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Abstract

Vancouver-based photographer Fred Herzog (1930-2019) and artist Jeff Wall (b. 1946) both represent their city’s topography. Herzog’s colourful images of Vancouver produced between the 1950s and 1970s reveal his interest in portraying locality as a key framework to explore the city’s topography. Wall often presents Vancouver as a backdrop for his staged, tableau images that explore European art history and cinematography. One of Wall’s earliest works, Landscape Manual (1969-1970), reveals his interest in picturing Vancouver’s suburban topography to explore conceptual art-making processes. This thesis argues that both Herzog and Wall offer distinctive interpretations of how to picture topography. This research draws from academic theorizations about place-making and photography. In addition, I have employed analyses about the materiality of photographic images, as well as the flâneur figure, to investigate how both Herzog and Wall prioritize processes involved in critically observing topography and creating photo-based art.
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Introduction: Picturing Topography in Vancouver

This thesis explores Vancouver-based photographer Fred Herzog (1930-2019) and artist Jeff Wall (b. 1946), and focuses on their images of the city’s topography from the late 1950s to the early 1970s. Fred Herzog immigrated to Canada from Germany in 1952, and moved to Vancouver in 1953 after briefly living in Toronto. He began taking photographs of Vancouver’s neighbourhoods in 1957, and continued to represent the city’s colourful local environments for decades. Conversely, Wall is an internationally acclaimed artist who was born in Vancouver and has lived there nearly all his life. While he is known today for his large, colourful images produced in the 1980s and 1990s that often contain art historical references, one of his earliest works, Landscape Manual (1969-1970), explores early conceptual art-making processes by picturing the city’s suburban topography from a car. Landscape Manual reflects a disengagement with Vancouver’s specific landmarks and shows its suburban neighbourhoods as unidentifiable, defeatured spaces. This approach to picturing Vancouver is rooted in conceptual art, and differs greatly from Herzog’s portrayal of the city’s locality. In this thesis, I argue that analyzing Herzog and Wall together reveals the ways they both thoughtfully address the crucial question of how to see and understand topography in Vancouver through photo-based art.

Topography is a key term in this research. The term topography is used in this thesis to describe the assemblage of both natural features and the built environment within a specific geographical area. The Oxford Canadian Dictionary of Current English defines topography as: “A detailed description, representation on a map, etc., of the natural and artificial features of an area.” Geographer Benjamin F. Coles also centres topography in the broader study of cultural geography. He defines topography as: “…a methodological encounter with place that utilizes
different types of writings, and more broadly, ‘texts,’ to engage with place and place-making and to (re)present the interrelations between its ‘surfaces’ and ‘structures.”"7 Topography is also differentiated from locality, which is a term used in this thesis to describe the distinctively local features of a specific geographical area, such as Vancouver. Christos Dikeakos’ understanding of how artists have pictured Vancouver’s topography in their photo-based work enriches these definitions.8 He describes his early black-and-white photographs of Vancouver shot from a car window in the late 1960s and early 1970s: “My views were driving in a direction of west to east, passing through semi-industrial foreground of the city’s smokescreen, capturing the city downtown skyline from a distance given its location — as a process of discovery of the topographical and notional fabric of the city.”9 Dikeakos’ commentary recalls the approach of New Topographics photographers Robert Adams, Lewis Baltz, Frank Gohlke, and Stephen Shore who represented human-made features, industrial environments, and the changing built environment as key components of American landscapes during the 1960s and 1970s.10

Through the representation of topography, artistic process emerges as another key idea in this study. Art-making process is defined here as the process by which artists create their works. Herzog often walked throughout the city, and patiently observed environments as he waited for a thought-provoking interaction or to see an eclectic shop window.11 This process leads to explorations of his work in relation to urban viewership, the flâneur figure, and scopophilia.12 Wall also emphasizes process in Landscape Manual, which privileges his experience of creating the work rather than the completed work itself. Black-and-white photographs in this artwork appear to be hastily shot from a car window, while passages written on a typewriter describe his own experiences and observations travelling through suburban Vancouver in a car. Furthermore,
words and sentences are occasionally crossed out with a thin black pen or marker, and other words are added, which helps audiences interpret the process of writing and assembling *Landscape Manual*. Process is also a key consideration in broader dialogues about conceptual art during the 1960s and 1970s. For both Herzog and Wall, their art-making processes, and distinctive ways that they explore and picture topography in Vancouver through their photo-based artwork, are critical points of analysis.

This thesis aims to generate nuanced understandings of photography in Vancouver by illustrating the ways that both Herzog and Wall were part of artistic milieus that prioritized the camera as an instrument to closely examine topography. Herzog chooses to prioritize the local in his representations of topography, and repeatedly shows the city’s waterfront, eclectic shop window displays, colourful barbershops, street signage, and billboard advertisements. In contrast, Wall’s *Landscape Manual* is a printed booklet with black-and-white images of suburban neighbourhoods in Vancouver shot from a car, paired with his own written reflections about travelling through suburbia. The refusal to explore locality in *Landscape Manual* privileges a conceptual focus that emphasizes the process of moving through and picturing topography, rather than displaying its site-specificity. Interestingly, Herzog witnessed the destruction of, and devastation in, the landscape in Germany as a teenager during World War II, and how the environment became “defeatured.” Herzog’s photographs of Vancouver reveal an interest in exploring his new home’s vividness. Meanwhile, Wall is witnessing his home city being transformed by interests that threaten to destroy locality to erect a dull sense of “sameness” within the landscape during the late 1960s and early 1970s. This is particularly evident in *Landscape Manual*’s grainy, black-and-white photographs of unidentifiable and startlingly similar homes, cars, and neighbourhoods.
in Vancouver’s suburbs. Herzog and Wall, therefore, are both reacting to “defeaturedness” from opposite angles in their photographic examinations of topography.

During the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, Herzog’s work was not widely recognized in Vancouver’s artistic communities, or the broader city. Christos Dikeakos observed in an interview: “So, the Vancouver photo aesthetic that we’re all familiar with now with Fred actually comes through that major 2007 Vancouver Art Gallery exhibition, which was basically unseen or unshown for decades…” Jeff Wall’s essay about Fred Herzog, “Vancouver Appearing and Not Appearing in Fred Herzog’s Photographs” (2011), which has been published in books such as *Fred Herzog: Photographs* (2011) and the *AA Files* journal in 2012, highlights Wall’s thoughtful consideration of Herzog’s work as he studied it later in his career. Analyzing this essay is crucial for the study of how Wall and Herzog picture topography, either by using it as a stage for conceptual art processes or embracing the city’s locality, in their photo-based art.

Studying these ways of interpreting topography in Vancouver additionally reveals how art can prioritize distinctively personal understandings of a region. Herzog and Wall do not depict topographical analysis as a scientific, objective process. Herzog’s work was initially and briefly interpreted as artistic photography in the late 1960s, but by the 1990s and early 2000s, curators and art critics frequently analyzed his work as documentary images that portrayed the vibrancy of Vancouver’s historical businesses and neighbourhoods. Herzog said of his approach in an interview with curator Grant Arnold, “It was my goal from the start to show city vitality.” Jeff Wall also described his understanding of Vancouver with art historian Jean-François Chevrier: “So, Vancouver is my hometown, the place I was born in. But I’ve tried to see it and experience it as if it was not.” This thesis aims to fill a gap in existing literature by focusing on diverse
artistic representations of topography that centre the artists’ experiences travelling through the city. Herzog and Wall are rarely analyzed alongside one another, and yet emphasizing this approach, as well as supporting it with Wall’s essay about Fred Herzog, offers a new way of understanding Herzog’s images in relation to artistic photography, as well as Wall’s early conceptual work in relation to broader interpretations of Vancouver’s topography.

**Literature Review**

To date, there are numerous academic sources that focus on Wall and his longstanding career, but few scholars have written about Herzog’s images. While Wall’s essay about Herzog, “Vancouver Appearing and Not Appearing in Fred Herzog’s Photographs” (2011), analyzes Herzog’s consideration of locality within Vancouver, and the history of the city’s built environment, other sources enhance existing literature about Herzog. Exhibition catalogues and books that describe Herzog’s work include: Grant Arnold’s and Michael Turner’s *Fred Herzog: Vancouver Photographs* (2007); *Unfinished Business: Photographing Vancouver Streets 1955-1985* (2005) by Bill Jeffries, Glen Lowry and Jerry Zaslove; *Fred Herzog: Photographs* (2011) by Claudia Gochmann, Sarah Milroy, Jeff Wall and Douglas Coupland; and *Fred Herzog: Modern Colour* (2017) by David Campany, Hans-Michael Kœtzle, and Jeff Wall. Two key articles with commentary from Herzog himself about his work include “Colour His World: The Photography of Fred Herzog,” by Meeka Walsh and Robert Enright in *Border Crossings* (2011), and Timothy Taylor’s 2013 article in *Canadian Art*, “The Way Things Are: Fred Herzog’s Art of Observation.”

These sources contain essays that describe Herzog’s life and early years in Canada, how he created his images, the photographic technology he used, and how his artwork has been analyzed and displayed in art galleries. They highlight the ways Herzog represented the distinctive-
ness of Vancouver’s topography. *Unfinished Business: Photographing Vancouver Streets* 1955-1985 is a key source for this study, as it contains an essay by Herzog about his art practice, as well as other essays by Rob Brownie and Annabel Vaughan, Christos Dikeakos, Bill Jeffries and Petra Watson that outline photo-history in the city, and how artists pictured topography in various ways. Lengthy interviews with Herzog, such as those published in *Fred Herzog: Vancouver Photographs* (2007) and *Border Crossings* (2011) furthermore enrich existing analyses of Herzog’s images, as they crucially show how he interpreted his images, photographic processes, and the city of Vancouver itself. Key essays within these publications, including David campeny’s “Of Time and Place,” as well as Hans-Michael Kœtzle’s “I Wanted to Show the World the Way It Is”: Remarks on the Colour Photography Oeuvre of Fred Herzog” in *Fred Herzog: Modern Colour* (2017) provide valuable insight into Herzog’s way of picturing topography, as well as the history of Vancouver’s artistic environments and photographic technology during the 1950s and 1960s. These essays additionally describe the earlier part of Herzog’s career in the 1960s and 1970s when few people within and outside of Vancouver knew about his work, as well as how his images gained critical acclaim in the early 2000s. This literature provides distinctive historical and artistic contexts for my study.

Wall’s early conceptual work, *Landscape Manual* (1969-1970) is a key area of focus for authors who assess the defeatured landscape and early photo-based, conceptual artwork and art-making processes in Vancouver. Essays that feature extensive analyses of this work include, “Photoconceptual Art in Vancouver” (1990) by Ian Wallace, Scott Watson’s “Discovering the Defeatured Landscape” (1991), and Dennis Wheeler’s “The Limits of the Defeated Language: A Review of *Four Artists*” (1970). These authors define the defeatured landscape as a way of
showing topography without alluding to its site-specificity; they also highlight how this way of picturing topography interested artists in Vancouver exploring conceptual art-making processes during the 1960s and 1970s. Grant Arnold’s book chapter, “Reference/Cross Reference: Conceptual Art on the West Coast” in *Traffic: Conceptual Art in Canada 1965-1980* (2011), is another key source that explores how *Landscape Manual* fits in a broader conceptual interest in picturing topography and map-making within Vancouver during the 1960s and 1970s. Christos Dikeakos’ essay, “A Vast and Featureless Expanse: the *car rides & street scans, 1969/1971*” (2005), as well as Dikeakos’ commentary in Adam Lauder’s article about Robert Smithson in Vancouver published in *Canadian Art* in 2015, are two other sources that complement the analysis about Wall’s *Landscape Manual*. They illustrate how Dikeakos, as another Vancouver-based artist, was also interested in exploring conceptualizations about topography and landscape through photo-based art. This body of literature about *Landscape Manual* and early photo-based, conceptual explorations of topography in Vancouver will be analyzed in relation to studies about historical landscape representation in Canada by Jonathan Bordo, John O’Brian, Carol Payne, and Anne Whitelaw to highlight how Wall re-interprets and ironizes existing understandings of landscape representation in his work.

Additional sources help to situate Wall’s work within conceptual art of the 1960s and its use of photography. These sources focus on artworks such as Dan Graham’s *Homes for America* (1966-1967) (fig. 1), Joseph Kosuth’s *One and Three Chairs* (1965) (fig. 2) and *The Bowery in two inadequate descriptive systems* (1974-1975) (fig. 3) by Martha Rosler. Artists Jeff Wall and Dan Graham, as well as authors Elisabeth Schellekens, Carolyn Wilde, Steve Edwards and Mark Lewis argue that these artworks are critical to early conceptual art interests. Their analyses
highlight how Wall’s *Landscape Manual* presents information in text passages as well as black-and-white images of suburbia in Vancouver shot from a car, to prioritize the experience of traveling through the landscape. Their writing links *Landscape Manual* to diverse ways of presenting information, which is evident in *Homes for America* (fig. 1), *One and Three Chairs* (fig. 2), and *The Bowery in two inadequate descriptive systems* (fig. 3) and demonstrates how conceptual artists working in the 1960s and 1970s often aimed to question what is deemed to be knowable and understood through their art-making processes.31 Jim Berryman, Ruth Blacksell and Heather Diack complement these ideas with their detailed analyses on conceptualism’s characteristic deadpan humour, emphasis on process, and privileging of language and text during this time period.32

Leah Modigliani’s (2018) book, *Engendering an avant-garde: The Unsettled Landscapes of Vancouver Photo-Conceptualism*, explores how experimental and conceptual artistic practices connected Vancouver with international audiences and art markets in the 1990s and early 2000s, particularly in the work of photo-based artists such as Roy Arden, Stan Douglas, Rodney Graham, and Jeff Wall.33 She particularly highlights the ways these artists learned from one another as students and professors at fine arts programs, such as those within Emily Carr University of Art + Design, the University of British Columbia, and Simon Fraser University.34 Modigliani notes the ways these artists’ practices focused on Vancouver by addressing suburbanization and the development of new infrastructure that replaced existing buildings from the nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries.35 Wall’s essay on Herzog (2011) identifies these changes to Vancouver’s topography as serious concerns, and highlights how Herzog was able to thoughtfully cap-
ture Vancouver’s distinctive neighbourhoods and histories. Modigliani links Wall’s preoccupation with these histories to the ways he, as well as other artists, aimed to create images of a “defeatured landscape” that did not represent how an artist imagined landscapes, such as Emily Carr’s paintings of natural environments in British Columbia, but rather aimed to separate the artist from specific local nuances to present Vancouver as any other large North American city. Interpreting Wall’s early conceptual work, *Landscape Manual* (1969-1970), alongside Herzog’s images offers a new way of considering how artists used the camera to picture and explore topography in diverse ways within the city during this time period.

Sources from other disciplines such as cultural studies, history, urban studies, and geography will enrich this research and illustrate how artists use lens and photo-based art to critically explore topography. Articles by Mia Hunt (2014) and Gillian Rose (2008), as well as Maarten Loopmans, Gillian Cowell and Stijn Oosterlynck (2012) address how cities are photographed. These authors consider place-making and auto-photography, as well as how the process of creating, exhibiting and discussing photographs helps communities understand place and environment. Analyses about the flâneur figure, and urban viewership, are central to my arguments about seeing and photographing topography. David Frisby’s chapter, “The Flâneur in Social Theory,” in *The Flâneur* (1994), edited by Keith Tester examines Walter Benjamin’s writings about the flâneur figure in urban spaces to investigate the ways photography prioritizes urban looking and creative interpretations of specific sites. Dikeakos’ 2005 essay, as well as Wallace’s essay, “Street Photos 1970,” which were both published in *Unfinished Business: Photographing Vancouver Streets 1955 to 1985* enrich these analyses of the flâneur figure. While Dikeakos introduces the concept of the North American “vehicular-flâneur” who drives throughout suburbia in
Vancouver to observe and represent it; Wallace highlights the correlations between photo-based art, collage, and seeing Vancouver as a multifaceted, readable document. These academic and artistic conceptualizations about place-making, picturing topography, the flâneur figure, and collage are significant to my study of Fred Herzog and Jeff Wall. They highlight how their differing approaches to picturing topography enrich and question existing understandings of what Vancouver is, and how residents experience it as they walk or drive through its neighbourhoods.

Methodology and Theory

My research draws on collections and archival material in Vancouver at the Vancouver Art Gallery, the Equinox Gallery, and the Morris and Helen Belkin Art Gallery at the University of British Columbia. It also draws on archival material at the National Gallery of Canada in Ottawa. The Vancouver Art Gallery and the Equinox Gallery are each celebrated for their institutional focus upon the history of photography within Vancouver. The Morris and Helen Belkin Art Gallery’s archives additionally include numerous articles, exhibition reviews and documents from the late 1960s and 1970s that assess early conceptual art in Vancouver, and particularly the work of Tom Burrows, Duane Lunden, Jeff Wall, and Ian Wallace. Books and exhibition catalogues about Fred Herzog’s work, such as *Fred Herzog: Vancouver Photographs* (2007), *Fred Herzog: Photographs* (2011) and *Fred Herzog: Modern Colour* (2017) are significant examples of literature about his work at the Equinox Gallery, as well as the libraries at the Vancouver Art Gallery and the National Gallery of Canada. Interviews with Christos Dikeakos and Ian Wallace, who are other Vancouver-based artists, are additional and key components of the study’s methodology. Both interviews were conducted via telephone in March 2022. Dikeakos’ and Wal-
lace’s insights into the work of both Herzog and Wall, as well as the history of photo-based art in Vancouver between the 1960s and 1990s, demonstrate how the camera became an important instrument to study and portray changing topography. Their commentary also highlighted the significance of artistic networks and relationships between artists in Vancouver.

This thesis analyzes the work of Herzog and Wall through three main theoretical perspectives, and focuses on the ways photography is a form of “place-making” that emphasizes how individual humans construct their identities and surrounding social communities as they observe various geographical areas. This theoretical perspective emerges from the work of Gillian Cowell, Maarten P. J. Loopmans, Stijn Oosterlynck, and Gillian Rose. Rose highlights this perspective in her article, “Using Photographs as Illustrations in Human Geography” (2008) when she observes how: “…increasing numbers of geographers are thinking about the ways that photographs can be active players in the construction of a range of different kinds of geographical knowledge.” Her specification of photographs as representation, evocation, material culture, and illustration presents the diverse ways that photography itself constructs understandings about environments. In their article published in 2012, Cowell, Loopmans, and Oosterlynck echo this perspective. They describe this concept as “place-making,” and highlight that photography both reveals and questions existing understandings of place. Yet, they also observe that photographic place-making is frequently an ongoing process. These perspectives present consistent photographic representations of topography as crucial to place-making, and consider how photographic place-making is a multi-faceted process of observation, movement through an environment, display, and evaluation.
The understanding of photographs as objects that Elizabeth Edwards and Janice Hart present in their book, *Photographs Objects Histories: On the Materiality of Images* (2004) will also be employed to study Herzog’s and Wall’s work. They write in their introduction section: “Photographs are both images *and* physical objects that exist in time and space and thus in social and cultural experience.” They additionally observe of their analytical approach: “This is intended not to attempt the impossible—to divorce the materiality of the photographic image from the image itself—but rather to consider in what ways the material influences contain or perform the image itself.” In this way, photographic images inevitably reveal a way of seeing an event or landscape. But their materiality, and simultaneous identity as objects, furthermore provides another way of understanding their significance. This is particularly relevant in studying Herzog’s and Wall’s work. For instance, Herzog’s images were initially produced as colourful slides that he showed to audiences in the 1970s and 1980s, and Wall’s *Landscape Manual* presents black-and-white photographs alongside descriptions of his own experiences within a slender paper booklet. Examining the materiality of both artists’ works will highlight crucial intersections between the way topography is pictured and photographic technology, as well as early conceptual art-making processes and a conceptual interest in the de-aestheticization of the art object.

Theorizations about the flâneur figure, particularly those by Benjamin (1999) and Frisby (1994), compose the third theoretical framework that will inform my analyses. Benjamin’s conceptualization of a flâneur figure who travels through urban spaces to both observe and document them can be applied to the ways Vancouver photographers and photo-based artists employed the camera to move through and portray local neighbourhoods as they interpreted them. Frisby’s understanding of the flâneur associates this figure with modernity, as well as highlights
the ways they simultaneously observe urban landscapes, read or interpret these landscapes as well as other relevant texts, and create additional works based upon their travels through a city.57
Recent interpretations of the distinctively North American “vehicular flâneur” figure that Dikeakos articulates in his essay in Unfinished Business: Photographing Vancouver Streets 1955 to 1985 will also enrich existing interpretations of the nineteenth-century European flâneur figure.58 Herzog’s and Wall’s work reflects the notion of the “vehicular flâneur” figure, as well as how seeing topography in Vancouver from a car renders the city as a kaleidoscopic collage.59 Analyzing these conceptualizations of the flâneur figure and urban observation will offer new ways of understanding how artists represented topography in Vancouver.

Chapter Outlines

I have organized my thesis loosely chronologically. The first two chapters are devoted to Herzog and Wall individually and a third chapter examines how Wall’s essay, “Vancouver Appearing and Not Appearing in Fred Herzog’s Photographs,” reveals a common approach to the city’s topography as a collage viewed from a car window. Following this introduction, Chapter One, “Centring Locality in Vancouver through Observation,” describes and analyzes Herzog’s photographs, and the ways he represents specific, local sites in Vancouver, such as the waterfront and shop windows in colour to explore how business owners and residents engaged with the city in their daily experiences. In Chapter Two, “Exploring Conceptual Art through Topography in Vancouver,” I analyze Wall’s Landscape Manual (1969-1970), and the ways it is both rooted in early conceptual art practice as well as reveals an interest in the “defeatured landscape” as a distinctive way of understanding Vancouver’s topography in the 1960s and 1970s.60 Studying Landscape Manual in relation to literature about North American suburbia, as well as specific studies
such as David Riesman’s *The Lonely Crowd* (1950) as well as *Learning from Las Vegas* (1968-1972) by Denise Scott Brown, Robert Venturi, and Steven Izenour, situates it within a specific historical context of increased North American suburbanization in the 1960s and early 1970s. Finally, in Chapter Three, “Jeff Wall, Fred Herzog, and Seeing Vancouver,” I examine Herzog and Wall together, with a particular emphasis on Wall’s essay about Fred Herzog and how viewing and photographing topography from a car is to see or experience the city as a collage. This also reveals how the multivalent, chaotic, and layered form of the collage is an apt model for the experience of Vancouver. The additional analysis in Chapter Three will complement the previous examinations of Herzog and Wall individually, as well as support the significance of assessing these artists together. The conclusion summarizes and consolidates this research.
Chapter One: Centring Locality in Vancouver through Observation

Fred Herzog (Ulrich Herzog) was born in Bad Friedrichshall, Germany, in 1930, and spent his childhood in Stuttgart. He immigrated to Canada as a young man in 1952, and lived briefly in Toronto before moving west to Vancouver in the spring of 1953. He initially began working on cargo ships, but by 1957, he found employment at St. Paul’s Hospital in the city as a medical photographer. Later, Herzog led the Photo/Cine Division of the University of British Columbia’s Department of Biomedical Communications beginning in 1961. In addition to this role, Herzog taught visual art at the University of British Columbia and Simon Fraser University from 1968 to 1974. He began taking photographs of Vancouver in the late 1950s, and said in an interview with art critic Robert Enright: “My best pictures were taken between 1957 and 1960, and for some reason I had it right from day one.” He would create a massive, colourful record of over 100,000 images of Vancouver’s local businesses, homes, shop windows and residents from the late 1950s to the early 2000s. Herzog stayed in Vancouver for the remainder of his life, dying in 2019. Today, his images offer present-day viewers valuable opportunities to learn about Vancouver’s history, as well as to explore the city’s vibrancy through his eyes.

In this chapter, I argue that Herzog’s photographic depictions of Vancouver represent his thoughtful, critical observations of topography as distinctly local. Critical observation was a key component of Herzog’s photographic technique, and it defines his substantial body of work, which is renowned today for the ways it captures daily life in Vancouver. This chapter begins with an examination of Herzog’s images of the waterfront topography in Vancouver, and the ways the waterfront’s built environment represented changing spaces in the 1950s. Herzog’s understanding of the flâneur figure will also be analyzed, to present how his interest in looking
and urban viewership shaped his images and identity as a photographer. Explorations of colour photography as well as specific film stock and camera technology will also be incorporated into this chapter to highlight how Herzog’s utilization of Kodachrome film and a Leica M3 camera helped him capture the vividness of the city’s topography during the late 1950s and 1960s.

Finally, interpreting Herzog’s practice as part of a greater interest in photo-based art in Vancouver situate his images in a broader regional context that prioritized camera clubs and associations as spaces of meaningful interactions between local photographers. While this chapter incorporates theoretical perspectives of the flâneur as described by Walter Benjamin, David Frisby, and Ilija Tomanic Trivundza, it also relies upon the work of Christian Patrick Monks, Timothy Taylor and Michael Turner for analyses of Vancouver’s waterfront topography, early colour photography, and the city’s photographic history. This chapter includes Herzog’s own assessments of his work in interviews with Grant Arnold, Robert Enright and Timothy Taylor.

Vancouver’s Waterfront Topography in the 1950s

Fred Herzog’s earliest images of Vancouver often show buildings, boats and people near the waterfront. CPR Pier and Marine Building (1953) (fig. 4) and Rescue (1957) (fig. 5) are two key examples of Herzog’s early interest in Vancouver’s 1950s waterfronts, and showcase the beginning of his careful observation of and enduring interest in picturing colourful local environments as a way of understanding Vancouver’s topography. Herzog described the city’s waterfront in the 1950s in an interview with art critic Robert Enright in 2011. The photographer said: “It was a very appropriate seaside city, a place with a harbour and international ships coming in. My first job was working on a freighter going to Alaska, which I got the day after I arrived in Vancouver.” In addition to CPR Pier and Marine Building (fig. 4) and Rescue (fig. 5), Herzog’s
other images of Vancouver’s harbour, such as *Princess Elizabeth* (1958) (fig. 6) and *Georgia Bridge* (1961) (fig. 7) represent his early interest in exploring the waterfront’s vividness and decidedly local topography.

*CPR Pier and Marine Building* (fig. 4) is a key representation of Herzog’s early interest in local spaces. He describes this image in an interview with Grant Arnold in 2007: “My first good pictures in Canada were from my first roll of colour film in 1953, including the picture of the Marine Building in the fog with the CPR pier in the foreground.” CPR Pier and Marine Building (fig. 4) shows the yellow, adjoining pier structures with dark brown roofs and windows. Gulls are standing on several of these roofs, and in the background, the top of the Marine Building emerges slightly from the thick blue-grey fog. This image shows a recognizable part of Vancouver’s waterfront topography and its built environment. Yet, it also highlights Herzog’s artistic interest in exploring colourful local spaces as he captures the distinct colour contrasts between the yellow pier structures, their dark brown rooftops, and the ghostly blue-grey fog. Michael Turner notes that CPR Pier and Marine Building (fig. 4) reveals the distinction between the administrative pier, and the towering Marine Building, where business executives supervised the importation and exportation of goods from Vancouver’s harbour. Comparing the pier’s older Spanish Colonial architecture to the newer Marine Building also reveals how Vancouver’s waterfront topography changed over time as the built environment expanded outward from the pier. Turner analyzes this idea in *Fred Herzog: Vancouver Photographs* (2007): “Indeed, this concentric pattern runs counter to the national narrative, a linear conception that has Vancouver’s history not as an autonomous foundation—a city built from the sea—but as a terminal for the
Canadian National Railway." Herzog thoughtfully captures these complex layers of architectural, economic, and social history within CPR Pier and Marine Building (fig. 4).

Rescue (1957) (fig. 5) is another early representation of Vancouver’s waterfront that shows Herzog’s interest in examining the city’s vivid topography at English Bay. Herzog captures a silver plane with “Rescue” featured in bold capital letters on its side, blasting off in front of broad, newly constructed modernist apartment buildings and a crowded waterfront beach. The North Shore Mountains’ vast green forests are shown in the background behind the apartment buildings. Rescue (fig. 5) presents how local housing was changing in the 1950s, and particularly the ways that modernist apartment buildings such as the ones pictured in this image were gradually replacing early twentieth-century Edwardian housing. This transformation within the city is also presented in the film, To Build a Better City (1964), which the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the City of Vancouver produced. To Build a Better City captures how municipal officials and urban planners in the late 1950s and 1960s often characterized the historical downtown residential areas, as well as parts of the Strathcona neighbourhood, as blighted and decaying. Modern, newly constructed apartment buildings, such as the ones in Rescue, and houses were perceived as representing a young, healthy urban centre. While Herzog could not have predicted how these construction projects would drastically alter the city’s appearance in future decades, Rescue (fig. 5) does show his keen observation and sensitivity to changes in the built environment.

Michael Turner also interprets how Herzog’s critical examination of the landscape is central to his photographic approach. Turner writes in his essay, “Fred and Ethel,” in Fred Herzog: Vancouver Photographs (2007) that Rescue (fig. 5), like CPR Pier and Marine Building (fig. 4),
presents Herzog’s interest in capturing split-second scenes as he observed the city. Colleague, friend and Vancouver-based artist Christos Dikeakos stated in an interview that Herzog was especially interested in representing the “decisive moment” that is commonly associated with the work of Henri Cartier-Bresson. Dikeakos explains this concept in the interview as: “…the photographic image kind of represents the essence of the picture’s existence.” Dikeakos adds: “Fred was in the hunt for that decisive moment for years, to capture the human activities of city life. He was patient, waiting and standing by to capture that ephemeral, spontaneous picture.” This spontaneity is especially evident in Rescue (fig. 5), which is an early representation of Herzog’s approach to depicting the city’s locality and understanding its distinctive topography. The plane taking off could also be interpreted as imbuing the landscape with a heroic quality, and a sense of optimism for the city’s future.

Herzog’s images of the waterfront in Vancouver can additionally be analyzed alongside the concept of place-making that Maarten Loopmans, Gillian Cowell and Stijn Oosterlynck present in a 2012 article. They write: “Place-making is considered a relational process which assembles place-elements in bundles of meaning to construct identities. This development of a shared local identity can be considered a process of social or everyday learning.” Loopmans, Cowell and Oosterlynck support this assertion with work by other scholars, including Timothy Ingold, Deborah Martin, and Doreen Massey, as well as Joseph Pierce, Deborah Martin and James T. Murphy in their definition and analysis of place-making. They also explain the fluidity of place-making, and write: “Although places might appear to have a stable identity, they are confronted with constant attempts at redefinition. Community-building initiatives often consciously engage with place-making.” In this way, photographs can reveal little-known features
of specific sites, as well as interpret cities in new ways, which is especially evident in the photography projects Loopmans, Cowell and Oosterlynck analyze in Ghent, Belgium and Bonnybridge, Scotland in the United Kingdom. Historical photographs of a city such as Vancouver can show present-day audiences what their neighbourhoods looked like, and invite reflections and discussions about how they have changed over time.

Both CPR Pier and Marine Building (fig. 4) and Rescue (fig. 5) are images featured in Fred Herzog: Vancouver Photographs (2007). This exhibition catalogue accompanied the first major exhibition of Herzog’s images at the Vancouver Art Gallery in 2007. While this exhibition helped other Vancouver residents learn about Herzog’s work, as he was not widely known at the time, it also reflects the process of place-making whereby images of a community are published and shared to help residents reflect upon it. Dikeakos describes this well-attended exhibition in an interview: “So, all of a sudden, you have Fred’s huge compendium of downtown, night and day scenes, of old neighbourhoods, of Vancouver and it was kind of a stroll of nostalgia and it was kind of neat to see a lost city of colourful Vancouver.” Exhibition reviews were published in the Globe and Mail, the Vancouver Courier, and the magazine of the Canadian Museums Association. The exhibition of these images in Fred Herzog: Vancouver Photographs in 2007 provided Vancouver residents with opportunities to view what Jeff Wall has termed the beautiful, “old Vancouver,” as well as share memories of travelling through the downtown, going to the Pacific National Exhibition (PNE), and shopping in local small businesses. While this exhibition was nationally significant, it was particularly impactful for Vancouver residents who viewed and reflected upon their familiar neighbourhoods individually and together. Herzog’s images generate understandings of Vancouver’s historical topography for present-day
audiences, and are instrumental in discussions about place-making and how residents understand the city.\textsuperscript{104}

The Flâneur and Urban Looking in Vancouver

Herzog’s role as a local photographer in Vancouver naturally led to his close examination of the nature of looking and viewership as he walked through the city. He thoughtfully describes his personal interest in urban looking as a way of understanding local topography during an interview with curator Grant Arnold that was published in 2007: “As early as 1956, I saw the city’s many manifestations in icons, archetypes and bipolar contrasts. I was both actor and \textit{flâneur}, because I wanted to know what the city feels like.”\textsuperscript{105} Herzog highlights in another interview with Robert Enright that he was not aware of the connections between the flâneur figure and photography in the 1950s and 1960s.\textsuperscript{106} However, in his commentary from 2007, he reflects upon how he was simultaneously an observer of daily life in Vancouver’s urban spaces, as well as a resident and photographer who travelled through the city to capture its colourful, local topography.\textsuperscript{107} Herzog’s camera, therefore, becomes an instrument to show the locality of what he sees in a distinctive Canadian city. Walking crucially provided him with encounters across socio-economic and cultural ranges.

Herzog’s specific description of himself as “both actor and \textit{flâneur}” connects his photographic prioritization of viewership to broader historical, literary and sociological understandings of the flâneur figure.\textsuperscript{108} Influential cultural critic and member of the Frankfurt School Walter Benjamin (1892-1940) notably described the flâneur as an individual who walked through the streets of nineteenth-century Paris to observe modern life within a bustling European city.\textsuperscript{109} He describes this figure in \textit{Arcades Project}: “The flâneur is the observer of the marketplace. His
knowledge is akin to the occult science of industrial fluctuations. He is a spy for the capitalists, on assignment in the realm of consumers.” Benjamin notes: “Basic to flânerie, among other things, is the idea that the fruits of the idleness are more precious than the fruits of labour. The flâneur, as is well known, makes “studies.” David Frisby describes the flâneur as a manifestation of the way Benjamin worked as he moved throughout Paris and other cities to both observe and document urban, daily life during the early twentieth-century. Frisby clarifies the flâneur’s three main objectives when he writes: “An investigation of flânerie as an activity must therefore explore the activities of observation (including listening), reading (of metropolitan life and of texts), and of producing texts.” He highlights that the connections between Benjamin himself and the flâneur figure reveal that the flâneur does not only travel through a city to observe it, but also is an actor through the production of analyses about what is seen.

In his own flâneur-like depictions of Vancouver, Herzog is best known for his interest in local shop windows, such as those represented in Café, Main (1960) (fig. 8), Single Bed Sheet (1960) (fig. 9) and A 1 Western (1961) (fig. 10), as spaces to explore viewership and looking to understand local topography, which in turn reveals his roles as a flâneur and photographer. Historically, windows as sites to both look out of and look into fascinated painters and photographers. Caspar David Friedrich (1774-1840), Johannes Vermeer (1632-1675), Eugène Atget (1857-1927), and Man Ray (1890-1976) explored windows as transparent, permeable sites of information exchange between people and their surroundings, or as artistic framing devices in their work. Both A 1 Western (fig. 10) and Single Bed Sheet (fig. 9) present the shop window as a space of exhibition and the display of miscellaneous colourful items, which to Herzog, signified “cultural microcosms of North American history.” However, Café, Main (fig. 8)
exemplifies Herzog’s thoughtful exploration of the flâneur figure and photography in Vancouver during the early 1960s. This image presents a Chinese man wearing a dark brown hat and light brown coat staring uneasily back at Herzog through a window. Leafy green plants line the windowsill, and the window’s thick condensation blurs the figures working behind the counter. Neon signage is visible in the window, and a reflection of overhead power lines on the opposite side of the street is also visible in the top left corner.

*Café, Main* (fig. 8) presents Herzog as a flâneur-photographer, and Herzog’s consideration of the flâneur figure through shop windows. Herzog’s identity as an observer and flâneur who examines the topography of local urban environments is clearly and immediately established through the exchange of gazes between Herzog and the customer within the café. Furthermore, this reflects how a shop window can be a site of exchange between viewers, and that Herzog as a flâneur-photographer may be observed just as he is observing his surroundings.

Catherine Lutz and Jane Collins further articulate this concept in their essay, “The Photograph as an Intersection of Gazes: The Example of National Geographic” when they write: “Under most circumstances, the photographer’s gaze and the viewer’s gaze overlap. The photographer may treat the camera as simply a conduit for the reader’s look, the ‘searchlight’ of his/her vision.”

In addition to facilitating this exchange of gazes between the photographer and photographed individual, the large café window shows how Herzog is able to observe the busy inner workings of a local business. This reflects Benjamin’s assertion that the flâneur examines commercial spaces within a city. *Café, Main* (fig. 8) is a key example of how exploring local shop windows can reveal the nuances of daily life for Vancouver residents in the 1960s, as well as the
distinctively local, urban topography of a Canadian city where residents and business owners interacted with one another.121

Many of these images that depict café and shop windows also reflect Herzog’s specific observation and representation of Chinatown in downtown Vancouver. Café, Main (fig. 8) presents an exchange of gazes through a window between Herzog himself and a Chinese customer sitting in the café, while several of his other images, such as Fishseller (1958) (fig. 11), Untitled, Pender Street, Chinatown (1961) (fig. 12), and Wig Shop, Pender Street (1991) depict businesses in and near Chinatown as key components of Vancouver’s topography. These images highlight how Chinese business owners often employed window displays with various products and bilingual signage to facilitate visual engagement from residents during the 1950s and 1960s. National Film Board photographer Gar Lunney’s black-and-white photographs of Chinatown in Vancouver, and the city’s Chinese residents, in the 1955 photo story “Vancouver’s Chinatown Largest in Canada” (fig. 13) also present an interest in Chinatown.122 However, Lunney’s images, and the text in the photo story, illustrate both the exoticization of Chinatown in Vancouver, as well as the misconception that businesses owned by Chinese entrepreneurs would not be distinguishable from other businesses in the downtown area in the coming years.123

Herzog’s photographs in contrast reveal these businesses to be a crucial part of Vancouver’s local economy and landscape for decades. They also reveal how these businesses facilitated a sense of community for Chinese residents in the city.124 For example, Herzog’s Newspaper Readers (1961) (fig. 14) presents a group of Chinese men reading the newspaper Chinese Voice in a shop window from the sidewalk.125 Wing Chung Ng describes the amount and variety of newspapers and magazines published in Vancouver’s Chinatown for Chinese residents.126 In
Newspaper Readers (fig. 14), the shop window is shown as a site of observation and social engagement, as well as illustrates how Chinese entrepreneurs, and in this instance, newspaper publishers, cultivated a sense of connection and community amongst Chinese residents in the city through their businesses.\textsuperscript{127}

Herzog’s work can also be understood in relation to broader scholarly investigations that analyze the relationship between the flâneur and photography.\textsuperscript{128} Benjamin described French photographer Eugène Atget (1857-1927), who was noted for the ways he travelled through Paris to both observe and document its changing landscapes with his camera, in the essay “Little History of Photography” (1931).\textsuperscript{129} Interestingly, Herzog may have also been quoting Eugène Atget, as his photograph Airshow (1968) (fig. 15), which shows people staring into the sky on a warm summer day, bears a striking resemblance to Atget’s Pendant l’éclipse (1912) (fig. 16), which presents a crowd of people in Paris looking at the sky during a solar eclipse. French photographer Henri Cartier-Bresson (1908-2004) emphasized that the flâneur-photographer critically observed urban life and rapidly documented its spontaneous moments with the camera.\textsuperscript{130} Susan Sontag (1933-2004) also highlighted the connections between the flâneur figure and urban photography in her book On Photography (1977).\textsuperscript{131} She identifies the flâneur-photographer as a bourgeois figure who only creates photographs of urban regions to observe them, instead of actively engaging with them or their residents.\textsuperscript{132} Scholar Ilija Tomanic Trivundza adds to the present-day body of literature that analyzes the flâneur and photography: “The photographic camera is an ideal prosthetic device for the flâneur, not only because it enables the instantaneous recording of chance findings but also because, as a medium, it is inherently open to change
The flâneur figure and urban viewership are both integral to examinations of urban photography.

Finally, it is also important to distinguish Herzog’s interest in looking and viewership as a flâneur-photographer in Vancouver from theorizations about scopophilia. Laura Mulvey defines scopophilia in her essay “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema” (1975) as: “There are circumstances in which looking itself as a source of pleasure, just as, in the reverse formation, there is pleasure in being looked at.” Mulvey’s essay focuses on scopophilia in Hollywood cinema as a force that signifies the male gaze directed at women, and the ways this gaze has been used to shape women’s behaviour and appearance in films. Herzog’s approach as a flâneur-photographer instead shows how looking was a key way of understanding Vancouver. His images from the early 1960s (figs. 8-10) present the window as a space to be looked out of and into, and where gazes could be exchanged. Chung Wah (1960) (fig. 17) and Room with Television (1967) (fig. 18) also showcase an interest in viewership. Chung Wah (fig. 17) depicts a man looking at the black-and-white photographs displayed in a shop window, while the many different images displayed on a wall in Room with Television (fig. 18) present a scene that is indicative of looking without an observatory figure. This reflects Herzog’s interest in finding scenes that are indicative of looking, and his interest in the ways photography captures the act of looking.

**Kodachrome and Colour Photography**

As Herzog depicted daily life in Vancouver’s vivid urban environments for over three decades, he simultaneously experimented with light, shadow, colour, and composition. Images such as Canada Dry (1966) (fig. 19) and Liquid Foods (1968) (fig. 20) bear a striking resemblance to Andy Warhol’s own examinations of postwar American consumerism and Pop art in the
early 1960s, while other images such as Hastings at Carrall, Looking East (1970) (fig. 21) showcase Herzog’s interest in photographically exploring the car windshield as a framing device to gaze at local environments. While Herzog’s black-and-white images often illustrate his artistic experimentation with light, shadow and contrast, it is also important to acknowledge that Herzog’s body of work is celebrated locally, nationally and internationally in part because it is a rare archive of Vancouver in colour from the late 1950s to the early 2000s.

Artistic colour photography was uncommon during the late 1950s and 1960s when Herzog began depicting Vancouver. Colour photography then was often associated with advertising, the fashion industry, and popular print media such as magazines. It became an increasingly integral part of documentary photojournalism shown in glossy American magazines such as National Geographic and The New Yorker throughout the 1930s and 1940s. In Canada, the National Film Board’s publication of Canada: A Year of the Land (1967) additionally signalled a correlation between documentation and colour photography. This book showcases vivid images from across the country that were taken by such photographers as Chris Lund, John De Visser, and Peter Varley. While Herzog’s work was not included in this publication, it was featured in The City of Vancouver (1976), which was another book that featured photographs to celebrate a specific Canadian region.

Hastings at Penticton (1960) (fig. 22) is one of Herzog’s images that exemplifies his interest in using colour photography to experiment with light and aesthetics, as well as document urban environments at night in Vancouver. This work presents the brilliance of downtown Vancouver’s neon lights at night. Glowing red, orange, pink and blue signs advertise a plethora of businesses. Taillights from cars on the road create a series of striking red lines on the right side of
the image. Hastings at Penticton (fig. 22) distinctly shows Vancouver’s locality, while at the same time presenting an artistic experiment of light, colour and shadow. Hastings at Penticton (fig. 22) illustrates how neon lights, which started to become part of Vancouver’s businesses in the 1920s and 1930s, were a key part of the downtown topography in the early 1960s. While city bylaws that discouraged the use of neon lighting were instituted in the mid-1960s, many neon signs disappeared from the downtown area a decade later. Hastings at Penticton (fig. 22) represents Herzog’s artistic fascination with colour and light, yet it also represents neon lights as key components of Vancouver’s topography in 1960.

Herzog’s images are distinctive in part because they are colourful depictions of routine life in Vancouver shot with Kodachrome film. He noted in several interviews that he felt representing Vancouver’s local, urban environments in colour appropriately captured their vitality. David Campany described Kodachrome as: “…a very fine-grained and tonally rich positive transparency film.” He added: “Kodachrome was not very sensitive to light and thus required relatively slow shutter speeds, but this, too, suited Herzog’s purposes. He preferred slow observation…” Herzog’s Kodachrome images were initially produced as slides that could be presented to audiences, as printing them with Kodak during the 1960s and 1970s was expensive. This format, and a disapproval of colour photography within mainstream artistic circles during this time period, made it difficult for Herzog to exhibit his work in galleries outside Vancouver. Instead, Herzog showed his colourful slides to local audiences in the city’s camera associations, as well as other venues. His first major exhibition was Fred Herzog: Vancouver Photographs at the Vancouver Art Gallery in 2007, and several years earlier, he had started to produce inkjet prints from digital scans of his transparency images. While these technological
developments helped replicate the colours of the original images, they also ensured Herzog’s work could be exhibited and purchased more easily.\textsuperscript{155} This enhanced his profile as a dedicated photographer both within and outside of Vancouver.\textsuperscript{156}

Furthermore, the ways technological developments shaped Herzog’s images calls attention to their materiality and simultaneous status as both images and objects, which Elizabeth Edwards and Janice Hart argue is essential to analyzing photographs in *Photographs Objects Histories: On the Materiality of Images* (2004).\textsuperscript{157} While Herzog’s slides would have appeared immaterial to audiences when he first presented them, the experience of seeing this slide show can be interpreted as material because of its multi-sensorial nature and the sense of community it fostered. Audiences would have sat together in a room and shared their ideas of the work with one another before, during, and after the slideshow presentation. They would have heard the clicking noises as slides were changed, and possibly smelled burning dust as well as seen dust rising up from the projector. Christos Dikeakos further explains the experience of seeing a slide show in an interview: “… when you see a slide show, they’re immersive, they’re very colourful, you’re seeing them in a darkened room, and they have your absolute attention.”\textsuperscript{158} The slide show would have also been a material experience for Herzog himself, who would have potentially been organizing his slides in a specific order before the show began, as well as working with the projector equipment and physically handling slides as he changed them throughout the presentation. Reflecting upon the materiality of Herzog’s early slide shows, and the sense of community they fostered amongst audience members, illustrates the significance of considering photographic images as objects. It also highlights how the presentation of these objects shaped viewers’ interpretations of what they show.
Joanna Sassoon’s chapter, “Photographic Materiality in the Age of Digital Reproduction,” within Edwards’ and Hart’s book, highlights the way a photograph’s inherent materiality is questioned when it is reproduced digitally. She writes that digitizing technology may often change the image’s colours, as well as crop out or delete visual information, and not feature inscriptions on the back, or dust on the surface of the image. While the materiality of Herzog’s images undoubtedly changed with the use of digital printing technology during the late 1990s and early 2000s, it also provides scholars with new opportunities to explore changing understandings of photographic materiality. Today, Herzog’s images are available for public viewing on numerous gallery websites, such as the Equinox Gallery, as well as in articles published online. Like the slide show presentation format, displaying Herzog’s images on websites invites interpretation about materiality. His work can appear immaterial in both slide shows and on websites. Both presentation formats are dependent on the denial of the physical in that an image can be experienced without being touched. Yet, it is also important to acknowledge that a great deal of physical technology is used to create this experience. Just Herzog showed his early work as slides in Vancouver, which fostered a material sense of community between audience members, so too might presenting his images online generate interest and discussion about his work in other communities outside of Vancouver. Herzog’s presentation of his images in various formats throughout his career illustrates how changing photographic technology has affected both the materiality and display of his images, as well as illustrated the developments of photographic technology more broadly. Further digital reproduction of his images for gallery websites, such as the Equinox Gallery in Vancouver, can lead to academic investigations of what photographic materiality means for digital platforms, and how images occupy digital space today.
Herzog’s choice of camera during the late 1950s and early 1960s, a Leica M3, also suited his method of walking throughout the city to represent it. Herzog’s first camera, a Zeiss Tessco, helped him learn about photography and how to capture images while he lived in Germany as a teenager and young adult. In 1950, Herzog began using a Retina I camera. By 1957, he had been living in Vancouver for a few years and started to use a Leica M3 camera. While a tripod was often necessary for taking pictures with the Retina I, the small, compact Leica M3 camera was preferable for walking through the city’s neighbourhoods to observe and take pictures of them. Photo-historian and curator Hans-Michael Koeztle described the camera by noting: “The Leica, which was thought-through ergonomically from the start, sat comfortably in the hand, meaning that it was also easy to handle in sensitive lighting situations, in other words, with a wide-open aperture and long exposures.” Koeztle adds that: “Those who worked with the Leica virtually fused with their camera. Taking photos with a Leica also means — little gear, minimal equipment, a certain photographic lightness of being…” Herzog’s representation of his own reflection in windows as he takes pictures, such as in U. R. Next (fig. 23) and Styling Barber Shop (fig. 24), indicate how his camera is an integral part of his identity as a Vancouver resident and observer.

Fitting Herzog into the Early History of Photography in Vancouver

Briefly exploring how Vancouver’s artistic networks began to develop in the 1930s and 1940s, and their specific prioritization of photography, reveals how the camera would become instrumental for the photo-based interest in the city’s topography that Herzog would become part of in the 1950s. During the 1940s, international salons and artist lectures were hosted by local organizations such as the Vancouver Photographic Society, which was formed in 1934, and the
Camera Arts Club, which was formed in 1938.\textsuperscript{168} Local photographers such as Hugh Aikens, Percy Bentley and Ken McAllister presented their work and information about their artistic processes at these events.\textsuperscript{169} Dutch-Canadian photographer John Vanderpant’s considerable involvement in the Vancouver Art Gallery during the 1930s helped them develop over fifty exhibitions of photographs in thirteen years, and he also hosted salons to promote photography at his portrait studio.\textsuperscript{170} He established the Vanderpant Galleries in 1926, which additionally became a centre of artistic activity and a place where visual artists, poets, and writers, gathered.\textsuperscript{171} His exhibition of works by American photographers Edward Weston and Imogen Cunningham in 1931 at the Vanderpant Galleries also prompted local discussions about artistic photography, pictorialism, and sharp-focus photography that was becoming increasingly well-known during the 1930s due to the formation of Group f/64 in California.\textsuperscript{172} Photographers such as Hugh Aikens, Percy Bentley, H. G. Cox, James Crookall, and Hugh Frith in Vancouver engaged in these discussions amongst a wider community of North American photographers throughout the 1930s.\textsuperscript{173}

Herzog was part of the local Lions Gate Camera Club, and also met other artists in the city.\textsuperscript{174} Several of these artists included Iain Baxter, Christos Dikeakos, Victor ‘Bud’ and Audrey Doray, Jack Shadbolt, and Bob Steele.\textsuperscript{175} Victor ‘Bud’ Doray was one of the founding members of the local artist-run centre Intermedia.\textsuperscript{176} Centres such as these fostered experimental approaches to photo and lens-based media in Vancouver, and strengthened relationships between artists working with photo-based media.\textsuperscript{177} Photography exhibitions at the University of British Columbia’s Fine Arts Gallery (currently known as the Morris and Helen Belkin Art Gallery) and the Vancouver Art Gallery in the 1960s, as well as the work of well-known
curator Alvin Balkind, promoted photography as an important artistic medium in Vancouver.\textsuperscript{178} For Herzog, the artists he met through local gatherings, such as Jim Breukelman, Roy Kiyooka, Shadbolt and Steele, helped him present his early images to audiences.\textsuperscript{179}

Decades later, the exhibition \textit{Unfinished Business: Photographing Vancouver Streets 1955 to 1985} (2003) at Vancouver’s Presentation House Gallery, curated by Bill Jeffries, showed a distinctive, enduring photo-based fascination with the city’s topography.\textsuperscript{180} While several of the artists whose work was included in the exhibition, such as the N. E. Thing Company, Christos Dikeakos, Jeff Wall, and Ian Wallace, represent a decidedly conceptual interest in picturing topography and examining landscape, other photographers, such as Brian Stablyk, Jack Dale, Svend-Erik Eriksen, and Herzog himself, focus on highlighting the locality of the city’s topography.\textsuperscript{181} Jeffries avoids drawing parallels between artists who may or may not have known one another, but instead poses the question: “how do cities define and identify themselves?”\textsuperscript{182} Interestingly, Herzog’s images were originally analyzed as fine art photography in his first exhibition, \\textit{Extensions}, with Jack Dale and Robbert Flick at the UBC Fine Arts Gallery in October 1969.\textsuperscript{183} However, the inclusion of his images in this exhibition, as well as \textit{In Transition: Postwar Photography in Vancouver} (1986) and \textit{The Just Past of Photography} (1994) at Presentation House Gallery, connects his work to a broader interest in topography and landscape.\textsuperscript{184}

The work shown in \textit{Unfinished Business: Photographing Vancouver Streets 1955 to 1985} frequently contrasts with the “beautiful B. C.” characterization presented in magazines such as \textit{Beautiful B. C.} and \textit{Western Living} during the 1960s and 1970s.\textsuperscript{185} Ian Wallace explains this concept in an interview.\textsuperscript{186} He says: “And in fact, both Jeff and Fred and other artists including myself, found a new kind of picturesque happening in the city like Vancouver. It was new and raw
and didn’t fit the usual mould of what you would call a pleasant looking city in the European model…” Michael de Courcy’s “Glorious Mountain View,” Dunsmuir at Richards (1976) (fig. 25) and “Mountain View,” Broadway at Granville (1976) (fig. 26) reflect Wallace’s assertion, and make fun of the characterization of “beautiful B. C.” by presenting a busy local street scene with aging buildings, signage, and overhead street car wires, and a mountain peeking through in the background. Jack Dale’s black-and-white images taken several years earlier in the late 1960s, such as Looking West, Hastings & Gore (fig. 27), and Looking West, Robson & Burrard (fig. 28), additionally show busy downtown streets that are jam-packed with prominent signage and long, sleek cars. Greg Girard’s black-and-white scenes of Vancouver from the mid-1970s resemble Dale’s work, but by the 1980s, Girard often presents colour-saturated urban regions within Vancouver, such as Parking Lot, Commissioner Street (1981) (fig. 29), Lane, 1000 block Robson Street (1981) (fig. 30), and Venus Theatre, Main Street (1982) (fig. 31). While conceptual ways of understanding topography will be analyzed in Chapter Two, these black-and-white and colour images from the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s collectively highlight how Vancouver’s locality was repeatedly assessed.

Herzog, Dale, and de Courcy position photography as a way of depicting and studying Vancouver’s urban environments from the 1950s to the 1980s. However, the early history of camera clubs and photography exhibitions within the city during the 1930s and 1940s clearly presents the medium itself as instrumental in the development of Vancouver’s artistic environments that facilitated the intense photo-based interest in the city’s topography. These histories of photographic societies, camera clubs, photographic exhibitions, and networks shaped the Vancouver that Herzog moved to in 1953 from Toronto.
Conclusion

This chapter has analyzed examples of Herzog’s work, such as *CPR Pier and Marine Building* (fig. 4), *Rescue* (fig. 5), *Café, Main* (fig. 8), and *Hastings at Penticton* (fig. 22), to explore how he thoughtfully centres locality in his representation of topography, and specifically, portrays Vancouver’s residents, businesses, and built environment. The history of Vancouver’s waterfront, as well as academic theorizations about the flâneur figure, enriched examinations of these works as well as situate them within broader scholarly discussions about changing topography, urban space, photographic history and photo-based art. Exploring photographic technology, such as Herzog’s use of Kodachrome film and the Leica M3 camera, additionally adds thoughtful interpretations of his process. Herzog’s practice is analyzed in relation to the artistic milieu in Vancouver to showcase the city’s longstanding history of photography clubs and associations that helped local photographers form meaningful connections with one another. In the next chapters, this thesis will show how Jeff Wall’s images also interpret topography in Vancouver in innovative ways that are rooted in conceptual art, as well as how analyzing Herzog and Wall together represents a distinctive way of studying the ways their work addresses topography through photo-based art.
Chapter Two: Exploring Conceptual Art through Topography in Vancouver

Vancouver started to become a centre for conceptual artistic experimentation and dialogues about photo-based art during the 1960s and 1970s. Artists such as Iain and Ingrid Baxter (N. E. Thing Company), Christos Dikeakos, Jeff Wall, and Ian Wallace were interested in art movements of the 1960s and 1970s, including Pop art, Minimalism, and conceptual art, and their works from this time period additionally indicate a consistent focus on exploring the topography of Vancouver. Their frequent examination of Vancouver’s urban and suburban areas, while denying explicit allusions to Vancouver, would become known as an interest in the “defeatured landscape.” Artists working with photo-based media were often not directly interested in exploring the site-specificity or locality of Vancouver, but rather used the suburban and industrial environments within it as critical backdrops for their interpretations of conceptual art. Conceptual artworks that explore topography through photography, performance, and video, as well as writing and language, in or near Vancouver provide an alternative assessment of the landscape that diverges from most common characterizations including in art, such as the work of Emily Carr, and tourist promotion.

This chapter will examine Jeff Wall’s Landscape Manual (1969-1970) as a key example of both early conceptual art in Vancouver, and a photo-based exploration of the “defeatured landscape” in the city’s suburban neighbourhoods. I argue that Landscape Manual represents how the city’s topography is transformed into a significant backdrop that facilitates a thoughtful investigation of conceptual art-making processes during the 1960s. This chapter begins with an exploration of Landscape Manual’s specific images and textual passages to highlight how Wall describes and portrays suburbia in Vancouver as he travels through it in a car. Furthermore,
Landscape Manual is representative of a greater conceptual interest in the “defeatured landscape,” which aimed to diminish the appearance of a place’s site-specificity in photographic images. Relevant academic literature and art criticism about the defeatured landscape will be addressed, and the work of American conceptual artist Robert Smithson will also be analyzed alongside Vancouver-based artists’ conceptual experimentations in the city. Wall’s emphasis on artistic, documentation processes will be discussed, as they are a key component of Landscape Manual. His analysis of process and the anti-aesthetic in photo-based conceptual art will also be connected to Dan Graham’s Homes for America (1966-1967) (fig. 1) and a preoccupation with North American suburbia during this time period, to situate his work within a greater sociological interest in changing urban topography. Finally, Joseph Kosuth’s One and Three Chairs (1965) (fig. 2) and Martha Rosler’s The Bowery in two inadequate descriptive systems (1974-1975) (fig. 3) will be presented as two key examples of conceptual art from this time period to link Landscape Manual to conceptual ways of thinking about objects, language, urban topography, and photo-based art.

While this chapter incorporates theoretical perspectives about photo-based art, conceptual practices, and the defeatured landscape that Christos Dikeakos, Ian Wallace and Scott Watson thoughtfully articulate, it also relies upon the work of several other art historians, scholars and critics such as Grant Arnold, Heather Diack, Leah Modigliani, John O’Brian, Sharla Sava, Elisabeth Schellekens, Anne Whitelaw, and Carolyn Wilde. These authors closely examine Wall’s work, the history of representing landscapes in Canada, and key artworks produced between the late 1960s and 1970s that present innovative ways of investigating the city of Vancouver with the camera.

Jeff Wall’s *Landscape Manual* (1969-1970) diverges significantly from historical representations of landscapes within Canada during the early twentieth-century. Art historians such as John O’Brian and Anne Whitelaw describe how landscape painting in Canada, and specifically the work of the Group of Seven, was used to create an understanding of Canadian identity, and Canada as a place of green forests, deep, blue bodies of water, and mountains, both nationally and internationally. Jonathan Bordo also observes that historical landscape painting in Canada removed Indigenous families and communities from the land. Bordo argues that early twentieth-century landscape painting in Canada represents a way of controlling the land and denying Indigenous peoples’ presence. Carol Payne’s research about the National Film Board’s Still Photography Division, and their creation of photo stories in the 1950s and 1960s, highlights how the landscape was photographically framed as a space that provided valuable natural resources for economic activities as well as reflected broader Canadian national identity. Payne also highlights that these photo stories often represent a colonial, paternalistic understanding of Indigenous peoples as individuals to be contained and controlled within the land. Wall’s inclusion of the term ‘landscape’ in *Landscape Manual* ironizes conventional historical depictions of environments. The work’s appearance and content instead highlights a distinctively conceptual emphasis on the relationships between art, writing, and urban topography in the 1960s.

Unlike the large, colourful images often shown in light boxes that Wall became recognized for during the 1980s and 1990s, *Landscape Manual* is a small, paper booklet with black-and-white images of Vancouver’s suburban neighbourhoods shot from a car window. Sharla Sava, Scott Watson and Ian Wallace highlight that *Landscape Manual* represents a “featureless”
or “defeatured landscape” without specific landmarks or sites that identify photographed regions as part of Vancouver. Landscape Manual also includes blocks of text. Words and sentences are occasionally crossed out with thick black lines, and additional ideas are added by hand with a thin black pen or marker. The prose within Landscape Manual is phenomenological, with the stream-of-consciousness passages that will be analyzed throughout this section centering personal experiences in the understanding of what a landscape is. The front cover of Landscape Manual (fig. 32) introduces the title and artist’s name, but also features a price of twenty-five cents, which artist Roy Arden identifies as part of the book’s “anti-aesthetic strategy.” Wall’s presentation of topography, and specifically suburban neighbourhoods in Vancouver, facilitates a conceptual exploration of process and picturing place.

Landscape Manual begins with an image (fig. 33) of what appears to be a suburban housing complex, with electrical wires connecting wooden telephone poles, and a small car parked in front of a large, rectangular building. The photograph (fig. 33) shows the shiny hood of the car Wall is sitting inside, and the street before the car fades into an unidentifiable grey mass. Other images within Landscape Manual (figs. 34-36) resemble this one, and present small, unidentifiable sections of suburban Vancouver from a car window. The heading above this initial image (fig. 33) is written in capital letters, and states: “From and for a Work in Progress.”
The text below it reads:

Toward a defeatured landscape on all levels, without any sense of loss, negation, subversion, etc.—reams of tiny photography. The beginning of a continuing interpretation with as yet untaken photographs, with as yet unreceived signals from the as yet existenceless future. This date, September 27, 1969, 7:15 p.m., will mark the “outset” of this endless experiment. The work in progress: sequences, interspersed with situations and spaces of a specific, dense nature—a sequence which is subtly altered, manipulated in a particular way, one procedure from a vault of endless possibilities. I myself sit here—or possibly ride in a car—and am somewhat more than just a “recording machine.”

This opening passage emphasizes the conceptual process of creating Landscape Manual, rather than the work as a finished product, as well as frames this piece as an “experiment.” Images on subsequent pages four, five and six (figs. 34-36) show similar environments, and represent the small, boxy detached homes and apartment complexes, as well as the long, shiny cars that were popular in suburban Vancouver during this time period. The images on these pages also include directions or thoughts underneath them, such as “make a U-turn to the left,” and “energetic interchange—bright—dull” on page four (fig. 34), “real scenery flashing past” and “RADIO ON” on page five (fig. 35), and “Artificial landscape. Note: tree, house, curb” on page six (fig. 36).

These images continue to portray material evidence of human life rather than specific human figures. They mirror the way Wall is clearly present within these suburban regions as he travels through them in a car; yet Wall himself is never visible. The written passages in Landscape Manual ensure Wall becomes visible, and also calls attention to the photograph as a construct.

Text passages in Landscape Manual show how Wall specifically explores his own experiences as he observes and depicts topography while driving through suburban neighbourhoods. For example, on page eight (fig. 37), Wall writes: “As the car raced over the roads, the notion developed that the conscious activity being undertaken resembled—or “was”—a kind of
diagram, a map of something, of some state. Yet it was very clear that what was being charted
was not the physical environment itself—at least, it was not only that.”219 He adds that Landscape Manual, and the process of creating it, instead reflects his own “…attention regarding the streets, the corners, the white pavement lines, the road beneath the rubber tires, the wind circulating inside the riding compartment and outside it…”220 He further explains this idea on the subsequent page (page nine) (fig. 38) when he writes: “These printed pages are likewise a graph of the attention brought to—or created out of—the conscious real-time analysis of the car-ride experience of the landscape as condition.”221 Within these passages, and other passages on pages fourteen, twenty-four, twenty-nine and thirty-six, Wall emphasizes his experiences travelling through and photographing the neighbourhoods, as well as giving instructions to readers about how to observe and take photographs of these suburban areas.222 In this way, the landscapes Wall shows are not only for him to depict. Rather, the experience of travelling through the landscape in a car becomes the artwork, and analyzing the region through photographic images and written reflections is a part of conceptually engaging with the site’s topography.

A key example of an instructional passage appears on page fifteen (fig. 39), and it illustrates the relationship between conceptual photo-based art, and suburban topography. Here, Wall highlights that it is “October 1, 1969, 3:15 p.m.” and that it is a “sunny afternoon, some rain of Apollinaire’s falls on a tree outside the window.”223 He subsequently describes what he terms a “Supplementary activity,” which is how to take photographs of the landscape from a car, and likely references the ‘supplement’ thinking of post-structuralism.224 Wall records each specific step of this process, and notes that during the printing stage, the second image should be “… printed to the same size or larger and maybe repeat the process again and again until the
landscape loses all features and becomes huge indeterminate silver bromide space, impossible to manipulate and related to everything.”225 The image of a glove compartment on page fifteen (fig. 39), as well as images of a large road in front of an apartment building and a wide highway with several other cars on page sixteen (fig. 40) do not directly reflect the quoted text on page fifteen (fig. 39). They collectively illustrate how Wall uses a combination of images and text to frame the suburban environment as a remote, unidentifiable mass without specific landmarks.226 Interestingly, Wall described 1950s Vancouver as “beautiful” during a discussion with Fred Douglas, Glen Lowry and Jerry Zaslove in 2004. He said: “I remember having what I later recognized as an aesthetic reaction to it as a child, of liking it and thinking it was beautiful but not really knowing what that meant.”227 However, Landscape Manual’s “anti-aesthetic” quality, as well as descriptions of artistic processes that showcase impersonal, defeatured suburban environments, highlights a conceptual understanding of changing suburban topography in Vancouver during the late 1960s and 1970s.228

Furthermore, Wall’s prioritization of his own perspectives and experiences, which is evident in both the framing of images from a car window and his writing, reflects a distinctive auto-photographic representation of topography. Maarten Loopmans, Gillian Cowell and Stijn Oosterlynck discuss this concept in their 2012 article.229 Loopmans, Cowell and Oosterlynck highlight that auto-photography is especially significant in theorizations of place-making, and define it as “a blend of autobiography and photography.”230 This photographic approach to picturing topography has also been discussed by many other scholars, such as Mia Hunt, Alan Latham, Melanie Lombard, and Gillian Rose interested in studying the intersections between photographic images, geography, and understandings of place.231 While Lombard and Rose identify auto-photography
as a way for researchers to prioritize the perspectives of those who have not historically been meaningfully incorporated into academic research, Latham identifies this diaristic research method as a distinctive way to show an individual’s uniquely personal understanding of their community.\textsuperscript{232} Similarly, \textit{Landscape Manual} is an example of this diaristic, personal research that pictures suburban topography in Vancouver to explore concept art-making processes. As Wall presents topography from a car window, and writes about art, life, and travelling through suburban neighbourhoods, he reveals his own uniquely personal interest in seeing topographical study as a way to explore conceptual art. He additionally reveals the broader experience of a lone driver travelling through an isolating landscape in a car as part of daily life. In this way, Wall’s \textit{Landscape Manual} reveals an interest in auto-photography to showcase both a personal and broader experience of suburbia.

\textbf{The Defeatured Landscape}

Wall’s \textit{Landscape Manual} (1969-1970) can be analyzed alongside an interest in the “featureless” or “defeatured” landscape within Vancouver’s artistic circles during the 1960s and 1970s.\textsuperscript{233} \textit{Landscape Manual}, like the early works of Christos Dikeakos, the N. E. Thing Company, and Ian Wallace, presents photographic depictions of Vancouver that do not include specific landmarks to identify the city.\textsuperscript{234} The landscape in \textit{Landscape Manual} is, therefore, “defeatured.” To viewers who are not familiar with the city, the streets, houses and apartment buildings that are represented in the manual’s images simply show North American suburbia.\textsuperscript{235} Many of these Vancouver-based artists represented suburban and industrial environments, which presented a distinctly different understanding of the idyllic, natural landscape shown in paintings by the Group of Seven and Emily Carr from the early twentieth-century.\textsuperscript{236}
Writers and critics started to use the term “defeatured landscape” to describe the early works of artists such as Wall, the N. E. Thing Company, Dikeakos and Wallace in 1970 and again in 1991. Dennis Wheeler showcases this interest in “featureless-ness” and the defeatured landscape in his review of the *Four Artists* exhibition at the UBC Fine Arts Gallery (later known as the Morris and Helen Belkin Art Gallery) in 1970. Wheeler writes: “One’s obvious initial reaction to the show is that there is a new sense of landscape, a sudden heat for the mundane suburban city stretching horizontally across the map of America. The featureless-ness of this map is what becomes energy, and there is no attempt to turn the banal into a monumental popularism.” He adds that: “This place is Vancouver, but it could as well be Chicago, Edmonton, Toronto, or anywhere. There is always a micro-identity, which is possibly singular; but it is currently overridden by the conclusive and reductive urban communication networks.” Twenty-one years later, Vancouver-based scholar and curator Scott Watson published the essay “Discovering the Defeatured Landscape” in *Vancouver Anthology: The Institutional Politics of Art*. Watson defines the defeatured landscape, as well as outlines how Vancouver-based artists frequently used the conceptualization of the defeatured landscape as a framework to explore topography in their photo-based art during the late 1960s and 1970s.

Watson identifies how relationships and dialogues between Vancouver-based artists, including Dikeakos, the N. E. Thing Company, Wall and Wallace, as well as such American artists as Dan Graham and Robert Smithson, led to this focus on landscape and topography. While Graham’s *Homes for America* (1966-1967) (fig. 1) will be analyzed later in the chapter in relation to Wall’s *Landscape Manual* to highlight conceptual ways of considering North American suburbia and magazine publishing, Watson presents Smithson as a key figure in Vancouver’s
artistic networks during this time period. Smithson developed earthwork pieces, such as *Island of Broken Glass* and *Glue Pour*, in the city while he lived there from 1969 to 1970. He was close to art critic Dennis Wheeler during this time period, and his method of scanning the landscape before identifying a site to photograph or create an earthwork within, such as *Glue Pour* (1970), interested other Vancouver-based artists.

Christos Dikeakos specifically highlights the connections between his images of industrial environments in the False Creek area of Vancouver during the late 1960s and 1970s, and Smithson’s photographic processes, in a *Canadian Art* article (2015). He said: “Smithson’s wasteland photos and Ed Ruscha’s objective photography had a direct correlation to my interest in picturing and photo-scanning the rust belt of False Creek in Vancouver.” Yet, Dikeakos also writes in his 2005 essay, “A Vast and Featureless Expanse: the *car rides & street scans*, 1969/71”: “My intent was not just to picture a local defeatured landscape similar to that written about and recorded by Robert Smithson in his observations on the entropic industrial American wastelands of urban disintegration.” He adds: “I also saw the indexing and scanning of the streets of Vancouver as part of a critical discourse on urban expansion and its social and political ramifications.” Wall also scans the suburban landscape in *Landscape Manual* as he travels through it in a car and photographs it. Wall repeatedly identifies his own consideration of the defeatured landscape throughout *Landscape Manual*. Yet, like Dikeakos, he interprets Smithson’s ideas about place and the defeatured landscape to produce a thought-provoking commentary on changing neighbourhoods during the 1960s and 1970s. His interest in the defeatured landscape, and denial of explicit references to Vancouver’s locality, also helps him position the personal experience of travelling through the landscape as the landscape itself.
This represents an innovative way of reflecting upon topography’s meaning, and how to centre personal human experiences in understandings of the landscape.  

Ian Wallace, who also photographed Vancouver’s neighbourhoods from a car, recognizes Dikeakos, Wall, and the N. E. Thing Company as key Vancouver-based artists whose artworks during the late 1960s and 1970s helped him reflect upon topography and photo-based art. He highlights in his essay, “Street Photos 1970” (2005), that Ed Ruscha’s *Every Building on the Sunset Strip* (1966) (fig. 41), Dan Graham’s *Homes for America* (1966-1967) (fig. 1), and Robert Smithson’s *Monuments of Passaic* (1967), (fig. 42) are other photographic studies of built environments that signalled a distinctive way of examining urban and suburban topography with the camera during the late 1960s. Miles Orvell connects Walker Evans’ interest in depicting broken cars and garbage within landscapes in the 1930s to Smithson’s *Monuments of Passaic* (fig. 42), and how refuse as well as contemporary suburban and industrial landscapes became a significant theme in the work of New Topographics photographers during the late 1960s and 1970s. These artists — including Robert Adams, Lewis Baltz, Bernd and Hilla Becher, Frank Gohlke, and Stephen Shore — were featured in the *New Topographics: Photographs of a Man-Altered Landscape* exhibition in 1975 in Rochester, New York at the International Museum of Photography, George Eastman House. Finis Dunaway describes this exhibition and the images it presented: “Rejecting the wilderness aesthetic of pure nature, the New Topographics photographers instead emphasized the visible markings of a “man-altered landscape.””  

Lewis Baltz’s images reveal this interest in representing changing topography. For example, his photographic series *Tract Houses* (1969-1971) (figs. 43-44), *The new Industrial Parks near Irvine, California* (1974), and *Park City* (1978-1980) present both industrial and suburban
environments. Baltz represents structural building processes, and how they have irrevocably altered American landscapes, in these images. Susanne Figner refers to these images as evidence of the “technological sublime” in American landscapes, as Baltz elegantly presents rubble, garbage, and grime in lonely looking, black-and-white construction environments that are often devoid of people (figs. 43-44).

Suburban neighbourhoods were built quickly throughout the United States during the late 1960s, and Baltz’s images in *Tract Houses* (figs. 43-44) show the mass-produced nature of suburban homes that appear grey, skeletal and lifeless. Smithson had a similar view of suburban neighbourhoods as representative of “an architecture of entropy”...

Dikeakos also interprets this concept: “The term entropic was originally used in physics and mathematics to refer to the measurement of the degradation and disintegration of the universe.” He adds: “Smithson applied this strategy both as a critique and a polemic in an effort to show the frozen features of an entropic expanse; i.e., the photos and video of a street scan would depict the featurelessness of “a place…”” Baltz’s *Tract Houses* (figs. 43-44) alludes to this interest in featurelessness, and highlights how other artists outside of Vancouver were using the camera to question and study changing North American topography.

**Process and Suburbia in Early Conceptual Art**

Wall’s specific focus on processes as art in *Landscape Manual* is indicative of a greater preoccupation with process in conceptual art. While Wall highlights in textual passages that his interpretations of, and experiences travelling through, the landscape are both the central focus of *Landscape Manual*, instructional passages that tell audiences how to look at and photograph the landscape further enrich the work’s manual component that guides readers through activities. *Landscape Manual* will also be analyzed alongside Dan Graham’s *Homes for America*
(1966-1967) (fig. 1) to highlight how Wall was considering the ways other artists prioritized conceptual art-making practices, and specifically assemblages of text and photographs, to critically examine changing North American urban topography. Deadpan humour, as well as the photographic interplay between chance and control, are other key elements of early photo-based conceptual art. Studying them in relation to Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40) and Homes for America (fig. 1) will enrich the analyses of these artworks, as well as illustrate their greater significance within conceptual art-making processes during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Furthermore, examining Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40) and Homes for America (fig. 1) alongside sociological and architectural studies that focus on the ways North America was changing during this time period will situate both works within specific historical contexts.

Jeff Wall’s prioritization of process as art in Landscape Manual reveals how he, as an emerging artist during the late 1960s, explores topography through the lens of conceptual art as he travels through suburban neighbourhoods in a car. It is these processes that render Vancouver’s suburban landscape as a defeatured space without site-specific landmarks, and show a conceptual system that represents the personal experience of travelling through the landscape as the landscape itself. As highlighted earlier in the chapter, Wall describes this when he writes that his work shows “the landscape as condition…” and prioritizes his own perceptions of streets and neighbourhoods. Conceptual artists working during the 1960s also often assembled text, images, charts, and graphs to humorously reflect upon the de-aestheticization of art, and playfully imitate systematic scientific and sociological research. Wall’s Landscape Manual reflects this conceptual interest in the process of de-aestheticization, and using deadpan humour to ironize scholarly activities that gather and publicize information. Wall’s focus on his own art-making
processes in *Landscape Manual* playfully make fun of scientific research processes that value the meticulous presentation of information. *Landscape Manual* counters this through grainy, black-and-white photographs shot hastily from a car window, hand-written words and phrases scrawled beside or crossing out typewritten passages, stream-of-consciousness prose, and the inclusion of the manual’s twenty-five cent price on the cover (fig. 32). The slender paper booklet itself, as well as the photographic and written representations of Wall’s experiences, ultimately portray knowledge production as an ephemeral and subjective exercise.273

Wall’s focus on presenting his own experiences of the landscape in a small, paper booklet can be analyzed alongside Elizabeth Edwards’ and Janice Hart’s analysis of the materiality of the image, as introduced in the preceding chapter.274 As noted in Chapter One, Edwards and Hart argue that the materiality of photographic images, and considering them as three-dimensional objects that occupy physical space, is essential for understanding their meanings.275 Furthermore, they write: “Presentational forms equally reflect specific intent in the use and value of the photographs they embed, to the extent that the objects that embed photographs are in many cases meaningless without their photographs; for instance, empty frames or albums.”276 This remains true for Wall’s *Landscape Manual*. The black-and-white images of suburban topography presented in the work reflect a conceptual interest in the de-aestheticization of the art object in part achieved through the manner of display. The images’ exhibition within a paper booklet, which Wall refers to as a manual, calls attention to their materiality and usefulness in the physical world. They are not intended to be admired purely for their content, but rather allude to Wall’s intention to guide readers in their movement through and evaluation of topography.
Wall highlights his consideration of the way readers may use his images, and the manual generally, when he writes: “…the photographs, the writing, the sequences established among the sets of photographs, the proposals for future car rides—are all in a quite precise manner maps for the (auto) analysis of my/your state of attention.” He adds that, “These maps are nothing but the result, the evidence of their own continuous operation in our continuous experience.” This passage underscores Wall’s consideration of the way the images, and manual itself, are to be used. The black-and-white images reflect Edwards’ and Hart’s assertion that photographic images are also things that are part of broader visual and material culture.

Dan Graham’s *Homes for America* (1966-1967) (fig. 1) is another key, early conceptual artwork that explores artistic processes to assess North American suburbia. *Homes for America* (fig. 1) presents Graham’s written reflections about suburbia alongside images of suburban homes that he took in the mid-1960s in New Jersey. It was published in *Arts Magazine* in 1967, and was also presented as a slide show. Wall explains that Graham originally created *Homes for America* (fig. 1) to be a publishable, magazine essay, rather than a lithographic print artwork. He writes of the work: “This model is a parody, a meticulous and detached imitation whose aim is to interrogate the legitimacy (and the process of legitimation) of its original, and thereby (and only thereby) to legitimate itself as art.” While Wall’s assessment reveals the ways *Homes for America* (fig. 1) critically interprets the process of art legitimation, scholar Ruth Blacksell also examines how this work highlights the process of publishing, and the ways editors at *Art Magazine* changed its appearance 1967. Graham, like Wall, presents the process of assembling visual and textual information, as well as thoughtfully considers de-aestheticization processes and the playful use of parody to reflect upon reportage, photojournalism, and the
publishing industry. Homes for America (fig. 1) and Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40) reveal a conceptual interest in the element of chance as part of art-making processes, which other artists such as Ed Ruscha also prioritized during the 1960s. Photographing suburban landscapes while travelling through them leaves room for the spontaneous possibility of the unexpected in both of these artworks, and yet their presentation formats also reveal an interest in book and magazine publishing processes that exhibit organized, controlled displays of visual and textual information.

Finally, it is important to situate Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40) and Homes for America (fig. 1) within a greater analytical interest in North American communities and topography, exemplified by David Riesman’s study The Lonely Crowd (1950), and the Learning from Las Vegas (1968-1972) research project conducted by Denise Scott Brown, Robert Venturi, and Steven Izenour at Yale University. Dan Graham highlights in an interview with scholar Mike Metz that sociological studies about changing American society, such as David Riesman’s The Lonely Crowd, and published, journalistic examinations of suburbia, such as those within Esquire magazine in the 1950s and 1960s, inspired him to explore suburban environments through the lens of conceptual art-making processes. While the publication of The Lonely Crowd in 1950 coincides with increased postwar suburbanization and the construction of single-family homes in the United States, Riesman also specifically observes a changing American “social character.” He describes young Americans as “other-directed” individuals. He characterizes this type of person as someone who is close to their nuclear family, and resides in a single-family home or in a suburban neighbourhood. Peter Latham has observed that this “other directed” characterization inspired William H. Whyte’s understanding of suburbia as a lonely environment that
emphasizes consumerism and uniformity in his best-selling book *The Organization Man* (1956). While Riesman does not include quantitative statistical data in his study to highlight his research process, his observations of how American society has changed over decades and centuries reflects an interest in studying the process of change.

*Learning from Las Vegas* (1968-1972) is another significant study that documented the changing landscape and built environment in the city of Las Vegas, Nevada. Denise Scott Brown, Robert Venturi, and Steven Izenour specifically focused on analyzing suburban neighbourhoods, urban sprawl, and strip malls in and around the city. Curator Britt Salvesen describes the study’s origins and aims: “Referring to canonical examples from modernist architectural history, such as Byzantine cathedrals and Renaissance palazzi, Venturi and Scott Brown traced the inner working of symbolism from “legitimate” sources up to the present day’s roadside and residential architecture.” Salvesen adds: “*Learning from Las Vegas* achieves incredible dynamism through its assorted reproductions of advertisements, photographs, postcards, paintings, maps, charts, and sketches.” Aron Vinegar identifies *Learning from Las Vegas* as part of a broader academic interest in the disorderliness in American cities during the 1950s and 1960s. During this time period, garish billboard advertisements became increasingly popular in downtown areas, and urban sprawl developed with the growth of suburban neighbourhoods. Wall’s *Landscape Manual* (figs. 32–40) and Graham’s *Homes for America* (fig. 1) reflect this interest in assessing changing cities. Wall and Graham explore conceptual art-making processes as a way of considering and making fun of research and publishing processes. *Landscape Manual* (figs. 32–40) and *Homes for America* (fig. 1) instead show knowledge-creation processes as ephemeral and potentially disorganized or confusing assemblages of text passages and images.
Positioning *Landscape Manual* in Conceptual Art

Wall’s *Landscape Manual* can additionally be analyzed in relation to two other key examples of conceptual art, namely Joseph Kosuth’s *One and Three Chairs* (1965) (fig. 2) and Martha Rosler’s *The Bowery in two inadequate descriptive systems* (1974-1975) (fig. 3) to situate it in broader, conceptual artistic practices during the 1960s and 1970s. Like Wall, Kosuth and Rosler employ combinations of text and image to explore systems of representation, and question the specific meaning of a chair, or of the Bowery region in New York City. The *Photo Show* (1969-1970) exhibition at the UBC Fine Arts Gallery (later known as the Morris and Helen Belkin Art Gallery), and *955, 000* (1970) at the Vancouver Art Gallery are two major and early exhibitions of conceptual art in Vancouver. These exhibitions displayed work by Vancouver-based artists, such as Dikeakos, the N. E. Thing Company, and Wall, as well as pieces by American artists such as Carl Andre, Dan Graham, Joseph Kosuth, and Ed Ruscha. Both of these exhibitions marked Vancouver as a city that was at the cutting edge of conceptual art discussions. Analyzing Wall’s *Landscape Manual* (figs. 32-40) alongside *One and Three Chairs* (fig. 2) and *The Bowery* (fig. 3) highlights how he, as an emerging artist, engaged with conceptual art-making processes as he examined suburban topography driving through Vancouver.

Scott Watson’s observation that Wall’s prose in *Landscape Manual* (figs. 32-40) is an attempt to “index the consciousness of the artist” is equally applicable to Kosuth’s *One and Three Chairs* (fig. 2). In this artwork, Kosuth also explores consciousness and different understandings of an inanimate object, which is a chair in this instance. He presents a physical chair, a photograph of a chair, and the written definition of a chair from a dictionary together to ask viewers: which one is the true chair? This artwork, and the central question it asks, therefore
explores systems of representation and Plato’s theory of forms. Wall in Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40) also iterates this focus on exploring what is true or real. He states in the beginning of his work on page one, and again on page eight, that the manual is an exploration of his experiences. Like Kosuth, Wall asks those who read Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40): what is the true landscape? Is it the one that Wall photographs from the car’s windshield and windows, or is the landscape instead a set of distinctive experiences and reflection of consciousness? Kosuth and Wall point out the funny imprecision of the English language, and playfully make fun of methodical scientific studies that aim to objectively present facts. As Elisabeth Schellekens writes: “By turning art theory into art practice, conceptual artists dealing with philosophical notions and distinctions also turn the abstract into something concrete.” One and Three Chairs (fig. 2) and Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40) reflect this conceptual interest in theory, and also highlight how Kosuth and Wall present information in various forms to encourage reflections upon what it means to know something.

Analyzing Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40) with Rosler’s The Bowery in two inadequate descriptive systems (fig. 3) additionally highlights how combinations of text and photographic images can display nuanced understandings of what a place is, and means. In this work, Rosler presents black-and-white photographs of storefronts and garbage on the street in the Bowery neighbourhood in New York City alongside words, which are derogatory terms used to describe those who are homeless or struggle with substance abuse. The Bowery was known as a site where people who lived in poverty, struggled with substance abuse or were homeless, congregated. Documentary photographers recurrently depicted them, as stereotyped emblems of the marginalized. Rosler’s work has also been compared to Ed Ruscha’s Every Building on Sunset
Strip (1966) (fig. 41), but instead appears as a “grungy, dark retort” that shows extreme poverty within New York City’s built environment.320 Every Building on 100 West Hastings (2001) (fig. 45) by Stan Douglas offers a distinctly Vancouver-based interpretation of this theme. Rosler and Wall both present combinations of text and image as key to understanding environments. Rosler’s inclusion of derogatory terms often used to insult and berate the Bowery’s residents, and Wall’s stream-of-consciousness writing that focuses on understanding his own experiences as he travels through the landscape, also both showcase how language can add thought-provoking immediacy to conceptual artwork. Rosler’s work ironizes the documentary photography of the Bowery region and offers viewers new ways of considering it through conceptual art without showing human figures.321 This resembles the ways Wall ironizes the history of landscape representation in Canada.322 He explores conceptual art-making processes as he investigates suburban Vancouver’s topography, rather than the surrounding views of nearby mountains and forests.

Studying Wall’s Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40) in relation to Kosuth’s One and Three Chairs (fig. 2) as well as Rosler’s The Bowery in two inadequate descriptive systems (fig. 3) illustrates how conceptual artists often use humour to critique systems of representation, as well as present combinations of photographs, text, and objects to showcase information.323 These distinctively conceptual combinations ask viewers or readers to thoughtfully consider: what really is a chair, a landscape, or the Bowery neighbourhood? This central question shows how Kosuth, Wall, and Rosler highlight the limitations of knowledge and understanding through conceptual art.
Conclusion

This chapter has analyzed Jeff Wall’s *Landscape Manual* as a key example of conceptual art in Vancouver during the late 1960s and early 1970s. With the creation of *Landscape Manual*, Wall presents a conceptual understanding of his own experiences as crucial to picturing topography, as well as topography itself as a stage that is necessary for exploring burgeoning conceptual art-making processes in the late 1960s and 1970s. While Dennis Wheeler and Scott Watson present the significance of *Landscape Manual*’s representation of a “defeatured landscape,” Christos Dikeakos highlights how Robert Smithson’s involvement in Vancouver’s artistic environments during the late 1960s and early 1970s fuelled an interest in closely and conceptually examining North American topography in photo-based art to show it as defeatured.324 Furthermore, analyzing Wall’s focus on process shows how *Landscape Manual* is connected to Dan Graham’s pivotal *Homes for America* (1966-1967) (fig. 1), as well as a greater interest in conceptual, de-aestheticizing art-making processes that prioritized deadpan humour.325 Assessing *Landscape Manual* alongside Joseph Kosuth’s *One and Three Chairs* (1965) (fig. 2) and Martha Rosler’s *The Bowery in two inadequate descriptive systems* (1974-1975) (fig. 3) illustrates how Wall’s work is rooted in the conceptual questioning of seemingly knowable objects or places with thought-provoking assemblages of text and photo-based art.326 In Chapter Three, this thesis will show how analyzing Wall’s early conceptual understanding of topography, alongside Fred Herzog, signifies an innovative way of understanding photo-based representations of the city, and reflecting upon its changing landscapes.
Chapter Three: Jeff Wall, Fred Herzog, and Seeing Vancouver

Jeff Wall thoughtfully examines Fred Herzog’s work, as well as Vancouver’s colourful, decidedly local topography that Herzog pictured throughout the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, in his essay, “Vancouver Appearing and Not Appearing in Fred Herzog’s Photographs” (2011). Wall focuses specifically on Herzog’s *New Pontiac* (1957) (fig. 46), and how the parked car, aging buildings, and vivid colours that characterize Herzog’s work provide present-day viewers with a glimpse of a beautiful, pre-1970s version of the city that Wall refers to as “old Vancouver.” However, the specific choice to focus on *New Pontiac* (fig. 46) in the essay also emphasizes the significance of the car in Vancouver during the late 1950s and early 1960s, as well as the seemingly disparate elements of the new car and aging buildings merged together in a single, collage-like arrangement.

Two key conceptual models emerge from Wall’s essay about Herzog, and guide this chapter: the “vehicular flâneur” and collage. In this chapter, I argue that showing the world from a car, and being a distinctly North American “vehicular flâneur,” is to see the world as a collage. The multivalent, chaotic and layered form of the collage is an apt model for the experience of Vancouver’s topography. Examining Wall’s essay in relation to the work of other Vancouver-based artists working in the 1960s and early 1970s, such as Christos Dikeakos and Ian Wallace, indicates how both Wall and Herzog explored urban looking through a North American driver-flâneur figure who travelled throughout the city in a car. In this way they produce photo-based, collage images that mirror the ways residents read their environments through brief glimpses of visual and textual information within a car. This chapter begins with an investigation of the 2011 essay and how it reveals Wall’s understanding of the city’s history and built environment in
the 1950s and 1960s. Next, I will examine the car in North American cities. Herzog’s other images of cars will be studied in relation to Wall’s Landscape Manual (1969-1970) and Instant Photo Information (1969-1970) (figs. 47-48) by Christos Dikeakos to highlight how artists in Vancouver were considering the car, urban viewship, and a North American flâneur during the 1960s and early 1970s. In the 2011 essay Wall states that there is a clear contrast between the new Pontiac car and the rusted, aging buildings around it shown in New Pontiac (fig. 46). He describes this striking contrast in the image as something that characterized the beauty of “old Vancouver.” However, this contrast also reveals an interest in collage, and the merging of the old and the new into one public, urban space. A critical interest in collage and photo-based art in Vancouver during this time period will also be incorporated into this chapter to illustrate how both Wall in Landscape Manual (1969-1970) and Herzog in his images of street signage rendered the city as collage. Finally, the chapter will conclude with an examination of how both Herzog’s and Wall’s images changed in subsequent decades.

While this chapter focuses primarily on Wall’s essay, “Vancouver Appearing and Not Appearing in Fred Herzog’s Photographs” (2011), it additionally incorporates perspectives from Grant Arnold, Christos Dikeakos, Ian Wallace, and Scott Watson about the North American flâneur and photo-based collage history in Vancouver during the 1960s and 1970s. Jean-François Chevrier, Mike Featherstone, Rolf Lauter, and Sharla Sava will also be cited throughout the chapter to provide scholarly assessments about photography, the North American driver-flâneur figure, and urban viewship in Vancouver.
Jeff Wall on Fred Herzog

In addition to creating an acclaimed body of art for over four decades, Jeff Wall is also recognized as the writer of thoughtful essays about such artists as Roy Arden, Marcel Duchamp, Dan Graham, and Ken Lum. In his 2011 essay about Fred Herzog, Wall analyzes both Vancouver as a city between the 1950s and 1970s, as well as the ways that Herzog looked at and depicted its topography.Originally published in *Fred Herzog: Photographs* (2011), the essay reappeared as a journal article in the *AA Files* in 2012 and was later featured in *Fred Herzog: Modern Colour* (2017). A digital version from 2011 is currently available on the Vancouver Magazine website.

Wall begins his essay about Fred Herzog by describing what he perceives as Vancouver’s recent transformation into a city with “vulgar, cheap, ugly and even ridiculous” buildings. He provides a brief account of local architecture and environments before the 1970s:

Until about 1970 there was something called old Vancouver, that city still characterised by the wooden houses in which most of its inhabitants dwelt, houses built on a restricted number of plans and patterns, the Beaux-Arts stone architecture of its most prominent structures, the British gardening of private and public spaces, the not-yet-complete infill of urban space, the low streetscapes of shop fronts with their canvas awnings over the sidewalks, the wide streets free of heavy automobile traffic, the articulate and tasteful street signage.

He observes that “old Vancouver” began to change throughout the 1980s and 1990s because of: “land speculation, urban zoning and rezoning, accelerating suburbanisation, as well as new standards of taste in building types and materials.” Wall expresses his admiration and feelings of nostalgia for Vancouver of the 1950s through the 1970s within these passages, and disdain for the ways its built environment and public spaces changed in later decades. In his essay, Wall positions Fred Herzog as a dedicated photographer who represented the city’s beautiful and
distinctively local topography.\textsuperscript{347} Ian Wallace also highlights Herzog’s significance to the photographic history of Vancouver when he states in an interview: “I would say, the first artist who really explored Vancouver photographically, the Vancouver that I see and I know, is Fred Herzog.”\textsuperscript{348} Wall also acknowledges in his essay that Vancouver’s local architecture, eccentric shop window displays, and neighbourhoods that existed during this time period were conducive to Herzog’s predilection to capture vibrant urban topography.\textsuperscript{349}

Wall centres Herzog’s photograph \textit{New Pontiac} (1957) (fig. 46) in his essay.\textsuperscript{350} This image shows a sleek Pontiac sedan parked behind a shed and two houses. Red-brown rust has eaten away at the shed’s thin walls, and the house with the deep blue siding and another house with emerald green siding stand opposite one another. A new, grey building is shown in the narrow space between the houses. In his essay, Wall describes the vivid colours of the image that define the car, the shed, and the two houses, while highlighting how Herzog represents time passing through the fading colours, and bright burgundy rust on the shed.\textsuperscript{351} Wall writes: “There is a ‘fittingness’ to the picture, just as all the little and large, old and new structures are fitted together into a particular urban ensemble, that ensemble of the old, ‘fitting’ Vancouver, that still-beautiful city, where shabbiness could still stand its ground.”\textsuperscript{352} Wall refers to the image’s irony, which is visible in the rusted shed and aging early twentieth-century blue and green houses that are positioned alongside a glimpse of the newer, grey building between them, and the elegant, parked Pontiac car.\textsuperscript{353} Ian Wallace also observes of Herzog’s work: “Fred looked at the side of Vancouver that most Vancouverites didn’t want to look at.”\textsuperscript{354} He adds: “It was kind of, the often shabby side of Vancouver, the side of Vancouver that didn’t fit what you’d expect a pretty, liveable city to be,” but that this was: “the real art of Vancouver, in many ways.”\textsuperscript{355}
Finally, Wall’s examination of *New Pontiac* (fig. 46) focuses specifically on the colours in the image. Wall draws attention to the “wasabi patina” hue of the buildings, the “two-tone Pontiac,” and the “delicate greens, browns, greys and blues, with three touches of red echoing each other and relating near and far” throughout the image. He links the blue hues on the left house, shed, and rear car window, and identifies the repetition of lighter and darker shades of green seen on the siding and door of the house on the right. The Pontiac’s lighter tones help it stand out amongst the dark blue and green siding of the houses.

Wall thoughtfully describes the green house on the right by observing:

> The green and yellow, combined with the black roof and maybe even the lighter door if it was original, create a subtle and sophisticated colour scheme that asserts its quality no matter how rickety its support. If the door’s colour is a later alteration, it was done with an innately nice eye. And the red roofing is a stroke of genius. Mondrian could not have done it better.

Wall’s reference to de Stijl artist Piet Mondrian (1872-1944) in this passage is a thought-provoking contrast to a large portion of his essay, which focuses on the ways local wooden houses, such as the blue and green ones shown in Herzog’s image, were recognizable components of Vancouver’s urban environments from the early to mid-twentieth century. As Wall examines these colourful houses, and the ways they both complement and contrast the new Pontiac car, he additionally shows Herzog’s interest in exploring the colours and textures of postwar Canadian consumerism, local Vancouver environments, and key elements of daily life in the city during the late 1950s.

**New Ways of Understanding the Figure of the Flâneur and Urban Looking**

Jeff Wall’s examination of *New Pontiac* (1957) (fig. 46) by Fred Herzog in his essay specifically focuses on the new, sleek sedan parked within the surrounding, aging built environ-
In this image, and in Wall’s analysis of it, the car is framed as a useful and prized possession in Vancouver’s urban topography. Studying the specific relationships between the car, travelling through environments, and the act of looking in both the work of Wall and Herzog between the 1950s and 1970s can reveal new ways of understanding a distinctly North American flâneur figure in photo-based art. Dikeakos, who — as noted earlier — describes himself in an essay as “a vehicular flâneur of Vancouver’s False Creek Basin.” He writes: “In Vancouver, and in my work, the pedestrian’s ambulatory gaze seemed to have shifted to that of the solitary driver, gazing from within the car.” Dikeakos further adds that driving: “…was the true Vancouver flâneur experience, one of solitariness and alienation.” Ian Wallace, in his essay “Street Photos 1970,” also observes the North American flâneur as an individual who drives, rather than walks, through urban environments to observe them. He connects celebrated interpretations of car journeys, such as Jack Kerouac’s book On the Road (1957) and Robert Frank’s photo-essay America (1956), with photo-based art made in Vancouver in the 1960s and 1970s, and specifically cites Wall’s Landscape Manual (1969-1970).

Landscape Manual, like Dikeakos’ Instant Photo Information (1969-1970) (figs. 47-48) and Wallace’s Pan Am Scan (1970) (fig. 49), emphasizes how visually scanning urban and suburban environments facilitates ways of reflecting upon alienation in cities, as well as changing topography. Topography is represented as artistic material in these images which alludes to Wallace’s understanding of how the artist creates artworks in specific locations, such as in urban environments or within a studio. While Pan Am Scan (fig. 49) shows photographic scans of architecture and people in central London within the United Kingdom, Instant Photo Information (figs. 47-48) presents Dikeakos’ experiences driving through Vancouver’s False Creek area.
The initial images (fig. 47) show the aftermath of violent car crashes, which recall Andy Warhol’s *Death and Disaster* series (1962-1963). Other black-and-white images in this work show how Dikeakos scanned industrial environments in the False Creek area from a car window.\(^{371}\) *Instant Photo Information* (figs. 47-48) also includes brief text descriptions of what Dikeakos sees and the locations he photographs. Workbook-like prompts guide viewers as they look at the artwork and consider the topography that is shown. *Instant Photo Information* (figs. 47-48) was also originally published in *BC Almanac*, a National Film Board of Canada Still Photography Division publication.\(^{372}\)

While the similarities between *Instant Photo Information* (figs. 47-48) and *Landscape Manual* (figs. 32-40) are apparent, the key connection between both these works is the way Dikeakos and Wall employed the car as a specific mode of transportation to photographically scan topography within Vancouver.\(^{373}\) The black-and-white images in *Landscape Manual* (figs. 32-40) and *Instant Photo Information* (figs. 47-48) frequently show other moving cars on streets that are usually devoid of pedestrians. In this way, Wall and Dikeakos show in *Landscape Manual* (figs. 32-40) and *Instant Photo Information* (figs. 47-48) how cars facilitate their own close examination of topography, as well as the ways that other residents are increasingly relying on cars, rather than walking, to observe, travel through, and experience Vancouver’s neighbourhoods. By driving through the city, the artists are enacting their own alienation while reflecting upon pervasive alienation in urban and suburban environments, including in Vancouver. Wall alludes to this sense of alienation in the city in his essay on Fred Herzog.\(^{374}\) He observes that changes to the city’s built environment from the 1970s onwards has led to: “…the density of disappointment and the envelope of depression that’s been created by the total abdication of
leadership by politicians, patrons and professionals in architecture, planning and urbanism, and
the hapless capitulation to institutionalized civic ugliness.”

This passage further suggests Wall’s sense of nostalgia for what he terms beautiful “old Vancouver” in the 1950s and 1960s.

Analyzing Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40) alongside Dikeakos’ Instant Photo Information (figs. 47-48) highlights how the scanning of Vancouver’s topography from a car, and being a “vehicular flâneur,” generates thought-provoking artistic commentary about changing topography, and alienation in the city.

Herzog has acknowledged that walking through Vancouver’s downtown during the late 1950s and 1960s provided him with opportunities to see and depict colourful barbershops, shop window displays, billboards, and local street signage; yet his commentaries about North American car culture and mobility, as well as his numerous images of cars in the city, also illustrate his consideration of the “vehicular flâneur” figure. For example, in a 2007 interview with Grant Arnold, Herzog described how the motorcycle he purchased in 1953 helped him travel and take photographs when he was not working on boats. He stated: “I bought a motorcycle at the end of 1953, and that was important to me psychologically. I wanted to be mobile; I liked the idea of exploring places. I took a camera and made landscape and urban pictures, but they did not hint at what was to come.”

Here, Herzog illustrates that he observed various environments as he travelled through them on a motorcycle, and crucially, created several of his earliest images of Canada and the United States after moving to Vancouver. Herzog specifically references cars when he describes their importance for residents’ daily lives: “Having no automobile for most citizens would lead to non-participation in daily public life.” While he acknowledges earlier in the interview that cars and fuel consumption exacerbate climate change, Herzog’s comment astutely
observes how cars have become essential for travelling to workplaces and schools, seeing family members and friends, and being part of community events. Herzog also adds that sleek, colourful cars in Vancouver, representations of these cars in advertisements on local billboards, and old, rusty cars that have been discarded, have always fascinated him for the ways they portray lifecycles and North American material consumption.

Herzog frequently depicted automobiles. Key among these photographs are: *North Vancouver* (1958) (fig. 50), *Cars at Cunningham Drugs* (1960) (fig. 51), *Used Car Lot* (1970) (fig. 52), and *Orange Cars Powell* (1973) (fig. 53). *Hastings at Carrall, Looking East* (1970) (fig. 21) also presents a rainy, downtown Vancouver scene in black-and-white that Herzog sees from within a car. The long, shiny car hood is visible through the windshield, and buildings with signage line both sides of the street. Herzog shows other cars, while pedestrians holding umbrellas cross the street at an intersection. The rain droplets on the windshield have made the entire scene appear blurry and unfocused. Rainwater beading on the car hood, and collecting in puddles on the street, emphasizes the various textures that define this urban environment. This image resembles both Dikeakos’ *Instant Photo Information* (figs. 47-48) and Wall’s *Landscape Manual* (figs. 32-40) through the way the windshield facilitates scanning, and becomes a framing device that amalgamates the street, buildings, traffic lights, and signage into one collage-like image. In this way, Herzog also shows his interest in representing the urban environment as art. *Hastings at Carrall, Looking East* (fig. 21) is not exclusively documentary photography, but depicts art and document merged together into a single image. *Hastings at Carrall, Looking East* (fig. 21) does not present a colourful, gorgeous car as a personal status symbol, which is frequently shown in Herzog’s other images of cars in Vancouver from the late 1950s and 1960s. This work’s creation
in 1970 indicates that Herzog was also interested in exploring urban viewership. He additionally interprets how seeing the city’s multi-layered topography from a car is a suitable way to portray the experience of travelling through it during this time period.

Furthermore, scholars acknowledge that the ways people use various forms of transportation to travel throughout cities, such as buses, cars, streetcars, and trains, impacts the experience of seeing. Academic theorizations of this present-day flâneur figure, and especially one who drives a car to observe urban spaces, emphasize how the environment is experienced through cycles of “immersion and detachment, between various insides and outsides…” Transparent car windows help the “vehicular flâneur” clearly observe urban environments. Scott Watson describes how Wall and Wallace explored the experience of topography through the lens of conceptual art in their photo-based work produced during the 1960s and 1970s. He writes: “Both artists became more intently interested in photography, not as high-medium or humanist social document, but as the recording device most appropriate to the construction of an index or semiotic of the urban environment…” Wall’s Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40) presents the car and camera as key instruments that collectively facilitate his creation of this “index or semiotic of the urban environment.” Wall further explains his perception of the way charming “old Vancouver” was brutally erased by global capitalism in his essay about Fred Herzog. Analyzing this essay alongside Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40) highlights his interest in conceptually exploring the way this charming “old Vancouver” was erased to create dull suburbia that was only accessible via car. Scholar Jerry Zaslove also reflects upon the prevalent “car culture” of Vancouver’s suburban environments in his 2004 interview with Bob Williams and Annabel Vaughan. While many of Herzog’s images present the car as a key component of Vancouver’s colourful, local
topography, *Hastings at Carrall, Looking East* (fig. 21) shows how he was also considering the way city environments were observed and experienced through a car window.

**The City as Collage in Photo-Based Art**

Travelling through Vancouver, especially in a car, leads to seeing the world as a collage. Buildings, street signage, pedestrians on the sidewalk, and other cars on the road flash by quickly, while the broad windshield simultaneously frames and merges them into one image. The multivalent, layered form of the collage is an apt model for the experience of Vancouver’s topography. It is travelling through the city neighbourhoods in a car, and carefully observing them from the windshield, that provides the viewer with a collage-like experience of the city. While seeing the city as a collage is evident in Herzog’s colourful images, as well as Wall’s *Landscape Manual* (figs. 32-40), Wall’s focus on Herzog’s *New Pontiac* (fig. 46) image in his 2011 essay also identifies the collage-like experience of seeing the old and the new blended together as a way of understanding “old Vancouver” during the late 1950s. Wall writes of this photograph: “The car is new, and the houses are emphatically old and weathered, the corrugated iron shed even more so.” As observed earlier in the chapter, Wall describes this seemingly mismatched combination as evidence of the image’s “fittingness,” and how it represents “a particular urban ensemble” that defined the historical beauty of Vancouver’s built environment.

Ian Wallace specifically articulates that conceptual artists working in the city during the 1960s and 1970s were also interested in collage-making. He describes Wall’s *Landscape Manual* (1969-1970) (figs. 32-40) and *A Portfolio of Piles* (1968) (fig. 54) by the N. E. Thing Company as “extended collages.” *A Portfolio of Piles* (fig. 54) represents industrial sites around the city of Vancouver, and Dikeakos highlights in an interview that Herzog himself worked with Iain
Baxter to create several images presented in *A Portfolio of Piles* (fig. 54).\(^3\) Wallace thoughtfully analyzes the links between photo-based art and collage in Vancouver when he states in his essay “Street Photos 1970”: “As a crossing point of an infinite variety of arbitrary movements permanently fixed into a unified image by the instantaneity of the photographic snapshot, the intersection images were like a real-time analogue to the technique of collage.”\(^4\) This conceptualization of “intersection images” stems from American writer William Burroughs’ “intersection points,” or blending of multiple examples of literature into his own work, which he describes in the essay “The Literary Techniques of Lady Sutton-Smith” (1966).\(^5\) Wallace cites *Street Reflections* (fig. 55) and *Pan Am Scan* (fig. 49) as two examples of his own work from 1970 that depict people reflected in windows within cities.\(^6\) Wallace explains: “These works were assemblages of serial images using a shifting time or spatial movement in the photographs. The heterogeneous nature of collage and particularly of its photographic variant allowed the chaos of reality to be read as a “literature of images.””\(^7\) Here, Wallace identifies how observing urban topography, and particularly the distinctive buildings, streets, and neighbourhoods that define cities, can inspire artists to portray the city as a collage, which can also appear as an idiosyncratic anti-narrative.

While observing Wall’s *Landscape Manual* (figs. 32-40), it is easy to see why Wallace describes the work as a collage.\(^8\) Wall presents black-and-white images showing random, unidentifiable suburban neighbourhoods in Vancouver, and intersperses them with written passages that contain his own reflections about art, life, and travelling through the landscape in a car. This presentation format illustrates a multimedia, layered, collage-like way of showing information. Numbered pages reflect an interest in a linear narrative, but the chaotic, collage-like appearance of the work playfully questions a reader’s expectation of linearity.
Landscape Manual’s (figs. 32-40) photocopied, Do-It-Yourself appearance also alludes to the collage-like “literature of images” and presentation of multiple viewpoints in a single publication, which Wallace initially described in his essay “Literature of Images” (1969) in the Free Media Bulletin. Canadian media theorist Marshall McLuhan, who was a key figure for Vancouver-based artists and particularly the N. E. Thing Company during this time period, described newspapers in Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man (1964) as being distinct from books because they offer readers collages of both visual and textual information. Furthermore, the black-and-white images in Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40) illustrate how travelling in a car, and observing topography from the car window, renders the environment as a collage. It is evident from Landscape Manual that being what Dikeakos terms a “vehicular-flâneur” is to see the world as a collage, and further, the chaotic, layered form of the collage is an apt model for the experience of Vancouver during the late 1960s and early 1970s.

While Landscape Manual reveals how Wall pictures changing topography in Vancouver during the 1970s, his essay on Fred Herzog highlights how he reflects upon it decades later. As observed previously, Wall clearly expresses his disapproval of the way Vancouver’s built environment began to change from the 1970s onwards. Wall writes:

I’m not arguing that every old building in Vancouver ought to have been preserved. Nor am I claiming that there is no good modern architecture. I am observing that in almost every case where an older building was replaced with a newer one, the newer one is uglier, less gracious and less enjoyable. In having become uglier and less enjoyable, they express only the lifelessness of their designers and builders, a dullness that is transmitted to the occupants and passerby. And this lifelessness has been the central artistic problem for photographers in Vancouver for the past 30 to 40 years.
Interestingly, Wall’s *Landscape Manual* also shows topography in Vancouver as lifeless. The collages of visual and textual information in this slender, paper book do not present the colourful spaces of Vancouver’s downtown that Wall describes in his 2011 essay.\textsuperscript{410} Rather, they allude to alienation that appears palpable within these suburban neighbourhoods. Wall pictures suburban topography as a never-ending mass of greyness, and visibly devoid of people interacting with one another on the sidewalks or front lawns. Analyzing *Landscape Manual*’s collages of information alongside Wall’s assessments from 2011 about Vancouver’s changing topography in the 1970s and 1980s begs the question: is Wall showing how new buildings constructed in Vancouver’s suburbs in the 1960s and 1970s are ugly and dull compared to the city’s historical built environment? In addition, is *Landscape Manual* Wall’s attempt at addressing lifelessness in the city’s built environment through photo-based conceptual art? While Wall alludes to the collage of old and new evident in Herzog’s photographs of beautiful “old Vancouver” in his essay, understanding *Landscape Manual* (figs. 32-40) as a collage furthermore suggests conceptual collage-making in the late 1960s as a key framework to consider changing topography and personal experiences driving through suburbia.

Herzog’s images similarly reveal his interest in picturing Vancouver’s topography as a collage. For him, the layered and colourful, kaleidoscopic experience of locality embodied the city during the 1950s and 1960s. Herzog’s *Hastings at Carrall, Looking East* (1970) (fig. 21) is a rare example of one of his images that show a black-and-white view of the city from a car. Buildings on either side of the street, traffic lights, and pedestrians holding umbrellas are blurred together into a single image that the windshield frames. Herzog’s well-known representations of vibrant street signage, such as *Granville Street from Granville Bridge* (1966) (fig. 56) and
Hastings and Carrall (1968) (fig. 57), are key examples of how he shows the city as a collage. While a car windshield does not frame either of these scenes, Granville Street from Granville Bridge (fig. 56) and Hastings and Carrall (fig. 57) reveal key local signage that would have been highly visible to motorists. In this way, Herzog also represents how driving, or for him personally, walking, through the city leads to experiencing it as a chaotic, multifaceted collage. In Granville Street from Granville Bridge (fig. 56), a prominent circular, blue sign reads in white text: “Mount Pleasant Chapel,” while numerous signs advertising hotels and motels, such as the Ramada Inn, Hotel Vancouver, and the Travel Lodge are behind it, as well as overlap with other orange, white, and black billboards. Hastings and Carrall (fig. 57) reveals a similar montage arrangement of visual and textual information. It displays signs advertising businesses such as B. C. Jewellers, Blue Ribbon Coffee, and Army and Navy Department Stores, alongside “No Stopping” municipal parking signs in the centre of the work. Signs, buildings, overhead electrical wires, street lights and telephone poles collide together to show how Herzog understands Vancouver’s environments, as well as the collage-like “chaos of reality” that Wallace identifies as he too considers how to picture topography in photo-based art.411

Finally, this analysis recalls academic theorizations of place-making and how photo-based art shapes understandings of place. Gillian Rose addresses these concepts in her article “Using Photographs as Illustrations in Human Geography” (2008).412 She describes how scholars John Allen and Michael Pryke utilize photomontage in their article “The Production of Service Space” (1994) to present the interconnectedness of the financial centre, in London, United Kingdom, which is made up of business executives, and the service centre, which includes janitors, security guards and cooks who work in these financial office buildings.413 Rose describes their
photomontages: “The first shows the exteriors of mainly finance buildings but the images become more complex until finally images of the service space thoroughly interpose in the finance space sections of the montage.” Rose demonstrates how photo-based collages can be instrumental in research about specific environments. Mia Hunt’s article, “Urban Photography/Cultural Geography: Spaces, Objects, Events” underscores this. Hunt states that contemporary artists have recently been preoccupied with capturing the spirit of a place. Herzog and Wall emphasize the ways that people travelling through Vancouver’s environments are able to read its topography as collages of buildings, objects, and signage, which encourages the viewer to make their own journey through the artwork.

Jeff Wall and Fred Herzog: Later Work

By the late 1970s, Wall’s artistic career diverged significantly from his early work in the 1960s, and connections to urban photography in Vancouver. He began to work in massive, colourful tableaux exhibited as glowing transparencies in light boxes. These works and format have been so widely celebrated that they have eclipsed Wall’s earlier work in public reception. While Wall often represents Vancouver in his images from the 1970s onwards, in those works the city is transformed into a space to examine converging ideas about modernity, European art history, and a social history of art as well as a socially-engaged critique of representational systems in society. During this time period, Wall also became interested in art historian T. J. Clark’s articulation of a social history of art. Art historians and critics have observed how Wall began to explore what it meant to be a “painter of modern life” in the 1980s and 1990s through photography. Charles Baudelaire (1821-1867) famously described the significance of painters representing the modern life that they observed in “The Painter of Modern Life.”
Although Baudelaire’s essay references Constantin Guys, the phrase “painter of modern life” is most often associated with Édouard Manet (1832-1883). Wall’s works in the late 1970s and 1980s, such as *Picture for Women* (1979) (fig. 58) and *The Storyteller* (1986) (fig. 59), often reference Manet and European art history to explore how photo-based art can represent modern life in present-day North America. His images of landscapes from the 1980s and 1990s showcase a similar theme of theatricality, and control of the landscape to create tableaux scenes.

*The Thinker* (1986) (fig. 60) and *The Old Prison* (1987) (fig. 61) reflect the shift in Wall’s career after the late 1970s. *The Thinker* (fig. 60) shows an elderly man with a sword at his back seated on a concrete block. His head rests on one of his hands, while the vast urban expanse that is Vancouver stretches out in the landscape before him. Busy highways, towering skyscrapers and mountains are visible in the distance, and a dark sign affixed to a nearby street light indicates that the figure is beside North Kootenay Street. Wall stated in an interview published in 2001 that this work is intended to reflect a monument plan that was created by German printmaker and painter Albrecht Dürer that he learned about in the mid-1980s, rather than Auguste Rodin’s *The Thinker* (1904). Dürer’s drawing for this monument presents a lone labourer with a sword who is seated at the top of a tall plinth created with sculptures of agricultural equipment such as shovels and pitchforks. Wall described this monument plan as “…very modern to me” and analyzed the labourer by noting: “He’s mourning for the fate of his class and his class’ hopes for emancipation. Their defeat is symbolized by the great sword in his back.” Wall’s *The Thinker* (fig. 60) highlights his orientation toward a Marxist critique of representation. This image presents a figure seated on a piece of concrete in the middle of a street to emphasize modern building construction in Vancouver and also throughout North America. Wall additionally
states that the central figure is “an aging worker,” and adds: “An aging worker who can’t work so hard anymore is someone who is going to be feeling pretty valueless and probably be treated as valueless.” In *The Thinker* (fig. 60), Wall employs Dürer’s drawing of a monument that explores class relationships and agricultural labour to in turn highlight isolation in Canadian society through the figure of an elderly employee during the 1980s.

*The Old Prison* (1987) (fig. 61) highlights Wall’s interest in exploring European art history, modernity and landscape during the 1980s. *The Old Prison* (fig. 61) shows a long and slender view of Vancouver. The left area of the foreground shows two stone, historical buildings placed side by side on a strip of land with piles of soil and a digging orange excavator. A small figure wearing a red sweater and blue denim jeans stands near a brown couch and discarded items as they look out at the landscape. A central bridge also connects two green land masses that are dotted with buildings. The second, upper half of the image presents dark clouds hovering directly over the landscape, and an area of blue sky further upward. Wall presents Vancouver’s residential, metropolitan, and industrial regions together in this image, alongside natural environments, such as grasses and shrubs in the foreground, green trees in the background, and deep blue bodies of water with a limitless sky overhead.

Wall’s method of drawing on art history to create this image, and specifically the ways seventeenth-century Dutch landscape artists sought to capture the “infinite landscape” in their paintings of natural environments, highlights how contemporary urban regions can be analyzed through European art historical perspectives. German art historian Rolf Lauter analyzes the connections between Wall’s representation of Vancouver in *The Old Prison* (fig. 61) and Dutch landscape painting. He writes: “In Wall’s picture, the lovely landscapes of the Dutch works
turn into a landscape destroyed, spoilt and plundered by civilization.” Lauter adds: “The “old prison” is a symbol for the prisons we call “society” or “city,” and contrasts diametrically with the idea of the breadth of nature and landscape.” However, it is also important to address that in *The Old Prison* (fig. 61), Wall thoughtfully questions these historical distinctions between urban and natural environments through photography, instead of painting. For example, he employs photography, a medium associated with the modern gaze, to represent a distinctively contemporary mixture of natural, urban, and industrial environments in Vancouver.

While Herzog continued to represent colourful local spaces in Vancouver throughout the 1970s and 1980s, in the later decades of his career, Herzog’s images often adopt a grimmer tone. This change is most evident in images such as: *Apparation* (1989), *Untitled* (2001), *Caged Stairs* (2001) (fig. 62), and *Untitled* (2004). *Apparation* shows the rusted surface of a large, blue metal dumpster within a park, while *Untitled* (2001) shows the smashed screen of what appears to be a household appliance below graffiti, black iron bars, and grimy bricks. Similarly, *Untitled* (2004) presents a boxy wooden, white structure in front of a line of other unidentifiable white structures in what appears to be an industrial site. *Caged Stairs* (fig. 62) also presents white stairs and metal netting in a seemingly industrial site. These images do not showcase the vivid warmth of Vancouver in the late 1950s and 1960s, but instead present urban or industrial areas that appear cold, metallic and sterile. They also reveal Herzog’s continued interest in showing the city’s changing topography as a collage, with graffiti, buildings, metal, and refuse merged together.

Herzog also gained increased critical recognition in Vancouver during this later time period. *Fred Herzog: Vancouver Photographs* (2007) at the Vancouver Art Gallery led to national recognition of and interest in his images, which was enhanced by the *Fred Herzog: Street Pho-

**Conclusion**

This chapter has analyzed Jeff Wall’s essay about Fred Herzog “Vancouver Appearing and Not Appearing in Fred Herzog’s Photographs” (2011) as a key document that can be studied to explore the relationships between Herzog’s urban photography of Vancouver and Wall’s *Land- scape Manual*.442 I argue that this essay provides an understanding for how Herzog and Wall critically investigate urban viewership through the car, and collages, in photo-based art during the late 1960s and early 1970s.443 Situating this essay in relation to Christos Dikeakos’ artwork and essay about the “vehicular flâneur” figure in Vancouver furthermore illustrates a new method of North American urban viewership that is completed from a car window, as opposed to walking through neighbourhoods.444 In addition, reflecting upon the relationships between Herzog, Wall, and an interest in photographic collage-making during this time period highlights the nuanced ways that both artists were considering how to look at and assess topography.445 The final section of this chapter discusses how both artists’ careers diverged in the late 1970s.446 This chapter highlights how analyzing Herzog and Wall together explores the multi-faceted ways of depicting Vancouver’s topography in photo-based art.
Conclusion

In 1959, Fred Herzog created *Old Man, Main Street* (fig. 63), which shows a man in a grey trench coat walking on the sidewalk. A colourful shop with red, yellow and blue panels is beside him, and the sunlight shining upon him casts his long shadow onto the side of the shop. Fifty-two years later in 2011, art critic Robert Enright observed in an interview with Herzog: “If you took the man out of *Old Man Main, 1959*, it would be a Jeff Wall photograph.”447 Herzog responded: “I stood there and looked at that wall with the colour panels and thought, “I’ll just wait for somebody to walk in.” That’s perhaps my most commonly used device. It’s not that I wanted to take a picture there, but I’m always alert to picture possibilities.”448 Jeff Wall was also mindful of these “picture possibilities” as he travelled through Vancouver’s suburbs in a car during the late 1960s.449 For him, suburban Vancouver also became a space to explore the possibilities of chance and control as he pictured topography from a car window in a broader investigation of conceptual art. Both Herzog and Wall share a common interest in the photograph’s theatrical possibilities. While *Old Man, Main Street (1959)* (fig. 63) reveals how Herzog carefully studied colourful, local environments to picture topography in Vancouver, Wall’s *Landscape Manual* instead reveals how conceptual art, and an interest in the “defeatured landscape,” informed the way he depicted topography.

This thesis draws on theoretical understandings of “place-making” put forth by Gillian Cowell, Maarten P. J. Loopmans, Stijn Oosterlynck, and Gillian Rose to argue that Herzog’s and Wall’s work demonstrates the multi-faceted ways that topography in Vancouver has been studied through photo-based art. I also draw upon the work of Elizabeth Edwards and Janice Hart to highlight how specifically examining the materiality of Herzog’s and Wall’s work reveals their
artistic processes, and how the process of picturing topography distinctively centres an artist’s experience as they move through the city, either in a car or by walking, or both. Furthermore, this study assesses Herzog and Wall in relation to theorizations about the flâneur figure, and how this figure developed into an isolated individual travelling through and observing a city in a car in North America during the 1960s. Following the work of Christos Dikeakos and Ian Wallace, I suggest that seeing Vancouver through a car window renders the city as a multi-faceted, chaotic collage. Examining Herzog’s and Wall’s work alongside one another reveals how observing the city as a collage is an apt way of picturing the city’s homes, businesses, and neighbourhoods.

In Chapter One, “Centring Locality in Vancouver through Observation,” I examine Fred Herzog’s focus on local environments within Vancouver. This chapter addresses how Herzog represented waterfront topography, and the distinctive, colourful shop windows within Vancouver’s downtown neighbourhoods. It introduces Walter Benjamin’s conceptualization of the flâneur figure as a useful framework for interpreting Herzog’s images. Herzog’s depictions of viewership and urban looking are also distinguished from Laura Mulvey’s theorizations about scopophilia to show how he considers the gaze, and exchanges of gazes, through shop windows and in neighbourhoods. Herzog’s representation of Vancouver in colour and use of the portable Leica M3 camera also reveals the importance of analyzing photographic technology as a key part of his artistic process. Furthermore, this chapter situates Herzog in the early history of photography in Vancouver to showcase artistic networks’ significance in the city.

In Chapter Two, “Exploring Conceptual Art through Topography in Vancouver,” I analyze Jeff Wall’s Landscape Manual (1969-1970) (figs. 32-40). In Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40), the topography is represented as a stage for Wall to explore early conceptual art-making
processes, such as de-aestheticization and the blend of image and text, as well as centre his own personal experiences of travelling through suburbia in Vancouver. The chapter analyzes Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40) in relation to the broader conceptual interest in the “defeatured landscape.” This chapter discusses the relationship between Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40) and Dan Graham’s Homes for America (fig. 1) to illustrate a conceptual preoccupation with artistic processes, and how conceptual artists often used deadpan humour to make fun of academic studies. This chapter concludes with an assessment of Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40) in relation to Joseph Kosuth’s One and Three Chairs (1965) (fig. 2) and Martha Rosler’s The Bowery in two inadequate descriptive systems (1974-1975) (fig. 3).

In Chapter Three, “Jeff Wall, Fred Herzog, and Seeing Vancouver,” I interpret Wall’s essay about Fred Herzog, “Vancouver Appearing and Not Appearing in Fred Herzog’s Photographs.” I argue that two conceptual models emerge from studying this essay: the “vehicular flâneur” figure and collage. Assessing the parallels between Wall’s Landscape Manual (figs. 32-40) and Herzog’s images of cars, shop windows and street signage from the late 1950s to the 1970s reveal how viewing from a car is to see and experience the world as a collage of homes, businesses, cars, and signage. The multivalent and chaotic, layered form of the collage is an apt model for the experience of Vancouver during this time period. The chapter closes with a brief discussion of how Herzog’s and Wall’s works diverge during the late 1970s and 1980s.

This thesis shows how analyzing the work of Herzog and Wall, who have exceptionally different ways of picturing Vancouver’s topography, alongside one another can yield a new way of centring Vancouver itself in discussions about photo-based art in the city. Herzog and Wall are not usually assessed together, but this thesis fills a critical gap in existing literature by offering a
new way of understanding Herzog’s images in relation to artistic photography, as well as Wall’s early conceptual work in relation to broader interpretations of Vancouver’s topography. In his 2011 essay, Wall explores how the Vancouver that Herzog photographed, and specifically its built environment, changed in the 1980s and 1990s. Wall asks if someone born in 1998 would admire the changed Vancouver as Herzog did decades earlier. He writes: “It’s conceivable that that someone born around 1998, today’s 13-year old future Fred Herzog, that boy or girl whose childhood and adolescence is being lived in today’s streetscape and who will carry the personal memories that will bind him or her to this shopping mall display window and this escalator and that Starbucks…” While I was also born in 1998, and turned thirteen years old when Wall’s article was initially published in 2011, I too wonder how currently emerging artists of my generation will artistically explore changing understandings of place and environment.

Vancouver in Herzog’s and Wall’s images can be viewed as both a colourful, local space, and a black-and-white, defeatured environment. These artists do not depict Vancouver as part of the “beautiful B. C.” aesthetic. Observing their images, and distinctively different interpretations of topography, together invites viewers to ask: what is Vancouver? Herzog’s and Wall’s processes of picturing topography in Vancouver also reveal the development of photo-based art in the city, and how different ways of making photo-based art emerged throughout the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s amongst networks composed of Vancouver-based artists, curators, galleries and artist-run centres.
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FROM AND FOR A WORK IN PROGRESS

Toward a defunctural landscape on all levels, without any sense of loss, mutation, subversion, etc.—visions of tiny photographs.

The beginning of a continuing interpretation with as yet unknown photographs, with as yet unrealised signals from the as yet existenceless future. This date, September 26, 1969, 7:15 p.m., will mark the "outlet" of this endless experiment.

The work in progress: sequences, interspersed with situations and spaces of a specific time, dense nature—a sequence which is subtly altered, manipulated in a particular way, one procedure from a vault of endless possibilities. I myself sit here—or monthly ride in a car—and am somewhat more than just a "recording machine".

The outlines of the region of concrete reactions—reactions "lived" in complex (i.e., timeless) time & remembered in "normal" time—complex but different. Instead of being an as expository work, the work should be a particular procedure itself, carried out as the writing (etc.) is carried out, becoming in effect indistinguishable from the procedure itself—not subordinate to any other particular physical etc. process, but instead, as concrete as any other particular procedure. Typewriting is an "physical" activity; interaction with materials, etc., as interaction with stone, steel, oil clay, etc. interaction with materials as primarily "structural": i.e., participation in any process is a condition of relating which demands a complete structural "metaphysics", and we can see more & more clearly that this dream & its response should be made as consciously as possible. When words are used, this necessity obviously becomes most apparent—close attention to interface of language/word—"apparent "opposition" of mistaking to "correct procedure"

Look carefully into the past; think now the surface as a (preliminary) particular articulation of many simultaneous functions, propositions, etc.—this "surface" articulation a particular and necessary structure, and, as such, intimately related to extended regions of abstraction, each as singular as the previous—all connected in 'crystalline' fashion, like the interchange on the broad high-speed freeway under the wheels of a car (1960 luxury Lincoln Convertible), then the cleaning approaches, the long straight secondary highways with rutted gravel shoulders, and further and further away, the complex and simultaneous network of natural driven, cemented and concrete—the white lines carrying sleepers out of hearing range. The real-landscape exists, then, as the region of primary involvement, carried to the page with real, primary words and actual chemical photographs.

A VISIT INTO THE REGION

The "regions" which make up the content of the ongoing system are of little importance in & for themselves. Because what we know, or what we are actually working with when we work at all, is an awareness of structures—when we make abstractions from these structures to qualitatively different kinds of structures—we understand that what we are doing involves a manipulation of elements or of the "objects" which are not important to us except in the manner in which we manipulate them.

I am riding in a car; the sun breaks and sets in the long highway windows. The engine, the wind tearing through rolled-down windows and wide-open vents under the dashboard, in my lap like a camera in a leather case. My hands are at my sides and I am looking out to the right out the window. Books and papers cover the book seat. The landscape rushes out through the rear windows of the car and slips away much too quickly to be contained; nevertheless, from time to time I snap a photograph through one of the car's windows.

Figure 33: Jeff Wall, Landscape Manual, 1969-1970, edition of 400, Courtesy of the artist.
might at any particular time correspond to specific images of any of the photograph held on the lap of the rider/participant. Car Ride B lasted for different "lengths" of time: one ride lasted as long as Car Ride A lasted as registered on a wristwatch; another lasted, like Car Ride A, until all the photographs had been flipped through—alike, therefore is analogous to the taking of the photographs in Car Ride A. The ride flipped through the photographs at his own leisure, but with the awareness of the possibilities afforded by the two different yet subtly co-ordinated levels operating within this mobile landscape. The reader did not attempt at any one to make any particular connections between "real" photo-images & "real" scenery flashing past the car windows.

HANS AT HIS SIDES

Consider now the immense number of car rides I have experienced in my lifetime. I am sitting in any one of five hundred cars, my hands at my sides, or folded across my chest, or in the pockets of my overcoat. One arm is out the window—one hand—maybe my right—is resting on the roof of the car, out the side, and my fingers are grasping the narrow wave channel at the edge of the car roof; my arm is stretched across the seat, etc. I have no camera—in fact, I am not even paying any attention to the landscape tearing by all around me; my eyes might be closed; the radio might be on.

The reader never knew whether or not the particular photograph he was looking at at any particular space-time co-ordinate was in fact taken on Car Ride A—the ride he was "attempting" to "reconstruct"—or on some other, totally "different" car ride. It was found—naturally enough—that this did not make the slightest difference. In the continually changing information field of the constantly moving car, all empty information was finally realized as being equivalent—everything was always "to the point". All the photographs were in some sense identical; all were equal ly unmanageable in terms of a specific attempt at a "causal" organization or orientation. However, when such a goal-structure was discarded, all the photos fell into place. The car ride, although in certain terms limited to a finite time-space length, was revealed in other ways as beginningless and endless.

There are many other possibilities for Car Ride B regarding media: that is, there are as many variants possible concerning the manner in which the "information" of Car Ride A is transmitted to Car Ride B. Therefore, there are many rides to be made.
The difference between all these car rides & the specific car rides described above ought to be apparent. The two car rides (A & B) are self-consciously systemic experiences in which "real-time" computation has become an integral part of the structure of the experience as a whole. This highly-artificial analogue—this "landscape"—is prevailing, as time goes by, to be less and less "artificial" when compared with "normal" day-to-day routine. This might be due to the fact that self-aware systematization and autopoiesis of apparently "routine" situations is not-necessarily "artificial" after all. On the other hand, this might be due to the fact that very much of what we generally think of as "normal", "routine" activity is in fact very highly structured and organized both in our minds/nervous systems and in the structures exterior to our minds/nervous systems, in spite of the fact that we have been largely unaware of the existence of such a state of affairs.

Artificial landscape. note: tree, house, curb

Every simple—or apparently simple—act is seen as the "result" of the interaction of an unimaginable number of components which, if successfully cataloged (if the system were completely defined) would include/comprise the entire universe at any particular point in space-time. The difference for us is in our operational awareness of this interaction and, at the same time, in our new awareness of the systemic levels upon which all of this activity take place in our minds/nervous systems. We are aware of our continual habit of making abstractions—in "real time"—from all our experience; we are aware of our incessant creation of all our routine experiences in terms of the multileveled, multidimensional organization and functioning of our entire organism. Therefore we are critically aware of the representational system that is language—and we are aware of the limitations language by nature has in regard to the totality of our experience. By continually attempting to see, we become aware of the parameters of the universe of "being"; we understand the difference between that which can be said and that which cannot be said. It is an awareness of the—not "categories"—but levels (all simultaneous) of our experience.

The experience in car rides A & B was one of infinitely expanded attention, an extremely precise kind of awareness, a total lack of the need for the attachment of any kind of "meaning" to the rides, the images, the sequences, the connections between all these components. The experience is complete and at the same time endless—it is like a mental "diagram" of functional living space while at the same time having the full weight and affective density of so-called "meaningful" experiences and situations.

Car Ride B is an exercise in affective disruption, the "pulling out of all the wires" of anticipation, prediction, rationalization of experience deemed no necessary before the particular experience in fact occurs. The image track established in Car Ride A is the basic "morpheme" of the autoanalytical situation of Car Ride B. B is obviously very different from A in very many ways, but as well, the "difference" between the two becomes indistinguishable and difficult to define. The various disruptions of image sequence (and if a verbal or written description is included in the carrying-out of the project, then word/image sequence analysis would be employed).

Figure 36: Jeff Wall, Landscape Manual, 1969-1970, edition of 400, Courtesy of the artist.
wareness of this relationship. Even further, it starts from the conviction that the elementary conditions of all the participants in a deep symbiotic awareness of at least the existence of the relationship between the individual nervous system and all the other systems in the universe, including of course, though not necessarily always first and foremost, all the other nervous systems.

stretches and reaches of activity between sections, the "negative moments" before or after particularized points. The ride could become, if one approached it with the "wrong" or incorrectly situated, state of mind, a long wait between only apparent occurrences.

These printed pages are likewise a graph of the attention brought to—or created out of—the conscious real-time analysis of the car-ride experience of the landscape as sensation—the photographs, the writing, the sequence established among the sets of photographs, the proposals for future car rides—all are in a quite precise manner made for the (auto)analysis of my/your state of attention. These maps are nothing but the result, the evidence of their own continuous operation in our continuous experience.

Vulgar Art

Figure 38: Jeff Wall, Landscape Manual, 1969-1970, edition of 400, Courtesy of the artist.
Nothing appears irregular or out of place (but then, "out of place" doesn't seem "workable" at all) In other words, things can be accepted immediately, without reaction and reflection—but not without the living memory of those photographs, which are not even yours, in the realm of your conditioned consciences—Conditioned in level after level—one can penetrate farther and farther; the photo-cards continue to fall into place; the photos continue to link themselves up in one single, apparently immutable order.

Word, image, or "verbal" structures can be seen as schemas of less particular (and so less simple to fully articulate) relationships; in language, the structure of the words should follow as closely as possible the structure of that which is occurring or existing outside the word universe, or outside a person's skin. In a world where this does not often occur, pathological problems of stunning simplicity are created. (Art) manipulation creates endless combinations: the relationships which are the "result" of this manipulation do not necessarily carry more or less "meaning" or "importance" than the "original" set of relationships (i.e., the original organization of activity or ordering of "physical" members). What is revealed in the infinity of ways in which the facets of the world—themselves continually changing—can be rearranged. They also show us that one arrangement does not necessarily take precedence over another.

Figure 41: Ed Ruscha, *Every Building on the Sunset Strip*, 1966, offset lithograph on paper silver Mylar-covered box, 17.81 cm x 14.29 cm (7-1/8 in x 5-5/8 in), Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States, [https://walkerart.org/collections/artworks/every-building-on-the-sunset-strip](https://walkerart.org/collections/artworks/every-building-on-the-sunset-strip).
Figure 42: Robert Smithson, *The Monuments of Passaic (The Sand-Box Monument, also called The Desert)*, 1967, photographs and cut Photostat map, 42 cm x 288 cm (16 17/32 in x 113 25/64 in), Museum of Contemporary Art, Oslo, Norway, https://holtsmithsonfoundation.org/monuments-passaic.
Figure 45: Stan Douglas, *Every Building on 100 West Hastings*, 2001, chromogenic print, 59.7 cm x 243.8 cm (23 1/2 in x 96 in), *Artsy*, https://www.artsy.net/artwork/stan-douglas-every-building-on-100-west-hastings.
Figure 46: Fred Herzog, *New Pontiac*, 1957, Courtesy The Estate of Fred Herzog and Equinox Gallery, Vancouver.

Figure 49: Ian Wallace, *Pan Am Scan*, 1970, five gelatin silver prints, 200 cm x 122 cm (79 in x 48 in), Courtesy of the artist.
Figure 50: Fred Herzog, *North Vancouver*, 1958, Courtesy The Estate of Fred Herzog and Equinox Gallery, Vancouver.

Figure 51: Fred Herzog, *Cars at Cunningham Drugs*, 1960, Courtesy The Estate of Fred Herzog and Equinox Gallery, Vancouver.

Figure 52: Fred Herzog, *Used Car Lot*, 1970, Courtesy The Estate of Fred Herzog and Equinox Gallery, Vancouver.

Figure 53: Fred Herzog, *Orange Cars Powell*, 1973, Courtesy The Estate of Fred Herzog and Equinox Gallery, Vancouver.

Figure 54: Iain Baxter and Ingrid Baxter (N. E. Thing Company), *A Portfolio of Piles*, 1968, photograph, 24.2 cm x 16.5 cm (9.52 in x 6.49 in), University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, https://omeka.library.ualberta.ca/items/show/3140.
Figure 55: Ian Wallace, *Street Reflections*, 1970, five gelatin silver prints, 200 cm x 60 cm (79 in x 23.5 in), Courtesy of the artist.
Figure 56: Fred Herzog, *Granville Street from Granville Bridge*, 1966, Courtesy The Estate of Fred Herzog and Equinox Gallery, Vancouver.

Figure 57: Fred Herzog, *Hastings and Carrall*, 1968, Courtesy The Estate of Fred Herzog and Equinox Gallery, Vancouver.

Figure 58: Jeff Wall, *Picture for Women*, 1979, transparency in lightbox, 142.5 cm x 204.5 cm, Courtesy of the artist.
Figure 59: Jeff Wall, *The Storyteller*, 1986, transparency in lightbox, 299 cm x 437 cm, Courtesy of the artist.
Figure 60: Jeff Wall, *The Thinker*, 1986, transparency in lightbox, 216 cm x 229 cm, Courtesy of the artist.
Figure 61: Jeff Wall, *The Old Prison*, 1987, transparency in lightbox, 70 cm x 228.6 cm, Courtesy of the artist.
Figure 62: Fred Herzog, *Caged Stairs*, 2001, Courtesy The Estate of Fred Herzog and Equinox Gallery, Vancouver.

Figure 63: Fred Herzog, *Old Man, Main Street*, 1959, Courtesy The Estate of Fred Herzog and Equinox Gallery, Vancouver.
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