11-1-1996

Shooting the touchers / Documenting human capital

Marten Czamanske

Shooting the Touchers / Documenting Human Capital

Graduate Thesis
Master of Fine Arts
School of Photographic Arts and Sciences
Rochester Institute of Technology

by Marten Czamanske

Exhibition
May 11-16, 1996

Thesis & Defense
November 1996

Thesis Board Members;

Alex Miokovic, Thesis Chair, Adjunct Professor, SPAS

_____ 11/17/96

Patti Ambrogi, Associate Professor, SPAS

11.16.96

_____ _____

Tim Engstrom, Associate Professor

_____ 11/16/96

Introduction

I entered the MFA program with the preconceived notion that it would require me to study and understand the art and techniques of photography to a greater extent than my undergraduate training had. I was hoping that the materials and processes that were the core, and bane, of my undergraduate education fifteen years earlier would eventually collide with my years of experience as a commercial photographer and create some sort of photographic epiphany. Fortunately it did, but in ways I couldn't have predicted at the time.

The program was about art-making, and the current issues and theories surrounding contemporary art, which surprisingly included photography. In the late seventies, while I had been memorizing slides of Italian Baroque paintings by various deceased men, a whole post-modern art movement was flourishing just four hundred miles away by artists that were very much alive, and with whom I was unfamiliar.

So then the question became, since I had very little knowledge of current art theory and criticism, how could I make meaningful art?

I started, as it seemed many others do, by making art based of self-examination and shirt-sleeve emotions. Fortunately, I had the luxury of being able to attend classes for a whole school year before becoming matriculated. That period allowed me to experiment with ideas of the *self* without having to subject that "self" to the scrutiny of quarterly reviews. But it was exposing myself to current artists and their ideas that was the essential catalyst for the work that was to follow the next year.

My first work for review was an installation constructed to be a metaphor that

represented the consequences of dis-information, or propaganda, that often obscures the "truth" but in a very alluring way. It consisted of a beautifully lit photograph, a 4'x8' foot image of a saturated green color, that was in fact artificial grass. It was concealed from the viewer by a large piece of perforated sheet metal and then by a chain-link fence with barbed wire on top. Depending on the angle the viewer could only glimpse a very small portion of the image through the layers and yet it seemed strangely whole. The green light was very enticing and beautiful. So it was unfortunate that I never documented the work. It was a great lesson to me as the piece could never easily be reassembled the way it appeared.

For the next review I presented another installation, influenced by James Turrell's work with light and Bruce Nauman's word-play. It consisted of two 40"x 60" photographs on which very small words were placed in the center. Both panels appeared side by side, one bathed in blue light and the other red. Using colored light from four projectors at different angles and metronomes to break the light at certain intervels, the effect was the illusion of two flickering holes in the wall. As the viewer moved closer, their figure or shadow would become part of the image. And if they moved even closer to the panels, they would find the two small words hidden on each panel. The blue one read "you know", the red said "Oh No". This piece was meant to be about the consequences of "words" that are taken out of context as well as information intentionally withheld, and how their effects can be insidious within a culture. Propaganda again.

I was advanced.

The following review was unremarkable, except a the remark written by the program coordinator which read "Marty come back!". The work was beautiful to look at

but lacked any meaningful explanation or coherence to previous work. Ironically I had spent more energy and time on that work than any previous.

The balance of that school year was spent working on and refining the issues and techniques that seemed to work. I experimented with industrial videos depicting repetitive motion by machines and humans. I then made kaleidoscope-like tubes with mirrors of various sizes in which I projected the videos. Because it was in an automobile parts plant that the videos were shot, I experimented with putting small toys in the tube that represented the finished product.

But the part that was missing for any serious thesis at that point was a personal stake, a commitment on my part to the art. I wanted to continue to examine issues concerning the power associated with the misuse of information in our culture and the consequences, but I still lacked the appropriate subject as the backdrop for my thesis.

Then I remembered what I did for a living.

Representation of Politics

Where I grew up, the fathers in our neighborhood were most likely to be employed as either lawyers, doctors, or corporate executives. My father was a sales manager for the Eastman Kodak Company. Because Kodak moved us from one city to the another every few years, our family tended to socialize with others that worked for the same company. During the summers we attended numerous company social events which gave us the opportunity to use our bright yellow and red coolers, umbrellas, and jackets with the company logo on them. We wore company hats, wrote with company pens and played golf with balls that were emblazoned with a big "K". I learned to take pictures with Kodak cameras with an endless supply of Kodak film. During the holidays we would be just as likely to see Santa in the company cafeteria as in any department store.

Not surprisingly our household reading included the company newsletter called *Kodakery*. It arrived regularly, seemingly every week, and I learned to read it right along with the local newspaper. The black and white, closely cropped photographs were of satisfied workers gathered around a desk, perched near an assembly line, or on the company baseball field. Many of those pictures included proud employees being rewarded for a notable effort of some sort with a certificate. In fact, one of the most prized awards, pictured over and over again, was the one you received after twenty-five years of service. The mention of my father's name or the company division he worked in, was enough to spark feelings of pride and accomplishment.

My father was part of something that was safe and benevolent. It seemed to me then that opportunity and prosperity awaited any employee that worked there long enough. It wasn't until I was old enough to work at the same company that I understood the significance of the company newsletter. It's purpose was nothing more than to make the workers, their families and shareholders feel the same way I did when I was twelve. Proud.

Now, as a free-lance corporate photographer, I make my living by participating in the creation of newsletters, annual reports and capabilities brochures called "corporate communications"; and not just for Kodak , but for anyone who will hire me.

During the fifteen years that I've been photographing people in corporate and industrial settings, several contemporary issues have developed that have a significant effect on the working classes in this country. Workers have to bargain for the terms of their employment: how much time and effort they were willing to expend in return for a wage, reasonable working conditions; and a level of security. But that agreement between owners and workers has become increasingly more complicated which has, I believe, been detrimental to the American worker.

Because of these developments corporate communications such as employee newsletters become important tools for companies to quell anxiety and fear within an organization. Similarly, annual and quarterly reports issued to shareholders, deliver precise messages that are meant to inspire confidence, and hopefully, investment. To shareholders, the images of workers, "doing what it takes"; or a picture of several mid-level managers planning to implement, "a new management model", signify progress and above all, control. Unlike advertisements, which seldom show real workers (except for the

occasional CEO), corporate messages use employees as their primary evidence.

The exhibition, *Shooting the Touchers / Documenting Human Capital*, is about the politics of corporate imagery. It is also about the evidential role that photography assumes within those messages, as well as, the role of the photographer.

In this paper I will try outline the recent developments that I feel have affected the American work place, and the dilemma they present to employees. I will discuss what other artist's think about photographs as messages. And finally I will explain how certain artist's work and thoughts have influenced my art.

Corporate leaders offer many explanations for the unsettled nature of the American word place: increasing global competition, an influx of illegal aliens; changing technologies that dictate work be done differently, and the lack of trained people to meet new challenges. It is because of these developments that during any serious conversation with employees, from factory workers to executives, includes issues concerning the loss of control they feel in their work place and the effect it has on their lives and the lives of others. The following are some of the reasons why:

The multiple layers of corporate ownership[1], like the "flags of convenience" used by large shipping companies[2], help conceal corporate intentions and increase the layers of authority that the average worker must understand and gain access to. Often times with little success.

Alan Sekula, in his photographic narrative *Fish Story*, develops metaphors associating the loss of identity within and between coastal communities, to the concealed nature of ownership; both of the vessels and the products they transport. In the same way, if you

extend the metaphor to include layers of ownership of and within corporations, it is easier to understand the frustration it creates among the employees and the communities they live in. When the levels of management and ownership become unclear, or remain concealed; or change frequently, the result is confusion and a loss of control.

In *Fish Story,* Sekula refers to the history of the maritime panorama, including the seventeenth century Dutch harbor paintings that act as boastful invitations in what was then a new era of global trading; and at the same time legitimizing the use of the "open" sea to acquire the land and possessions of others. Many corporations use the same signifiers in advertising today that promote "open trade" and "global markets" in hopes of increasing market share.

> "The panorama is paradoxical: topographically "complete" while still signaling an acknowledgment of and desire for a greater extension beyond the frame. The panoramic tableau, however bounded by the limits of a city profile or the enclosure of a harbor, is always potentially unstable: 'If this much, why not more'?"[3]

Conversely, I believe, corporate images depicting labor-power are "anti-panoramic". Unlike corporate ads designed to create the illusion of opportunity, photographs of industrial spaces are often claustrophobic, placing workers into tight frames or boxes that are neatly designed to fit on a page. Often laborers are not portrayed as "heroic workers" in glorious settings, but as a collective group of workers in very controlled situation. This seems intentional. The only panoramic vistas to behold, based on my experience, reside in the corporate boardroom, which is, as Alan Sekula might agree, the metaphorical equivalent of the bridge on a ship. In 1845, while standing on a ship viewing the Port of London, Friedrich Engels wrote,

"I know of nothing more imposing than the view one obtains of the river when sailing from the sea up to the London Bridge. Especially above Woolwich the houses and docks are packed tightly together on both banks of the river. The further one goes up the river the thicker becomes the concentration of ships lying at anchor, so that eventually only a narrow shipping lane is left free in mid-stream. Here hundreds of steamships dart rapidly to and fro. All this is so magnificent and impressive that one is lost in admiration. The traveler has good reason to marvel at England's greatness even before he steps on English soil. It is only later that the traveler appreciates the human suffering that has made all this possible."[4]

Their is a dilemma that has been created by the democratization of the equity markets that has enabled workers to become owners, and often of their own labor. Employees now have a paradoxical interest in making certain their company performs well so their personal investments (which are directly related to the company's stock performance) appreciate, but possibly at the expense of their own jobs.

During the early 1980's, the United States underwent a major expansion in the service and manufacturing sectors (particularly high-tech industries) that was primarily fueled by financial commitments made possible by deficit spending on the part on the US government. A boost in the economy was created by government purchases of military items, and associated products designed for a large-scale military buildup based on a Cold War ideology-a classic Keynesian fix for an economy that was coming out of the worst recession since WWII. With government induced growth, profits soared which fueled an dramatic increase in the level of corporate mergers and acquisitions. Extraordinary wealth was being realized by many at the top of the economic ladder. Not to be left out, working class individuals, who traditionally invested in bank related investments such as certificates of deposit and government bonds, began to speculate in the more lucrative, but volatile stock and bond markets. Mutual Funds became the investment of choice.[5]

At the same time companies decided traditional retirement costs were prohibitive for new hires. They offered in its place the option to employees of contributing to their own retirement with investments vehicles such as 401Ks and the opportunity to directly invest in their companies stock. Employees, in effect became owners, but of such a small shares that they could wield no meaningful influence. Nonetheless, many employees in the work force had a new stake in the organization's level of economic success, which is inconsistent with the immediate needs of the individual worker.

Large institutions and pension funds also increased their percentage of monies invested in those riskier markets. The influx of redirected monies from a relatively new segment of the populace fed the markets which in turn enticed more people to participate. Individual retirement accounts, which include various stocks and bonds grouped as a single investment, promised and delivered enormous returns, but they were not necessarily induced by the strength in consumer growth, the business climate, or earnings.

When the market crashed in 1987, the strain on the markets eased and so did the historically unrealistic returns on investments institutions and individuals were enjoying. When the economy began to slow in the late 1980's, (a victim of the government's borrowing that reduced the investment capital needed to sustain growth) the nation's corporations began to trim excesses to remain profitable. The rate of return on most corporate investments remained attractive, but only within an historical perspective. People weren't routinely getting 20 and 30 percent returns, and similarly, neither were large corporate pension funds, municipal funds, or union pension funds.

As the markets continued to grow at more conservative rates, but not at the rates

anticipated by these "new" investors, competition forced fund managers to put the pressure on corporate CEO's and boards to do more trimming and increase profitability. This pressure sparked corporate down-sizing with short term remedies such as spending less on research and development, fewer capital expenditures, and increased layoffs. The goal was to discourage large institutional investors from dumping their shares for more lucrative prospects. Even the illusion of corporate cutting through corporate announcements and press releases helped to provide a short-term gain in the value of the companies shares at the market overnight.

I'm told that during a photo session including a CEO of a large manufacturing firm, a manager for the New York State employees pension fund was bending the CEO's ear about the lackluster performance of the company stock. The implied threat by the fund manager was that he would pull all or part of the two million shares the fund owned out of the company and on to more profitable ventures if the price of the shares at the market, and the percent of profits dispersed as dividends, weren't increased. Soon after, an announcement was made, plants were sold or closed and jobs were cut. But this time it was different. This time job cuts were made across-the-board. Not only the people with the least seniority or the most undesirable performance were let go, but whole departments indiscriminately. This particular company, by the way, still managed a billion dollar profit that year.[6]

No longer does seniority, attendance or performance matter in the corporate equation. Companies respond almost immediately to financial market demands which are fueled by unreasonable expectations and greed. Corporations, no longer tempered by

strong labor unions[7], create and exploit the anxiety in the work place. From executives to laborers, the fear of losing one's job is very real.

Adjusting wages "across the board", as opposed to performance, eliminates the only bargaining tool a laborer has: his labor-power, that is the level of his or her ability to produce.

> "Perhaps the single most important factor in the growing fragility of the economy is the developments in labor markets. Deriving from both structural change within the economy and adverse economic policy, these developments have caused declining wages and widespread job insecurity. Capital mobility has increased, enabling firms to freeze wages and benefits or to obtain outright concessions under a threat of relocation. These problems would be bad enough in an economy with strong labor unions and low unemployment, but they are likely to be worsened in an economy in which labor is weak and companies not only lay off workers but also force wage concessions from those not laid off."[8]

If you walk through many companies in Upstate New York, and particularly Eastman Kodak, their is a sense that employees are trying to understand the new corporate climate. However, as anxiety and fear builds within the organization, a strange corporate justification begins to surface as you talk to employees about their concerns. Statements like, "*But at least I have a job,*"or "*I didn't receive a cost-of living increase, but then nobody did.,*" and "*I don't care what the CEO makes, as long as he turns this place around to be more competitive.*"are routine phrases during many conversations. Though having been spared yet another layoff, or mass firing, the explanation for the company's actions seems to take on the corporate voice. It is as though the corporations have successfully co-opted the victims for their own internal propaganda. It reminds me of, what is referred to as, the "Stockholm Syndrome"[9] in which the victim grows to admire and respect his/her captor for sparing them the torture (layoffs) that were inflicted on others.

The new corporate culture values information and knowledge at the expense of labor. In the transition from a industrial/manufacturing based economy to a post-industrial, technologically based economy (knowledge is valued over labor) information becomes the 'currency' which makes the electronic media (print media, cable television, computers and the Internet) the 'bank'. Marshall McLuhan talks about the changing nature of private corporations in a post-industrial economy in his book *Understanding Media* this way:

> "The distinctive feature of the 'electronic age' is then the increasing significance of information. Information has become the crucial commodity and, in turn, commodities have increasingly assumed the character of information".[10]

McLuhan also suggests that learning and knowing become increasingly central. That with electronic technology "all forms of employment become "paid learning" and all forms of wealth result from the movement of information."[11]

Twenty five years later that form of "paid learning", the actual participation in the work place during the transition, is itself questionable in light of wholesale buy-outs and layoffs of labor regardless of knowledge and technical skills. In part the situation seems less determined by the cyclical nature of economies than to the increasing use of individuals as "currency". Rather than Karl Marx's idea of labor as "value", any employee now can be leveraged for the short-term profitability of the private corporation.[12]

New Zealand Sociologist, Barry Smart, writes about the post-industrial condition:

> "The motivation behind the continuing development and deployment of labour-saving automated and computer controlled production technologies when there is no shortage of labor remains a matter of concern. Certainly it is questionable whether the principle impulse behind such developments is economic rather than, for example, the combined and compounded compulsions, interests, beliefs, aspirations of the military, management, and technical enthusiasts." [13]

Alan Sekula argues against,"the commonly held view that the computer and telecommunications are the sole engines of the third industrial revolution". He goes on to say, "I am arguing for the continued importance of maritime space in order to counter the exaggerated importance attached to that largely metaphysical construct, "cyberspace," and the corollary myth of "instantaneous" contact between distant spaces."

Politics of Representation

The production of photographs for corporate communications is somewhat problematic. Superficially, presenting corporate propaganda successfully in the form of a photographic image seems fairly straight forward. That is until you realize that the color of the light is most disagreeable, especially on film; the objects to be photographed are not the most appropriate and may need to be disguised; and the employee designated to be a subject, or the prop, has only a sketchy idea of what this adventure is about. A great deal of preparation goes into making just one image, with a great deal of emphasis on excluding information, either by framing or by lighting. The result often appears as if the photographer just happened upon the scene and captured the "decisive moment". And the success of that image can be judged by how well the visual information was *managed*.

Corporate photography is meant to be evidence, documentary in nature, that lends the greatest amount credibility to a company message. To become aware, and begin to understand the complexity of the issues surrounding documentary photography is to understand why the genre fits so well in the corporate lexicon. Observing the complexity of such staged political images as these, photo-historian and critic Abigail Solomon-Godeau writes:

> "set into motion ample testimony to the problems, ambiguities, and conundrums that hover, acknowledged or not, around the epistemological constructions such as 'documentary photography,' instrumental intentions (e.g. political or art photography as discreet practices), and the discursive mutability of photography in general. These issues far exceed the question of what has been represented within the photographic frame and turn on subject/object relations, spectatorial address and reception, venue and context of presentation, and the

power relations inscribed in the agency of the look- the viewer's, the photographer's and the photograph's."[14]

The photographs presented in my thesis show, especially the twelve images in the large room, were constructed to edify the subversive intentions by corporate entities towards it's labor in a format that is traditionally used to support it. By de-emphasizing the identity of the human subjects, the viewer is encouraged to examine the stance, the quality of light, and the framing of a corporate image. Maintaining the anonymity of the subjects in these images is a conscience effort to frame an argument centered on a corporation's need to objectify the performance of the labor force by the same measure as the machines they work on and the objects they produce. By withholding information within the frame rather than from the frame, the burden of meaning and intentions is on the institution that commissioned the work. By re-presenting corporate images in such way, my goal is to challenge the established structures within which corporations speak. As Alan Sekula writes:

"For the problem confronting any genuinely radical cultural production is not simply a matter of transforming existing forms through the insertion of some new politicized content or subject matter, but rather to intervene on the level of the forms themselves, to disrupt what the forms put in place."[15]

The work of Uta Barth, a contemporary artist teaching at the University of California at Riverside, employs similar strategies of de-emphasizing detail. She says of her work, "I keep trying to find ways to shift the viewer's attention away from the object they are looking at and toward their own perceptual process in relation to that object."[16] Although her work has little in common with the political overtones I'm examining, her work does use light and space to challenge the viewer to examine the conventions of the image without specific clues.

> "Barth offers only the most isolated clues as to content. Conceived so that an isolated detail stands in for a larger reading of the implied whole, each piece thus conjures a moment in a trajectory of seeing, as if the eye had fallen on a series of elements within a familiar space and these were remembered and the space of memory."[17]

Artist Jeff Wall uses large light boxes to produce "super photographs" that try to accomplish a similar effect using light and space.

> "But in a luminescent picture the source of the image is hidden and the thing is a de-materialized or semi-dematerialized projection. The site from which the image originates is always elsewhere, And this "elsewhere" is experienced, maybe consciously, maybe not, in experiencing the image."[18]

The use of light boxes for the twelve photographs was intentional. First, it re-presents the employee photographs in a format that is traditionally reserved for advertising: the trade show. And second, all twelve images can be viewed simultaneously, similar to the printed page.

The challenge of producing overtly political art, such as *Shooting the Touchers,* is very problematic. In part, my show illuminates the dilemma of being part of the very institution intended to be critiqued: corporate communications, and by association the photographic institution that resides within RIT. One of the perils of political photography, as it was used by the likes of Jacob Riis, and later Walker Evans in the 1930's, is that it is often times commissioned by the same system that created the issues represented in the photographs. Solomon-Godeau writes:

> "We must ask whether the place of the documentary subject as it is constructed for the more powerful spectator is not always, in some sense, given in advance. We must ask, in other words, whether the documentary act does not involve a double act of subjugation: first, in the social world that has produced its victims; and second, in the regime of the image produced within and for the same system that engenders the conditions it then re-presents."[19]

I believe corporate photography, not only exemplifies this proposition, but thrives on the power of the "double-act" to enhance its message. But to critique as I have done, the systems active within corporate photography and corporate communications in general, is not without risk. I attempted in *Shooting the Touchers* to make the objects anonymous, to enable the images to be free of issues surrounding re-presentation. Alan Sekula uses the example of Fred Lonidier and his work called "The Health and Safety Game" (1976) that deals with the 'handling' of industrial injury and disease by corporate capitalism and talks about the perils with this kind of art.

> "The danger exists, here as in other works of socially conscious art, of being overcome by the very oppressive forms and conditions one is critiquing, of being devoured by the enormous machinery of material and symbolic objectification. Political irony walks a thin line between resistance and surrender."[20]

A good example of that dilemma is illustrated in the work of Bill Bamberger who photographed soon-to-be jobless employees in a North Carolina furniture factory. *Factory Lives* is a photo essay dealing with the worker's and the plant they prepared to shut down. The White Furniture Company was closing its doors after over one hundred years of manufacturing fine furniture in the small town of Mebane, North Carolina. The reason was the company had been consumed in a merger and it was not in the new company's interest to keep it open. Bamberger said he was impressed by the way the employee's talked "in hushed pride" about their company. It seems that Bamberger wanted to make a political statement about the senselessness of 200 people losing their jobs in a once productive factory fallen victim to a corporate merger. To me, however, the photographs seem to fall over the "thin line" Sekula talks about. Bamberger surrenders any chance of change or

effect by photographing the persons in a stance that itself suggests resignation.[21] Referring to documentary photography, Sekula references the need for the genre to be subject to political critique. Why was it commissioned? What are the underlying motivations of the project? Who does it serve? To whom does it do injustice?

Shooting the Touchers needs to be critiqued in the same manner if it is to survive Sekula's call for a new documentary style. "A truly critical social documentary will frame the crime, the trial, the system of justice and its official myths."[22] I have tried to frame, most directly, the crime by placing *The Toucher* in direct opposition to *The Shooters.* If their is any failure (that I'm willing to identity) it would be that "the trial" of the corporate communications regime, was held in an art school and not a union hall. However, I've tried to frame the work not only as a critique of the corporate communications regime as a whole, but more specifically RIT and it's photographic institution that continues to produce corporate image-makers. In that respect, the place of my show could not have been more appropriate.

Selected Bibliography

Bamberger, Bill. "Factory Lives." *Double Take.* Fall 1995.

Barth, Uta. *At the Edge of the Decipherable: Recent Photographs by Uta Barth.* Los Angeles: The Museum of Contemporary Art. 1995.

Crow, Thomas. "Profane Illuminations: Social History and the Art of Jeff Wall." *Artforum.* February 1993.

Heilbroner, Robert. *Teachings from the Worldly Philosophy.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company. 1996.

Johnson, Haynes. *Sleepwalking Through History, America in the Reagan Years.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company. 1991.

Levine, Robert., Thomas Palley. "Recipe for a Depression." *The Atlantic Monthly.* July 1996.

Price, Mary. *The Photograph: A Strange Confined Space.* Stanford: Sanford University Press. 1994.

Rosenblum, Naomi. *A World History of Photography.* New York: Abbyville Press. 1984.

Sekula, Alan."Dismantling Modernism: Reinventing Documentary." *Photography Against the Grain, Essays and Photoworks.* Halifax: The Press of Nova Scotia College of Art and Design. 1985.

Sekula, Alan. *Fish Story.* Rotterdam: Wittte de With Center for Contemporary Art. 1995.

Smart, Barry. *Modern Conditions, Postmodern Controversies.* London: Routledge. 1992.

Solomon-Godeau, Abigail. "Who is Speaking Thus?" from *Photography at the Dock.* Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press. 1991.

Thurow, Lester. "Why Their World Might Crumble." from a Special Issue on the Rich. *New York Times Magazine.* November 1996.

Traylor, Janet. "The George Gund Foundation." *Photo District News.* October 1996.

Footnotes

1. For example, fifteen years ago Taylor Instruments Company made various kinds of instrumentation in Rochester, NY. After decades of operation it was then sold to a British firm, whose US offices were located in North Carolina, and re-named Kent-Taylor. Several years later it was sold to Asea Brown Boveri, a Swedish company. It then became ABB Kent-Taylor. And just last month it was renamed ABB Instrumentation Inc.

2. Allan Sekula, *Fish Story.* (Rotterdam: Wittte de With Center for Contemporary Art. 1995) page 50.

3. Allan Sekula, *Fish Story.* (Rotterdam: Wittte de With Center for Contemporary Art. 1995), page 43.

4. Friedrich Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, 1845, trans. and ed. W.O. Henderson and W.H. Chaloner (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1968), p.30.

5. Haines Johnson, *Sleepwalking Through History, America in the Reagan Years. (*New York: W.W. Norton & Company. 1991). throughout this book Johnson describes the impact of these new investments on the American economy.

6. Steve Kelly, a staff photographer at Photo Resources Dept. at the Eastman Kodak Company, during a conversation in reference to the 1991 Eastman Kodak Annual Report.

7. President Reagan's dismissal of the air traffic controllers in 1981, a reversal of the National Labor Relations Board traditional support of Labor unions.

8. Thomas Palley. Robert Levine. "Recipe for a Depression." *The Atlantic Monthly.* (July 1996). Page 43.

9. The "Stockholm Syndrome"originates from an incident surrounding a bank robbery in Stockholm during the 1970's in which the hostages emotionally associated with the robbers rather than the police that were negotiating a surrender.

10. Barry Smart. *Modern Conditions, Postmodern Controversies.* (London, Routledge, 1991) p.141.

11. Karl Marx. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, (New York. Random House. Vintage Books. 1977).

12. Robert Heilbroner. *Teachings from the Worldly Philosophy. (*New York: W.W. Norton & Company. 1996).

13. Smart, Barry. *Modern Conditions, Postmodern Controversies*. (London, Routledge, 1991) p.187.

14. Smart, Barry. *Modern Conditions, Postmodern Controversies*. (London, Routledge, 1991) p.189.

15. Abigail Solomon-Godeau. "Who is Speaking Thus?" from *Photography at the Dock.* (Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press. 1991). p 189.

16. Elizabeth A.T. Smith. *At the Edge of the Decipherable: Recent Photographs by Uta Barth. (*Los Angeles: The Museum of Contemporary Art. 1995.) p.3.

17. Elizabeth A.T. Smith. *At the Edge of the Decipherable: Recent Photographs by Uta Barth. (*Los Angeles: The Museum of Contemporary Art. 1995.) p.5.

18. Jeff Wall. *Typology, Luminescence, Freedom, Selections from a conversation with Jeff Wall.* p.99

19. Abigail Solomon-Godeau. "Who is Speaking Thus?" from *Photography at the Dock.* (Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press. 1991). p 183

20. Alan Sekula. *Photography Against the Grain, Essays and Photoworks 1973-1983*, (Halifax, The Press of Nova Scotia College of Art and Design.) p.53.

21. "Factory Lives: Photographs by Bill Bamberger".*Double Take*, (Fall 1995). p43.

Duplicate Transparency

MARTEN CZAMANSKE
© 1996

Duplicate Transparency

MARTEN CZAMANSKE
© 1996

Duplicate Transparency

MARTEN CZAMANSKE
© 1996

Duplicate Transparency

MARTEN CZAMANSKE
© 1996

Duplicate Transparency

MARTEN CZAMANSKE
© 1996

Duplicate Transparency

MARTEN CZAMANSKE
© 1996

Duplicate Transparency

MARTEN CZAMANSKE
© 1996

Duplicate Transparency

MARTEN CZAMANSKE
© 1996

Duplicate Transparency

MARTEN CZAMANSKE
© 1996

Duplicate Transparency

MARTEN CZAMANSKE
© 1996

Duplicate Transparency

MARTEN CZAMANSKE
© 1996

Duplicate Transparency

MARTEN CZAMANSKE
© 1996

Duplicate Transparency

MARTEN CZAMANSKE
© 1996