being adventuresome and conservative at the same time. He had it both ways and, of course, it launched Uelsmann's career.

---

[229] Lee Witkin founded Witkin Gallery on East 60th Street in Manhattan in March 1969. It was the first commercial gallery in New York devoted exclusively to fine photography, exhibiting established figures (e.g. Eugène Atget, Edward Weston and Frederick H. Evans) and younger artists (e.g. Duane Michals, George Tice and Naomi Savage). Light gallery, widely considered the first gallery in New York City to focus on contemporary photography, opened in November 1971 on the third floor of 1018 Madison Avenue. Tennyson Schad founded the gallery and hired Harold Jones to be its first director. The inaugural exhibition included works by Thomas Barrow, Harry Callahan, Robert Fichter, Emmet Gowin, Aaron Siskind, Frederick Sommer, Bea Nettles and Douglas Prince (both of whom were in *Photography into Sculpture*) among others. Castelli Graphics is thought to be the first non-photography gallery to promote the careers of fine art photographers such as Robert Adams, Lewis Baltz, Ralph Gibson and others. It opened in 1969 at 4 East 77th Street. (Various sources including the Witkin Gallery and Light archives at the Center for Creative Photography, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ.)

[230] The exhibition was titled *Jerry N. Uelsmann*, MoMA Exh. #820, February 15-April 16, 1967.

The 1964 Philip Johnson addition to MoMA included space for the photography department. We were on the third floor. All you had to do was push a button in the gallery and an intercom came on upstairs and anyone could ask to see Weston prints. Eventually, we had to put a rope across the stairwell and take the thing out because all we did all day was answer viewing requests.

Statzer: Could you talk about the Photography Department's exhibition program as well as how *Photography into Sculpture* came about and fit into it?

Bunnell:John's main shows, of course, as head of the department, were large exhibitions on the first floor and were usually accompanied by a catalogue. We did all kinds of exhibitions in the third floor gallery for which there were no catalogs. If the show travelled, and there was then an active circulating exhibition program at MoMA, there was a folded brochure. *Photography into Sculpture* was actually on the first floor. Interestingly, it was in the same two galleries as the New Documents exhibition had been where Arbus, Friedlander and Winogrand showed back in '67.

In a sense, I started this kind of focus on younger, contemporary photographers at MoMA. I did Robert Adams' first show. Emmet Gowin's first exhibition. Paul Caponigro, that kind of thing. I did some historical exhibitions, too. I did a show of Pictorialists and I frequently did new acquisitions exhibitions. I did a Minor White sequence in new acquisitions. We bought some Frederick Evans platinum prints. We bought a group of silver prints by Max Waldman who was the photographer of The Living Theater that

made famous the Marat Sade nude play. So I did those kinds of things whereas John concentrated on the bigger shows.

Statzer: What was the exhibition approval process at MoMA? Did *Photography into Sculpture* go through a formal review?

Bunnell:I had to make a formal presentation to John first and then to the exhibitions committee, which was chaired by the museum's director René d'Harnoncourt, in front of other curators.[231] If an exhibition was going to be in the departmental gallery it didn't involve this process, but anything on the first floor had to go through this system. Budgets and publicity people were all a part of it. I wouldn't say it was cutthroat but when I took up three months of gallery space it meant that Prints and Drawings were not going to get in there or Architecture and Design, or Painting, for that matter. So I gave this presentation saying that I had begun to discover this kind of work and I had a couple of examples and snapshots that I had taken. Everything was approved.

I took a year or so to do the research and travel to Vancouver, Los Angeles, and elsewhere to pick out the actual objects. The next thing you know, these crates started to arrive. At MoMA, the person who probably had the greatest amount of power in the

---

[231] In 1944, René d'Harnoncourt (1901-1968) joined the staff of MoMA as Vice President in charge of Foreign Activities and Director of the Department of Manual Industries, holding several positions until his appointment as Director of the Museum in 1949. He was an art historian specializing in Mexican folk art and continued to organize and install exhibitions such as *Arts of the South Seas* (1946) and *The Sculpture of Picasso* (1967). The Museum celebrated its 25th and 30th anniversaries under his direction. A successful fundraising campaign coincided with the 30th resulting in an expansion of the museum's building, which opened May 25, 1964. He died in a car accident months after his retirement from the Museum in June 1968. (Various sources including the *Dictionary of Art Historians*. Sorensen, Lee, ed., www.dictionaryofarthistorians.org.)

entire museum was the registrar, because once an object entered the building there was no way that you could see it without going through a formal procedure. Every now and again I'd be down in the cage where the temporary loans were kept and I would ask the assistant registrar if Szarkowski had come down to take a look at anything. She'd tell me to look at the ledger. You had to sign in and out every time you were there. I looked through the ledger and no Szarkowski. Finally the day came when the registrar and the art handlers brought everything up to the first floor gallery. Big screens were put up so the public couldn't see. About half way through the first day of installation, Szarkowski bangs on the screen and said, "Can I come in?" That was the first time that he saw any of that material!

Statzer: No kidding?

Bunnell: Yeah, and he loved it. He had very interesting ideas in some cases about where to put works. If you look at the installation views, you'll see that some pieces were hung high up on the wall. He looked at all of this and said, "It's going to be great. Good," and left. That was that.

At that time, when you were a curator in a museum you wrote the text panels, and for instance, more often than not, they were unsigned. At MoMA, however, everything was credited so my name would appear at the bottom of the wall label. That meant that if the show failed, it was *me* that was going to fail. When the press came they would know

exactly who the curator was. Of course, if critics wanted to take it up with Szarkowski, they could.

Statzer: As you say, there were no catalogues for your shows, *Photography as Printmaking* and *Photography into Sculpture*, but you obviously worked hard to place essays about them in publications so that the content reached a wider audience.[232]

Bunnell: I had a very good relationship with Jean Lipman, who was the Editor in Chief of *Art in America*. I could pretty much call her up and place an article. She liked what I wrote and the concepts behind what I was showing. Yes, I was very conscious of that. Part of it was the residue, actually, of my Rochester experience. All kinds of wonderful things happened in Rochester but few people ever saw them.

The question wasn't whether you had traffic at MoMA, but if you lived in Phoenix or Tucson or someplace like that, you weren't about to just jump and go to the Museum of Modern Art. The goal was to get out there. MoMA was very conscious of that. There was also an active museum newsletter and we were required to promote our own shows in the newsletter to members who were all over the country.

Statzer: Going back to the show itself, how did you find the work in *Photography into*

---

[232] A tri-fold brochure was produced for *Photography as Printmaking* that includes a short text written by Bunnell and the checklist. No such brochure exists for *Photography into Sculpture*. Bunnell wrote a short text for MoMA's Members Newsletter (No. 8 (Spring, 1970), pp 11-12) as well as more extensive and well-illustrated articles: "Photographs as Sculptures and Prints," *Art in America*, September – October 1969, pp 56-61; "Photography into Sculpture" in *Arts in Virginia* the Virginia Museum magazine, vol 11, no. 3, Spring 1971, pp 18-25; "Photography into Sculpture," *artscanada*, June 1970, vol. 27, no. 3, issue no. 144/145, pp 21-29; and "Photography into Sculpture," *Creative Camera*, no. 72, June 1970, London, England, pp 190-191.

Sculpture? For example, what led you to Vancouver and the work of Jack Dale and Michael deCourcy?

Bunnell: I may have learned about the Vancouver activity in several ways. In California I heard that artists from Vancouver were very conversant with what was going on there. They came south as far as Los Angeles to check it all out. At MoMA I seem to remember becoming aware of the work of Iain Baxter and his N.E. Thing Co. in Vancouver. Through him I may have been introduced to his colleagues like Michael deCourcy. I knew James Borcoman who was the curator of the National Gallery in Ottawa. It could very well be that he mentioned that there were these lively, unconventional, and interesting people working in Vancouver.[233] Then there was also the magazine, *artscanada* that I was familiar with. In general, I learned about new work by word-of-mouth. I would talk with somebody and they in turn would suggest so and so. There was certainly a ripple effect of working with Robert Heinecken and his students and their friends. I may have found Doug Prince because he taught with Jerry Uelsmann who was a friend of mine and I know Doug brought his work to Museum of Modern Art because I remember that they came in boxes that we had to unpack. In other words, it was not like they came in a traditional portfolio case like most of the work that was presented to John Szarkowski and me. I may have found Dale Quarterman, who lived in Virginia, through an old college classmate in Rochester, George Nan, who taught at Virginia Commonwealth University.

---

[233] For a recent assessment of art activity in Vancouver during the 1960s, see *Traffic: Conceptual Art in Canada: 1965-1980*, Grant Arnold and Karen Henry, eds. Art Gallery of Alberta, Halifax INK; Justina M. Barnicke Gallery at Hart House, University of Toronto; Leonard & Bina Ellen Art Gallery at Concordia University, and Vancouver Art Gallery, 2012.

I met Jerry McMillan through Heinecken or Richard Jackson. McMillan, in turn, introduced me to Ed Ruscha. I went to his studio and we talked about a little bit of everything. He knew I was out there to work on the show and was curious about who I was seeing.

In any event, the photography community was so small that everybody knew one another. Once I got started with my research for *Photography into Sculpture*, all I had to do was go to a Society for Photographic Education (SPE) meeting and there would be the professors from all of these different schools who were teaching photography.[234] They would say, "Oh my god! I have this student doing this kind of work," or I would initiate the conversation and ask if they had any students who were doing three-dimensional work. In other words, this kind of situation just snowballs and one thing leads to another.

There was much more of that in locating works for *Photography into Sculpture* than when I did *Photography as Printmaking* in 1968 because then I knew what I was looking for and I knew how it fit into the history of the medium.[235] One of the problems I had with *Photography as Printmaking* was that the MoMA print department was not comfortable loaning a Rauschenberg to a fellow department. They had a vision of printmaking in spite of the fact that it was photo technique printmaking and they did not

[234] The first national meeting of SPE was held in Chicago in 1963 and the articles of incorporation were signed in May 1964." (Source: Society for Photographic Education website, www.spenational.org/about/history.) For more on the formation of SPE see, *SPE: The Formative Years*, introduction by Nathan Lyons, Visual Studies Workshop in association with the Society for Photographic Education, Rochester, NY, 2012.

[235] Bunnell framed *Photography as Printmaking* as a continuation of the history of the medium while *Photography into Sculpture* explored contemporary concerns. (Source: conversation between the author and Peter Bunnell, summer 2013)

want it to be shown in the photography department. Even Szarkowski was a little concerned about that. He said, "Well, I don't think Rauschenberg is a photographer." That was before we knew that Rauschenberg did, in fact, make straight photographs.[236]

There were these domains that had certain critical parameters both inside the museum and beyond it that carried into the 1980s and 90s. For example, when the 150th anniversary of photography was celebrated in 1989, the National Gallery in Washington, DC did a significant exhibition.[237] They wanted to borrow Princeton University Art Museum's Hamish Fulton. I was one of the first curators who knew the history of photography to buy a Hamish Fulton. He got wind of The National's request and refused to let the work be shown because he said that it was a photography exhibition and he was not into photography. He saw himself as another kind of artist. I got on the phone with him in England and reminded him that it was the National Gallery in Washington that wanted to exhibit his work not some small regional museum. I also told him to face facts and be honest that this was a photograph and that without photography he could do his long walks but he would have no evidence of them. He finally gave in and it was a hit of the show. I think they used it in the brochure.

Statzer: There was no historical element in *Photography into Sculpture*. Did you consider expanding the checklist to include historical precedents? In your essay in *artscanada* you reference and illustrate examples such as Rauschenberg, Antoine

---

[236] For a current assessment of Rauschenberg's involvement with photography see, *Robert Rauschenberg: Photographs 1949-1962*, David White and Susan Davidson, eds. Schirmer and Mosel, 2011.
[237] The title of the exhibition is *On the Art of Fixing a Shadow: 150 Years of Photography*, on view at the National Gallery, Washington, DC, May 7 – July 30, 1989.

Pevsner, Edward Weston, ambrotypes, which are a nineteenth-century process, and lantern slides.

Bunnell: No. *Photography into Sculpture* was considered an exhibition of contemporary works being made at that moment.

Statzer: Did you talk to your counterparts in painting and sculpture at MoMA about what you were finding?

Bunnell: I did not have a meeting that I can recall with any curator in the painting and sculpture department as to what, in fact, that group defined as sculpture. I just took it for granted that I knew what sculpture was. That may have been my bias in the reverse. I was confident about what I was doing and where it was coming from.

I did, however, recently find a memo dated February 26, 1970 from me to William Lieberman in the painting and sculpture department briefing him on the content and background of *Photography into Sculpture*.[238] It concludes, "I have informally discussed some of my ideas with members of your staff and I have appreciated their counsel. If you have any questions about the show, please do not hesitate to contact me and I hope you will be with us for the opening on the 7th." So, obviously, I was discussing my ideas with

[238] William S. Lieberman (1924-2005) began his long career at MoMA in 1943 as a volunteer in the Department of Exhibitions and Publications under the direction of Monroe Wheeler. He left the museum for two years to attend graduate courses at Harvard including museum studies with Paul J. Sachs. In 1945 he returned to the Museum as assistant to Alfred H. Barr, Jr. In 1949 he became the first curator of the Department of Prints. In 1966, he became director and curator of the merged Department of Prints and Drawings. He left MoMA in 1979 to become Chairman of the Twentieth Century Art Department at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. (Various sources including his obituary in the *New York Times*, "William Lieberman, 82, Prominent Curator, Dies," Grace Gluek, June 3, 2005.)

someone in painting and sculpture. Then Lieberman replied back to me on March 4, "At our curatorial staff meeting today, all curators were very interested by your *raisonné* of the photography exhibition and thanks for letting us see it. However, everyone seemed to think that "Three Dimensional Photography" might be a much more accurate title, at least from your description of the show." And then there's one dated March 31, "We found to our chagrin this memo," the one that I just read, "was attached to another piece of correspondence and you never received it. Our profuse apologies." You can imagine what a dull title "Three Dimensional Photography" would have been. Some people would have thought it was an exhibition of stereos or something.[239] I just love the memo about the lost memo – so bureaucratic.

Statzer: The exhibition Information was on view July 2 through September 20, 1970, overlapping with *Photography into Sculpture* for three days…

Bunnell: Right, Kynaston McShine's show. Ed Ruscha's *Every Building on the Sunset Strip* was displayed in Information under a sheet of Plexiglas – on *that* Formica table [pointing to his dining room table]. In those days, when an exhibition closed, MoMA's demolition gang came in and removed all traces of it. Things like that table were sent down to the Museum's basement and the staff could bid on it. I had just moved to a new apartment and needed a dining table so I bid $10 for the thing and got it.

---

[239] By "stereos" Bunnell means "stereographs" or "stereoviews" which are a pair of images mounted to a single surface, usually a cardboard card that was inserted in a stereoviewer and resulted in an image that simulated the effects of three dimensions. Viewing stereographs was a popular form of entertainment beginning in the mid-1850s. (Source: *Looking at Photographs: A Guide to Technical Terms*, Gordon Baldwin, J. Paul Getty Museum, 1991.)

Kynaston had not been at MoMA very long when I was working on *Photography into Sculpture*.[240] I knew him and found him approachable and I would say that we probably discussed things. I can't remember exactly what. Among the people in painting and sculpture, which was run by Bill Lieberman and the almighties up there, Kynaston was young and new. At certain meetings of curatorial committees and things we would be on an equal level, so to speak. The photography department had a library that was separate from the main MoMA library. Kynaston would visit and check things out. He would have been doing research for his own exhibitions. I do remember talking to him and looking at Information.

Statzer: What were your impressions of *Information*? Did you think of it as having implications for photography as you and Szarkowski were presenting it at MoMA?

Bunnell: Information was a wonderful exhibition that brought fresh, young artists to the museum.[241] Looking at the catalogue today I can see how strongly indebted it is to the photography of the time: fundamental data informational images, appropriated images, mass media, etc. I cannot say that this sort of photography was represented by the program Szarkowski and I presented. But I can assure you I was aware of much of it and also recognized that much of it was outside the mainstream of photographic art practice at

---

[240] "Kynaston McShine (1935-) has held positions in the Museums' Department of Painting and Sculpture as Associate Curator, 1968-71; Curator of Exhibitions, 1971-84; Senior Curator, 1984-2001; Acting Chief Curator 2001-03 and Chief Curator at Large, 2003 to the present." (Source: Finding aid for "The Museum of Modern Art Archives: Kynaston McShine *Information* Exhibition Research")

[241] *Information* included 150 artists (e.g. Vito Acconci, Carl Andre, John Baldessari, Bernd and Hilla Becher, Daniel Buren, Victor Burgin, Walter de Maria, Jan Dibbets, Dan Graham, Hans Haacke, Sol Lewitt, Richard Long, Helio Oiticica, Yoko Ono, Edward Ruscha, Robert Smithson, Jeff Wall, and Lawrence Weiner) from 15 countries (including Argentina, Brazil, Canada, England, Germany, Italy, United States, and Yugoslavia). Scholars of conceptual art consider *Information* a seminal exhibition.

the time. Some photographers came close – Winogrand and Friedlander, for instance, and they would be the cornerstones of our exhibitions. There were a few others, but again what Kynaston brought together was a very early manifestation of another kind of expressive photography as part of a complex pictorial endeavor. I should also mention that Szarkowski was acknowledged by Kynaston in the *Information* catalogue.

Statzer: How did you come to know the work of Robert Watts who was a Fluxus artist, not a photographer?[242]

Bunnell: I can't remember whether I met him through a dealer or I picked him up in a magazine. Perhaps someone like Ted Victoria, who was in a slightly different community, suggested that I look at his work.

Statzer: Victoria was still a student at Rutgers when his work was included in *Photography into Sculpture*. Watts was one of his professors.

Bunnell: So that could have been the connection. Andre Haluska, whose work was also included in Photography into Sculpture, is also from New Jersey so I may have met him through the Rutgers connection or he may have brought a portfolio to the Museum.

---

[242] Robert Watts (1923-1988), a founding member of Fluxus, used photographs and photography techniques extensively in his work. The Robert Watts Papers are held at the Getty Research Institute. For more information about Watts and Fluxus see, *Experiments in the Everyday: Allan Kaprow and Robert Watts: Events, Objects, Documents*, Benjamin Buchloh, Judith Rodenbeck and Robert Haywood, New York: Columbia University, Wallach Art Gallery, 1999; *Off Limits: Rutgers University and the Avant-Garde, 1957-1963*, Joan M. Marter and Simon Anderson, Newark Museum and Rutgers University Press, 1999; *In the Spirit of Fluxus*, Janet Jenkins, ed., Walker Art Center, 1993.

Statzer: Was it controversial among the photography community to include someone like Watts who was not considered a photographer?

Bunnell: I don't think anybody narrowed it down that much. I think the issue was, Is this photography at all? Who are these artists? Can we call them photographers? Is this a further extension of photography or is Bunnell and others who are alluding to challenging the nature of two-dimensional and three-dimensional reality and the flat photograph on to something or is this just a hair-brained idea? In a way, this is what Information was about as well.

If you read the reviews of *Photography into Sculpture*, opinions were pretty split. There were those who said that it was "interesting" or "curious." Those are innocuous words that would be used by reviewers to speak generally about the exhibition but then they would take specific examples and go after them. I think the fact that the show has gotten attention in recent years has to do with the fact that at least a third of the objects were really good and have lasted for the thirty-five years since I organized the show at MoMA.

Looking back, there is work that I would not include now. You have to remember that I was dealing with work that was literally made yesterday. In fact, I can't remember who it was but someone sent me a work while we were actually installing the show.[243] In a few

[243] A letter from Bunnell to Joyce Neimanas dated April 21, 1970 confirms that it was she who narrowly missed inclusion in *Photography into Sculpture*: "Dear Joyce: I was already installing my exhibition when your work arrived, but I did consider it for the show. In the end, however, I concluded that in the context of the exhibition the two pieces were not entirely relevant. … In the future I hope to prepare an illustrated essay on the subject and I may be back to you concerning your work. Incidentally, I thought the work illustrated in the Akron catalogue [*Into the 70s*, Akron Art Institute] was most interesting." (Curatorial Exhibition Files, Exh. #925. The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.)

cases it was stretching it. I think some things have stood up better over time – for example, Heinecken, Doug Prince, Richard Jackson, and Leslie Snyder. I still think Ellen Brooks's piece is very interesting. Ted Victoria has taken the basic tenet of his ideas and moved on and is now dealing with light sources and environmental boxes.

Photography into Sculpture was adventuresome. I would say that it was controversial only to the degree that this smallish club had to make up their mind. It wasn't as if the whole world had to accept it. At the same time, it got reviews in *Time* magazine and the *New York Times* and several of other places.[244] It was a big deal to get into the *New York Times*. A bulletin board hung outside the office of the director of publicity at MoMA. If you found your review clipped to the board, you had made it for the Museum and for the cause and for yourself. That was something good. It was like gamesmanship among the whole staff.

Statzer: When I did my research in the MoMA archives there was a very thick folder of PR clippings for this show.

Bunnell: It got good coverage. I can remember the opening night.[245] The two galleries

---

[244] See "Art: New Dimensions," *Time*, April 13, 1970, p. 64. Two reviews appeared in *The New York Times*: "Modern Museum Displays Photography as Sculpture," Hilton Kramer, *The New York Times,* April 9, 1970; and "Sheer Anarchy, Or a Step Forward?," A.D. Coleman, *The New York Times,* April 12, 1970. Other reviews of interest appeared in *Women's Wear Daily* (April 8, 1970), *Photographic Business and Product News* (July 1970), *Modern Photograph Magazine* (May 1972), *Popular Photography* (August 1970), *Apartment Art Mart* (Winter 1970), *Popular Photography Italiana* (1970), *Photo-Ciné-Revue, Paris* (December 1970), and daily newspapers such as *The Chicago Tribune, Dallas Morning News, St. Louis Post Dispatch,* and *San Francisco Chronicle* (December 1, 1971). There were well over thirty clippings in the public relations files for the exhibition in the MoMA archives.

[245] Nearly 300 people attended the opening reception on Tuesday evening, April 7, 1970. Several of the artists were in attendance including Michael de Courcy, Jack Dale, Robert Heinecken, Andre Haluska,

where *Photography into Sculpture* was installed were on the way to the restaurant where the drinks were served. Everybody had to walk through and look at the show – whether they were interested or not – and then go on to the restaurant. I can remember really being congratulated and the people who wanted to comment said, "I've just never seen anything like this. This is really extraordinary."

Statzer: It then traveled to eight other venues. Did you get around with it?[246]

Bunnell: Oh yes. I went to Houston and gave a talk at Rice and I know I went to Otis Art Institute in Los Angeles among others. At that point Heinecken lived somewhere in Los Angeles near a film studio. The building facade from Gone with the Wind was still standing there. Bob had bought a used Jaguar and we tooled around LA in it. We had a great time.

Statzer: How did you get to know Robert Heinecken?

Bunnell: I suspect that I heard about his work and his teaching early on in the 60s. I don't believe he brought anything to MoMA when I was there. It was probably through our association with SPE in the 60s. He was very active, as was I. At one point he became

---

Jerry McMillan, Bea Nettles, Ed O'Connell, James Pennuto, Ted Victoria, and Robert Watts. According to MoMA records, photographers Diane Arbus, Duane Michals, Tod Papageorge, Irving Penn and William Larson attended. Michael de Courcy remembers Lee Friedlander was there taking pictures with his "ring flash." I contacted Friedlander but was unable to see any photographs from the event.

[246] Bunnell did not keep a list of where he lectured about the exhibition but he did take more than 60 color slides for such occasions.

chairman and I was an officer under him. Eventually, I became chairman.[247]

I should note that he had a show at the Witkin Gallery in New York in October 1970 – after my exhibition – and then he joined the Light Gallery there in 1971 where he exhibited regularly. I might add that Heinecken was also represented in my *Photography as Printmaking* show at MoMA in '68 so I had a good understanding of his work by that time. He was great to be with. He was all for provocativeness and it was part of his teaching pedagogy. It was for a good purpose; that is, to get the student or fellow artist to think critically and to appraise carefully what he or she was doing. His work set new boundaries for photographic exhibitions; both in terms of form and content. He was a major figure and his work is just now coming in for renewed interest.

Statzer: Do you recall giving talks about *Photography into Sculpture*?

Bunnell: I assume that I gave talks at the other venues. I have the slides that I made for that purpose. Sometimes I did a gallery talk where you took people through the gallery on a Sunday afternoon. In those days I was paid maybe $100 plus coach airfare, so it wasn't a big deal. As with everything else, prices went up.

As a professor of photo history, I lectured on *Photography into Sculpture* until I retired in 2002. It was just a little moment in a larger talk about varying trends, but it was important

[247] Robert Heinecken served on the board of directors of SPE from April 1968 - March 1973 holding the positions of vice chair and chairman. Peter Bunnell served on the board of directors from March 1970 – March 1977, serving as secretary while Heinecken was chairman from March 1970 - March 1973. Bunnell was chairman from March 1974 – March 1977. (Source: Society for Photographic Education website, www.spenational.org/about/history.)

to see where it fit in with other postmodern developments. One of the pieces I would always show was Richard Jackson's because I just loved it and the whole story about it was funny and pertinent – not only how I found him but how he made his pictures. The numbers on the negatives in the piece – his Social Security and draft numbers – were made with a penlight. I would always show Michael Stone's works with the little bags containing hand colored photographs. There were three pieces under the title, "Channel 5 News, KTLA Los Angeles, California," comprising scenes of the Vietnam War, the California Highway Patrol, and police chief/broadcaster Tom Reddin. That is the illusion to politics that I was making at the end of the Arts in Virginia piece. There were politics in *Photography into Sculpture* and sex and Vietnam and police brutality. It wasn't just about formal elegance or picture puzzles by Bob Heinecken.[248]

Statzer: But you didn't flesh out those ideas much in your essays…

Bunnell: I chose to adopt a certain formalist attitude and to highlight technique. The question is always how much room is available and what should be the central issue? I did not want to overlook political and social content, which I pointed out in the wall label, but at the same time it wasn't what was really driving most of these artists. Take Jack Dale and those big glass plate constructions. Those were apolitical in a sense. Michael deCourcy, who did the boxes, his whole point was the stacking. I remember

[248] In the mid to late 1960s, Robert Heinecken made interactive assemblages with moveable pieces that resembled jigsaw puzzles but had no single resolution or correct configuration. One example is *Refractive Hexagon* (1965) in which gelatin silver prints of fragments of a female nude were adhered to wood pieces that were placed in a circular tray. *Fractured Figure Sections* (1967), which was in *Photography into Sculpture*, represents another type of interactive assemblage or puzzle made by Heinecken. Gelatin silver prints were adhered to the edges of nine wooden blocks that were stacked on top of one another to form a standing female nude. The sections could be rotated so that the breasts of one figure sat upon the waist and hips of another, etc.

when we did the installation at MoMA I found two preparators and said, "OK, I want you to pile up these hundred boxes in the corner. Come over as far as here and that point there and just do it." That's who did the installation at Michael's request. Michael's whole point was that the placement was random. Those boxes had a different image on each side. One fellow liked the black image so he stacked boxes so that it was facing out.

There was an art movement in Vancouver called Intermedia which was, in part, about accident and chance. DeCourcy was part of that crowd so that's where some of his ideas are coming from. Jack Dale and N.E. Thing Co. led by Iain Baxter were also a part of that group. Baxter is very interesting. I have a number of his pieces in my own collection. He was into maps and all kinds of things.[249] With the National Film Board of Canada, Baxter, deCourcy, Dale and several other Intermedia artists did a wonderful book of vernacular photographs. It was titled *BC Almanc(H) C-B*. It had no captions, no title page, nothing. It was just a thick book printed on newsprint stock. It came out in 1970.[250]

Statzer: It seems to me that by circumventing museum protocol and its mandate for a curator to install works of art, deCourcy asked you to deputize those who don't usually have the authority to arrange works of art in that environment. Isn't that a political, democratizing process? Is that an accurate or useful way to look at his installation?

---

[249] Iain Baxter was born in England in 1936. He was educated in the United States at the University of Idaho (BS in 1959 and MA in 1962) and Washington State University (MFA in 1964) and has lived and worked in Canada since the mid-1960s. He and Ingrid Baxter, his collaborator and wife at the time, took on the pseudonym "The N.E. Thing Co."

[250] The *BC Almanc(h) C-B* was exhibited concurrently with *Photography into Sculpture*at the Vancouver Art Gallery, Vancouver, April 5 – May 9, 1971. De Courcy was in charge of the exhibition design and installation. Peter Bunnell attended the opening of the exhibition. (Source: Conversation between the author and deCourcy in 2013)

Bunnell: Very much so. It would go for the Heinecken pieces as well. The viewer was to be considered a random person with the ability to break down preconceived notions of correctness and representational order. This is the same spirit that pervaded McShine's *Information* show. In fact, N.E. Thing Co. was in *Information*. This was all clearly something of the moment in 1970.

Statzer: Did you design the exhibition and layout for *Photography into Sculpture*?

Bunnell: In those days there were installation workers who drove nails in the wall but there was no overall exhibition designer or office of that nature. All the curators designed their own installations. I always enjoyed installation. I was never one to make a model and figure out where the pictures would go in advance. I waited until I got in the gallery and experienced them there. I had the walls painted light turquoise for *Photography into Sculpture*.

Statzer: How did you make decisions about placement of the objects in the gallery?

Bunnell: The show was in two galleries that were connected by a corridor. When you looked into the front gallery you saw the Lynton Wells piece, which was a full figure. I thought it would be a bit bizarre to look into the space and see a figure standing there and not be able to tell whether it was an actual person or a photograph. Then when you came down the passageway into the second gallery Leslie Snyder's "Leda" was the first thing that you saw. It was big and hung from the ceiling. I also positioned some of the pieces

higher on the wall. Darryl Curran's, which were relatively flat pieces but still three-dimensional, were hung about nine feet from the ground. The Chengs were also placed in cases high on the wall. Doug Prince's pieces were placed in a large case with rear illumination. Originally, however, his boxes were meant to be held in the hand and turned around so that you saw the image from all angles. Ted Victoria's piece was meant to be held as well, like a camera. We built a clear base for it so that the materials he used were carried through in it. It faced a glass wall that looked onto the sculpture garden.

Statzer: Many of the works in *Photography into Sculpture* were meant to be touched, handled or activated by the viewer or someone other than the artist -- the installation of deCourcy's cardboard boxes, Heinecken's puzzles, Prince's boxes, Stone's plastic bags, Victoria's piece. Did you inform the viewer somehow that, ideally, touch was an important element of those pieces?

Bunnell: In the wall label I stressed the three-dimensional quality of the works and implied that they were to be handled in ideal circumstances. Reading the label copy now I probably did not make that explicit enough which is interesting because we had to work so hard to create environments for the works that would, in effect, protect them from the large museum audience. One gets a sense of that by the many Plexiglas cases we had to construct. But some works, like Leslie Snyder's "Leda," simply moved on its own in the currents of air in the gallery. It should be remembered that it is general museum practice that you do not touch the objects on display.

Statzer: In my research, I came across a videotaped lecture that you gave at the Center for Creative Photography in Tucson in 1979.[251] By this time, seven years had passed since you left MoMA to accept the first endowed chair of photo history at Princeton. During the Q and A portion of your lecture, you said, "When I look back at it, the sad thing about the two shows that I did, particularly the sculpture show, is that nothing happened." This book takes the opposite point of view and celebrates all of the ways in which the work in *Photography into Sculpture* is representative of strategies and the desire to challenge the medium, how it engaged not only photography but other art of its time, and predicted current trends.

Could you elaborate on your comment? What were your hopes for *Photography into Sculpture*? What changes did you think were necessary at the time to move the medium forward? How do you assess the legacy of *Photography into Sculpture* now?

Bunnell: Well given the way you phrase the question, and as you say, what has happened recently would seem to invalidate my earlier concern. But I think what I meant by my comment in 1979 was that by that time I had not witnessed a serious continuation of the formal or physical notions that *Photography into Sculpture* expressed. Many of the artists had turned in other directions and gave up this concern for three-dimensionality. They may have continued with alternative processes, but the sculptural aspect was left behind. It should also be seen that by the early '80s the notion of appropriation in image making was gaining significant ground, including in some cases, by artists who did not come

[251] This lecture is titled "A Will to Style: Observations on Contemporary Photography," 1979, Center for Creative Photography, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ.

from a photographic background at all. Finally, perhaps because I was no longer in the museum field, but rather teaching and doing only some curating, I was not in a position to further encourage the trends I supported in the *Photography into Sculpture* exhibition; that is, through successive exhibitions or publications. This may all change now that aspects of this movement are again attracting attention with perhaps an actual renewal. I would like to think so.

APPENDIX A – SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS – INTERVIEWS WITH THE ARTISTS

Ellen Brooks

March 29, 2012, New York, NY

Statzer: You were a student when *Photography into Sculpture* opened at MoMA. Could you tell me about studying photography at UCLA? What was it like to be Robert Heinecken's student?

Brooks: I transferred from University of Wisconsin, Madison to UCLA as an art major in my junior year. My first class with Heinecken was in the fall of 1966. He was very imposing in this quiet way. He taught us rudimentary darkroom and camera technique but otherwise we were on our own. The preceding summer I had taken a photography class with Edmund Teske where he taught even less technique than Heinecken. The first assignment required us to take our cameras out into the world to photograph. I had a bad experience with that. I felt like an intruder and I wasn't comfortable so right away I started bringing models into the studio and photographing them. Ever since then I have been working indoors, setting things up to photograph. This was an important time for me for another reason. I started to learn what it meant to have a different kind of life – a life in art – and I began thinking that it could be *my* life.

I liked working with the body, which goes back a long time for me. When I was nine, I was obsessed with the reproduction of Thomas Hart Benton's painting of Persephone in

the book *American Painting* [Skira, 1969]. When I was 15, I made a life-size plaster cast of a pregnant woman's torso. When I first became Heinecken's student, I didn't know about his use of the body as a subject. He was careful about sharing his work with us and it wasn't until the end of graduate school, which was three or four years later, that I saw any of his work. There were very few museums and galleries that showed photography so it was nearly impossible to see Robert's work in those venues. Of course, there was no Google either, so there was no easy way to learn about your teacher's work on your own.

Robert was incredibly receptive to ideas. I didn't have to fight with him. He was subtle, encouraging and incisive when it came to questioning motives and execution. There are two things that Robert said over time that were critical to me as an artist, that influenced the way I thought about the photograph and what I brought to teaching photography. The first is that photography is an abstraction. As soon as the shutter is released it records an impression of whatever is in front of the camera but that impression is altered from reality in a fundamental way. The second is that photography is a mark making device. Mark making. That was a liberating concept but it was also a philosophical quandary about representation and the "truth" of what is being looked at.

I have this letter from Heinecken addressed to Michael Stone, Bob Flick, Leslie Snyder and me. There's no date but it has a return address from Chicago. We were all his graduate students at the time.

MS: Would you like to read some of it?

EB: Sure. *"Dear Mike, Ellen, Bob and (Leslie), Arrived safely in Pig City – It seems OK but it is too soon to know much. The apt. they got me is adequate and actually much better than I expected. It's on the north side about 3 blocks from the lake and in a very interesting neighborhood. Mostly Puerto Rican. Good bars, grills, theater etc very close. I'm furnishing the apt. with found furniture."* This makes me so sad. "*At the moment it is mostly sleeping bags and suitcases but next trash day things will pick up. We visited with people along the way and had some good talks. Had a carousel ride with Marvin Bell in Iowa City…"* That's his cousin who was a poet. *"…which was quite thrilling. School doesn't start until next week sometime so I have a few days to aclimate [sic] before digging in (or at least to the extent that I intend to dig in.) [paragraph break] One reason for writing is to mention a few things that you all must do. First, obviously is the work. I probably never really expressed my genuine pride and joy in your accomplishments. I hope that each of you, some day, experience..."* Oh my god. *"I hope that each of you some day have similar experiences with your students (real or implied). Second, I think you will (or are) experiencing a let down at this point. The MA - MFA relationship is still unclear to me really, and I think one has to consciously make an effort to get steam up again. The next year or whatever has somehow got to become even more intense and real than before. This is a tough thing to do. Whatever happens now to your work has to be evolutionary in nature and at the same time, distinct. There is a dichotomy in this, which is real and may prove difficult. I have no qualms about any of you and am only expressing a kind of signal. OK? In a practical sense, I want each of you to pin down your MFA committees as soon as possible. […] As you will soon realize, Lee [Friedlander] has a lot for you. Use him to his and your capacities and go out of your*

way to afford him every consideration. He also needs to be challenged as much as you or I do. […] Everywhere I stop people know our work. It feels good. Amen, Heinecken. Drop a line and say you're feeling fine."

MS: I'm glad that you read that letter. It gives me an indication of how warm, insightful and open he was with his graduate students. How did you come to make *Flats: One Through Five*, the work in *Photography into Sculpture*?

EB: In the late 60's, when I was first in school, I was interested in how the photograph occupies space. I was asking questions like, "What is the size and scale relationship of the photograph to the viewer? Why does it seem to always exist on a wall, at midpoint, as a band of gray?" I did come to know the historical and academic reasons, and the truth of the matter is, that over the course of its history the photograph wasn't always presented on the wall, but in the hand or on a shelf, to name just two alternatives. I thought there must be other ways of reading photographic information based on how it was delivered to the viewer. In early pieces I used the floor as a site for looking. The work at this time was about the act of looking and being looked at, about voyeurism and vulnerability. This psychology has always fascinated me. I wanted to shift the scale of the photograph, to take it off the wall and see that it could be read in a different way but remain photographic.

While I was an undergraduate, I started to make sculpture. I was also working with Pat O'Neill. I started combining my ideas about sculpture and photography. For example, I

sandwiched two identical 4" x 5" negatives of nudes and made a print. The result was symmetrical, abstract, erotic and rather ugly. Then I cut around the outline of the shape, mounted it on thick paper, and then made a 2-inch lip around the image, so there was a band around it. It hovered about two inches off of the wall.

What I'm saying is that early on, even as an undergraduate, I questioned the role of photography as well as the placement, context, and veracity of the photograph. I was distrustful of the canons and I challenged conventional modes of "reading" a photograph by making photographic sculptures and installations. I wanted to extend the idea of what a photo is or could be.

MS: Can you remember some of the artists that interested you or you feel were important to the development of your work?

EB: Ed Ruscha's books *Every Building on the Sunset Strip* and *Thirty-four Parking Lots,* etc. were key to my thinking outside of traditional uses of the photograph. I also thought a lot about Robert Rauschenberg, Wally Berman, Joseph Cornell, Robert Irwin, Ed Kienholtz, and Roland Reiss. I loved going to the movies and it was pure pleasure for me to sit in theaters watching double features. Film noir, Antonioni, Hitchcock, Fellini, Werner Herzog, and Truffaut are standouts. I watched a lot of Japanese films, too, including *The Blind Swordsman,* the *Zatoichi* series*, Woman in the Dunes, Ugetsu,* and *Hiroshima Mon Amour*. Kurosawa and Ozu. I loved *Dr. Strangelove*.

I was interested in Vija Celmin's sculptures, Nancy Spero, Agnes Martin, and Frida Kahlo. The Cal Arts feminist Art Program began in 1971 just as I was finishing up at UCLA. Women artists were not in abundance at the San Francisco Art Institute where I began teaching in 1973 [Brooks left SFAI in 1982], but Feminism was beginning to have an impact.

Sculpture was always important to me. When I was fifteen I saw a Giacometti that left a lasting impression. I saw Donald Judd's sculptures from the 60's at LACMA. In graduate school I had a split major in photography and sculpture. I used the photograph for its look of veracity and set it against three-dimensional forms and tactile materials like Astroturf which, by the way, is an obvious simulation of grass and not the real thing. The flats [*Flats: One Through Five*] were mounted with special brackets so that they floated off the wall something like the way Judd's stacks attached to the wall, but my pieces were hung in horizontal progression at waist-level so that the viewer would have the vantage point from above looking down. There is a nude couple printed on photo linen and they roll one over the other in each flat in a cinematic way, as if they were three-dimensional film stills.

MS: I'm assuming that Heinecken told Bunnell about your work. What was it like when he came to your studio?

EB: Amazing and intimidating. I am sure I was very nervous. He came to the house where I was living and working. I had installed my piece titled *Lawn Couple* in the living

room. It was an artificial environment consisting of a 12' square piece of Astroturf. Nude figures on photo linen were shaped over an armature and slipped into a hole that I cut in the Astroturf so that it read as one continuous surface.

MS: So was *Lawn Couple* essentially a 12 by 12 foot version of one of the flats in *Flats: One Through Five*?

EB: Not really because the *Lawn Couple* bodies are one-and-a-half-life-size and more sculptural. Because it was on the floor, and occupied a sizable amount of space, you could step into the piece and get close to the couple. The viewer was faced with the voyeuristic dilemma of simultaneously wanting to look and not wanting to look at what seemed like real naked people. *Flats* also deals with voyeurism but it is a kind of miniature portable installation rather than a sculpture in the formal sense of the word.

These pieces were part of my MA show. I had another year after that to complete my MFA. Heinecken always felt that you shouldn't show when you were in school. I don't think he was in favor of that kind of early exposure because he felt it could short circuit one's work and ideas.

MS: Were there any surprises for you in *Photography into Sculpture?*

EB: How few women were in it.

MS: You're right. There were only three women in the show – you, Leslie Snyder and Bea Nettles. There were 20 men.

EB: It was so male and the men got most of the attention. I was also disappointed that much of the work in the show remained rather two-dimensional and illusionistic. In many cases the flat picture plane continued to dominate. Some of the artists were trying to create or heighten the illusion of space rather than to work with actual space or the space that the sculptural object occupied. Also, I was surprised to see a relative lack of interest in scale and materials. Many of the pieces were rather small and the materials had little to do with the content of the work.

MS: That's where the show missed the mark for you? The sculptural aspects weren't strong enough in some of the work?

EB: Right but you have to realize that my focus was sculpture as much or more as photography. I don't think I was stunned or startled or surprised by some of the work in the show because it was still about trying to make an object based on two-dimensionality. By the time *Photography into Sculpture* happened, I had made my over-life-size installation pieces where I was solving issues of scale and materials. I was also trying to reference objects in the culture and I was concerned with how the work interacted with the viewer. That was key.

I thought that there were successes, too. It was wonderful seeing Michael de Courcy's stacked boxes at the restaging of the show at Cherry and Martin [2011]. They looked so good! I loved the Lucite sandwich by Robert Watts, too. I thought it was beautiful. Also, Carl Cheng's and Richard Jackson's pieces. When I saw Heinecken's cube, it looked even more beautiful than I had remembered it. When I think back to how the piece looked in the late 1960s, the photographs felt separate from the base but now the materials are more integrated. The tones of the photograph seem to have shifted to a warm brown and the white of the paper is not so white. I'm guessing that the photographs have been tinted from years of being around Heinecken's constant cigarette smoking. It's subtle but now the photo components are integrated with the color of the walnut wood base.

Bob Brown had a solid grounding in photography and was engaged in questions of objectness, illusion, scale and size. His work without Penutto was conceptual and sculptural. It looked straightforward but it was complex in terms of content. He did a room installation [*Cinder Block Room*] in a group show at the M.H. De Young Museum in 1974 [*New Photography: San Francisco and the Bay Area*, April 6 – June 2, 1974 and Fine Arts Gallery of San Diego, July 13- September 8, 1974]. The walls were covered with black and white photomurals of cinder blocks so that it appeared as though the room was made out of them. It was so pure. I remember being drawn into the room and how the room itself became a sculptural entity. The wooden floor glowed in contrast to the flat rendering of the cinder blocks.

MS: Did you call yourself a photographer or were you opposed to that?

EB: Was I opposed? What I call myself has been fluid. I don't think I ever saw myself as strictly a photographer. In graduate school my thesis was in sculpture *and* photography. I started teaching photography when I was 24 years old but have never shown in a photography gallery. This was a decision on my part because I didn't want to limit how my work was read. Over the years, my work has been installation oriented, large-scale, and unframed. It didn't have a conventional place on the wall and therefore it didn't fit in a classic photography gallery. It was also a matter of audience. People who went to photography galleries weren't interested in my work. In retrospect, there are photography shows that I wish I wouldn't have been in. I was sensitive about being included as the token object maker and I was wary of a certain orientation towards crafts that that implied in the photo world.

MS: What were you reading around 1970? What music were you listening to? What were you talking about with your friends? This is more a question of how you were engaged with politics and the broader culture.

EB: I was engaged politically. As a kid I was very involved in Civil Rights and I tutored a young boy who lived in Watts before the riots. I got involved in demonstrations in support of the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley. University of Wisconsin in Madison was an amazing school academically and politically. I was very active politically when I was there. For example, I went to student meetings where we made plans to fly to Selma,

Alabama although I decided not go. I remember when George Wallace came to speak at the University. In spite of real political fervor on campus against the right wing the University administration supported free speech in practice by allowing the hated George Wallace to come there and speak.

When I transferred to UCLA in 1966, Vietnam was really heating up. MLK was assassinated in 1968. I remember sitting in a classroom talking to Robert Heinecken when the news came in. We sat there stunned. There had been so much hope in him! Nixon was elected the same year and then came the Kent State shootings, Cambodia, and Watergate.

Los Angeles paled in comparison to San Francisco and New York in terms of activism, although my boyfriend at the time was the first conscientious objector who was tried in California. Michael Stone's bags about the media and news reporting were excellent objects about the politics of the time and how we were being fed the news. My MFA thesis show titled *Beach Piece* had a lot to do with the Vietnam War and other issues.

I was seeing a lot of movies and dance while I was at UCLA. I saw Martha Graham, Merce Cunningham, and Laura Dean. There were small theater groups in Los Angeles like The Snake Theater. I attended meetings of a performance group that included Barbara Smith, Alex Hay and others but I did not perform. I worked in an amazing bookstore – Campbell's Bookstore – in Westwood, the neighborhood around UCLA. I read a lot – Raymond Carver, Joan Didion, Kurt Vonnegut, Joseph Helller, John Fowles,

Lillian Hellman, John Irving, Evelyn Waugh, Erica Jong, Toni Morrison, Henry Miller, and Anaïs Nin. I saw the Antonioni movie *Blow Up* over and over and *Zabriskie Point* had an impact on me.

MS: What did you do after *Photography into Sculpture?* How did your work change?

EB: I created *Beach Piece*, which was photo linen bodies, shaped and stuffed on plywood, then inserted in the sand at Venice Beach. I moved to Northern California after completing my MFA and worked on a large piece called *Breadspread* that was in an exhibition at the De Young Museum. It's a big cyanotype based on a three-drawing piece by Warhol. It's huge, 11' x 35,' printed on cloth.

I always considered the relationship between the photograph as a physical object and the environment in which it was placed. I began making my piece, *Adolescence,* in 1973 and it took three years to complete. I photographed kids 10-15 years old, with permission from their parents, and I wanted to make the images sculptural, similar to what I had done with *Beach Piece*. They were seated figures. I used photo linen and shaped it so that the head and torso would be one piece that was up against the wall and the legs would be another piece of shaped plywood coming out from the wall at a ninety-degree angle. I worked on that for a while. Then, I moved to San Francisco into a loft across the hall from [Robert E.] Bob Brown and Cherie Raciti. I remember putting those pieces up in the loft. I had already made quite a few of them but I just didn't like the way they looked. I didn't know how to resolve the plywood and stapled edge. I think Bob came over. I don't

know if he suggested it or if it came out in conversation but I took them off the board and pinned both sections together as one body, flat on the wall. I said to myself, "*that's* more sculptural than what I was originally trying to do."

MS: Was that the end of photo sculpture for you?

EB: I'm not sure where it began and where it ended. At UCLA I was dealing with issues of installation and how the photograph is presented and those are continuing concerns. I always installed the adolescents in a group of seventeen. When I finished installing them for the first time at the art gallery at University of Nevada Las Vegas, I felt very anxious. The energy in the room was charged because here were these nude adolescents looking out into the room. It was very charged for me each time I installed it. I realized that there was this energetic kind of space created by the photographs. It was really about the space in the center of the room. That was a real breakthrough. I dropped the idea of forcing the photograph to be sculptural when, in essence, it was sculptural through the scale, how it was installed, and the relationship between the photographs and the viewer in the space.

Over the course of my career, in seven to ten-year cycles, I have made bodies of work that appear rather different from one another but there are aspects that unite them. For example, I have been studio-bound since my class with Teske and my work has always contained something made or constructed. In the 1980s I set up small figures in domestic scenes and photographed them. Ultimately, what unites them is my use of the photograph, that I treat it as an abstraction and mark marking. I am indebted to

Heinecken for these ideas as well as his vision, grace and intelligence. I feel lucky to have had the life that I wanted where I can work and explore ideas.

MS: What was the impact of *Photography into Sculpture* on your career? Was there one?

EB: I think so although my *Beach Piece* was after that and it brought me a lot of attention. I was telling someone recently that I never went for a real job interview. I think I got jobs because the work was NOT mainstream and it was experimental. I exhibited my work regularly so I had visibility plus it was fairly rare to have an MFA at that time. Actually, being a woman, a young woman at that, with an MFA and a show record, was even more unusual. All of those factors made it easier for me to get teaching jobs.

MS: There seems to have been a lot of support for you and your work in California. What was it like to move to New York City and to try to make it there?

EB: Barbara Gladstone started showing my work in 1980. In 1982, I decided to take a sublet in New York for ten months. I thought it would be a short stay but it went well and I have been here now for thirty-one years. I would hasten to add, however, that it wasn't easy. When I arrived, I had a three-year-old daughter and was a single mom but more to the point was the fact that most West Coast artists were treated as poor stepchildren by the New York art establishment. It was quite political and the social scene among artists was cliquish. Transplants were thought of as derivative, second-rate interlopers. One exception was when the Cal Arts "mafia"—Jack Goldstein, David Salle, James Welling

and others – settled in New York during the 1970s. It is a complicated issue but I do sense that attitudes have softened even more over the last 15 years and that curators, students, and artists are moving more fluidly between the coasts now.

Phillip Martin's beautiful restaging of *Photography into Sculpture* at Cherry and Martin gallery [Los Angeles, 2011] was brilliant and timely. There has been a resurgence of interest among contemporary artists in how the photograph is made, presented, and understood, how it functions as an object, and where it fits into the glut of images. But digital media has its own vocabulary and the activity of viewing the vast majority of photographs is very different now -- the screen, emitted light, swipes and bigger audiences. For example, there have always been "selfies" or self-documentation but the idea of distribution is a compelling question. Artists are also exploring the demise of the analog camera, film and darkroom practices. While there has always been camerless photography, it is now being explored as a result of the digital explosion. During the 1960s and 70s, I think we were dealing with some of the same or similar issues as younger artists today who are making pieces from photography and about photography. Inquiry and dialogue, people questioning the medium, is on a continuum. It's just taking a different form.

Robert E. Brown

July 2012, Vallejo, California

Statzer: Where and when did you start making photographs and thinking about photography?

Brown: I was lucky to grow up in Rochester, New York, the home of George Eastman and Eastman Kodak. When I was in fourth grade my father taught me how to develop film and make prints in our home darkroom. My mother took me to Saturday art classes at the local museum and after-school music lessons at the Eastman School of Music. A seventh grade field trip to the newly opened George Eastman House left me enthralled with photography.

MS: What came after grade school?

REB: I was a high school photographer and yearbook photo editor. A drafting teacher with interest in photography encouraged me. Three years of drafting classes helped me to develop mechanical drawing skills. I learned how to render objects as seen from different viewpoints and to draw them in perspective. The Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) accepted me as an early applicant to their photography program.

MS: What happened at RIT?

REB: From 1955 to 1959, when I graduated with a BFA in Photographic Illustration, I ate, breathed and slept photography seven days a week. I loved it. Saturdays and summers, I worked for commercial photographers. I couldn't wait to get to RIT each day. The teachers, courses, and students were so engaging, reaching deeply into photography. My life's work and fascination with photography became "fixed" forever.

MS: Are there specific lessons, concepts, or approaches that you learned at RIT that still apply to your photography today?

REB: The scientific courses in chemistry and physics – including the effects of solutions, light and lenses on the image – continue to be sources for my discovery of how we see and what a photograph is. The courses in Visual Communication, as well as the lectures in photographic history at the George Eastman House, have always challenged my thinking. Learning how to “read” a photograph has been one of my most important tools to understanding photography as a visual communication form.

MS: When you first moved from Rochester to California you went to the Bay Area. What were some of your early experiences there?

REB: I moved West to San Francisco, California in 1961, after serving two years as a U.S. Army Photographer. The west coast landscape photographer's work really appealed to me. But at the same time I realized that if I was to show my photographs, it would

have to be in a museum display, as there were no publishing houses nor gallery outlets available for young photographers. I spent time analyzing museum display characteristics. It led to thinking how the next photograph would appear on a museum wall. My three major room exhibits – MA thesis, (1967,) *Daisies*, (1969,) and *Cinder Block Room,* (1974) – started with the end display in mind. I then found the subject matter needed, photographed it, and created the exhibits.

In 1967, the Master of Arts program at San Francisco State College pushed me to do something different. I started to *think* like an artist, that uses photography. An artist is different from someone who pushes a button, holds a pencil, or picks up a hammer. The turning point was in an MA multi-discipline graduate seminar at San Francisco State College. A printmaker asked, "When are the photographers going to do something different than black and white photos on white mat boards?" The road forward was shown to me.

That question was the impetus for my MA thesis, *Blad and White Photographic Transparencies, Their Form and Use in a Visual Presentation*. It consisted of 16" x 22" black and white transparencies sandwiched between plexiglas. They were displayed on tables. To see them, viewers picked them up and observed them against large light boxes. It was also exhibited in 1968 at the George Eastman House, in Rochester NY, where it was titled *Confrontation*. It felt good to give something back to that city.

When seeing the MA thesis, I wanted the viewer to physically experience what a photographer does when holding up processed film, or a print, for the first time and looks to see "what they got." Holding a print is a different experience from viewing it on a wall. A photo on a wall belongs to the wall. A photograph is an object first. Part of the effect of the exhibit was in reference to the Happenings Art movement. Michelangelo Antonioni's 1966 film *Blow Up* also influenced me as did Marshall McLuhan's statement, "The medium is the message." The latter still does.

MS: What was the reaction to your installation?

REB: They liked it. One of the nice things about transparencies is that you can look through them and see other images and people. The viewer is stacking images in a random way. And, of course, you must participate or you don't see them. They would just lie on the table in front of you.

MS: Tell me about the images in your MA thesis work.

REB: I switched from using an 8"x10" camera to 35mm and went out in the street and made photographs of strangers. A slow shutter speed caused some blurring of the faces, which then became mask-like. The masks we live behind, was the theme. I do enjoy various subjects but these have been my only exhibited photographs of people. Landscape and cityscape subjects hold my creative interest. Partially, because a landscape is still, like a photograph.

MS: Were some of these images included in *Vision and Expression* [George Eastman House, 1969]?

REB: Yes. The one of the boy looking up.

MS: What did you do after you finished graduate school?

REB: After finishing at SF State, I became the first full time photography teacher at the University of California, Northridge. I taught there for three years.

In 1969 I created a solo exhibit called *Daisies.* It was a photographic frieze 2 and 1/4 inches high by 57 feet long, mounted at eye level on the room's walls. The daisies were small, randomly arranged, and hand-tinted with color photographic dyes. Three visual experiences were planned. The first was the over all effect of the frieze going around the room. Next, was a close-up inspection of the small daisies, and lastly where ever one stood, the images would appear similar, but different in coloring and arrangement.

MS: How did you come to make the work with James Pennuto in *Photography into Sculpture*?

REB: While living in L.A. from 1967-1970, I was doing all kinds of research into chemistry to figure

out what material to use to make a three-dimensional photograph. Plastic came to the rescue.

Painters and sculptors were working in different plastic forms then. I saw the formability of plastic and that if it was used for printing a photo silkscreen image, the image would bend without cracking.

Using the photo silkscreen process, I printed the three pieces in the *Photography into Sculpture*

exhibit from my 4" x 5" black and white negatives onto flat thermoplastic sheets with single color inks. James Pennuto, a fellow artist, heat vacuum-formed these prints into three-dimensional shapes.

Hill was the first piece formed. I had previously printed it as a flat 8" x 10" black and white, silver halide, photographic fiber-base paper print. In its three-dimensional form it became a half sphere that hangs on a wall. I feel it best achieved my goal of creating a three dimensional photograph. It combines many elements of a two-dimensional photograph with the primary three-dimensional shape, a sphere.

MS: Did you like the way the image was translated in the silkscreen process?

REB: Yes. It picked up some contrast, but served the purpose well.

MS: *Hill* was definitely interesting enough as a straight image but to take it to a sculptural dimension makes it a totally different object.

REB: It seems that way. Perhaps it appears different, because shapes have their own meaning. The end result (three dimensional piece) combines a shape meaning with an image illusion meaning.

MS: Was there anything tricky about screen printing the image onto the plastic?

REB: No, it was pretty straight forward. Jim sent me the plastic that could be vacuum-formed. I printed on it and sent it back to him.

MS: How did Bunnell select the three pieces that were in *Photography into Sculpture*? Did he come to your studio?

REB: I had a close connection to Peter from our time together at RIT. We periodically kept in touch. He contacted me before his trip to L.A. in 1969 and wanted to see my new work. That is when I was living in the San Fernando Valley teaching at Cal State Northridge. I drove over to L.A. and some side street with the work to show him, hauling the *Hill* and *Tracks* out of the back of the car. He liked them, and decided during that meeting to include both pieces in his exhibit. That was the first time I heard about the show. He asked if we had another piece, and I said we would make one. It became *Three-Phase Split*.

MS: Could you describe the collaborative process between you and Pennuto?

REB: It was a wonderful experience to be sharing different viewpoints and bringing them together. When the possibility for creating a three-dimensional image arose, I thought the subject matter of the hill, its shape and the overall texture created by the uniform size of the rocks, would be a perfect image for three-dimensionality. After that image was vacuum-formed and I saw how the process worked, I went searching for subjects like the muddy tracks that became *Tracks,* and other visual material applicable to form into three dimensions. The *Three-Phase Split* image came from a 4" x 5" black and white aerial photograph I had taken. I enjoyed the split image series idea that Jim developed.

MS: Did you go to the opening at MoMA?

REB: No, but I saw it in San Francisco at SFMoMA.

MS: Do you remember your response to the show when you saw it?

REB: It was displayed like most photography shows, in the hallway. But still the works were exciting and a fresh statement that contrasted with the standard west coast photography look of that time.

Years later, upon visiting the show at the Cherry and Martin gallery, I appreciated seeing the variety of materials the artists were exploring and their creativity. There are pieces that put flat photographs on or in three-dimensional shapes, and a few pieces that are three-dimensional photographs.

For me, a flat two-dimensional object has a different message than a three-dimensional object. A flat piece says one thing, a sphere says another. I feel, the greater the balance of elements from both dimensional vocabularies, the stronger the effect. The viewer keeps going back and forth, relating the qualities of each dimension.

Adding illusion presents another challenge. The original *Hill* photograph was flat. It contained a photographic illusion of a three-dimensional hill. The piece in *Photography into Sculpture* was a three-dimensional object whose shape (half sphere) mimicked the photographic illusion's hill shape. I felt it was a good blend of illusion and something real.

Other dimensional qualities that blended in that piece include the half sphere's edges. Three of the edges were straight, the top edge was curved, (following the hill shape.) The part attached to the wall was a rectangle, like a rectangular photograph. It was mounted on a wall, like a flat photograph on a wall. But it came forward, hanging off the wall, exhibiting the effect of gravity on a sphere. The pieces' brown color referred to the hill. If the piece had been life size, it would have been stronger. But that is another story.

MS: Do you think *Photography into Sculpture* was important? Did it have a significant impact on photography?

REB: It was important, for sure. Among other things, it presented different ways of exhibiting photography. There were free-standing pieces, wall, table and pedestal works. The exhibit as a unit continued a search for answers to fundamental artist's questions: what is Photography and how might it be presented?

I see photography as basically a two-dimensional illusionistic medium. We continue to be fascinated by its reference, via illusion, to what we look at. That may be one of the blocks prohibiting us from taking it farther. The illusion of a narrative, grips us so hard that it is difficult
to expand our thinking to what else photography might reveal to us. I feel *how* we see is more important than *what* we see.

MS: What kind of work did you make after *Photography into Sculpture?*

REB: Starting in the early 1970's, I worked with mural paper, producing large 8 ft x 17 ft images. The subject matter of walls and an industrial door were printed life size to enhance their object quality and have the image appear as close to reality as the subject. This work culminated with the *Cinder Block Room* at the DeYoung Museum in 1974. That was a sixteen-foot square room whose walls were covered with eight-foot high black and white photographic mural paper. The image was a 1:1 scale cinder block wall,

and close in tone to the real subject. The lighting was from a single low watt light bulb hanging in the room's center. I wanted the piece to lend a restful but present feeling. An open doorway was near the end of one wall.

For the next group of photographic objects, I used funds from a 1975 NEA Photography Fellowship Grant to produce 1:1 scale color photographs of flat industrial forms such as windows, metal plates and a bus cargo door. The edge of the photos were cut to the object. Throughout this time I was questioning the relationship between photographic illusion's projection of reality with perceived reality.

MS: Did you like working at that scale, the physicality of it?

REB: Yes, working with black and white mural paper was very exciting, a very physical experience. It also provided the viewer with more of a confrontational experience with a photograph. I had tired of the persistent, although comforting, feeling one gets from looking at a miniaturization of something. I used a darkroom with a large sink and hand made trays for the processing.

I have always tried to make something beautiful with my photography. To me, the cinderblock wall I photographed, was a beautiful wall. It wasn't just any cinderblock wall. Other people may not see that, but I do.

MS: Is that why prosaic subjects persist in your work from the 1960s and 70s?

REB: What do you mean?

MS: I'm thinking of how your work contrasts with other West Coast photographers like Ansel Adams, Edward Weston and Minor White. Cinderblock walls and sidewalks are not beautiful objects found on the beach in Carmel. Your work depicts ordinary materials and references ordinary experiences.

REB: Everybody sees beauty in a different way. To me the subjects I choose are beautiful. And, if I can get you to walk out and look at concrete and get excited by it, then I've done something.

MS: After talking to several *Photography into Sculpture* artists, I've discovered that you and some of your cohorts seem to resist style and avoid repeating yourself in the pursuit of the next idea. Is that a fair assessment of your approach?

REB: Yes. I have never been interested in style or doing something repeatable that attracts others. Moving ahead to the next discovery that photography can reveal, excites me.

MS: Would you consider yourself a conceptual artist?

REB: No. I'm trying to do something with photography that is unique to *it* as a medium.

MS: Did you call yourself a photographer in the 1960s and 70s and do you think of yourself as a photographer now?

REB: Is this a loaded question? In what way will the answer satisfy you?

MS: I've been asking this question of a lot of artists who were in *Photography into Sculpture* because it seems to have been an important and contentious issue during the 1960s and 70s.

REB: Photographers were rightly touchy about this. The culture and especially the art world looked down at photographers. Perhaps we have moved beyond that thinking. But like many people, I love photography and sometimes just take pictures for the fun of it. Other times I make photographs by searching for something visual to express my idea.

Today, after 65 years of fascination with photography, I continue to explore and create new work with this medium. I am amazed at what photography teaches me about seeing and perception. I would never have reached this place without the enlightenment, encouragement and support of my parents, family, friends, students, and hundreds of people in the Arts. It has been a joy and a pleasure to share my love of photography through photographs and teaching.

James Pennuto

July 12, 2012, San Mateo, California

Statzer: You are known as a Bay Area art conservator. What is your background as an artist?

Penutto: I studied painting at the Art Student's League in New York with Byron Brown, in 1959-60, something like that, and then I went back to Illinois and bought a business, a frame shop. I did that for four or five years until I was offered a job in Cleveland where I learned to do restoration. I spent eight hours at the shop and came home and put eight hours in at the studio. That's when you are young and can do things like that plus my wife was tolerant of it. She worked for the Cleveland Museum bookstore. When we moved out here she became a registrar at SFMoMA. They didn't have a conservation studio there at that time so I did conservation for them [SFMoMA].

MS: How did you come to make the work with Robert Brown that was included in *Photography into Sculpture*?

JP: I was impressed with Jerry Balane who did vacuum-form plastic pieces. I saw his work when I was back East and I was impressed by the process. When I moved out here I went over to the Berkeley campus and talked to him about the process. He was kind enough to show me his set up for vacuum-forming plastic. I decided to build my own machine and produced a number of pieces. They weren't similar to his at all but because

of the nature of the plastic, they took on similar qualities.

I met Bob Brown in San Francisco through his wife Cherie Raciti. He was a photographer at the time and still is, I assume. I've lost track of him over the years. I'm not sure how the collaborative, three-dimensional work came about. I guess it was in the air at the time. Because I had this facility with the plastic and knew how to use it to create forms and shapes, we decided to try to make photography into three-dimensional objects.

Prior to my collaboration with Bob, I had been incorporating neon with the plastic and one piece was sold to Eleanor Coppola. It was used in the movie *The Conversation* [Francis Ford Coppola, director (1974)]. It was a vacuum-formed shape with a little stand. It lit up and kind of glowed. It was at the end of a hallway and was the only light in the scene. I didn't know anything about it being in the movie until I saw the movie in the theater and there was my piece. Eleanor was collecting neon at the time.

MS: How were you put in touch with Peter Bunnell?

JP: I'm not came sure what came first, Bunnell's show or the work. Bob may be clearer on that since he knew Bunnell. Bunnell didn't know me. I was definitely not a photographer so I wasn't any part of that situation.

MS: Did you go to the opening in New York? What was that like?

JP: Yes, Peter was there and we had dinner and all that stuff. Jerry McMillan was there. I think everybody showed up. It seemed like there were about fifteen or twenty people. There was a table full of people.

MS: Were there any surprises for you in the show? Clear omissions? Interesting inclusions?

JP: I thought they were all interesting pieces. I thought Quarterman's [*Marvella*] was interesting. The McMillan pieces always amused me. He got a lot of mileage from them. I thought Cheng's vacuum-formed pieces were interesting, as well. You have to remember that I'm really a painter and I did this little side trip into three-dimensions. I also got involved with doing some work with sound. SFMoMA has one of my sound, image and text pieces.

MS: Peter Bunnell included only brief discussions of subject matter in his writing about the show. Would you like to comment on that or concepts you were concerned with at the time?

JP: You know that's a good question. I think it was just a matter of presenting this work in another form instead of something flat. We were trying to expand photography into something more three-dimensional. What we did was a play on maps. They [commercial map makers] would create topographical images and then vacuum form over them. What we did was a play on that. There wasn't any deep or philosophical thing going on. As far

as I was concerned, it was just art for its own sake. We were just playing around with the image and space. We wanted to see what it looked like. It's really more whimsical. The image is prosaic. It's not a romanticized take on landscape. I don't know what Bob would say. He may be a little bit more serious than I am about this thing.

MS: Did you discuss the exhibition with your friends or peers?

JP: I didn't discuss the show with friends or peers, not even with Bob. We went our separate ways after that.

MS: What was the significance or importance of *Photography into Sculpture* in general and for you personally?

JP: Therese Heyman bought *Tracks* for Oakland Museum's collection. I'm pretty sure it was *Tracks*.

I always thought it was odd how Peter really had the courage to do this thing. You could see that he had resistance all the way through with the Museum and all of that. I found that disappointing but I wasn't surprised.

[…] There was no feedback. Nothing came about after the fact, after the show. No one contacted us, or at least me, and I could understand that because I was not really a photographer and most of the stuff was photography. I just sort of came in through the

back door in this situation. In general, it didn't seem like it produced any interest. It was like it was kind of a fad or something, just stuff that came out of L.A., which wasn't exactly true, as we know. There was work from Canada, for crying out loud.

MS: What did you do after *Photography into Sculpture*?

JP: I made casts from the feet of people who were in my life at the time, around 1971. Ed Ruscha and a few other people like Terry Fox, Jerry McMillan and Howard Fried, the conceptual artist. The soles of their feet were vacuum-formed in translucent plastic in a truncated pyramid shape. It was like a little dedication to them. I called it the *Suite of Feet* or *The Soles of Twenty Souls*. It was in an exhibition that toured.

By around 1970 I had started to feel that the art world was getting a little tedious. I found that conservation was more rewarding. I would rather preserve the work than to make it. Why fill up space with stuff that's not going to move? I still paint and I'm always composing something in my head. I see something out in the world and think maybe it would be a good painting. You really *see* the world when you look at it that way.

Carl Cheng

May 10, 2012, Santa Monica, California

Statzer: Thank you for agreeing to talk with me about *Photography into Sculpture.*

Cheng: I should tell you that by the time I was in the exhibition I had already moved into making audio/visual sculpture projects and installations. I was probably not as dedicated to photography as other people that you've interviewed.

MS: There's a range of how connected people were to photography and whether they went on to make photographs or other kinds of objects.

CC: Yes, Looking back at the 1960's, there was already a worldwide interest in photography. Academically speaking, photography was beginning to be accepted as Art Department curriculum. My experience, like some of my fellow artists during that time, was that I migrated to Bob Heinecken's class at UCLA as he established the photo department in the Fine Art School. It was in 1966-70 that I started to make the pieces that ended up in the MoMA show.

I was thinking back to the panel discussion. Ellen (Brooks) was correct in saying that none of us actually looked back to reflect on what we were doing. It was the beginning of my so-called art career. I didn't look at photography as a career but as a valuable art

tool.

MS: What were some of your early influences?

CC: I went through industrial design as an undergraduate when UCLA had more of a Bauhaus approach to art where everybody took basic courses together. Also, the Bauhaus idea of integrating art with industry and society really appealed to me. I had a strong interest in technology. I was raised in the San Fernando Valley and that was where Lockheed was. During WWII as kids we were around all those people who were grinding out airplanes by the minute for the war effort. That technology and the film industry made L.A. blossom. Not that I understood that then but we were exposed to it as kids. Just like if you grew up in Detroit, you'd be aware of automobiles more than other people. Technology was all very new and I grew up with that. I wasn't a car freak or anything. It was just that technology itself was interesting. Photography as an art medium was exciting to me because it involved chemistry, light sensitive materials and optics.

When I first enrolled at UCLA, in 1959, I started out in painting. Then I saw the industrial design department where they were using industrial tools and all kinds of new materials and immediately changed my major to industrial design. At the time, there was a strong academic clique in the UCLA Fine Arts School based on painting. Photography, to them, was a mechanical, technological medium that did not involve the artist's hand work and a lot of painters had rejected it. It was not part of the fine art curriculum.

MS: It sounds like Heinecken was good at setting up an environment without many boundaries.

CC: Yes, while the whole tradition of black and white fine art photo prints was well established in the art world. As students, none of us in those first classes were adhering to the Ansel Adams's pictorial approach to photography. In fact, I think, we were standing on Ansel Adams to start the department because nobody liked the Zone System approach that Adams represented. Heinecken was very free about that. I also remember the first moments when we were all sitting together [in the new photography department]. He was sitting on the table and he said, "I don't know what we're going to do." I thought that was the most honest thing I'd ever heard from any faculty member. It definitely was a fresh approach to the medium of photography.

Meanwhile, in the sixties, there was a complete social and cultural upheaval in this country. As an Asian-American who was raised slightly before the post-war baby boom, I saw what racist America was about. When you live in a place like the San Fernando Valley, where there were only three Chinese families out there, with a family with five boys, we were popular kids. So it wasn't like I was abused like an African-American person who, at the time, couldn't even go to the Valley without being followed by the cops. As the anti-war movement grew it revealed a society fractured by racial, economic and gender discrimination. Even having long hair meant that you were labeled a hippy and you could go to jail. To me, this was the dawn of multi-cultural America. Asians were always marginalized but after that there was more acceptance.

MS: How did you come to make the pieces in *Photography into Sculpture?*

CC: I was making three-quarter sized car parts as photo objects at the time. I mounted the car parts on plywood and cut out the contour into a 1 1/2" thick photo object. There happened to be a molding machine in the industrial design shop and I started playing with that in terms of a photo object. Once I took a picture of an object and decided to use it, then the object has a contour that I could use (with the molding machine) to encapsulate it in molded plastic. I just started putting them together and they seemed to work as sculpture.

MS: How do the photographs get laminated inside of the plastic?

CC: I just put the film in the middle and sandwiched the plastic moldings to it. The frame of the vacuum molded pieces was a piece of plywood with a hole cut out in the shape of the object that you're trying to mold to. I made two halves of a bubble with the same contour by flipping the plywood. Then I just put the film in between, glued it together, and trimmed the excess plastic. That's it.

So the film was not conforming to the shape? It's flat inside the bubble?

CC: Right. It became another layer you looked through. I liked the idea of looking through a number of flat images and seeing a three-dimensional object appear. At the

time there wasn't a film that you could photographically expose and then vacuum mold into a shape. If there was such an item I probably would have used it. For me, at the time, I was just seeing if it was possible to make sculptural objects out of photography.

MS: Did Heinecken have much to say about plastics or just the photographic elements?

CC: No. There was a lot more happening outside in society than whether I was using plastic or not. Even when we were students, we were taking pictures of the anti-war demonstrations, riots, Nixon, and all that stuff. We would come back and store our film in the photo lab. The FBI came and was able to open selected lockers to confiscate all the film footage. There were a lot of upheavals in the school that related to anger about the Vietnam War, equal rights, women's rights, etc. Anyone with any intelligence knew that we were only in Vietnam for political purposes. To me, that was more important than anything else but when I looked around at UCLA, the faculty in the art department, seemed unconcerned. They didn't even relate to anything like that, which was very disappointing to me. I went in to the glass studio at UC Berkeley and they were making peace signs to sell and donate. They were mobilized. But at UCLA there were just a few demonstrations and that was it.

MS: Did you take the photographs that were used in the pieces in *Photography into Sculpture?*

CC: Yes. The subject matter in most of them is fairly depressing, like that one of the

veterans titled *V.H.* I took pictures of the veterans and found some images of wheel chair vets. I liked the fact that the person and the wheel chair got molded into one shape. The distortions in the plastic occur naturally too.

MS: There was no catalogue for this show but Peter Bunnell wrote several articles in which he said very little about content. Would you like to tell me more about the subject matter or other concerns you brought to your work during that time?

CC: My attitude during the 60s and 70s, while experiencing firsthand the social unrest of the moment, was fairly negative about our country's democratic principles. My photography was mostly about dark subjects.

The piece I did that was *positive* is the one titled, *UN of C* or the *United Nations of California*. It shows two bears, fucking and a series of California flags. After forty years, the piece looks very pop art-like to me. By the time I made *UN of C,* the San Fernando Valley looked like the United Nations. Every nationality seemed to live there. That, to me, was the most positive thing that happened during that time.

Most of my work hasn't been just about my personal self and by the early 1970s I'd taken on the mantle of AKA John Doe Co.

MS: How were you put in touch with Peter Bunnell for this show?

CC: Basically, Heinecken just said they are going to do a show, blah, blah, blah. Bunnell came over, saw my work and selected some.

MS: Were you impressed that somebody from MoMA was in LA? Was that important to you at the time?

CC: Well, of course, it was flattering for your ego and self worth. But that doesn't last more than fifteen minutes.

MS: Were you interested in other artists who used plastic?

CC: Yes.

MS: So during the late 1960s what other artists did you find interesting?

CC: Most of the teachers that I liked were not tenure-track but were visiting artists like Llyn Foulkes and the sculptor Richard Boyce who isn't well known. He made female genitalia out of clay. As an artist, you kind of have a meeting of the minds with other artists. When you do, they become friends for life. Heinecken was one of those kinds of guys. He didn't have to tell me too much and he accepted me. I felt that he was impressed with what I did so that made him accept me as an artist. After every year he would write a review of what he saw in your work. He wrote some of the best comments I ever read. He had a way of talking about your work in a very humanistic way. I was moved by it. I

thought he was a wonderful, sincere person.

MS: Did you see *Photography into Sculpture*?

CC: I thought I did but, looking back, I wasn't even in the country at the time. In 1970, my girlfriend and I were already in Japan on a two-year trip that took us to Southeast Asia, Bali and India. I returned to the US in 1972.

MS: When you saw the restaging of the exhibition at Cherry and Martin, what was your overall impression?

CC: It's hard to describe what that feels like. At that time, soon after making those specific pieces in the show, I would design, build and install motorized sculptures, installations, water projects and public art. That was my life, really. When I see these early accomplishments I think, "Oh yeah, that's neat! Did I do that?" [laughing]

MS: Are you talking about your own work or more generally about the work in *Photography into Sculpture*?

CC: I'm just talking about myself. I mean, these other artists are independent artists, not only photographers and I'm not disrespecting photographers, but I know some of them as classmates at UCLA during that time and after the show we all took off in different directions.

MS: Do you think *Photography into Sculpture* was an important exhibition?

CC: Culturally speaking it allowed for a more liberal idea of what a photograph could be, if nothing else. Otherwise, we might still be an Ansel Adams pictorial school of photography.

MS: Its influence was temporary?

CC: I wouldn't have expected it to be otherwise given how *Photography into Sculpture* is the title of an exhibition. Sculpture has been an institution since the cave man, you know. So it's hard to say what is going to last as sculpture. In the MOMA show, sculpture is the giant elephant and photography is a technique around it. The title is transitory and that's what's nice about it.

MS: What did you do after *Photography into Sculpture*? How long did you continue to make photo sculptures?

CC: I was still making the vacuum-formed photo pieces a year after I left school even though I was working on other types of sculpture.

MS: You eventually started making public art projects. What about public art appeals to you?

CC: For complex reasons, I do not think of myself as a gallery artist. Some of my art projects could be sold but I do not have a line of work or signature style that fits the cottage industry concept. When the percent-for-art mandate was passed by most states, it created an opportunity for artists to compete for public commissions. I liked making art that goes directly to the public. Using public money demands a certain responsibility, too. In public art you are given a site, but it comes with politics, both social and cultural, that have to be deciphered. You then try to make something out of all of that. Visualizing something is what I like to do. Public art forces me to engage the public on a personal level.

Daryl Curran

May 7, 2012, Culver City, California

Statzer: How did you come to make the work that was included in *Photography into Sculpture*?

Curran: Yeah, because the work I had in the show barely qualified! [Laughing] In fact, I thought it was the least qualified until I saw the pieces that Bea Nettles did. I thought, "Wait a minute, Bea. This is even less dimensional than mine." [Laughing.]

I had this idea that I was going to make dimensional pieces. As a way of teaching myself how to do this, I made 12" x 12" x 1" squares like the ones in *Photography into Sculpture*. I was also using mural paper, which is not fragile like other photo papers. I could bend it around corners and everything because the paper was so tough. One piece led to another. Some were cut out, some were the full photograph only, some were silk-screened on, and some were spraypainted. The idea of following through on the three-dimensional pieces never happened because these looked really good to me. However, I did try some 3-D pieces. I made Plexiglas boxes with film inside and a rotating acrylic cylinder lined with a high contrast litho film positive but it was too complex. Technically I couldn't solve it and visually it didn't have anything going for it. I also tried some Plexiglas cylinders with an image on the inside but they just never quite gelled.

One of the ideas I pursued at the time was the play between the matte surface and the gloss surface. Usually that didn't come up in photography except for the term, "8 x 10 glossy," which everyone knew because they were required for reproduction in newspapers and magazines. There were no photo galleries at the time but I was aware of other kinds of art going on. In L.A., artists like Larry Bell, Billy Al Bengston, and Craig Kauffman were interested in technology. Their art was pristine, industrial and cool. Larry Bell, it seems to me, was using etched glass. You'd have non-reflective against reflective surfaces, matte against gloss. I liked that and I saw a parallel in photography with matte paper and glossy paper. I wondered if there was a way for me to create a similar play of surfaces. So, for a while I cut out images made on matte photo paper and dry mounted them on to gloss surface paper and spray painted with matte spray.

MS: In your early experiments with three-dimensional photographs, were you trying to learn something about the photograph or say something about what a photograph was or could be?

DC: I think it was more formal than that but there were properties of the photograph that interested me. At the time, the photograph was still believable. It was still a fact. Photograph equals fact. What I liked about it was how you could take that fact and twist it. Of course, that's commonplace today but at the time the photograph was irrefutable. It was evidence. I liked that you could blend things and shadows and sandwich negatives. All of that subverted the foundation of photography as a fact-finding device. That informed all of my work. I like to call it "reality/unreality" or "reality/photographic

reality." Reality and photographic reality aren't exactly the same. They are close and sort of travel a parallel path but they can interweave, too. Jerry Uelsmann's work, as an example, blends believable images into fantasy, seamlessly. His photographs challenge viewers to accept them.

MS: By the way, did you see Warhol at Ferus Gallery or the Duchamp retrospective at Pasadena Art Museum?

DC: I did not see the Duchamp show. I saw another assemblage show but not Duchamp. I did see the Warhol show at Ferus. It was impressive to me. The gallery was just lined with soup cans all the way around. The repetition influenced me. The work I started doing then included repetition. I didn't think of it at the time but that had to come from seeing Warhol.

MS: Did you invite Bunnell to your studio? What was your conversation with him like?

DC: I showed Bunnell those three-dimensional boxes that didn't work. I was still kind of working on them but he wasn't impressed at all and because they were incomplete, they weren't anything he could use. At least they fit the category because they really were three-dimensional. The other ones I showed him, the 12" x 12" pieces, hung on the wall and he liked them. He said that he needed more wall pieces because everything else was going to be on a pedestal or in a vitrine. So, he chose four of them and three were included in the show.

MS: How were you put in touch with Peter Bunnell?

DC: The key person was Robert Heinecken because he was constantly in touch with all of these people. When anybody came to town Heinecken was the contact person. He would have a party or something and invite people over. You were able to keep up networking connections through Heinecken if they didn't contact you themselves. In this case, Peter already knew that we were doing something so when he came to town he already had his list of people he wanted to see.

I met Peter at the 1969 SPE Conference in Oakland and he was going to drive over to San Francisco to see an Ed Ruscha and Larry Bell or Billy Al Bengston show – I can't remember which two of the three were in it. I asked him if I could go with him and he agreed. I got to know him that way and we continued to stay in touch.

Heinecken had all of the connections but when Robert Fichter came to town he brought the various elements together. I think of Fichter as the catalyst. For example, I had never met John Upton or Todd Walker but Fichter had. He would hold these little Sunday afternoon gatherings where people would bring proof sheets, prints and books and we'd all talk. That became a gathering place. Michael Stone rented a studio apartment from Fichter and so he was part of that conversation. He was a student at the time and just developing his ideas but he had great access to all kinds of information that hardly anyone else in the country had through his proximity to Fichter.

MS: It seems that Fichter and Heinecken had different ways of bringing people together.

DC: That's right. Exactly.

MS: The two of them together made a very rich community possible.

DC: They did indeed. Yes.

MS: Did you go to the opening of *Photography into Sculpture* in New York? What was that like?

DC: I was pretty excited to be included. I thought, "Gee, who am I to be included in a show like this?" I knew other people in town who were in it like Ellen Brooks, Leslie Snyder, Bob Brown, Carl Cheng, Michael Stone, Jerry McMillan and Heinecken.

I couldn't afford to go to the opening in New York, which was too bad. I should've scrambled to get some money to go to that because that would've been a lot of fun and a different kind of moment. But I didn't do it. The only people I know that were there were Jerry McMillan and Heinecken.

MS: Did you see the show elsewhere? What was that like?

DC: I saw it when it was here at Otis Art Institute, which was down by MacArthur Park at the time. I visited it several times. I think that there were two gallery spaces. I was impressed by James Pennuto and Bob Brown's pieces as well as Lynton Wells' larger than life size figure and Richard Jackson's work. I noticed that my black plexiglas work was marred by fingerprints and smudges.

MS: Were there any surprises for you in the show? Clear omissions? Interesting inclusions?

DC: Well, Richard Jackson. I had never heard of him. At that time the fine art photography community was very small. You were really talking about twenty people — fifty at the most—throughout Southern California. He wasn't really a photo guy. He was an artist who was doing lots of different things and this was one of them. I thought it was very smart work. That was a surprise and so were some of the people from Vancouver. Was it Jack Dale who did the Plexiglas pieces with the nude figure? I thought those were terrific. I have a couple of Doug Prince's pieces. I hadn't seen his work before Photography into Sculpture. We both became members of SPE [Society of Photographic Education] so we got to know one another over the years.

Richard Matthews, who was a sculpture student at UCLA, might have been an interesting person to include in the show. He was mounting his own mural photographs on Masonite then cutting them out and combining them with different objects. In fact, he used gas pumps as subject matter but he made real, physical gas pumps. He also made an ornate

dressing table with photographs of objects like furniture and nude figures that had been cut out into shapes incorporated into it. His work influenced me as a way of looking and using images of industrial icons. He did sculptural pieces in the early sixties and then he moved on to filmmaking. The only other piece I can think of that might have been included was by Keith Smith. He painted a pair of saddle shoes with liquid emulsion and then printed feet on them so that there was a photograph of toes where the toes would be inside. For Smith it was about the irony of imaginary toes appearing on the top of the shoes. It was nothing that he pursued as a mission to investigate three-dimensional ways of making photographs. It was just his usual way of working through things.

MS: What discussions did the show prompt for you and your peers?

DC: I always talked about *Photography into Sculpture* with my classes and every time I do any kind of lecture or panel discussion I bring up this exhibition because photo people are not writing the history of photography. Dealers and curators from other areas who consider Gilbert and George the top of the heap as far as photography goes are writing it. There is a real lack of recognition and lack of understanding about the subtleties of the medium and how people even looked at the picture beyond subject matter. For instance, a picture of Mick Jagger will be priced higher than a photo of BB King. Most dealers, especially, wouldn't know what to make of the kind of work in *Photography into Sculpture*.

MS: Did you consider yourself part of the photo community during the late ‘60s and into the ‘70s? Did you call yourself a photographer?

DC: Yes, but some people actively resisted calling themselves photographers then and still do. They want to be known as an artist and they play down their connection to photography. Jerry McMillan will probably do that because he considers himself a photo sculptor and indeed he didn't come from a photo background. I mean, he invented that himself and he didn't take any photo classes that I know of. But then look at someone like Ken Josephson, who's doing terrific work, comes from a tradition of academic study and of creative activity that’s purely photographic. Even though he knows all kinds of painters and he knows the history of art very well, he's absolutely committed to the photograph.

MS: What was the significance or importance of *Photography into Sculpture*? Did it have a lasting impact?

DC: I find it very interesting that the exhibition has been… resuscitated [laughing]. I thought the show didn't have any impact at all at the time. Although, I saw student work locally and at SPE conferences that was more along that dimensional vein and much more exploratory. Apparently there was a ripple effect of that show like an underground earthquake, a below-the-sea earthquake, moving along but you don't see it on the surface of the water. Apparently it worked something like that because a couple of years later people were doing all kinds of things after that show moved its way across the country.

Now, whether it was due to the influence of *Photography into Sculpture*, I'm not sure. But that kind of work suddenly started to show up.

I guess it did have an effect on a smaller circle. But I don't think it had any effect at all in the art world because photography didn't have any effect at all on the art world in the 1970s. No one looked at photography. It just didn't matter. Generally, in the big time art world of collectors and curators and museum directors, it did not do a thing.

Listen, Photography into Sculpture was a hybrid but it was also investigative. Everyone in this exhibition was trying to push the limits of what the medium could do by means of their ideas—whether that idea was Jerry McMillan's or Robert Brown's. In fact, Robert Brown's work after *Photography into Sculpture* is a really good example. His cinderblock wall was a killer installation. When it was on view at the De Young Museum in San Francisco [1974], people would walk in and say, "Oh, it's an empty room" and move on not realizing they were looking at the art. It was so far advanced! And Michael Stone's work was really terrific as far as I was concerned. The fact that he was pursuing ideas about media, politics, and commodification through the operating system of photography was amazing.

MS: You were very involved in the photography community in Los Angeles. Could you talk about what it was like there during the 1960s and into the 70s?

DC: Se did not have a real photographic aesthetic in L.A. Maybe that was the reason that *Photography into Sculpture* was able to emerge. We weren't the Bay Area that had that long tradition of view camera landscape perfection that emerged out of Imogen Cunningham and Edward Weston and all of the disciples who kept that tradition alive. That was always there and it represented a kind of landmark and a standard. And then, in Chicago, Harry Callahan and Aaron Siskind with their brand of photography and Ken Josephson and all of the people who were their students at the Institute of Design, they had a standard. In New York City, of course, you had social landscape photography being done. In LA we didn't have any of that. We didn't have a standard or a role model so it didn't matter what you did. You could do anything. You weren't fighting against anything. You weren't challenging anything. We were sort of in a vacuum. It was the same way for filmmakers. They could do anything because Hollywood was so far out of reach that it felt like a different medium.

MS: You were that isolated? You didn't feel pressure or influence from any other part of the country?

DC: Probably not when this show took place. In say the early 60s there was very little contact. Until SPE started I didn't know anybody else in the whole country that did anything photographically. Then Robert Heinecken came back from SPE and said, "There is this group of guys teaching here and there – well it was all men at the time -- and doing this and that, and it's all very interesting." SPE became a clearinghouse for ideas once you learned about it but you wouldn't know about it unless you were engaged

in the academic field as a student or teacher. If you didn't know that and were just here in LA, you would be pretty isolated.

MS: So part of the incentive to be a member of the academic photo community – beyond a paycheck – was that you had access to a community of photographers through SPE that was not bound by region?

DC: Exactly, even just people to look at your work because you weren't going to get an audience if you walked up to LACMA with a portfolio of prints. Fred Parker was hired at the Pasadena Museum of Art around 1968 or maybe 69. This was good news to the photo community. Fred was from a fine art photo background and it signaled that photographic work would be accepted into the larger art world. Fred reached out to photographers, mainly through SPE, and asked for donations to bolster the museum's small collection. He got a generous response and that work was included in a major exhibition of recent acquisitions.

MS: Did you make pilgrimages to GEH to show your portfolio to the curators there?

DC: No, well, I came back from Europe the first time in 1966 and went to GEH from there but I didn't show my work to anyone there until 1974. Heinecken told me to go to GEH. Fichter, who was at Eastman House at the time, picked me up from the airport in his car. The community was that small. Robert Heinecken would just call up Nathan Lyons and say that I was coming.

MS: As you all got jobs and became situated in various universities and colleges around Southern California… well, it just seems like a good place and a very rich moment.

DC: I think it was. John Upton might show up with two to three community college students and someone else would bring a couple of graduate students. So people of all levels would come together and there wasn't really a hierarchy. Everybody was equal. No one thought of himself as being superior, either. It was all too new. Even though I had a teaching position at the time I didn't feel like I knew any more than anybody else did. Fichter made sure it felt like that. But it was also about the personalities. For example, Todd Walker was a walking encyclopedia of photography and he was just the most genuine guy. You could ask him anything about photography and he'd rattle off an answer. He could describe anything and how to do it or how to do something in a better way or how not to pay Kodak a bunch of money because he would have some economical alternative.

There was that little gallery in Costa Mesa, started by one of John Upton's students. It couldn't have been much bigger than this room and was in some office space. Even so, anyone and everyone who was interested in photography in Southern California would be there because it was a photo gallery with a photo exhibition.

It was a very good cooperative feeling because no one was hiding or protecting anything. If you wanted to know how to do something, ten people would tell you. Years later I was

talking to a painter and he said that no painter would ever tell you that a curator from so and so museum was in town because they were all protecting their interests.

Also, in any art department that had photography during the late 60s and 70s you found a lot of people drawn to the medium that didn't even know about it previously, especially printmakers. Graphic designers and illustrators were also drawn to photography, would take a class and go "Wow, I didn't know you could do this." Photography suddenly broadened their horizons, stimulated the creative process and expanded what they could do with various mediums they were involved with. I think there was a lot of cross-fertilization that way. Even if the person was still a sculptor, when they returned to doing their own sculpture after taking photography, there was an influence there. Photography's influence rippled throughout the disciplines in that way.

When I was at Cal State Fullerton [starting in 1967], I know I had that experience. People would take my class and then go back to doing whatever they were doing. For instance ceramics students would take my class and they would ask whether you could photo silkscreen glaze and I would say, "I don't know. Let's try that." The next thing you know, two years later, there were twenty people doing photographic images on ceramics. It just moved that way, in cycles. All of a sudden it would catch on and then, two years later, no one would be doing it.

Michael deCourcy

May 2013, by phone from Westminster, British Columbia

Statzer: What were some pivotal experiences or influences that helped shape your work or philosophy of art around 1970?

deCourcy: In 1968 I became involved with the Vancouver artist collective, Intermedia. That became a sort of graduate school for me. I had been to a couple of art schools but never completed a degree. In fact I was bored with that kind of art but Intermedia was a real free for all and I found the atmosphere really exciting. I met and collaborated with a lot of really interesting and happening people there.

In terms of my photography influences, in 1961 after a couple of frustrating years at art school I quit and left my hometown of Montreal and headed west to Vancouver. I was disillusioned with traditional art media and anxious to pursue my interest in photography, a medium which I felt might connect me with real time life experience in ways that painting and sculpture couldn't. I taught myself photography by going to the library and studying photography books, photographs, and magazines. I also travelled around during this time, hitchhiking mostly, across Canada and up and down the west coast. I lived for a year in Big Sur, California working at the Esalen Institute. While in the Big Sur-Monterey area I figuratively retraced the steps of Edward Weston. His photographic work and memoirs of his life as an artist were a big influence on me in terms of being an artist. I had also looked at and admired the social landscape work of American

photographers like Garry Winogrand, Lee Friedlander, Bruce Davidson, and of course Robert Frank and I kind of wanted to do work like them. Even though they inspired me, when it came down to it I found I couldn't do it that way. It became clear to me that it wasn't primarily art that I was looking for in photography. I was also studying Zen and in that context I found myself contemplating the true nature of the photograph and how photography could work in terms of my own interior search — like who I was and what I was doing and what the outside world was all about. It was a way of connecting with the world. That was the kind of process I wanted art to be for me. I didn't believe that photography's true nature was to be hung and framed, replacing paintings in an art gallery. That's what I saw people in photography doing. They were trying to turn it into "Art".

I somehow got into this thing where for a photograph to have meaning it had to work— out in the world. I saw photographic images as objects or symbols, essentially interchangeable, so it was what you did with them by, for instance, pairing them up or contextualizing them in other ways that made them meaningful. I asked myself, how do I make a photograph work for me? I looked around and I saw photographs on billboards and in magazines, basically, in advertising. Advertising seemed to be where photographs were most at home. If they weren't in your family album they were out on billboards. I rejected the whole notion of pretentiousness that surrounded the art of the photograph. That sort of bothered me. I had a strong blue-collar attitude towards art. I wanted to make art that was in some way more universally accessible, not hidden away in a museum.

MS: How did you come to make the work that was included in *Photography into Sculpture*?

MdC: At Intermedia we connected with companies and got quite a bit of support from them. That support came by way of free materials. Bob Arnold was an American expatriate living in Vancouver who had studied art at Pomona College. He was a big influence on me. He was making box sculptures, working with corrugated cardboard boxes, just boxes as materials. They were supplied by Crown-Zellerbach Canada Ltd. Bob and I would cart a load of these little six-inch square cardboard boxes he was working with around the streets of Vancouver to different sites, busy street corners and back lanes and the like, where Bob would build sculptures with them. He liked to stand back where he wouldn't be noticed and observe how people interacted with these simple box installations. I documented these interventions and this notion of art in unconventional public venues made a strong impression on me.

I was at the time already working with laminated corrugated cardboard sheets as the substrate for a room-size interactive photographic installation called *Room With Cutouts* for an Intermedia show at the Vancouver Art Gallery (VAG). I had also produced a series of large-scale corrugated cardboard photographic jigsaw puzzles. I began to think about printing photographic images onto boxes. Stacking them became a way to sequence and juxtapose those images in order to generate meaning. Then Peter Bunnell came into the picture looking for content for his *Photography into Sculpture* exhibition and it all came together.

Peter had heard of the three-dimensional photographic work I had been doing at Intermedia. We chatted. He liked the idea of the *Silkscreened Box* project and he asked me to put a proposal together. Then I got Crown-Zellerbach involved and they provided the boxes and hooked me up

with a display company who provided the screen-printing. The whole idea behind the boxes was to create "working" photographic art. It was a model of how to get artist-made photographic images onto trucks, trains, boats, loading docks and other environments in which boxes and containers end up in the real world. I saw it as a form of collage. I envisioned my boxes with all kinds of different images on them on the back of a truck being driven around town.

The first edition of four hundred silkscreened boxes were shown in two very different contexts. They operated at a high art level when they were installed at MoMA and as a part of a traveling exhibition but at that time showing in traditional venues didn't mean a lot to me. Everyone had to remind me that showing at MoMA was important. They also functioned in a lowbrow way as the subject of a commissioned conceptual print work for the June 1970 cover of *artscanada* magazine. This involved the photographing of stacks of boxes in twelve different urban locations in and around Toronto. A proof sheet of the resulting images made up the cover of the special edition of the magazine, which reviewed the *Photography into Sculpture* exhibition.

MS: How were you put in touch with Peter Bunnell?

MdC: I think it was probably Iain Baxter of N.E. Thing Co. who directed Peter towards Vancouver, Intermedia, and ultimately, Jack Dale and myself.

MS: What was your conversation with Bunnell?

MdC: Well there wasn't a lot of conversation when he came to visit. I wasn't really

outgoing in that sense and I was probably pretty shy. He was great, very forthcoming and friendly and extremely supportive. He was interested in my life and my family. There wasn't any formality at all even though he showed up in his bow tie and was always impeccably turned out.

Once the boxes were made we discussed their installation and placement in the gallery. I had tried to create formal sculptures out of the boxes but it seemed pretentious to me. As I was working in my studio I realized that the stacks of boxes sitting on the other side of the room in a disorganized fashion seemed more interesting to me than the formal shapes I was trying to make with them. It was at that point that I decided to ask the custodians of the museum to put them together as if they worked in a warehouse. In fact I left it up to the custodians at each one of the venues. That is key, in my mind, to how they became art in a different way.

MS: Did you go to the opening in New York? What was that like?

MdC: It was just the weirdest trip. I had my wallet and passport stolen but my dealings with Peter Bunnell were terrific. I went to the Museum and he let me see their Weston collection. I got to look at and handle original Edward Weston prints. That was really exciting to me. There were tons of people at the opening. I was introduced to a lot of people but I don't remember any particular conversations. The main thing I do remember was Lee Friedlander snapping close-ups using a ring flash, a technique I had never seen before. I have often thought since then that I would really like to see that series of pictures.

MS: Did you see the show elsewhere?

MdC: When *Photography into Sculpture* was shown at the Vancouver Art Gallery in the spring of 1971, it shared the gallery with the installation of the *BC Almanac(h)-CB* a publishing and group exhibition project which I had designed and co-curated with Jack Dale. Both exhibitions took an unconventional and somewhat conceptual approach to photography and in that sense they resonated well together. Because my work was central to both exhibitions I was commissioned by the VAG to produce a photographic artwork to be featured on the invitation.

MS: Were there any surprises for you in the show, clear omissions or interesting inclusions?

MdC: It was such an exciting atmosphere at the opening that I don't think I had a good look at the work until I saw it later in *artscanada* magazine. There was a whole lot of media interest in that show. The *artscanada* coverage in itself was so surprisingly thorough that it could almost have functioned as the exhibition's catalogue. The show also appeared in *Popular Photography, Newsweek, and TIME*. It was interesting, as a 25-year-old who considered himself to be aligned with the counterculture to suddenly see my work cast in an international spotlight. It was very good for my resume. Among other benefits resulting from this sudden elevation of my professional profile was an invitation from the Governor General for my wife Lorene and I to attend a function at Government House in Ottawa in honor of His Royal Highness Prince Charles. An event that was, I must say, a bit of a challenge for a couple of hippies.

MS: Peter Bunnell included only brief discussions of subject matter and iconography in his

writing about the show. Would you like to comment on subject matter or concepts you were concerned with at the time?

MdC: I was very much into the five elements– fire, earth, metal, water and wood– and that's what the imagery on the boxes represents. The elements connected with my experience, which was one of being a hippy, health food, environmentalism, and the West Coast. It's a beautiful place we live in here in Vancouver, on the sea and surrounded by mountains, which are all white-capped in the wintertime. There are forests nearby and lots of birds. The boxes formed a landscape, basically. They are a three-dimensional representation of the land, a map in and of themselves, just as intact photographs are in general maps. All photographs constitute a map of something.

MS: How did your work evolve after Photography into Sculpture?

MdC: The *BC Almanac(h)- CB,* a publication and exhibition in 1970 was another way for me to turn photography into sculpture. It was the next step. With the *BC Almanac(h)- CB* the sculpture was the book. That was the shape that I was interested in and the medium was publishing. It had no text, just four hundred pages of wall-to-wall photographs— a big fat book of images that was sold at newsstands and bookstores. It involved fifteen artists— photographers, painters, sculptors and poets – some of whom had never before used photography in their work. The idea was that art was something bigger than the medium you worked in. I wanted to see what might happen if we were to place a camera, and control over the apparatus of publishing, into the hands of an artist. In this sense the process was both conceptual and experimental.

Andre Haluska

May 2013, by phone from Coral Springs, Florida

Statzer: What were some pivotal experiences or influences on your work around 1970?

Haluska: I went to Temple University [Tyler School of Art] and lived in Philadelphia for four years and then went to school in upstate New York -- a program through the State University of New York called the Visual Studies Workshop with Nathan Lyons and his staff. I started there in 1970 and graduated in 1972 with the second or third graduating class. I did my thesis on stereo photography but most of my work came out of what I was doing at Temple where I had been a design student. You know design students. They are always scrounging around for things to put together for something else.

MS: Did you work with someone in particular at Tyler?

AH: The guy that turned me onto photography was William G. Larson. He was a first year photography teacher there. The photo lab was very primitive. One day he was walking down the street outside by apartment and I said, "Hi, can I show you some things?" and he came in. I showed him a little painting that I was working on. It was layers of paint on Plexiglas. It was about 5 x 5 inches, just stuff left over from design classes that I had put together for a painting class. Larson said, "You know you can do that photographically." He turned me onto Kodalith, the graphic arts film. Then things took off. The piece in *Photography into Sculpture* evolved from that. I carried that

aesthetic to VSW and I worked stereographically. I was altering left and right sides and introducing different materials to stereoviews. I did that also with the dimensional pieces. I considered myself to be a directorial constructivist. By that I mean finding things and making a little story out of them.

MS: Could you, for example, take the piece that was in *Photography into Sculpture* and tell me the story?

AH: It's meant to evoke a feeling. That particular one is pretty melancholy, a self-portrait. The area depicted in the left side of the piece is from the New Jersey Pine Barren where I spent a lot of time. So I was looking back to the past. Right around that time my father died. I was twenty-one years old and all kinds of bad things were running about in my head. I started putting a lot of small toys, found objects, found photos, original photos, even dirt, in some pieces.

MS: It sounds like you had a better time at Tyler than VSW…

AH: Probably. Philadelphia was a livelier city than Rochester, although being near George Eastman House left a lasting impression. When I went to Rochester and saw the photography work being done there it made me want to be a better photographer and photographic printer. Up to that point my pieces were not very technically sound. I put my mind to becoming a good photographer and I think that I succeeded.

MS: Do you remember how were you put in touch with Peter Bunnell?

AH: Sure, through Bill Larson. Bill would make periodic trips to the MoMA to visit with Bunnell and suggested that I do the same. So I called him up. Maybe every 6 months I would take a trip up there and show Bunnell what was in the briefcase.

MS: Do you remember any conversations you had with Peter Bunnell about your work or the show?

AH: I do recall one thing he told me. He said that he didn't want any of the people he was choosing for this exhibition to be one shot wonders. He wanted people to be committed to what they were doing.

MS: Did you go to the opening in New York? What was that like?

AH: A bunch of my friends from Tyler came up for the opening. There was a very large and nice turnout. I remember being somewhere for an after party and we missed the last train. Honestly, I can't remember how we got back.

MS: Were there any surprises for you in the show? Clear omissions? Interesting inclusions?

AH: The first time I saw the show was at the opening and, actually, I was quite envious

of some of the work. I thought it was great. I remember one piece that was flat. It looked like a grassy area or grassy mound with something in it. [Ellen Brooks, *Flats: One Through Five*] I think that one sticks out the most. Another one was the vacuum-form balloon guy. [Carl Cheng, *Sculpture for Stereo Viewers*] Not so much for the photo work but the fact that he actually vacuum-formed something. How did he have access to that kind of technology?

MS: Did you consider yourself part of the photo community during the late '60s and into the '70s? Did you call yourself an artist or a photographer?

AH: I remember calling myself, "a photographic artist." I was not a still photographer. I was like a constructivist. I made stuff. I didn't print stuff. In fact a lot of the work I did at VSW was printmaking more than photography, as it were. I used photographic images but employed more of a printmaking approach. I worked with a fellow there named Syl Labrot. He was doing a lot of screen-printing and John Wood taught me book binding. There were a lot of one-of-a-kind books from that era, too.

MS: Generally speaking, what were you reading, thinking about, studying, listening to or discussing at the time (around 1970)?

AH: There was a movie, Frederico Fellini's, *Satyricon* that I just fell in love with. Every time it showed I would go. I bought the book that talked about the movie. The imagery just blew me away. I also got interested in archeology and devoured a bunch of books on

that. Also there is an Art News Annual Book that I fell in love with called, *The Grand Eccentrics*. It was published in 1966. There are artists in that book who are just nuts like Hironymous Bosch but I was more intrigued by Max Klinger. He did this work called *The Joys and Enigmas of a Strange Hour*. It's about this fellow picking up a glove at a skating rink that was dropped by a lady. He is fascinated with this glove and it haunts him. He idolizes it, he hates it and he dreams about it. That stuck with me all of these years.

Richard Jackson

May 8, 2012, Sierra Madre, California

Statzer: How did you come to make *Negative Numbers*, the work that was included in *Photography into Sculpture*?

Jackson: When I moved to Los Angeles from Sacramento, I hadn't been out of the military very long. [Jackson was in the Coast Guard for six years. "It was almost like getting out of prison or something."] One of the numbers in the piece is my social security number. I hope nobody figures that out. [laughing] The other number is my military ID number. Those are numbers with negative connotations and I decided to just expose them on a negative using a match as the light source. I did it all myself. I made the camera with a surplus lens because I wanted it to be 8" x 10." I don't know what it was, probably some military photography thing. I bought a bellows and made a frame. I made it just for this project and then I took the pictures myself. I don't remember if it took more than one attempt. I also figured out how to process the film. I made a little darkroom in the closet. I also used when I made a set of pinhole pictures of the moon. The moon pictures are about Jackson Pollock's painting called *Moon Vibrations*.

I never really pursued photography. Once those two projects were done I just kind of stopped doing photography. They are very specific things that express ideas. They aren't just nice pictures. You know, I like a nice photograph. They are beautiful and I appreciate the technique. Grant Mudford is a good friend and I appreciate that he takes these

beautiful pictures but it's not something I care about. I don't really care about the quality enough and I'm not very good at it. These aren't pictures, they're projects. That's the difference.

I wasn't trying to make photography into sculpture or anything else. I wasn't trying to move photography along like I suspect that other people in *Photography into Sculpture* were. I can understand that and I can appreciate it because that's what I'm trying to do with painting -- to move it into another area so that I can maintain some interest in it. I would imagine that it would be hard to sustain interest in something that you're so good at. […] To extend photography, I can appreciate that but how I got lumped into that is purely accidental.

MS: How were you put in touch with Peter Bunnell?

RJ: I think I was working somewhere trying to make a living. I met him when he was looking around. He came over to the studio and decided to put this thing in. I don't remember it being finished or even showing it to him but it must have been done.

MS: Can you recall anything about your conversation with Bunnell?

RJ: I remember he came over and looked at everything but I don't remember the conversation. At that time I wasn't anybody. It would be different now but then I wasn't anybody and he wasn't anybody. Well, he was a curator at the Modern but he wasn't

anybody...

MS: Well, he wasn't John Szarkowski, the head of the photography department. Is that what you mean?

RJ: Yeah, right. We were kind of at equal places. I never thought, "Oh wow. This guy is coming over from the Modern."

MS: No? It didn't seem like a game changer?

RJ: No. He seemed like a nice guy but after that nothing happened.

MS: There was no impact on your career as a result of *Photography into Sculpture* or showing at MoMA?

RJ: Zero. Absolutely zero.

MS: He came out, he selected the work, you packaged it up, sent it to MoMA, and it went on tour for two years then...

RJ: It came back and I threw it away. Nothing had changed at all. It's not like now. You get into the *Whitney Biennial* and all of a sudden there's a big surge. You can capitalize on that or just be tossed back.

MS: I think I know the answer to this but did you ever consider yourself part of the photo community?

RJ: I was never in any other shows that dealt with photography so *Photography into Sculpture* was really a one off for me. I still am a one off. [laughing] In that exhibition, you can tell my work is very different. The rest of the work is about projecting the photo image onto some object or something. Mine was just the negative. It was very different.

I worked around the Pasadena Art Museum right after it opened. They have a big photo collection. The one photo I really like is that big bus. It's a full sized photograph of a bus that folds out. [Mason Williams, *Bus* (1967)] I like those kinds of things that push photography in a way and conceptualize it. That's the thing. I don't think the work in *Photography into Sculpture* was conceptualized in the same way.

MS: Can you quantify the differences between the work in *Photography into Sculpture* and conceptual art?

RJ: Well pretty much they are all trying to do the same thing – to make a photo sculpture instead of saying, "I have an idea. Now, how's the best way to achieve it?" I could have made *Negative Numbers* out of neon. I could have gotten two plates this size and had the images etched or sand blasted in. Then the idea would have been the same but the thing is the negatives. I thought, "Oh wow, I've got to use negatives."

MS: So there is an idea that's lodged in the materials, in this case, the photographic negative.

RJ: Yeah, and that's it. I thought, "What's the best way to express this idea?" It's photo. Other people in *Photography into Sculpture* are going at it the other way. "Hey I want to make an object that is different using photo. I'll put it on Astroturf or all this other stuff."

These people who I was in the show with remember me and saw me as part of that whole thing. I was teaching at UCLA some years later after Robert Heinecken had already retired. He came over one day just to say hello to me. That was pretty nice because I never thought I was a part of the photo world. I didn't know that they were still aware of me or cared. I understand that *Photography into Sculpture* was important to them but it was far more important to them than to me. Heinecken was the nicest guy in the world.

MS: In your estimation, what was the significance or importance of *Photography into Sculpture*? Did it have a lasting impact?

RJ: When you look at that work now, some of it is pretty cool because it's gadgetry and stuff but I don't think it changed anything. I don't think it changed photography. Photography is always better when it is conceptualized, like painting or anything else. There needs to be a reason for that image and if you project it on to a box or you project it onto a flat photo paper without one [an idea or concept]... then it's like putting lipstick

on a pig. Do you know what I mean? It doesn't change anything to put it on a box. There has to be a reason that it's on a box and the box has to be meaningful. It just can't be "Hey, we're going to make photography a sculpture," or even, “we're going to project a photo and then paint on it.”

I saw the restaging of *Photography into Sculpture* and I had a problem with the way women are depicted. It was the same thing when I saw the Heinecken show at Pasadena [*Speaking in Tongues: The Art of Wallace Berman and Robert Heinecken*, Pasadena Armory, 2011]. It takes me back to a time where everything looked so cool but women had no place in our world. They were shown in a kind of sexual context, and they still are, but it's not so cool anymore. *Photography into Sculpture* was before the feminist revolution. That's a little bit of a problem for me. That takes something away from the idea of the object. Right away you are up against something. It's dated. If you saw that kind of work from a student at a university now, you'd think, “Boy, this isn't so good or it just looks like student work.”

Jerry McMillan

May 8, 2012, Pasadena, California

Statzer: What were some pivotal experiences and important influences on you and your work?

McMillan: I was a self-taught photographer and I lived with four other guys: Ed Ruscha, Joe Goode, Don Moore and Patrick Blackwell. All of us were from Oklahoma City and went to Chouinard Art Institute. We rented a big house in Hollywood. Patrick had gone to Chouinard and then left and joined the Navy to get the GI Bill. He learned photography in the Navy. If I had problems I'd go to him and he'd help me. We set up a darkroom because everyone in the house in one way or another was interested in making photographs but I was really involved in it.

I did a photograph for an art exhibition announcement called *War Babies* [1961]. I had the flag that I bought for that photograph so I decided to use it in a series using the flag as a metaphor. The *Flag Series* was the first series of photographs I did, where before I was just shooting different kinds of things and teaching myself photography. That was in 1962. In 1963 I did the *Jan Series*. I wanted to photograph a black girl. It was during the civil unrest but I wasn't interested in photojournalism. I was more interested in using photography as art because I had studied art. I didn't study photography because they didn't teach photography as an art form at Chouinard. After I finished the *Jan* and *Flag Series*, I went to Walter Hopps at Pasadena Art Museum and asked him if he would take

a look at this stuff. He came to see my work and he said that he'd love to show it at the museum.

A few days later I put up all my work around the room and looked at it. All of my friends were painters and sculptors and they were showing at the museum. When I looked at my work I said to myself, "I have so much respect for the people that show there, I just wouldn't want somebody to look at my work and say, 'You know, Jerry, this is nice but it kind of reminds of this guy's work. Did you see this book? Those are really nice but they kind of remind of…' and I decided that I didn't want that happening to me. I want people to know it's a Jerry McMillan when they see it. So I told Walter that I would really appreciate it if I could wait. He told me just to let him know when I was ready.

I started thinking about whether I could make a work of art that was part photograph and part painting or something but when you looked at it you just said, "That's art. It's just a work of art." So I started thinking about how I could do that. How would that take place? What would I do? In answer to those questions I made the door and window paintings on silver gelatin prints [*Door #1* (1964) and *Window #2* (1965)]. They were among the earliest works in which I dealt with space where flat, painted, graphic space and the illusionistic space of the photograph were incorporated in the same piece. I showed them at Rolf Nelson Gallery in Los Angeles in 1965. [Two years after their initial meeting McMillan again showed his work to Hopps, which resulted in an exhibition at Pasadena Art Museum, Dec 1966 – Jan 1967, concurrent with a retrospective of works by Joseph Cornell.]

MS: How did you come to make the work that was included in *Photography into Sculpture*?

JM: In 1963, I made a box with pictures of my wife on the outside. She was about to have our second child and I thought of her as a container. I was thinking about women's things so I put up all of this stuff that related to women on my studio wall. I shot a photograph and made a box out of it. Also, when I was making the *Jan Series*, I made a lot of test strips. I'd wrinkle them up, put them in places, and photograph them. It was teaching me that there was no reason to think of the print as precious. Then I started thinking, "Well gosh. Why do photographs have to be flat and mounted on a board?" And then, "If they weren't flat, what would they be like? What would they be?" So that's when I did the wrinkled paper piece, which was the first bag that I did.

I took a piece of brown craft paper and wrinkled it up and photographed it. Then, I made a blow up of it. And then, I went to the grocery store, got a paper bag, took it apart and measured it. I made a bag identical to a paper bag from the grocery store – scored it, folded it. When I was finished I looked at it and said, "What I like about this is that this bag is perfect but it *looks* like its been mutilated." I liked that play when something looks like it's one thing and it's really something entirely different. Also, the fact that it was now an object, not an image. I said, "Wow. I really like that a lot." I hadn't seen anything like that.

MS: How were you put in touch with Peter Bunnell?

JM: I didn't know Heinecken, Darryl Curran, or anyone like that so I didn't meet Bunnell through them. I guess it was Tom Garver who was director of the Newport Harbor Art Museum. I guess he heard that MoMA was looking for photo sculptures or something like that and I think he recommended that Bunnell look at my work. I think I was one of the last people he saw. He pretty much made the decision to include me on the spot.

MS: Did you go to the opening in New York? What was that like?

JM: My wife Patty and I went to the opening. It was our first time in New York and it was a big moment. Again, I was used to the Pasadena Art Museum. It was small and personable. I got to MoMA and it was stuffy. Bunnell was ready to place my work in the show so I went over and was picking up things and he just had a fit, "Don't touch anything!" he said. They had guys in there working and he said, "Oh my god, they will go on strike!" I didn't know any better so I said, "But I'm the artist!" and he replied, "I'm the only one who can handle anything. I don't care who you are. The artist isn't allowed to touch anything or these guys will all go on strike." I had never experienced anything like this. I just couldn't even believe it. I thought, "Man! What a place! This is awful!" It was pretty crazy.

In the photograph Bunnell is playing with the boxes. He was going to have some of them turned sideways and I said "Uh-uh. No. Wrong. That's not the way I want them shown. I want them shown straight on. All of them straight up and down. That's the way I think of

them." I didn't want them being cleverly placed where you are trying to be a little sexy because they are not meant to be sexy. They were really meant to be serial images of something that is all the same but yet they are all different.

MS: Were there any surprises for you in the show?

JM: There were a lot of things about *Photography into Sculpture* that I didn't like. For one, it was in a hallway and the walls were painted a mint green. It was like a color you would paint a bathroom. I couldn't believe it. Why isn't it white or gray? It could've been a light gray. Why is it green? There were little things like that that made it not as monumental for me at the time. But there were a number of works in there that I really admired and thought were terrific. I thought Doug Prince's little boxes were sensational. I liked Heinecken's and I liked Curran's. I became friends with Jim Pennuto in San Francisco and Bob Brown. I liked Bea Nettle's piece at the time. I got to know Carl Cheng but I don't think I met him at the opening. I know him from over the years and I really like him. He's a terrific guy. I liked Richard Jackson's piece. It was pretty far advanced for the majority of the photography community. I probably was surprised to see all their work.

At the end of the tour when it came to Otis I thought it looked kind of old and used. Worn out. I don't mean that things were damaged but that things had already moved on, in a sense.

There were just a lot of things about MoMA... I wasn't blown out by MoMA by any means but I sure liked Peter Bunnell a lot. I thought John Szarkowski was pompous and narrow minded, to be honest about it, and he wasn't friendly. I was in *Mirrors and Windows* and several other shows so we talked about my work several times but he never seemed to understand it. I just thought he was a guy who hadn't caught up with the times, basically. I thought Peter should have been where John was. It was a shame but that's the way it is.

MS: What was the impact of the show on you or your career?

JM: It opened up a lot of things for me, especially coming in contact with Heinecken. Right after I came back he asked me to teach at UCLA Extension. Then I was hired to teach at Cal State Northridge. I also filled in a couple of times at UCLA when Heinecken was gone. And, I got to know that there was a photo community. That was interesting.

MS: Did you consider yourself part of the photo community during the '70s? Did you call yourself an artist or a photographer?

JM: In the 1960s, I didn't even know there was a photography world. I had one friend who was a photographer, Maurice Yanez. I did not know any other photographers and I didn't know that there was a photo community. I called myself an artist and an artist photographer. When I finally met the photography world they resented that I called myself an artist. They didn't like that because it was like I was ashamed of being a

photographer. They were trying to show in the art world and I was already showing there and they didn't like that. It was an issue, particularly in those days.

MS: Generally speaking, what were you reading, thinking about, studying, listening to or discussing around 1970 that would have fed into your life and work?

JM: I don't know if I can remember all of that. Basically, there was only *Artforum* magazine. That was the only thing you saw. Also just being involved in the art world and my friends in the art world had an impact on me. I remember that years later I was on a panel with Jack Welpott. I don't know how the question came up but it was something about what we saw and read. He was talking about how excited they were in the early days for *Aperture* to come. And I thought, "Oh my god! No wonder! Now I know the difference. We were waiting for *Artforum*! We never looked at *Aperture*. We were looking at *Artforum*. That's the difference between Northern and Southern California! [laughing]

MS: What was the significance or importance of *Photography into Sculpture*? Did it have a lasting impact?

JM: *Photography into Sculpture* should have made a bigger dent but because of conceptual art— just common ordinary photography used for a different kind of idea — the art world accepted photography because a lot of artists were using it. Photo sculpture got put aside. Conceptual art dominated and still does.

I thought *Photography into Sculpture* was really important. I thought that it showed that there are other ways of thinking about photography and being a photographer than just shooting regular, common photographs. Still, one of the problems is exposure. If the museums only show certain kinds of things then that's what people tend to do. They aren't asked to try new things. I think of my work as challenging what was going on. It wasn't what I call "classic" photography.

Basically, the kind of inquiry I was interested in was suppressed. First of all there wasn't really a big market for photography in 1970 and then the photography world and the art world started going through recessions. Art galleries weren't selling paintings so they sold photographs, which were cheaper. Those dealers didn't really know anything about photography. At the same time you have the photography world, dominated by the classic people who were the power brokers of photography, so that's the kind of things that got shown.

Bea Nettles

May 31, 2012, Urbana, Illinois

Statzer: How did you come to make the work included in *Photography into Sculpture*?

Nettles: In 1968, I was a graduate student here at the University of Illinois in painting. I was having a difficult time with the photography professor Art Sinsabaugh who wanted me to make a black and white portfolio to prove that I could print well. I thought, "I'm a graduate student, I know what I want to do. This is absurd." I did it but I kept on making my other work. I decided that I couldn't work with him and over the summer of 1969 I worked with a painting teacher. That's when I started to machine stitch the photos. That came about purely from my own invention because I was quilting and I thought it would be really neat to sew photos or sew etchings or something. I went back to the studio and started doing that and by that summer I had started sewing paper photos together.

Then Bart Parker arrived at University of Illinois. He was very open-minded, very soft-spoken and gentle. I took photo from him and that worked out great during the fall semester (1969). Then Sinsabaugh came back from his sabbatical and I thought, I'm not going to do this again, so I took an independent study with Bart. I walked upstairs to the darkroom and there was a sort of manifesto posted that only people in Art blah, blah, blah—whatever that course number was—were allowed to use the darkroom. That meant I wasn't allowed to use it. This was January 1970. I finally ended up printing in a basement somewhere off-campus where some student had an enlarger. I used heat tapes

under the trays to keep the chemicals from freezing. I was down there in a thrift shop fur coat and gloves printing. That's how the work in *Photography into Sculpture* was printed.

MS: How were you introduced to Peter Bunnell?

BN: I came home from the grad studio and I found a letter in the mailbox from the Museum of Modern Art. I thought it was an offer for a book club or something and I almost threw it out, but I opened it. It was from Peter Bunnell. It said, I hear you're doing this interesting work—because Robert Fichter [Nettles' first undergraduate photography instructor at University of Florida, Gainesville] told him about my work—I'm doing this show and I'd like to come see your work.

We arranged for him to fly to this little tiny airport in Champaign, Illinois. Peter Bunnell gets off the plane in his white shirt and his little perky bow tie. I took him to the grad studio. It was a really ratty place. Someone later told Sinsabaugh that Bunnell had been in town, but it wasn't me as I had been asked not to mention it.

MS: Did you go to see the show at MoMA?

BN: I can't remember how I managed it financially. I flew and stayed with someone there. I might have combined my job interview with Nazareth College in Rochester [Nettles' first teaching position] and the opening. [reading from an old itinerary] "April 4th, 1970. Champaign to New York, New York to Rochester and back to New York."

Nazareth probably paid part of the way and I got the trip out to the opening. I remember the dress I wore. It was a little taffeta thing with stars on it, a rosy-colored deal. I remember an older guy hitting on me but I was too naïve to realize what was going on and I ignored him politely. It was an interesting evening. It was, of course, a highpoint. I was thinking that I had it made and the rest of my career was going to be easy.

MS: Did you have any impressions about the specific pieces in the show? Were there surprises?

BN: It was just very gratifying. It was a relief to actually see some experimental work. Not that I was unaware because Fichter was doing pretty crazy things, although, they weren't sculptural. *Photography into Sculpture* didn't blow my mind. Let's put it that way. There were some materials that I was envious of. I wished that I'd known about how to do vacuum forming. Obviously, several of us had discovered photo-linen already.

MS: Would you like to comment on subject matter or themes in your work in *Photography into Sculpture*?

BN: *Pleasant Pasture II* was just a pleasant landscape. It wasn't like heavy duty or anything. At that point, the whole point was the experimentation and the quilting and the idea of making a photographic landscape out of fabric. I hadn't seen anything like it other than Claes Oldenburg. There is no doubt that he was an influence on anyone in art school in the sixties. I liked his work. I liked the humor in it, too.

The portraits were referencing earlier times—daguerreotypes and so forth—although, they were a bit vampy in the way I'm looking with a vintage flapper hat and a velour, peachy colored bathrobe. I did a fair amount of self portraits dressed up in these vintage finds.

MS: What happened after *Photography into Sculpture* opened?

BN: I went to the opening at MoMA and shortly after I got back I had my thesis show and oral defense. I had work in my show like the work I had in *Photography into Sculpture* and it was pretty radical for everybody concerned, including the Painting Department. A lot of the paintings were quilted. I also made etchings on fabric that were sewn. It was a really painful deal. Three hours of people telling me my work was too personal. I sat there. They were doing their job, I guess. I had to be tough to get to that point. There were a fair number of women graduate students but no women studio teachers around when I was a student. To do personal early proto-feminist kind of work when all you had were male teachers was pretty tough. I had to go about it in a persistent, polite, perhaps non-threatening way. There was a lot of humor and irony in my work. As I sat there and these guys were giving me a hard time I remember thinking, "Well, I have work at The Modern. You can't hurt me!" [*Photography into Sculpture* was also on view at The Krannert Art Museum at University of Illinois in Urbana, IL, October 11 – November 8, 1970, shortly after Nettles graduated from there.]

I think one of the differences of being in Los Angeles was having a mentor. I don't think those kinds of leaps would be too hard to take if you were working with Heinecken. Where I was it was considered really bizarre and radical. One of my influences was my grandmother who was kind of a feminist and an artist way before her time in the sense that she just did things at home. She used to machine sew paper together to make books for me or make lampshades out of laced-up Clorox bottles. I saw her using all of these bizarre materials so I knew you could do it.

MS: Was there was anything going on in the Midwest that would have rivaled what was happening in LA at that time?

BN: Oh god, no! No. There probably could have been since Keith Smith was at the School of the Art Institute in Chicago doing his quilts in 1970 but I don't think there was a point person at the SAI for Bunnell.

MS: Did *Photography into Sculpture* prompt discussion among you and your peers?

BN: Not really. I showed my work at George Eastman House in December 1970. That's how I got the job at Rochester Institute of Technology. Some of the RIT people came to the opening or afterwards saw the show and said they were going to have an opening in the photo area and that I should apply.

I wouldn't have known about it otherwise but I applied and got the job. I was at RIT for only a year when William Larson recruited me to go to Tyler School of Art in Philadelphia. All of this movement or momentum was based on my three-dimensional work that people were excited about. It was very unusual work. There was no one in Rochester that I'm aware of that was doing anything like it. Betty Hahn was still doing gum prints on paper when I arrived.

Most of the teachers at RIT thought I was kind of flakey. They weren't rude to me. They just dismissed me. I had one teacher who would just barge in to tell me to be sure to be done because his class was going to start in five minutes. Even in some mainstream media Betty Hahn and I were mixed up and reviewed as Bea Hahn and Betty Nettles. There were teachers at RIT who never learned my name. They called me Betty after she left. It was like, we're two different women. It's worth getting the differences and learning the names.

MS: Did you call yourself a photographer?

BN: No, I called myself an artist.

MS: Were you opposed to calling yourself a photographer?

BN: Most people were! Lee Witkin asked Betty Hahn and me, "Why do you show in photo galleries? You'd be better suited in an art gallery." But I think both of us realized

that we didn't have a chance in an art gallery. It was a big pond and we could maybe survive in the smaller pond of the photo world.

I can't say enough good things about Robert Fichter. What he did for me, in many ways, launched my career. As an undergrad he was my basic photo teacher. There are three major things that he did for me and I always try to make sure that he gets credit. First, Fichter recommended me as Jerry Uelsmann's darkroom assistant. Second, he recommended me to teach photography at Penland in the summer of 1968. Then, he introduced my work to Peter Bunnell, which led to *Photography into Sculpture.* I had driven to see Robert in Indianapolis in March 1970 for a Society for Photographic Education conference. It was there that I showed my slides to Harold Jones who later showed my work at George Eastman House and at Light Gallery. I don't know that I had that much support at [University of] Illinois but I had someone back in Florida who did help me. Everyone has to have someone like that. It's pretty rare that you break into anything without a little bit of help.

Guiseppe (Joe) Pirone

June 20, 2012, by phone from St. Louis, Missouri

Statzer: Could you start by telling me about some pivotal experiences or important influences?

Pirone: I was a photographer in the military, the Air Force. That's how I got interested in photography as a tool. In fact, I was never really interested in photography as an aesthetic pursuit. I sort of got into it sideways.

I got out of the military and continued to take pictures of the family. [We moved around a bit] and then I got accepted at Washington University. While I was there I started taking classes in the art school. I had always sketched and built things but art school was very contagious. I was there on the GI bill. It was against the rules to change my major but I argued with the school that I was in my twenties and a Korean war vet and they couldn't stop me from taking what I wanted to take. I called their bluff and I got to take what I wanted. I essentially got a degree in English Literature with a huge load of art classes. I graduated in 1962 with my bachelors, hung around St. Louis for a while, painting and supporting myself doing photo for the few ad agencies in St Louis. I found commercial photography easy, mindless.

In 1966-67, I moved to New York to paint. It was during the blackouts. The first one was quite festive. It was beautiful. There was this huge full moon over the city and as it

slowly got dark there was a quizzical feeling in the air over the city, like “what is going on?” Finally, people with battery-operated radios found out that there was a huge blackout. By and large, it was absolutely dark. You know, it was great. The intimidating spirit of New York had broken and people were talking to one another. The first blackout was nice but the second one was awful. I had to walk sixty-five blocks to go to work. Then, in December there was a transit strike during freezing cold weather. That's when I thought, “uh uh, I don't want to live here,” and moved to San Francisco.

I really liked Diebenkorn and some of the funky sculpture being made in San Francisco. I went over to SFAI, talked to some people and enrolled in the MFA program in photography because it was easier to get accepted than the painting program. I continued painting but I shifted to making minimalist sculpture. All the while I was still doing commercial photo because that's how I supported myself, much to the chagrin of the "serious" photographers in the department. They didn't like the idea of me doing ads. I worked with Blair Stapp and Jerry Burchard at SFAI. Stapp ran the program. He wasn't a very strong figure so it was kind of a loose program.

I was sort of the odd man out, anyway. The school was divided into the funky street journalists -- the "photography has to have social impact" school -- and they all walked around in their military clothes with cameras slung over their shoulders and canisters of film instead of bullets. And then there were the Don Worth/Minor White mystical guys. I thought both sides were missing the whole point. Art has nothing to do with cults, which I thought Minor White had. I sort of looked beyond all of that and was making sculptures.

One day I thought, “This is kind of stupid. The sculptures I am making are just empty geometric shapes.” I wanted to put something inside of them. I thought about going the way of the surrealists and putting dolls inside but decided against that. Then, I discovered stripping film. It's a commercial lithographic product and it's like a decal. You make your image on it, soak it in water, and then you can lift the image up and put it on anything you want. The piece that was in Bunnell's show was made that way. So I made photo images and put them on glass and then I started playing around with the sculptural concepts like movement through space and how to create a sense of time.

This work, of course, upset a whole lot of people at the SFAI who said, "That's not photography." And I replied, “What are you talking about? I used the camera, right? I used film, right? I used chemicals.” They would argue about it but I just kept on working.

MS: Were you the only one in the photo program who was challenging the faculty at SFAI?

GP: I actually was. My challenge throughout graduate school was whether I was an artist or a photographer. My attitude was if you're a photographer go down to Los Angeles and go to commercial photography school. If you're an artist, shut up and watch what the painters and sculptors were doing. Most of the photographers were very, very parochial. Few of them could draw or even had an interest in drawing. The whole idea of

connecting hand and eye was alien to the photography students, which is why most of them were there anyway. It's been sort of the unspoken maxim of photography that if you could draw, you'd be drawing. That goes way back, way back. I got my MFA degree and as far as I was concerned it was like getting a drivers license. The degree doesn't say, "MFA in photography," it just says, "MFA" and it relates to whatever I was doing.

MS: Do you know how Peter Bunnell found your work?

GP: Bunnell called and wanted to see my work. I don't know how he found out about it, maybe through Robert Heinecken. So he came over and chose two pieces but decided that one of them was too sexual in content and took the one that was less overt. The one he chose was a very small piece, 12" x 12." The logistics of making them large were difficult. I was limited to the size of the stripping film and with glass there was a hell of a weight problem. If I used Plexiglas there were problems getting the images to adhere. Because of those kinds of strictures, the pieces remained small or smallish.

MS: Did you go to the opening of *Photography into Sculpture* in New York or see it elsewhere, or did you experience it only through press coverage?

GP: My piece [*Succubus Three: She Comes and Goes Bump in the Night*] was pretty successful. A lot of the propaganda written for the show used it. I think *TIME* magazine and the *Chicago Tribune* used it. I was in San Francisco when all that happened. It [San Francisco] is a little bubble where the rest of art world doesn't really affect you. I was

never interested in the rest of the art world. I just wanted to make this stuff. I was absolutely fine with that isolation.

MS: Did you consider yourself part of the photo community during the late ‘60s and into the ‘70s? Did you call yourself an artist or a photographer?

GP: I really wasn't that interested in photography in that historic, “I am a photographer” way. I just thought that it was a medium. That was it. I used it for what it was like a lot of conceptual artists did and do. They don't go around saying that they are photographers, but rather an artist and this is what I use. That was a tough call at the Art Institute [SFAI]. When I was teaching there I would give assignments to the students to go out and make images with no film in the camera and they couldn't do it. It was the film that was binding you, not you. That is a problem, isn't it?

I went up to Canada and met Michael deCourcy and hung out with him for a while. He introduced me to people who were using photography as a tool. That was very interesting.

MS: What did you do after *Photography into Sculpture*?

GP: The show went on tour [in 1970] and I left San Francisco and went to Italy for almost eight years. There I started making photo silkscreen prints because that was one way I could make larger photo imagery. Then I thought, “The sculptures are good

enough. Why do I have to put stuff inside them?" So I abandoned the photo imagery and started making three-dimensional pieces. I also slowed down on the painting. The next thing I knew I was just building things, objects.

Before I left for Italy I taught at the Art Institute [SFAI]. Fred Martin hired me. I took it upon myself as a personal mission to get as many students as possible to stop making their stupid photographs and to realize that it wasn't just taking pictures of so and so and talking about who it was and where it was taken. I wanted them to understand that there was a lot of other stuff involved. It worked to a degree but it was an uphill battle to challenge the culture there. Jerry Burchard was a preeminent street photographer and he had a huge following. He made some interesting imagery but he was an undisciplined guy. He had no idea what art and aesthetic philosophy had to do with him and the making of his work. He was just sort of blowing through it all and that model was attractive to a seventeen- or eighteen-year-old art student. Very attractive.

I continued making minimal work and got involved in this whole dialogue, monologue really, between the hand and the machine. So many people were having stuff manufactured for them. I was tying to get somewhere in between, to see the influence of the hand on the object while maintaining the minimalist part of it, as well. I pursued that for years and years and finally the hand won. [laughing]

Douglas Prince

June 20, 2012, by phone from Portsmouth, New Hampshire

Statzer: What were some pivotal experiences or important people who influenced your work? How did you come to make the work that was included in *Photography into Sculpture*?

Prince: The photo sculptures evolved from a couple of things I was interested in. I'd always been interested in miniature environments as a kid. Making realities in shoeboxes and miniature dioramas were always interesting. I made a lot of plastic models of planes and boats, too. That miniature reality was always attractive to me.

Between undergraduate and graduate school (1965) I was living in Des Moines where I met Joe Brown who was a photographer for the VA hospital. He was one of the only people I found in that whole city who understood photography as a fine art. He took me to a darkroom where they used graphic arts film. That was an epiphany. I had never seen film handled that way. Prior to that film had always been something to be put in the camera. The idea of using film in the darkroom and printing on it like a piece of paper was full of possibility. I tried making collages behind the film. I also painted on the back of film like they do in cells for cartoons. I found that I could overlay film over objects. I did a series of those kinds of things.

I had stacked some slides I was putting together and saw the possibility of putting images

together in layers. I was also doing stereo photography at the time. There was an impulse to break out of the flat, two-dimensional photographic print because it never really had any substance. It was just an illusion of space, textures, and objects but I wanted to make a tangible object. I had some ambrotypes. I actually had one that was 5" x 7" that had an image on both sides and mounted so that you could see both sides at once. So it was that kind of thinking. I was also making stereo photographs and presenting them was a challenge. I made Plexiglas boxes with lenses and others that had mirrors in the center and so I had some experience working with Plexiglas from making those.

Also, during World War II my father made freestanding picture frames out of Plexiglas from broken windows that came out of B17s. I had those around the house my whole life but didn't make that connection with my work until I gave a talk at the Annenberg Center last year.

When I was an undergraduate student I went to an electronic surplus supply place up in Cedar Rapids, IA, called Collins Radio. I don't know why I was going there but I just liked the objects. They had some prototype boxes that were about 8" square and 4" deep, Plexiglas boxes that had grooves in the side panels. Circuit boards would slide into these things. I was really attracted to that structure. Some of my very first photo sculptures replicated those boxes. They even had a handle on the top and little rubber feet on the bottom just like those prototypes.

As a student I was also able to spend time with Hans Breder, who was a sculpture

professor at the University of Iowa. At that time he was making cubic, minimal pieces with clear Plexiglas and mirrors. His aesthetic sense and craftsmanship were influential in the growth of my photo-sculpture ideas.

MS: How were you put in touch with Peter Bunnell?

DP: I was teaching at University of Florida with Jerry Uelsmann and Todd Walker. Peter Bunnell and Jerry Uelsmann were good friends, so he would come down to Florida to visit. We would do things like go tubing down the Ichetucknee River together and have parties. I probably brought work to Jerry's house for Peter to see.

MS: What do you remember about your conversations with Bunnell?

DP: I remember him looking at one of the very early photo sculptures. I think it was *Living Room with Dragonflies*. The back panel was open. Peter and I had this discussion about whether it should remain transparent, so that the viewer would look through the photo sculpture and see the environment behind it. I was really more in favor of putting a piece of translucent Plexiglas in the back that closed that environment.

The pieces that had clear backs allowed the viewer to incorporate what was in the room into what they saw in the box. I thought that was distracting. The frosted backs eliminated that but still let in light. There were people like Rauschenberg where the

transparency was part of the whole concept of the piece but I was more about the images and I wanted to maintain control over my image.

Also, I remember having a conversation with Peter about the content of the photo sculptures and he introduced the word, "problematic." I originally started making the sculptures as very realistic. I thought of them as miniature realities. There was a wall and then you would look through the wall because there was a window and there was a landscape. Things were intended to be very real. Then things became more problematic with the juxtaposition of objects that would not necessarily be there logically like the floating fan or seeing clouds through a wall. That was something I remember discussing with Peter, which he encouraged.

MS: Did you see the show? What was that like?

DP: I did see the show. I think I did, that was forty years ago, but I don't think I was there for the opening. I have no memory of that. I remember seeing the work there after it opened. I also saw one of my boxes on display in the permanent collection for a while after the show. It was a little individual box on a pedestal. I appreciated the fact that the carpet was worn bare in front of it where the viewer would stand.

MS: Were there any surprises for you in the show? Clear omissions? Interesting inclusions?

DP: I had this feeling that many people were more involved in the making of the sculpture rather then in the images. I didn't really see myself making a sculpture or a media statement. Maybe that was something that was happening but I was really pursuing the content of the images that I could put together in that format. I continued to work like that for about thirty years, so it was something I was serious about.

MS: A lot of people worked this way only briefly. Was it in *Darkroom 2* [Lustrum Press, 1978] where you mentioned seeing Carl Cheng's photo sculpture in *Artforum*?

DP: When I was a young faculty member at the University of Florida, I saw Carl Cheng's work in a magazine in the University library. I think it was *Art in America*. I remember seeing it and saying, "Damn! He stole my idea." It wasn't that he stole my idea, but that he had a very similar idea and he would be recognized for it. I think it was the guy holding the balloons.

MS: And then Peter Bunnell included both of you in *Photography into Sculpture*.

DP: I think the idea -- and it's an important delusion to have -- that you've discovered something that's never been done before is a great motivation and a great catalyst for doing things but it's very seldom true. Whenever I get a good title I think I really have something but then I Google it and there are twenty thousand people who have already used it.

MS: What was the impact of the show on you or your career?

DP: It was all very positive to be the age that I was at the time and to be in a group show at MoMA. It also perhaps led to certain expectations. I did have some shows at Light Gallery and Witkin so I think it was an entree to those types of gallery exhibits.

MS: Did the show prompt interesting discussions for you and your peers?

DP: I don't think so. About that time I was at University of Florida with Todd [Walker] and Jerry [Uelsmann] and it was standard operating mode. I mean, Todd was doing *Sabatier* prints and photo silkscreen and collotypes, all kinds of things. Jerry was doing his multiple negative printing. I was doing photo sculpture and exploring all of the possibilities that had to do with film. The students were participating in all of that so it was part of the environment. That kind of experimentation was already in place by the time *Photography into Sculpture* happened. The exhibition confirmed and reinforced that way of working.

MS: What was the significance or importance of *Photography into Sculpture*? Did it have a lasting impact?

DP: I think it distilled a creative spirit in photography and changed the direction and future expectations of fine art photography in the twentieth century. A lot of people were just exploring ways of making an image that hadn't been seen before that overview

exhibition. There was probably as much experimentation in the nineteenth century with people doing all kinds of playful things with photographic emulsions, like images on windows or on big buttons. I have a beautiful pocket watch, ca. 1900, that opens up and there's a photographic portrait of a woman on the back. It's a piece of sculpture.

Dale Quarterman

June 19, 2012 by phone from Old Church, Virginia

Statzer: How did you come to make the work that was included in *Photography into Sculpture*?

Quarterman: I was a graduate student in photography at the Illinois Institute of Technology [IIT] with Aaron Siskind and Arthur Siegel. My thesis at IIT was about three-dimensional photographic prints. People in the past had done crazy things in dimensions. It is really quite interesting. I remember going to the Library of Congress and researching old magazines. At the advent of photography the whole idea of the photographic image was wide open so people tried absolutely everything. It wasn't a new idea to put photographs on sculptural forms. They talked about it in these old magazines.

I also did a series of three-dimensional images at IIT. At that time, it was 1969 or so, Peter Bunnell was putting together the show. I don't know how I heard about it but I was already doing this work and then I found out about the show and approached him.

I remember seeing *The Persistence of Vision* [1967] at George Eastman House. I was a student at the time. I grew up in Rochester and whenever I was back in town for the summer or whatever, I would see what was up there. I didn't go there specifically to see the show. I just happened on it. I saw photographers that I had never seen before, like [Jerry] Uelsmann, and it just blew me away. That was really inspirational at the time. I

can remember that show as a, “wow.” It was quite different because people in it were not making traditional photographs.

MS: But most of work in *Persistence of Vision* was not three-dimensional.

DQ: Right, only Robert Heinecken. He did images on blocks that were kind of three-dimensional. Images were stuck on the sides of a dimensional object. But even before I saw that show I was combining multiple images together in different ways. I always liked that kind of experimentation more than the straight photograph.

MS: Were you encouraged to make three-dimensional work at IIT?

DQ: I didn't get a whole lot of encouragement for that but no one was telling me not to do it. I don't really remember whether they liked it. I was interested in it so that's what I pursued.

MS: Who was *Marvella* and how was the piece made?

DQ: She was someone that I knew in Chicago. I have no idea why I did that piece. All of my dimensional pieces were figures. The other one of the nude guys were buddies of mine. I wanted to take some nude shots and no girls would do it. Those were artist friends of mine from Rochester.

I had the idea of what I wanted to do with *Marvella* in my head, so I took the images with that in mind, especially the outside where she is totally clothed. I shot front view, side view, back view. All of my pieces were made with foam core because it was easy to cut and built up in layers. For *Marvella*, the inside was hollow. It was then a matter of attaching the photographs. Some parts were dry mounted but for the curved parts, they were attached with archival glue. Figuring out how to handle the glue without messing up the photographs involved a bit of trial and error. It had to be tacky enough to stick but not so wet that it made the photographs buckle. It was challenging technically but I'm kind of crazy like that. I enjoy that stuff. That is pretty much how most of my pieces were made. I think the first pieces, which were more square, were built over balsa wood frames but that was too laborious. Foam core worked better.

Marvella was reproduced in *TIME* magazine and all over the damn place. That's how art is. If you have an image of something a little bit sensational and a magazine publishes it, the other magazines will, too. It ended up in the *Encyclopedia Britannica Book of the Year 1971*. There it is, *Marvella*. The article talks about current photograph and included work by other photographers like Arthur Tress. Anyway, *Marvella* got around. The other people in the show were probably pissed and saying, "Why are they showing that thing all the time for?" because, you know, there was a lot of good work in that show.

MS: Did you go to the opening in New York? What was that like?

DQ: I didn't make it to the opening but I did see the show at MoMA. I thought it was great -- all of the different people in it and different approaches. Everybody was doing

dimensional work but in totally different ways. That was pretty amazing to me. I, like everybody else, was just doing my own thing, kind of in a vacuum. I don't think that the other people in this show, or most of them, knew what was going on in the country in that genre. It was really neat to see it all together. I knew Robert Heinecken's work prior to that show and I knew Douglas Prince's wonderful little boxes. I'd seen his work somewhere before but most of the other people I didn't know.

MS: Generally speaking, what were you reading, thinking about, studying, listening to or discussing around 1970?

DQ: I was always reading the photo magazines -- probably *Popular Photography, Camera Arts, Aperture,* and *Afterimage*. The *Time Life* series of photography books was great. The volume on different areas of photography came out in the 70s [*The Art of Photography*, 1971]. I read *artscanada* regularly all through the 70s. It was a great magazine. I wasn't a big reader otherwise.

MS: What did you do after *Photography into Sculpture*?

DQ: I did dimensional work for a few years after *Photography into Sculpture* but then I started doing more flat work. It was still sculptural. I would build sets to photograph. They were little sets of ideas. One was influenced by Japanese culture and symbolism. I took a job at Virginia Commonwealth University and taught photography there for many years.

Charles Roitz

July 5, 2012 by phone from Boulder, Colorado

Statzer: How did you come to make *Ecological Anagoge -- Triptych*, the piece that was included in *Photography into Sculpture*?

Roitz: I had just started graduate school at San Francisco State with Jack Welpott. Actually, that piece was done in one of the big city parks there. My major was photography but my minor was sculpture so I was working on both. I thought a lot about the differences in perception that you get from two- and three-dimensional things and what it means to abstract something into specific, important forms. So I was dealing with all of those questions. That piece was the first photography into sculpture piece that I made. I did about six more after that. I made it on my kitchen table in my apartment on Guerrero Street. It was memorable. That was a wonderful time in my life.

MS: What was your experience at San Francisco State?

Welpott let people do what they wanted and he would analyze it but he was never specific in telling you what you should do. He was pretty open-minded. I think that profited a lot of people. He was a good teacher and a good guy.

MS: Did you attend the opening or get to see the show? Where did you see it?

CR: I never got to see the show. I wish that I had. I was probably busy having a baby or something. By that time I was in Boulder and working full time. I had a lot of good years teaching there. My graduate students are teaching all over the place now.

MS: Peter Bunnell included only brief discussions of subject matter in his writing about the show. Would you like to comment on that or what concerned you at the time?

CR: My piece has a spiritual basis. For one thing it's a triptych and the triptych idea seems to come from icons. An icon is not specific but a general statement of form. In later years I had a school of sacred arts in Santa Fe. Everything I did was on the spiritual path, seeking out knowledge, and drawing from what I had done in the past and personal experiences. An anagoge is anything that leads you up. An icon is an anagoge but so is the church. This piece also has to do with race. I think the kid pictured in the piece is a minority.

MS: Did you have any conversations with your peers about *Photography into Sculpture*?

CR: I don't remember having any conversations with my peers about the show. They were all into straight photography. We started a group called the Visual Dialogue Foundation. Several of us would get together and talk, including Leland Rice, Linda Conner and Judy Dater. It was a straight photo group. We came together in graduate school and were a close-knit group. It was a good thing to do. We talked about our work and had shows together.

MS: In your estimation, what was the impact of *Photography into Sculpture?*

CR: I think it had an impact on the field. It sent some people in different directions but most photographers that I knew were still pretty straight. By the way, I was still taking straight photos while I was making photo sculptures.

MS: What kind of work did you pursue after *Photography into Sculpture*?

CR: I kept doing the photo sculptures when I got to University of Colorado in 1970. I got a milling machine and a lathe so I could cut my own stuff. I did it several years after *Photography into Sculpture* and I had an exhibition at the Denver Art Museum in 1974 called *Charles Roitz: Photographs and Photosculpture.* I'm tempted to get back into it. Now there are machines that have incredible possibilities that use lasers to cut three-dimensional objects from two-dimensional images.

Michael Stone

August 28, 2012, Santa Fe, New Mexico

Statzer: What were some pivotal experiences or influences that helped you to arrive at the work in *Photography into Sculpture*?

Stone: I loved TV as a kid. When I was little I watched baseball, basketball and the noontime TV matinees that showed old movies. Los Angeles, where I grew up, is TV and Hollywood. When you drive down the streets in LA most of the billboards depict TV shows, movies or some sort of entertainment event. Nowhere else is it like that. Well, maybe in New York.

My father was an architectural and industrial draftsman at Douglas Aircraft. He always wanted to be an architect. He let me play with his drafting tools and X-acto knives when I was very young. I am sure I was still in grammar school at the time. I would rubber cement magazine images to illustration board and make cutouts with an X-acto knife. I wanted to create something in three dimensions with layers. I see this emerging later when I was in the graduate program at UCLA. My layered piece of mountains in Photography into Sculpture exhibits this theme or technique from my past.

Like my father, I also thought I wanted to be an architect. I studied architecture at Berkeley for a semester but got homesick and came back to LA where I enrolled at UCLA. Campus was a fifteen-cent bus ride from where I lived in West LA. The

Industrial Design program in the Art Department was the closest thing I could find to architecture at the time. That program was very intimidating for me. Henry Dreyfuss was Professor Emeritus and in charge of the program. He was commemorated on a postage stamp for his design work [1930s through 1970s]. Dreyfuss would come to our reviews. A suit and tie was the dress code. I was very intimidated by the whole thing and did a poor job of communicating my ideas. Looking back, the work I did was pretty good. I just did not have the confidence to pursue that field.

Luckily, Industrial Design students were required to take a photography course. I was a senior at the time. I took my first photo class from Pat O'Neill, did well, and was enjoying the process. I spent one year in the Industrial Design graduate program. During that time I took advanced photo study courses from Robert Heinecken. I started making my black, layered boxes. I was hooked and applied for the fine arts graduate program with an emphasis on photography. I was accepted along with Ellen Brooks and Robbert Flick.

My time in Industrial Design proved very important because I learned how to make things and it helped me to combine photography and sculpture. Industrial design has a lot to do with packaging design and my work at that time in the photography graduate program had to do with making sculpture that looked like they were store-bought or commercially packaged items. Carl Cheng's vacuum-formed figures were an inspiration, too. [Cheng also studied industrial design at UCLA.]

I lived with Robert Fichter and his wife at the time, Marjorie Jordan, for a year-and-a-half. They had a really big influence on me because I met a lot of people who came to visit Robert and Marjorie. Robert was a very creative artist and encouraged me to try many things. We had big gatherings at the house where we lived in Culver City. Fichter had a lot of acquaintances that we socialized with, for example, Fred Parker who was photography curator at the newly finished Pasadena Art Museum (now the Norton Simon Art Museum). Fred liked my TV work and put me in a couple of shows he organized there. Parker created a great collection of photographs. The collection was recently published in the book The Collectible Moment. I remember meeting Nathan Lyons, Robert Sobieszek, Todd Walker, Walter Chappell and of course Peter Bunnell at Fichter's. There were many others that I cannot recall.

MS: What was it like to be Robert Heinecken's student?

Stone: Heinecken didn't teach us much technology. There was one session on exposure, one on developing negatives, and one on printing. That was it. If I wanted to make a technically good photograph, I had to learn it on my own. I think this minimal technology attitude was stressed by the academics in the art department at UCLA. We were not learning a trade but studying art. Heinecken was concerned about his students developing their own vision and encouraged us to explore. He could look at and communicate about our work for hours. He was a good teacher and instilled an attitude about quality in our art without emphasizing technology.

Lee Friedlander came to teach for a quarter while Robert Heinecken was a visiting instructor somewhere else. Lee could not grasp the work that was coming out of the graduate program. To Friedlander, we were not photographers. He was a good photographer and he was also a very nice man, just a wonderful person, but he wanted us to make photographs. Another visiting artist was Keith Smith. Things were not so rocky with Keith.

MS: How were you put in touch with Peter Bunnell? Did he visit your studio? Do you remember your conversation with him?

Stone: I seem to remember that it was Fichter who introduced me to Bunnell but it was probably Fichter and Heinecken. I was very nervous about Bunnell coming out to visit. Here comes this guy in a suit and tie from the Museum of Modern Art. I did my best to overwhelm him, at least that's what I tried to do. I just kept on talking and talking. I talked more then than I'd ever talked before. It turns out that I didn't need to do that, but it was such an exciting moment, and I had my fingers crossed that I would be accepted. I think that this was the first time that I communicated to someone outside of the graduate program what my work was about.

MS: What was your experience leading up to the show?

Stone: I remember the opening night of my Masters thesis show in the art gallery at UCLA. Ellen Brooks, Robbert Flick, and I finished during the same semester but our

thesis exhibits were held at different times. The thesis exhibits were made up of one person from each program in the art department. So there would be one photographer, one painter, one sculptor, one designer and so on. On my opening night, this older woman came up to me at the opening and said, "You stole this idea from somebody in New York at the Museum of Modern Art." She just would not believe that it was my work that she had seen there. We argued for a long time. I don't know who she was but she was obviously well traveled and had probably seen a lot of art. I never convinced her.

On the afternoon of my thesis show opening and just having finished the installation, a newscaster came by with a TV film crew. He filmed other thesis shows but he seemed to be attracted to what I was doing. We spent a long time talking about the politics of my art. I'm sure I was crucifying then-governor Ronald Reagan as he was in several of my pieces. There was Nixon, too. The newscaster seemed to agree with my views. The video was going to be a segment on the news but the reporter had a heart attack the next day. He survived it but he didn't come back to work for a month so I missed the showing on the news. Somebody said that they saw it in Northern California but I never got to see it. It was a local network affiliate. That was my 15 minutes of fame and I missed it!

MS: What was the impact of the show on you or your career?

Stone: It was the MoMA! It was very exciting and important to me. Having grown up unsure of who I was, being in that show kind of put me over the top. I don't brag about it but how many people get to be in MoMA?

MS: Were you interested in books, film, or music? What aspect of popular culture might have informed your work? Were you involved with politics?

Stone: The movies *Blow Up* and *MASH* were a big deal. So was *2001*. The music was great too. I participated in a lot of the anti war marches and I spent a lot of time convincing friends that what was going on in Vietnam was... Actually, I became radicalized in high school. It was the Cuban Missile Crisis that turned me around or made me political. My sister and brother in law were twelve years older and very liberal. They introduced me to a lot of things, for example they got me a subscription to *I.F. Stone's Weekly*. I.F. Stone was great. He would publish a four-page leaflet that would take articles from various sources, putting them together in a way that proved contradictions in government propaganda. Then there was *The Nation* and *The New Republic*. Vietnam and the draft was a scary time because I didn't want to go. I participated in a lot of anti war demonstrations but I didn't burn my draft card because I was scared of that kind of stuff. My photo sculpture was political. There was a lot of anti-Reaganism and anti-Vietnam in my work. The big bag piece I made depicts Tom Redden who was a very right wing police chief from LA turned newscaster [cover]. I did a piece with Nixon, too. A lot of the things I made depicted figures from the political right. I felt good about expressing my frustrated political and social views through my art and still do.

MS: What kinds of work did you make after *Photography into Sculpture*?

Stone: I made TV and sculptural works into the late 70s, which is probably longer than most of the participants in *Photography into Sculpture*.

I moved to Washington after I graduated from UCLA in 1971. There I continued to make photo sculptures until about 1978. My residence was in a remote area of Eastern Washington. Packing and shipping the sculpture was very time consuming, so I started making two- dimensional flat images, still using the photographic process. The carry over to two-dimensional photographic images retained many of the ideas and visual elements of the sculptural pieces. For example, hand coloring, toning, toy airplanes and cars photographed instead of installed in pieces. And more recently, with the advent of Adobe Photoshop, I have been able to more freely express my vision using layered composites and color– modern day X-acto cutouts and layers. And, the political satire certainly continues.

Ted (Theodisus)Victoria

April 30, 2012, New York, NY

Statzer: Would you like to start by talking about graduate school and your teacher Robert Watts, who was also in *Photography into Sculpture*?

Victoria: I'd like to go back a little further to undergraduate school. I really had no relationship to photography whatsoever. I studied painting with Ilya Bolostowsky at SUNY New Paltz. I studied printmaking there, too, which led me to photography. I learned photo silkscreen, kind of like Rauschenberg, and photolithography. For my senior thesis I made a series of prints based on *The Ghent Altarpiece*. [...] I was really involved with printmaking.

MS: Who was teaching there?

TV: Reggie Neal. He showed in New York and set up one of first photo silkscreen workshops. This was just post-Pop and everything. Warhol, Rosenquist, and Rauschenberg were using photo imagery. I was kind of influenced by them.

Back in undergraduate school I was doing color separations. They would look like regular prints on the wall but I started putting lights behind them. It's funny, in *Photography into Sculpture* there are a lot of people doing what I was doing five years earlier. I was making similar work to Douglas Prince in undergraduate school, with

transparencies and all, although my imagery was a little risqué.

I became interested in solar energy. In fact, I was in an exhibition at the Museum of Contemporary Crafts where I made a sound piece using natural energy. Way back then it was very difficult to even find solar batteries. I finally found a place in Wisconsin that sent me a couple of them. They were really expensive. My thesis show was based on using natural energy, primarily the sun.

MS: How did you come to make *View*, the work in *Photography into Sculpture*?

TV: I was in New Brunswick during my second year in graduate school at Rutgers. I had a box of Howard Johnson's macaroni and cheese, I think. I put it in the oven and there was a little flap on the box that said, Experiments for Children 8-12 years old. If you take a magnifying glass and a piece of wax paper and hold the magnifying glass up to the window and hold the wax paper behind, you will project an upside down image of whatever is outside the window. I tried it and said, "Holy shit, look at that!" Now, if I had known anything about photography I would have realized that this was a box camera. I thought, “My god that's unbelievable.” It was utilizing the sun. The first thing I did was build a box out of cardboard and put it in the window. I could see people walking by, upside down, and noticed they had a skip and a hop in their step, whatever. I still have a photograph of that somewhere. That was the premise for the piece in *Photography into Sculpture*.

The funny thing is that when I did that experiment with the wax paper and everything, it was about six months later someone told me that I was making *camera obscuras* so I started doing research on them. That got me very interested in the early history of photography. I read *The Latent Image* and really enjoyed that book. I also liked very early photographs, how rough and crude they looked. They were really raw, grainy images like what people are trying to do now digitally.

MS: How did you meet Bunnell?

TV: I still, to this day, don't know how Bunnell found out about my work. Maybe Bob Watts told him that he knew a kid doing *camera obscuras*, not that I was calling them that.

MS: How did he choose that particular piece?

TV: They were all so simple at the time. Later I started making large ones for about two years. I did a piece at University of Iowa that had these huge screens, 5 feet in diameter. I was projecting *camera obscura* images onto them. It was a beautiful piece showing the Iowa River and an inverted tree.

MS: What was in front of the piece at MoMA? What would the viewer have seen had they looked through it?

TV: The [sculpture] courtyard. We moved it to a place in the gallery to maximize sunlight. You need really strong light for *camera obscuras*.

MS: Why did you make the boxes out of plexiglas?

TV: I made them out of wood sometimes and plexiglas. There was a reason that I made the one in *Photography into Sculpture* and others that followed out of plexiglas. I wanted to have this image floating and I didn't want it to look like it was hiding wires coming through the pedestal. I wanted to show that there were no wires so I had it on a clear pedestal. There was no such thing as video projection at the time but I didn't want to it to be confused with television or anything like that.

MS: Your piece was so minimal and clean. I could make a leap to someone like Larry Bell or Donald Judd. Should I make that leap, is that valid?

TV: I was very aware of Bell's work but I never associated his work with mine. He did a totally different thing. For example, to get that material put on the glass he needed a piece of equipment worth $60,000 or something. I think they use that material on jet planes. They were very beautiful, subtle, minimalist pieces. I made no connection with Bell, Judd, or any of the minimalists.

MS: Did you ever consider taking the pieces off the base to be held and interacted with?

TV: Oh yeah. I found these little wood boxes made in Poland. I made them into *camera obscuras*. They were so simple but people were wowed by them. You could point it anywhere.

MS: Did you go to the opening of *Photography into Sculpture*?

TV: Of course. Are you kidding? It was at the Modern! At the time, I didn't realize how important that was. It was a great opening. Of course, it was at night and my piece didn't work in low light so people were walking around it saying, "What the hell is that?" You could see a few lights but that was it. That's part of why I later got into pieces where I could control the light.

MS: That must have been frustrating.

TV: Oh yeah. What Bunnell was doing at the time… that was quite a show. I don't think a lot of people realized it at the time, that *Photography into Sculpture* was a historical show. There were a lot of other works in it that were more sculptural than mine and using real photography. I loved it. My piece is so simple, not to put down my piece, but I was just starting to do that kind of thing. The idea stayed with me.

MS: Did you have any other impressions of *Photography into Sculpture*? Anything that surprised you?

TV: Well, again a lot of the work was like what I had been doing for years before that in undergraduate school. I thought that maybe I should have kept doing them. They looked like salable things! Especially those transparency things. Who was the guy who did the tabletop?

MS: Richard Jackson. Are you talking about his piece *Negative Numbers*?

TV: I remember being very impressed by that. Watts had a beautiful piece in the show. When I was a student I did silkscreen for him. He was doing very pop things like printing genitals on underwear. They were Fluxus objects. Watts was my sculpture teacher. I knew him quite well.

MS: Did Watts talk about the idea of integrating photography with sculpture?

TV: No, but he used a lot of photography. He was a strange guy […] but he wasn't difficult. He was very supportive of my work. He never really gave you answers but was more of a catalyst. He just sort of threw things out to see if you would run with it. Other instructors would say things like, "There's too much red in there. Take it out." Watts got you thinking more. I'd walk out of a critique and say, "What the hell did he say?" It would bug the hell out of me for a couple of days and then I'd put it together.

The thing with Rutgers was that we were right on top of New York. Rutgers was probably one of the greatest places to be in terms of graduate school, better than Yale.

When I was there Bob was very much involved with Fluxus. George Maciunas lived right up the street so they were constantly going into his studio and took people with them. Jon Hendricks was there. There was a big Fluxus contingent. Allen Kaprow taught there two years before I arrived. He supposedly did his first performance there. Rutgers has a unique history. Hans Haacke was teaching there. It was really a good place to be. Everyone was pretty supportive of one another.

MS: What were you reading around the time you were making the work in *Photography into Sculpture*? What movies were you seeing? What music...?

TV: I remember music, primarily. We would come into New York and it was such a heavy music scene. I remember when I bought the first Velvet Underground album with [Warhol's] banana on it. Once I moved into New York, I used to go to Max's Kansas City all of the time. You could go upstairs for five dollars and see Iggy Pop. It was unbelievable. It was in a space this size!

MS: I don't want to forget to ask you about your piece in *Photography into Sculpture* getting damaged. Were you asked to remake it?

TV: I think it was the third day after the show opened and some kid ran into the piece. I thought it was taped down, and I think it was, but he just smashed it. Remember the base was pretty invisible. I got a phone call from Peter and I remade it right away. When I got the insurance settlement from MoMA there was enough left over that I was able to buy

this place [his loft in SoHo, 1971].

MS: What kind of work did you make after *Photography into Sculpture*?

TV: I really wanted to get away from walking into an installation in a dark room. I wanted to make them like moving pictures on the wall. They are beautiful images. They have no grain to them, they are live, the color is true, and they still exist that way.

The piece at the Museum of Contemporary Crafts was a whole room of projections of what was outside the building being projected on the inside of this huge room. I also did a piece with Ernie, my brother-in-law, where he was locked up in a *camera obscura* all day. He took food and beer inside. There was Ernie upside down playing his guitar, eating, and writing letters.

I did a piece at 112 Greene Street where I brought the sky down to the basement. I got to the point where I had three different lenses sending in three different images to make *camera obscura* photomontages.

MS: Did you show your work in other photography exhibitions or venues?

TV: I liked being in photography shows. I especially liked showing at the George Eastman House [*Telling Stories*, George Eastman House, 1998].

Lynton (Lyn) Wells

March 31, 2012, New York, NY

Statzer: What were some pivotal experiences or important people who influenced your work? How did you come to make the work that was included in *Photography into Sculpture*?

Wells: When I was in high school, I would go to the Five Spot Café where I heard Thelonious Monk. It was great. Are you kidding? All this strange weird music? I would get an upper classman to drive me into the city because I only had a learner's permit. $1.50 beers, no one bothers you, and you can sit there and listen to this stuff. I asked my friend what he thought and he said that it was creepy -- all those big black guys in those funny hats. I thought, "What are you talking about?" Nobody bothered us! They were happy we were there. But it was the fifties with the man in the gray flannel suit and lots of conformity. Most people my age didn't go outside of what they knew or their environment. That stayed with me forever.

Another thing that happened before I went to college, about 1957, was Jack Kerouak moved to town with his mother and lived right next to one of my high school classmates. He introduced me to Kerouak. We got along well and I spent the summer with him. He sent me to New York to meet Allen Ginsberg and Peter Orlovsky. We would hang out and get drunk and stoned. My parents were concerned but I was seventeen and already had a job and a car. I was good in math and art so I made a deal with my parents that I

would go to art school and study industrial design.

MS: How were you put in touch with Peter Bunnell?

LW: I read Peter Bunnell's article in *Art in America* ["Photographs as Sculpture and Prints" Sept-Oct, 1969]. I think I wrote him a note saying that I was making some sculpture out of photography and mailed it with a slide.

MS: Did you go to the opening in New York? What was that like?

LW: I don't know whether they had a particular opening or not but I remember going to see the exhibition. It was strange. I remember sending Erwin [the man depicted in his piece] up to go see it. I told him, "Everyone is walking past looking at you in the gallery at MoMA!" He was happy! [laughing]

MS: Were there any surprises for you in the show?

LW: I had no idea that any of this stuff was going on until Peter told me about it. Absolutely no idea whatsoever, except when I read his article in *Art in America*. At that point photorealism and a whole bunch of other things that had to do with photography were out there. Photography was entering the art world in a different way.

MS: What was the impact of the show on you or your career?

LW: It was fine to have a show at MoMA except that *Photography into Sculpture* didn't make that big of an impact here in New York. It had more of an impact on the rather small photography world. But for me to get the work out of the studio and into a public space, that was a big deal. A month after *Photography into Sculpture* opened I showed the photo linen figures at The Walker Art Center. Martin Friedman curated a show called *Figures/Environments* and included me. I remember getting on a plane with Alex Katz and his wife to Minneapolis to install the work. I met Paul Thek who was also in the show. That was really interesting. He was crazy but we got along pretty well and hung out together. I met Duane Hansen, Alex Katz and Red Grooms but I mostly hung out with Paul. It was fun and it was the first time that I talked to local people from the community about my work. It's a good museum. They helped me with the installation and were very kind but the whole time it was as if I was sitting on my own shoulder, watching all of this happen. I thought, "This is what it is like if you go public, in a sense. This is what an artist's life is like." Paul was like me in that he wasn't fooled by it at all. He talked about going to Italy in the summer and doing small paintings like Vinny van Gogh. [laughing]

MS: Generally speaking, what were you reading, thinking about, studying, listening to or discussing at the time?

LW: I've always read a lot. I was interested in philosophy in school but didn't take any classes. I'm probably the only person you'll meet who got through *Being and Nothingness*. [laughing] I was reading Pynchon, Henry James, Stendhal, Gogol, Russians of course, Tolstoy. In contemporary fiction – Kurt Vonnegut, *Catch 22* – stuff that was a

little further out, at that point, than normal. Now I'm reading a book about Rome by Robert Hughes. I spent a year in Rome my last year at Rhode Island School of Design. When I was there I went to see the *Portrait of Innocent X* by Diego Velázquez at the Doria Pamphili Gallery. I think that changed my life. If he had the guts to make that painting, why not go for it?

MS: What was the significance or importance of *Photography into Sculpture*? Did it have a lasting impact?

LW: It wasn't what the photography community expected it to be. I thought that there were a number of people that were interested in taking photography to a different place, seeing if you could stretch the boundaries of this medium, which is just after all a medium. I mean we aren't in Paris when Atget was taking pictures. We were starting somewhere, exploring it, and hoping to make it count.

MS: Could you talk about the content of your piece in *Photography into Sculpture*?

LW: Besides making photo linen figures of Erwin [who was an artist who had a studio in the same building; fig. 79] and my mother and father I was doing all of these characters that were sort of made out of pixie dust. You know, sort of *Alice in Wonderland*, that was something "other." They were characters in imagined scenarios more than anything touching on reality.

MS: What did you do after *Photography into Sculpture*?

LW: I stopped making figures but continued to use photo linen. I was in the *Whitney Biennial* around 1973 or something like that. People were responding to the work very well. I remember lots of people calling and writing to me about photo linen and asking for technical information. At one point I had so many requests that I wrote up a sheet that I could send out so that I wouldn't have to explain it every time.

CONCLUSION

This dissertation has three primary goals. First, it recovers the 1970 MoMA exhibition *Photography into Sculpture* from the obscurity of footnotes and brief mentions in texts that survey 1960s and early-1970s American photography. An archival record of the exhibition, absent before now, has been created

Second, this dissertation provides an extensive oral history of *Photography into Sculpture*. Peter Bunnell details his experiences as a curator of photography at the Museum of Modern Art. Notably, there was no exhibition catalogue prepared for *Photography into Sculpture* and very few of the artists in the exhibition were asked about their three-dimensional photo objects at the time or during the intervening decades. The oral history fills that gap by including interviews with seventeen out of the twenty-three exhibition artists. With the benefit of hindsight, they reflect on the exhibition as well as their own work and ideas.

Last, the archival record and oral history are combined with other scholarly sources to inform the critical analysis found throughout the dissertation. Chapter I grapples with the question of why *Photography into Sculpture* merits this sustained study. Chapter II elaborates on and clarifies the intentions and strategies used by Peter Bunnell and the artists represented in *Photography into Sculpture,* including a nuanced take on Bunnell's view of medium specificity. Robert Heinecken is revealed to be a pioneering spokesman for experimental photography in the U.S. in Chapter III. All chapters lead to the conclusion that American photographers and photo curators posed significant challenges to photographic modernism during the 1960s and 1970s.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Center for Creative Photography

Robert Heinecken Archive

Society for Photographic Education Archive

Oral History Collection, William Johnson interview with Peter Bunnell, February 24, 1979

Oral History Collection, lecture by Peter Bunnell, "The Will to Style: Observations on Aspects of Contemporary Photography," February 1979

Collection of Peter C. Bunnell, Princeton, NJ

Collection of Nathan Lyons, Rochester, NY

Archive of the Museum of Modern Art, New York

Photography as Printmaking, Registration and Exhibition Files

Photography into Sculpture, Registration and Exhibition Files

George Eastman House, Rochester, NY

Persistence of Vision, Exhibition Files

Vision and Expression, Exhibition Files

New Topographics, Exhibition Files

Other Sources

Phoenix Art Museum Exhibition Files

San Francisco Museum of Modern Art Archives

UCLA Slide Collection

Princeton University Slide Collection

LensWork online, Brooks Jensen interviewing Carl Chiarenza, 2008

Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, Robert Watts Papers

Conversations with the Author

Carl Chiarenza, September 2014 and November 2014

Nathan Lyons, August 2014 and November 2014

Philip Martin, 2011-2014

Joyce Neimanas, November 2014

Douglas Nickel, March 2014

Marcia Resnick, July 2014

Jerry Uelsmann, August 2014

Books and Articles

Adams, Ansel. *Ansel Adams: An Autobiography*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1985.

Ault, Julie. *Alternative Art New York, 1965-1985*. New York: The Drawing Center; with Minneapolis, MN and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

Baetens, Jan and Heidi Peeters, "Hybridity: The Reverse of Photographic Medium Specificity?" *History of Photography* 31, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 3-10.

Batchen, Geoffrey. "Cancellation." In *The Last Picture Show: Artists Using Photography 1960-1982*, edited by Douglas Fogle, 177-82. Exhibition catalogue. Minneapolis: Walker Art Center, 2003.

Beckenstein, Joyce. "Ted Victoria: Only the Object is Real." *Sculpture* 29, no. 6 (July-August, 2010): 34-9.

Belz, Carl I. "The Photography of Robert Heincken." *Camera* 47 (January, 1968): 6-13.

Biro, Matthew. "Reality Effects: Matthew Biro on the Art of Robert Heinecken," *Artforum* 50, vol. 2 (October 2011): 250-59.

Bohn-Spector, Claudia and Sam Mellon. *Speaking in Tongues: Wallace Berman and Robert Heinecken 1961-1976*. Exhibition catalogue. Pasadena, CA: Armory Center for the Arts, 2011.

Bolton, Richard, ed. *The Contest of Meaning: Critical Histories of Photography*. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 1989.

Brandow, Todd and William Ewing. *Edward Steichen: Lives in Photography.* Minneapolis: Foundation for the Exhibition of Photography; and Lausanne: Musée de l'Elysée: in association with New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2007.

Bunnell, Peter C. *Lynton Wells: Paintings 1971-1978*. Princeton, NJ: The Art Museum, Princeton University, 1979.

--------."Photography as Printmaking." In *Degrees of Guidance: Essays on Twentieth-Century American Photography*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

--------."Photographs as Sculpture and Prints." *Art in America* 57, no. 5 (September-October, 1969): 56-61.

--------."Photography into Sculpture." *artscanada* 27, no. 3, issue no. 144/145 (June 1970): 21-29.

--------."Photography into Sculpture." *Arts in Virginia* 11, no. 3 (Spring 1971): 18 – 25.

--------."Photography into Sculpture." *Creative Camera*, no. 72 (June 1970): 190-91.

--------."Photography into Sculpture." In *Degrees of Guidance: Essays on Twentieth-Century American Photography*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

--------."Photography into Sculpture." *Members Newsletter*, no. 8, Museum of Modern Art (Spring 1970): np.

--------."Remembering L.A." In *The Collectible Moment: The Photography Collection of the Norton Simon Museum*, edited by Gloria Williams Sander, 74-7. Pasadena, CA: Norton Simon Foundation, 2006.

Carroll, Noel. "The Specificity of Media in the Arts." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 19, no. 4 (Winter, 1985): 5-20.

Chiarenza, Carl. "Carl Chiarenza, from an unpublished article, September, 1976." In *Robert Heinecken*, edited by James Enyeart. Exhibition catalogue. Carmel, CA: Friends of Photography and New York: Light Gallery, 1980.

Coleman, A.D. "Hybridization: A Photographic Tradition." In *Tarnished Silver: After the Photo Boom: Essays and Lectures* (New York: Midmarch Arts Press, 1996), 153-160.

--------."Money, Space, and Time: Or the Curator as Juggler." *In Light Readings: A Photography Critic's Writings 1968-1978* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 63-68. First published in the *New York Times*, June 6, 1971.

--------."Photography at MoMA: A Brief History." 98-106. *In Tarnished Silver: After the Photo Boom: Essays and Lectures* (New York: Midmarch Arts Press, 1996), 98-106.

--------."Photography: Recent Activity." In *Light Readings: A Photography Critic's Writings 1968-1978* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 158-60. First published in *Popular Photography*, December 1973.

--------."Sheer Anarchy, Or a Step Forward?" *New York Times* (April 12, 1970): D-30. Later published in *Light Readings*, 28-31.

--------."Who Will Be the Replacements?" In *Light Readings: A Photography Critic's Writings 1968-1978* (New York: Oxford University press, 1979), 103-105. First published in the *New York Times*, May 7, 1972.

Curran, Darryl. *Darryl Curran Photographs 1967-1981*. Exhibition catalogue. Alta Loma, CA: Chaffey Community College, 1982.

--------."Notes on a Southern California Photography Community." In *The Collectible Moment: The Photography Collection of the Norton Simon Museum*, edited by Gloria Williams Sander, 79-81. Pasadena, CA: Norton Simon Foundation, 2006.

--------.Interview about the exhibition The Photographic Object, Le Consortium, Dijon, France. Vimeo.com/70275725.

Desmarais, Charles. *Proof: Los Angeles Art and the Photograph 1960-1980*. Exhibition catalogue. Laguna Beach, CA: Laguna Art Museum, 1992.

Durant, Mark Alice, ed. *Robert Heinecken: A Material History*. Tucson, AZ: Center for Creative Photography, 2003.

Eisinger, Joel. *Trace and Transformation: American Criticism of Photography in the Modernist Period*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1995.

Enyeart, James, ed. *Heinecken*. Exhibition catalogue. Carmel, CA: Friends of Photography, and NY: Light Gallery, 1980.

Euclaire, Sally. *The New Color Photography*. New York: Abbeville Press, 1981.

Fried, Michael. "Art and Objecthood." *Artforum* 5, no. 10 (June 1967): 12-23.

Friedman, Martin. "Lynton Wells." In *Figures Environments*, 28-9. Exhibition catalogue. Minneapolis: Walker Art Center, 1970.

Gefter, Philip. "The Next Big Picture." *New York Times* (January 26, 2014): AR1.

--------."View from a Judgment Seat: Quentin Bajac in conversation with Philip Gefter." *Aperture* (Winter 2013): 57-60.

Green, Jonathan. *American Phtography: A Critical History 1945 to the Present*. New York: Abrams, 1984.

Greenberg, Clement. *Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism*. 4 vols. Edited by John O'Brian. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Grundberg, Andy. "Robert Heinecken: Artist Who Juxtaposed Photographs, Is Dead at 74." *New York Times* (May 22, 2006).

Hagen, Charles. "Robert Heinecken: An Interivew." *Afterimage* 3, no. 10 (April 1976): 8-12.

Heinecken, Robert. "Introduction." In *Celebrating Two Decades in Photography: Recent Work by UCLA/MFA Recipients*. Exhibition catalogue. Los Angeles: Grunwald Center for the Graphic Arts, UCLA, 1985.

--------."Painters on Photography." Lecture, Symposium on the History of Photography, co-sponsored by George Eastman House and the Society for Photographic Education, Rochester, NY, November 27-28, 1964. Robert Heinecken Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ.

--------."The Photograph: Not a picture of but an object about something." In *21st Annual Art Directors Show*. Exhibition Catalogue. Los Angeles: Art Directors Club of Los Angeles, 1965. Reproduced in *Robert Heinecken: Object Matter*, edited by Eva Respini, 155. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2014.

--------."A Record of Creative Work in the Field of Graphic Design." Masters thesis. University of California, Los Angeles, 1960.

--------."Manipulative Photography" also titled "Equal Rights for Crooked Photography (Possibilities and Aims of Manipultion)." Lecture, Symposium on the Teaching of Photography, sponsored by the Society for Photographic Education, Chicago, IL, December 28, 1965. Society for Photographic Education Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ.

--------."Manipulative Photography." Lecture, George Eastman House Advanced Studies Workshop, Rochester, NY, August 3-31, 1967. Published later in *Contemporary Photographer* 5, no. 4 (1967): np.

Hirsch, Robert. "Flexible Images: Handmade American Photography, 1969-2002." *Exposure* 36, no. 1 (2003): 27-29.

--------.Seizing the Light: A Social History of Photography. New York: McGraw Hill, 2000.

--------.*Transformational Imagemaking: Handmade Photography Since 1960*. Burlington, MA: Focal Press, 2014.

Jay, Bill and Henri Barendse. *Light and Substance*. Exhibition catalogue. New Mexico: University of New Mexico Art Museum, 1974.

Jenkins, Janet. *In the Spirit of Fluxus*. Exhibition catalogue. Minneapolis, MN: Walker Art Center, 1993.

Jenkins, William. "The Extended Document: An Investigation of Information and Evidence in Photographs." In *The Extended Document*. Exhibition catalogue. Rochester, NY: George Eastman House, 1975.

--------."Introduction." In *New Topographics: Photographs of a Man-Altered Landscape.* Exhibition catalogue. Rochester, NY: George Eastman House, 1976.

Kahnweiler, Daniel Henry. *The Rise of Cubism*. In "1911: Picasso and Braque Develop Analytical Cubism," in *Art Since 1900*, edited by Hal Foster, Rosalind Krauss, Yve-Alain Bois, and Benjamin H.D. Buchloh, 107. New York: Thames and Hudson, 2004.

Kienholz, Lyn and Elizabeth Belinski and Corrine Nelson. *L.A. Rising: SoCal Artists Before 1980.* Los Angeles: California International Arts Foundation, 2010.

Klausner, Betty. *Carl Cheng, John Doe Co., Twenty-Five Year Survey*. Exhibition catalogue. Santa Barbara: Santa Barbara Contemporary Arts Forum, 1991.

Kramer, Hilton. "Modern Museum Displays Photography as Sculpture." *New York Times* (April 9, 1970): 50.

Krauss, Rosalind and other authors. "Photography: A Special Issue" *October* 5 (Summer 1978).

Krauss, Rosalind. "Photography's Discursive Spaces." In *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths*, 131-50. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 1986.

--------."Reinventing the Medium." *Critical Inquiry* 25 (Winter 1999): 289-305.

--------."Sculpture in the Expanded Field." In *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths*, 276-90. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 1986.

Kuspit, Donald. "The Epistemophilic Instinct of Carl Toth." Foreword in *Carl Toth*. Bloomfield Hills, MI: Cranbrook Art Academy, 2005.

Lehmer, Stephen K. *Photographist: Robert F. Heinecken* (interview transcript). Los Angeles: Oral History Program, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, 1998.

Levinson, Jerrold. "Hybrid Art Forms." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 18, no. 4 (Winter, 1984): 5-13.

Lewis, Steven, with James McQuaid and David Tait. "Teaching: Interview with Robert Heinecken." In *Photography: Source and Resource: A Sourcebook for Creative Photography*, 29-34. State College, PA: Turnip Press, 1973.

Lippard, Lucy. *Six Years: The dematerialization of the art object from 1966 to 1972*. New York: Praeger, 1973.

Lord, Barry. "The Eleven O'Clock News in Colour: REALISM(E)S, realists, tableaux-vivants, painting, photography, photo-sculpture and slide shows: documentation." *artscanada* 27, no. 3, issue no. 144/145 (June 1970): 4-20.

Lyons, Nathan, ed. *The Persistence of Vision: Donald Blumberg, Charles Gill, Robert Heinecken, Ray K. Metzker, Jerry N. Uelsmann, John Wood*. Exhibition catalogue. New York: Horizon Press and Rochester, NY: George Eastman House, 1967.

--------.*Vision and Expression*. Exhibition catalogue. New York: Horizon Press and Rochester, NY: George Eastman House, 1969.

--------.*SPE: the Formative Years*. Rochester, NY: Visual Studies Workshop and The Society for Photographic Education, 2012.

Malcolm, Janet. "Diana and Nikon," *The New Yorker* (April 23, 1976): 133.

Mann, Margery. "Marvella, Is That You?" *Popular Photography* 67, no. 2 (August 1970): 100-101, 104.

McDonald, Jessica S. "Centralizing Rochester: A Critical Historiography of American Photography in the 1960s and 1970." PhD diss. University of Rochester, 2014.

--------.*Nathan Lyons: Selected Essays, Lectures, and Interviews*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2012.

McShine, Kynaston, ed. *Information*. Exhibition catalogue. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1970.

Metz, Gary. *Charles Roitz: Photographs and Photosculpture*. Exhibition catalogue. Denver: Denver Art Museum, 1974.

Moore, Kevin. "No Crime Involved—But with That Assumption." In *Robert Heinecken*, 184-88. London: Ridinghouse, 2012.

Nettles, Bea. *The Skirted Garden: Forty Years of Images*. Self-published, 2011.

Newhall, Beaumont. *Photography: Essays and Images, Illustrated Readings in the History of Photography*. New York: Museum of Modern Art and Boston, MA: New York Graphic Society, 1980. See especially, Sadakichi Hartmann, "A Plea for Straight Photography," 185-88; Paul Strand, "Photography," 219-21. Edward Weston, "Random Notes on Photography," 223-27.

Nickel, Douglas R. "History of Photography: The State of Research." *The Art Bulletin* 83, no. 3 (September 2001): 548-58.

--------."John Szarkowski: An Interview." *History of Photography* 19, no. 2 (Summer, 1995): 135-42.

O'Toole, Erin K. "No Democracy in Quality: Ansel Adams, Beaumont and Nancy Newhall, and the Founding of the Department of Photographs at the Museum of Modern Art." PhD diss. University of Arizona, 2010.

Parker, Fred. *California Photographers 1970*. Exhibition catalogue. Davis: University of California, Davis, The Memorial Union Art Gallery, 1970.

Peckman, Steven. *Jerry McMillan*. Exhibition catalogue. Northridge: California State University Northridge, Art Galleries, 2012.

Phillips, Christopher. "The Judgment Seat of Photography." In *The Contest of Meaning: Critical Histories of Photography*, edited by Richard Bolton, 15-47. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 1989. Previously published in *October* 22 (Fall 1982): 27-63.

Prince, Douglas. "Douglas Prince." In *Darkroom 2*, edited by Jain Kelly, 97-109. New York: Lustrum Press, 1978.

Ratcliff, Carter. "Route 66 Revisited: The New Landscape Photography." *Art in America* 64, no. 1 (January – February, 1976): 86-91.

Reeve, Catharine. "The Paraphotographer: An Interview with Robert Heinecken." *Darkroom Photography* (September 1986): 16-21, 32-3.

Respini, Eva. "The Photograph: Not a Picture Of But an Object About Something" (1965). In *Robert Heinecken: Object Matter*, edited by Eva Respini. Exhibition catalogue. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2014: 155.

Respini, Eva and Drew Sawyer. "A 'New Prominence': Photography at MoMA in the 1960s and 1970s." In *The Photographic Object 1970*, edited by Mary Statzer. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, forthcoming.

Reynolds, Charles. "Photography: Fact or Artifact." *Infinity* 17, no. 5 (May 1968): 15-18.

Rubin, David S. Ellen Brooks: *Nature as Artifice.* Exhibition catalogue. Cleveland, OH: Cleveland Center for Contemporary Art, 1993.

Salvesen, Britt and Alison Nordstrom. *New Topographics*. Exhibition catalogue. Tucson, AZ: Center for Creative Photography and Göttingen, Germany: Steidl Publishers, 2009.

Sandeen, Eric J. *Picturing an Exhibition: The Family of Man and 1950s America.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1995.

Sekula, Allan. "Reinventing Documentary." In *Photography and Language*, edited by Lew Thomas, 13-14. San Francisco, Camerawork Press, 1977. Published previously in Fred Lonidier "Health and Safety Game" and Philip Steinmetz "Somebody's Making a Mistake." Exhibition catalogue. Edited by David Ross. Long Beach: Long Beach Museum of Art. Later version published as "Dismantling Modernism: Reinventing Documentary (Notes on the Politics of Representation)." *Massachusetts Review* 19, no. 4 (December, 1978): 859-83.

--------."The Invention of Photographic Meaning." *Artforum* 13, no. 5 (January 1975): 36-45. Published later in *Thinking Photography*, edited by Victor Burgin. London: Macmillan, 1982.

Sobieszek, Robert A. "Sculpture as the Sum of Its Profiles: François Willème and Photosculpture in France, 1859 – 1868." *The Art Bulletin* 62, no. 4 (December, 1980): 617-30.

Solomon-Godeau, Abigail. "Photography after Art Photography." In *Photography at the Dock*, 75-85. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991.

Sontag, Susan. *On Photography*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1977.

Soutter, Lucy. "Expanding Photography circa 1970: Photographic Objects and Conceptual Art." In *The Photographic Object 1970*, edited by Mary Statzer. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, forthcoming.

--------."The Visual Idea: Photography in Conceptual Art." PhD diss. Yale University, 2001.

Stainback, Charles. *Special Collections: The Photographic Order from Pop to Now*. New York: International Center for Photography, 1992.

Stone, Michael. "Los Angeles, 1967-70." In *The Collectible Moment: The Photography Collection of the Norton Simon Museum*, edited by Gloria Williams Sander, 87. Pasadena, CA: Norton Simon Foundation, 2006.

Swartz, Alexandra. *Leave Any Information at the Signal: Writings, Interviews, Bits, Pages*. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 2004.

Szarkowski, John. "Commitment." In *SPE: The Formative Years*, edited by Nathan Lyons, 70. Rochester, NY: Visual Studies Workshop Press, 2012.

--------.*Mirrors and Windows: American Photography since 1960*. Exhibition catalogue. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1978.

--------.*New Documents: Diane Arbus, Lee Friedlander, Garry Winogrand*. Exhibition catalogue. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1967.

--------.*The Photographer's Eye.* Exhibition catalogue. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1966.

Tonkonow, Leslie. "Ellen Brooks." *Journal of Contemporary Art*, www.jca-online.com/brooks.html.

Townsend, Charlotte. "Photo Show: SUB Art Gallery, University of B.C. December 1969-January 1970." *artscanada* 27, no. 3, issue no. 144/145 (June 1970): 49.

Turner, Peter. *American Images: Photography 1945-1980*. New York: Viking and Barbican Art Gallery, 1985.

Uelsmann, Jerry. "Post-Visualization." Lecture, Symposim on the Teaching of Photography, sponsored by the Society for Photographic Education, Chicago, IL, December 28-29, 1965). Society for Photographic Education Archive, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ. Published later in *Contemporary Photographer* 5, no. 4 (1967): np.

Upton, John. *Minor White, Robert Heinecken, Robert Cumming: Photography as Metaphor, Photography as Object, Photography as Document of a Concept*. Exhibition catalogue. Long Beach: Fine Arts Gallery, California State University, Long Beach, 1973.

Ware, Lynne. Robert Heinecken, *Photographist: A Thirty-Five Year Retrospective.* Exhibition catalogue. Chicago: Museum of Contemporary Art, Chicago, 1999).

Wasserman, Emily. "Photography as Printmaking, Museum of Modern Art." *Artforum* (Summer 1968): 71.

Wilson, Tom Muir. *Into the Seventies: Photographic Images by Sixteen Artists/Photographers*. Exhibition catalogue. Akron, OH: Akron Art Institute, 1970.

Witkovsky, Matthew. *Light Years: Conceptual Art and The Photograph 1964-1977*. Exhibition catalogue. Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago, 2011.

Wolf, Sylvia. *Ed Ruscha and Photography*. New York: Whitney Museum of American Art and Göttingen: Steidl, 2004.