Most recently, efforts to form an active daguerreian artist community have come to fruition in the form of the ImageObject event. Previously, the only event to focus on the contemporary daguerreotype was the Daguerreian Society's annual symposium, and only then as an adjunct to its main focus, daguerreotypes from the nineteenth century. ImageObject is an annual international contemporary daguerreotype exhibition, symposium and trade fair, and is held in New York City at the time of the AIPAD (Association of International Photographic Art Dealers) show. In the late 1990s it was rare to see contemporary alternative processes at AIPAD: such artworks at that time were held somewhat in the same regard as historical re-enactment images. At this year's event, however, I noted they stood out as an obvious trend in the gallery spaces. ImageObject aims to build on this, but in promoting the daguerreotype process and bringing the genre closer to the art market rather than keeping it as an adjunct to the antiquarian collecting market. In this way it will attract more artists to take up the practice, and the resulting sales will make it a self-sustaining pursuit rather than an expensive pastime.

My involvement in this genre came about a result of my background in photographic collection management. In 1997, I undertook a one-year certificate programme at the George Eastman House, entitled "Photographic Preservation and Archival Practice." Learning the historical processes first-hand set me on the path towards becoming an artist. These processes were something quite different from what I had experienced in my home darkroom: they imbued me with a desire to make something with more intimate presence than a black-and-white, resin-coated paper print.

Digital photography as a means of artistic expression leaves me with a sense of a creative void rather than with a feeling for an object that feeds inspiration back to me. I put this down partially to its lack of scarcity and intrinsic value that I believe constitute an artwork. In this respect the daguerreotype becomes the antithesis of a digital image: it is unique, not only because it is both positive and negative, but also because no copy can reproduce the extraordinary quality of the original. With a digital image, any number of copies can be made, all exactly the same as the original. This is less of an issue with a paper print from a positive/negative photographic process, but the product of such a process still offers a far lesser sense of immediacy than a daguerreotype does. When you hold a daguerreotype in your hand — a portrait of an important individual, say — you know that the plate was physically present in front of the sitter when the artist took the exposure. That knowledge brings an intimacy to the viewing: the image as a physical object speaks to the viewer in a way that a photograph, as mere information in a transitory vessel, never can. The daguerreotype, therefore, seems particularly well suited to the fine art photography market: the authenticity of a piece is unquestionable and the intrinsic value is high.

The process of making a single daguerreotype image is a far cry from the ease of conventional photography, or even many of the other 'alt' processes. So much effort is needed to prepare the plate that it is difficult to treat the actual exposure as a spur-of-the-moment undertaking. Practitioners usually take many years to overcome the hurdles of obtaining both the necessary equipment and the experience to cope with the difficulties of the process. Even once that level of expertise has been attained, the making of each individual image is something of a trial, and if the daguerreotypist makes his or her own silver plates it is further exacerbated. Copper plate is cut to size and polished and electroplated with silver, a process that can be a profession in itself. To prepare the plate for sensitisation it must be brought to a fine, mirror-like polish. It is difficult for the uninitiated to judge the high level of polish required to form the light-sensitive silver salt through exposure to the halogens of iodine and bromine. Only through trial and error will the appearance and subtle qualities of the necessary polish become apparent.

I need approximately three hours to prepare a single plate for sensitising, starting from mill finish (unlike most practitioners, I used cold-rolled Sheffield plate, which requires some extra steps). The halogens used need to be of the right concentration, and this working stock must be constantly monitored and adjusted, usually the day before shooting. The amounts of iodine and bromine applied to the plate must be proportionally correct: this is determined on the day by first shooting a test plate. For a test plate and, for example, two plates for exposure, this means at least a day's worth of polishing prior to the day of shooting. In exposing a plate to a scene, the exposure time is also judged based on experience. The ISO of a plate is about 0.02, but other factors will also determine the exposure, so practical knowledge plays an important role. Development of the image in the mercury pot and the

amount of gilding is also determined by experience and constant inspection. At any time in the preparation process, a calculation error in sensitisation, exposure, development and/or gilding can ruin an exposure. Alongside all this effort and concentration on technical matters, the daguerreotypist of course also needs to pay attention to artistic concerns. Common exposure times for my daguerreotypes range from two to 20 seconds, making still lifes a more attractive subject matter.

I present my daguerreotypes in high-quality, traditionally made enclosures. This presentation is not intended to serve as historical re-enactment, but to expand the experience of the image as a unique and revered object. The authentic presentation of a modern image, I feel, lends it a timeless quality. My plates are sealed in French-style passe-partout that have reverse painted cover glasses as matte windows. These in turn are presented in finely made wooden cases covered in Moroccan goatskin leather, all made by methods outlined in an 1854 catalogue.

The presentation of an image as an object of reverence — essentially a taonga — dovetailed well with my series on Māori culture. As Māori historian Amiria Henare has said, taonga represents the "connective tissue between generations." Other forms of taonga play an important part of portraiture as well: bone and greenstone carvings and precious woven cloaks were often worn historically by sitters for their portraits. Furthermore, the use of portraiture at tangi reflects the importance given to images as objects. All of these aspects come together in one of my favourite kuia portraits that I produced. Rangianewa, from the local hapū Ngāti Wāirere, wore the family taonga important to her for her sitting — a korowai and a bone hei tiki. I feel the portrait captures her grace and dignity, and as a daguerreotype it transforms what could have been a mere photograph into taonga. Rangianewa passed away later that year and I offered the portrait to the family. They asked me to keep it for the year following her death, and in accordance with tikanga they also asked for it to be kept hidden from view for that year. I stored it in a safe and presented it to the family at the unveiling of her tombstone at Taupiri urupā.

Looking to the future, I have recently updated my fuming boxes, mercury pot and camera setup in order to be able to shoot a larger format (that of whole plate, which is 6.5 × 8.5 inches). To me, this is the largest practical conventional format for the daguerreotype; beyond that, reflections make viewing difficult, especially if the image is hand held. Modern daguerreotypy is at an exciting turning point, and in organising the ImageObject event I hope to expand its popularity at a time when mainstream photography continues to move even further away from its origins.

Essay

## STAGING THE MEDIUM IN BEN CAUCHI'S
### *THE EVENING HOURS*

## Kevin Fisher

This essay was provoked by the 2012 retrospective of Ben Cauchi's photography: *The Sophist's Mirror,* and the subsequent book on the artist titled *The Evening Hours.*[1] The images were produced using the collodion wet plate method, which originated in the middle of the nineteenth century, and they are fixed either upon glass (ambrotypes) or metal plates (tintypes).[2] Cauchi has been working with this process for over a decade. The content of his images vary among studies of objects and anatomy, non-descript interior and exterior spaces, tools of the artist's trade, and self-portraits of the artist. Many of the images (and their titles) involve overt and subtle references to phantasmagoria, such as the levitation of objects and practices of alchemy.

Cauchi's devotion to an archaic form of mid-nineteenth century of photography, already outdated and largely abandoned two decades before the "invention" of cinema, strikes a chord with Rosalind Krauss's evocation of the power of obsolescence within the political economy of Walter Benjamin. His contention is that in becoming obsolete the medium is released from its developmental vector as a commodity within industrial capitalism and restored to a set of open possibilities that attended the utopian moment of its creation.[3] Indeed, the first image in the "plates" section of *The Evening Hours* – showing the side of the building that houses the artist's studio – is titled "Utopia".[4]

I want to argue that this is more than coincidental and reflects the way that Cauchi's art creatively elaborates the utopian moment of which Krauss speaks by forging a dialogue between obsolete medium and subject matter. It is in this sense that I want to situate his work within what Hollis Frampton has referred to as the practice of metahistory. Although the term bears no direct relation to Hayden White's historiography – describing a mode of artistic production as well as writing – its critical thrust (to problematize the assumption of a natural evolution of media) is complimentary.[5] For Frampton, "the metahistorian . . . is occupied with inventing a tradition, that is, a coherent, wiedly set of discrete monuments, meant to inseminate resonant consistency into the growing body of his art. Such works may not exist, and then it is his duty to make them."[6] In this respect, metahistory is a fiction, but one which embraces its own constitutive act in juxtaposition to other received histories in which the presumption of natural evolution conceals a most unnatural selection by forces of the market.

Frampton's metahistory can thus be viewed as the creative correlative of Benjamin's project of "Ur-history" whose objective, according to Buck Morss, "was to rescue the historical objects by ripping them out of their developmental histories – of law, religion, art, etc. – into which fictional and falsifying narratives they had been inserted in the process of their transmission".[7] Accordingly, Frampton welcomed the moment at which "cinema passed into obsolescence and thereby into art," an event "it is customary to mark . . . at the advent of video."[8] Although Frampton referred to himself and other contemporary filmmakers specifically as metahistorians of film, as a theory of practice it was not restricted to any particular medium or, especially, any received definitions of medium-specificity. He once defined film as "whatever will pass through a projector" which of course includes photography.[9] One of Frampton's best-known films, *Nostalgia* (1971) incorporates his own still photography and traces his personal development from photographer to filmmaker as a means to metonymically re-enact the "birth" of cinema, and question its incorporation of photography, which, echoing Krauss and Benjamin, he describes as "conceived in the belly of the muse, but later plucked from her ashes and nurtured in the thigh of commerce."[10]

If every metahistory qua fiction cannot avoid a return to origins, the move is signaled in Cauchi's *View from the Studio Window* (2005), which overtly references what is widely regarded as the first photographic image fixed to a substrate, Nicéphore Niépce's *View from the Window at Le Gras* (1826). Similarly, Cauchi's *The Start of It All* (2008) presents the fractured groundglass of an old camera mounted upon its stand: evoking severally the figure of the window as the governing metaphor of photographic indexicality; the material substrate to which early photographs were fixed; and the (literal and cultural) place – on this quasi-easel – that painting previously occupied. While Frampton's metahistory of cinema reflexively incorporates photography in films like *Zorn's Lemma* (1970) and *Nostalgia,* Cauchi's metahistory of photography references the instruments of painting, as in *Artist's Tools* (2006) or *White Lie* (2003), as well as the hand and gesture of the artist – as in *Hand* (2004) and *Self Portrait (A Gesture)* (2005), which the automatism of photography is credited with displacing, and in *Mirror* (2009), whose standard of perfect mimesis photography strove to emulate, but has now surpassed and leaves emptied in a vacated mise en scène.

Metahistory must also confront the fiction of the medium with rival fictions. On this point, I want to reflect on how Krauss's assertion of obsolescence takes shape within her critical genealogy of discourses on medium specificity in the visual arts from the 1960s onwards. She writes disparagingly of the "militantly reductive modernism that mandated absolute flatness in painting as a means to restore the medium to its material specificity by purging it of all extraneous elements."[11] However, in its attempts to escape the appropriation by the culture industry, the practice of painting:

contracted. . . and refracted by the prism of theory. . . had now become an object just like any other three-dimensional thing. . . The paradox was that the autonomy to which painting had aspired – being about nothing but its own essence… had proven chimerical, and that abstract art's very modes of production – executed in serial runs, for example – seemed to carry the imprint of the industrially produced commodity object, internalizing within the field of the work its own status as interchangeable and thus as pure exchange value.[12]

Thus the notion that "the medium [is] made specific by being reduced to nothing but its manifest physical properties" levels the art object to the very state of base materiality to which capitalism aims to reduce the world.[13]

Benjamin's ambivalence towards photography within capitalism was a product less of its own commodification (which also had progressive effects in terms of the destruction of aura as cult value) than its reification of a world of things reduced to base materiality, a reified abstraction that prepared the world for commodification.[14] Curiously, Benjamin would refer to this deceptive power of the image as "phantasmagoria," emphasising its productive relation to what it pretended to reflect as a fact of nature.[15] Jean Baudrillard would take the concept of phantasmagoria further by arguing that photography (and photographic-based cinema) produce and *precede* the extra-representational world of objects whose existence as things in-themselves it pretends to represent and verify.[16] This conjuring act, he asserts, provided a crucial support for the reductive empiricism that informs both industrial capitalism and Western science. In this sense photography can be said to have a recursive relationship to the modern concept of the medium as material substrate. It may be somewhat responsible for producing the reductive objectification of the medium that Krauss critiques.

If photographic indexicality ironically conceals the medium's most persuasive (however disavowed) and enduring phantasmagoria – the conjuring of an objective world – I want to suggest that Cauchi's avowed foregrounding of overtly phantasmagoric themes provides a countervailing critical fiction within his metahistory. Specfically, the embrace of phantasmagoria recaptures the ontological possibilities of early photography as a medium able to see beyond the physical/empirical world rather than becoming a slave to its positivistic duplication. For example, the plate *Dead Air* (2003) depicts an object that resembles a needle or stylus suspended vertically within a cloudy glass chamber. The vessel recalls both Victorian aesthetic display and the sort of early modern scientific device used to isolate empirical phenomena. I'm thinking specifically here about the way such chambers were used for the experimental production of a vacuum, in which birds and other animals would be asphyxiated and resuscitated, as represented in Joseph Wright of Derby's paintings *An Experiment on a Bird in the Air Pump* (1768).[17] The paradox attending to the empirical demonstration of an absence qua void situated the vacuum chamber at the boundaries of the scientific and the paranormal, and it was popular as a parlour trick. In Cauchi's work, the dead air within the chamber is also allegorical of the atmosphere within the photograph. Although oxymoronic in literal terms, the "dead air" captured within this apparatus of empirical science is nevertheless reified, made to exist. The work is thus a reflexive parody of experimental demonstration, which reveals the disavowed power of science to produce the phenomena it pretends to observe – a sleight of hand by which it deceives itself. The magically suspended object beneath the glass within the image foreshadows the later positivistic function of the photographic image as a container that produces its own laws of physics as *Self-Portrait with Hovering Cloth* (2005) and *Ghost* (2005). The plate titled *Pseudo-Levitation* (2003) takes on particular significance in this regard, as a book suspended above a table clearly reveals threads connecting it to the hand above. As a self-conscious performance on the artist's part, the image is a faked fake – a double negation. The aim again is not to prove but to parody. If it is parodying anything it is the folly of the later photographic conceit to attempt to reveal the empirical truth of the world without any contrivances, props or (in this case) 'strings attached.' If modern photography functions as witness to the autonomy of objects within the gaze of empirical science, it also reciprocally draws validity from the science of its material and technical base, in relation to which the medium is conceived as passive substrate. This faith in photography as grounded in the science of light and chemistry is problematised by Cauchi's invocation of alchemy (the Other of nineteenth century science) in plates such as *Potions* (2007) and *Mixing Solutions* (2003) that depict the combination of chemicals required for the collodion process. The relation of emulsion to medium is the subject of the plate titled *The Evening Hours* (2008). In this image a chemical bottle lies turned on its side on the floor with the cork nearby.

Here the mise en scène works to conflate the medium and the representation it enables, closing off any objective externality or referent. It is like M.C. Escher's *Drawing Hands* (1948) in which two hands reciprocally draw one another into being, but in this case as if the emulsion on the surface of the photograph had spilled out of the bottle from within its represented space. As elsewhere, Cauchi signals a recursive and mutually constitutive relationship between representational space and extra-representational referent, but here explicitly links it to the question of medium and materiality. In so doing, the image draws attention to a prominent feature of all Cauchi's work: the impression of a preserved fluidity and soluble depth within the emulsion despite its fixity. The effect is heightened through tension with a contrary recurring element in which the emulsion appears to separate and curl away from the substrate (especially around the margins of the images), as if refusing to alloy with it. Materiality itself stages a counter-reductive allegory in which the medium demonstrably enacts its non-identity with the substrate.

The redemptive power of Cauchi's work as metahistory is inextricable from his investigations of the specificity of its medium. However, the sense of the medium that can be derived is of a very different modality from the reductive materialism that both Krauss and the work itself critique. Indeed, the notion of medium specificity operative in Cauchi's work is much more closely aligned with an alternative movement within 1960s visual arts that Krauss refers to as the "filmic model," which she describes as phenomenological and aggregative.[18] The model developed within structural film circles (of which Frampton was a part), and asserted that the medium of cinema (as an experience) could not be isolated within any individual component of its apparatus. As Frampton observed, "the act of making a film, of physically assembling a filmstrip, feels somewhat like making an object… but the instant the film is completed, the 'object' vanishes [and] the phantom work itself transpires upon the screen."[19] What Krauss calls the "phenomenological vector" of structural film would attempt to construct an experience that was specifically enabled by the interdependence of the diverse elements of the apparatus, and bring this entire correlation to reflection within the viewing process.[20] She focuses on Michael Snow's film *Wavelength* (1967), in which the only camera movement is a steady 45 minute-long zoom. As film phenomenologist Vivian Sobchack points out, the zoom is quite distinct from the tracking shot insofar as it does not express an objective, physical movement through space, but rather enacts an intentional movement analogous to the act of attention. As she writes, "it is the film's view, not its material 'body,' that changes its address and situation in the world…"[21] In *Wavelength* the phenomenological vector is expressed as a sort of optical and intentional corridor through space-time.

If Snow's film dwells on a form of movement that is both specifically cinematic and non-objective, Cauchi's photographs, I wish to contend, produce a type of duration that is also non-objective and specific to the obsolescence of his medium. I refer here to the long duration of exposure, whose redemptive powers Benjamin located in the way "the procedure itself caused the subjects to live their way into, rather than out of the moment… They grew into the picture."[22] To the rhetorical question put by Geoffrey Batchen in the opening essay of the *The Evening Hours*: "Could this 'growing into' be the ultimate subject of Cauchi's art?"[23] I would answer an emphatic 'yes'. Moreover, as an expression of becoming and duration it generates a variation of the non-objective corridor realised in Snow's *Wavelength,* but visible only as trace of a slight blurring that results from the effort to keep camera and subject as still as possible for the duration of exposure. The effect is detectable in many of the images, though most demonstrably in the series titled *The Doppler Effect* (2010), and especially the self-portraits where it seems deliberately cultivated. The above title is instructive as it refers to an inherently temporalised phenomenon (discovered just a decade before the collodion process was developed) in which waves emitted from an approaching source compress together into a higher frequency, as often demonstrated by the sonic distortions of passing trains. Analogously, what the images present is not a frozen moment but a compressed palimpsest of lived duration, accessible to us in the duration of our own reception as a sort of supplementary dimension that stands in an ambiguous relation to space. The phenomenon is expressed in more schematic form in the plate *Dead Time* (2007) in which a levitating circular shape, blurred around the edges, oscillates between object and opening/vortex.

In the context of Krauss's second definition of medium specificity, we might well ask along what phenomenological vector does this corridor lead? Inadvertently perhaps, the graphic expression of the length of exposure (this "living in") effects the analytic separation of duration from movement by isolating that fourth direction (or fourth

dimension) of time in which everything is always moving even if standing still (if such a thing were possible). It is reminiscent of Muybridge's collodion prints of waterfalls which Frampton described as "tesseracts," the graphic extension of a three dimensional object through the fourth dimension of time. "What is to be seen," he writes, "is not water itself but the virtual volume it occupies during the whole time-interval of the exposure."[24] However, by contrast, Cauchi's work resists mapping this effect onto any of the three directions/dimensions of space. *The Doppler Effect* thus manifests an expression of time de-linked from the illusion of spatialised movement that both the directional blur and the moving image would, according to Bergson, impose upon the experience of time.[25] It is also distinct from the later quick exposure, which reified the illusion of the static instant that Benjamin would contrastingly describe as "living out of the moment". Indeed, for Bergson, it is from out of this reified abstraction of the static moment that the cinematic illusion would "live" the fiction of time as movement: "we take snapshots, as it were, of the passing reality, and… we have only to string them on a becoming abstract, uniform and invisible, situated at the back of the apparatus of knowledge… [to] set going a kind of cinematograph inside us."[26] It is in this sense that Cauchi's work constitutes a photographic precursor of what Deleuze describes as "the time image" in which movement is subordinated to the experience of non-linear time, rather than time being subordinated to linear movement.[27]

Within industrial capitalism this reduction of time to fixed instants also provides the correlative of the reduction of reality to objective matter. As D.N. Rodowick argues, "the rationalization of space, and the expression of time as space, renders the image susceptible to conversion as money, making it a warrant of capital."[28] Hence the critical force of Frampton's *Nostalgia* as metahistory, which uses the cinema to depict the burning of a series of photographs (unrelated except for the fact that they were all taken by the filmmaker) while narrating associated memories, rather than re-animating the photos to reconstitute those memories. For Cauchi as for Frampton, the metahistorian works simultaneously with and against the grain of the medium's automated aspects as a means to release it from the determinations of market forces within its industrial development. This discussion would seem to resonate Roland Barthes' insistence that any reduction of photography to its instrumental or material basis obscures the essence of the medium as time.[29] Although several reviewers of Cauchi's work invoke Barthes, particularly in relation to his thoughts about death and the punctum, I feel the application is not straightforward. For example, none actually identify the punctum, that detail of contingency and unintended affective charge, within his specific images.[30] Indeed, I would suggest that this is because Cauchi's work actually deters this type of analysis, which depends on the unintended element within the mise en scène or affect of the human subject. Cauchi's images are the antithesis of spontaneity and routinely foreground props and items of staging associated with studio photography. Objects do not seem to naturally belong in their spaces, but are rather placed there as in a temporary container. Figures are often cloaked, obscured and turned away from the camera. Even the self-portraits in which Cauchi faces the camera are decidedly affectless. All of this cuts against the personalizing thrust of Barthes' punctum, bidding us instead to look behind and in back of things, deflecting attention back to the medium itself.

There is, however, according to Barthes, "another punctum from the 'detail'… which is no longer of form but of intensity, the lacerating emphasis of the noeme *('that-has-been')*."[31] For example, in Alex Gardner's photographic portrait of Lewis Payne prior to his execution in 1865, Barthes doesn't assign the punctum a specific location within the image, but asserts it as a general function of the temporal paradox: "he is dead and he is going to die."[32] But even in this adjusted account of the punctum, the effect is still tied to the past-ness of the subject. In Cauchi's work, by contrast, it is not the figures that reach us from across time past through the medium, but a dead medium and its "dead time" that is resurrected in the present. In this sense it not only intermediates between different historical moments, but also invites the viewer to "live into" distinctly historicised temporalities. Here is where the redemptive power of the work lies.

1   *The Evening Hours: Ben Cauchi,* ed. Aaron Lister (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2013).

2   For a short history of the collodion process in relation to Cauchi's work, see Geoffrey Batchen, "The Way of All Things," in Lister, *The Evening Hours,* 12.

3   Rosalind Krauss, *"A Voyage on the North Sea": Art in the Age of the Post-Medium Condition* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 1999), 41.

4   Lister, *The Evening Hours.*

5   See Hayden White, "Introduction: The Poetics of History," in *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1973), 1-42.

6   Hollis Frampton, "For a Metahistory of Film: Commonplace Notes and Hypotheses," in *On the Camera Arts and Consecutive Matters: The Writings of Hollis Frampton,* ed. Bruce Jenkins (Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 2009), 136.

7   Susan Buck-Morss, *The Dialectics of Seeing: Walter Benjamin and the Arcades Project* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1993), 218.

8   Frampton, "For a Metahistory of Film," 136.

9   Ibid., 137.

10  Hollis Frampton, "Some Propositions on Photography," in Jenkins, *On the Camera Arts and Consecutive Matters,* 6.

11  Krauss, *"A Voyage on the North Sea,"* 9-10.

12  Ibid., 10-11.

13  Ibid., 7.

14  Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in his *Iluminations,* trans. Harry Zohn, ed. Hannah Arendt (New York: Shocken Books, 1969), 225-26.

15  Buck-Morss, *The Dialectics of Seeing,* 144.

16  Jean Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulations* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1983), 48.

17  See David Solkin, "ReWrighting Shaftesbury: The Air Pump and the Limits of Commercial Humanism," in *Early Modern Conceptions of Property (Consumption & Culture in 17th & 18th Centuries),* ed. John Brewer (New York: Routledge, 1995), 599.

18  Krauss, *"A Voyage on the North Sea,"* 24-25.

19  Frampton, "For a Metahistory of Film," 138.

20  Krauss, *"A Voyage on the North Sea,"* 25.

21  Vivian Sobchack, "The Active Eye: A Phenomenology of Cinematic Vision," *Quarterly Review of Film & Video,* 12:3 (1990), 25.

22  Walter Benjamin, "Little History of Photography," in his *The Work of Art in the Age of its Technical Reproducibility and Other Writings on Media,* trans. Edmond Jephcott and Kingsley Shorter, eds. Michael W Jennings, Brigid Doherty and Thomas Y Levin (Cambridge MA: The Belknap Press, 2008), 280.

23  Batchen, "The Way of All Things," 14.

24  Hollis Frampton, "Eadweard Muybridge: Fragments of a Tesseract," in *On the Camera Arts and Consecutive Matters: The Writings of Hollis Frampton,* ed. Bruce Jenkins (Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 2009), 27-8.

25  Henri Bergson, *Creative Evolution,* trans. Arthur Mitchell (New York: MacMillan, 1954), 322.

26  Ibid., 322-3.

27  It can only be a "precursor" insofar as for Deleuze the time image depends on montage, which exploits the interval between frames, whereas the photographs within *The Doppler Effect* series compress intervals through montage *within* the frame. For a discussion of Deleuze's concept of the "time image," See D. N. Rodowick, *Gilles Deleuze's Time Image* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997).

28  Rodowick, *Gilles Deleuze's Time Image,* 236 n.13

29  Roland Barthes, *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography,* trans. Richard Howard (New York: Hill & Wang, 1980), 20-21.

30  See Barthes, *Camera Lucida,* 43-48.

31  Ibid., 96.

32  Ibid.

# THE OLDER PHOTOGRAPHY GETS, THE YOUNGER IT FEELS[1]

## Courtney Johnston

We live in an age of near ubiquitous connectivity, of computer/camera combinations that we carry around in our pockets, of liking and retweeting and pinning, of documenting and publishing our lives online, specifically through photographs. What underlies this seemingly primal need to capture and share our own likenesses and our impressions of the world?

In 1970, Edwin Land, the founder of Polaroid and the inventor of the instant camera, recorded a promotional film for the company. Laying out an idea he'd been working on for quarter of a century, he stands in front of a brand-new, empty factory.

> "We are still a long way," he says, "from the camera that would be, oh, like the telephone: something that you use all day long… a camera which you would use not on the occasion of parties only, or of trips only, or when your grandchildren came to see you, but a camera that you would use as often as your pencil or your eyeglasses."[2]

This camera will be "something that was always with you," he says, and it would be frictionless. Point, shoot, see. It would be as simple and as natural as — and here he reaches into his coat — as taking a wallet out of your pocket, holding it up, and pressing a button.

In the late 1940s, cameras still only went with you on special occasions. You took your photos and sent your film to a processing plant, and received your prints in a week. In November 1948 Polaroid released the Land Camera. It developed its own film inside the camera in about a minute, the back of the camera popping open and letting you peel the negative away and expose the print. The first batch of cameras, expected to meet demand for weeks, sold out in hours. By the 1970s, amateur photographers were shooting over a billion photos a year.

Polaroid didn't just invent a new technology: they introduced us to a new style of casual documentary photography. In 1974 Land wrote:

> A new kind of relationship between people in groups is brought into being… when the members of a group are photographing and being photographed and sharing the photographs.

> It turns out that buried within us… there is latent interest in each other; there is tenderness, curiosity, excitement, affection, companionability and humour… We have a yen for and a primordial competence for a quiet good-humoured delight in each other.[3]

We live, of course, in the future Land described. We carry computers in our pockets that let us take photos wherever and whenever: we are photographing and being photographed and sharing the photographs, effortlessly. Every day, we are consciously crafting and embellishing our self-image, our personas, through the images we make and share. We have come to see every moment of our lives as something we can capture, record, pin down, pass on. More than this: the act of framing up our view is the way we grant our attention to a moment, mark it as and make it memorable.