

# **A ONDA ZAPOČINJE RAD**

Zapažanja o konceptualnom  
i dokumentarnom u suvremenoj  
fotografiji

-



-

# **THEN THE WORK TAKES PLACE**

Remarks on the Conceptual and  
the Documentary in Contemporary  
Photography

Konceptualne i dokumentarne fotografske strategije obično se doživljavaju kao oprečne, takoreći međusobno isključujuće. S jedne strane riječ je o intervencijama u fotografiju kao „sustav“, a s druge strane o razradi isprepletenih koncepata reprezentacije i stvarnosti. U prvom slučaju čini se da je „predmet“ fotografije ona sama, a u drugom je slučaju to „samo“ ono što ulazi u vizualni doseg fotografije.

No, ta dihotomija previše olako prelazi preko činjenice da fotografija sama po sebi predstavlja konceptualizaciju gledanja i opažanja, dakle odnosa vidljivosti i stvaranja vidljivim: „Realistički prikaz konceptualno (sic!) i historijski počiva na preuzimanju modela koji stvarateljima slike, kao i promatraču, dopušta da zahtijevaju sustavne veze između slike i predmeta koji ona prikazuje, a potom ih doista i pronadu. Jedino što taj predmet nije samo svijet kakav on jest, kako izgleda, pa ni način na koji ga mi vidimo; posrijedi je zapravo standardizirana, karakterizirana, jasno definirana predodžba o samom gledanju.“<sup>1</sup> Dakle, čak i kad nastane to što opisujemo kao „fotografiju“, bez vidljivih zahvata u postupak (pri čemu bi valjalo razjasniti što se zapravo smatra „postupkom“), čak i kad se pogled ili kamera usmjere prema predmetu, već nastupa konceptualizacija onoga što možemo nazvati „predmetom“, „slikom“, „reprezentacijom“. U kontekstu fotografije možda je, dakle, riječ o dokumentarnom, kao o oduvijek konceptualnom, ili o oduvijek konceptualnoj

intervenciji u dokumentarno, ili pak o dokumentarnom kao o nezaobilaznom području konceptualnoga.

Lako je moguće da je te dvije, na prvi pogled oprečne strategije, tradicije, pa čak i ideologije slike teže razdvojiti ili razlikovati nego što se to obično pretpostavlja. Jeff Wall u svojoj je raspravi o konceptualnim fotografskim strategijama među ostalim govorio i o slavnom novinskom prilogu „Homes for America“ (1965.) Dana Grahama te o djelu „Duration Piece #7“ (1973.) Douglasa Hueblera. Riječ je o oponašanju reportaže ili dokumentacije, što neizostavni slikovni karakter fotografije odvodi sve do točke gdje „ne postoji ama baš ništa bitno što bi se moglo prikazati“, u izvjesnom smislu do reportaže bez događaja.<sup>2</sup> Na taj način ti radovi u neku ruku pomiču konfiguraciju fotografskog i uvode autorefleksivnost fotografske slike, koja nju samu pretvara u područje autorefleksije, ne intervenirajući pritom u sliku – štoviše, iz slika se upravo ponešto i izvlači.

Isto bi se, više od trideset godina poslije, moglo ustvrditi i za seriju fotografija „Morning of the Magicien“ Joachima Koestera (2005.). Serija tematizira propast komune koju su 1920. godine u Cefalu na Siciliji osnovali Aleister Crowley i Leah Hirsig, a koja je bila smještena u nekadašnjoj vili Santa Barbara na brdašcu iznad grada. Vila je preimenovana u „The Abbey of Thelema“ po knjizi „Gargantua“ (1534.) François Rabelaisa, koji je u njoj zamislio idealnu zajednicu pod maksimom: svatko

Conceptual and documentary photographic strategies are commonly understood as contrary, even as mutually exclusive. On the one hand, they are interventions in the “system” of photography, while on the other they are a cutback on the complex concepts of representation and reality: whereas in the former case the “object” of photography seems to be photography itself, in the latter it is “merely” what comes within the reach of photography in terms of visibility. However, this dichotomy overlooks all too easily the fact that photography is itself a conceptualization of seeing and perceiving, including the relationship between visibility and visualization: “Realistic representation rests conceptually [sic!] and historically on the assumption of a model that (...) allows us [the image producer and the spectator] to demand and indeed find systematic relationships between the image and the object of the representation. But this object is not simply the world as it is, the world as it appears, nor is it even the way we see it; rather it is a standardised, characterised, clearly defined conception of seeing itself.”

<sup>1</sup> Thus, even if that which we describe as “photography” takes place without visible interventions in the procedure (whereby it should be clarified what counts as a “procedure”), that is, if our gaze or a camera is directed at a particular object,

that already implies conceptualization of that which can be described as “object”, “image”, and “representation”. Therefore, regarding the field of photography it is possibly about the documentary as the already conceptual, or about an intervention in the documentary that is always conceptual as well, or the documentary as the inevitable ground for the conceptual. Perhaps it is more difficult to keep apart or differentiate these two strategies, traditions, or even visual strategies than it has been commonly thought. In his debate on conceptual strategies in photography, Jeff Wall has, among other things, discussed Dan Graham’s famous magazine article “Homes for America” (1965), as well as Douglas Huebler’s “Duration Piece #7” (1973). As imitations of reportage or documentation, they continue the inevitable representational character of photography, where there is “expressly nothing important to represent”: in a sense, it is reportage without an event.<sup>2</sup> Thus, these works shift the configuration of the photographic to some extent, introducing a self-reflectivity of the photographic image, which transforms the image itself into a ground for that self-reflection, yet without intervening in it – instead, something is actually taken out of the images.

The same could be stated for Joachim Koester’s series “Morning of the Magicians” from 2005, thirty years later. The series refers to the demise of a commune that Aleister Crowley and Leah

neka radi što želi. Crowley je po uzoru na Rabelaisa osmislio koncept zajednice koji se radikalno razlikovao od racionalizma i modernističke volje za redom.

Koester kreće tragovima te utopije, posjećuje točnu lokaciju u Cefalu i pozicionira fotografije ruševine i njezine okoline između dokumentarno-topografske dokumentacije i pomno odabranih slikovnih konstrukcija: oba postupka proizvode nestvarno lijepe slike koje podsjećaju na pejzažnu romantiku, ali i na pokušaje da se tome posebnom mjestu podari nov retrospektivni i vizualni naboj, da ga se zaogrne plaštem tajnovitosti. Međutim, fotografije i dalje ostaju pune praznina, nedorečenosti i nagoviještenih kontekstā, klizeći tako prema granicama dokumentarnih strategija, tj. razradi fotografskog koncepta na mjestu koje se tome konceptu opire i izmiče mu.

Fotografski albumi Eda Rusche zasigurno se mogu smatrati inkunabulama konceptualne fotografije, primjerice *Twentysix Gasoline Stations*, „a book of some kind“, nastala 1963. godine, zatim *Some Los Angeles Departments* (1965.) i *Every*

*Building on the Sunset Strip* (1966.) te *Thirtyfour Parking Lots in Los Angeles* realiziran 1967. godine. Njegove slike ne pričaju nikakve priče, nisu svjedočanstva ili fotografske konstrukcije nikakvih posebnih trenutaka, one ne pripovijedaju ni o čemu osim o pukom postojanju arhitektonskih i poluurbanih situacija koje prikazuju: benzinske crpke na putu između Los Angelesa i grada u Oklahomi u kojemu Ruscha živi, zgrade duž Sunset Stripa u Los Angelesu, parkirališta i bazene. Njegova djela nisu čak ni skice za neki fotografski film ceste, ne postoji metapriča koja bi fotografije posložila u „smislen“, narativni niz. Drugim riječima, nije posrijedi ni reportaža niti dokumentacija „nečega“ – to „nešto“ kao da nedostaje, odnosno kao da postoji samo u nabranju onoga što se pojavljuje pred kamerom: 26 benzinskih crpki, potom nekoliko stanova u Los Angelesu (zašto baš ti stanovi?). Slike su u potpunosti svedene na svoj status dokumenta i, kao takve, ne poštuju čak ni temeljna pravila fotografiranja, kako piše Jeff Wall: „Žarišne daljine nisu prilagođene udaljenosti predmeta, ne vodi se računa o dobu



REINHARD

BRAUN

Hirsig founded in Cefalu on Sicily in 1920, in the former Villa Santa Barbara on a hill above the city. The villa was renamed into “The Abbey of Thelema” after Rabelais’ book “Gargantua” (1534), where he defined the ideal community called “Theleme” under the motto that everyone could do what he or she wished. It was intended to overcome all social differences. Following Rabelais, Crowley devised a communal concept that radically differed from Modernist rationalism and will for order. Koester undertakes to explore that utopia and visits the settlement in Cefalu, setting his photographic shots of the ruin and its surroundings somewhere between documentary/topographic representation and carefully devised image constructions: both result in seductively beautiful images, reminiscent of landscape romanticism, but also of attempts at recharging this special place retrospectively and visually by surrounding it with something mysterious. And yet, the images remain full of gaps, of missing knowledge and contexts that are merely hinted at, thus sliding towards the margins of documentary strategies: they continue an image concept in a

place that resists and evades that image concept. The early books by Ed Ruscha certainly belong to the incunabulas of conceptual photography: *Twentysix Gasoline Stations*, “a book of some kind” produced in 1963, *Some Los Angeles Departments* (1965), *Every Building on the Sunset Strip* (1966), and *Thirtyfour Parking Lots in Los Angeles* (1967). No stories are condensed in these images, no special moments are caught or constructed in the photographic medium; they tell of nothing but the pure presence of the represented architectural or semi-urban situations: gas stations located alongside the road between Los Angeles and Ruscha’s residential town in Oklahoma, buildings along the Sunset Strip in Los Angeles, garages, and swimming pools. They do not even construct a “road movie” and there is no meta-story that would arrange the images into a narrative and therefore “meaningful” series. In other words, it is neither a reportage nor a documentation of “something” – in fact, that something seems to be missing altogether, or rather it consists merely in a list of those things

dana i kvaliteti svjetla, kadriranje slike pretjerano je funkcionalno, pri čemu su predmeti uz rub naprasno odsječeni, ne uzima se u obzir specifičan karakter prikazanoga trenutka – sve u svemu riječ je o urnebesno smiješnom uratku, gotovo sarkastičnoj mimikriji načina na koji 'obični ljudi' inače fotografiraju svoje stanove. (...) 'Dosadne' su, 'nezanimljive' i 'ne govore ni o čemu'.<sup>43</sup>

Ono što se, međutim, kod njih osjeća jest stanovito ispreplitanje estetike, tehnike i predmeta; kad bi serije Ruschinih fotografija pripovijedale o *nečemu drugom*, kad bi uspostavile *neki drugačiji* diskurs, kad bi one bile „dobre fotografije“, bi li vodile više računa o specifičnome karakteru prikazanoga trenutka ili bi bile manje naprasno obrezane?

Je li intencionalnost povezana i s nekom posebnom pozornošću prema tehnici? Ili, da preformuliramo pitanje: koliko Ruscha zajedno sa svojim fotografijama izlaže i očigledan amaterski pristup kameri? Koliko, samim time što se medij tako očito gura ispred predmeta slike, ta strategija izrasta u neku vrstu

autorefleksivnoga prikaza medija, a time upravo i u manifestaciju konceptualnih ideja i praksi?

Kakva je, dakle, važnost odnosa gledanja, vidljivosti i slike za razliku između konceptualnoga i dokumentarnoga?

Pozabavimo se, primjerice, serijom fotografija Marine Hugonnier pod nazivom „Towards Tomorrow“ (2009.). S kopna Aljaske vide se morski motivi koji otvaraju pogled prema Rusiji. U Americi je još danas, dok je u Rusiji, s one strane datumske granice, već sutra. Taj pogled u budućnost očituje se u velikim, nestvarno lijepim snimkama mora i oblaka. Na nekim se slikama razabire kopno. Slike su vrlo realistične, sve što se nađe pred kamerom krasi dramska ljepota. No bez obzira na sve, ne uspijevaju prikazati ono što doista predstavljaju: sutra, budućnost, datumsku granicu. Fotografijama je na taj način naslovom upisano, odnosno pripisano, nešto što njima samima nedostaje, što se u svom tom obilju vidljivih elemenata ne vidi. One, doduše, uklanjaju nedostatke koje je Ruscha ugradio u svoje serije fotografija – nepažljivost prema obrezivanju, osvjetljavanju i

A ONDA  
ZAPOCINJE RAD

... THEN THE WORK  
TAKES PLACE



POSTAV IZLOŽBE  
„THEN THE WORK  
TAKES PLACE“,  
CAMERA AUSTRIA,  
GALERIJA, GRAZ,  
2009., SNIMIO  
CHRISTIAN WACHTER

33

EXHIBITION VIEW  
“THEN THE WORK  
TAKES PLACE”,  
CAMERA AUSTRIA,  
GALLERY, GRAZ,  
2009, PHOTO BY  
CHRISTIAN WACHTER

that happened to appear before the camera: 26 gas stations, and then some apartments in los Angeles (why exactly those?). Images are completely reduced to their status of documents. And as such, they do not even follow the basic rules of photographic production, as Jeff Wall has written: “improper relation of lenses to subject distances, insensitive to time of day and quality of light, excessively functional cropping, with abrupt excisions of peripheral objects, lack of attention to the specific character of the moment being depicted – all in all a hilarious performance, an almost sinister mimicry of the way ‚people‘ make images of the dwellings with which they are involved.” (...) they are ‘dull’, ‘boring’, and ‘insignificant’.<sup>3</sup> And yet, this analysis hints at a specific combination of aesthetics, technique, and the object: would Ruscha’s series deal with *something else*, would it open a *different* discourse, if they were “good photographs”, if they would pay more attention to the specific character of the photographed moment, or be cut less abruptly? Is intentionality bound to a specific sort of attention or even technique? In

other words, to what extent does Ruscha also represent an “amateurish” attitude towards handling the camera, which cannot be overlooked? To what extent does this strategy become an art of *self-reflexive* demonstration of the medium, and thereby a manifestation of conceptual ideas and practices, precisely by allowing the medium to force its way before the object of depiction in such a conspicuous manner? So what is the point of the relationship between seeing, visibility, and image with regard to the difference between the conceptual and the documentary? Let us take a series like Marine Hugonnier’s “Towards Tomorrow” (2009) for comparison. From Alaska, one sees seascapes that open up a view towards Russia. In the US, it is still today, whereas in Russia, on the other side of the date line, it is already tomorrow. That view into the future is shown on large formatted, seductively beautiful shots of clouds and the sea. In some photos, one may discern a hint of the mainland. The images are fully realistic, they show everything that was before the camera in all its dramatic beauty; and yet, they are incapable of

predmetu – no svejedno ne odlaze korak dalje u dokumentiranju onoga što se nalazi u ishodištu njihova zanimanja. Estetika, dakle, ne može nadoknaditi praznine u slikama, pogotovo dokumentarnim fotografijama.

Pa što je onda to što u dokumentarnim fotografijama oduvijek nedostaje, a što ih istodobno uvodi u rasprave o strategijama koje se obično opisuju kao konceptualne?

Je li moguće da se konceptualno nalazi baš na području dokumentarnoga kao što se to u početku tvrdilo? Je li zamisliva teorija slike koja premošćuje taj jaz? Je li uopće riječ o premošćivanju (ideološkoga) jaza, nije li riječ upravo o suprotnom, o učvršćivanju toga jaza posred fotografskoga medija?

Naslov jednoga eseja Benjamina Buchloha o Allanu Sekuli glasi „Fotografija između diskursa i dokumenta“.<sup>4</sup> Čini se da taj naslov, koji uspijeva proširiti čitavo područje fotografskoga, već označava fotografiju onako kako je to deset godina poslije formulirao Jacques Rancière: sliku kao sirovu osjetilnu prisutnost / kao diskurs koji šifrira priču.<sup>5</sup> Ta sintagma s druge strane podsjeća na tezu W. J. T. Mitchella: „Ne postoji vizualni medij. Svi mediji su miješani i u njima osjetila i znakovi sudjeluju u različitim omjerima.“<sup>6</sup>

I Georges Didi-Huberman govori o „dvojakom ustroju“ fotografije – „između zajamčena poznavanja onoga što je

prikazano i nesigurna prepoznavanja onoga što je vidljivo, između nesigurnosti u viđeno i sigurnosti u doživljeno“.<sup>7</sup> Riječ je o „razlici koja intimnost slika na platnu pretvara u personifikaciju čudnovatoga, u ono ‘izvanjsko’ kolektivne povijesti“.<sup>8</sup>

Neka se čudnovatost, dakle, provlači fotografijama upravo prepoznavanjem onoga što one prikazuju. Kao da postoji nekakvo „puknuće čitljivoga i vidljivoga u tijelu same slike: s jedne strane je identitet objekta, reprezentacija, oblik, motiv, referencijalno označeno (prepoznatljivo isto)“, a s druge strane „njegova *drugost/naličje*, bezličnost, koja stvara mrlju ili simptom, njegov nagrđeni simbol koji nas ranjava i ostavlja bez riječi i koji buja i širi se posvuda na slikama čim ga se ondje krene tražiti“.<sup>9</sup> Podsjeća nas to na Foucaultovo razlikovanje između sagledljivoga i izrecivoga, na pukotinu što zijeva slikom, koja označava slojeve i linije prijeloma diskursa, onaj prazni prostor između teksta i slike, „načinjen od okova oko vidljivosti i okova oko čitljivosti“.<sup>10</sup> Odnos vidljivoga i izrecivoga/sagledljivoga jest odnos „negiranja i zabrane, mjesto na kojem se moć, žudnja i znanje približavaju strategijama reprezentacije“.<sup>11</sup>

Tako ni fotografije nisu površine na kojima je jednostavno nešto prikazati. Takvo prikazivanje je i samo prostor za koji se valja boriti, prostor prožet žudnjama, znanjem, zabranama, moći, konvencijama, normama i tako dalje, i tako dalje. U fotografiji se vidljivost i znanje takoreći sudaraju: „Slike se sudaraju

REINHARD

BRAUN

representing their own object: tomorrow, the future, the date line. Thus, their title inscribes into them or assigns them something that is missing in the images as such, something that cannot be seen despite all that abundance of visibility. They resolve the lack of attention with regard to cropping, lighting, and the object, so to say, which Ruscha has implemented in his series. And yet, they do not make any step further in documenting that which is the starting point of their interest. Therefore we may say that aesthetics is unable to close the gap of images, particularly of documentary photographic images.

What is it then that is always missing in documentary images, and which at the same time takes them towards the debates around those strategies that tend to be described as conceptual? Could it be that the conceptual resides in the midst of the field of the documentary, as initially claimed? Could we imagine a theory of images that would close this gap? And is it at all about closing an (ideological) gap, or rather about enhancing this gap in the midst of the photographic as such?

Benjamin Buchloh has written an essay about Allan Sekula with the following title: “Photography between Discourse and Document”;<sup>4</sup> spanning over the entire field of photography, this title seems to anticipate a characterization of the photographic image that Jacques Rancière formulated ten years later: image is a raw sensual presence and a discourse that encodes a story.<sup>5</sup> This phrase reminds in turn of W.J.T. Mitchell’s hypothesis

that “there are no visual media (...) all media are mixed media”, in which the senses and the sign types take part in various proportions.<sup>6</sup> Georges Didi-Huberman also speaks of a “twofold order” of the photographic image “between a *certain* knowledge of what is represented and an uncertain recognition of what is seen; between the uncertainty of having *seen* and the certainty of having *experienced*”,<sup>7</sup> which is a “difference by which images of the *intimate*, having appeared on screen, become the *strangeness*, even the *foreignness*, of collective history”.<sup>8</sup> Thus, a sort of strangeness suffuses the photographic images precisely as one realizes what they are showing. There seems to be a “rupture of the readable and visible in the very body of the image itself: on the one hand, there is the object of identity, the representation, the form, the motive, the referentially defined (the recognizable sameness)”, while “on the other hand, there is its very otherness, its formlessness, which produces a stain or a symptom, its distorted sign, that wounds us and leaves us speechless, and that sprawls everywhere in images, as soon as we begin to explore them”.<sup>9</sup> We are reminded of Michel Foucault’s differentiation between the visible and the speakable, a gap that opens up the image by marking the layers and divisions in the discourse, that empty space between text and image, “made of the fetters laid upon visibility and the fetters laid upon readability”.<sup>10</sup> The relationship between the visible and the speakable/readable is a relationship of “negation and prohibition,



kako bi na vidjelo mogle doći riječi, riječi se sudaraju kako bi na vidjelo mogle izaći slike, slike i riječi se sudaraju kako bi razmišljanje moglo imati svoje mjesto u vizualnom.<sup>12</sup> Ono što se ovdje iščitava kao konstruiranje specifične genealogije teorijskih perspektiva na fotografiju, a što ona zapravo ne može i ne želi biti, trebalo bi barem naglasiti sumnjičavost prema uvježbanim klasifikacijama fotografskih strategija i, još važnije, dokumentarnom pripisati refleksivnost o samom fotografskom: prvenstveno s obzirom na ono što se vidi, ono što se daje na vidjelo, što se oduvijek zbivalo unutar i izvan fotografije i što se uvijek samo u obliku same fotografije može prikazati kao ono što se zbilo. Kad, dakle, govorimo o fotografskim slikama, paralelno uz referencijalno označeno (kao i njegov oblik, pojavnost, estetiku, izbor, motrište itd.), moramo uzeti u obzir i ono što bez daljnega ne prelazi u ustroj slike, naime otpor, takoreći moć koja se nastoji oduprijeti slici, „slijeću pjeću“ na slici do koje se ne dopire, koju ne definira vizualnost, nešto *unutar* slika, i to *usred* slika, što se opire njihovoj ustroju jer je dio slike, a ipak joj se opire, izmiče, proturječi.

U svakom slučaju, riječ je o pukotini koja fotografiju premješta u nestvarnost, ambivalenciju, neprikladnost i neuravnoteženost. Na ovom se mjestu dokumentarne prakse pretvaraju u konceptualne time što izgleda kao da diraju u to nedodirljivo.

A ONDA  
ZAPOČINJE RAD

THEN THE WORK  
TAKES PLACE

a place in which power, desire, and knowledge converge in strategies of representation”.<sup>11</sup> Thus, photographic images are not surfaces on which something could be made visible without much trouble. This “making visible” is itself a contested locality, suffused with desire, knowledge, prohibition, power, conventions, norms, etc. etc. In photographic images, visibility and knowledge practically clash with each other: “Images jostle together making words suddenly appear, words jostle making images suddenly appear, images and words jostle and make the thinking find its place in the visual.”<sup>12</sup> What can be understood here as the construction of a specific genealogy of theoretical perspectives on photography, yet cannot be and refuses to be such a construction – it should at least emphasize suspicion with regard to some established classifications of photographic strategies and, what is more important, attribute a sort of reflexivity to documentary photography itself: above all with respect to that which can be seen, which is offered to be seen, which always happens before and beyond the image, and yet it is only in the form of the photographic image as such that it can be made visible as that which has occurred. Therefore, when we speak of the photographic image, we must acknowledge not only what is referentially defined (and its form, figure, aesthetics, choice, standpoint, etc.), but also what gets transformed into the order of the image with some difficulty, putting up resistance, perhaps a kind of power that seeks to resist the image: a “blind

<sup>1</sup> Joel Snyder, „Das Bild des Sehens“, u: Herta Wolf (ur.), *Paradigma fotografie. Fotokritik am Ende des fotografischen Zeitalters*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt/Main, 2000., 28 (engl. verzija: Joel Snyder, „Picturing Vision“, *Critical Inquiry*, 6, 1980.).  
<sup>2</sup> Jeff Wall, „Zeichen der Indifferenz: Aspekte der Photographie in der, oder als, Konzeptkunst“, u: Gregor Stemmrich (ur.), *Szenarien im Bildraum der Wirklichkeit. Essays und Interviews*, Verlag der Kunst, Amsterdam/Dresden, 1997., 409 (engl. verzija: „Marks of Difference: Aspects of Photography in, or as, Conceptual Art“, u: Ann Goldstein, Anne Rorimer (ur.), *Reconsidering the Object of Art: 1965–1975*, The Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles, 1997.).  
<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 429–430, 431.  
<sup>4</sup> Benjamin Buchloh, „Allan Sekula: Photography between Discourse and Document“, u: Chris Dercon, Paul van Gennip (ur.), *Allan Sekula: Fish Story*, Witte de With, center for contemporary art, Rotterdam, 1995.  
<sup>5</sup> Usporedi: Jacques Rancière, *Politik der Bilder*, diaphanes. Frz., Berlin, 2005., 19.  
<sup>6</sup> W. J. T. Mitchell, *Bildtheorie*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt/Main, 2008., 323.  
<sup>7</sup> Georges Didi-Huberman, *Bilder trotz allem*, Wilhelm Fink. Frz., München, 2007., 129.  
<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*  
<sup>9</sup> Philippe Dubois, *Plastizität und Film. Die Frage des Figuralen als Störzeichen*, Verlag und Datenbank der Geisteswissenschaften, Weimar, 2003., 128.  
<sup>10</sup> W. J. T. Mitchell, *Bildtheorie*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt/Main, 2008., 219.  
<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*  
<sup>12</sup> Georges Didi-Huberman, *Bilder trotz allem*, Wilhelm Fink. Frz., München, 2007., 198.

spot” within the image, which remains beyond reach and is not defined through visibility, *something* within the images, even *in the midst* of images, which defies the order of images, which is a part of the image and nevertheless evades, resists, and opposes the image. It is by all means a rupture which pushes the photographic image into impropriety, ambivalence, inadequacy, and misbalance. At that point, documentary practices are marked as conceptual strategies, as they seem to touch upon that untouchable aspect of images.

<sup>1</sup> Joel Snyder, „Picturing Vision“, in: *Critical Inquiry*, 6, 1980, 28.  
<sup>2</sup> Jeff Wall, „Marks of Difference: Aspects of Photography in, or as, Conceptual Art“, in: Ann Goldstein, Anne Rorimer (ed.), *Reconsidering the Object of Art: 1965–1975*, The Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles, 1997, 409.  
<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*, 429–431.  
<sup>4</sup> Benjamin Buchloh, „Allan Sekula: Photography between Discourse and Document“, in: Chris Dercon, Paul van Gennip (ed.), *Allan Sekula: Fish Story*, Witte de With, Center for contemporary art, Rotterdam, 1995.  
<sup>5</sup> Cf. Jacques Rancière, *Politik der Bilder*, diaphanes. Frz., Berlin, 2005, 19.  
<sup>6</sup> W. J. T. Mitchell, *Bildtheorie*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt/Main, 2008, 323.  
<sup>7</sup> Georges Didi-Huberman, *Bilder trotz allem*, Wilhelm Fink. Frz., München, 2007, 129.  
<sup>8</sup> *Ibidem*.  
<sup>9</sup> Philippe Dubois, *Plastizität und Film. Die Frage des Figuralen als Störzeichen*, Verlag und Datenbank der Geisteswissenschaften, Weimar, 2003, 128.  
<sup>10</sup> Cf. W. J. T. Mitchell, *Bildtheorie*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt/Main, 2008, 219.  
<sup>11</sup> *Ibidem*.  
<sup>12</sup> Georges Didi-Huberman, *Bilder trotz allem*, Wilhelm Fink. Frz., München, 2007, 198.