


PHIL CHANG

Press Pack



PHIL CHANG

BORN

1974, Elkhart, IN
Lives and works in Los Angeles, CA

EDUCATION

2005 M.F.A. California Institute of the Arts, Valencia, CA
1997 B.A. University of California Irvine, Irvine, CA

SOLO EXHIBITIONS

2019 George Eastman Museum, Rochester, NY (forthcoming)
2017 *Matte Black Marks, Matte Black Pictures*, M+B, Los Angeles, CA
2015 *Pictures, Chromogenic and Pigment, #2*, Praz-Delavallade, Paris, FR
CMP Projects, California Museum of Photography, University of California, Riverside, CA
2014 *Pictures, Chromogenic and Pigment*, M+B, Los Angeles, CA
2012 *Cache, Active*, LA><ART, Los Angeles, CA
Studio Affect, Pepin Moore, Los Angeles, CA

GROUP EXHIBITIONS

2017 *Four Person Summer Group Show: Phil Chang, Laeh Glenn, John Houck, Ian James, Roberts & Tilton*, Los Angeles, CA
Light Play: Experiments in Photography, 1970 to the Present, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles, CA
I Love L.A., Praz-Delavallade, Los Angeles, CA
2016 *A Matter of Memory: Photography as Object in the Digital Age*, George Eastman Museum, Rochester, NY
About Time, San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, San Francisco, CA
Rotation 2016: Recent Acquisitions, California Museum of Photography, Riverside, CA
Arturo Bandini, Los Angeles, CA
Unfixed: The Fugitive Image, Transformer Station, Cleveland, OH

M+B

- 2015 *Russian Doll*, M+B Gallery, Los Angeles, CA
The Human Apparatus, Klemm's, Berlin, Germany
Lens Work: Celebrating LACMA's Experimental Photography at 50, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles, CA
- 2014 *Me and Benjamin*, curated by M+B, Galerie Xippas, Paris, France
Aggregate Exposure, George Lawson Gallery, San Francisco, CA
Material Object, Curated by Justin Cole, Charlie James Gallery, Los Angeles, CA
Tip the Wink, The Institute of Jamais Vu, London, UK
Process, Photo Center Northwest, Seattle, WA
- 2013 *Page 179, Artforum, September 2013*, Brennan & Griffin, New York, NY
Influenced by the Sun, Cohen Gallery, Los Angeles, CA
Alchemical, Steven Kasher Gallery, New York, NY
Endless Bummer II / Still Bummin', Marlborough Chelsea, New York, NY
Inaugural Exhibition, Pepin Moore, Los Angeles, CA
The Black Mirror, Curated by James Welling, Diane Rosenstein Fine Art, Los Angeles, CA
Flicker, Control Room, Los Angeles, CA
- 2012 *Crystal Chain*, Invisible Exports, New York, NY
Megabodega, Family Business, New York, NY
Woman, Laughing, Isolation Room/Gallery Kit, St. Louis, MO
- 2011 *Second Story | New Editions*, Pepin Moore, Los Angeles, CA
No More Reality, Creatures of Comfort, New York, NY
Sing Me To Sleep, Angles Gallery, Los Angeles, CA
- 2010 *Young Curators, New Ideas III*, P•P•O•W, New York, NY
- 2009 *Beyond Process*, Renwick Gallery, New York, NY
The Awful Parenthesis, Cirrus Gallery, Los Angeles, CA
Palomar: Experimental Photography, Marvelli Gallery, New York, NY
Ooga Booga Reading Room, The Swiss Institute, New York, NY
- 2008 *The World Is All That Is The Case*, Hudson Franklin, New York, NY
When It's A Photograph, Bolsky Gallery, Otis College of Art & Design, Los Angeles, CA
I Am I A Killer, Sam Lee Gallery, Los Angeles, CA
Intersections, Outpost for Contemporary Art, Los Angeles, CA
- 2006 *Best Played With A Straight Face*, Hudson Franklin, New York, NY
Rose Bowl Flea Market Biennale, CLANCCO and Outpost For Contemporary Art, Pasadena, CA
New American Talent: 21, Arthouse at the Jones Center, Austin, TX

M+B

- 2005 *Supersonic 2005*, Los Angeles Design Center, Los Angeles, CA
Shipping & Receiving, Armory Northwest/965, Pasadena, CA
FIVE, Scalo Project Space, New York, NY
Some Notes On Personal Acts That Other People Perform, Lime Gallery, CalArts, Valencia, CA
Crossfade, Teoretica Gallery, San Jose, Costa Rica
- 2004 *After Komoru Shinako*, Main Gallery, California Institute of the Arts, Valencia, CA
MFA Mid-Residency Show, California Institute of the Arts, Valencia, CA
GPS: Cypress Park, Los Angeles, CA
- 2003 *December Test*, South La Brea Gallery, Los Angeles, CA
November Test, D301 Gallery, California Institute of the Arts, Valencia, CA
- 2002 *Home Series*, Grand Central Art Center, California State University Fullerton, CA

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY


- 2016 Roach, Thomas. *The Beauty of a Social Problem – Interview with Walter Benn Michaels*, Objektiv, August 9
Crow, Kelly. "SFMOMA Stakes Out Photography." Wall Street Journal, April 28
- 2015 Taylor, Phil. "Phil Chang. Praz-Delavallade." ARTFORUM, July 16
- 2014 Cotton, Charlotte. "Photographer's File: Phil Chang," IMA Magazine, Vol 9, August
Mizota, Sharon. "The Focus Cleverly Blurs in 'Soft Target' at M+B," Los Angeles Times, August 22
Karapetian, Farrah. "Theatrical Photographs," nonsite.org, May 2
Graves, Jen. "Currently Hanging: The Unveiling of Phil Chang's Photograph," The Stranger, May 8
Upchurch, Michael. "Photo Center NW'S 'Process' is About More Than Images," The Seattle Times, March 28
Luna, Gina. "Process PCNW Welcomes New Photography Exhibition," The Capitol Hill Times, March 13
Robertson, Rebecca, "Expired Photo Materials Find New Life in Contemporary Photography", ARTnews, February 17
- 2013 Cotton, Charlotte. C-Photo: Photographicness, Volume 7
Aletti, Vince. "Goings On About Town: Art – Alchemical," The New Yorker, July
Diehl, Travis. "The Black Mirror," Artforum.com, Critics' Pick, February
Ollman, Leah. "Black As Everything and Nothing at Diane Rosenstein," Los Angeles Times, January 31
- 2012 Lehrer-Graiwer, Sarah. "Phil Chang," Artforum, Summer
Welling, James. "Associations for Phil Chang," nonsite.org, April 17
Michaels, Walter Benn. *Meaning & Affect: Phil Chang's Cache, Active*, LA><ART, March
Winat, Carmen. "Affective Turns? ", Artforum.com, Critics' Pick, March

M+B

- Mizota, Sharon. "Phil Chang at LA><ART ," Los Angeles Times, March 23
Tumlr, Jan. "Dark-Side Minimalism," X-Tra, Fall, Vol. 15, No. 1
Blind Spot, Issue 45, May, edited by Matthew Porter and Hannah Whitaker
Modrak, Rebekah & Bill Anthes, Reframing Photography: Theory and Practice, Resources & Artists Listing, Routledge
Haroutounian, Christine. "In View of Affect: An Interview with Phil Chang," Graphite, April
Wagley, Catherine. "Phil Chang: Studio, Affect," Snapshots, Photograph, July 31
Tuck, Geoff. "Notes On Looking," April 7
- 2011 Herman, Jane. "Now Selling," T Magazine, The New York Times, July 27
Kim, Mia. "No More Reality," The Wild, July
Rodo-Vankeulen, Noel. "Books About Photo and Photos About Text," iheartphotograph, April 13
Tuck, Geoff. "Notes On Looking," January 5
- 2010 Lehrer-Graiwer, Sarah. "500 Words," Artforum.com, May 13
Williams, Sarah Bay. "Three Photo Books and One Book On Photo," Unframed, May 21
Congyun, Liu. "Phil Chang, Interview," Photo World, Xinhua News Agency, September
Tuck, Geoff. "Notes On Looking," November 11
- 2009 Aletti, Vince. "Galleries – Chelsea," The New Yorker, June 22
Walleston, Aimee. "Photography Wow," T Magazine, The New York Times, June 5
Curcio, Seth. "Palomar: Experimental Photography," Daily Serving, June 5
- 2008 When It's A Photograph, Catalog, Otis College of Art & Design
Biel, Kim. "I Am I A Killer," Artweek, October
Grider, Nicholas. "Interview with Phil Chang," iheartphotograph, April 29
- 2007 Balaschak, Chris. "2007 Works"
2006 New American Talent: 21, Catalog, Arthouse at the Jones Center, Austin, TX
- 2005 Matuk, Farid. "Less So The Man: Chang's Some Notes On Personal Acts That Other People Perform"

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY (VIDEO)

- 2016 "Phil Chang and Peter Holzhauer," The People Radio, Episode 37
<https://m.soundcloud.com/insertblanc/ep-37-phil-chang-peter-holzhauer-the-people>
- 2015 "CMP Projects: Phil Chang," UCR ARTSblock
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wVeFQHpf6A8>



CURATORIAL PROJECTS

- 2014 *Soft Target*, organized with Matthew Porter, M+B, Los Angeles, CA
- 2012 *Affective Turns?*, Pepin Moore, Los Angeles, CA
- 2009 *Seeing Sight*, LACE Benefit Art Auction, Los Angeles Contemporary Exhibitions, Los Angeles, CA

ARTIST TALKS & LECTURES

- 2016 Panelist, The Photographic Event, San Francisco Museum of Modern Art
Artist Lecture, Broken Windows course, California Institute of the Arts
Panelist, "Photography is Magic," LA Art Book Fair, moderated by Charlotte Cotton, Los Angeles, CA
- 2015 Artist Lecture, "UCLA-LAMA Art History Practicum Initiative," Instructors Miwon Kwon and Britt Salvesen
Artist Lecture, "*CMP Projects*," California Museum of Photography, University of California, Riverside
Panelist, "Photography and Philosophy," Los Angeles County Museum of Art, CA
Panelist, "Remembering Forward: Conversations on Photography, LA><ART, Los Angeles, CA
- 2014 Panelist, Material Object, Charlie James Gallery, Los Angeles, CA
Artist Lecture, Department of Art and Art History, University of California, Davis
Artist Lecture, Department of Art History, University of Mostar, Bosnia Herzegovina
Panelist, Artists in L.A.: The Expanded Field and Photographic Possibilities, photo L.A.
Artist Lecture, Program of Photography & Imaging, Art Center College of Design, Pasadena, CA
Artist Lecture, Advanced Photography, University of Southern California
- 2013 Office Hours, LA><ART, Los Angeles
Panelist, The Language of Photography, Palm Springs Photo Festival
Artist Lecture, Advanced Painting Course, California State University, Los Angeles
- 2012 Artist Lecture, Department of Art, University of California, Riverside
Panelist, *A Discussion On Aesthetics, Affect and Issues of Value in Contemporary Art*, LA><ART, Los Angeles
- Panelist, Exhibition Research Forum, Los Angeles
- 2011 Artist Lecture, Los Angeles Art Now, Antioch University Los Angeles
- 2010 Panelist with Britt Salvesen and Patterson Beckwith, Art Catalogues at LACMA, Los Angeles, CA
Artist Lecture, Photography Now, UCLA Extension Program

M+B

- 2009 Artist Lecture, Summer Art Institute, Department of Art, University of California, Los Angeles
Artist Lecture, Photography Without A Darkroom, The City College of New York, NY
- 2008 Artist Lecture, *When It's A Photograph*, Otis College of Art & Design
Panelist, 2008 Resident Artist and Architect Critiques, MAK Center for Art and Architecture
Guest Lecture, Professional Practices, Otis College of Art & Design
- 2007 Artist Lecture, Art Center College of Art & Design, Visiting Artist Course

MONOGRAPHS


- 2010 Phil Chang, *Four Over One*, Wallis Annenberg Photography Department, The Los Angeles County Museum of Art, May

ESSAYS & ARTICLES

- 2015 Cotton, Charlotte. "*Photography is Magic.*" *Aperture*, September
Michaels, Walter Benn. "*The Beauty of a Social Problem: Photography, Autonomy, Economy.*" The University of Chicago Press (cover)
- 2013 "Phil Chang: Cache, Active | Conversation with James Welling," *Aperture*, Spring, #210
- 2011 "Interview with Walter Benn Michaels on Photography and Politics," *nonsite.org*, Issue 2
- 2010 "1 Image 1 Minute," *X-Tra*, Volume 12, Number 2, Winter 2010 (Organized by Micol Hebron)
- 2009 "Dead and Alive," *Words Without Pictures*, Wallis Annenberg Photography Department, The Los Angeles County Museum of Art, May 2009
- 2008 "Conversation With Charlotte Cotton and Phil Chang," *When It's a Photograph*, Otis College of Art & Design, November

ACADEMIC POSITIONS & APPOINTMENTS


- 2016 Faculty, The Milton Avery Graduate School of the Arts, Bard College
- 2007 – Present Visiting Faculty, Department of Art, University of California, Los Angeles, CA
- 2007 – 2014 Lecturer, Photography Program, Otis College of Art & Design, Los Angeles, CA



2007 Part-time Faculty, Foundation Program, Otis College of Art & Design, Los Angeles, CA

COLLECTIONS

Los Angeles County Museum of Art, CA
San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, CA
California Museum of Photography, CA



PHIL CHANG

Phil Chang (b. 1974, Elkhart, IN) received his MFA from the California Institute of the Arts and his BA from the University of California, Irvine. Recent solo exhibitions include *Monochromes, Static and Unfixed* at the California Museum of Photography, Riverside and *Cache, Active* at LA><ART, as well as a forthcoming solo exhibition at the George Eastman Museum, Rochester, NY. Recent institutional group shows include *Light Play: Experiments in Photography, 1970 to the Present* at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art; *A Matter of Memory: Photography as Object in the Digital Age* at the George Eastman Museum, Rochester, NY; *About Time* at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art and *Unfixed: The Fugitive Image* at the Cleveland Museum of Art's Transformer Station, OH. Chang's work has been written about in *ARTFORUM*, *The New Yorker*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Aperture*, *Blind Spot*, *IMA Magazine* and *C-Photo*. Other published texts include those with Charlotte Cotton, James Welling and Walter Benn Michaels, and an artist's book *Four Over One*, published by the Los Angeles County Museum of Art. Curatorial projects have included *Soft Target* at M+B, *Affective Turns?* at Pepin Moore and *Seeing Sight* at Los Angeles Contemporary Exhibitions. His work is in the collections of the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art and the California Museum of Photography, Riverside. Phil Chang lives and works in Los Angeles.



PHIL CHANG

Selected Portfolio

M+B



Phil Chang

Installation View of *A Matter of Memory: Photography as object in the Digital Age*, group show at the George Eastman Museum, Rochester, NY
October 22, 2016 – January 29, 2017

M+B



Phil Chang

Installation View of *About Time: Photography in a Moment of Change*,
group show at San Francisco Museum of Modern Art
May 14 – September 25, 2016

M+B



Phil Chang

Magazine Tear-Out #1, 2010

unfixed gelatin silver print

image size: 9-1/2 x 7-1/2 x inches (24.1 x 19.1 cm)

frame size: 19 x 15 inches (48.3 x 38.1 cm)

(PC.05.015.19)

M+B



Phil Chang

Three Sheets of Thin Paper, 2010

unfixed gelatin silver print

image size: 9-1/2 x 7-1/2 x inches (24.1 x 19.1 cm)

frame size: 19 x 15 inches (48.3 x 38.1 cm)

(PC.05.018.19)

M+B



Phil Chang

Installation View of *Pictures, Chromogenic and Pigment #2*, solo show at Praz-Delavallade, Paris
May 30 – July 25, 2015

M+B



Phil Chang

Installation View of *Monochromes, Static and Unfixed*, solo show at
California Museum of Photography, University of California, Riverside
May 2 – August 8, 2015

M+B



Phil Chang

Two-person presentation with Dwyer Kilcollin at NADA, Miami
December 4 – 7, 2014

M+B



Phil Chang

*Replacement Ink for Epson Printers (Magenta 172202)
on Canson PhotoSatin Premium RC Paper, 2014*

unique archival pigment print
signed, dated and titled verso
22-½ x 17-½ inches (57.2 x 44.5 cm)
(PC.02.045.22)

M+B



Phil Chang

Replacement Ink for Epson Printers (Cyan and Yellow 446602)

on Epson Premium Glossy Paper, 2014


unique archival pigment print

signed, dated and titled verso

60 x 44 inches (152.4 x 111.8 cm)

(PC.02.042.60)

M+B



Phil Chang

Installation View of *Me and Benjamin*, group show at Galerie Xippas, Paris
November 14, 2014 – January 10, 2015

M+B



Phil Chang

Installation View of *Pictures, Chromogenic and Pigment*, solo show at M+B, Los Angeles
September 13 – October 25, 2014

M+B



Phil Chang

Installation View of *Pictures, Chromogenic and Pigment*, solo show at M+B, Los Angeles
September 13 – October 25, 2014


M+B



Phil Chang


Installation View of *Pictures, Chromogenic and Pigment*, solo show at M+B, Los Angeles
September 13 – October 25, 2014

M+B



Phil Chang
Untitled (Orange Monochrome 03), 2014
unique chromogenic print
signed, dated and titled verso
60 x 48 inches (152.4 x 121.9 cm)
(PC.01.008.60)

M+B




Phil Chang
Untitled (Yellow Monochrome), 2013
unique chromogenic print
signed, dated and titled verso
60 x 48 inches (152.4 x 121.9 cm)
(PC.01.003.60)

M+B




Phil Chang
Untitled (50% Gray Monochrome), 2014
unique chromogenic print
signed, dated and titled verso
60 x 48 inches (152.4 x 121.9 cm)
(PC.01.002.60)

M+B



Phil Chang
Installation view of *Untitled (Blue Monochrome 03)*, 2014
unique chromogenic print
signed, dated and titled verso
60 x 48 inches (152.4 x 121.9 cm)
(PC.01.012.60)

M+B



Phil Chang
Installation view of *Untitled (Blue Monochrome 05)*, 2014
unique chromogenic print
signed, dated and titled verso
60 x 48 inches (152.4 x 121.9 cm)
(PC.01.014.60)

M+B



Phil Chang

Replacement Ink for Epson Printers (Black 446004)

on Epson Premium Glossy Paper, 2014

unique archival pigment print

signed, dated and titled verso

60 x 42 inches (152.4 x 106.7 cm)

(PC.02.021.60)

M+B



Phil Chang

Replacement Ink for Epson Printers (Cyan and Yellow)

on Epson Premium Glossy Paper, 2014

unique archival pigment print

signed, dated and titled verso

60 x 44 inches (152.4 x 111.8 cm)

(PC.02.001.60)

M+B



Phil Chang

Replacement Ink for Epson Printers (Black 446004)

on Epson Premium Glossy Paper, 2014

unique archival pigment print

signed, dated and titled verso

60 x 44 inches (152.4 x 118.8 cm)

(PC.02.023.60)

M+B



Phil Chang

Replacement Ink for Epson Printers (Blue 172201)
on Epson Premium Luster Paper, 2014
unique archival pigment print
signed, dated and titled verso
22-½ x 17-½ inches (57.2 x 44.5 cm)
(PC.02.007.22)

M+B



Phil Chang

Replacement Ink for Epson Printers (Magenta 172201)

on Epson Premium Luster Paper, 2014

unique archival pigment print

signed, dated and titled verso

22-½ x 17-½ inches (57.2 x 44.5 cm)

(PC.02.017.22)

M+B



Phil Chang

*Replacement Ink for Epson Printers (Red and Yellow 172203)
on Epson Premium Luster Paper, 2014*

unique archival pigment print
signed, dated and titled verso
22-½ x 17-½ inches (57.2 x 44.5 cm)
(PC.02.031.22)

M+B



Phil Chang

Installation View of *Studio, Affect*, solo show at Pepin Moore, Los Angeles
July 7 – August 11, 2012

M+B



Phil Chang

Peel on Wood Table, Alternate for Studio, 2012

one one-color stencil prints on vellum, one gelatin silver print, one archival pigment print
signed, dated and titled verso

image size: 15-1/2 x 21-1/2 inches (39.4 x 54.6 cm) (each)

framed size: 36 x 21 inches (91.4 x 53.3 cm) (each)

edition of 3


(PC.04.001.36)

M+B



Phil Chang
Installation View of *Cache, Active*, solo show at LA<ART>, Los Angeles
March 10 – April 14, 2012

M+B



Phil Chang
Monochrome, Exposed, 2011
unfixed silver gelatin print
image size: 9- ½ x 7-½ inches (24.1 x 19.1 cm)
framed size: 19 x 15 inches (48.3 x 38.1 cm)
edition of 3 plus 2 artist's proofs



PHIL CHANG


Press and Press Releases

M+B

Objektiv

The Beauty of a Social Problem Interview with Walter Benn Michaels

By Thomas Roach
August 9, 2016



Phil Chang | Cache, Active, 2012 | LA><ART | Los Angeles

Thomas Roach: I'll lift questions from WJT Mitchell to begin: Who are you? What do you do? What crucial facts in your background would you mention if you were introducing yourself to a stranger on an airplane?

Walter Benn Michaels: So I pretty much keep to myself on airplanes but I guess the relevant facts about me are that I teach in the English Department at UIC and that, in addition to writing about literature and literary theory, I write about politics and art. And in politics, I'm an orthodox Reedian (Adolph); in aesthetics, an orthodox Friedian (Michael).

TR: You wrote recently: "If what you want is a vision of the structures that produce both the policies we've got and the desire for alternatives to them, art is almost the only place you can find it." Why do contemporary practices in photography interest you specifically? Or, why is photography the exemplar?

WBM: The main thing that's drawn me to photography has just been that for most of my looking-at-art lifetime, much of the most ambitious and exciting work has been made by photographers or artists with a strong connection to photography. Of course, there's been lots of meretricious and boring work too (that's inevitable) but, starting with Jim Welling's work in the early 80s, so many of the things that have just blown me away have been photographs. And one reason for that, I think, has been photography's centrality as a site for thinking about a particular set of theoretical questions that have turned out also be important political questions: the role of the artist in determining the work's meaning, the role of the reader or beholder, the relation of the work to the world

M+B

Of course these questions matter for every art. But it's not hard to see their particular salience for photography. The fact, for instance, that you can make a picture just by pressing a button on the camera can easily be understood to raise questions about the relative demands of skill and concept, or about how tight the relation between the artist's intentions and the picture's meaning can be, or even (something I'm writing about right now) about what exactly an intention or an intentional act is.

And, precisely because the photographer's contribution to the meaning of the work can come to seem attenuated, the beholder's can come to be accentuated. The most vivid early example was obviously Barthes's punctum – the insistence on what the beholder felt regardless of or despite whatever the photographer might have meant. And, of course, that distinctive appeal to the viewer is linked to the photograph's distinctive relation to what it's a photo of. Just to choose an artist I haven't written about but whose work I'm interested in, if you look at LaToya Ruby Frazier's photographs of Braddock PA, there's a kind of non-identity between how we respond to the subjects of those photographs and how we respond to the photographs as art. One depends on how we feel about de-industrialization, racialized poverty, etc.; it's about us. The other depends on how we understand what Frazier is trying to do with these pictures; it's about art. So the indexical relation of the photograph to its subject generates a certain appeal of the photograph to its beholder's subjectivity. But the photographs' claim to be art demands a response that, while it is routed through the indexical – routed through our response to the plight of the people the photos depict-- is fundamentally different from it.

TR: What you're describing here are mainly aesthetic issues but you write about them as if they were also political issues. Is it overly simplistic to describe your interests as "Aesthetic Autonomy vs. Political Autonomy"?

WBM: Well, you're dead on about autonomy. What I was just describing about the photo's relation to the world and to the beholder suggests the ways in which the (straight) photograph or the photogram – with its causal dependence on what it's a photo of and hence its openness to the different responses different viewers will have to the sight of (say) deindustrializing Braddock -- is maybe the least autonomous art object imaginable. But what I've been interested in is photographers who both acknowledge and seek to overcome this structural openness, who seek to establish the autonomy of the work. What they're producing is works that insist on a meaning that's independent of and even indifferent to the response of the viewer. And while that's obviously an aesthetic project, I argue that it's also a political project, and, today, a very particular kind of political project -- not liberal but left, organized around neither individuality nor identity but the concept of class.

TR: Are the artists you describe in *The Beauty of a Social Problem* (2015) – Evans, Wall, Binschtok, Chang, Deschenes, Ou – protesting a set of aesthetic structures analogous to class?



LaToya Ruby Frazier, *Grandma Ruby and U.P.M.C Braddock Hospital on Braddock Avenue*, 2007. Gelatin silver photograph, 20 x 25 in. Courtesy of the artist © LaToya Ruby Frazier.

WBM: I don't think they're protesting anything but I do think they have a class aesthetic, whether or not they have a class politics (which some do and some don't). Today, the core of liberal (or neoliberal, not much difference) politics is the effort to make capitalism fairer, to minimize the role played by racism, sexism, etc. in depriving people of the ability to succeed in the market. And what that effort requires is precisely a kind of attention to and appreciation of both identity and individuality -- who people are, how we see each other and treat each other. A kind of ethics. But the work of artists like Binschtok and Chang and Ou (as least as I understand them) is not interested in and in fact refuses those kinds of relations. It's interested instead in its own structure, its own logic (that's part of what's meant by autonomy). So what we see in their work is a world that does not depend on how we see or feel about it. And it's that world that provides us an image of our own, of a society structured by the logic of labor and capital, not by how capitalists feel about workers. By exploitation, not by unfairness or a failure of compassion. In this way, what amounts to an aesthetics of indifference finds its use also as a politics of indifference. It's an aesthetics and a politics instead of an ethics.

TR: Re-enactment interests you. You describe the points at which blankness and generalization are necessary for convincing reenactment -- you use Tom McCarthy's hockey mask wearing actors in *Remainder* (2005) as an example. I'm reminded of an anecdote of Charles Ray's related to *Unpainted Sculpture* (1997) -- his meticulous casting of a Pontiac Grand Am death-wreck in fiberglass. He describes the frustrating failure of the project until he began filling and smoothing between the cast parts with Bondo. He describes Bondo as a cinematic fade between scenes, interstitial filler between the perfectly reproduced component parts without which the copy, somehow, failed. It was a baffling problem for him... that he would need Bondo, that an indexical process like casting would fail to convincingly copy a thing without the addition of a material not present in the original.

M+B

WBM: There's a lot in that question! In Ray, of course, what's partly at stake in making the copy is transforming the object (made by nature, like Hinoki or by chance – literally accident – like Unpainted Sculpture) into the bearer of the artist's intentions. In Remainder, intentionality is approached a little more obliquely. What re-enactment does is instantaneously produce normativity – you're not just walking down a hallway, you're walking down a hallway that either does or doesn't look like it's supposed to. So the whole point of McCarthy's re-enactor is that he's obsessed with getting it right and that when he does get it right he feels the "tingling" of what he calls "significance." Which is to say, meaning. Just as Ray produces meaning by making chance into intention, McCarthy's re-enactor produces meaning by making a hallway into the representation of a hallway. And what's crucial about the blank is not so much that it makes the representation more convincing but that, like the space demarcated by a frame, it functions to mark the conceptual difference between material that means and material that doesn't.

TR: So that's what you're getting at when you write "it's only abstraction – the blankness that turns something (a hockey mask, paper, cement) into a representation of nothing – that makes the very idea of remainder possible"? And, to paraphrase, that with this renouncement of thingness, with this use of a concrete material as 'a nothing' we somehow rehabilitate the material itself for use. How do Phil Chang's unfixed Cache, Active works rehabilitate or affirm representation by virtue of their slide into monochromes?

WBM: Because the Cache, Active works are pictures that, once you expose them to the light immediately begin to turn into monochromes, they might be thought to do exactly the opposite of what I'm talking about; they seem to start as representations and collapse or, I like your word, slide into the sheerly material. But since there are important ways in which photographs aren't exactly representations in the first place (that's the point of all the indexicality stuff), there's an equally important way in which the slide into materiality functions to assert that fact – to insist on a materiality that was always already there. And in that sense – the sense in which these works are not only material but are about their materiality – the slide is their way of refusing to slide, of making what looks like the disappearance of representation into a representation.

TR: Do artists like Chang make it possible for other artists to assume less fraught or even uncaring relationships with the thingness of photographs?

WBM: That's a good question. Insofar as there's an internal logic at work here, the answer might almost be that work like his, properly understood, might make it not only possible but almost necessary. To be in the room with one of the Cache, Actives while it's fading is a powerful experience. It's like being shown the work as an epitaph for the process that made it. So maybe after that experience, a certain kind of interest in the ontology of the photograph begins to get replaced. If you look at Chang's more recent work (like on the cover of my book), you can see a slightly different direction, a different sense of what makes a photograph a photograph. Actually, you can see this tendency also in what Owen Kydd calls his durational photographs. And in Binschtok's Clusters and, of course, Demand's Pacific Sun.

TR: You compare Walker Evans' FSA pictures to Liz Deschenes' mirrored photograms. I understand the economic conditions surrounding both bodies of work are important to your analysis, but why Evans? Why not a comparison between Deschenes and say, Steiglitz's Equivalents? Some of these were made in the same period of extraordinary inequality. Or Moholy-Nagy's photograms? (He was in Chicago then.)

WBM: No doubt there are things you could say about Deschenes in relation to Steiglitz's Equivalents or Moholy-Nagy but I was drawn to the Evans because I think both his work and hers address the question of the beholder in differently revelatory ways. In the book, I try to show how Evans's ambition to make art functions to foreground the difference between the photographer and his subjects, how his effort to make art out of people who (in his and Agee's view) have no conception of art, makes the photographs address the inequality between their subjects (who don't see them as art) and their viewers (who do). So what interested me in Deschenes was that in the mirrored photograms, what we see – not sharecroppers but ourselves – eliminates that inequality, while the beauty of the works themselves – which I understand in part as producing a desire not to see our own reflections – functions to complicate that effect of identity.

More generally, I would say that while you are of course right that the economic conditions in which a work is produced seem to me important, they're not dispositive. It's the work's formal ambitions that I think function as the structure of address to those conditions. And, of course, Evans tended to be very vehement about the fact that his photographs had no politics. I don't know if Deschenes feels the same way and I don't know anything about what her politics are. So putting them together was maybe a way also of making a slightly larger point about how politics work in art.

M+B

WSJ

SFMOMA Stakes Out Photography

Following a three-year expansion, SFMOMA will have the largest exhibit space devoted to photography in the U.S.

By Kelly Cros
April 28, 2016

When the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art reopens May 14, it will devote more space to exhibiting photographs than any other art museum in the U.S.

Following a nearly three-year, \$305 million expansion, the museum will have 14 galleries spanning 15,000 square feet exhibiting photos—more room than the photography galleries of New York’s Metropolitan Museum of Art and Museum of Modern Art combined. On top of that, the museum has created a new study area for researchers called the Pritzker Center for Photography and added a pair of refrigerated storage vaults for the 18,000 photographs in its collection.

Director Neal Benezra said he hopes such moves will prove that photography is every bit as significant as other art forms. “Photography is one of the foundations on which this house is built,” Mr. Benezra said of the 81-year-old museum. “We want to set it up as the equal of painting here.”

The museum launched its expansion plan seven years ago to make room for the addition of 1,100 works, mainly paintings and sculptures, amassed and lent to the museum by Gap clothing founder Don Fisher and his wife, Doris. But Mr. Benezra said he and his staff seized on the chance to enlarge its galleries for photography as well. Of the 145,000 square feet of total gallery space in the museum, 10% is reserved for photos alone.

Board chair Charles Schwab, who collects photographers like Jeff Wall and Thomas Struth, said, “We need to see photographers as the true artists they are—and we need to remind people that it’s still an affordable way to collect. That’s how I got started, with photos and prints.”

Walking around the 10-story museum’s airy new floors designed by Norwegian firm Snohetta, photographs pop up all over, often in experimental forms: Alison Rossiter’s mysterious landscapes comprise smudges and marks left on century-old photo paper she finds and develops, as is. Just as haunting are Phil Chang’s unfixed photographs, which aren’t fully developed and therefore turn over-exposed black a few hours after they’re displayed. Corey Keller, a photography curator, said the museum bought several sets of Mr. Chang’s work so it can occasionally swap in fresh examples. “It’s terrifying to watch his images disappear,” Ms. Kenner said. “He’s turning a photograph into a performance.”

The museum also enlisted tech firms to amp up some of its photographic displays, a strategy also aimed at nurturing its ties to Silicon Valley. (Yahoo’s chief executive Marissa Mayer is a trustee.) The study center now includes specially commissioned animated videos about some of San Francisco’s pioneering photographers, from Eadweard Muybridge to Carlton Watkins.



The newly expanded SFMOMA, opening May 14 PHOTO: HENRIK KAM/SFMOMA



Phil Chang
Woman, Sitting, 2011

M+B

Nearby sits an Adobe-designed device that looks like a 1980s video-arcade game but actually allows people to arrange small objects on a table—the contents of their pockets, say, or purses—before a camera in the machine snaps and prints a souvenir photo of the objects and the person arranging them. Chad Coerver, the museum's chief content officer, said the "parlor game" is intended to take the museum selfie a step further. "It's a chance for people to compose something beyond making a face and saying 'cheese,'" he said.

Sandy Phillips, the museum's senior curator of photography, said her team spent months pinpointing and analyzing the collection's strengths—namely, its holdings of 19th and 20th-century Western landscapes by artists like Ansel Adams as well as postwar Japanese street photography by artists like Daido Moriyama. After that, curators set out to fill in gaps. They've since added at least 1,000 photos to its permanent collection, fueled by gifts and purchases.

These include Edward Weston's classic portrait of a nude woman, "Nude on Dune," and Dorothea Lange's landscapes. Curators took trips to Mali to bolster their holdings of African photographers, and a private foundation in Japan gave the museum several hundred pieces by contemporary Japanese photographers.

Curators unearthed hundreds of 1930s-era photographs that had been donated by the Works Progress Administration that had never been studied or shown as well as 5,000 little-seen photos taken during the 1970s, Ms. Keller said. They included some "amazing experiments" by artists like Sonia Landy Sheridan who used photocopiers in their art but aren't widely known—yet, she said.

All this research informs "About Time: Photography in a Moment of Change," the eight-gallery rehanging of the permanent collection. Instead of a straight chronology, curators juxtaposed images old and new to explore how photographers wrestle with time in their work and use it to their creative advantage. Masterpiece examples include Julia Margaret Cameron's 19th century languid portrait of a sleeping boy, Muybridge's motion studies of a walking nude woman and Harold Edgerton's famous milk splash.

But there's also newer work like Trevor Paglen's time-lapse images of surveillance satellites arcing over the sky above Yosemite and Matthew Buckingham's archaic slideshow projector that will show a single shot of a bronze sculpture of a Danish warrior in Copenhagen—until heat from the projector blanches his slide white.

Pressrelease

Phil Chang

PHIL CHANG

30.05.2015 - 25.07.2015



Replacement Ink for Epson Printers (Black 446009) on Epson Premium Glossy Paper, 2014

unique archival pigment print

152,4 x 111,8 cm - 60 x 44 inches

ENGLISH

Praz-Delavallade is pleased to announce *Pictures, Chromogenic and Pigment, #2*, an exhibition of photographic monochromes and works on paper by Phil Chang. This will be the artist's first show with the gallery and his first solo exhibition in Europe.

Like the recent exhibitions of his artwork and the group show that he has organized, *Pictures, Chromogenic and Pigment, #2* continues Chang's interest in using forms of production and materiality that allow his photographic work to function only in the context of contemporary art. Chang's interest is in eschewing the plurality that is specific to photography in order to occupy a plurality specific to art itself, namely art's ability to function as decor, as an object of discussion, as an artifact, and as a commodity. This exhibition is the second iteration following an exhibition from 2014 at M+B and is the first to pair a series of purple monochromes with black works on paper.

5, rue des Haudriettes - 75003 Paris

T: +33 (0)1 45 86 20 00 - F: +33 (0)1 45 86 20 10

info@praz-delavallade.com

The monochromes in the exhibition were made using a digital file that measures 14,400 pixels x 18,000 pixels and constitutes 777 MB of information. Each monochrome on view was printed in Los Angeles at the fine art photo lab and community darkroom, Contact, using an Océ LightJet 430 to expose Kodak Endura Glossy photographic paper. The paper was developed and bleach-fixed using a Kreonite KMIV RA4 color processor. Each of the works were mounted on aluminum by Pro Image Service and framed under Optium Museum Acrylic by Atelier Tetragone.

The works on paper were made by applying inkjet printer ink onto inkjet paper using Quickie brand sponge mops in lieu of a computer and inkjet printer. Each work consists of bottled ink manufactured by Media Street that has been applied to glossy inkjet paper manufactured by Epson. Like the photographic monochromes, each of the works were mounted on aluminum and framed under Optium Museum Acrylic.

Phil Chang received his MFA from CalArts and his BA from the University of California, Irvine. Solo exhibitions include the California Museum of Photography at UCR ARTSblock; M+B, LAXART and Pepin Moore, Los Angeles. Chang's work has been included in group exhibitions at Marlborough Chelsea, Renwick Gallery, The Swiss Institute, Otis College of Art and Design, Control Room, and LACMA. His work has been written about in *Artforum*, *The New Yorker*, *The LA Times*, *nonsite.org* and has appeared in *Aperture*, *Blind Spot*, *C-Photo*, and *IMA*. Chang's publications include *Four Over One*, an artist's book published by the LACMA in association with Textfield, Inc. Chang's curatorial projects include *Soft Target*, a group exhibition that he co-organized in June 2014. He is currently visiting faculty in the Department of Art at UCLA and a lecturer at Otis College of Art and Design. Phil Chang lives and works in Los Angeles.

FRANÇAIS

Praz-Delavallade est heureux de présenter *Pictures, Chromogenic and Pigment, #2*, une exposition de photographies monochromes et d'oeuvres sur papier de Phil Chang, dans ce qui constitue la première exposition de l'artiste avec la galerie, ainsi que sa première exposition personnelle en Europe.

A l'image des expositions récentes de son travail, ainsi que des expositions de groupe qu'il a organisées, *Pictures, Chromogenic and Pigment, #2* poursuit la réflexion de Phil Chang sur une matérialité, une forme de production qui permet à ses travaux photographiques de se mesurer au contexte de l'art contemporain. Chang s'interdit cette pluralité qui est spécifique à la photographie pour s'inscrire à l'inverse dans une logique propre à l'art, autrement dit : la capacité de l'art à fonctionner en tant que décor, sujet de discussion, artéfact ou bien de consommation.

Les monochromes proviennent d'un fichier image de 777 Mo d'une taille de 14 400 x 18 000 pixels. Ils ont été imprimés à Los Angeles au laboratoire photo Contact. Le papier photographique (Kodak Endura Glossy) a été exposé sur une Océ LightJet 430, avant d'être développé et fixé dans un appareil de traitement couleur Kreonite KMIV RA4. Chaque oeuvre a été montée sur aluminium par Pro Image Service et encadrée sous une plaque d'Optium Museum Acrylic par l'Atelier Tetragone.

Pour les oeuvres sur papier, au lieu de se servir d'un ordinateur et d'une imprimante, Chang a appliqué de l'encre pour imprimante jet d'encre sur du papier brillant (Epson) à l'aide de balais-éponge de la marque Quickie. L'encre a été fabriquée par Media Street. Tout comme les monochromes, chaque oeuvre est montée sur aluminium et encadrée sous Optium Museum Acrylic.

Phil Chang a obtenu son MFA à CalArts et son BA à l'University of California, Irvine. Ses expositions personnelles se sont tenues au California Museum of Photography - UCR ARTSblock; M+B, LAXART ou Pepin Moore, Los Angeles.

M+B

ARTFORUM

Paris

Phil Chang


PRAZ-DELAVALLADE

5 rue des Haudriettes

May 30–July 25

July 16, 2015

By Phil Taylor



Photography seems increasingly difficult to delimit as it dissolves into an undifferentiated mass of imagery. By contrast, Phil Chang's work in and around photography is insistently precise and deceptively simple. For the present exhibition, two bodies of work face off across the gallery, crossing digital and analog modes of photographic production and reproduction. One of these, a group of five untitled purple monochromes from 2015, is the result of a printing process that enables digital image files to be produced as traditional chromogenic photographs. The monochromes progressively increase in chromatic intensity along one side of the gallery, with the modulation of color values resembling exposure bracketing, a photographer's convention that highlights the image as a function of light. Opposite, four works on paper titled "Replacement Ink for Epson Printers on Epson Premium Glossy Paper," 2014, each feature a single sweeping streak resulting from black ink applied with a sponge. The artist's manual gesture is made mechanical through repetitions that mimic the markings of a printer stuttering as it runs out of ink. There's an intriguing parallel with Frank and Lillian Gilbreth's motion-study photographs for the scientific management of labor, but here action is subsumed into a trace that is its own final product.

Chang's work is divorced from the camera but explicitly linked to the supporting services and technologies that produce photographic objects for the art world. His materialist investigations occupy equivocal sites from twentieth-century painting—the monochrome and gestural abstraction—in order to test some of the ways photography is made to function and what it is made of. By limiting each group of works to a single gesture, a pictorial space is opened for the technological substructures and protocols by which photographs circulate.



California Museum of Photography
Sweeney Art Gallery
Culver Center of the Arts
University of California, Riverside

3834 Main Street
Riverside, CA 92501
951.827.3755
culvercenter.ucr.edu
sweeney.ucr.edu
cmp.ucr.edu
artsblock.ucr.edu

PRESS RELEASE

For Immediate Release

California Museum of Photography at UCR ARTSblock presents

CMP Projects

Phil Chang: Monochromes, Static and Unfixed

May 2–August 8, 2015

Gallery talk: Saturday, May 16, 5pm

Public reception: Saturday, May 16, 6–9pm

FREE AND OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

CMP Projects presents a solo installation by artist Phil Chang. The project is suspended on the border of photography and non-photography, demanding that the viewer consider the medium's inherent qualities. The exhibition will feature a selection of photographs from Chang's recently conceived untitled series of monochromes (2014–ongoing). These photographic prints are made without the use of a camera or film, thereby pushing our understanding of the medium as it abandons the analog for a decidedly digital age.

Additionally, one unfixed photographic work will be featured in the exhibition. An evolution of his highly acclaimed body of work "Cache, Active" (2012), *Monochrome, Exposed* (2015) is a new unfixed photograph that will be exposed over the course of its own exhibition's first hours, effectively rendering it, too, a monochrome.

Monochrome, Exposed will be unveiled and the artist will offer public remarks in the gallery at 5pm on Saturday, May 16.

Works included in the exhibition

Phil Chang

Monochrome, Exposed, 2015

Unfixed gelatin silver print

Phil Chang

Untitled (Orange Monochrome 04), 2014

Untitled (50% Gray Monochrome), 2014

Untitled (16% Gray Monochrome), 2014

Untitled (Yellow-Green Monochrome 01), 2015

Untitled (Yellow-Green Monochrome 02), 2015

Untitled (Yellow-Green Monochrome 03), 2015

Unique chromogenic prints

All works courtesy of the artist and M+B Gallery, Los Angeles

Phil Chang (born in Indiana in 1974) is an artist currently based in Los Angeles. His work has been the subject of solo exhibitions at M+B, LAXART, and Pepin Moore (all Los Angeles). His work has also been included in exhibitions at The Swiss Institute, Marlborough Chelsea, Brennan & Griffin, Invisible Exports, PPOW, and Renwick Gallery (all New York); at Otis College of Art and Design, and Control Room (both Los Angeles); and at The Institute of Jamais Vu (London), among elsewhere. His work has been reviewed in *Artforum*, *The New Yorker*, and *The Los Angeles Times*, and has also appeared in *Aperture*, *Blind Spot*, *IMA Magazine*, and *C-Photo*. In 2010, Chang produced *Four Over One* (published by the Los Angeles County Museum of Art in association with Textfield, Inc.). His curatorial projects include co-organizing the group exhibition *Soft Target* (M+B, Los Angeles, 2014). Chang earned his MFA at The California Institute of the Arts, and his BA at University of California, Irvine. He is currently visiting faculty in the Department of Art at UCLA, and a lecturer at Otis College of Art and Design. *CMP Projects* is the first solo museum presentation of his work.

<http://www.philchang.com>

CMP Projects is an ongoing series of solo presentations curated by Joanna Szupinska-Myers, CMP Curator of Exhibitions at the California Museum of Photography, part of UCR ARTSblock. Past exhibitions have featured work by Zoe Crosher, Claudia Joscowicz, Ramón Miranda Beltrán, and Heather Rasmussen. The series is partially supported with funds provided by UCR's College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences (CHASS) and the City of Riverside. Additional support for *Phil Chang: Monochromes, Static and Unfixed* has been provided by M+B, Los Angeles.

At Large Magazine
December 2014

X + I

Curated by Matthew Porter

COMPILING A LIST OF FIVE ARTISTS IS EASY. It's an exiguous grouping that allows you to slash and burn, to cut with efficacy, and excuses you from oversight. Expand the list to twenty, and cuts are unnecessary—now you have plenty of capital to make your point. But eleven is a cruel number, the April of list making. You have to kill off ideas to bring life to the project. So the following list is incomplete, and it's also too long. It does however, at the time of writing, bring together a group of artists, all born in the early to mid seventies, most of whom probably didn't fully integrate computers and the Internet into their lives until after college. Now, they take what they need from the digital, virtual, and binary world of bits, while keeping themselves rooted in traditional means of picture making. To be relevant, contemporary art doesn't require the exclusive use of the technology of its time—making art is also a practice of utilizing the materials left behind by innovation.

M ATTHEW PORTER



Untitled (Orange Monochrome)
2014
Unique chromogenic print
© Phil Chang; courtesy M+B Gallery, Los Angeles

Untitled (Orange Monochrome)
2014
Unique chromogenic print
© Phil Chang; courtesy M+B Gallery, Los Angeles

Phil CHANG

Chang's practice is an ongoing dialectic centering on photography's main principles: longevity, depiction, and material. While his intention is often to expose the medium's fraught nature, his exhibitions bring a beautiful equanimity to these problems. His attention shifts easily from an unfixed gelatin silver print's inevitable self-effacement to the monochromatic possibilities of color printing. For Chang, the concern is less with what the pictures depict, or the meaning found within them, and more about how we think of their material properties and commodification. To understand Chang's way of thinking, consider how pictures are ranked in an online image search, and the invisible coding, or what he calls "algorithmic realism," that determines those positions. Maybe if Boris Groys made images, they would look like Phil Chang's.

M+B

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE



PHIL CHANG Pictures, Chromogenic and Pigment

September 13 – October 25, 2014

Opening Reception

Saturday, September 13, 2014 from 6 to 8 pm

M+B is pleased to announce *Pictures, Chromogenic and Pigment*, Phil Chang's first solo exhibition with M+B. The exhibition runs from September 13 to October 25, 2014, with an opening reception on Saturday, September 13 from 6 to 8 pm.

Pictures, Chromogenic and Pigment will include photographic monochromes and works on paper. The exhibition expands on Chang's interest in aspects of process, duration and materiality. The works on view reflect how Chang's production is structured by the question of what strategies must be enacted so that the work can solely function in the context of contemporary art.

The monochromes in the exhibition were made using a digital file that measures 14,400 pixels x 18,000 pixels and constitutes 777 MB of information. Each monochrome on view was printed at the fine art photo lab and community darkroom, Contact, using an Océ LightJet 430 to expose Kodak Endura Glossy photographic paper. The paper was developed and bleach-fixed using a Kreonite KMIV RA4 color processor. Each of the works were mounted on aluminum at Finishing Concepts and framed under Optium Museum Acrylic at Art Services Melrose.

The works on paper were made by applying inkjet printer ink onto inkjet paper using Quickie brand sponge mops in lieu of a computer and inkjet printer. Each work consists of bottled ink manufactured by MediaStreet that has been applied to various finishes of inkjet paper manufactured by Canson, Epson and Museo. Like the photographic monochromes, each of the works were mounted on aluminum at Finishing Concepts and framed under Optium Museum Acrylic at Art Services Melrose.

Phil Chang (b. 1974) received his MFA from The California Institute of the Arts and his BA from the University of California, Irvine. Solo exhibitions include *Cache, Active* at LA><ART and *Studio, Affect* at Pepin Moore, both Los Angeles, 2012. Chang has exhibited both nationally and internationally in a number of group shows including The Swiss Institute (NY), Marlborough Chelsea (NY), Brennan & Griffin (NY), Invisible Exports (NY), Charlie James Gallery (LA), PPOW (NY), Renwick Gallery (NY), Otis College of Art and Design (LA), Outpost for Contemporary Art (LA), Control Room (LA), Institute of Jamais Vu (London) and Isolation Room/Gallery Kit (St. Louis), to name just a few. His work has been written about in *ARTFORUM*, *The New Yorker*, *Los Angeles Times* and has appeared in *Aperture*, *Blind Spot*, *C-Photo* and *IMA Magazine*. Other published interviews include those with Charlotte Cotton, James Welling and Walter Benn Michaels. In 2010, Chang completed *Four Over One*, an artist's book published by the Los Angeles County Museum of Art in association with Textfield, Inc. Chang's curatorial projects have included *Soft Target* (M+B, 2014), *Affective Turns?* (Pepin Moore, 2012) and *Seeing Sight* at LACE in Los Angeles. He is currently visiting faculty in the Department of Art at UCLA and a lecturer at Otis College of Art and Design. Phil Chang lives and works in Los Angeles.

Location:	M+B , 612 North Almont Drive, Los Angeles, California 90069
Show Title:	Phil Chang: Pictures, Chromogenic and Pigment
Exhibition Dates:	September 13 – October 25, 2014
Opening Reception:	Saturday, September 13, 6 – 8pm
Gallery Hours:	Tuesday – Saturday, 10 am – 6 pm, and by appointment

For press inquiries, please contact Jeanie Choi at (310) 550-0050 or jeanie@mbart.com.

For all other inquiries, contact Shannon Richardson at shannon@mbart.com or Alexandra Wetzel at alexandra@mbart.com.

#

M+B

Los Angeles Times

Review The focus cleverly blurs in 'Soft Target' at M+B

By Sharon Mizota
August 22, 2014

In photography, targets are high-contrast printed patterns or color bars that help achieve the hallmarks of a “successful” image: sharp focus and accurate color. In their group exhibition “Soft Target” at M+B, curators Phil Chang and Matthew Porter (both also artists who make photographs) set out to trouble such certainties.

Featuring pieces by 30 artists — most working in a photographic vein — the show celebrates “softness,” or the moments when art blurs or reconfigures the lines between figure and ground, inside and outside, nature and artifice or any other opposition you can conjure.


Sometimes it’s a literal softness, as in Adam Putnam’s murky image of measuring tools scattered on the ground or Shannon Ebner’s blurred close-up of the letter A on a lighted sign.

Elsewhere, it’s the idea of camouflage, as in Andrea Galvani’s photograph of a motocross biker so covered with mud it’s nearly impossible to distinguish figure from ground. Conversely, Dan Torop pokes fun at color targets and camouflage by holding a red piece of paper behind some red flowers. It’s unclear (and immaterial) which red is the “right” one.

David Goldes’ elegant black and white photograph of sugar crystals forming in a glass explores the line between foreground and background more metaphorically, as liquid becomes solid. Barney Kulok’s “Untitled (Councilwoman)” approaches the problem from the opposite direction, depicting a public figure as a near-black silhouette: nothing but a boundary line.


Another tactic employs the cutting and suturing of an image in unexpected ways. Julie Cockburn takes a found black and white portrait of a woman and explodes pieces of her face into a lovely chrysanthemum-starburst. In Soo Kim’s works, different photographic moments occupy the same space as she excises parts of one print and lays it like a doily over another.

Similarly, a mesh of black triangles partially obscures Hannah Whitaker’s portrait. It’s not actually a cutout, but the pattern does shift the placement of eyes and other parts as if it were.



Installation view of *Soft Target* at M+B, Los Angeles
Organized by Phil Chang and Matthew Porter

M+B



Asha Schechter photographed a beautiful, opalescent abstraction made from strips of film, a piece of a jigsaw puzzle and a ping-pong paddle, but if the title didn't tell you this, you would never know. And Richard Caldicott's tiny, strikingly reductive piece juxtaposes a simple, geometric photogram with its cutout paper negative. It's a wondrously simple meeting of object and image, a condensation of the photographic process in which light, guided through an aperture, makes an image.

Chang and Porter have curated this show as artists would, tracing visual and conceptual themes through disparate works without the benefit (or encumbrance) of historical context or artist's intention.

Surely, not all of the included works operate solely within the frame in which they are presented in "Soft Target," but that is largely the point. The show emphasizes the impossibility of ever achieving an exact or precise focus: An artwork's meanings are always multiple, open to interpretation, bleeding softly out of the frame.

M+B, 612 N. Almont Drive, L.A., (310) 550-0050, through Aug. 30.
Closed Sundays and Mondays
www.mbart.com

Photographer's file



Replacement Ink by Epson Printers (Cyan and Yellow) on Epson Premium Glossy Paper, 2013

連載 シャーロット・コトンのフォトグラファー最前線

フィル・チャン

BIRTH OF YEAR / 1974年 PLACE / ロサンゼルス
EDUCATION / カリフォルニア大学、カリフォルニア芸術大学 WEBSITE / <http://www.philchang.com/>




Replacement link for Epson Printers (Green and Cyan) on Epson Premium Glossy Paper, 2013




Replacement link for Epson Printers (Yellow and Red) on Epson Premium Glossy Paper, 2013



Replacement link for Epson Printers (Black) on Epson Premium Glossy Paper, 2013



Replacement link for Epson Printers (Red and Yellow) on Epson Premium Glossy Paper, 2013



Replacement link for Epson Printers (Cyan) on Epson Premium Glossy Paper, 2013



Replacement link for Epson Printers (Yellow) on Epson Premium Glossy Paper, 2013



Replacement link for Epson Printers (Red and Yellow, 172) on Epson Premium Luster Paper, 2014



Replacement link for Epson Printers (Cyan 13100) on Epson Premium Luster Paper, 2013

コンセプトを極限まで簡素化した作品が 浮き彫りにする現代写真の本質への問い

翻訳=宮城 太 Translation: Futoshi Miyagi

フィル・チャンの作品作りは、見るとすぐに理解できる直接的なかたちではありませんが、作家と写真という媒体との関係性についての本質的な問いかけから始まります。私たちが取り巻くイメージの世界を鋭く洞察した上で、手板定し、問題提起する写真についての概念は写真作品として作り上げるべきなのか、それとも別の方法を取るべきかをチャンは問うのです。そして、熟考されたコンセプトをもとに、しっかりとした方向性や決断力を持って、彼はゆっくりと制作を進めていきます。知的考察を土台とする彼の作品は、現代写真の特性に注意を向けるよう観る者を促します。考え抜かれたプロセスを経た彼の作品は、現代における写真について、深遠な議論を産むひとつの指針となるでしょう。

★ ロサンゼルスにある彼のスタジオを訪ね、制作中の「Works on Paper」シリーズを見たとき、コンセプトはすでにほぼ完成していると感じました。作品は、単色の印刷用顔料を使い、さまざまな種類のインクジェット用紙の上にブラシで一本か二本の線を引いただけの驚くほどシンプルなもの。それぞれの作品には、インクの種類と色、用紙のブランド名がタイトルとして付けられており、写真の素材が工業的なものであること

のひと塗りの動作において、華美な技巧性が皆無であることも特筆に値するでしょう（もちろん、それぞれの線は熟考され、信念を持って印されています）。そこには、現代絵画、特に彼が拠点を置くロサンゼルスで盛り上がりを見せる抽象絵画シーンの文脈との親和性も見られます。絵画でもなく、明らかに写真といえる作品でもない「Works on Paper」は、私たちが写真表現で見失ってしまったものや、気付かなかったことに目を向けさせることで、変換する媒体であるという写真の本質的な特徴を作品の主題とし、物理的に目に見え、読み解きやすいかたちで提示するのです。

チャンは、次のように語ってくれました。「現代のアート創作が抱える課題に對峙することが好きなのです。イメージが氾濫する時代において、これらの作品がどのような不協和音を生み出すのか楽しみです。インクジェットが多用される時代に写真作品を作ることの意義や、写真のピクセルひとつひとつを自動で処理することができる時代に塗るといふ身体的な行為を取り入れる意味とは何なのか。『Works on Paper』では、写真表現の境界線を飛び越える手段としてそのような問いかけを前提とし、いかにシンプルな行為を必要とするのか、どのようにしたら

を改めて提示します。チャンの印象的な作品群を通して、観る者の焦点は、隠された主題や哲学的なタイトルもない、現代写真において多用されている素材の純粋な影響力に合致します。

意識的な透明性と簡素化によって、アート作品であることを宣言する彼の作品は、イラストレーションや広告と誤ってとらえられることはありません。「インクジェットプロセスと素材」とを主題として扱いつつ、ストリートフォト。を作ることはできるのか、「写真という媒体を既存の定義から解放することは可能か」といった、勇敢な写真の本質の簡素化を通じた問題提起は、現代美術における写真媒体の軌道を占う上でも時宜にかなっています。チャンは、機械によって自動的に行われる撮影や編集を避け、写真媒体のデフォルトの技術的性質を直接的且つ、目に見えるかたちに落とし込んだ作品を作るのです。

チャンは、「Works on Paper」において写真のあり方を主題とし、写真の物理的な性質だけでなく、何が写真として扱われるものを構築するのかという写真の本質にも言及しています。彼が連続して作りだす顔料インクの線は、それぞれが手作業で描かれた固有のものであり、写真が持つ無限の複製能力を失っています。また、チャン

現代写真における物質的・技術的事実から写真を解放することができるのかを突き詰めているのです」

★ チャンが、現代写真を再定義しようとする同世代の作家たちと異なる点は、彼が作りだす作品の絶対的な普遍性や安定感です。ピクセル単位で編集を行うソフトウェアやインクジェット印刷が自動的に生み出す写真表現にさまざまな手を加えることで新たな表現を模索する作家が多くいる一方、チャンは簡潔で明白な作品が提示する写真のあり方を持って、現代美術の対話の中に新たな議論を持ち込みます。彼の作品は、慣例的な写真論に邪魔されず、実際に見ることのできるかたちで、写真とは何かを考える機会を私たちに与えてくれるのです。

Charlotte Cotton
ロンドンをベースに活躍するキュレーター兼ライター。ヴィクトリア&アルバート美術館写真部門キュレーター、ロンドンのフォトグラフィーズギャラリー企画主任、ロサンゼルス美術館のアネンバーグ写真部門総括の経歴を持つ。2012年のテグフォートビエンナーレのメインエキシビション「Photography is Magic!」や今年のフォトエスパーニャで「スペイン現代写真展」のキュレーションを務めた。

M + B

IMA

By Charlotte Cotton
August 2014

Phil Chang's art practice starts with questions; an essential but not immediately obvious statement about his relationship with the medium of photography. Astutely aware of the conditions of our contemporary image world, the impetus for Chang's recent bodies of work concern whether the photographic ideas that he postulates and problematizes are best addressed through the rendering of photographic works or by other means. Chang works slowly and with the direction and determination that comes from having well formed ideas already in place. With the intellectual ground work already set, his practice is focused on prompting the viewer to pay attention to the contemporary character of photography. Through such a thoughtful practice, he creates what will likely become some of the most enduring experiences of photographic thinking of this point in time.

Visiting his Los Angeles studio to see the progress on his 'Works on Paper' series, I can sense that so much of the intellectual work is already done. The works are startlingly simple; with a single or double strokes of unmixed printing pigments on different stocks of inkjet paper. Each work is titled with the type and colour of the ink and the brand name of the paper stock, reminding us of the industrial authorship of photographic materials. The experience of these striking works distils and focuses our thoughts on the undiluted affect of contemporary photography's ubiquitous materials without the smokescreen of an ostensible photographic subject or a philosophical title. Through their deliberate transparency and simplicity, these works declare their status as art and could not be mistaken for or repurposed as illustrations or advertisements. The questions that have driven Chang's eloquently pared down interrogation of photographic properties are apposite for the current arc of photography within contemporary art, speculating on whether it is possible to make a 'straight' photograph using the inkjet process as both material and subject and take the medium outside of its established definition. Chang circumvents the automated layers of photographic capture and post-production in order to create a direct and tangible experience of the default technological properties of the medium.

Phil Chang's active choice for 'Works on Paper' to work with such an economy of means not only speaks to the material properties of photography but also to the idea of what can constitute a photographic object. His apparently simple repetition of the stripe of pigment ink through each unique and hand-rendered gesture removes the medium's infinite reproducibility. It's significant that Chang's single gestures are without artistic flourish; reducing the possibility of being read as virtuoso gestures (although they are thoughtful, of course, and read as determined markings) in the terms set out in contemporary painting and in particular the current vitality of abstract painting currently in Chang's home city of Los Angeles. Functioning as neither painterly or obviously photographic, his 'Works on Paper' remind us of what we forget to see and what gets lost in photographic depiction. In so doing, Chang makes photography's essential character - as a medium of translation - a subject on its own tangible and legible terms. As Chang states, "I'm happy to but up against the creative problems of now. I really enjoy the discontent that this creates in the working process in an age of image ubiquity. What does it mean to make pictures in an inkjet era? And to use the physical gesture of brushing, now the automated way to navigate photographic pixels? 'Works on Paper' relies on these active precedents as a way to transgress photography and work out how simple a gesture needs to be and how close to denying the material technological fact of contemporary photography. "

What distinguishes Chang from many of his contemporaries who are recalibrating contemporary art photography is the fundamental stability of the objects he creates. While we are seeing many fertile artistic practices that subvert, weaken and version the automated outcomes of pixel based software and the conventions of inkjet printing, Chang starts a new thread for our contemporary discourse about the idea of photography that circulates around his simple and definite works. Without the distraction of conventional photographic perspective and a subject in 'Work on Paper', Chang invites us to consider the idea of photography as something that we are capable of truly seeing.

M+B

the Stranger

Currently Hanging: The Unveiling of Phil Chang's Photogram, and Its Disappearance, Tonight, With Words by Rebecca Brown

May 8, 2014
By Jen Graves



UNVEILING OF PHIL CHANG'S WORK

Process, the current group exhibition at the Photo Center NW in commemoration of the 175th year since the announcement of the daguerrotype, is a series of experiments in different ways to make pictures. They can be cameraless. They can be burned on and through by the sun. They can be exceedingly temporary, like Phil Chang's piece will be when it's unveiled tonight before an audience, with readings by authors Rebecca Brown, Rebecca Bridge, and Adam Boehmer. Until tonight's event, Chang's piece, framed on the gallery wall, has been covered over with black plastic taped down. The wall label says:

His unfixed gelatin silver print photograms go directly from the darkroom easel into a safelight box and then a gallery frame clothed with a black cover, and do not see the light of day until the image is on exhibit.

It takes a little while for the image to become as sharp and bright as it is going to get, and then it takes another little while—a few hours in all—for it to disappear.

Say hello and goodbye to Chang's photograph tonight.

M + B

NONSITE
● ORG

Theatrical Photographs

May 2, 2014

By Farrah Karapetian


En route through medium specific investigation in an era of collective and performative action in the art world, some photographers have taken a turn for the Minimal. Not only do many of the works in question correspond aesthetically to certain affects of Minimalism, but they behave as did Minimalist works as well: performing for their viewers, dependant upon their viewers, and in general inverting the conventional relationship between the subject and the photographic window. What does this instinct mean, forty years after painting made something like the same theatrical turn? How is it of consequence to photography and what photographic practices led up to it? Why might it happen now, in the context of artmaking at large?

Four vertical rectangular panels hang on a wall at the 2012 Whitney Biennial. They seem stained but shimmery, like rusty galvanized sheet metal. They are each ten feet high and together take up seven feet of width, but the panel on the left is double the width of any of the three to its right. They are spaced evenly apart on the wall. If they seem designed or destined for this space, it is because their tonality somewhat rhymes with that of the flagstone floor. If they engage with the space, it is because they reflect it somewhat. They are a few mm thick and stand off the wall. They recall pieces of factory-finished material Carl Andre might have arranged on a floor in the 1970s.

They are, however, made by Liz Deschenes in 2012, and they are, actually, cameraless photographs. They are not raw material, positioned à la Andre; the phenomena on their surface is both pictorial and material, the result of light and chemistry's interaction on photosensitive paper. Realizing that they are photograms, and knowing that photographs are often mounted to metal and that Deschenes' work has a history of self-reflexivity, it's possible to imagine a reference in this surface to the idea of the picture's support: an image of or like metal mounted to metal. In this case, though, the prints are mounted to Dibond, a substrate of aluminum and polyethylene, and so, no: Deschenes' photograms do not depict metal or any other material; they are a material and they act as such (if assisted in this role by their substrate, which enables them to lie flat). Deschenes has arranged this material as Andre might have arranged the material at his disposal. The difference is in the nature of the material: it is not raw – a form with a given surface – but, rather, it is worked – a form with an intended finish on its surface. Every photograph has a worked surface, but these make issue of the fact. That these prints are cameraless and that chance is a part of this as it is a part of every photographic process does not detract from the fact that the surface is invented rather than found. A picture is here. The picture refuses the nomenclature of the pictorial insofar as it is all over and refers to no noun, but it is in fact an image.

Photographic pictures are conventionally read with respect to their referent: a photographic picture of a line invokes as much of a question of how the line came to be as does a photographic picture of a cheerleader. Deschenes' pictures, here, can be explained – and are, in press materials – but more than begging their own origin story, they simply exist in real space and time. Part of what lends them this authority is the repetition of the panels' forms: like the iterative nature of Minimalist sculpture, they beg questions of relations between their own parts, of relations between those parts and the space in which they are installed, and between their parts and the viewer(s) that stand before them, slightly reflected in their surface.


What does it mean to arrange a photograph as if it were a material? If the photograph, laden with signification such that anything it looks like it must refer to, is asked to lie on a wall and look like metal but adamantly not be so, with which facts and which fictions does it play? Also, does it perform as an art object other than in real space and real time? Does it, in other words, require of its viewers the activity of Minimalism, or even if possible the activity of viewers of more contemporary performative work, such as that which surrounds the Untitled piece at the Whitney Biennial 2012?



Liz Deschenes, Red Transfer (diptych),

M + B

Liz Deschenes has been working with photography and against depiction throughout her career. Her green screen photograms of the first decade of the 21st century function at once as green screens and as representations of green screens. They suggest an interest in the apparatus of photography both through their color and the postures in which they are installed. Some are tacked to the wall and flow onto the ground seamlessly, as would a backdrop in a commercial shoot. Some, however, picture green screens in commercial situ. This project, then, marks a transition in the treatment of a print: as window onto an event in which an object is pictured and, alternatively, as object itself, to be viewed – and potentially acted upon or with – by an active subject.



Liz Deschenes; Blue Screen Process, series 2001-02.

Other works of Deschenes' prior to the work at the Whitney Biennial similarly assert their lack of depicted referent but admit less overtly to the photographic postures to which they refer than do the green screens. Some of her dye transfers, for example, are two monochromes framed next to one another on the wall – subtly sculptural in their doubling, but not transparently so. It is possible and valid to read them, in other words, as two pictures next to one another, framed, even if those in the know understand that there is a logic to the doubling that has to do with how dye transfers are made. The sculptural nature of these prints – their pairing, their existence in space together – is available to all photographs: two photographs can be shown together and augment one another, compositionally or conceptually. One print can be rotated, disturbing the effects of the photographic fiction. This is true of Deschenes' dye transfers and also of her moirés, which are optical experiments, almost to the irrelevance of their physical realization, except in that their significance relies on being viewed – a physical relation between the work and its affecting subject.

It is really the green screens that pave the way for the assertion of the theatrical body of the print that is the accomplishment of her work since 2009, especially in *tilt/swing*, *shift/rise*, and the *Untitled* work at the Biennial. Deschenes' green screens, and especially the ones that exist in real space, have a sculptural logic that does not belong to all photographs: they have a specific scale – big enough for a person to stand on, immersed – and a specific height at which they are hung, a specific distance of the ground that they traverse. The logic of the size and scale of the green screens is fixed, at least at its minimum.

At the Langen Foundation in 2011 and again at the Art Institute of Chicago in 2012, she situated a black, mounted photogram in a corner: its shadow shed behind it, describing both the absence of sculptural or architectural stuff behind the print and the presence of a back to the print at all. Here again the nature of the print as material, rather than picture, is asserted. Material has a back; pictures don't. Here again the specific scale of the print is important: it must reach from one wall to the other and therefore has a minimum width, plus it must not be taller than the distance between floor and ceiling and therefore has a maximum height. If Deschenes could have gone bigger or smaller in one or the other direction, still, the specificity of the scale becomes a question as it does not for most photographs. Here, we do not speak of the relatively short width of the piece as being intimate nor the relatively tall height as being ambitious: we see that there's a fit, and that's architecturally-responsive – the room as a frame. It is not site-specific – we overuse that term; this piece can be moved – but it does delineate a phenomenon of the space of the room in which it is situated as would, say, Richard Serra's *Delineator* of 1974-75 (installed at the Museum of Modern Art in New York just after the 2012 Biennial came down.)

In 2009 and 2010, in two versions of a piece called *tilt/swing* (360° field of vision), Deschenes playfully deployed mounted photograms in a 360 degree circuit from floor to ceiling; the prints in this piece behave like the seats on a carousel, abstracted into planes. They also, however, behave like a Donald Judd, dependent as they are on the presence and position of their viewers for their specific realization. If the title of the piece refers to the phenomenon of large format photography used frequently to correct parallax divergence, often in architecture, Deschenes' work here inverts this possibility, creating of her prints an architecture of their own, necessarily viewed in perspective.

Another piece of Deschenes' shown at the Whitney is a dyad of two photograms, both reflective, which are housed at angles in their frames. That these boxes are modeled after the windows of the Whitney's Marcel Breuer building is the piece's intended nod to architecture, but, more essentially, the relations of the prints to the boxes in which they are housed and the relations of one box to the other inscribes the sculptural and performative reality of the prints even more deeply into the Minimalist tendency towards real space and real time. If her earlier diptychs – the moirés, the dye transfers – could be read as two pictures next to one another, these read as two material actions, making the space of the frame one space in which the meaning of the piece plays out. Here is a relation of picture to support that radicalizes the notion of frame recognizable in an Elad Lassry union of pictorial color with frame color or in a Jeff Wall lightbox. The print does not just extend into or depend on its frame; it interacts with it, and that is all.

M + B

Deschenes then begins to build into the logic of each of her photographs a specific quality – scale, frame, posture, and sometimes color. This is what abstraction means, in case we have forgotten: a work of art does not “look abstract” and it “is” not “an abstraction.” A work of art abstracts a specific quality. Sometimes such qualities derive from observation: a subject can be abstracted, but that does not mean that it is rendered blurry or otherwise stylistically abstract.

It has seemed, throughout photography’s history, that the abstract potential of a photograph is understood to be housed in the pictorial rendering of a subject. In general, when we speak about the photographic print as bearing imagery, we presuppose a subject, but of course that subject can be constituted of abstract concerns.

The concerns of abstraction have changed radically for photography over the years: they have moved, literally, through the window that is the surface of the print. If they begin in an object that looks abstract – photographs of distressed surfaces – and move to include abstraction in terms of the way, say, an artist handles color or the focus on a camera, they soon become about the way the content of an image is staged, the way the physical print circulates in society, and how the print is made, perhaps cameralessly. In any one of these phases of concern, part of what is abstracted is the idea of photography itself and of what it does, in terms of action verbs: the photograph contains an abstract picture, then photograph affects the abstraction of a picture, the photograph makes abstraction in a picture, the photograph is an abstract picture.

Deschenes’ work includes the physical behavior of a print in a room in this canon of abstract concerns: the photograph behaves abstractly. Moving through these phases of abstract focus is a natural condition of the pictorial, as has been modeled by painting. Key, though: presupposing a performing body for the print does not necessitate a hostility to imagery; on the contrary, in this era of overwhelming numbers of pictures, it is existentially healthy to try to make a good picture, however little it may picture and however much it may perform.

In her work, Liz Deschenes does not neglect to address, at once, two very important qualities of photography: photographic prints can manifest and bear imagery, and they can create and occupy space. The first of these realities photographic prints do in a way no other materials can; the second of these realities photographic prints do in a way other materials can do as well, if differently. Artists working in mediums other than photography borrow the first of these realities when they appropriate the photograph: they borrow images, and the investment viewers have in the veracity of images or the circulation of images. Critics refer to the first of these qualities when they tie photography into a history of painting and also when they locate the majority of photography’s relationship to sculpture in the photography of sculpture.

The second of these qualities is less frequently tended to, but is important for the sake of the argument of Deschenes’ work: prints are objects that exist in space and are affected by it, no matter how shallow their third dimension nor how well-protected their surfaces by glazing or frame. What Deschenes does, increasingly, is to build the second of these qualities into her work abstractly, through orientation, placement, and scale. Objecthood becomes the abstract proposition of her work.

What Liz Deschenes does not do that some photographers might be tempted to do, given this focus on the performative nature of the physical print, is forget that her photographic bodies have faces, and that the logic of the photographic body in space depends upon what is on that face – referential or, as is the case with her, not.



Liz Deschenes. Tilt / Swing (360° field of vision, version 1), 2009. 6 unique silver toned black and white photographs – various dimensions. Overall dimensions: H: 136 L: 192 W: 58 inches

M + B

Even when the surface of her prints is decidedly monochromatic, the particulars of the colors she chooses matter. The green screen is green because green screens are that particular green. The dye transfers are particular in their shades. The blacks she uses are occasional and describe space in the way a Serra drawing does, though more typically rectangular than irregular. The rough blur of the metallic surfaces or the strangeness of the moiré: each of these two-dimensional decisions reads intentionally, unemotionally, and logically with respect to how the prints are deployed.

It is nothing new to expect that the print have a body. Wolfgang Tillmans' paper drop pictures (in which a curling paper is pictured) and Lighter pictures (in which the paper in real space is folded or bent) are concertedly and abstractly about objecthood. Tillmans' work, though, does not account for the dual nature of the photographic print, linking with any particular logic the folded, dropped body of the photographic paper and the monochromatic image on its surface. Mel Bochner certainly happened upon the body of the print in the 1970s, in his work with the grid, and pursued a kind of system as far as why certain of these prints were silhouetted (cut out around their images) before being mounted to the wall. Photograms in which folds determine imagery, like those of Simon Dobbroe Møller, Markus Amm, and Walead Beshty, build the body of the print abstractly into its pictorial sphere. Photograms in which the paper support influences pictorial information otherwise than through folding are the province of Marco Breuer, especially. A difference between this work in photography and Deschenes' current work is the way her pieces stand up for themselves amongst the Biennial's many more obviously performative artworks. Her photograms describe themselves – abstractly, as well as in the terminology of press releases – as as performative a set of objects as anything else in the show. This is one reason why they are being shown now.



Charles Ray; Ink Box; 1986; painted steel box and ink; 36 x 36 x 36 inches

Another reason this work is being shown now is its irony. To use a photograph as a Minimalist object could be an ironic gesture: even though Deschenes is using the photograph as a material rather than to refer to a material, the work refers to a prior discovery about the way material, deployed, can delineate space. This is quotation, whether the artist intends it to be so or not, and quotation of this kind lends itself to irony. The literal rendering of a Minimalist object in a language other than that of the raw material in which Minimalist objects were originally rendered suggests that the location of difference is in the material. That difference inverts the literal meaning of the reference.

In Charles Ray's Ink Box (1986), the essentializing tendency of the Minimalist cube is rendered less privately significant through the use of an everyday material: ink. In Deschenes' work, the photograph could be seen as as everyday a material as ink; unfortunately, this is a stretch. Ink arrives from the factory as readymade as does steel; photographs as Deschenes uses them are, again, invented, and yet we usually see them as artifacts of events outside of the real space and time in which they are seen. It is this quality of inventedness that again distinguishes her contribution to the idea of how photographs behave as material: the irony is not in an inversion of expectation re: Minimalism, but rather, re: photography. To use a photograph as a material in a quasi-Minimalist manner is, in itself, ironic.

It is also not necessarily a new thing for photography to try to participate in the affects of Minimalism – aesthetic or conceptual. In 1980, Allan McCollum showed his Glossies, a number of inks and watercolors on paper, with self-adhesive plastic laminating film; these were, depending on the show, exhibited in a pile in a display case or on a table or affixed to the wall, sans frames. They are not photographs, but

they perform as such in the gallery. In 1997, Alvaro Perdices produced a series of Black Photographs at 72 x 48 inches, which are mostly black, but have flickers of light in them, where traces of cigarettes had flitted across his frame. Perdices claims to have been flirting with Minimalism from a queer perspective, and hangs the photographs very close to the floor so that they seem very much like doors, especially given their dimensions. Despite the fact that the photographs enter the space of the gallery because of the way they are installed and despite the monochromatic mimicry of Minimalism, the pieces still refer specifically (via large vinyl wall labels) to the place at which they were taken, and therefore do not decry the photographic imperative to refer to a space before and beyond the real space and time of the gallery. They purport irony in the way they appropriate Minimalist affect and subvert it with cigarette butts, but do not insist on their literal presence in the room.

M + B

They did not have to; in 1997, the abstract concerns of photography did not lean towards the performative objecthood of a print as they do in some circles now. Across the country from the Whitney Biennial in 2012, at LAXART in Los Angeles, hang Phil Chang's *Cache, Active*: twenty-one black rectangles inside of white rectangular mattes inside of black frames. They are hung in three rows of seven and are evenly spaced. Shiny, the prints and/or their frames reflect the room in which they are hung. If arriving to the exhibition just as it is hung, an observer would have seen pictures in the frames instead of black photographic paper. The pictures were of many subjects, none of which were of particular consequence, especially in combination with one another. The paper was unfixed, meaning that after the picture had been exposed, the paper had been developed, development had been stopped, and observers could see the picture, but that the paper would continue to be subject to the effects of light, because it had not been put into a fixer bath: hence, after a set period of time, black paper. The project reads (to those who know that *Imagery Was Here*) as existentially averse to the contemporary situation of being mired in a plethora of imagery; this position rhymes with the randomness of the variety of images set to fade to black. They reject all imagery and discover nothing: if nothing matters, nothing matters, they propose, as opposed to Tillmans' "if one thing matters, everything matters." They are a performance of exhaustion, like a post-post-Pictures generation sigh.



Phil Chang; *Cache, Active*; 2012

The story associated with the black rectangles, though carried on in the oral history of those in the know, is phenomenologically unavailable in the prints. Knowing that story, though, and knowing that there used to be an image other than the monochromatic one now visible, creates a sense of interiority to the photograph, as if it had an under or inner painting – as if it had an inside, like the hollowness of the Minimal object or the shadowy space in back of a silhouetted Mel Bochner or a corner piece by Liz Deschenes. This, along with the language of performance used to describe the piece in its press release and in the essay by Walter Benn Michaels that accompanied its unveiling, suggests the theatrical postures of the Minimalist object: the performance of the piece represents a death, and therefore a life. Minimalist photographs beg their own anthropomorphism. The stories of the objects live in the minds of the viewer, and the viewers therefore collectively sustain the significance of the piece; without them – or the oral history – the piece would be a simple monochrome series. Unlike Allan McCollum's *Surrogates*, Chang's *Cache, Active*, does not reference the dense display style of a nineteenth-century salon. The black rectangles, iterated across a white wall, reflecting those who regard them and who sustain their meaning, reference Minimalism and the rejection of the illusionistic abstractly in operation therein.

A particular character of this work is that it doesn't make it feel as if it matters. Since the images redacted by the piece's performance are of no apparent consequence, we don't have an erased DeKooning drawing or a mauled poster of a dictator; we have a sense of nothingness, erased, creating a sense only that the photograph can behave as a Minimal object rather than a depicting thing – because it wants to and can. This is similar, if different in tenor, to Tillmans' forty-two black rectangular prints exhibited in the corner of the UCLA Hammer Museum in 2006: *For the Victims of Organized Religions* could, for all we know, depict the same things as did Chang's *Cache, Active*, but Tillmans' piece purports to matter in its rejection or memorialization of specific imagery.


In general, Tillmans looks like he loves pictures – they're everywhere and of all kinds in his shows – and so when he departs from that strategy, it is clear that he is treating the other more physical experiments not as replacements for images – not as negations thereof – but as their own constituent photographic argument. Similarly, Walead Beshty's folded paper photograms exist among his oeuvre of investigations of the imagistic "processes through which we produce meaning." They are not negations of images; they are objects unto themselves. Chang's black pictures are not objects unto themselves; they are performing objects, and with or without having seen their performance, that is their meaning: photographs perform. They do not discover a phenomenon; photographers know that their pictures, if unfixed, will fade to black. They do not reject any specific kind of imagery, as did Tillmans' black pictures; not do they reimagine or reclaim any specific kind of imagery, as did the Pictures' Generation's Cindy Shermans or Richard Princes or the post Pictures generation Elad Lassry's. They do not use their frames or mattes sculpturally, interacting with them like a piece by Lassry or Wall or Deschenes, except insofar as they rely on their frames and mattes to emphasize their iteration.

M+B

The consequence of a performative photograph on photography at large is that it enables the medium to more clearly enter the working space of other mediums in the 21st century: it moves the work through the conventional photographic window and into the space of invented objects that function in real space and time. No longer an artifact of another space or time, the photograph acts out any number of verbs as much as a material could enact any verb on Richard Serra's Verb List Compilation: Actions to Relate to Oneself (1967-1968). How does a photographic print – monochromatic or lacking in recognizable referent – prove more meaningful than a piece of construction paper when deployed in space? It draws on the attachment of years of belief in the photographic artifact: these pieces are only ironic or suggestive when they activate our received understanding of the photograph as a marker of an event, even if that event takes place here and now, in the neo-Minimalist space of the gallery. As the 2014 Whitney Biennial includes more collectives and collaboratives than ever before as well as more performance, distributed more organically throughout the rest of the show's artwork, it is no wonder that the photograph should aspire to performative, interactive presence. A challenge for the photograph as it undertakes these postures, then, is to investigate what it means to perform, what kind of picture should engage in such behavior, and, of course, why.



Wolfgang Tillmans; For the Victims of Organized Religions; 2006



ARTnews

Expired Photo Materials Find New Life in Contemporary Photography

02/17/14

By Rebecca Robertson

"I woke up one day and thought, 'I should have been a conservator,'" says photographer Alison Rossiter. "I thought, 'Things are disappearing, and I want to know about them.'"

That was in 2003, and the silver gelatin photo materials Rossiter had used since the 1970s were beginning to disappear. Rather than changing careers, Rossiter volunteered at the Metropolitan Museum of Art's photo conservation lab, where she learned everything she could about the history and composition of light-sensitive paper and film. In her own work, she began making photograms with old sheet film that she bought on eBay. One order contained a bonus: a box of Eastman Kodak Ektachrome paper that had expired in 1946. Running a few sheets through her darkroom chemistry, Rossiter was astonished to find that the paper, damaged by time and unusable for making regular prints, was instantly compelling when she finished developing it.

"It looked to me like a graphite drawing," Rossiter says in her Manhattan studio. "A completely finished abstract drawing. I couldn't believe it. From that moment on, I knew that there was something to go find in old, unused photographic papers."

Rossiter began hunting for expired paper online, collecting boxes of forgotten brands with exotic names such as Gravalux and Velox. Developing them, she discovered tones ranging from rich coffee to inky black, on paper that was velvety or slick. There were sheets with mirroring around the edges like tarnish, where the silver in the paper had oxidized. On some sheets, she found traces where fingerprints or mold had disturbed the emulsion, and faint marks where light had slowly leaked through the packaging, leaving the paper "roasted by time," she says.

Rossiter titled each sheet with the brand of the paper as well as the date it expired and the date she developed it, describing a finite span of time that alludes to the looming end-date of the silver gelatin process itself. If the history of photography is a succession of technologies, says Rossiter, "we get to witness the biggest one, where—whhhpp!—the whole light-sensitive thing was thrown out."

Rossiter is one of a growing number of artists using what's known as analog photography—photographs made using light-sensitive paper and film—as their subject, rather than as simply the means of reproducing an image. In part, this interest in the materiality of photography reflects the massive shifts brought on by the digital age, which has made traditional photographic methods increasingly obsolete in everyday life.

In response, artists are looking to the history of pre-digital photographic processes with a fresh interest in experimentation. They are recycling and breaking down analog materials, pushing them in unintended and unexplored directions, and mining old snapshots for new meanings. While this work is unabashedly rooted in the physical, the central question it prompts is often conceptual: what is photography today?

M+B

Recent gallery shows such as “Unique” at Von Lintel Gallery and “Alchemical” at Steven Kasher Gallery, as well as museum exhibitions such as “Surface Tension” at the Center for Photography at Woodstock, New York, in 2012 and “What Is a Photograph?” on view through May 4 at the International Center of Photography in New York, are working to make sense of the growing interest in materiality. Carol Squiers, the ICP show’s curator, says she wanted to explore “what it might mean for the analog era to end in photography and the digital era to completely take over.”

What Squiers found was a sort of anarchic esthetic in which artists rebel against the prescribed uses of their materials. She writes in the show’s catalogue that “the more the digital seems to triumph, the more artists seem to turn away from it.” Using processes ranging from C-prints to tintypes, they break photography down “into its technological layers and then recast it in the materiality of the physical world.”

The demise of film is the subject in Brea Souders’s series “Film Electric.” She photographs fragments of her own film and prints she has cut into tiny pieces. Souders began the project while cleaning out her archives in preparation for a move. “I was cutting the pieces up so nobody would take them from the waste bin,” she recalls. Also in the trash was an acetate negative sleeve, a long plastic envelope used to protect film. When she pulled it from the bin, slivers remained attached to the plastic, held by static electricity.

“Some of them fell and others stuck, and I just thought that was really beautiful, the way my memories were clinging together. It was a metaphor for film trying to hold on, literally,” Souders says. She photographs arrangements of these pieces in poetic, airy forms against a pale background. Cut from negatives and contact sheets, each fragment is recognizable, at least to her. Pointing to a shard of film, “This is Belize, I can tell by the shape of those palms,” she says in her sunny studio in her Brooklyn apartment. “I think we all experience memory in a similar way, with little bits and pieces of things colliding in unexpected ways. We all remember things in snippets.”

Souders, who recently completed a residency at the Camera Club of New York where she will have a solo show opening February 20, continues to shoot occasionally with her Hasselblad to make new raw material for the project. She shoots mostly digitally. Still, she admits, “I do miss film.”

Brendan Fowler’s large framed prints also combine fragments from his past, but more violently. Hung from the wall, his stacks of large, framed ink-jet prints crash through each other, leaving ripped paper and broken glass where one image pierces the others. The photos themselves are studiously casual—they show friends and messy studios—but many include an emblem of photography or digital culture. In Summer 2010 (Computer on 20” Slingerland Bass Drum, Accident/The Wood Fell On Me In Studio May 20 2010 #5, “Poster For Dialog With The Band Aids Wolf” Screens in Studio, Flower in Patty’s Gazebo 2), 2010, the photo on top shows a computer monitor running Photoshop, resting on a drum. Other works depict a stack of photographs or a cell phone’s glowing screen. The series, included in the Museum of Modern Art’s “New Photography 2013” exhibition, is a sort of narrative mash-up, but it also emphasizes the physical, breakable nature of the photos—impossible qualities for a purely digital image.

Matthew Brandt also destroys his pictures in the process of creating them. For his series “Lakes and Reservoirs,” Brandt traveled throughout the West and collected samples from the bodies of water he photographed. Back in his Los Angeles studio, he submerged the large C-prints in the water they depict until the paper disintegrated into a rainbow of lurid colors as its layers dissolved. In Wilma Lake CA 1, 2008, the edges of a rocky landscape have been eaten away by water, the sky has turned magenta, and the hills are red and yellow.

M + B

“There’s only so much control you can get out of water,” says Brandt, who has nonetheless learned what to expect from the process. “If I leave them soaking for longer, I know it’s going to break down to the yellow or white layer. If I take it out earlier, it might be the red layer. There are a lot of nuances.”

For Brandt, the work is connected to the history of 19th-century photographers who recorded the West, such as Timothy O’Sullivan. He also references diminishing water supplies, and by extension, disappearing photo technology. “Sometimes I revisit a lake, and in the summer the water is almost gone. I like capturing those moments, being a witness to these falling water lines, and then thinking of that in relation to the dwindling C-print process,” says Brandt. “Pretty soon I won’t be able to make these. It is definitely getting more difficult to get the paper.”

While Brandt takes his prints out of their water bath before they disintegrate completely, the images in Phil Chang’s series “Cache, Active” disappeared almost as soon as they were shown, destroyed by the light needed to view them. Made on expired silver gelatin paper that has been left unfixed, the portraits, photograms, and landscapes faded to an eerie brown over the course of the opening of the exhibition at Los Angeles in 2012. Rather than referencing historical processes, Chang sees the work as a response to the Internet age. Unlike a digital image that can be sent across space and exist in multiple locations, the prints must be viewed in person, and quickly.

For John Cyr, the disappearing tools of analog photography are his subject. Since 2010, he has been photographing the developer trays used by black-and-white photographers ranging from Aaron Siskind to Sally Mann to Eddie Adams (a book of the images will be published by powerHouse next month). Some are scrubbed clean while others are stained black with silver salts, reflecting the habits of their users, living and dead. The curved edges of the basins, shot against a black background, give the plastic and metal trays a monumental, funereal air.

Anne Collier also used an image of a developer tray in her 2012 photo installation on the High Line in New York. From a billboard overlooking the elevated park, the artist’s eye stared out from a liquid-filled tray. Tinged with a look of anxiety or sadness, the eye watched over its viewers through a disappearing medium. Where Cyr considers himself a photographer, Collier’s approach takes a wider aim at the art world.

Marco Breuer’s work may have begun as reaction to his strict photographic education rather than to the approach of digital, but, he says, “for me the interesting part is the friction, interacting with a material in an unauthorized fashion.” He became interested in challenging the limits of photo materials after studying photography in his native Germany in the late 1980s and early ’90s, when digital photography was only a rumor, he says. At the time, the technically precise Becher School (“you know, the Ruffs and the Gurskys”—students of Bernd and Hilla Becher at the Kunst- akademie Düsseldorf), was the de facto official German school of photography.

“I thought, there has to be another way of working,” Breuer says, and he set out to unlearn the rules he had been taught. What would happen if he pressed photo paper between his teeth, for instance, or exposed it to flame?

“I placed objects on black-and-white paper in the dark room, and then I set them on fire, so the object would illuminate itself,” the artist says from his studio in Hudson, New York. The next logical step was to eliminate the object entirely. “If it’s just me and the paper, how can I extract images out of this material? So I got into sanding and scratching and scraping and heating, and all these other forces.”

M + B


Breuer found that by starting from the simplest materials, “you could carve out your own space, and there was still discovery possible.” Since then, he has continued to work with the basic elements of photography, making photograms or disrupting the paper directly to create beautiful, rigorous abstractions, which he shows at Yossi Milo Gallery in New York (where Brandt and Rossiter also show).

Since 1990, Breuer has also collected snapshots, a passion he shares with a number of artists. The ones he likes most are those that have been altered because of some dissatisfaction. “People go in and write on photographs, or they cut a person out,” he says. What interests him is the “liberty taken with this object. Once you start taking the scissors to it, you have to deal with how it curls and how you’re going to paste it down. That’s sort of the material aspect of it.”

For Garrett Pruter, part of the appeal of old photographs is the access they grant to an otherwise private past. For a recent project, he bought a box of slides on eBay that depict the life of family in Indiana. “It’s very strange to have access to these memories,” he says. “It almost feels unnatural, because this is not the way we live anymore.” His show last year at Charles Bank Gallery (now Judith Charles Gallery) in New York incorporated the images in a number of forms. For him, old family photos offer a record that will be lost with the switch to digital. “It’s almost like going through someone’s hard drive,” says Pruter.

Among the works in his show were a series of melancholy monochromatic paintings in muted pinks and earth tones, made from scraped photo emulsions. From the box of 2,000 slides, Pruter selected a few and made around 20,000 drugstore photo lab copies. He collected the emulsion in bowls, making a sort of physical average of each image. “For each image, you basically have a different flat color that emerges. Some paintings are a single image,” he says, while others combine several, treating each photo as a kind of paintbrush. The result “almost becomes a monument that’s composed of all these thousands of images,” says Pruter. “It represents the complete decay of this moment,” from each original Indiana slide, while at the same time “breathing new life into it.”

Rebecca Robertson is photo editor of ARTnews.



THE NEW YORKER

GOINGS ON ABOUT TOWN: ART

“ALCHEMICAL”

July 2013

The critic and curator Kevin Moore has organized a smart, seductive show of photographs that don't just record phenomena; they embody them. Most of the pictures concern the effects of light, whether it's glinting off a building in Tokyo like a prismatic wand in Roe Ethridge's misty cityscape or exploding in buttery rays in James Welling's view of Philip Johnson's Glass House. In images by David Benjamin Sherry, Ryan McGinley, Hannah Whitaker, and Elena Dorfman, monochromatic washes of color turn nature theatrical. Artifice and mystery combust in Phil Chang's geometric photograms—all four have faded to coppery brown since being exposed to light at the show's opening. Through Aug. 10. (KASHER, 521 W. 23rd St, New York, N.Y. 212-966-3978)

– Vince Aletti

M + B

ARTFORUM

“The Black Mirror”

February 27, 2013

By Travis Diehl

The polished black face of a Claude glass renders “views” romantic and emotional—though this tool more accurately reflects the viewer’s projections. In “The Black Mirror,” what you see is what you see. This is an exhibition of black stuff—and it’s possible to see nothing else. Yet a sustained look can produce a show more variegated than it initially appears. The viewer first encounters Matthew Brandt’s *George Bush Park, Houston, TX, 2009–11*, a monochrome made of handmade paper and charcoal from wood found at its namesake, reflective only insofar as it indexes that site. Right away, this work offers twin reads of this “dark” exhibition: as an inconsequential formal romp, and as a somber poem on the pathos .of the index and of representation in general

Still, several works make dull use of blackness. In *Dead Day IV, 2008*, Barnaby Furnas deploys “black” to blot out a colorful canvas. Farrah Karapetian’s *Framed Monochrome (Real Estate), 2012*, a “for sale” sign made of a blackened photogram, confuses overexposure with the housing market. Yet similar indexical caesuras by Brandt and Phil Chang—whose unfixed prints *Woman Laughing; Upright Log, Studio; and Man Sitting*, all 2011, are not black but the eggplant-flesh gray of photochemical entropy—question how an artwork might ever represent a complex subject. Meaning becomes a function of the viewer’s reflection, as with Eban Goff’s sphincterlike *Twin, 2013*, where black wax and polished metal polygons are shaped to receive a body; or Rodney McMillian’s three identical photos of a flaking foam bust painted black. Black allows contrast, or the grays of photographic grain, as in the shimmering stream and blotchy .rich foliage in Whitney Hubbs’s 2009 photo *Untitled (Reflection)*—blown-out and antipicturesque

John Szarkowski’s 1978 MoMA survey “Mirrors and Windows” plotted photographs on a continuum of subjective reflection and objective transparency. Never mind the index—for what role does it play after representation? What game is this? Why, it’s the photographic game—one we recognize post-Szarkowski as distinctly subjective. Sure enough, in “The Black Mirror,” there is much of cocurator and photographer James Welling—for whom the photograph represents the photographer above all. Welling’s tiny, slippery silver chromaprint *Lock, 1976*, depicts a two-by-four angled against the back of a door. The piece hangs across a small room from a glossy black John McCracken plank—two leaning, pathetic blacknesses, .reflecting one another, propping each other up

**LA><ART IS PLEASED TO PRESENT A
NEW BODY OF PHOTOGRAPHIC WORKS BY PHIL CHANG**



Phil Chang, Double (Exposure 3), 2007-2009
archival pigment print, courtesy of the artist and LA><ART, Los Angeles

Phil Chang: Cache, Active

LA><ART Gallery Two
March 10 – April 14, 2012
Opening Reception: March 10, from 6-8pm

Panel discussion to be held on the occasion of the closing of the exhibition
April 14 at 2pm at LA><ART (2640 S. La Cienega Blvd)

Cache, Active includes twenty-one photographs that expose and fade in the light necessary to view them. These photographs are produced by using expired photographic paper; the types of photographs include abstraction, appropriated imagery, portraits, still lifes, and landscapes. Each photograph is not subjected to darkroom chemistry, allowing for a durational process to occur. Because the expired paper's sensitivity to light has been greatly diminished, the photographs on view will expose in five hours of continuous exposure time, gradually transforming to a reddish-brown monochrome. Each photograph is presented in a custom picture frame with removable backing that allows for a replenishing of a photograph during the exhibition of the work. *Cache, Active* seeks to raise questions along the lines of value, reception, intention, and the conditions of an exhibition site.

The work also addresses the efficacy and viability of contemporary artworks within the larger context of the present day recession. These questions hinge on a formal and durational operation where the photographs on view will fade precisely because of the physical conditions particular to the exhibition site: placement on the wall, the lights of the gallery, and the act of viewing the work. Walter Benn Michaels has contributed an essay as a supplement to the exhibition, entitled "Meaning and Affect: Phil Chang's Cache, Active".

About the Artist

Phil Chang received his MFA from The California Institute of the Arts and his BA from the University of California, Irvine. His work has been exhibited in group shows at Pepin Moore, Renwick Gallery, Angels Gallery, and The Swiss Institute. His work has been written about in Artforum.com and The New Yorker. In 2010, Chang completed "Four Over One," an artist's publication that is published by the Los Angeles County Museum of Art in association with Textfield, Inc. In addition to his project with LA><ART, Chang has organized "Affective Turns?", a group exhibition at Pepin Moore gallery in Los Angeles. He is currently visiting faculty in the Department of Art at UCLA and a lecturer at Otis College of Art and Design. Phil Chang lives and works in Los Angeles.

ABOUT LA><ART

Founded in 2005, LA><ART is a leading independent nonprofit contemporary art space in Los Angeles, committed to the production of experimental exhibitions and public art initiatives. Responding to Los Angeles' cultural climate, LA><ART produces and presents new work for all audiences and offers the public access to the next generation of artists and curators. LA><ART supports challenging work, reflecting the diversity of the city and stimulates conversations on contemporary art in Los Angeles, fostering dynamic relationships between art, artists and their audiences. LA><ART produced and commissioned over 100 projects in its first five years. In 2012, LA><ART will launch its Vision Campaign including The Occasional – a city wide exhibition and public art initiative. This platform for LA continues the organization's ongoing commitment to supporting artistic and curatorial freedom while focusing on commissioning new work in experimental contexts.

LA><ART's programs are made possible with the generous support of the Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, the Danielson Foundation, the G.L. Waldorf Family Fund, The Los Angeles County Arts Commission, The City of Los Angeles' Department of Cultural Affairs, Proskauer Rose LLP, and LA><ART's Board, Producers Council, Collectors Circle and Curators Council.

LA><ART is located at 2640 S. La Cienega Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90034

T.310.559.0166 F.310.559.0167 www.laxart.org

LA><ART is open Tuesday through Saturday 11am – 6pm

Forthcoming Exhibitions:

Laura Parnes and Lovett/Codagne

LA><ART Galleries One and Two

Participant Inc. Project at LA><ART

Guest Curated by Lia Gangiatano

April 21 – May 19, 2012

Opening Reception: April 21, 2012, 6-8pm

Meaning & Affect: Phil Chang's *Cache, Active*

Walter Benn Michaels

The photographs and photograms in Phil Chang's *Cache, Active* series are on expired photographic paper that has been left unfixed. This means that when they are exposed to light, the image very quickly begins to fade and, after several hours, pretty much disappears, leaving instead a reddish brown monochrome. There is an important sense in which you don't simply look at these photographs, you watch what they're doing; it's a kind of performance. And it's more like a live performance than a movie or video since it's not repeatable—you can't just play it again when it's over. But also—and here the performance model gets complicated—it's not just over when it's over. Something (the monochrome) remains. So what we're being asked to pay attention to is not just the performance and not just the final object but the relation between them.

When I first saw one of these works, it was wrapped in black plastic to keep out the light. When the plastic was taken off, it looked for a while like this, depicting several sheets of layered paper on what is, of course, another sheet of paper, the (untreated) photographic paper. Because of the layering, the surfaces depicted in the photogram have real volume. Its title, *Two Sheets of Thick Paper on Top of Two Sheets of Thin Paper*, suggests Chang's own interest in that fact. By contrast, the thickness or thinness of the paper that constitutes the object—the photogram itself. A section of it is visible as black on the bottom which seems immaterial. There are, in other words, five pieces of paper visible in the photo but only four depicted. And at the same time, what we're actually looking at is only one piece of paper, but the question of its thickness or thinness is never raised. So what I mean by calling the volume of the photographic paper immaterial is, first, that the photogram renders the thickness of the paper it's on irrelevant and, second, that this irrelevance—the difference between the paper it's a picture of and the paper it's on—is significant. This is what the photogram is about. And significance is not a physical property of the picture; aboutness is not material.

At the same time, however, the materiality of the photographic paper—not its volume but the fact that it's expired and untreated—does turn out to matter. As the light begins to take effect, the depicted paper (the two thick sheets on top of the two thin ones) becomes harder and harder to see. Which means not only that the contrasting colors and volumes of the paper are lost but that the contrast between the (paradoxical) immateriality of the photogram as an object and the (inversely paradoxical) materiality of its subject also begins to disappear. Insofar as we have thought of the photograph not just as embodying this contrast but as being about it, it's not only the contrast but also the aboutness that fades. The original photogram depicted sheets of paper; fading to reddish



Two Sheets of Thick Paper on Top of Two Sheets of Thin Paper, 2010.
Unfixed silver gelatin print, 15 x 19 inches.

brown, it stops depicting anything. The original photogram was about the immateriality of the difference between a piece of paper and the representation of a piece of paper. The eventual monochrome may be understood as having lost or abandoned or repudiated its capacity to represent, and as having thus given up the claim to represent anything. Or it might be understood as asserting a claim to its materiality.

And, if we read *Cache, Active* this way, we can begin to locate it in relation to some other significant efforts of 21st-century artistic production, all of which we might place under the general heading of what Tom McCarthy, citing the philosopher Simon Critchley, calls letting “matter matter.”¹ McCarthy's own *Remainder*, with its commitment to what he calls “sheer materiality,”² would be an instance, as would, in photography, what James Elkins describes as Marco Breuer's efforts to make photographs that “undermine representation”³ and, in sculpture, what Julian Rose calls the “completely nonmetaphoric structures” of Oscar Tuazon. For Tuazon, “the problematic is never one of representation”⁴ His “fundamental achievement,” according to Rose, is “to build a structure that does not look like but is.”⁵ We can see the relevance of this formulation to Chang just by noting the way in which the pictures in *Cache, Active* may be understood precisely to begin by looking like but end by simply being. Moreover, if we extend our range to the invocation in Stephen Best's and Sharon Marcus's influential essay, “Surface Reading” of Susan Sontag's antecedent formulation—the critic should concern herself with “what [a work] is” rather than “what it means”—we can begin to see the pictures in *Cache, Active* not just as exemplifying, but as enforcing this shift of attention.⁶ They don't just let matter matter, they make metaphor, meaning and representation itself into matter.



Monochrome, Exposed, 2012.
Unfixed silver gelatin print, 15 x 19 inches.

So far, then, we have a photo that begins by being about the difference between what it is and what it represents but, as the representation disappears, undoes that difference, leaving behind a remnant of the picture. But when we put it this way, it's not hard to see that any account along these lines can't quite be right since, if it's possible to see the final monochrome as the culmination of the process through which a picture disappears, it's possible also to see it as the culmination of the process through which a picture is created. How did Chang make the particular monochrome I saw? By making a photogram on expired photographic paper, leaving the image unfixed and exposing it to light. What I've been calling the work's performance is nothing other than the causal account of its production, the kind of account you can give for any work of art. The difference is just that Chang has folded the process through which the work was produced into the experience of seeing it. This is a difference that matters. For one thing, in a kind of paroxysm of medium specificity, it absolutely insists that the monochromes be seen as photographs. And, for another, in insisting that the way the monochromes have been made is crucial to our experience of them, it makes them into objects that have to be understood, objects that don't resist interpretation, but require it.

We see the final monochromes not only as being what they are but, as having a relation to what they aren't—or, at least, aren't any more. They are, in a certain sense, abstractions, in a kind of variation on the old Lacanian formula—“the symbol manifests itself first of all as the murder of the thing.” They continue to bear a relation to the depicted things they have replaced. This relation is most obvious in some of the photographs where you can actually see a trace of the original image. But it's just as important when you can't, where, as in the photograms, the indexical trace of the image has been effaced and



what the monochrome marks is precisely that effacement. In both cases, the monochromes signify the absence of the original image, functioning either as a kind of screen behind what once was visible can be imagined to have retreated. They read as a kind of epitaph for something that is gone. And this signifying function marks an inversion of the demand for the thing that, instead of meaning, “simply is.” What we get here is a thing that (in order to mean) cannot simply be, i.e., a thing determined in its being as much by what it isn’t as by what it is.

Cache, Active embodies an encounter not just with meaning but, to recall Michael Fried’s famous remark about the sculpture of Anthony Caro, with “meaningfulness as such.” But if, in one way, this parallel is almost exact—the position Fried was writing against in “Art and Objecthood” has more than a family resemblance to the one articulated by Rose, Tuazon, Critchley, et al—in another way, it’s a little misleading. The modernists Fried was defending had developed their own position prior to and independent of Minimalism, whereas Chang (born in 1974) has never lived in an art world in which the appeal of the literal—call it postmodernism—was not being articulated in one form or another. His position is indelibly marked by a certain intimacy with rather than a straightforward refusal of the literal.

The difference between “meaningfulness” at the beginning of postmodernism and meaningfulness today is not just an art historical one. It’s also an economic one. Whether you measure by the increase in inequality at home or the spread of capitalism abroad, the penetration of the market into every corner of the globe and every form of production—including, obviously, the production of art—is complete today in a way that seemed almost unimaginable in the late 60s and early 70s. If it’s true that an artist like Chang has never lived in an art world without the postmodern, it’s also true that he has never lived in an America in which inequality wasn’t increasing. Since the year of his birth, all the growth in American income has gone to the top 10% while the income of the bottom 90% has actually declined. It was once possible for a writer like Douglas Crimp to imagine a truly “materialist critique of art” (his exemplary instance was Serra) that would resist the “idealism of modern sculpture” (Caro) and seek “to defeat consumption altogether”—that would replace the experience of art as a “luxury commodity” with “the experience of art in its material reality.” That ship has sailed to, and then back from, Shenzhen. In fact, today, if we’re looking for something to emblemize what it might mean to resist the commodity, almost the only place we can find it is in the idealism that Crimp deplored, in the resistance to the material that we see in *Cache, Active*.

As Nick Brown has emphasized in “The Work of Art in the Age of its Real Subsumption Under Capital,” the distinguishing feature of the commodity, is the fact that, produced only to be sold, what matters about it is never what it was intended to do but only that it gets bought. As the producer of the commodity, I may make something for you to use in a certain way but what counts is only that you buy what I made; what you actually do with it is your business. And if, in art, we’ve usually put the point in more positive terms (think of the critique of the artist’s intentionality and the celebration of indeterminacy, of the artist’s willingness to give up control of the work, etc.), nevertheless it’s been the same point with art, then, as with any commodity, not only is the price of the work determined by its buyers, so also are the uses to which it’s put. And the experience they have of it is their experience. In fact, the only thing about the

work of art that is not determined by its buyers, the only thing about it that’s not reducible to the commodity it otherwise is, is its meaning.

That’s why *Cache, Active*’s insistence on the experience of meaning is both its aesthetic and its politics. The response to these pictures that Phil Chang presumably wants is for us to like them and buy them. But what the pictures Chang has made require is something more like our understanding than our affection, and they not only require it, they also dramatize the specificity of the requirement. This is what’s at stake in the encounter they stage with their own materiality. It’s only the felt power of the reduction to being that gives their insistence on meaning its force. And it’s also why the sense of loss as the original image fades is crucial but not dispositive. And like the disarticulation of meaning from being, the disarticulation of meaning from feeling requires an encounter with its appeal. It’s only the intimacy with what it doesn’t do that makes it possible for *Cache, Active* to do what it does.

Walter Benn Michaels teaches English at UIC. His books include *The Gold Standard and the Logic of Naturalism* and *The Shape of the Signifier*; his current project is *The Beauty of a Social Problem: Photography in the 21st Century*.

1. Tom McCarthy, “Book of a Lifetime,” *The Independent*, July 30, 2010 <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/books/reviews/book-of-a-lifetime-le-parti-pris-des-choses-by-francis-ponge-2038686.html>
2. Tom McCarthy in *The New Geography, A Roundtable*, with Jeffrey Kastner, Nato Thompson and Eyal Weizman, *BookForum*, Apr/May 2009 http://www.bookforum.com/inprint/016_01/3511
3. James Elkins, “Renouncing Representation” in *The Edge of Vision*, Lyle Rexer (New York: Aperture, 2009), 270.
4. Julian Rose, “Structural Tension,” *Artforum* (October 2010), 223.
5. Ibid.
6. Stephen Best and Sharon Marcus, “Surface Reading,” *Representations*, 108 (Fall 2009), 10.
7. Douglas Crimp, *On the Museum’s Ruins* (MIT Press: Cambridge, 1993), 155, 154, 167.

Published by LA X ART on the occasion of the exhibition of Phil Chang’s *Cache Active* at LA X ART, March 10 - April 14 2012.

LA X ART

www.laxart.org



PHIL CHANG *CACHE, ACTIVE*

Above: Studio view, *Two Sheets of Thick Paper on Top of Two Sheets of Thin Paper*, 2010. Unfixed silver gelatin print, 15 x 19 inches.

M + B

ARTFORUM

Phil Chang

LAXART

Straightforward depiction simply doesn't cut it for a photographer like Phil Chang. Not today, not this deep into the digital-imaging revolution unleashed by Google, Instagram, iPhones, and all the other democratizing platforms, apps, and mobile devices that have made photographic representation not only ubiquitous but ever more virtual. The medium, decidedly in protracted flux, has been thrown into crisis and forced to grapple with the new reality of chronic image-exhaustion. How can photography resist the numbness of which it is the very cause? Structurally, Chang might suggest—perhaps even suicidally. For this LA-based artist, a contemporary photographic aesthetic must be as much about what's not pictured and not visible as about what is, and the work's critical agency must be constructed through an exploration of process and materiality.

In this show, Chang presented a test case—an installment of new works from the series "Cache, Active," 2010–, a wall of images printed on expired photographic paper that was left unfixed so that each print would (and did) rapidly degrade in the exhibition space as soon as it was brought into the light necessary to see it. Representation was caught in a double bind, its latent instability and urgency hyperbolized even as it vanished before the viewer's eyes in an act of self-sabotage. Presenting photography as a durational performance, the artist literally unveiled the works at the opening, exposing them to the gallery's bright fluorescence, which gradually darkened the pictures until, after several hours, all appeared a uniform dull maroon tone. In effect, photography's presumed fixity was recast as transience, invisibility, and opacification.

Installed as a horizontal grid of twenty-one pieces—all identically framed in black with a white matte and vertically oriented like portraits, or like Allan McCollum's "surrogates"—the series appeared monochromatic for the rest of the exhibition's run. Yet prior to the photographs' chemical disappearance, the installation simulated an ersatz vintage-photo wall, the pictures encompassing, in their warm sepia shades, a range of the medium's principal genres, from portraiture and landscape to still life and photogram abstractions. Each image was titled with a dry description of the thing it very soon no longer depicted—for example, *Man. Sitting*, 2011, or *Single Piece of Cardboard Balancing on Edge*, 2010, or *Sea #2*, 2011—which cast a strange, mournful air back onto the prints' ghostly blankness.

Crucially, there was a narrow window of opportunity for seeing these pictures. And the finality stung. Catalyzing and theatricalizing absence, Chang triggered affective pangs of loss, insisting on the multivalent mortality of his images, while at the same time allegorizing the obsolescence of photography's (pre-digital) technology. As

they faded, the pictures lingered in the memories of those who had seen them, at once raising the stakes of viewership through the moral imperative of bearing witness and privileging oral description as the primary way in which the work's vanished history will survive and circulate thereafter.

Though it may seem a throwback to late-1960s Conceptualism or faintly give off the air of a clever trick—like Robert Barry photographing an invisible liter of inert gas released into the atmosphere—Chang's disappearing act in "Cache, Active" is timely and forceful. Perhaps it is the project's emphasis on *becoming* monochrome, experienced here as a doomed process in which pictorial heterogeneity settles into drab homogeneity, that pushes Chang's gesture toward critique of the contemporary image regime and lends the procedural "trick" real depth. There is a crushing inexorability conveyed in the turning over from distinct to interchangeable units (the very definition of the commodity); it is the force of entropy, the collapse of all difference into sameness, equilibrium—and it feels like death. But despite this grim sentence, the series' resulting equivalence radiates something liberatory. Denying representation's permanence, letting go of documentation in exchange for opacity and blockage, the flushed monochromes suggest a relinquishing of selfhood and ego in pursuit of transcendence—glimpsed here as the specter of abstraction.

—Sarah Lehrer-Grauer



View of "Phil Chang," 2012.

SUMMER 2012 325



NONSITE
● ORG

Associations for Phil Chang

April 17, 2012

By James Welling

Editor's note: We kindly refer the reader to Walter Benn Michael's *Meaning and Affect: Phil Chang's Cache, Active for context.*

I want to start by introducing the idea of “inherent vice.”¹ In the language of insurance, “inherent vice” is the natural tendency of an object to self-destruct for no apparent reason. The inherent vice of glass or marble objects, for instance, is that they can collapse at any moment; the material is structurally unstable. For photography, and particularly for color photography, the inherent vice of the photograph is that it inevitably tarnishes, no matter how hard we try to slow it down.²

I'd like to mention quickly the now gigantic industry in archival preservation of photographic materials. Chang's work suggests this: no one wants their photographs to fade in their lifetime. The term “archival” is announced on the box of the plastic page protectors I buy from Staples. The purple glue stick I buy from 3M is now acid-free, i.e. archival. If I were to chart the rise of the interest in archival preservation from the late 1970's on, I would start with the Wilhelm Imaging Institute's³ groundbreaking study of the accelerated aging of color photographs. ⁴

In his text, Walter Benn Michaels discusses Chang's use of the photogram. But many of the component units of *Cache, Active* are not photograms but photographic contact prints. So what is the difference between a photogram and a contact print? A photogram is made without a photographic positive or negative. An object shadows the sensitized surface/paper to produce an image. A contact print is created when the sensitized surface/paper is put in contact with a photographic positive or negative.⁵ The “contact print” is frequently opposed to prints made with a photographic enlarger because contacts are sharper than prints made by enlargement. As we will see in a moment, sharpness is not the only reason contact printing is employed for certain photographic processes.

Some of the earliest photographs used a sensitized surface that visibly darkened when exposed to light. Known as a printing-out process (POP), the POP emulsion was so slow that the exposure had to be made under strong ultraviolet light. After 1880, a “faster” sensitized surface was developed. Developing-out processes (DOP) were optimized for exposure using artificial light. After developing-out paper was exposed to light, an invisible, “latent image” formed and this image was made visible by a chemical developer.

Although Chang is using DOP paper for *Cache, Active*, he is exposing it as a POP. That is, he's exposing the DOP paper to bright light and making a POP print on it. So, it should be noted, that in order to create the representational parts of *Cache, Active*, Chang needed to carefully think through the process of making the work. Chang's procedures in making the work are both necessary and roundabout. Necessary because in order to use DOP photographic paper as POP, Chang needed to put massive amounts of light on the paper to coax an image from the material. And, in order to make “photographic” images, a photographic enlarger would not be bright enough to expose the paper as a POP print. The roundabout solution Chang came up with was to create a same size negative from his original negative or digital file so that he could make a POP contact print with a UV light source on DOP paper.

M + B

A quick aside here: Michaels and Chang mention that the photographic paper is “expired” in Cache, Active. When applied to photographic materials “expired” can be a bit inaccurate. Kodak puts an expiration date on its materials to tell you that they may not perform perfectly after the expiration date. Yet, as photographers, we all know that expired paper or film more often than not works exactly as it should some years after its expiration date. If expired paper were truly “expired,” as in “dead,” no image would result. I don’t know how old Chang’s paper is, but there is still enough chemical potential stored in to produce an image. Perhaps the idea of expired paper also adds to the affect inherent in the work; expired, no longer manufactured paper etc. is used. It occurs to me that Chang’s paper may not yield any sort of developed-out image, but there’s still enough silver in the paper to print-out. Or it may still be OK to print on using an enlarger. Either way, the paper has enough compounds that react to light so that the term “expired” is somewhat misleading.

The notion of making a photograph that eventually turns a black, recalls a paper that portrait photographers used in the 1950’s and 1960’s. Kodak Studio Proof 6 was a printing out paper that was intentionally left unfixed by photographer so the client’s picture would darken after a few hours. And the client would then have to buy prints that were properly fixed. I remember watching the proofs of my high school yearbook photographs turn black in the afternoon sun.

A few years ago I thought of curating a show of “black” photographs. In addition to Chang, the show would include work by

Jose Alvaro Perdices
Black Photos, 1997

Liz Deschenes
Tilt / Swing, 2009

Walead Beshty’s
Transparencies, 2009

Allan McCollum’s
Glossies, 1980

Marco Breuer
Nature of the Pencil, 2009

Breuer uses a sheet of maximally exposed and processed photographic paper (i.e. black paper) to carefully scratch lines at different depths to reveal colored dyes below. For Breuer, Phil’s work would be a starting point, not an end point.

Finally, I’d like to mention three works made by Chang’s peers that I associate with Cache, Active:

Erika Vogt’s *Action Unrestricted*, 2005, a film that unspools onto the exhibition floor, thereby hastening its destruction.

Mathew Brand’s *Lakes and Reservoirs*, 2011, waterlogged chromogenic prints with the emulsion partially destroyed

Evan Holloway’s, *Negative Value Drawing*, wherein the value of the work decreases (by fiat) each time it is sold.

M+B

Holloway's drawing focuses on value inversion in the art world. In the art market, the older the thing is, the greater its value. Holloway flips this around and forces the first collector of the work to agree to sell it at a lower price in six months. And so on for the next purchaser. This is in line with the economics of digital technology where new devices are priced higher than old ones. Because of its inherent vice, photography occupies a somewhat fraught place between these two positions, and this seems to be the crux of matter in Chang's *Cache, Active*.

REFERENCES

1. I began my talk by mentioning that I do association not theory.↑
2. All analogue or chemical photographic processes make use of the tendency of silver compounds to darken when exposed to light.

Thomas Wedgwood and Humphrey Davy are often footnoted as the inventors of photography. In the first decade of the 19th century they created photograms on salted paper. However they were unable to fix the images they made, so the work eventually turned black. I've often wondered what happened to these images. I'd love to see one. Couldn't the blackening be chemically reversed or bleached back to discern an image?

In 1997 Sandra Goldbacher made "The Governess," a film about the invention of photographic fixer. Minnie Driver plays a destitute young woman who is forced to hide her Jewish identity in order to work as a tutor for a wealthy Scottish family. Driver falls in love with the mad-scientist-inventor-head-of-the-household, Tom Wilkinson who, like Wedgwood and Davy discovered a photographic process but could not fix his images. Driver is deeply moved by a fading photograph of a bird's wing and she embraces the quest to make the image permanent. She takes the picture back to her garret room and begins to celebrate—in secret—the Passover Seder. Driver accidentally splashes salt water on the print and this fixes it. From there the romance goes south when Wilkinson takes the credit for the all-important discovery. Driver's character leaves Scotland with this secret knowledge, returns to London and succeeds as a masterful portrait photographer.↑

3. http://www.wilhelm-research.com/about_us.html↑
4. Stephen Shore set his 8×10 color contact prints at low prices because he anticipated that they would fade. This price structuring may have been the result of Wilhelm's research into image permanence.↑
5. The printing plates in offset lithography are exposed by contact using a UV light source.↑
6. Introduced in 1892, discontinued in 1987, Kodak's Studio Proof printing-out paper was the longest continuously manufactured photographic paper.↑

About the Author

James Welling's books include *Glass House* (2011); *Light Sources* published by Steidl/Mack (2011); *Flowers* (2006); *Photographs 1974-99* (2000); *Wolfsburg* (1994); *Usines de Dentelle* (1993); and *Les Voies Ferrées/St. Etienne et La Plaine du Forez* (1990). In 2004, Welling produced the feature film *Easy* which screened in Dramatic Competition at the 2004 Sundance Film Festival.

M+B

Los Angeles Times

Art review: Phil Chang at LAXART

March 22, 2012

By Sharon Mizota



Photo: Phil Chang, "Cache, Active" installation view. Credit: LAXART, Los Angeles.

Phil Chang's suite of 21 photographic works at LAXART look like slabs of old milk chocolate that's just about to turn white. Each work is actually a piece of expired photographic paper exposed with either a negative or various objects placed directly on top. The paper was then left unfixd, which means the images were never set, and the works kept "developing" as they were exposed to light in the gallery. Hence their smooth, chocolate-y sameness.

Each however, has a rather evocative title like "Sea #2" and "Woman, Laughing." Searching for traces of these images is a bit like looking at an Ad Reinhardt black painting — a rather existential experience as you search for minute variations in the darkness. Chang's work did bring a smile as I searched in vain for some evidence of something as simple as "Three Sheets of Thin Paper." But the chocolate refused to give anything up.


In this sense, the exhibition is both the aftermath of the work and an integral part of its making, a paradox that points to the tension between making art and exhibiting it. Does viewing complete the piece? And conversely, can a work be said to be finished if no one ever sees it? By blurring the line between making and exhibiting, Chang's enigmatic show reminds us, quite starkly, that the conditions under which we look at art largely determine what we see, and whether we recognize it as art at all.


PHIL CHANG


FINAL MONOCHROMES MONOCROMOS FINALES


Phil Chang's portfolio is an additional iteration of his recent durational photographic work. Chang makes a series of photograms, laying objects (and in these instances sheets of paper) onto the surface of photographic paper that has expired. Chang then exposes the entire surface of these unfixed photograms to light, the abstract image fading to a monochrome over the course of around five hours, which is an unusually long timeframe due to the reduced sensitivity of the out-of-date paper stock. Chang lays out the sequence here so that the monochrome outcome of the process is printed (and, significantly, fixed through the printing process) on the underside of the framed photogram and the beginning of its exposure to light, hence making the turning of the pages of this portfolio an equivalent or reenactment of the duration of the work.


El portfolio de Phil Chang es una reiteración de su trabajo fotográfico reciente en relación al tiempo. Chang crea una serie de fotogramas, colocando objetos (y en estas instancias hojas de papel) en la superficie del papel fotográfico caducado. Después, Chang expone a la luz la superficie completa de estos fotogramas no fijados durante el transcurso de unas cinco horas—un periodo excepcionalmente largo debido a la sensibilidad reducida del papel caducado—, haciendo que la imagen abstracta se desvanezca hasta hacerse monocroma. Chang compone aquí la secuencia de modo que el resultado monocromo del proceso se imprime (y, de manera significativa, se fija durante el proceso de impresión) en el reverso del fotograma enmarcado como consecuencia de su exposición a la luz, haciendo que, de esta manera, el pasar de las páginas del portfolio sea análogo a la duración de la obra, o bien una recreación de la misma.













185
Phil Chang
Monochrome, Exposed, from the series *Cache, Active*, 2012
Unfixed gelatin silver print
18.9 × 15 in
© Courtesy of the artist and Pepin Moore, Los Angeles
Phil Chang
Monocromo, velado, de la serie *Escondite, activo*, 2012
Gelatinobromuro de plata sobre papel baritado no fijado
48 × 38 cm
© Cortesía del artista y de Pepin Moore (Los Angeles)



186
Phil Chang
Untitled (Final Monochrome 01), 2013
C-Print
24 × 20 in
© Courtesy of the artist and Pepin Moore, Los Angeles
Phil Chang
Sin título (Monocromo final 01), 2013
Impresión cromógena
61 × 50,8 cm
© Cortesía del artista y de Pepin Moore (Los Angeles)



187
Phil Chang
Three Pieces of Wood Laid on Side and One Piece of Wood Balancing on Edge, from the series *Cache, Active*, 2012
Unfixed gelatin silver print
18.9 × 15 in
© Courtesy of the artist and Pepin Moore, Los Angeles
Phil Chang
Tres trozos de madera colocados de lado y un trozo de madera balanceándose en el borde, de la serie *Escondite, activo*, 2012
Gelatinobromuro de plata sobre papel baritado no fijado
48 × 38 cm
© Cortesía del artista y de Pepin Moore (Los Angeles)



188
Phil Chang
Untitled (Final Monochrome 02), 2013
C-Print
50 × 42 in
© Courtesy of the artist and Pepin Moore, Los Angeles
Phil Chang
Sin título (Monocromo final 02), 2013
Impresión cromógena
127 × 106,7 cm
© Cortesía del artista y de Pepin Moore (Los Angeles)



189
Phil Chang
Two Sheets of Thick Paper on Top of Two Sheets of Thin Paper, from the series *Cache, Active*, 2012
Unfixed gelatin silver print
18.9 × 15 in
© Courtesy of the artist and Pepin Moore, Los Angeles
Phil Chang
Dos hojas de papel grueso sobre dos hojas de papel fino, de la serie *Escondite, activo*, 2012
Gelatinobromuro de plata sobre papel baritado no fijado
48 × 38 cm
© Cortesía del artista y de Pepin Moore (Los Angeles)



190
Phil Chang
Untitled (Final Monochrome 03), 2013
C-Print, 2013
50 × 42 in
© Courtesy of the artist and Pepin Moore, Los Angeles
Phil Chang
Sin título (Monocromo final 03), 2013
Impresión cromógena
127 × 106,7 cm
© Cortesía del artista y de Pepin Moore (Los Angeles)



191
Phil Chang
Man, Sitting, from the series *Cache, Active*, 2011
Unfixed gelatin silver print
18.9 × 15 in
© Courtesy of the artist and Pepin Moore, Los Angeles
Phil Chang
Hombre, sentado, de la serie *Escondite, activo*, 2011
Gelatinobromuro de plata sobre papel baritado no fijado
48 × 38 cm
© Cortesía del artista y de Pepin Moore (Los Angeles)



192
Phil Chang
Untitled (Final Monochrome 04), 2013
C-Print, 2013
50 × 42 in
© Courtesy of the artist and Pepin Moore, Los Angeles
Phil Chang
Sin título (Monocromo final 04), 2013
Impresión cromógena
127 × 106,7 cm
© Cortesía del artista y de Pepin Moore (Los Angeles)

BIOGRAPHIES PHOTOGRAPHICNESS

Lorenzo Durantini

Lucas Blalock (Asheville, North Carolina, United States, 1978)

Lucas Blalock earned his BA from Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, New York, in 2001, attended the Skowhegan School of Painting and Sculpture, Maine, in 2011, and earned an MFA from the University of California, Los Angeles, in 2013. Blalock's practice begins with traditional large-format photography that he then scans and manipulates on the computer. He employs self-reflexive retouching gestures that assert their presence within the picture and hold equal weight to his subject matter. Blalock unpacks the programmatic language of photography and places tools that are usually masked from the final display of photographs in full sight. He likens his pictorial disruptions to Brechtian interventions that make the viewer aware of the contradictory process of representation that photography entails. Blalock has had recent solo exhibitions at Ramiken Crucible in New York and White Cube in London, as well as taking part in many group exhibitions including shows at MoMA PS1 and Wallspace in New York. Blalock has published *Towards a Warm Math* (Hassia, 2011) and *I Believe You, Liar* (iceberg, iceberg, iceberg, 2009). Blalock lives and works between Los Angeles and New York.

Phil Chang (Elkhart, Indiana, United States, 1974)

Phil Chang received his BA from the University of California, Irvine and his MFA from the California Institute of the Arts. Chang's work employs obsolete photographic materials to explore notions of the economy whilst analysing the political implications of the studio as a site for producing art. In *Four Over One*—an artist's publication that was published by the Los Angeles County Museum of Art whilst Charlotte Cotton was the head of the photography department—Chang merged digital imaging technology with expired photographic paper to create what he described as a "zero-sum process that mimics capitalist cycles of built-in obsolescence". For his solo exhibition *Studio, Affect* at Pepin Moore gallery in Los Angeles, Chang compiled a loose compendium of images of famous artists such as Francis Bacon and Giacometti working in their studios and presented it alongside his own studio practice in an array of chromogenic prints, silver gelatin

prints, laser prints, pigment prints, stencil prints, and offset prints. His work has been exhibited in group shows at Marlborough Chelsea and Family Business, in New York and at Diane Rosenstein Fine Arts and Control Room, both in Los Angeles. He is currently visiting faculty in the Department of Art at UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles) and a lecturer at the Otis College of Art and Design, in Los Angeles. Phil Chang lives and works in Los Angeles.

Charlotte Cotton (United Kingdom)

Charlotte Cotton is a writer and curator. She has held positions including curator of photographs at the Victoria and Albert Museum, head of programming at The Photographers' Gallery and head of the Wallis Annenberg Department of Photography at Los Angeles County Museum of Art. She is the author of *The Photograph as Contemporary Art* and founder of Words Without Pictures and Eitherand.org.

Emmeline de Mooij (Delft, The Netherlands, 1978)

Emmeline de Mooij lives and works between Amsterdam and New York, where she is currently pursuing her MFA at Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, New York. De Mooij is a multidisciplinary artist working in performance, photography, painting and sculpture. Her work explores evolutionary biology and the body's relationship to nature and often incorporates playful aspects of shamanism and tribalism. In her solo exhibition *Oxytocin* at Legion TV in London, De Mooij presented a combination of wall-based and framed prints exploring alternate psychotherapy and her own personal experience of motherhood. Her book *Bush Compulsion*, made in collaboration with Melanie Bonajo in 2009, documented playful rituals that the artists staged in a forest which culminated in an exhibition called *Strip It Down Baby, Give Me Those Bare Necessities* at Gallery Steinsland Berliner (GSB), Stockholm. De Mooij has also had solo exhibitions at Capricious Space, New York and Villa Noailles, Hyères, France. She participated in the PhotoGlobal programme of the School of Visual Arts, in New York, from 2009 to 2010 and in 2013 she was nominated for the Prix de Rome.

Lucas Blalock (Asheville, Carolina del Norte, Estados Unidos, 1978)

Lucas Blalock obtuvo su licenciatura en el Bard College (Annandale-on-Hudson, Nueva York) en 2001, estudió en la Skowhegan School of Painting and Sculpture (Maine) en 2011 y realizó el máster en Bellas Artes de la Universidad de California en Los Angeles en 2013. La práctica artística de Blalock comienza con fotografías tradicionales de gran formato que escanea y posteriormente manipula en su ordenador. Utiliza gestos autorreflexivos al retocar las imágenes que afirman su presencia dentro de ellas, aportando el mismo peso a sus fotografías que a la temática de las mismas. Blalock desglosa el lenguaje programático de la fotografía y sitúa a plena vista las herramientas que habitualmente se ocultan del resultado final de las imágenes. Relaciona sus alteraciones pictóricas con intervenciones brechtianas que hacen que el observador sea consciente del contradictorio proceso de representación de la fotografía. Blalock ha realizado exposiciones individuales en Ramiken Crucible, en Nueva York y en la galería White Cube, en Londres, además de participar en numerosas exposiciones colectivas como las celebradas en el MoMA PS1 y Wallspace, ambas en Nueva York. Blalock ha publicado *Towards a Warm Math* (Hassia, 2011) y *I Believe You, Liar* (iceberg, iceberg, iceberg, 2009). Blalock vive y trabaja entre Los Ángeles y Nueva York.

Phil Chang (Elkhart, Indiana, Estados Unidos, 1974)

Phil Chang obtuvo su licenciatura por la Universidad de California en Irvine y su máster en Bellas Artes por la California Institute of the Arts. Chang utiliza para su trabajo materiales fotográficos obsoletos para explorar nociones económicas mientras analiza las implicaciones políticas del estudio como un lugar en el que se produce obra artística. En *Four Over One*—un libro de artista que publicó el Los Angeles County Museum of Art cuando Charlotte Cotton era directora del departamento de fotografía—Chang fusiona la tecnología de creación de imágenes digitales con el papel fotográfico caducado para crear lo que él describe como un "proceso de todo o nada que imita los ciclos capitalistas de obsolescencia intrínseca". Para su exposición individual *Studio, Affect* en la galería Pepin Moore de Los Angeles, Chang presentó un compendio de imágenes de artistas famosos como Francis Bacon o Giacometti trabajando en sus estudios paralelamente a sus propias prácticas artísticas de estudio, en un surtido de impresiones cromógenas, gelatinobromuros de plata

BIOGRAFÍAS FOTOGRAFICIDAD

Lorenzo Durantini

sobre papel baritado, impresiones láser, impresiones con tintas pigmentadas, impresiones con plantillas e impresiones *offset*. Su trabajo ha sido incluido en exposiciones colectivas en Marlborough Chelsea y Family Business en Nueva York, además de en la Diane Rosenstein Fine Arts y la galería Control Room, ambas de Los Angeles. Actualmente es profesor invitado del departamento de Arte de UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles) y profesor de la Otis College of Art and Design, también en Los Angeles. Phil Chang vive y trabaja en Los Angeles.

Charlotte Cotton (Reino Unido)

Charlotte Cotton es escritora y comisaria. Ha trabajado como comisaria de Fotografía en el Victoria and Albert Museum, como directora de programación en The Photographers' Gallery y como jefa del Departamento de Fotografía de Wallis Annenberg en el Los Angeles County Museum of Art. Es autora de *The Photograph as Contemporary Art* y fundadora de Words Without Pictures y Eitherand.org.

Emmeline de Mooij (Delft, Países Bajos, 1978)

Emmeline de Mooij vive y trabaja entre Ámsterdam y Nueva York, donde actualmente estudia un máster en Bellas Artes en el Bard College (Annandale-on-Hudson). De Mooij es una artista multidisciplinar que realiza *performances*, fotografías, pinturas y esculturas. Su trabajo explora la biología evolutiva y la relación del cuerpo con la naturaleza, y a menudo incorpora aspectos divertidos del chamanismo y de tribalismo. En su exposición individual *Oxytocin*, en Legion TV (Londres), De Mooij presentó una combinación de algunas fotografías enmarcadas y otras colocadas directamente en las paredes, que exploraban la psicoterapia alternativa y su experiencia personal con la maternidad. Su libro *Bush Compulsion*, publicado en colaboración con Melanie Bonajo en 2009, documentaba unos divertidos rituales que las artistas organizaron en un bosque, los cuales culminaron en una exposición titulada *Strip It Down Baby, Give Me Those Bare Necessities* en la Gallery Steinsland Berliner (GSB) de Estocolmo. De Mooij ha realizado exposiciones individuales en Capricious Space en Nueva York y Villa Noailles, en Hyères (Francia). De 2009 a 2010 participó en el programa PhotoGlobal, de la School of Visual Arts de Nueva York, y en 2013 fue nominada al Prix de Rome.

Anne de Vries (La Haya, Países Bajos, 1977)

Anne de Vries se graduó en la Gerrit Rietveld Academie

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Phil Chang | *Studio, Affect*
7 July - 11 August 2012

Pepin Moore | 933 Chung King Road | Los Angeles | California | 90012

Opening reception: Saturday, 7 July 2012, 7:00 - 9:00 pm
Gallery hours: Wednesday - Saturday, 12:00 - 6:00 pm



Pepin Moore is proud to present *Studio, Affect*, an exhibition of new works by Phil Chang, on view from July 7th through August 11th 2012. A reception for the artist will be held Saturday, July 7th from seven to nine in the evening.

As his third and final project that examines the various implications of affect, Phil Chang includes works in *Studio, Affect* that obliquely address the role of the studio in contemporary culture. *Studio, Affect* includes various depictions of artist's studios -

photographs of book pages depicting Francis Bacon's disheveled space, Giacometti in his studio studying his wife, Richter sitting on an office chair – alongside images from catalogs that rely on tropes of the studio. Also included are images Chang has produced which depict his own production. These include photographs of laser prints that have served as studies, and the running sheets (offset prints) from the production of his artist book from 2010. In total, *Studio, Affect* relies on an array of images presented in an array of formats – chromogenic prints, silver gelatin prints, laser prints, pigment prints, stencil prints, and offset prints – that are hinged within frames. This decision has to do with a desire for “looseness” in presentation that formally and structurally addresses the political and economic implications of the studio.

Phil Chang (b. 1974, Elkhart, Indiana) received his MFA from the California Institute of the Arts, Valencia, and his BA from the University of California, Irvine. His two previous projects on the implications of affect were exhibited at Pepin Moore (*Affective Turns?*, 2012 – a group exhibition organized by Chang) and *LA><ART* (*Cache, Active*, 2012 – a solo exhibition of works printed on unfixed photographic paper). Chang's work has also been exhibited at Renwick Gallery, New York; The Swiss Institute, New York; Cirrus Gallery, Los Angeles; and Hudson Franklin, New York; among others. His work has been written about in *Artforum*, *The New Yorker*, *The Los Angeles Times*, *artforum.com*, among others, and has been featured in *Blind Spot*. In 2010, *Phil Chang: Four Over One*, was published by the Los Angeles County Museum of Art in association with Textfield, Inc. He is currently visiting faculty in the Department of Art at the University of California Los Angeles and lecturer at Otis College of Art and Design. Phil Chang lives and works in Los Angeles.

For more information please contact the gallery at +1 213 626 0501 or gallery@pepinmoore.com

image: Phil Chang, *Laser Prints & DWR*, 2011, chromogenic print and laser prints, 40 ½ x 30 ½ inches, edition of one

M+B

photograph

Phil Chang: Studio, Affect. Pepin Moore Gallery, L.A.

July 31, 2012

By Catherine Wagley



Phil Chang, Peel on a Wood Table. Courtesy Pepin Moore Gallery

Douglas Huebler, the conceptualist with a good heart and a sharp, hungry mind, said many quotable things in the years he was active, from the 1960s through 1980s. But the one quoted most often is this: "The world is full of objects, more or less interesting; I do not wish to add any more." He wished to add ideas and possibilities instead, presenting these through typewritten letters or documentary photographs. But this was before digital cameras, laser printers and the Internet, with its video banks and social networks. It was also before images, documents, and all their various permutations began to seem as overwhelming as things. Phil Chang's exhibition at Pepin Moore Gallery through August 11 straddles this very problem: Which is more oppressive? The excess of things or the excess of information?

Called *Studio, Affect*, Chang's exhibition is his third this year to fixate on how one thing affects another. The first, a group show Chang curated at Pepin Moore called *Affective Turns?*, mostly included process-oriented photographic work by artists interested, at least loosely, in the issue of "how." How does a picture get made, then what can it do once it's in the world? For his second, *Cache, Active* at LAX Art in Culver City, he improperly developed images on expired photo paper and, once the exhibition was hung, it took three to five hours for the gallery lights to turn them into brownish monochromes. This latest exhibition includes images related to an artist's studio, pictures of actual studios and evidence of studio processes.

One of the show's most striking works, Chang's series of three prints called *Peel on a Wood Table*, show a peeled-up leaf of photo-paper that angles across the frame from left to right and lays on a roughed-up surface. The exact same scene appears in each print. The first is an archival pigment print, the second a gelatin silver, and the third a composite of one-color stencil prints on vellum. You don't doubt for a moment that these photographs, framed and tastefully composed with shadows so rich they recall Irving Penn's still lifes, are objects—they take up real physical space. Nor do you doubt that they give information, suggesting the multitude possibilities available to an image-maker. But they don't add to this multitude. Instead, they impose on it some semblance of concision and subtlety, which is no small feat.

Review of Phil Chang, 'Studio, Affect' at Pepin Moore Gallery by Andrew Cameron

"The importance of the studio should by now be apparent; it is the first frame, the first limit, upon which all subsequent frames/limits will depend." -Daniel Buren, "The Function of the Studio"

In his solo show titled 'Studio, Affect' at Pepin Moore in Chinatown, Phil Chang presents a series of works related to that space whose "extinction" Daniel Buren so ardently theorized nearly forty years ago: the artist's studio. All bounded by the same elegant black frames, the works in 'Studio, Affect' seek to provide depictions of studio space, remnants of work accomplished in such spaces, and a metaphor for their function all at once. By composing the photographs in their frames the way one might compose images on a pegboard, Chang presents each piece as a forced context in which to consider images of drastically different intention and function, but whose appearance together in an artwork provides access to terms outside of the reach of any individual photograph.

Hung near a window in the larger gallery, the piece *Amanda, Annette, Giacometti*, 2011, presents two overlapping photographs floated from the black background of their single mat. The top image, printed in color and oriented as a 'portrait', is an extremely angled view of an open book turned to a black and white photograph of the artist Alberto Giacometti at work on a sculpture while his wife, Annette, stares into the camera from the background. The bottom image, printed in black and white and oriented as a 'landscape,' is an image of a smiling young woman sitting in what appears to be a modernist chair and looking at the camera's lens. Taken together, the photographs provide a picture of the problematic figure of the muse in the artist's studio. When one considers the fact that the top image is of an open book belonging to Chang himself, the bottom image is a kind of 'screen test' which Chang used for other work, and that both photographs were taken in Chang's studio, the frames and limits Buren describes in the above quote begin to expand and contract. One might even say that what those frames are opening and closing upon is the possibility of an affective relationship between photographer, subject, and viewer, somehow impossibly mediated by the photograph.

The six smaller works in the show, presented in more traditional mats and framed individually, approach this problem structurally, and with a subtlety matching the best examples of the larger work on view. Each hung as a triptych, these two sets of work function almost as perceptual primers for the rest of the show by presenting three qualitatively and processually different prints of the same photograph. One set is an image of a corner of a sheet of photographic paper laying on a wooden table and curling up towards the lens, and the other is an oblique view of a framed photo hanging on the studio wall, but both images are similar in their presentation of the concrete conditions for sight as much as the necessary role of context for visibility. In the piece 'Peel on Wood Table, Alternate for Studio,' 2012, the shiny sheet of paper laying on the table reflects the light needed to see it into the camera's lens, and in doing so registers its own qualities as pictorial surface as much as the wood surrounding it reminds us that even figureless and concrete abstraction ultimately rests on a ground. Similarly, the oblique view of the dark photo hanging on the wall in the piece 'Reflection of West Wall, Studio,' 2012, prevents us from seeing the framed photo itself, and instead provides a reflected glimpse of the rest of the studio omitted from both the depicted and actual frames. All of this is complicated by the fact that the prints in each triptych were made using three different imaging processes: traditional silver-gelatin, inkjet, and risograph, which is a high tech stenciling process designed for high volume printing. Were these mere juxtapositions of various means of obtaining a photographic print, the results might be less interesting, but Chang has chosen his images wisely, and here provides a structural lesson on the material basis of photographic vision even as he points to the ever more elusive and expanding frames which corral and contain that vision as sight. Ultimately, this may be the main thrust of 'Studio, Affect'; that while Buren's point about the place of production affecting the means of appearance is well taken, so too should we consider that what does or does not appear, and how it does or does not do so, affects the place of production as much as anything else. And when we consider Buren's original goal of proceeding from the studio's extinction, we should rightly see it in light of the studio's ubiquity as attitude, mindset, and affective space of creative production so prevalent in our late capitalist moment, which is perhaps the same light productively illuminating the photographs of Phil Chang.

M+B

ARTFORUM

“Affective Turns?”

March 26, 2012
By Carmen Winant

Pepin Moore 03.03.12-04.07.12

The difference between affect and effect, as well as their correct application, can often times trip a person up. For the record (however reductive): To effect is to cause a direct result, and to affect is to influence. This discrepancy, and to a greater degree the conjectural implications of affectation-at-large, are the subjects of the astute and musing “Affective Turns?” curated by the Los Angeles-based artist Phil Chang. The show has a necessarily loose thematic center, as each piece questions and refers back to the power of its own creative or political influence—realized or unrealized—without being pedagogic or overt. It’s an interesting parallel: As benefits a successful art practice, affect deals in the ineffable .production of hypothetical meaning and experience

The show features eleven artists working across video, photography, sculpture, and works on paper. Erika Vogt’s sculptures Instrument and Guide, both 2012, are made from wood and latex paint, among other materials. Both pieces are narrow and elongated, and are constructed as notional, nearly functioning objects—simultaneously awkward and elegant. Arthur Ou’s Untitled, 2012, is a nine-by-twelve-inch silver gelatin print of roughly pressed particleboard. The dark, cropped rectangle at the top right of the print has all the proportion of a nationalist flag turned clockwise on its side. Erlea Maneros Zabala’s 2011 “Exercises on Abstraction Series III,” each made with India ink on offset paper, are particularly remarkable inasmuch as the three pieces continually shift in appearance between wood grain, marble facade, and proteinous cross sections. True to form, this series, along with the other strong work in this .show, operates in suggestion rather than confirmation

M+B

LACMA UNFRAMED

Three Photo Books and One Book on Photo


Friday May 21, 2010

By Sarah Bay Williams

LACMA's Wallis Annenberg Photography Department has published four books in the last year that have one thing in common: in their own individual ways, they communicate our relationship to very specific moments from the first 150 years of photographic history. Only one of the four, coincidentally titled *Four Over One*, by Phil Chang, uses images to explicitly explore a world dealing with digitization and obsolescence in photographic processes. Another, *Words Without Pictures*, edited by Alex Klein, includes pointed essays discussing online images and digitization. The other two books, *The Sun as Error*, by Shannon Ebner, and *Bananas for Moholy-Nagy*, by Patterson Beckwith, are so not about digital photography—so steeped in analog filmic processes—that their obvious footing across the divide becomes part of the message.

It's hard not to wrestle with the topic of digital photography in today's conversation about photography. I recently attended a two-day slap fight of ideas verging on verbal pugilism at times—the symposium “Is Photography Over?” hosted by SFMOMA in April. You could probably count the minutes on two hands (maybe three...) before the word “digital” pounced onto the scene and began to be regularly peppered throughout the days' conversations as a path to an answer, only to be quickly abandoned for more interesting fodder. It's not breaking news that digital has changed the way that we take, view, disseminate, think about, talk about, process, collect, commodify, archive, protect, believe, disassociate ourselves from, manipulate, research, and relate to photography. But has digital strangled photography to death, lassoed with the lariat of a binary zero? According to the thirteen panelists of “Is Photography Over”—artists, curators, academics, and authors—probably not. Or at least the players creating photographic art in the hereafter (or is it just art?) are looking quite spry.

The books mentioned above will continue to explore what it is that's “going on” with photography. Phil Chang's monograph *Four Over One* is page after page of gently shaded but monochromatic prints that shift like the weather from one image to the next. Finding an explanation for this seemingly subject matter-deficient presentation takes a bit of detective work. Other than a production note on the second-to-last page (“The photographs in this publication were made using an i2s Digibook 2000LC book scanner and Kodak Kobachrome II RC photographic paper”) and a list of specifications in place of a list of plates, there is one sentence buried within the acknowledgements that speaks to the theme: *Four Over One* is “... a project that centers on economy and obsolescence....” I guarantee this is one of the most unusual books you will ever come across.



“ID:17 APERTURE: F5.6 HEIGHT:132 CM PPI: 600 PASSES: 6 SIZE: 70.1 MB”—from *Four Over One*, by Phil Chang (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 2010), p. 55

M+B

THE NEW YORKER

GOINGS ON ABOUT TOWN

ART

JUNE 29, 2009

“PALOMAR: EXPERIMENTAL PHOTOGRAPHY”

Sensing a trend toward anything-goes experimentation (think Wolfgang Tillmans, Eileen Quinlan, Liz Deschenes), the gallery pulls together a tight, terrific show of six young artists who use photography in unconventional ways. They have little in common except nerve and formal grace, expressed in modestly scaled work. Perhaps the most elegant is Phil Chang, who echoes Tillmans in two quasi-abstract images of curling paper. But Mariah Robinson, Tamar Halpern, Asha Schechter, Talia Chetrit, and Nancy de Holl also make strong showings with layered, intriguing pictures that deserve solo follow-up shows. Through June 27. (Marvelli, 526 W. 26th St. 212-627-3363.)

– Vince Aletti



M+B

DAILYSERVING

AN INTERNATIONAL PUBLICATION FOR CONTEMPORARY ART

Palomar: Experimental Photography

By Seth Curcio
June 5, 2009

Currently on view at Marvelli Gallery in New York City is the exhibition Palomar: Experimental Photography. The exhibition contains photographic works by 6 artists including, Phil Chang, Talia Chetrit, Nancy de Holl, Tamar Halpern, Mariah Robertson, and Asha Schechter. While the exhibition is incredibly diverse in the varying techniques, approaches, sizes and formats employed by each artist, the work is all united by a soft-spoken conceptualism that defies the often overly glossy, high production images that we are accustomed to viewing by both commercial and artistic sources. Many of the works in the show are created through an ink-jet or digital c-print process, while other works are created through the re-photographing of existing imagery or by darkroom manipulation processes, such as solarization, ambrotype, photograms, and multiple exposures. While the work is seemingly compelled by formal concerns, upon further inspection, one notices that it is a new type of conceptualism that is driving many of the artist's decisions, resulting in work that is as visually seductive as it is smart.



M+B

2007 Works

Chris Balaschak



*Ami, Fogging
A Window, McArthur
Park, Los Angeles,
2005, 30 x 40 inches,
C-print*



*Double (Exposure
6), 2007, 16 x 20
inches, Digital
C-print*

In her 1977 essay “Notes on the Index,” Rosalind Krauss defined contemporary art as indexical. The work that fascinated Krauss was that which indicated an elsewhere, that is, work that was proof or evidence of what was not apparent in the work itself (such as documentation of earthworks or performance art). Most notably, this term “index” has been applied to photography, as photography, like no other art, purports to index what it captures. Krauss’s contention, however, was problematic. Her definition of the photographic index relied on a certain qualification: the parasitic attachment of the caption was what created the photographic index. The photograph alone, without such a qualifier, has a more problematic relationship to its indexical ambition.

Phil Chang’s work has evolved to question this basic premise of photographic meaning. The object of Chang’s work appears to always disappear, to be just beyond the moment of exposure, as if the photograph is only a hint of what was intended to be captured. Reason and effect are moved to the periphery in an image like *Ami, Fogging a Window, McArthur Park, Los Angeles* (2005), where a woman, leaning in to breathe on a plate glass window, leaves an ephemeral mark the camera is challenged to depict. A similar motive drives Chang’s recent series *Double (Exposure)* (2007). Here photographic paper, a digital scanner, and the effects of photographic exposure, all collapse beneath the flatness of a single photographic image. Chang’s photograph witnesses a process with an outcome just beyond the horizon of exposure. Like all of his work, this cleverly titled series imparts the supreme lack of photography – it’s uncertainty as a direct witness.