

1-1-2007

Attitudes towards face-mounting in contemporary photography

Dawn Vernon
Ryerson University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.ryerson.ca/dissertations>



Part of the [Film and Media Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Vernon, Dawn, "Attitudes towards face-mounting in contemporary photography" (2007). *Theses and dissertations*. Paper 267.

This Thesis Project is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ Ryerson. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Ryerson. For more information, please contact bcameron@ryerson.ca.

TR
340
V47
2007

ATTITUDES TOWARDS FACE-MOUNTING IN CONTEMPORARY PHOTOGRAPHY

By

C. Dawn Vernon

A thesis project

Presented to **Ryerson University**, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

And

George Eastman House International Museum of Photography and Film,
Rochester, New York, United States of America

In partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Masters of Arts

In the Program of

Photographic Preservation and Collections Management

Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 2007
© **C. Dawn Vernon, 2007**

**PROPERTY OF
RYERSON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY**

UMI Number: EC53677

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI Microform EC53677

Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis.

I authorize Ryerson University and George Eastman House International Museum of Photography and Film to lend this thesis to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Signed_ _____

C. Dawn Vernon

I further authorize Ryerson University and George Eastman House International Museum of Photography and Film to reproduce this thesis by photocopying or by other means, in total or part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Signed_ _____

C. Dawn Vernon

Abstract

This thesis is a survey of current issues surrounding face-mounting; a mounting method for large scale photographs where the face, or front of the photograph is permanently adhered to a sheet of clear acrylic. This relatively new process is controversial because of preservation concerns in combination with a high monetary value that is now being applied to the work of some contemporary artists utilizing this process for large scale photographs. Through interviews with photographers, gallerists, curators, and conservators this paper explores the rationale behind the use of face-mounting, as well as its aesthetic and preservation impact, it's presence on the fine art market, and it's future in private and public collections.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my thesis advising team, Robert Burley and Abhay Sharma. As well, I would like to thank Alison Nördstrom for providing me with numerous email addresses and phone numbers, Maia-Mari Sutnik for her continued encouragement and all the people willing to participate in interviews: Grant Arnold, Eric Breitung, Stephen Bulger, Blaine Campbell, Brian Clamp, Monte Clark, Lee Ann Daffner, Carol Ehlers, Toni Hafkenscheid, Arni Haraldsson, Shirley den Hartog, Katherine Hinds, Bill Hunt, Catriona Jeffries, Toshi Koseki, David Maisel, Luis Mallo, Scott Massey, Peter Mustardo, Carol Squires and Ann Thomas.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family and friends for their continued support.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Process Description	3
2.1. Face-mounting techniques	3
2.2. Process problems	4
2.3. Conservators and their face-mounting research	5
3. Methodology	10
4. Artists	11
4.1. First awareness and use of face-mounting	12
4.2. Responses to museum policy about face-mounting	14
4.3. Artists understanding and concern with face-mounting	17
4.4. The trend of face-mounting	18
5. Gallerists	21
5.1. First awareness	21
5.2. Preservation issues	23
5.3. Trends	24
6. Collections	27
7. Conclusions	30
Appendix I. Interview questions	31
Questions for Artists	31
Questions for Gallerists	32
Questions for Curators	33
Appendix II. Interviewee biographies	34
Photographers	34
Gallerists	35
Curators	36
Conservators	37
Bibliography	38

1. Introduction

Through interviews with various professionals involved in the medium of fine art photography, including artists, gallerists, collectors, curators, and conservators, this project is an exploration of some of the attitudes expressed about face-mounted photographs. I hasten to add that there is no new technical data in this paper, and that my exploration into face-mounting barely scratches the surface of the immense range of attitudes and opinions about the process. Nevertheless, this project is an investigation into the rationale behind the use of face-mounting, its aesthetic and preservation impact, its presence in the art market, and its future in private and public collections. I have excluded commercial/industrial uses of face-mounting, and have focused on its fine art use.

Throughout the history of the medium, photographs have taken many forms and have been presented in many different ways. Often the way a culture or artistic movement chooses to present its artistic and cultural artifacts reflects its aesthetic preferences at any given time.¹ In the late 1950s, artists began to make work that challenged the borders between the traditional media -- painting, sculpture, printmaking, and photography. Photography combined with other fine art practices to become a part of the generalized amalgam of art practices and the increasing decompartmentalization of the fields of contemporary art. Photographs not only came to emulate the size of historical painting, but they also acquired colour which is more obviously associated with painting than with traditional photographic materials. Although photography had achieved this new scale, photographers were not necessarily trying to imitate other artistic techniques (except in specific cases); rather, artists were exploring photography's range by combining artistic techniques and commercial technologies.

¹ Pénichon, Sylvie et al., "Two Finishing Techniques for Contemporary Photographs," *Topics in Photographic Preservation* 9 (2001): 85.

The new materials being used as well as the new scale of the photographic works have resulted in handling, exhibition, and preservation challenges that were not issues previously. For functional, aesthetic and conceptual reasons, many artists have been favoring face-mounting, a mounting method where essentially the emulsion, or face, of the photograph is glued to glass or polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA) such as Plexiglas®. Functionally, mounting large scale photographs provides a flatness that cannot readily be achieved when a large un-mounted photograph is cornered or hinged in a traditional passepartout with picture framing glass, which might otherwise result in cockling or buckling of the print; face-mounting adds rigidity to the photograph and eliminates the need for heavy glazing, thus facilitating handling. Other advantages of face-mounting include potential protection against ultra-violet radiation, fingerprints, and air-borne pollutants.² Aesthetically, face-mounting offers a finish that significantly alters the original characteristic of the photograph; after a photograph has been face-mounted, there is no air space remaining between the glazing and the photographic emulsion which results in a intensification of contrast and a perceived heightening of hue saturation and sharpness, all culminating in a very luminous image.

In contemporary photographic practice, art is typically based on conceptualization, creation and method of exhibition.³ Subsequently, as conceptual ideas behind methods of display and exhibition play a large role in artistic practice, face-mounting grew in popularity through the 1990s and early 2000s. However, negative attitudes have developed towards the process because it is irreversible, the long term stability of the face-mounted print is in question, and there are many difficulties associated with preserving a large piece of Plexiglas®. Furthermore, there has been a jump in the market value of face-mounted photographs, resulting in increased research into preservation issues related to this process.

2 Pénichon, Sylvie et al., "Two Finishing Techniques" : 85.

3 Docquier, Françoise, "Art Photography," The Abrams Encyclopedia of Photography, [2004]: 191.

2. Process Description

2.1. Face-mounting techniques

There are two categories of materials available for face-mounting photographs: pressure-sensitive adhesives, and silicone rubber and primer systems.

Pressure-sensitive adhesives are usually an acrylic-based adhesive supported by a plastic carrier⁴ (although they are available as unsupported films as well). The adhesive sheet is applied between the emulsion side of the photograph and the acrylic sheet by pressing it between two cylinders. Until recently, pressure-sensitive adhesives have generally been used for advertising, however as the results are visually indistinguishable from prints face-mounted with silicone rubber, and the process is often less expensive, it is gaining popularity in the 'fine-art' market.⁵

The silicone rubber and primer system of face-mounting has derived from the Diassec[®] process, which is a process that uses moisture-curing silicone rubber as an adhesive between the photographic emulsion and a sheet of acrylic.⁶ Heinz Sovilla-Bruhlhart, of Switzerland, developed the Diassec[®] process in the early 1970s and patented it in 1972 because he saw the need for a mounting method that would both preserve and protect large scale photographs. Through this process, the emulsion or face of the photograph is permanently adhered to a piece of polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA) using silicone as an adhesive because it is chemically stable and inert. Essentially, the front of the photograph is sealed irreversibly in an airless environment that should not chemically harm the photograph and should protect it from fluctuations in relative humidity,

⁴ Pénichon, Sylvie et al.: 89.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Jürgens, Martin. *Silicone Rubber Face-Mounting of Photographs to Poly(methyl methacrylate): Process, Structure, Materials, and Long-Term Dark Stability*, Masters of Art Conservation Thesis. Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario. May 2001: 1.

atmospheric pollutants, and possibly ultra violet light. Because only a handful of mounting studios world wide are licensed by Diassec®, and because the popularity of face-mounting has greatly increased over the last decade, a number of unlicensed mounting studios have begun to offer virtually the same process. Although most mounting studios respect the license agreements, and are selling their process under different names, the term Diassec® has become almost a generic term, and is often being used to describe all face-mounted photographs.

Aesthetically, face-mounting offers a unique aesthetic that can be conceptually appealing to many photographers. In contrast to conventionally matted or non-matted framed photographs, the glazing sheet is fused to the photograph forming a single object, resulting in a highly glossy surface (depending on the surface finish of the PMMA). The face-mounted photograph also has heightened contrast, darker colours and a perceived saturation of hues as a result of the elimination of light scattering that is present in the layer of air between the print surface and the glazing in a conventional frame.⁷ "The original surface of the photographic print cannot be seen, independent of the viewing angle or distance. Instead, light reflects from the surface of the Plexiglas®, behind which is a deep "space" of colour, namely the thickness of the PMMA sheeting. When an unframed Diassec® print is viewed from the side, the colour of the photograph can be seen in the Plexiglas® sheet edges, resulting in a print that appears to be of thick, solid colour."⁸

2.2. Process problems

A combination of stability and appearance are the most important issues to everyone involved. For the most part, the adhesion, whether it be by silicon rubber or pressure-sensitive adhesive is permanent. Delamination, discoloration,

⁷ Jürgens, 3.

⁸ Ibid.

and accelerated fading of the dyes or staining in the substrate have been reported in only a few instances. Furthermore, there has been concern for other collections objects stored in close proximity to a face-mounted photograph because as the silicone sealant hardens it produces acetic acid, which can cause decay in other objects. The main problems that have been observed with face-mounted photographs is the susceptibility of the acrylic to physical damage which can occur through handling, storage, or cleaning. Surface cleaning is an ongoing task as PMMA collects dust electrostatically.

In depth discussions of the problems in face-mounting can be found in, *Silicone Rubber Face-Mounting of Photographs to Poly(methyl methacrylate): Process, Structure, Materials, and Long-Term Dark Stability*, by Martin Jürgens, who has done extensive accelerated aging tests on Diasec® mounted photographs, or in the chapter *Plastic Lamination and Face Mounting of Contemporary Photographs*, written by Sylvie Pénichon and Martin Jürgens, found in the book *Coatings on Photographs: Materials, Techniques, and Conservation*.

2.3. Conservators and their face-mounting research

I began looking into the conservation research in the area of face-mounting by contacting both Martin Jürgens and Sylvie Pénichon as the majority of material published about face mounting has been done by one, or both of these two conservators. Pénichon told me about some of the research she had conducted previously that had involved talking to artists; she also suggested a few people for me to talk to. Jürgens discussed the Global Face-Mounting Initiative, which is a group of ten conservators and scientists, lead by Dr. Bill Wei, who are investigating face-mounting issues. Jürgens explained that the group is really quite informal, even though it has a very grand name, and nothing has been published yet. The group meets once a year and talks about developments

in research on face-mounted objects. For the most part, the group is currently looking at objects in collections and evaluating their condition so that they can put together a 'damage atlas'.⁹

Next, I contacted Peter Mustardo at The Better Image, a private conservation lab in New Jersey. Mustardo is fascinated by the process and states that face-mounted photographs "have changed the nature of photography, the perception of photography, the price, the market of photography."¹⁰ Mustardo goes on to say that "without [face-mounting], these [photographs] are just run of the mill colour prints."¹¹ However, he also agrees that they aren't without problems, "from the most simple task of dusting, to the more complex task of dealing with scratches and punctures, indentations, from both the back and the front."¹² At The Better Image, they have dealt with pieces that have been abraded from the back, so that the paper base has become detached from the acrylic, they have also seen a number of face-mounted works that have been scratched and gouged from the front. They currently have a face-mounted photograph that has been donated to the lab for research, that had been punctured by a forklift.

The face-mounted photograph that he is currently looking at presents a whole new problem. "We thought we were making headway in the treatment of these things, you know, we buff out scratches and basically make some miraculous, and sometimes some substantial improvements. But the one we have here now has stymied us. What they're doing increasingly with these large format pieces, is they are face-mounting onto a mat surface acrylic to avoid the glare, now you can imagine what happens when you scratch a mat surface, it's not just a simple process of buffing out the scratch, because you buff out the matting agent. So, we're working Eric Breitung at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, trying to find some kind of acrylic fill that will match the dispersive effect of

9 Jürgens, Martin. Conservator, Germany, personal communication, May 2007.

10 Mustardo, Peter. Conservator, USA, personal communication, June 2007

11 Ibid.

12 Ibid.

the mat acrylic, but the trick is applying it into the thin scratch or flat abrasion. So there are all kinds of problems that they've raised. And some of them solved, or potentially solved, and some of them still with big question marks."¹³ Another issue that Mustardo has noted is the difference between the patented Diassec[®] licensed process and the other mounting techniques that are in use. In general, Mustardo has seen very little problems with Diassec[®] mounted prints, in terms of detachment or delamination, whereas he has seen more of these problems with the other face-mounting processes which potentially have less stringent manufacturing standards.

Mustardo believes that "it is our task to educate the public, the buying public, about what these things actually are and how to care for them, it's a difficult job as usually the people who are willing to spend five-hundred-thousand, or a million dollars on these things, have very little concern sometimes about what it is, it's more or less a trophy that they've aquired and they don't want to hear about any difficulties that it might have. But that's a broad blanket statement. They oftentimes leave that concern to their private curators or whoever ... I'm a fan, I think they are lovely objects, they certainly help the colour saturation, and the planarity of them, but they are certainly not without some real, real problems physically, in the short term and in the long term."¹⁴

On the recommendation of Peter Mustardo, I contacted Eric Breitung, an Andrew W. Mellon Conservation Fellow at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, in New York City. Breitung's expertise is in plastics and films, so he found that face-mounting was an appropriate place for him to conduct research. Through his research project, titled *Improving the Abrasion Resistance of Face Mounted Large Format Photographs*, Breitung is investigating different materials that artists could be using, as well as coming up with suggestions for either protecting or fixing preexisting face-mounted photographs. Breitung believes that the biggest problem with face-mounted photographs is the light scratches that occur

¹³ *ibid.*

¹⁴ *ibid.*

when people try to clean the surface of the PMMA. Another problem is trying to remove these scratches without changing the surface.

Lastly, I contacted Leanne Daffner, conservator of photographs at the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in New York City. For two reasons, there has been interest in face-mounting at MoMA for close to a decade. First, when Daffner started at MoMA, she was assessing the preservation needs in the collection and recognized that there were a handful of face-mounted works, and realized that it was a group of photographs that probably needed some special attention. Almost simultaneously, MoMA started organizing an Andres Gursky exhibition, which opened in 2001, and traveled extensively to Paris, Madrid, Chicago, and San Francisco. As part of the preparations for this exhibition, a survey was done of the work to assess condition. A plan was devised for safely crating these delicate photographs around the world, as well as safely exhibiting the photographs. "By the end of the show, we saw some things that happened, saw how these works traveled, how they held up, and what some of the issues were." Shortly after the exhibition, MoMA got a Andrew W. Mellon Fellow in the conservation department, Erin Murphy, who began a research project in surface cleaning of face-mounted works. From MoMA's experience with the Gursky exhibition, they knew this was an important issue, and that surface cleaning was prominent on many people's minds. Murphy's research findings on cleaning methods of face-mounted works, will be published in *Topics in Photographic Preservation Vol. 12*, a publication by the Photographic Materials Group.

Daffner has also put together a sample set of face-mounted work to undergo aging tests in different environments including cold storage and ambient light. They have been monitoring these samples for close to eight years now, and intend this to be a long-term project which is meant to complement previous accelerated aging tests. Daffner's goals are to help answer the questions of exhibition, storage practices and transportation, and contribute whatever she can to others looking at the subject.

Daffner agrees that the biggest problem with face-mounting is preservation; her feeling at this point is that the PMMA surface always looks best when it is brand new, or when there has been very little handling, with no surface marks or wear and tear. Over time, as the surface gets marred, by brushing, or wiping, or when deeper scratches occur, the surface becomes dull. Although materials are being developed to fill surface scratches, coatings or textures on the PMMA can create further challenges. Daffner thinks this is a matter of being vigilant about preservation from the moment these photographs come in the door.

Structural issues, depending on how they are fabricated, can also be a problem according to Daffner. Many artists, like Andres Gursky, Thomas Ruff, and Thomas Struth, among others, tend to frame their works, but there isn't a lot of integral strength that supports the sheet of PMMA, as often there is just a sheet of acrylic with a strainer behind it and nothing else holding it in. Other photographers use a different system of sandwiching their photographs between two pieces of acrylic, with flush cut edges, which makes the photograph look like it's floating on the wall. These photographs are very tricky to store and handle, as there is nothing to grab onto, or nowhere to pressure pack for storage or transport. Daffner believes that these "integral issues, poor processing, bad mounting, are a kind of given with anything contemporary, especially with works like this that are really meant to be beautifully produced, machine-like and industrial,"¹⁵ as a result, any imperfections are very noticeable and detract from the overall quality of the work.

¹⁵ Daffner, Lee Ann. Conservator, USA, personal communication, June 2007.

3. Methodology

It was my goal when selecting people to interview, to include recognized professionals with varied backgrounds and interests in photography, as well as people geographically dispersed. For photographers, I selected both emerging and established artists, from a range of locations, including, Vancouver, Toronto, New York and San Francisco. The gallerists were also from Vancouver, Toronto, New York. The curators I spoke with are located in Vancouver, Ottawa, Miami, Chicago and Houston.

I made initial contact with my interviewees by email. I kept these initial emails brief, outlining who I was, what I was doing and why I wanted to talk with them. I had a varied, but better than expected response rate. I contacted 14 artists for interviews and spoke with 5. I contacted 6 gallerists and had interviews with 5. I contacted 5 curators and had interviews with all 5. Initially, I was requesting telephone interviews, however, many of the curators requested that I email them my questions so that they could answer them at their convenience. The telephone interviews were significantly more successful than the email interviews because I was able to ask more follow-up questions, and thus get more detailed information from the interviewees.

All interviews, whether they be with artists, gallerists, or curators, were comprised of five or six questions, some with sub questions, and ranged in length from seven, to twenty-five minutes depending on how much information the interviewee was willing to reveal. Although each interview would vary depending on the direction the interviewee took with the questions, I ensured that the same points in each interview were covered, including: the development of face-mounting, it's aesthetic and preservation impact, it's presence on the market, and it's future in collections. A list of interview questions can be found at Appendix I.

4. Artists

Out of 14 artists I contacted for interviews, only 5 were available to speak with me. I feel that there was a bit of hesitation from artists to speak about this topic because they are often attracted to materials and techniques for reasons other than durability or permanence, as they are more involved with the expression and exploration of new concepts. Fugitive factors do not surface readily as a concern. When speaking about the preservation issues involved with contemporary art, Maia-Mari Sutnik, Curator of Photography at the Art Gallery of Ontario says, "A conservator's 'nightmare' is work by artists such as Noland, Kelly, Louis, who painted beautifully straight onto unprepared 'raw' canvas ... as are the range of material objects used in the Combines of Rauschenberg and Kienholtz or keeping the moths away from Oppenheim's 'Fur-lined Tea-cup', (although I understand the challenge has been met with some kind of moth-resistant treatment). Also the plastics, vinyl, and Styrofoam used by Oldenburg for his soft sculptures have become a problem. Our 'Giant Floorburger' (aka 'Giant Hamburger') collapsed when the stuffing dried out. And, then there are those works which have 'burn-out' factors, i.e. Flavin's neon tubes, transparencies of Wall, etc. – although Wall is now concerned over the diminishing quality of the colour in his older transparencies and replacements are being made to meet his criteria. All of these issues are more curatorial and conservation concerns although they are also recognized by the makers. [...] Artists interests are mainly in the aesthetic exploration of materials for art making [...] and since [many contemporary artists] are making over-sized photographs which have a tendency to 'ripple', but are meant to be viewed firm and in many cases without frame, they have no reason to feel skeptical about face-mounting since it solves the aesthetic problem for them with the desired effect."¹⁶ The artists I spoke with agree that face-mounting solves an aesthetic problem for

¹⁶ Sutnik, Maia-Mari. Curator, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

them, and were quite willing to speak with me about the use of face-mounting in their practice.

4.1. First awareness and use of face-mounting?

I began each of my interviews with the photographers by asking how and when they first became aware of face-mounting. Although their first memory of the process ranged from the early 1990s to approximately 2003, all the photographers I spoke with, with the exception of Toni Hafkenscheid, first saw the process used by the Düsseldorf school of photographers. Mr. Hafkenscheid was first introduced to the process in 2000 because some of his students at the Rietveld Academy in Amsterdam were using the process; he started to use the process shortly after. Arni Haraldsson first saw the process in the early 1990s and started using the process in the mid 1990s and for undisclosed reasons stopped using the process two years ago. Luis Mallo became aware of the process in approximately 1996, and used the process for the first time in 1999. David Maisel remembers seeing the process for the first time in 2000, and started experimenting with it approximately two years later. My last interviewee, emerging artist Blaine Campbell first saw the process in 2003 and is still waiting for an appropriate time to start using it.

My second question with the photographers was to inquire as to why they had begun to use face-mounting as their mode of exhibition. For some, the decision to begin face-mounting was primarily a functional one, as with Arni Haraldsson who began to use face-mounting because he began to work on a large scale, "Prior to [face-mounting] I was using 8-ply mats but they came only as large as 40x60", at least that I could easily get hold of. Since I was putting my own work together, I always had issues with dust and for that reason didn't get into using spacers. I found that I could control dust easier when using mats. Anyway, once the work got to be about 50x60 inches, it was much easier to face-

mount it. Any other way I found to be just too cumbersome and ungainly, often making the work quite heavy. Also, face-mounting allowed to easily change work from one frame to another, it also meant that I could easily store work up-right."¹⁷

For other photographers, the decision to face-mount was based on aesthetic and conceptual reasons. Luis Mallo face-mounted his *Laminas* series, "because the nature of the images called out for a different approach. Using face-mounting allowed me to exclude the frame in the presentation. This left the photograph entirely by itself, floating, and gave the image more impact. Again, the content of the work, in a way, dictated the method of the presentation ... it gave the photograph a clean and formal look that I liked. It was also functional in that it reinforced and extended the message of the work, while it simultaneously facilitated a successful presentation solution."¹⁸

David Maisel employs face-mounting for a combination of functional and aesthetic reasons. Maisel originally mounted his work to museum board, leaving exposed board around the edges of the prints. For example, a 48" square print would be mounted on a 60" square piece of board. Next, he experimented with mounting on aluminum and the Plexi. About his mounting practice, he says, "I mounted to aluminum first, I did that for maybe a year, and I wasn't satisfied with it, it felt too clinical to me, so I went back to a sample I had done of face mounting to Plexi, and I thought, I have to try this, I have to see what I think. And it was working for me, anyway, it was working with the non-glare Plexi, that actually seemed to answer all of the production issues that I had, it protects the surface of the paper, yes it's permanent but it protects the surface of the paper, it reduces glare and it just felt right aesthetically."¹⁹

Toni Hafkenscheld started face-mounting because of the demand, "my gallery dealer and I tried it a few times, and people really responded to it, and we basically had the option to either frame it or face-mount it and it seemed that

¹⁷ Haraldsson, Arni. Photographer, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

¹⁸ Mallo, Luis. Photographer, USA, personal communication, June 2007.

¹⁹ Maisel, David. Photographer, USA, personal communication, May 2007.

almost everyone was buying the face-mounted work really, so at that point we tried to just do face-mounting all the time." Hafkenschaid also favors face-mounting because of aesthetic reasons, and the "fact that it enhanced the colours of the work. I'm not sure of exactly the reasons for that, but color is very important in my work, and it just seems to really crank up the colour."²⁰

None of the artists I spoke with said that they feel any pressure from their galleries in regards to how they present their work. The majority of the artists thought that they should work closely with their gallerists to develop presentation and display methods that work best for their photographs. "Gallerists are incredibly astute when it comes to these things," states David Maisel.²¹ I am influenced by [my gallerists] because they care, they are experienced and they have strong opinions, but it doesn't mean that we always agree."²² All the artists agree that ultimately, it's their responsibility to choose how the work is presented, because "how a work is presented says a lot about 'it' and how its maker wants 'it' to be read."²³

4.2. Responses to museum policy about face-mounting

I asked each artist what they thought about two policies that museums might develop in regards to face-mounted photographs. The first policy I asked them about was the possibility of museums collecting a duplicate, or storage print in addition to the exhibition print. It is general practice that the back-up print will usually be taken out of storage when the original exhibition print is no longer fit for exhibition, whether it be because of damage to the mounting or because of dye fading in the print. Unless it has specifically been arranged with the artist, the

²⁰ Hafkenschaid, Toni. Photographer, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

²¹ Maisel, David. Photographer, USA, personal communication, May 2007.

²² Ibid.

²³ Haraldsson, Arni. Photographer, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

back-up print will be mounted the same as the original exhibition print. The second policy I asked the artists about, was museums developing policy to not collect anything face-mounted. I don't know any museum that has an established policy not to collect face-mounted images, however, I did discover in my research interviews that there is a significant museum in the US that is considering such a policy based on preservation concerns. Although I made repeated attempts to confirm this information by contacting the museum, no one was willing to comment on this issue. However, institutions may also choose to not collect anything face-mounted because of space/storage concerns, as face-mounted photographs are typically large.

In regards to both policies, Luis Mallo states that "museums are responsible for the safekeeping and preservation of art for future generations. Whatever techniques they are forced to use towards this end is fine by me. If they feel that face-mounting is not something they can preserve properly, then I understand and respect their concern."²⁴ David Maisel also supports museum policy, but he also thinks that face-mounting should not be singled out, "I think that there are a lot of real reasons to have a backup print, not just face-mounting, I think that even rear mounting is a reason to have a backup print. I think even the way images may or may not fade when exposed to light over long periods of time, all those things, I don't think it's a bad idea. [...] In terms of museums and their investment in work, and their desire for that work to have as much longevity as it can. I actually applaud anything that they want to do, I just don't think that face-mounting is the only issue that these works on paper have to deal with."²⁵ However, Maisel thinks that a policy to not collect is "pretty extreme". He thinks that face-mounting is a solution that works best for him, but doesn't "define the work [and thus], shouldn't limit the work."²⁶ Although he likes to give the people purchasing his work a finished object so that he can control the aesthetic

²⁴ Mallo, Luis. Photographer, USA, personal communication, June 2007.

²⁵ Maisel, David. Photographer, USA, personal communication, May 2007.

²⁶ Ibid.

decisions, which means mounting and framing, he also thinks that institutions that are collecting occupy a slightly different role than the individual collector. He thinks that if an institution has a policy to not collect face-mounted work, that they should have a dialogue with the artist who might be willing to present the work in a different manner for the collection, as he has done upon special request in the past. Specifically, an institution was considering collecting a body of work, but was unsure about their ability to appropriately care for the work if it was face-mounted, so after the curator illustrated the situation to him, he decided that in that specific situation he would provide the museum with the work un-mounted.

Blaine Campbell also supports the idea of a back-up print. "Given the very delicate nature of face-mounted work, coupled with rumors regarding stability of the face-mounted work, having a back-up print makes sense. Its use and display should be subject to the artist's wishes however, the gallery should not have the right to simply use the back-up print as they see fit."²⁷ Arni Haraldsson suggests that there are preservation strategies that might make collecting a back-up print unnecessary, "I think that having a back-up print is not a bad idea, however, it's not absolutely necessary. One collector of my work had a framer insert a second, very thin piece of plexi over the face-mounted work. When I later saw the work at his residence I thought it looked alright. I had thought that the second piece of plexi would somehow dull the heightened sense of resolution but it didn't. I suppose this is not unlike placing a piece of glass over a painting, although perhaps not as dramatic."²⁸

In response to the idea of an institution developing a policy to not collect any face-mounted works, Hafkenscheid thinks that concern about collecting new processes has been a cyclical phenomenon in museums and that the same fear, or uncertainty about collecting came up with early colour prints as well. "It seems like we go through these stages every 20 years or so, and it's true that no one really knows what will happen in the future. But, I think that if an artist chooses to

²⁷ Campbell, Blaine. Photographer, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

²⁸ Haraldsson, Arni. Photographer, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

present their work this way, then it's really too bad that the art institution or the museum wouldn't really want to support that work."²⁹ However, Hafkenschaid would be in full support of supplying a museum with a preservation print if it would put their mind at ease.

4.3. Artists concern with face-mounting preservation issues

Preservation issues are the key concern with face-mounted photograph as the long-term preservation of a photograph is paramount to a collector. I asked each artist what they felt the most important, or critical preservation issues associated with face-mounting were, if they thought there were any, and if these concerns were balanced by aesthetic concerns.

Haraldsson admits to hearing horror stories about discolouration and delamination, however, he hasn't had any problems with his own work, including the ones dating back to the mid-1990s. "Generally speaking I think that preservation issues are balanced. I think photographers use face-mounting because they like the look of it and also that the labs have promised that it is archival. The preservationist needs to consider the unique characteristics of face-mounting (a sense of seeming heightened resolution, in certain instances the appearance of inward illumination, a sense of lightness) and why the method may have been used, so that in the act of preserving a work the possible intentions of the photographer are met rather than ignored. This is another way of saying that the very work itself, what contributes to its impact, what makes it what it is in its totality, is the method of its presentation. Here we are of course nearing McLuhan's famous dictum that the medium is the message."³⁰

Toni Hafkenschaid is not concerned about any issues with face-mounting, but is aware that different labs use different processes that might, in the long

29 Hafkenschaid, Toni. Photographer, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

30 Haraldsson, Arni. Photographer, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

term, have different results. For him, the biggest concern is if the lab can keep the print surface clean during mounting, so that there is no dirt or hair between the PMMA and the print. Hafkenschaid has used several labs in the past, some with more success, in terms of cleanliness issues, than others. He has some face-mounting done with a silicone method, and some with an adhesive film and from his experience, thinks that the adhesive film works better.

Blaine Campbell thinks that "the aesthetic choice definitely outweighs any preservation issues, though the buyer should be aware of potential problems when buying such work."³¹

Mallo thinks that although there may be some issues with face-mounting, "the C-Print is already fragile by nature." Mallo has been told by the mounting studio he uses, that face-mounting "did not corrupt or affect the print's durability, but he [also] realize[s] that because it's a permanent process, it may get in the way of some of the more recent preservation methods used today."³²

Maisel wonders if concerns are warranted, as most works, including works on paper and rear-mounted works all have problems of some sort. . "A work [...] can get damaged in any number of ways, [...] it can happen any time a work is out in the world."³³ Maisel has seen occasions where the mount has failed, including twice with his own work, where the work has been damaged through a shipping accident or carelessness.

4.4. The trend of face-mounting

The idea that face-mounting is a trend comes up in most discussions about the topic. However, there has been speculation as to whether this trend is nearing an end. When asked about face-mounting as a trend, all the artists

31 Campbell, Blaine. Photographer, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

32 Hafkenschaid, Toni. Photographer, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

33 Maisel, David. Photographer, USA, personal communication, May 2007.

agreed that it is to some extent a trend, and one that has gained momentum. Most of the artists think that the process will continue to be used as long as prints continue to be large and as long as photographers are looking for a particular aesthetic.

Haraldsson stresses that the presentation of his work is very important. He thinks that not only does it determine, "the reception of a work, but also contributes to its content -- people receive a work differently depending on how it is presented." He continues that, "face-mounting may be in less demand than it once was, partly due to the prohibitive costs involved, and partly due to the popularity of using spacers"³⁴, "³⁵ but he thinks that for very large scale works, it might continue to prove the best option.

Both Hafkenschaid and Campbell think that the process is here to stay. Hafkenschaid says that he thinks it's become a bit of a trend here in North America, but in Europe it seems to be "less of a trend and more of just a different mounting technique, that's really been around for quite a while."³⁶ Campbell thinks that, "given the amazing aesthetic qualities of face-mounting and the transformation of a photo print into a delicate object, the trend will continue as long as the issue of delamination is resolved."³⁷

Mallo thinks that face-mounting, "runs the risk of looking dated [and] one has to be careful about presentation and using methods that detract from an honest and effective appreciation of the message of the art,"³⁸ unless the mounting method is a part of the concept.

³⁴ A spacer is a strip of wood or plastic that is inserted in between the photograph and the glazing in a frame; it is usually adhered to the frame around all four sides. The purpose of the spacer is to eliminate the need for a mat, while also maintaining a distance between the glazing and the emulsion of the photograph, so that they do not bond together.

³⁵ Haraldsson, Arni. Photographer, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

³⁶ Hafkenschaid, Toni. Photographer, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

³⁷ Campbell, Blaine. Photographer, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

³⁸ Mallo, Luis. Photographer, USA, personal communication, June 2007.

Maisel thinks that face-mounting is absolutely a trend, and that is the main reason he was initially reluctant to start using the process, "I remember walking through Chelsea, in [approximately] 2001 ... and seeing all of these really, what I thought was terrible works, that were face-mounted, and it looked cheap and ugly and plastic, and there were a thousand reasons why I didn't like it. And it's funny how I've had this happen several times in the process of making work and making these kinds of aesthetic choices, where there's this process I really initially loathe, that comes back and becomes actually an area to investigate, and ultimately to work with. I had the same response when I started seeing Cibachromes in galleries years before, where I felt like these colours are so nasty and lurid and awful, and then within two years I was making the largest scale Cibachromes that I could because I needed colour that was nasty and lurid and awful. I've actually learned from these types of experiences that it's important to not rule anything out. I don't know that I'll be face-mounting every body of work forever, I don't feel like I need to be new, or to make those kinds of blanket decisions, what I'm trying to do, is for each body of work find a method or a series of methods that works for those images."³⁹

³⁹ Maisel, David. Photographer, USA, personal communication, May 2007.

5. Gallerists

In the book, *Collecting Photography* by Gerry Badger, Gallerist Howard Greenberg says, "In contemporary art photography there's an entirely new market that has grown, particularly in the last ten years, and which functions almost separately from the traditional market for fine photograph. The photography is mostly conceptual, exhibited in contemporary art galleries and often large and in colour. Contemporary artists have used photography more than any other medium in the last twenty or so years. It's exhibited and sold in galleries where traditionally, photography was never sold before."⁴⁰ Gallerists, among others including: critics, scholars and connoisseurs, have a great amount of influence on the art market, as they often control private and public perceptions of current trends, ultimately affecting the trajectory of art and art history.

5.1. First awareness

Both Monte Clark and Catriona Jeffries, both gallerists in Vancouver, first became aware of face-mounting through the Düsseldorf School of Photography (Gursky, Struth, et al) in the early 1990s, and became aware of photographers using it in Canada, specifically Vancouver, shortly after. Clark sees a "real connection between what's going on in Germany with photography and certainly what's going on in Vancouver."⁴¹ Clark believes that there were no particular attitudes expressed about face-mounting when it was first gaining popularity, except for it being 'new'. Jeffries agrees, although "as time went on it was seen as a very sound and acceptable process, that offered a luminosity differentiated

⁴⁰ Badger, Gerry. *Collecting Photography*. Mitchell Beazley Press, 2003.

⁴¹ Clark, Monte. Gallerist, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

from a back-lit photograph and was seen as a highly experimental process in photography."⁴²

W.M. Hunt, a gallerist in New York city, recalls seeing the process done for the first time at Paris Photo. Specifically, with the photographs of Robert Cauldecot who was doing large, still-life photographs of Tupperware. Hunt thought that the face-mounting made the photographs look "very slick and sharp [and] the presentation was quite appropriate to the image."⁴³ Hunt doesn't recall any specific reactions to the process when it was new, other than it just being "a different way of showing things."⁴⁴ However, he admits that he had some reservations about the process almost immediately because he was concerned with the vulnerability of the surface of the face-mounted photograph. He thinks that while others may have also had this opinion, it wasn't necessarily vocalized.

Although Brian Clamp, a gallerist in New York city, doesn't remember specifically when he started seeing face-mounted photographs, he thinks it was probably six or seven years ago with the photographs of the Düsseldorf school, Gursky in particular. Clamp thinks that there has been archival and preservation concerns about face-mounting, from institutions mostly, since the beginning. Clamp also thinks that it was a fashionable choice. "In many ways it was sort of a fashionable choice that had to do with trends and display actually. Just sort of a contemporary feel to the work. A nice alternative to having to use traditional glazing."⁴⁵

42 Jeffries, Catriona. Gallerist, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

43 Hunt, W.M. Gallerist, USA, personal communication, May 2007.

44 Ibid.

45 Clamp, Brian. Gallerist, USA, personal communication, May 2007.

5.2. Preservation issues

Monte Clark doesn't think that there are any preservation issues with face-mounted work, beyond the fragility of the surface. "The surface is your art, so if you damage it you've damaged your work. But welcome to the world of painting, or anything else for that matter, that isn't framed."⁴⁶ Clark sees another problem with face-mounting in that American photographers don't have access to the patented Diasec® process. Because American photographers have their face-mounting work done in labs that mount commercial, or advertising work and push things through quickly, artists are not getting consistent quality. Clark thinks that many artists have stopped using the process because they are not getting the kind of quality they desire. In response to other issues with the process, such as colour fading, Clark says that face-mounted photographs are "similar to all colour photography. These things have a life span, dependant on many factors ... In the larger picture, I don't think the fact that the photograph has been face-mounted is such a huge issue."⁴⁷

In Catriona Jeffries' mind, the most pressing preservation issue with face-mounting is the analysis of it. Jeffries thinks that you can't, and shouldn't, stop an artist from using a medium that they have chosen to use, however there needs to be the administration through their studio, or gallery, because potentially from time to time, work might need to be re-printed. Jeffries thinks that both collections and artists are expressing concern over face-mounted works because if a work changes, the collector is of course dissatisfied, but the artist is also concerned that their work has deviated from their initial intention.

W.M. Hunt thinks that the people to vocalize concern about face-mounted photographs initially were curators, Charlotte Cotton, and then Anne Tucker. Hunt thinks that basically the "feeling is that some of the chemistry is locked up in that kind of sandwiching, resulting in potential problems. Basically it is

⁴⁶ Clark, Monte. Gallerist, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

⁴⁷ Clark, Monte. Gallerist, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

apprehension, but apprehension that's not born out by any research that I've seen."⁴⁸ Dealing with not only exhibiting photographs, but selling them, Hunt thinks it's important to react to the market, and if the market doesn't want to take the risk of collecting face-mounted photographs, it's easy to change and use different techniques.

Brian Clamp thinks that archival issues definitely need consideration. "We're told [face-mounting is] 100% archival, and nothings going to happen to them, but honestly, no one's going to know until several years down the road."⁴⁹ Contrary to Hunt, Clamp thinks that it's not the collectors that are thinking about preservation issues, but the artists. "More artists are really thinking about it than collectors have been. [Face-mounted] prints continue to sell well, however I know artists who used to face-mount who are no longer doing it."⁵⁰

5.3. Trend

Monte Clark thinks that the process gained popularity because of a combination of functional and aesthetic reasons as well as the perception that it was becoming a trend. "I certainly saw it a lot more a few years ago and I saw it on photographs where it wasn't required, I mean the whole point of doing it is because it does something to the light. But there were artists where it didn't even matter to them, they just liked the slickness of it."⁵¹ Clark cautions against using a specific process, no matter what it is, if the work doesn't benefit from it. Although Clark admits that some artists might have used face-mounting because it was trendy, when asked specifically if face-mounting is a trend, or if it's starting to reflect an aesthetic of the 90s, he said, "comments like that make me very leery.

48 Hunt, W.M. Gallerist, USA, personal communication, May 2007.

49 Clamp, Brian. Gallerist, USA, personal communication, May 2007.

50 Ibid.

51 Clark, Monte. Gallerist, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

Those are dangerous types of remarks to make, because when you say 90s, it kind of has a derogatory effect. And you know, some amazing, amazing artworks were done in the 70s, 80s, 90s, and today, and what's today's photograph in 10 years. When you're talking about really trendy things, absolutely. But, make no mistake, I would love a Gursky from 1992 or 1996, and the fact that it's from that year would only strengthen it. It's a very strong period for the work. I don't like clumping stuff into trends. I certainly don't like putting things into decades. Especially the previous one or two decades, it's just too soon to tell."⁵²

Catriona Jeffries agrees with Clark that classifying face-mounting as a trend is inappropriate. "If an artist needs to use an application, then they need to use it. It doesn't matter, it's irrelevant whether it's a trend, it's relevant whether an artist wants to use a material process, and a material process that is sound, if that material process is not sound, for certain reasons, the artist will still decide if they will take it on and take the direct measure to pursue the work through it's life. So it was heavily used in the 90s and into the early 2000s maybe, and is less used now, because in my mind, the material truth of creating in the lab a C-print, the luminosity, that you might have achieved through the [face-mount] could possibly be achieved in other ways; in the digital application we have much more power now to control those kinds of aesthetic decisions as an artist. So perhaps as technology has moved on, or failed, but as we move on we recognize failure that there is a decision to move on in the later 90s, it was a technical decision that was at the time relevant and advanced, and things have moved on since then. So I wouldn't call it a fad, or a trend, it's just, well, I guess you could if you wanted too, but it's a moment of use, and then we continue to move on with material experimentation."⁵³

Contrary to Clark and Jeffries' opinions, when I asked W.H. Hunt if face-mounting was a trend, he immediately responded, "dead, DOA. I've increasingly

⁵² Clark, Monte. Gallerist, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

⁵³ Jeffries, Catriona. Gallerist, Canada, personal communication, May 2007.

found the look to be dated."⁵⁴ Currently Hunt recommends that artists leave their photographs exposed to the elements, framed with Plexiglas® glazing, which he thinks creates a more "classic impact."⁵⁵ Clamp agrees with Hunt's sentiments about face-mounted photographs being a passing trend. Clamp thinks that, "more than any conservation issue, more as just an aesthetic issue, I am really trying to turn people away from [face-mounting] as it looks very dated now."⁵⁶ Clamp continues, "what usually happens, with our gallery anyway, is that we sell the print, and then if you want it face-mounted, that is an additional charge, but what was interesting is that a lot of museums, I have noticed, were just buying the prints and then displaying them in different ways. They were more interested in just the photographic print instead of the whole display."⁵⁷

54 Hunt, W.M. Gallerist, USA, personal communication, May 2007.

55 Ibid.

56 Clamp, Brian. Gallerist, USA, personal communication, May 2007.

57 Ibid.

6. Collections (private, public and corporate)

Collections can be established for many reasons, including: investment, scholarly study, and personal enjoyment, among others. Like the gallerist, a collector can have considerable influence on the art market, as it is the collector, both private and institutional who are placing increasingly high bids at auction, driving and influencing the market. Furthermore, the collection curator has enormous power, as essentially the curator will assess what is important at a particular time, and will set aesthetic standards through acquisitions, exhibitions, and research.

I spoke to 3 institutional curators and 2 private collectors, who are as follows: Grant Arnold, audain curator of British Columbia Art at the Vancouver Art Gallery, Carol Squiers, curator at the International Centre of Photograph, Ann Thomas, curator of photographs at the National Gallery of Canada, Carol Ehlers, curator of the LaSalle Bank collection in Chicago, and Katherine Hinds, curator of the Martin Margulies collection in Miami. All of the curators requested that I email them my questions. Therefore, in general, I have less information from, and about the collections, consequently this chapter is arranged by curator/collection instead of by interview question/topic.

The LaSalle Bank corporate collection, for which Carol Ehlers is the curator, has had face-mounted work in it's collection since photographers started using the process. For example, they have been collecting Thomas Struth photographs ever since the 80s. His photographs were not face-mounted then, but they have close to 40 photographs of his, representing every stage of his career. Ehlers admits that she "doubt[s] [face-mounting] was a concern at the time, it probably should have been, or at least brought up, but [doubts] it was."⁵⁸ All of the colour work in the collection is in cold storage, including the face-mounted works. Ehlers considers the mounting and framing of a photograph to be integral to the artist's vision of the piece, and to her "that trumps any

⁵⁸ Ehlers, Carol. Curator, USA, personal communication, May 2007.

conservation concerns."⁵⁹ In her opinion as a curator, the artist's vision of the final piece is integral to the meaning of the photograph. "If the artists are creating their own frames, as is the case with Struth, it's not the ideal [...] conservation wise, for several reasons, but it's endemic to the period today."⁶⁰

In Ehlers opinion, there are "huge preservation issues with an immense amount of work that is being made today, however, there is excitement of creativity and the possibility of what artists can do is overriding the concern, as perhaps it should be. ... As a curator, I believe it is more important for me to collect what is reflective of this day, and not what I believe artists should be making."⁶¹ Ehlers thinks that face-mounting is definitely a trend, and that some artists are just following the trend, but also "that some [artists] are actually choosing these things for real reasons as well."⁶² Ehlers biggest preservation concerns are protecting the Plexi from damage, and thinks that often their backings aren't as adequate as they should be.

Grant Arnold, the Audain Curator of British Columbia Art at the Vancouver Art Gallery (VAG) said that the VAG has collected face-mounted photographs since 1988. Beyond being "conscious of the fragility of the surface when considering loan requests,"⁶³ they have not been treated differently than other photographic works in the collection. The VAG doesn't have any policies regarding face-mounted works and the fact that a photograph is face-mounted would not affect their decision to acquire it . Arnold does not believe that face-mounting is a trend, "it may become less popular, but I suspect it will be in use for some time to come."⁶⁴ He also thinks that "the vulnerability of the surface to scratching and abrasion"⁶⁵ is the most pressing preservation concern.

59 Ibid.

60 Ehlers, Carol. Curator, USA, personal communication, May 2007.

61 Ibid.

62 Ibid.

63 Arnold, Grant. Curator, Canada, personal communication, June 2007.

64 Ibid.

65 Ibid.

The National Gallery of Canada, of which Ann Thomas is the curator of photographs, has only one face-mounted photograph in the collection which was purchased in 1993. The Gallery doesn't have a policy regarding the collection of face-mounted photographs, as "a contemporary photograph that is deemed worthy of being in the collection because of the aesthetic innovation or the excellence that the work represent"⁶⁶ would be collected regardless of the method of its creation. Thomas continues, "Curators would like all the works that they acquire to come with guarantees of preservation longevity, but this is not always possible. It is "highly possible that the aesthetic that has been, and remains popular, will not be so 10 years from now, but I will not dismiss it as a trend as it is tied into an aesthetic of clarity and transparency."⁶⁷ Thomas believes that "maintaining the surface free of abrasions and dust and learning more about the long term effects of the adhesives on the print surface,"⁶⁸ are the most pressing preservation issues.

Carol Squiers, one of the curators of photographs at the International Centre of Photography (ICP), in New York City, says that the ICP has been collecting face-mounted photographs for approximately 6-7 years. Although the ICP doesn't have any policies at present regarding face-mounted photographs, their registrar is currently researching face-mounting and might establish a policy in the future. Squiers emphasizes that the ICP "collect[s] photographs, not processes,"⁶⁹ so similarly to the National Gallery of Canada, if a photograph is deemed worthy of being in the collection, it will be acquired regardless of the process of it's creation. Furthermore, Squiers thinks that the most pressing preservation issues are in determining how the adhesive that is used interacts with the surface of the photograph, and if the process proves to be unstable, only then will it become a passing trend.

⁶⁶ Thomas, Ann. Curator, Canada, personal communication, June 2007.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Squiers, Carol. Curator, USA, personal communication, June 2007.

7. Conclusions

The attitudes towards face-mounting in contemporary photography are complex and varied. The rationale behind the use of face-mounting, its aesthetic and preservation impact, its presence on the market, and its future in private and public collections, varies depending on a person's role as artist, curator or collector. Photographers consider mounting to be a significant component to the conception of their artwork. Gallerists view face-mounting as an alternative method for the display of photographs, that may or may not be nearing the end of its popularity. Many curators think that the last decades have been a period of change and experimentation involving the adoption of new technologies and materials, and therefore, they choose the work that not only speaks to them, or complements the collection, but also work that represents what is happening in contemporary art, no matter what the materials.

Face-mounting offers a unique aesthetic that can be conceptually appealing to many photographers. Perhaps artists will move away from the slick, commercial aesthetic; however, as long as scale and planar rigidity are issues, face-mounting will continue to be a viable option for the presentation of contemporary photographs. Furthermore, unless materials are developed to be more durable, preservation issues will continue to present numerous challenges. Indeed, as face-mounted photographs from the 1990s and early 2000s age and make their trajectory through exhibition, travel and storage, museum professionals will find the need to establish specific guidelines for the handling of face-mounted works to ensure the works continued safekeeping.

Appendix I. Interview questions

Questions for artists:

- When did you first become aware of face-mounting methods for print finishing?
- Do you currently, or have you ever used face-mounting in your own artistic practice?
-Why did/didn't you choose to use face mounting?
- Do you feel influenced by gallerists or collectors regarding the presentation and finishing of your work?
- Some institutions, when collecting face-mounted photographs, have adopted policy to also collect an un-mounted (back-up) print at the same time. What do you think about this policy?
- Some institutions are reluctant to collect anything face-mounted, what do you think about this policy?
- What do you think the most pressing preservation/conservation issues related to face-mounting are, if there are any?
-Are these balanced or outweighed by aesthetic reasons?
- Do you think that face mounting is a trend?

Questions for gallerists:

- When did you first become aware of face-mounted photographs on the market?
-Can you reflect on some of the attitudes expressed about face-mounting at the time.
- Did these attitudes translate into market values, then or now?
- Have you noted a face-mounting “trajectory”? For example, has there been a notable increase in the number of artists who are using this mounting method, or a notable increase of people wanting to buy it, etc.
- When did the artists you represent start face-mounting their photographs?
-Do you know why they chose to start face-mounting?
- What do you think the most pressing preservation/conservation issues related to face-mounting are, if there are any?
-How are these balanced against aesthetic concerns?
- In your opinion, who has expressed more concern over the potential preservation issues of face-mounting, artists or collectors?
- Do you think that face-mounting is a trend?

Questions for curators:

- Does your institution have any face-mounted photographs in its permanent collection?
 - When did your institution first begin collecting face-mounted photographs?
 - Were the first acquisitions of these photographs gifts or purchases?
 - Have they been cared for differently than other objects in the collection?
- Does your institution have any policies that specifically regard the acquisition of face-mounted photographs?
 - If so, when was the policy established why, and by whom?
 - Has the policy changed? If so, how?
- Would the fact that a photograph has been face-mounted affect your choice whether or not to acquire it? For example, would you give preference to a non-face mounted photograph?
 - Is this preference based on preservation or aesthetic reasons?
- Do you think that face mounting is a trend?
- What do you think the most pressing preservation/conservation issues related to face-mounting are, if there are any?

Appendix II. Interviewee biographies

Photographers:

Blaine Campbell is an emerging artist in Vancouver, Canada. He recieved his BFA in photography from Emily Carr Institute of Art and Design in Vancouver in 2006. Beyond his fine-art practice, Campbell specializes in portraiture and architectural photography.

Toni Hafkenscheld is originally from Rotterdam, Netherlands, and has a MFA from the Rietveld Academy in Amsterdam. Hafkenscheld has lived between Toronto and Amsterdam since the early 1990s. Both in his commercial and fine-art practice, Hafkenscheld explores the boundaries between reality and illusion.

Arni Haraldsson is an artist based in Vancouver, Canada. His work has been exhibited nationally and internationally. His work is based on documenting the fading relics of high modernist architecture as a means of reading recent historical change and exploring their symbolic complexity and status as monuments and utopian models.

David Maisel studied architecture, landscape architecture, and photography at both Princeton University and the Harvard Graduate School of Design - before leaving the latter to pursue his photographic career full-time. Maisel lives in the Bay Area and exhibits, photographs internationally and is most widely known for his aerial work, which includes studies of North American mines, clear-cut forests, urban sprawl, and evaporation ponds.

Luis Mallo is originally from Havana, Cuba, but has been living in the USA since the mid 1970s. Mallo studied photography and graphic design at F.I.T. in NYC, and continues to live and work in Brooklyn. Mallo exhibits his photographs internationally.

Gallerists:

The **Stephen Bulger** Gallery opened in Toronto in 1995 and exhibits both national and international, historical and contemporary photographers. Bulger specializes in narrative and documentary photographs.

Monte Clark opened in Vancouver in 1992, and in Toronto in 2001. The gallery exhibits and promotes second and third generation Vancouver School photographers that have had direct influence by Vancouver artists such as Jeff Wall. Currently exhibiting approximately seventy percent contemporary photography, the gallery exhibits and promotes contemporary Canadian, American and European artists.

Catriona Jeffries opened her first gallery in Vancouver, Canada in 1994. Jeffries focuses her exhibition program on the city's post conceptual art practices and the critical relationships between these practices and select international artists. In 2006 the gallery expanded to a new location.

ClampArt, was established in Chelsea, NYC, in 2000 by Brian Paul Clamp. ClampArt. specializes in a broad range of modern and contemporary paintings, prints, and photographs, with an emphasis on early 20th-C American art in addition to a variety of Modern and contemporary photography.

W.M. Hunt has been a collector of photography for over 30 years and a dealer for 10. In 2005, Mr. Hunt jointly established the Hasted Hunt Gallery in NYC with Sarah Hasted. The work exhibited at the Hasted Hunt Gallery ranges from classic vintage to contemporary photographic work by emerging artists. Their programming also includes artists' talks, educational seminars, and lectures.

Curators:

Grant Arnold is the Audain Curator of British Columbia Art at the Vancouver Art Gallery and has curated numerous historical, modern and contemporary art exhibitions, many with a focus on photography.

Carol Ehlers has been the curator of the LaSalle Bank Photography Collection in Chicago since 2001. Ehlers was previously a gallerist. The LaSalle Bank Photography Collection was created in 1967, making it one of the oldest corporate photography collections in the world. The collection, which exceeds 4,500 photographs, has examples of work by over 700 international photographers, and dates from 1839 to the present.

Katherine Hinds has been the curator of the Martin Margulies collection 1998. This Miami based collection which is exhibited seasonally at The Margulies Collection at the Warehouse which has 45,000 square feet of exhibition space, includes both vintage and contemporary photography from 1910 to the present, as well as video, sculpture and installation. This collection is based on seminal works that represent major shifts in photographic art. Free admission, lectures for students, guided tours, prominent guest speakers and national conferences are all factors designed by the Martin Z Margulies Foundation to improve public accessibility and interaction with contemporary art.

Carol Squiers is a curator at the International Centre of Photography in NYC, former curator of photography at P.S.1. and former senior editor of American Photo.

Ann Thomas is the Curator of Photographs at the National Gallery of Canada.

Conservators:

Eric Breitung is an inorganic chemist with a specialty in coatings and thin films. Breitung is currently an Andrew W. Mellon Conservation Fellow at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, in New York City.

Lee Ann Daffner is a conservator at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City. She holds a B.A. in printmaking from San Francisco State University, and an M.A. and certificate of advanced study in conservation from the State University College at Buffalo.

Peter Mustardo along with Nora Kennedy founded The Better Image (TBI) in 1991, in Milford, New Jersey. TBI is a conservation lab that specializes in photography conservation

8. Bibliography

Badger, Gerry. *Collecting Photography*. Mitchell Beazley Press, 2003.

Cyntia Karnes and Katherine Jennings, "Contemporary Artists' Perspectives on Coating, Lamination, and Face Mounting," Coatings on Photographs: Materials, Techniques, and Conservation pages 347-358. Photographic Materials Group, American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works, 2005.

Docquier, Françoise. "Art Photography," The Abrams Encyclopedia of Photography, Harry N. Abrams, Inc., NY, 2004.

Jürgens, Martin. "Silicone Rubber Face-Mounting of Photographs to Poly(methyl methacrylate): Process, Structure, Materials, and Long-Term Dark Stability." Masters of Art Conservation Thesis. Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario. May 2001

Pénichon, Sylvie and Martin Jürgens, "Plastic Lamination and face Mounting of Contemporary Photographs," Coatings on Photographs: Materials, Techniques, and Conservation pages 219-233. Photographic Materials Group, American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works, 2005.

Pénichon, Sylvie and Martin Jürgens. "Two Finishing Techniques for Contemporary Photographs," Topics in Photographic Preservation pages 85-96. Volume nine. American Institute for Conservation. Photographic Materials Group, 2001.

Pénichon, Sylvie and Martin Jürgens "Issues in the Conservation of Contemporary Photographs: The Case of Diasec or Face-Mounting," AIC News, March 2002. Vol. 27, No.2.

Pénichon, Sylvie, Martin Jürgens and Alison Murray. "Light and Dark Stability of Laminated and Face-Mounted Photographs: A Preliminary Investigation," Works of Art on Paper, books, Documents and Photographs, IIC Congress, Baltimore, 2-6, Sept 2002.

Wei, W. "Issues in the conservation of Face-Mounted Photographs," Working Group Photographic Materials Newsletter, Pages 10-11, June 2006.