

AFTER THE ARTEFACT

AN EXHIBITION OF CONTEMPORARY PHOTOGRAPHIC PRACTICE

JOHN DELACOUR
PAUL HEWSON
MARK HINDERAKER
MARK JOHNSON
GEOFF KLEEM
MIRANDA LAWRY
JUILEE PRYOR
JACKY REDGATE
BRUCE SEARLE
INGEBORG TYSSEN

WOLLONGONG CITY GALLERY

July 5 - August 5, 1984

Wollongong City Gallery's initial approach to Geoff Kleem for a one-person photographic exhibition snowballed into a proposal from ten Sydney photographers to prepare a major exhibition for the Wollongong City Gallery. It was proposed a publication should accompany the exhibition to fulfil the important task of making the exhibition, and photography as a medium, more accessible to the public. The publication would deal with the diversity of approach, concept and practice manifested in this exhibition, AFTER THE ARTEFACT.

Accepting an artists' curated exhibition was somewhat problematic, especially in resolving curatorial responsibility and veto, and in the production mechanics and ideology of the publication. A lot of work was yet to be executed and traditional thematic curatorial concerns were temporarily set aside.

AFTER THE ARTEFACT offers the opportunity to observe contemporary photographic practice and we thank sincerely the participants and contributors.

Barbara Tuckerman
WOLLONGONG CITY GALLERY

A Foreword

It is tempting to effect a distrust of 'thematic' exhibitions and to assert that the diversity of photographic practice is an embodiment of the medium's strength.

In a sense, then AFTER THE ARTEFACT may be seen as a 'survey' show, although when the idea for an exhibition like this was first entertained (that is, an exhibition curated by the participants), the hope was to bring together bodies of work that demonstrated a marked similarity of photographic intent. Not unexpectedly, as the present group came together, attitudes and curatorial strategies altered—to the extent that even the choice of title, AFTER THE ARTEFACT, began to seem contentious.

Contentious, because four of the participants (Lawry, Hinderaker, Tyssen, Johnson) appeared to be pre-occupied with the 'print'; the surface of their photographs. These four resolutely pursue print quality, elegant formal composition and seem to experience no ambivalence when faced with the seductiveness of photography's illusionism.

Grant Mudford, an expatriate Australian photographer working on the American West Coast, was convinced 'that given time, scrutiny and inspiration, you could nominate anything and somehow make a brilliant photograph out of it that would be infinitely more interesting than what it is in life'.

The rather indefinite variables of inspiration and time notwithstanding, we can accept this elucidation as an eloquent formulation of 'formalist' beliefs. Now, the principles that underpin 'social documentary' photography can almost be seen as an inversion of Mudford's aesthetic conviction. Logically developed, it is reasonable, if a little narrow perhaps, to believe that no photograph could be generated without a triggering reflex initiated by either social or personal commitment to the subject.

When Miranda Lawry discusses her Landmarks project and speaks of documenting 'the deliberate and extensive destruction . . . by large scale mining operations (of) . . . ancient and valued Aboriginal sacred sites', we perceive the profound difference in photographic intent between herself and Mudford. To an unpractised or careless eye however, Lawry's social message seems subverted by the sparkling surface of her prints.

This tension between surface and content is anticipated and utilised by Mark Hinderaker as well. He recognises that 'the strong aesthetic character' of his image 'will work ironically with the subject matter—both attracting and repelling the viewer, overcoming an unwillingness to confront the tangible realities of the nuclear situation'.

Ingeborg Tyssen bestows equal weight of elegant treatment to both virgin wilderness and roadside shambles. The strategy she's developed to 'work ironically' is thus slightly different to Hinderaker, but equally successful.

Mark Johnson's Sydney Beaches series, I feel, is probably more reasonably placed within a social topographical framework, than within the parameters 'a photography of social commitment' would prescribe, although he too can be seen as employing elements of the formalist canon to embellish a primary message. If these four then, view the 'artefact', the photograph itself, as a rather seductive presence upon which a polemic might be draped, Geoff Kleem's work might be seen as an indecent assault upon its person. His work addresses itself to the problems of pictorial illusionism, to trying to deal with the 'photograph-as-object' and to an examination of the suppositions and assumptions made when a photograph is viewed. His elliptical work in the present show Las Vegas embraces the post-modernist preoccupation with the appropriation of existing imagery.

In fact, this issue of appropriation is given even broader treatment in Jacky Redgate's work. By holding our attention perhaps a little longer than they should, her museum-style prints from 'found' snapshot negatives, seem to challenge our notions about 'authorship' in photography.

Notions about 'authorship' interest Paul Hewson, also. Earlier work took as its starting point the precedent set by the painter Robert Rauschenberg's famous quip—'This is a portrait of Iris Clert, if I say so.' There is an echo of Prufrock in the title *Love Songs*, a series which works in a similar way to the previous pieces, but is moodier and more serious. Hewson's expectation is to 'manipulate or even invert, by contextual placement and the title given to the series as a whole, the subjective response to individual pieces within the group'.

Juilee Pryor's mixed media installation transforms a private loss into a public reconciliation.

John Delacour has generated work in Wollongong specifically for this show. Delacour is 'engaged by the tension which results' when photography transforms a commonplace subject into a mystery-laden one.

This last concern interests the present writer as well.

So, it is tempting to effect a distrust of 'thematic' exhibitions and to assert that the diversity of photographic practice is an embodiment of the medium's strength. In a sense then, *AFTER THE ARTEFACT* may be seen as a survey show.

BRUCE SEARLE
May 1984

Concept and Percept

'The light of sense goes out in flashes' . . . 'A virtue which irradiates and exalts/All objects through all intercourse of sense'—these are two instances where the word 'sense' occurs in Wordsworth's autobiographical poem, *The Prelude*.

Examine Wordsworth's usage of 'sense', and it is soon apparent that the word is not unambiguous. In fact, William Empson was able to construe a whole theory of perception and knowledge from Wordsworth's usage of 'sense' in *The Prelude*. 'Sense' can mean sense data, the senses, sensation, sensibility, commonsense, intuition and meaning. Empson showed that Wordsworth exploited the full versatility of the word, usually engaging all its meanings simultaneously. 'Sense' therefore suggests a circuit connecting the inner with the outer world, filtered through an individual's personality or sensibility.

The circuitous transactions of 'sense' make our experiences intelligible to ourselves and also enable us to communicate them to others. 'Sense' is the basis of art, both the making and appreciating of it.

The photographs in this exhibition need to be understood in terms of a sensing process. But first we need to rid ourselves of the widespread misconception that photography is merely a literal, outer-directed, factual, 'transparent' carrier of visual information. All ten photographers in this exhibition force us to acknowledge that the motif is chosen, that it is treated in a particular way, that it is exhibited in public with the intention to provoke certain responses and suggest certain ideas. In other words, we are made to realise that photographs are as much conceived and created as they are 'taken'.

If we are faced with a photograph that does seem entirely literal and impersonal (especially if we encounter it in the context of an art gallery), we will no doubt find it extremely vexing and provocative. What is the motive, what is the point? If the photograph is not sufficiently interesting or out-of-the-ordinary in a literal sense we may wonder whether it is formally interesting, whether it has a figurative or metamorphic side to it, or whether it will be explained by the group of series in which it occurs. Is there a polemical point, a joke, a story or a concept to supplement the seeming meagreness, the banality or opacity of the picture?

Everybody will have experienced this kind of disorientation while looking at photographs, or at any kind of art. The more frustrated we become with the image's literalness, the clearer we realise that we *do not really believe* that photographs are simply factual, transparent things. We want to make sense of them, we need them to mean something. In trying to fathom the photographer's intent, we enter a process of sensing that is, so to speak, behind the photograph as well as in front of the photograph.

The willingness to stop, scrutinise, remember, respond and interpret is basic to any creative enterprise. Many works in this show require the imaginative participation of the viewer in a sort of collaborative venture with the artist. By means of our sensing process, we augment and modify our superficial impression of the photograph's literalness.

Mark Hinderaker's photographs offer a good illustration of the way a bland, calm, abstract composition can be illuminated by the ideas a viewer brings to bear on the picture. We see a flat surface of rivetted steel plates, and then discover that this is a section of a B52 bomber, a plane designed to carry (amongst other things) atomic bombs. Immediately we grow concerned about the missing rivets and the signs of wear and tear.

The bleached tone and simple demarcations in the picture might suggest other pictures we have seen which also consist of relatively uneventful, pale zones with a few stark divisions such as aerial photographs, say, or desert landscapes. Hinderaker actually intends these pictures to allude to landscape photography.

We are persistently disturbed by the frontal, opaque surface of the metal plates, which denies us the view (the world) we expect to find in a photograph. This obstruction is symbolic, in the sense of a world erased. It is also symbolic of moral priority, in the sense that nuclear disarmament looms in the forefront of Hinderaker's concerns.

On yet another level, the marked, stained, etched surface of the B52 bears a certain resemblance to the flat surface of the photographic negative and the photographic print, both of which are eroded or 'weathered' by the imprint of light.

Until now, I have borrowed Wordsworth's/Empson's usage of 'sense' as a way of explaining how perception and knowledge might relate to one another. To complicate matters somewhat, Juilee Pryor's and Jacky Redgate's photographs both raise the question: can we really *know anything*, let alone grasp the full significance of a photograph? Pryor presents us with a fuzzy, unremarkable snapshot of a domestic interior presided over by a young woman. The woman is standing in front of a painting of a birthday cake.

This photograph belongs in a series of three: the other photographs show, respectively, a teddy bear suspended on a wall near the top of a window, and the same young woman sitting, partly concealing her face, in front of a mirror on which the word 'fat' is written. These images might mean little or nothing to us, but they mean a lot to Pryor. They were taken in her sister's flat shortly before her sister died of a drug overdose. After the event, Pryor has brooded on the pictures, looking for signs of her sister's self-destruction and for an explanation of her death.

The hanged teddy, the pointed knife beside the birthday cake, the dot of light shining through the crook of her sister's elbow, 'fat' scrawled on the mirror, even the shadows in the room become highly suggestive.

The riddle of another human life, another human death, is also the subject of Jacky Redgate's pictures. As if deliberately punning on the expression that photographers 'take' pictures, Redgate didn't shoot any film for these photographs: she acquired old negatives from the collection of some London relatives. She did make the prints herself, however, and very beautifully. The negatives were considerably enlarged producing brooding, dolorous expanses of black, sharply contrasted with gleaming whites, making a visual drama worthy of the great English photographer Bill Brandt.

Over the period 1953-1962, we usually encounter Margaret in the same pose, with her arms clasped defensively over her stomach. Lacking all other information about her, this gesture seems to be a clue to her character. There is no sign of tension in the face of this almost expressionless English rose, but it is evident in her anxious body-language.

Even if we knew the story of Margaret's life, we go back to the photographs with the question: who was Margaret *really*? Was she a martyr, was she a saint, was she simply resentful of her circumstances? These are questions that photographs can never answer. We vainly try to infer this information from the surface of things, which is all a photograph can show.

When the intention and meaning of a photograph cannot be readily grasped, either we turn away from it in impatience or we are tantalised by the difficulty, and look and think with redoubled concentration. Many photographers actually contrive this time-lag between seeing and understanding, so as to intensify the viewers' involvement and to protract the process of sensing.

The Russian literary critic Victor Shklovsky formulated a theory of 'ostranenie' (making strange, defamiliarisation) in 1917. 'Art exists that one may recover the sensation of life', he wrote. 'It exists to make them feel things to make the stone *stoney*'.

The purpose of art is to impart the sensation of things as they are perceived and not as they are known. The technique of art is to make things 'unfamiliar',

to make forms difficult, to increase the difficulty and length of perception because the process of perception is an aesthetic end in itself and must be 'prolonged'.

Shklovsky's theory had great impact on the Russian photographers who were his contemporaries, including Alexander Rodchenko, to whom John Delacour dedicates a series of pictures in this exhibition. In fact, Shklovsky was a reviver of the theory of Defamiliarisation (*ostranenie*) rather than its originator. The theory was first put forward many decades before the invention of photography, at just the time that modern art was born in the guise of Romanticism. In 1798, Wordsworth in England and Novalis in Germany both gave definitions of Defamiliarisation, submitting these as a theory of Romantic realism.

Novalis: 'By endowing the commonplace with lofty significance, the ordinary with a mysterious aspect, the familiar with the merit of the unfamiliar, the finite with the appearance of infinity, I am Romanticizing'.

Wordsworth: 'The principal object . . . proposed in these poems was to choose incidents and situations from common life, and to relate or describe them, throughout, as far as was possible in a selection of language really used by men, and, at the same time, to throw over them a certain colouring of imagination, whereby ordinary things should be presented to the mind in an unusual aspect'.

Nearly 200 years later, the practice of Defamiliarisation still informs some of the most vital contemporary art especially in the field of photography. As a contemporary exponent of Defamiliarisation, John Delacour's contributions to an exhibition in Wollongong are, as might be expected photos of Wollongong: not the Art Gallery, the Town Hall, the beaches or the mountains, but features of the environment that most people wouldn't stop to notice—a pile of refuse at the foot of a wall, a commonplace petrol station, a back yard decked with laundry.

Delacour points his camera at things commonsense would deem unprepossessing, unsightly, disorderly. Yet when we look at his pictures, the normal values we give to sights such as these are altogether reversed. The pictures are immaculately designed, beautifully proportioned; colours and textures all seem to fall into their appointed places. What we *know* as scruffy and commonplace, we perceive afresh as orderly, gorgeously coloured, beguilingly glamorous. Most of us will no doubt retain vague memories of a time when the world seemed such a wonderland of rich and curious sights, when, as children, we scrambled over vacant lots, and found the drive into town exciting. Delacour's photographs recapture something of the sense which, as adults, we have lost.

If there is such a startling difference between the world we know and the world we perceive in a photograph, can we still maintain that photography is truthful, objective and realistic? Most of the photographers in this show dramatise truisms about the nature of photography. They emphasise the obvious because photography itself, like those familiar, unexamined aspects of our environment, has become so natural and normal for us, that we are no longer aware nor critical of its peculiarities. It is necessary for photographers to defamiliarise photography to show us its limitations, how the camera can lie, how the photographer has a determining influence on what we see and how we see it.

One truism about photography is that photographs reduce a three-dimensional flux into static, two-dimensional images. Like John Delacour, Mark Johnson reveals the unnaturalness of this reduction by transforming something ultra-ordinary into something almost weird beyond belief. The beach locations in Johnson's pictures are a familiar stamping ground for most Sydneysiders. Normally we would barely glance at the grotesque mixtures of architectural styles, of the changing rooms, lifesavers' clubs, refreshment kiosks and so on. But Johnson's intention is not just to show us how unobservant we are of some architectural curiosities.

His photographs resolve the informal, scattered arrangements spread out in three dimensions, into flat images which seem absolutely, irreproachably

designed. We might suspect that the artist has stage-managed the scene, telling people where to sit on the beach, even commanding pigeons on the roof to move a little to the left, a little to the right.

The glare on the sand gives bodies a cut-out quality, and we may want to check whether the silhouettes have not been collaged onto the paper. But no, these are 'straight' photographs.

Like most of the great photographers of the past and present, Johnson has a sixth-sense for the place and the moment when nature falls into a pattern. It is not a pattern anyone would necessarily recognise as such. It is the sort of pattern the camera recognises, that we only discover through the frame of a view-finder. The reality of nature and the reality of the photograph are not the same: he emphasises their disparity by presenting an illusion of sunbathers as co-ordinates of a mystic geometry, parts of a grand design. Each photograph, seen in isolation, may seem uncanny, a fluke, but Johnson gives us picture after picture where the 'impossible', the 'too good to be true' has clicked into place.

Maximum audacity of design is enhanced by maximum lucidity in the printing. No nuance of tone and texture is unconsidered, and everything is significant in relation to a whole which is greater than the sum of its parts.

Ingeborg Tyssen's landscape panoramas also gain an important part of their aesthetic substance through the way she prints them. Printing is a way of expressing as it were *enunciating* the contents of a negative. Printing a negative slightly darker or slightly lighter, on one or another type of paper, making the print a little larger or smaller, all these factors affect the photographic image. Tyssen is acutely sensitive to all the fine tunings and inflections involved in printing.

Light discloses things to sight, and Tyssen uses the enlarger lamp in the darkroom like a probe, revealing as much or as little detail as seems fit, finding the appropriate tone for the image, whether subdued, sparkling or scorched. In her work one is always aware of the image as something developed and produced.

Another truism about photography is that photographs isolate things and remove them from their context. In a lot of work in this exhibition, there is a conscious reaction away from the convention of exhibiting isolated, uncaptioned photographs which are assumed to 'speak for themselves'. Consider what happens to Tyssen's landscape photographs when they are arranged in series (i.e. placed in a context): is the series literal, showing stops along a journey from A to B? Is it metamorphical, making a gradation between virgin forest on the one extreme, and flattened, denuded farmland during a drought, on the other extreme? Is it a spectrum between longer and shorter exposures under the developing lamp, moving from a dark, velvety print quality to a blanched, washed-out quality?

Miranda Lawry's series, Landmarks, also features the refined textures made possible by sensitive printing. 'Landmarks' is a pun. At first sight the paired photographs seem to be only texture, only marks on a flat surface. Like Tyssen's series, her work has an ecological theme. The lower image of each pair shows a cluster of outlines of Aboriginal hands painted on a rockface, which must once have been (and possibly still is) a sacred site.

The upper photographs show prospectors' shafts cut into rock, gouges in the ground made by earth-moving equipment, heaps of rubble and marker poles left by Australian miners. These photographs illustrate two attitudes to the earth: the Aborigines patting the rock, believing they could draw strength from its mystic power, the white Australians ripping the earth apart for profit, asserting their dominance over it.

Lawry's work puts over a message about white and black Australian cultures, about nature conservation and greed, and makes its points with admirable economy. The work also signals that we are not examining a simple either/or situation, wholly good Aborigines versus wholly bad miners. Lawry seems to

want to effect a balance between these attitudes to the land. She communicates this to us through the way the textures of the upper photographs are continued or echoed in the lower. Top and bottom are not emphatically contrasted.

Although we know better, we might even fancy that a shaft cut in the rock has some ancient religious significance, is an entrance to a temple or walled city and that the miners' marker-poles are part of some tribal rite, or graveposts. Also, the resemblance of the upper photographs to the documentation of Land Art and Performance works in the 1970's suggests a metamorphical contrast between sculpture and painting (which manipulate their materials directly) and the relatively detached and passive nature of photography, which doesn't interfere much with things 'out there'.

Martin Heidegger wrote a fascinating essay, 'The Thing', which begins with a consideration of the mass media and their effect on our perception. More than anything else, photography (in the form of cinema and television as well) has brought about a shrinkage of time and space.

'Yet this frantic abolition of distances brings no nearness', Heidegger wrote, 'for nearness does not consist in shortness of distance. What is least remote from us in point of distance, by virtue of its picture on film or its sound on the radio, can remain far from us. What is incalculably far from us in point of distance can be near to us. Short distance is not in itself nearness. Nor is great distance remoteness. . . . What is happening here when everything is equally far and equally near?'

Geoff Kleem's work seems to ask the same question. Like Heidegger, he has been much preoccupied with 'The Thing', with the photograph as an object among objects. He is also preoccupied with the way photographic images circulate in our culture, and how it has happened that a place most of us have never visited, on the other side of the world, has become a shorthand expression for bright lights, tinsel, showbiz, boozing, gambling and gangsterism. Las Vegas, or a notion of Las Vegas, is so familiar that some people even use its name as an adjective ('very Las Vegas'). The city has the burden of living up to its myth, confirming the PR cliché.

On a trip to the USA, Kleem bought a tiny plastic camera attached to a key-ring. Inside the camera was a tiny wheel of colour transparencies, souvenir pictures of Las Vegas. Those minute pictures have been blown up into large Cibachrome prints.

The images are very fuzzy and we need captions to indicate what we're looking at. The captions name their subjects, but the images connote rather than describe Las Vegas: one image is no more than a smear of coloured lights; hotels are so indistinct that they could be high-rise buildings anywhere. The photographs attain the exact characteristics of cliché, unexamined, generalised mnemonic, stale.

As if illustrating Heidegger's discussion of nearness and distance, Kleem counterpoints the generalised shots of distant Las Vegas with a series of photographs which are intimate and specific in subject. Paradoxically, the relationship between the two series of photographs reverses-out for a viewer, who can have no inkling of the private meanings the more personal photographs hold for Kleem. We're saddled with the question: 'What is happening here when everything is equally far and equally near?'

Paul Hewson also produces a conundrum by arranging discrepant things in a serial relationship. The series is prominently captioned, 'Love Songs'. Because the photographs are indicated to be a set, we mentally bracket them off and assume there is a unity, a rhyme and a reason. We guess that the objects in the photographs are symbols, since the unity of the series isn't evident in the formal arrangement and the sequencing.

We get our first encouragement by noticing a picture of a singer holding a microphone. One photograph shows a severed, bloodied(?) hand emerging from wrapping-paper for a bouquet of flowers(?). This symbol is possibly connected to the German text in Gothic script, where a few words are comprehensible to me

e.g. 'Schweineblut'—pig's blood, and the pages general drift seems to concern a family and an act of butchery (?). The carved Indian goddess presents no problem to my understanding, but the broken strap which has fallen in an arabesque on the hessian background (a background which other pictures share) has my imagination reeling; however, I can conclude nothing from it. On the extreme right of the series are . . . sine waves of a love song? A sonar map of the bottom of the sea? A computer screen's analogue for the sensation of desire? A visual rhyme for the Indian goddess's distended breasts?

Hewson's artfulness is to feed us just the right quantity of encouraging clues so that we go on guessing, go on thinking up ways in which heterogeneous things could 'Rhyme', fabricating in the process love songs of our own. Hewson's work doesn't propose itself as a 'text' so much as a *prefext* for the viewer to think poetically. We have to fabricate our own meanings and project our own sentiments into whatever 'love songs' we weave around this enigmatic catalyst.

Like Kleem and Redgate, Hewson appropriates his imagery from other ready-made images—an Indian sculpture, a Susan Norrie sculpture, an old German book, T-shirt graphics, a TV picture. The romantic titles grate against the impersonality of the pictures, but this contradiction mobilises our fantasy and buffets our ideas back and forth. Perhaps Hewson would concur with Flaubert that 'the highest and most difficult achievement in Art is not to make us laugh and cry, nor to arouse our lust or rage, but to do what nature does—that is, to set us dreaming'.

Without its prominently displayed title 'Love Songs' would only be an inventory of mismatching pictures. We have already examined how our sense of an image is affected by background knowledge (Hinderaker), stories about the people photographed (Redgate, Pryor), declarations of intention (Delacour), serial arrangements and/or paired images (Tyssen, Kleem, Lawry), a title (Hewson), and by virtually repeating the impossible (Johnson). In his wall-photographs and in his books, Bruce Searle juxtaposes images and texts. The texts are a mixture of narrative, confession and polemic and are spiked by a sharp wit and an undeniable cleverness.

One of the things Searle aims to show is that once isolated, uncaptioned photographs are left to 'speak for themselves', their meaning is not only limited, but highly unstable. He demonstrates this point by never letting the image alone, cueing the viewer with ironic, sometimes enlightening, sometimes misleading and contradictory messages. But the trick always works: we look at the picture, we read the text, we look at the picture again, and something in the picture has changed.

His infra-red photographs of the Marrickville Catholic Seminary have a not-quite-right look about them. 'Found' text in the form of signs (Get the Good Oil, Keep Left) and handwritten captions (e.g. 'The most ordinary things seemed to take on a special meaning') increase the uneasy feeling that something is abnormal and unnatural about these pictures. In fact, it is the distorting effect of the infra-red film that makes the crowns of the palm trees too light, and makes all surfaces seem porous.

But even if we can attribute a cause to the strangeness, the photographs persist as things 'not right': Searle likes to keep his work under constant suspicion.

The soliloquys accompanying the pictures are about an absurd dilemma regarding the photographer's point of view, his having a theory, having theories, not having any theory. The texts may seem cynical or flippant, but they drive home an uncomfortable truth: the sensing process of the photographer and of the viewer is never on certain ground. Instead we are always faced with the vexed question of orientation. If we orient ourselves differently, we perceive everything differently.

Realising this, if ever we despair at the impossibility of knowing with certainty what is good and right, we can at least take heart in the reassurance that what we have learnt by trying to understand has usually been worth the effort after all.

Terence Maloon
May 1984

Light in The Shade: Reference Points Within Photography

'Documentation' is to an extent, a spurious concept of photographic writing and practice. The evidential assumptions of photography have been extensively questioned⁽¹⁾. Much of the interest of a 'straight' use of the medium lies elsewhere. An ostensibly factual presentation of subject matter may directly refer to issues explored, perhaps equally indirectly, in other media and disciplines, as this essay attempts to suggest.

A photographer may find a carnality, a loss of objectivity, perhaps a sense of 'the field', in the natural, and even the urban, landscape. The notion of perceptually constituted 'appearances' or phenomena, allows for such facts of experience. Such a relation to the subject may in fact be one of love. To photograph, it has been said, is to appropriate. To photograph may also be to love. With reference to the work of art, Mikel Dufrenne has said that 'aesthetic experience recalls us to a presence, to a sort of primitive relation in which subject and object cease to be distinguished and opposed'⁽²⁾. 'This return to the presence, by which the subject overcomes his separateness, is indeed an act of love . . .'⁽³⁾. Later, he refers to Merleau-Ponty's term 'perception sauvage', 'where, at the limit, we would be one with the object . . . where we are not only in agreement with the object but are living it with ourselves; where we are it, in some ways . . .'⁽⁴⁾.

Phenomenology provides insights into the extent to which appearances are constituted by perception. Husserl (founder of the phenomenological movement) wrote that 'Through reflection, instead of grasping simply the matter(s) straight out . . . we grasp the corresponding subjective experiences in which we become 'conscious' of them, in which they 'appear'. For this reason, they are called 'phenomena', and their most general essential character is to exist as the 'consciousness-of', or 'appearance-of' the specific things . . .'⁽⁵⁾. This presentation in consciousness Husserl also termed the 'thing itself'⁽⁶⁾. Merleau-Ponty, for whom phenomenology was 'a study of the advent of being into consciousness'⁽⁷⁾, wrote later: 'To return to the things themselves is to return to that world which precedes knowledge, of which knowledge always speaks and in relation to which every scientific schematization is an abstract and derivative sign language, as is geography in relation to the countryside in which we have learnt beforehand what a forest, a prairie or a river is'⁽⁸⁾. (Kant's 'Ding-an-sich', 'thing in itself' or 'noumenon' was, by contrast, the unknowable thing in the world corresponding to the 'phenomenon', or appearance in consciousness.)

We may compare Edward Weston's use of the term 'thing itself' (and also 'essence') from his Daybooks of Husserl's time. For example, 'the camera should be used for recording of life, for rendering the very substance and quintessence of the thing itself . . .'⁽⁹⁾. 'Once my aim was to interpret a mood, now to present the thing itself'⁽¹⁰⁾. 'One is faced with the real issue, significant presentation of the "thing itself" with photographic quality'⁽¹¹⁾.

Husserl's 'thing itself' is reached by a process of 'bracketing', which 'consists in focusing on any part or all of my experience and then observing, analysing, abstracting and describing that experience by removing myself from the immediate and lived engagement in it'⁽¹²⁾. From the world as 'the self-evidently existing universe of realities which are continuously before us in unquestioned givenness', Husserl comes to 'a new cognitive attitude' in which the 'world' is for us . . . the world which is present to us . . .'⁽¹³⁾. Approaching experience in this way, 'the phenomenology of perception . . . will be the presentation of invariant structural systems without which perception of a body and a synthetically concordant multiplicity of perceptions of one and the same body as such would be unthinkable'⁽¹⁴⁾. The 'invariant structural system' by which a body is perceived through the multiplicity of its presentations is, in Husserl's scheme, its 'essence'. Husserl wished to describe the basis of all mental activity in terms of these 'essences' and to account for their genesis.

Such a concept of 'essence', as that which underlies and gives unity to the various perceptions of a given thing, is perhaps comparable to Gestalt

psychology's expression of the perceptual organisation of sense data into consistently meaningful 'wholes'. Merleau-Ponty was influenced by the work of Gestalt psychologists and wrote that 'the central phenomenon of perceptual life is the constitution without any ideal model, of a significant grouping'⁽¹⁵⁾. Kohler, a pioneer of Gestalt concepts, states that 'Objects exist for us only when sensory experience has become thoroughly imbued with meaning'⁽¹⁶⁾. Psychologists, he felt, had 'the task of separating all these acquired meanings from the seen material *per se*, which consists of simple sensations'⁽¹⁶⁾. Much experimental work convinced Kohler and others that 'sensory organisation constitutes a characteristic achievement of the nervous system'⁽¹⁷⁾. A number of semi-physiological 'laws' were postulated to account for this sensory organisation. These 'laws' were a psychological re-expression of Husserl's 'essences'.

Some of the more superficial levels at which two dimensional images operate have been explained in terms of Gestalt characteristics. In fact, Cartier-Bresson's 'decisive moment' can be seen in these terms . . . 'you can take a print . . . trace on it the geometric figures which come up under analysis, and you'll observe that, if the shutter were released at the decisive moment, you have instinctively fixed a geometric pattern without which the photograph would have been both formless and lifeless'⁽¹⁸⁾. Perhaps the viewfinder frame stimulates organisational processes in the brain which contribute to the generation of an 'interesting composition'!

Phenomenology did not regard language as the fundamental process by which meaning is constituted. More recently, however, the 'filter' by means of which sense data appear as already meaningful has been regarded as linguistic 'because the meaningfulness of experiential data is normally articulated in words'⁽¹⁹⁾. Thus, 'Experience normally has the character . . . of being experience of the meaningful, being capable of description, of being filtered. The filter of experience is provided by language . . .'⁽²⁰⁾. However, the 'description of the structure of linguistic understanding leads us to aspects of understanding which, although connected with language, are not in themselves linguistic . . .'. Further, 'not only the connection between the primary elements of understanding may be non-linguistic, the primary elements themselves may be non-linguistic . . .'⁽²¹⁾.

'Filtration' processes giving meaning to sensations are also evident in recent neurophysiological work. The evidence is from animal experiments and the results naturally cannot be transposed directly to the human species. However, the results do suggest an extent to which our perceptually derived knowledge is a function of the nature of the processes by which we perceive. Naturally, there are numerous other variables which modify our perception and which cannot be reduced to crude physiological data.

The retina is the layer of light-sensitive and other associated cells at the back of the eye. In virtually no way can the retina be compared with the image plane of a camera. The connections between the retina cells are very complex and in the last two decades or so, much has been learnt about their function in different species. The studies of Hartline and his colleagues confirmed that 'receptors, by virtue of their inherent properties, operate upon the information they collect from their surroundings to favour certain features of it. The processing of sensory data begins in the receptors'⁽²²⁾. An illuminated cell may exert an inhibitory effect on neighbouring cells, resulting in an accentuation of edges and contours, and an enhancement of contrast. Cells have also been found which respond to movement within the visual field but which are relatively inactive when the object in question is stationary. 'The visual system is almost exclusively organised to detect change and motion', Hartline concludes⁽²³⁾. His work on the horseshoe crab was with a view to understanding its retina as 'an integrative system which processes the raw data of the retinal image preparatory to transmitting it, as useful visual information, to the higher centres in the animal's brain'⁽²⁴⁾. Bronowski, commenting on this Nobel Prize-winning work, writes that although it 'may seem very smart that the eye is ready-wired to see straight boundaries or curved boundaries, contrasts of light, and so on' . . . 'exactly because search mechanisms for these things are built into the eye, we are constantly deceived about the nature of the outside world because we

interpret it in terms of the built-in search mechanism'⁽²⁵⁾. The 'filter' transforming sense data into meaningful information begins neurophysiologically at the very first level of sensation.

More complex 'search mechanisms' have been found. In 1959, a study called 'What the Frog's Eye Tells the Frog's Brain' found that the 'eye responds to movement, to changes of illumination and to what we may call "rotundity"'. A small black shadow is signalled strongly and serves to evoke the fly-catching reflex. This "bug-detector" gives an immediate response (the tongue shooting out for fly-catching) without loss of time by information processing by the brain'⁽²⁶⁾.

It is possible that in humans in addition to retinal data-processing mechanisms, there may be more complex connections between cells in the brain itself, subserving more sophisticated 'feature detectors'. However, as Kaufman points out in his lucid text, 'Perception', form detection based entirely on the operation of 'feature detectors' is a philosophically contentious proposition. Moreover, feature extraction does not account for many aspects of perception studied in humans by non-neurophysiological means. Nevertheless, feature extraction is thought by many, says Kaufman, to contribute to visual perception⁽²⁷⁾.

It appears that concepts we form about the physical world reveal much about our perceptual processes but perhaps not as much about that world itself as we assume. What assumptions would we make about the world if we could not perceive wavelengths of the visible spectrum, and relied for our assumptions about the world on perception of other forms of energy? What notion of space would we have if we could not move or touch? The making and viewing of images raise many questions. 'Nothing is more difficult', said Merleau-Ponty, 'than to know precisely what we see'⁽²⁸⁾.

Mark Johnson
May 1984

References:

- (1) See, for example, 'Do photographs tell the truth?' by Howard Becker in 'Afterimage', Vol. 5, No. 8, Feb. 1978, Visual Studies Workshop, New York, and 'On News Photography' by Wayne Hooper in 'Metro', No. 56, Winter '81, Association of Teachers of Media, Melbourne.
- (2) 'Linguistic Analysis and Phenomenology' ed. W. Mays & S. C. Brown, MacMillan, 1972, p. 134.
- (3) Ibid., p. 134.
- (4) Ibid., p. 150.
- (5) 'Phenomenology' by E. Husserl in Encyclopaedia Britannica (1927), transl. R. E. Palmer & reprod. in 'Phenomenology and Existentialism' by Richard M. Zaner & Don Ihde., Capricorn Books, 1973, p. 50.
- (6) 'The Paris Lectures' by E. Husserl, Martinus Nijhoff, 1975. Introd. p. XIX.
- (7) 'Phenomenology, Language and Sociology. Selected essays of Maurice Merleau-Ponty', ed. John O'Neill, Heinemann, 1974. Introd. p. XXVI.
- (8) Preface to 'Phenomenology of Perception', by Merleau-Ponty, reprod. in Zaner & Ihde, p. 74.
- (9) 'Daybooks of Edward Weston', Aperture, 1961, Vol. 1, p. 55.
- (10) Ibid., Vol. II, p. 79.
- (11) Ibid., Vol. II, p. 155.
- (12) 'The Paris Lectures', *ibid.*, Introd., p. XX.
- (13) 'Phenomenology' by E. Husserl, in Zaner & Ihde, p. 58.
- (14) Ibid., p. 55.
- (15) 'The Philosophy of Merleau-Ponty' by John F. Bannon, Harcourt, Brace & World Inc., 1967, p. 60.
- (16) 'Gestalt Psychology' by Wolfgang Kohler, Liveright Publishing Corporation, 1947. Reprint in Mentor Books, p. 43.
- (17) Ibid., p. 94.

- (18) 'The Decisive Moment' by Cartier-Bresson, 1952. Reprod. in *Photography*, ed. Nathan Lyons. Prentice Hall Inc., 1966, p. 47.
- (19) 'On Phenomenology as a Method of Philosophy' by Philip Pettit, in 'Linguistic Analysis & Phenomenology', *ibid.*, p. 246.
- (20) *Ibid.*, p. 248.
- (21) 'Description as the Method of Philosophy: a reply to Mr. Pettit' by Ernest Tugendhat, in 'Linguistic Analysis & Phenomenology', *ibid.*, p. 260.
- (22) 'Studies on Excitation and Inhibition in the Retina', ed. F. Ratliff, London, Chapman & Hall, 1974, p. 646.
- (23) *Ibid.*, p. 654.
- (24) *Ibid.*, Foreword, p. XIX.
- (25) 'The Origins of Knowledge and Imagination' by Jacob Bronowski, Yale University Press, 1978, pp. 17-18.
- (26) 'The Intelligent Eye', by R. L. Gregory, McGraw-Hill, 1970, p. 22.
- (27) 'Perception. The World Transformed', by Lloyd Kaufman, Oxford University Press, 1979, p. 155.
- (28) 'The Philosophy of Merleau-Ponty', *ibid.*, p. 63.

Thanks to Paul Crittenden, Department of General Philosophy, Sydney University, for reading the manuscript and making valuable suggestions.

Rupture, Generation or Continuity? The '70's and an '80's Photography (A Speech from a Rostrum)

At the end of 1983, as part of its normal exhibition programme, the Department of Photography at the Australian National Gallery held an exhibition 'A *decade of Australian photography 1972-1982*'. The exhibition was drawn from the Philip Morris Arts Grant Collection, a corporate sponsorship programme that oriented itself around the work of 'young, bold and innovative artists'. The show was the latest of a succession of exhibitions and publications drawn from that collection, the largest and most significant collection of '70's Australian photography. It was not the exhibition's intention to offer a significant reappraisal of the period's photography, more to provide a curatorial summation of the collection itself. For these reasons the exhibition would have been largely familiar to anyone acquainted with recent Australian photography and the Philip Morris Arts Grant.

Yet something did distinguish this exhibition from previous Philip Morris Arts Grants exhibitions and publications: despite the fact that some works of quite recent execution were included, one couldn't help but get the sense, when viewing the exhibition, that what was once a 'now' photography had become a 'then' photography, what was once 'our' photography had become 'their' photography.

The exhibition seemed to arouse little interest within the ranks of Australia's newer photographers. This apparent disinterest in the work exhibited revealed, once and for all, that the photography 'explosion' of the early '70's, which had stopped the clocks for six or seven years, was now no longer even an echo. From the viewpoint of 1983 the '70's was, for photography at least, a long summer that didn't so much turn into autumn as disappear over the horizon.

Not only were many of today's emerging photographers ignorant of the emergence of their predecessors in the '70's, they were also disinterested. They seemed to find the work uninspirational and easily locatable within the larger histories of photography that they had been taught. To them, art-historical chapter-headings such as 'formalism', 'expressionism', 'street photography', or 'feminist pedagogy' accrued all too easily to the work exhibited.

Though they may have been ignorant of the photographers, they were not ignorant of the photography. They thought that they had seen it all before.

The exhibition revealed a distinct sense of rupture between the '70's and the '80's photography. This is, of course, only to be expected: historical rupture is a central tenet of Modernism, against whose bosom photography has always snuggled. (Postmodernism will be referred to later in this essay.) Yet if we closely examine Australian photography since the boom of the early '70's, we find that this rupture is more readily identifiable within the institutions of Australian photography than in the photography itself.

For instance the dealer photography galleries of Melbourne, to which the eager young photographers of the '70's came with their portfolios under their arms, have either closed or appear to be on the verge of doing so. The Australian Centre for Photography, which opened as a separate gallery and workshop in the heart of Sydney's dealer gallery belt, has restructured in a single building on Oxford Street, intent on broadening its basis in both the general and photographic communities. The privileged pedagogy of one or two 'leading' art colleges, with its concomitant valorization of the guru-like teacher, has been expanded into a whole range of educational opportunities right across Australia. The photographic climate seems to have changed so much that a one or two person show at a dealer gallery, so highly valued on the CVs of the '70's, seems to almost have an air of presumption in the '80's, when photographers are just as willing to join together to hold group and theme shows at a variety of institutional spaces. (Witness the present exhibition.)

Hence we have those terms I have used so freely thus far—the '70's and the '80's. But although the institutional changes within Australian photography clearly indicate such a distinction, it is not nearly as clear within Australian photography itself.

In fact the continuities of theme and practice are just as evident as the discontinuities. The phallogocentric juvenilia of the '70's—the soppy shots of nude girlfriends, the sepiaed 'studies' of nature, etc., etc.—has thankfully shrivelled. The serendipitous snaps of 'streetwise' photographers, which certainly had more to offer, have been banished in the face of popularly read critiques of the single, coherent photographic image and its place in hegemonic visual culture (in particular liberal-humanist press, film and TV discourses). It is tempting to suggest that disdain for the single image is the mark of '80's photography, but it is not a mark that distinguishes it from the '70's. Many of the most important photographers of the '70's worked with serial imagery (e.g. John Rhodes) constructing narratives at various levels of interpretive ambiguity. Others (e.g. Carol Jerrems) constructed directorial, almost fictionalised spaces, implicating the photographer in, and therefore deneutralizing, the act of photographing itself. Other photographers (e.g. Micky Allan) overtly compromised the photographs glassy, windowlike surface with sophisticated, gestural handcolouring techniques. The cataloguing imperative, as a structuring process that defines the photographer as a self-conscious investigator of the limits of the photograph as an informational and aesthetic unit, is also common to both decades. It is not difficult to see the diachronic lines of continuity, influence and individual career that are deeply scored across both the '70's and the '80's. The rupture between the decades is a contextual and an institutional one, rather than a formal, stylistic, or thematic one.

But this fails to explain why newer photographers tend to find the work of their predecessors boring. The reason is, I think, in large part because they feel they have seen it, or else work very much like it, 'all before'. To them it remains, for all intents and purposes, virtually indistinguishable from similar work produced by European or American photographers.

The only thing that does, ultimately, divide the two decades is that, during the '70's, any regionalist problematic that may have disturbed, or even affected, Australian photographers was swamped by the sheer newness of their activity. The question of sustaining any artistic photographic practice at all usurped the question of sustaining any particularly Australian photographic practice. The commonality felt by the Australian photographers of the '70's was a commonality of time, of nowness, rather than a commonality of place, of hereness.

The young photographers of the '70's probably felt entirely untroubled by regionalist problematics as their eyes scanned the magazine racks for the silver cover of *Creative Camera* containing this month's collection of portfolios by their fellow young photographers in Europe or America. Likewise, overseas visitors were invited to Australia for pontifical visits and treated with a fraternal familiarity when they arrived. 'One could say that photography in Australia is on the same plane as elsewhere' claimed the editorial of the inaugural edition of *Light Vision*, 'Australia's International Photography Magazine'.

Thus, although there are, of course, differences identifiable in retrospect between photography in Australia and elsewhere during the '70's, any sense of continuity between the '70's and '80's amongst Australian photographers themselves tends to be dissipated in the sea of 'global photography' to which they blithely subscribe. Because the difference between the practices of photographers in Australia and photographers elsewhere are scrupulously effaced there seems nothing in particular for one generation of Australian photographers to contribute to the next. Collections such as the Philip Morris Arts Grant appear to become vitiated by their look-alikeness before they are even complete.

The '70's and the '80's, having lost hold of each other, seem to be carried along independently by the currents of global photography with its global histories. (This is not to elevate 'global photography' to the status of a hegemonic bogey.

Neither is it to call for a parochial tradition of 'Australian photography—Australian art has already gone through several re-runs of that episode. Nor is it to call for the invention of a paternalistic relationship between the two 'generations'.)

However, if a sense of continuity could be established for Australian photography, going all the way back to when the boom began in the early '70's, then perhaps a more complex, stronger Australian photography would result, one that felt more confident in itself and had a more substantial basis from which to contribute to the current upheavals in Australian culture generally and Australian art in particular. Australian photography still inhabits the peripheral: the longer it continues to construct itself as a series of youthful nowness, the longer it will maintain the familiar problematics that have accompanied it throughout its history. These problematics centre around the right, or ability, of photography and photographers to participate in the art discourse at all. And if so, at what level.

It is in the face of these weary, but continuing problematics that this call for continuity is made. Because, from the point of view of art in the '80's, to make a call for photographers to re-examine, or even just examine, such a thing as the '70's for a sense of continuity may seem reactionary in the extreme. After all, the leitmotif of '80's art is, under the rubric of Postmodernism, precisely the ruptures and foliations of synchronic sets of cultural nownesses. But to regard such a call as reactionary or misplaced is to ignore the discursive formation of photography within art.

Quite simply there was little art photography of any consequence in Australia before the 1970's. We have to go back, probably to the 1930's, before we can again find photography locating itself in the art discourse. Nor can photography be conveniently counted as just another component of '80's Postmodernism, the site for which is, primarily, still the traditional art mediums. Photographic reproductive processes may be crucial to much Postmodernist art, but art photography is not; nor, on the evidence is it dead. (Again, witness the present show.) Although a good deal of current photographic activity, some even from this show, can be inscribed into Postmodernist discourses (as broad as they are becoming), much photography, some even from this show as well, could not.

Furthermore, most probably because of those very problematics of photography within art, photography still resolutely refuses to become institutionally integrated into art, or to die out. Despite the devout prayers of photographic and art practitioners alike it remains a discipline all too readily identifiable by that one word—photography. Although photography was warmly welcomed by art in the '70's, the fact that it is still regarded from a safe distance is readily apparent when one examines the geography of the hanging of recent Biennales and *Perspectas*; photography's representation and presentation by dealer galleries; the course structures of art schools; the books and magazines in which photographic writings appear; and even shows such as this one, the motivational rationale for which is, simply, that all the ten artists exhibiting use photography. The photographic medium, rather than the photographic practice, is still the fundamental criterion for evaluating and categorizing photographers.

Thus we are left with the situation of photography being a medium which, like it or not, is left largely to itself to determine its own status, write its own histories, and inscribe its own formation within art. It is from this position that a call for continuity can be regarded as properly made.

And it is shows such as this one, with its casually random mixture of the 'older' and the 'newer' photographers—photographers who were collected during the '70's along with photographers who contributed to the institutional changes of the '80's and photographers who have only recently graduated from art colleges, which may be a very useful point from which to begin to establish a continuity stretching back further than just a year or two. In this way, part of the boom of the '70's could be profitably recouped for the '80's.

Martyn Jolly
March 1984

John Delacour

1948 Born in Sydney.

Selected Exhibitions

- 1976 Watters Gallery, Sydney. (With John Rhodes.)
1977 Pinacotheca Gallery, Melbourne.
1979 'Australian Art Photography', Department of Foreign Affairs.
1981 'Sydney Focus/Melbourne Shift', V.C.A. Gallery, Melbourne.
1982 'The Bay Window Project', Watters Gallery, Sydney.
Tasmanian School of Art Gallery, Hobart. (With David Stephenson.)
1983 'Australian Perspecta', Art Gallery of N.S.W., Sydney.

Selected Publications and References

- 1979 *Australian Photographers: The Philip Morris Collection*, Philip Morris Pty. Ltd., Melbourne.
1980 *Art and Australia*, Vol. 18, No. 2.
1982 *Art and Australia*, Vol. 20, No. 1.
1983 'Merlin & Bayliss: Work from the Hill End Studio', Art Network No. 9.
Camera Arts, Vol. 3, No. 6, U.S.A.
1984 'Sydney Topography: The photographs of Mark Johnson', *Art and Australia*, Vol. 21, No. 3, Autumn 1984.

Collections

Australian National Gallery, Canberra.
Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

Grants

Visual Arts Board, Australia Council.

Other Experience

- 1981 Appointed to the Visual Arts Board, Australia Council.
1982 Part-time lecturer in photography, C.A.I., Sydney.
1983 Full-time lecturer in photography, C.A.I., Sydney.

Paul Hewson

1948 Born Feilding, N.Z.

1980 Moved to Sydney.

Curatorial and Other Experience

- 1979-80 Editor *The Photo-Forum Supplement*, N.Z.
1982-84 Founder/Director IMAGES Gallery, Sydney.
(Joined by Bruce Searle in 1983.)

Selected Exhibitions

- 1977 Snaps Gallery, Auckland, N.Z.
'Ex Camera', N.Z. Academy of Fine Art, Wellington, N.Z.
University of Queensland Art Museum, Brisbane.
1978 'Little Works', Auckland City Art Gallery, Auckland, N.Z.
1982 'Mixed Show', Stephen Mori Gallery, Sydney.
'Photography at the Unit', ART UNIT, Sydney.
1983 'Gods, demi-gods, and demi-demi-gods', IMAGES Gallery, Sydney.
'Acquisitions 1973-83', University of Queensland Art Museum, Brisbane.
1984 IMAGES Gallery, Sydney. (With Bruce Searle, Geoff Kleem and Mark Johnson.)
'Zone XII', ART UNIT, Sydney.

Selected Collections

Auckland City Art Gallery, N.Z.
University of Queensland Art Museum, Brisbane.
Australian National Gallery, Canberra.

Selected Publications and References

The Active Eye, Manawatu Art Gallery, May 1975, N.Z.
Art New Zealand, Art Magazine Press, Issue 10, 1978, N.Z.
Photo-Forum, Photo-Forum Inc., Issue 46, 1980, N.Z.
Australian Arts Review, Warner Associates, 1983.

Grants

- 1977 The Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council, N.Z.

Mark Hinderaker

1946 Born in U.S.A.

1970-76 Resident in Australia.
Presently residing in Australia.

Qualifications

- 1969 B.A. Literature, The University of California, San Diego.
1973 Diploma in Education, S.C.B. Hawthorn, Melbourne.
1976 Graduate Diploma in Applied Film and TV, Swinburne Institute of Technology, Melbourne.
M.A. English, Monash University, Melbourne.
1979 M.A. Art (Photography), University of New Mexico, U.S.A.
Currently employed as a lecturer (part-time) in photography at Newcastle College of Advanced Education and S.C.A., Sydney.

Curatorial and Other Experience

- 1980-81 Fellow in Art History and Museum Studies, Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, U.S.A.
1982-83 Acting Curator of Photography, Art Gallery of N.S.W., Sydney.
Visiting Fellow, Department of Photography, S.C.A., Sydney.
1982-84 Editorial Committee, *Photofile*, published by Australian Centre for Photography, Sydney.
Executive Committee, A.C.P., Sydney.
Photography reviewer, *Sydney Morning Herald*.

Selected Exhibitions

- 1979 M.A. Thesis Exhibition, University of New Mexico, U.S.A.
1982 Viewpoints Gallery, A.C.P., Sydney.
IMAGES Gallery, Sydney.

Selected Publications and References

- 1976 'W. Eugene Smith Talks about Minimata'. (Videotape.)
'Family Relationships in the fiction of Charles Dickens'. (M.A. Thesis.)

Grants and Awards

- 1964-69 Regent's Scholarship, The University of California, U.S.A.
1970-72 Monash Graduate Research Scholarship.
1980-81 Rubenstein Fellowship in Art History and Museum Studies, Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, U.S.A.

Mark Johnson

1946 Born in Sydney.

Selected Exhibitions

- 1980 Wollongong City Gallery Art Purchase Exhibition.
1981 The Australian Centre for Photography, Sydney.
The Developed Image Gallery, Adelaide.
'Sydney Focus/Melbourne Shift', Victorian College of the Arts, Melbourne; The Developed Image Gallery, Adelaide.
1982 'Landscape, Australia', National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne.
'Year of the Tree Show', Art Gallery of N.S.W., Sydney.
1983 'A Decade of Australian Photography 1972-1982', The Philip Morris Arts Grants, Australian National Gallery, Canberra.
'NEW WORK', IMAGES Gallery, Sydney.
'The Lady (Warwick) Fairfax Photography Awards', Art Gallery of N.S.W., Sydney.
'The 1984 Show', IMAGES Gallery, Sydney.
1984 'Architecture and Photography 1948-1982', National Gallery of Victoria. IMAGES Gallery, Sydney. (With Bruce Searle, Geoff Kleem and Paul Hewson.)

Collections

Art Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide.
National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne.
Australian National Gallery, Canberra.
Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery.
Visual Arts Board (Australia Council) Art Purchase Program.
Parliament House, Sydney.
Art Bank, Sydney.

Selected Publications and References

- 'Photography in the Australian Art Scene', *Art and Australia*, Summer 1980.
'Mark Johnson', (interview/portfolio), *Words and Visions*, No. 9 & 10.
'Sydney topography: the photographs of Mark Johnson', *Art and Australia*, Vol. 21, No. 3, Autumn 1984.

Grants

Visual Arts Board, Australia Council.

Other Experience

- 1982-83 Executive committee, A.C.P., Sydney.
1983 Founding member *Photofile*, editorial committee.
1984 Editor *Photofile*, A.C.P., Sydney.

Martyn Jolly

1959 Born in Brisbane.

Qualifications

1981 B.A. in photography, S.C.A., Sydney.

Selected Exhibitions

1981 'Four Photographers', Bondi Pavilion, Sydney.

Curatorial and Other Experience

- 1981 Student internship at Australian Centre for Photography, Sydney.
Curatorial Assistant in Photography Department, Australian National Gallery, Canberra.
1982 Executive Committee, A.C.P., Sydney.
Co-curated the exhibition 'Australian Photography: Pictorialism to Photojournalism', Australian National Gallery, Canberra.
1983 Re-elected to Executive Committee, A.C.P., Sydney.
Co-curated the exhibition 'A Decade of Australian Photography', A.N.G., Canberra.

Selected Publications

- 1980 Published and edited *Halide*, S.C.A., Sydney.
1981 Editorial Collective and contributor to *Photo-Discourse*, S.C.A., Sydney.
1982 Contribution to text of *International Photography 1920-1980*.
1983 'Another Way of Seeing', (book review) *Photofile*, A.C.P., Sydney.
'Faces of the Street', (book review) *Photofile*, A.C.P., Sydney.

Geoff Kleem

1953 Born in Young, N.S.W.

Qualifications

1976 Diploma in Art (painting), Alexander Mackie, C.A.E., Sydney.

Selected Exhibitions

- 1982 'Photographic Work', Viewpoints Gallery, A.C.P., Sydney.
1983 'Photographs and Proposals for Larger Works', IMAGES Gallery, Sydney.
1984 IMAGES Gallery, Sydney. (With Bruce Searle, Mark Johnson and Paul Hewson.)
'Zone XII', ART UNIT, Sydney.

Publications and References

- 1981 Editorial collective and contributor, *Photo-Discourse*, S.C.A., Sydney.
1983 *Art Network*, No. 9.

Miranda Lawry

1957 Born in Sydney.

Qualifications

- 1979 B.A. in photography, S.C.A., Sydney.
1981 Post-graduate Diploma in Visual Arts, S.C.A., Sydney.

Curatorial Experience

- 1982 Gallery Assistant, A.C.P., Sydney.
1983 Gallery Co-ordinator, A.C.P., Sydney.

Selected Exhibitions

- 1982 'Contemporary Sydney Photographers', Queensland College of Art Gallery; Canberra School of Art Gallery.
'Second Sight', Visibility Gallery, Melbourne.
1983 'NEW WORK', IMAGES Gallery, Sydney.

Selected References

- 1982 *Studio Access Project*.
Photo World.

Grants

1983 Visual Arts Board, Australia Council.

Terence Maloon

Qualifications

Camberwell School of Arts.
University of London, Goldsmith's College.
University of East Anglia. (B.A. Hons.)

Teaching Experience

- 1972-79 St. Martin's School of Art, London.
1981-82 Sydney College of the Arts, Sydney.
1972-84 Visiting lecturer at numerous colleges in U.K. and Australia.

Selected Publications and Editorial Experience

- 1976-79 Assistant editor and regular contributor, *Artscribe* magazine, London.
Deputy visual arts editor, *Time Out* magazine, London.
1982-84 Art critic, *The Sydney Morning Herald*.

Juilee Pryor

1956 Born in Fern Tree Gully, Victoria.

Selected Exhibitions

- 1981 'From Behind the Wardrobe', Women's Art Movement.
1982 'Photographs', IMAGES Gallery, Sydney.
'Photography at the Unit', ART UNIT, Sydney.
'Women and Art Festival Reject Exhibition', ART UNIT, Sydney.
'APMIRA', Paddington Town Hall, Sydney.
'Intra-mundane Art Package', ONE FLAT, Brisbane; PRAXIS, Perth; ART UNIT, Sydney.
1983 'ANZART-in-HOBART', Tasmania.
'Gods, demi-gods, and demi-demi-gods', IMAGES Gallery, Sydney.
'Photo-entente', IMAGES Gallery, Sydney.
'ART UNIT goes West, UP CAKE ART', Fairfield, Sydney.
1984 'International Women's Day Exhibition', Bondi Pavilion, Sydney.
'Zone XII', ART UNIT, Sydney.

Curatorial Experience

1982-84 Co-ordinator ART UNIT, Sydney with Robert McDonald.

Selected References

1983 *Art Network*, No. 12.

Jacky Redgate

1955 Born in Hammersmith, England.

1967 Emigrated to Australia.

Qualifications

B.A. in Sculpture, South Australian School of Art, Adelaide.

Selected Exhibitions

- 1982 'What we lost is our home in this world', (installation), Experimental Art Foundation, Adelaide.
'APMIRA', Paddington Town Hall, Sydney.
'The Christmas Show', ROAR Studios, Melbourne.

Ernst Jandl

Ernst Jandl's work is a blend of visual and verbal play. His poetry often consists of words that are visually striking due to their arrangement or the use of unusual characters. He is known for his 'phonetic poetry' where the sound of the words is as important as their meaning. His visual art often incorporates text and graphic elements, creating a complex interplay between the two.

Ingabrunn 1977

Ingabrunn 1977 is a collection of Jandl's work, featuring both text and visual art. The text pieces are characterized by their rhythmic and phonetic qualities, often using a mix of letters and symbols to create a unique visual language. The visual art pieces are equally innovative, often using text as a central element in their compositions. The collection is a testament to Jandl's versatility and his ability to push the boundaries of both poetry and visual art.