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00:07: ERIN O’TOOLE: I’m really honored to have this opportunity to introduce three artists whose work I admire greatly and with whom I always enjoy talking: Janet Delaney in the center—you probably guessed; Richard Misrach at the end; and John Divola next to me. John and Richard and I have actually had a public conversation before about the connections between their work, and Janet and I talk pretty much all the time. So it feels very natural to be sitting here with them, even with all of you out there listening.

00:44: O’TOOLE (Cont.): So we invited the three of them to join us today because they’ve all worked in color since the 1970s. Sadly, what that means is that they’ve all had the unhappy distinction of having witnessed some of their early work shift colors over time. They all have a deep understanding of the pros and cons of working with different color processes, and they’ve all reprinted earlier works in recent years. They have all also had long and illustrious careers, so I’m only going to make a few quick biographical remarks, so we have more time for conversation. If you’re not familiar with their work, I encourage you to go out and buy their books. They have all published really great ones.

01:28: O’TOOLE (Cont.): So I’m going to start with Janet, who recently released her second book with MACK Books, called Public Matters, which is a great title—I came up
O'TOOLE (Cont.): with it. [laughter]—which features photographs taken in San Francisco in the 1980s, primarily in the Mission District. It was released very recently and you can buy it in the SFMOMA store, as we just realized. So her first book, published in 2013, was of her best-known series, *South of Market*, which documents the neighborhood in which we happen to be currently sitting, in the 1970s and eighties, which was a moment of great transition in this area. That work was the subject of a one-woman show at the de Young in 2015.

02:20 O'TOOLE (Cont.): Richard Misrach has been photographing the American West for more than forty years. He’s probably best known for his ongoing series *The Desert Cantos*, which now comprises thirty-nine groups of pictures. He’s long been interested in the impact of humans on nature, on the environmental consequences of nuclear testing, industrial pollution, and development, among other things. In recent years, his focus has been on the border between the US and Mexico, and in 2016, he collaborated with composer Guillermo Galindo on the multimedia exhibition *Border Cantos*, which was shown at the San Jose Museum of Art, The Amon Carter, and Crystal Bridges. He’s published many monographs over the years, and his work has been the subject of numerous solo shows throughout the country.

03:05: O'TOOLE (Cont.): So normally, I wouldn’t read a bio that I didn’t write myself, but I love the way that John Divola describes his work on the website for the University of California at Riverside, where he has taught since 1988. It says, quote, “John Divola works primarily with photography and digital imaging. While he has approached a broad range of subjects, he is currently moving through the landscape, looking for the oscillating edge between the abstract and the specific.” Very nice. And I know you wrote that, too, because I can hear you say it in my head. So John has had more than seventy solo exhibitions around the world, and has published numerous monographs. Shows of recent note include the 2017 Whitney Biennial and his 2013 retrospective *As
O’TOOLE (Cont.): *Far As I Could Get*, which was co-organized by the Santa Barbara Museum of Art, LACMA, and the Pomona College Museum of Art.

04:01: O’TOOLE (Cont.): And the other thing I would like to say is that they were all born and raised in Southern California, which is— At roughly the same time. So anyway, that’s either a coincidence or not, depending on well you know me. So please join me in welcoming them. [applause]

04:24: O’TOOLE (Cont.): So I’d like to start by asking each of you to talk about how you first came to work in color. You also started working in black and white, and I just wanted to hear what inspired your move to color. Would you like to start, Richard?

04:41: RICHARD MISRACH: Can you hear me? Okay. So I began— It was really interesting. I was already doing split tone black and white photographs. I went from straight black and white to split tone, kind of adding this one color at a time into black and white. And then I think the big things was John Szarkowski’s essay on William Eggleston. At the time, I saw William Eggleston’s work and it didn’t speak to me; I didn’t get it. But the essay that Szarkowski wrote about it was the ah-ha moment and I started photographing in color at that point. So I think that was ’76.

O’TOOLE: And what work was the first work that you made that was in color?

05:25: MISRACH: Well, I started shooting kind of everything, but the first major body, I would say, would be my night Hawaii work of 1978. That was actually commissioned by AT&T for a show called *20 American Photographers*, that opened at the Corcoran. And so I went from black and white. That was kind of the first time I showed. And what’s interesting in this context is that I made those prints— Actually, Janet made those prints. They were thirty by forties, and they were considered mammoth prints back at
MISRACH (Cont.): that time. And in fact, at the show at the Corcoran, they were roundly criticized for being too large. Thirty by forties. Just saying.

06:09: O’TOOLE: And they were C-prints then?

MISRACH: They were C-prints.

O’TOOLE: Okay, Janet?

06:14: JANET DELANEY: I am much more pragmatic, no big essay. Basically, I was studying black and white photography at SF State, which was the kind of epicenter for fine printmaking. And I realized that I needed to get a job, and I thought I should take a color photography class, just as I was about to graduate. And I went into those little darkrooms with a tube and starting pouring chemistry through it and I just became completely mesmerized by it. And so that’s 1975, and I’ve never stopped. Just always black and white all the through— or color all the way through. Yeah. Left the black and white world altogether.

O’TOOLE: John?

07:00: JOHN DIVOLA: Well, I started out at the same time. I graduated from graduate school in 1974, got a job in a lab that happened to be a color lab. But I didn’t really learn much about color there, although I dabbled at it. And then I got some adjunct teaching jobs, and I got a job at a place called Loyola Marymount University, where I adjunct but I was the whole photo department. Which meant I had a room that in the basement of the science building, and a little teeny darkroom. But when I was sitting in what was called my office, which they stuck me in a room which had the slide copy machine in it, I got a call that they’d built a brand new communications building. And they said, “Oh,
DIVOLA (Cont.): you know what? We’ve got a color darkroom.” I guess the architect thought they should have a color darkroom, and there was a color darkroom in the basement. It had totally outfitted—Nobody in the communications building had any interest in it or knew what to do with it and they said, “Would you like to come use it?” So I went over there and taught myself how to make color. And it was like a drum with a screen that the print would sort of sit on.

08:07: DELANEY: Remember the hair dryer?

DIVOLA: Yes, yes, the hairdryer.

DELANEY: Yeah, big part of it.

DIVOLA: Every test had to be dried. And so the first body of work I tried, I was working around LAX in a neighborhood, and I did these house removal photographs in 35 millimeter. And that was in ‘75, I think. And the prints looked so terrible I never showed them until later, when I could drum scan them. And then I did the Zuma photographs, which were medium format, in ’77 and ’78. And that was the first body of work I really did with color.

O’TOOLE: And the Zuma prints were C-prints, but didn’t you also make dye transfers of them?

08:46: DIVOLA: I did a dye transfer portfolio a few years later, which is a whole ’nother story, but—

O’TOOLE: So previous to this time, color was sort of looked down upon, shall we say. And especially—Janet, we’ve talked about this before—for documentary photography.
O’TOOLE (Cont.): And so I wonder, had you been brought up in your photography education to believe that color was lesser than black and white? Or was that something that by this time had already sort of passed and that it was something that was new or exciting or what?

09:27: DELANEY: I think my understanding of the issues around color really stemmed from the fact that the artist-photographer couldn’t make their own prints. And so there was a really big shift once people could go in their own darkroom with the tube and try to muscle through it on their own, and have that sense of authorship about how the print looked. So my early education was really based on the fact that a photograph was the result of not only being out with the camera and conceiving what you were doing, but also how you would actualize that idea yourself in the darkroom. It was integral to the whole thing.

10:06: DELANEY (Cont.): In terms of documentary work, I think that I employed color very strategically, because I felt like my work was not so much a critique of the negative as it was bringing attention to what I wanted to honor in the South of Market neighborhood. And so color seemed the way to do it. I tried in black and white, but the neighborhood looked pretty shabby, and four-by-five view camera color made it look a lot better. And since I was trying to take a positive position on it— Also, I had looked at Susan Meiselas’ work, which came out close to that time, in Nicaragua. And so I felt a conviction to that. I’d also traveled all through Central America with a color medium format in ’77-78. So I was using it because that’s what I did.

O’TOOLE: Did you have any experience with that idea of color being sort of a lesser medium than black and white or not?
11:12: MISRACH: Well, I just think at the beginning—like, say 1972—it wasn’t a viable way to work. It just was not ever taken seriously, other than fashion or commercial photography done in the past. But the fine art was black and white. And as I said before about this Szarkowski essay, the way he opened that whole idea is that the real world is actually in color, and black and white is abstraction. That idea is just like, oh, my God. Because we used to think of black and white as realism. And now it looks really abstract to me. So it just was a little switch. Simple as that for me.

O’TOOLE: How about you, John?

11:53: DIVOLA: Well, I mean, I remember Baltz telling me that color was vulgar. But—

DELANEY: Well, it really had been because the way the methods were—

DIVOLA: Well, yeah. I think at that time, it was thought that black and white was the kind of authentic index that told you everything you needed to know about volume and texture and information, and color was this kind of superfluous frosting, in a sense, and suitable of photographs of colorful sailboats and things of that nature. So the Szarkowski thing of sky and blue being synonymous and it was a great line in that Szarkowski essay—But I must say, I think my reaction was not the same as wanting to make something realist. It was, well, okay, it’s frosting; I’ll frost the hell out of it. But so—

O’TOOLE: So did all of you make your own prints then, at least in the early days?

12:56: MISRACH: No. Janet worked in a lab and she made my prints, which I forgot till she told me today, so that’s—
O’TOOLE: And I didn’t know when I invited the two of you.

MISRACH: Yeah.

O’TOOLE: Janet told me.

MISRACH: No, so that’s really great. And no, I mean, I made my own black and white prints. And for years, though, I used the labs because it just wasn’t viable to really do it. And I did have a home darkroom, and I even worked in a lab in L.A. for a summer, under one of those drums. I just hated it. But now with digital printing, now I make all my own prints again, because I missed being a printmaker that I was when I was doing black and white. But basically, no, labs did my work for many years.

O’TOOLE: So did you know about, and were you concerned about, the relative impermanence of color when you first started using it?

MISRACH: Is that for—?

O’TOOLE: Whoever wants to—

DIVOLA: Well, I don’t know how impermanent they were. I had no idea initially. And then probably by the early eighties, I think it became clear that it was impermanent.

MISRACH: It was Henry’s fault.

DIVOLA: And I remember switching over to Cibachrome, thinking that, well, that was supposed to— And that’s the reason I did the dye transfer portfolio, frankly, was not
DIVOLA (Cont.): that I was dissatisfied with the type C Ektacolor photographs, but that I wanted some sort of edition of record that would be more permanent. Only to find out those fade, as well. But so yes, very quickly that became clear.

14:29: DELANEY: Early on, I used Agfa paper, which was fiber-based. And I was just discussing with the fact that I didn’t bleach out the silver— And those prints actually still look really good. The only thing that’s missing is content or any value of why you’d want to look at them. [laughter] But they’re—

O’TOOLE: But the color looks great.

14:50: DELANEY: But the color is perfect. But I always pull them out and I’m always hopeful that there’s going to be something in them. But they’re just perfect, that’s all I can say.

O’TOOLE: But you’ve said to me that you knew pretty early on.

DELANEY: I knew right away. I’ve been thinking about this since my earliest experiences with photography, which was basically in my intimate relationship with my family photo albums. And being a child of 1952, my own photos were fading and it made me very nervous to see my own life disappearing. And you know, my brothers and sisters look great, and then there I was, like already almost gone, right?

O’TOOLE: Think when I was born.


O’TOOLE: They’re even worse.
DELANEY: They’re even worse. So I knew color faded, and I think that in this period of time in the seventies— Well, both I was young and conceptual art made photography look downright conservative, because you were making something. You weren’t just thinking or taping yourself to a wall or something, you know? So it seemed really solid to make a print, you know? And the fact that it wouldn’t be around long, well, nothing seemed like it was going to be around very long. And so while I worried about it, we worried about where we would put them and what boxes we’d store them in. And I was just saying earlier that I was very involved with the Moscone Center and the whole plan that was happening, which was supposed to be the Esplanade, which is now the Yerba Buena Gardens.

O’TOOLE: Which is just right across—

16:19: DELANEY: Right across the street from the museum. And at that point, they were bringing in— It was very much about let’s have community input. And they knew a lot of artists lived South of Market, which is where I was living and working. And so they invited artist’s input. And we all said, “Could you do cold storage for photographs? That would be such a brilliant idea, and we could have a bank in the city of San Francisco to store our photographs,” which we knew needed to be cold. And this is like 1980, really. So that didn’t happen. Surprise, surprise. We got an ice rink, though. Ice rink’s very nice. It’s cold. We could just stick them underneath, right?

O’TOOLE: How about you? Were you aware of the fact that they would change?

17:01: MISRACH: Yeah. I mean, I think again, family albums, those were the obvious color photographs [that] faded, and so that was— You know, it was hard not to be aware of that. And then even those early ’78 photographs, I remember that they
MISRACH (Cont.): started to deteriorate pretty quickly. And the galleries were really reluctant to handle you if you did color work. So I definitely ran into that in the early days. So we kind of knew. But it didn’t matter because we were young and stupid. No, but I mean, just like that was not— Now of course, in hindsight, all that work that we did, it’s painful.

O’TOOLE: Well, and so to move to that subject, we talked a little bit earlier in the day about the original materials and sort of the materiality and the value of that and the connection to the time in which it was made. And when you hear curators and conservators talking about this, what’s your take on that? How do you feel about the issue of trading that connection to the past with replacing it with a new print?

18:18: MISRACH: I’m jump in there. I’m sure all of us feel pretty strongly. So it really is interesting that the museum has one mission and the artist has the other. And I think the bottom line is when we made those first images, we were limited to what we could even imagine was possible, by just limitations of the material. There’s very little contrast control, scale was very limited, all that. In some ways—and maybe somebody here had already said that, but—the potential—or maybe Stephen Shore was saying—the potential for what these images could be couldn’t be realized. And so now, when I’m printing eight by ten negatives and scanning them, printing them eight by ten feet, there’s information in those negatives that you can’t even see in the old things. It’s astonishing what kind of information’s in there. And for artists not to exploit that and take advantage of it— We just couldn’t do it before; it wasn’t a choice. It wasn’t an aesthetic decision, it wasn’t a conceptual decision. Now that this has been opened up, I think it’s almost the artist’s responsibility to— And that doesn’t mean printing large; it could be printing small. Or if you’re printing on papers with current pigment, it’s going to look different than those old prints. If you try to make them look like the earlier prints, I think that’s a recipe for disaster. There were so many limitations on quality
MISRACH (Cont.): control. It’s amazing what people were able to do with analog, given those limitations. It’s kind of remarkable. But now it’s opened up in a big way. And the last thing I’ll say on that is that it’s been a digital revolution that has allowed us, it’s enabling us, to do things with color photography, especially with those artists working in the seventies. It’s a little window we have of the 1970s was a revolution in not only the photography world, but the art world, and color photography’s impacted that. And that generation is aging. So we have a short window to address those issues. Sorry, I’ve got to throw out one more thing, then I’ll shut up, I promise.

O’TOOLE: No, please.

20:25: MISRACH: Recently at the Guggenheim Museum, they had a similar issue with conceptual artists. Basically, I think it was the— [inaudible voice] Panza Collection, thank you. And so there was people like Donald Judd and Bruce Nauman, people like that. And so a lot of the pieces that the Panza Collection purchased, and sometimes they were conceptually scaled down or early pieces that, whether they’re made out of wood for, say, Donald Judd, they didn’t hold up well, so they had to be remade. Or with Bruce Nauman, it might be other materials. Some artists felt like whatever the new iteration is, that’s fine. Like Nauman’s very loose. Donald Judd, on the other hand, kind of disowned these works because they were not made properly enough. So the problem is you have a bunch of artists, and each one might have a slightly different take on it. I think most artists feel like those early faded pink prints on display, we’d rather be taken out and shot, because that never was the intention.

DELANEY: Right.
21:28: MISRACH: And so now we have an opportunity like never before. I mean, it’s remarkable what we can do. We can recreate these things. And they’re not going to look identical. So okay, now I’m done.

DELANEY: That’s all true. And I just want to add to the fact that we don’t have anything, really. The things that you have in historical preservation in museums are not the things that were collected. Those things are gone. They faded. So what are you referencing? Unless you reference what the artist feels is a representation of their work while they’re alive.

O’TOOLE: Well, and you were saying to me earlier that you felt a connection yourself more to conceptual art, even though your work belongs, in a lot of ways, to the documentary tradition. But you were relating it, given when you were making it, the kinds of artists you were looking to, that you were seeing it in a different, in a broader context.

22:29: DELANEY: I think that I have never worked with the idea of galleries and with collectors in mind. It was always much more seen as activist art. And the idea was to get it up on the wall someplace or just to get it out into the community in a much more raw and immediate—Get the turnaround really quickly. And so I wasn’t thinking in terms of a fine art object that had to have a preservation. But I was thinking in terms of history. And so I knew that it would have a historical life, and so I kind of had to dance between both of those things. But I think that conceptual art, as I mentioned before, really influenced the fact that we were willing to engage in something that wasn’t as archival. I mean, I knew what to do with a black and white print. You know, the two fixing baths and the selenium toner and cleaning the screen racks. I mean, we could go through the elaborate dance to make something that would have—And they’re phenomenal, gorgeous prints, those things. But that wasn’t the intention. For me, the idea behind the
DELANEY (Cont.): artwork was much more important than whether or not this thing would have that kind of life.

23:40: DIVOLA: Well, I think there is a point that has to— There is a difference between what we’re replacing the prints with and what they were. But unfortunately, what they were is just lost. But there was a— Like, I think in the mid-seventies, the color negative material was designed for wedding photographers. They had the beautiful pastel colors and—

DELANEY: For white people.

DIVOLA: Yes. But so when you work with these materials, you kind of internalize that vocabulary and you make work. And then when Cibachrome comes along, which is a very flawed material— I mean, I did a bunch of work in the eighties that was entirely driven by the characteristics of that material. I don’t think I would’ve done what I did, except that I sort of internalized that vocabulary. But for me, there’s this big change that happens with digital, which even relates to a sort of— Almost every large C-print that’s out there, somebody’s scanned the negative and turned into a digital file, and then used the LightJet printer. So the artist is actually looking at a digital file on a screen and deciding what looks right; and then some operator is trying to match that, or now we’re looking at it on the screen and trying to get the proper output. So I think of myself, at least since this digital divide, where I’ve gone back and I’ve scanned all my early color negatives, I have this digital archive. And I’ve always thought of my work as basically archives. I’ve always been suspicious of the idea of the masterpiece, that there’s only like four really good images from that set of fifty. And so I’ve always been suspicious of that and always been more interested in those fifty. And so I’m interested in that archive. And now there’s this possibility to have us sit down at screens while we’re still alive and say, ‘Okay, this is a calibrated screen. That’s the way I want it to look.
DIVOLA (Cont.): Let’s drop into the gray step wedge. Let’s put that file somewhere. And then it doesn’t matter how the materials change; at least you have this original source. So I’m much more interested in somebody taking my digital archive than I am carrying after this print or that print or that print, at this stage.

26:13: O’TOOLE: In terms of the future.

DIVOLA: In terms of the future, yeah. Because that archive’s much more extensive than what’s out in the world, and I think—Yeah. So that’s my position on that.

O’TOOLE: Richard, are there things that you’re doing similarly with that mind, with the future in mind, about how you want things to be preserved?

26:35: MISRACH: Well, what I would love to see is the museums to create a set of protocols—and I guess this is one step in that direction—of how to—We do have this incredible opportunity that not only do we have these photographs that are vintage and carefully preserved; but it’d be nice to be able to display them. And I think now and I think—Jeff, correct me if I’m wrong but—that the Met has what they call reserve prints. So it’s a backup print that’s matching their—It’s seems to me that at least, at least, we can now have thumb drives with the digital files that were made to print those, you know? So along with the reserve print, or what we call a match print, there’s no reason that this couldn’t be done in perpetuity. You’d have to refresh things, but now with digital stuff, it’s much easier. And then Henry was telling me there’s a brand new—Henry, what’s it called?

HENRY WILHELM: Multispectral imaging.

27:34: MISRACH: There’s basically a scanner, a $120,000 scanner...
DELANEY: Always.

MISRACH: ...for the museums. But that can actually, in a couple minutes, scan a print, analyze every pixel, basically, so that you can go back and recreate that. It's actually—I mean, and this technology's probably coming fast and furious anyway, and I think it's already at the point now where it would not be hard to reproduce, reprint. The challenge would be, is that the substrates, the different papers and things, are going to be changing over the years. The digital technologies, you're going to have to refresh and upgrade those things, so they don't go the way of the floppy disc and things like that. But I think it's actually very manageable now. I think we're at that point. And again, the 1970s, probably twenty, twenty-five photographers working seriously in color at that period. It's a really powerful moment in the history of photography and art, as far as I'm concerned. And most of the people are still alive. And it'd be really nice to kind of work up those protocols for what does that mean. I mean, what rights does that give the museum, if they can keep reproducing the things? And I think that’s very doable. And again, the Guggenheim is dealing with a number of conceptual artists, or Sol LeWitt has wall drawings that people can redo and redo. These things are very, very doable. And I'm glad you're all here, because you really need to do this.

O’TOOLE: Janet, do you have any thoughts on this matter?

29:05: DELANEY: Well, that sounds like a good idea. I think it’s a really good idea. But one other thing that often comes to my mind is, if we’re watching the prints fade, are the negatives fading? And so that makes me anxious because I have some negatives. So I’ve been sort of madly scanning everything and hoping that that will sort of stave off—Please.
MISRACH: Can I say something. So again, in the seventies, not that many photographers— And I’ve got 30,000 eight by ten negatives that I’ve never printed before, and they’re still looking really good. But Henry was telling me that if we can put it in cold storage at zero degrees—not forty-five degrees, but in zero degrees—they will be fine in perpetuity, until you decide to scan them or figure out what to do with them. But that will stop any progressive damage. And I have got these eight by tens going back to 1979, and they look great. And they’ve not been in cold storage.

30:00: DELANEY: But then the question is, if you didn’t print them before, why would you want to print them now?

MISRACH: Oh, because I can. Oh, okay, that’s a great question. In the past, 50% of my eight by ten negatives I couldn’t print because it would look too contrasty.

DELANEY: Right.

MISRACH: They had a developer streak or something like that. I can scan those now and take those out. I can adjust the contrast. It’s like I’ve got a whole archive of things I’m going through now; it’s blowing my mind because I can-

30:25: DELANEY: I was shocked the first time I made a scan. It was kind of embarrassing. It was just like, whoa. Who knew all that was going on the background? I was like, how to manage these things?

DIVOLA: Well, I think there’s some urgency to sort of doing— At least in terms— First of all, you do not need every museum to have the digital file. It’s like it used to be every university slide library, they would make their own set of digital slides from books. There really needs to only be one place on earth, right, that has them.
DELANEY: Maybe two.

30:54: DIVOLA: Well, yeah. Well, a backup. But so you just need one. But for example, people that use LightJet printers, which are digital printers with lasers that made—So everybody’s large prints. So a lot of people’s files are sitting at those labs, right? They didn’t even get the file. The lab scanned the negative, they kept it, and if they wanted to reprint they would ask the lab. So somebody needs to go to those labs and get those files. And we’re getting older and if we die or—God knows what my daughter would do with all these scans that I’ve got, all these hard drives I’ve got. So there is some urgency to sort of gathering them up, and then having a protocol in terms of standardizing the file itself. Because when you go to print—Like for example, if I go to print something, to do a final output, I put it up on the screen and I make a print. And there’s a profile for that paper, and sometimes that profile’s not perfect. So I actually make it not quite the way I want it on the screen, so the print will come out the way I want it.

MISRACH: Right.

32:05: DIVOLA: Well, that’s not what’s sitting on my computer, right? That’s not really what I want to be sitting there. What I need to do is then go back, readjust it back to what I want it to look like, and then drop in a step wedge, which I haven’t done. So there needs to be a protocol in terms of finalizing these digital files and then sending them somewhere to storage. And then with some kind of set of instructions about what’s permissible and what’s not permissible, if any particular museum wanted to access that file.

MISRACH: Right.
O’TOOLE: We talked a bit about destroying or not destroying originals if you reprint for an institution. And I wonder what your feelings are about that subject.

32:46: MISRACH: I personally like the idea that you keep the early prints, I think. And again, I’ve done that with you. And actually, in my studio, when I get, in fact, those two prints over there, those I will keep and mark as study prints. And I remove the edition number but I keep them, because I think it’s very educational. And one of the things that I have done over the years, since Janet started printing my color, is that if a print was made in 1979 and there’s no slash-print date next to it, then that means it was printed that year and that was Ektacolor, because that’s what it was back then, chromogenic print. A few years later, I started switching to, say, Fuji Crystal Archive. So what I would do there, if the negative was made in 1983 and I printed it in 1987 on Fuji Crystal Archive, I would actually— Every single print that I have has the negative date, the print date, and the paper that I use. And again, with your museum. But I’ve done that on every single print. And this is probably thousands of prints, at this point. But it’ll say, ‘Kodak Endura, Fuji Crystal Archive, Canson Platine,’ which is what I’m printing on now. So I think that that’s actually really useful, to have those different iterations; and that over time, you go back and compare. It’s invaluable information.

34:07: O’TOOLE: All the conservators just were like, ‘Oh, thank you, Richard, for doing that.’ This is something we— There’s something called a PIR, photography information record—is that the right—that we send out to artists when we acquire work. And often the thing that gets left off is the paper and the process. And this is something that can be really useful in the future. So I think that they are thanking you silently out there. How about you, Janet? What do you think?

DELANEY: I see the value of keeping the older print, as long as you put a big X on it, something like. You know, it says, ‘Will not show.’ Because it isn’t the print that you got
DELANEY (Cont.): from me originally; it’s something else, and it isn’t what I would intend to put out. I was saying when I went back to the conservation event—Was that 2014? 2017 maybe?

O'TOOLE: ’14, I think.

35:01: DELANEY: ’14, right. I just wanted to rip them off the wall when you showed me what you had, and you kind of tied me up and said, “No, you can’t touch your own prints. They’re not yours anymore,” you know? And it’s such an awkward feeling, when you made them yourself and you see them out there and you don’t really think they’re what you want on the wall. And so I’ve been patiently waiting for this event. [laughter] I’m hoping to get some closure on this particular issue.

O’TOOLE: John?

35:27: DIVOLA: Again, I’m more attached to the idea of the image than the object. And I don’t mind an institution having it. I don’t know that they need to have every single print that’s re—But I think it’s an interesting illustration for one image. But you know, those prints are so faded at this point. Every once in a while, something will fade in a benevolent way, you know?

DELANEY: They can be beautiful, really.

DIVOLA: It’ll become this new third thing.

DELANEY: Yeah.
DIVOLA: Which has nothing very much to do with us. But yeah. And if it’s somebody, a collector, I absolutely insist that it’s destroyed because I don’t want it out in the world.

O’TOOLE: Yeah.

36:08: DIVOLA: But yeah. So I don’t have an objection to it, but I kind of hate the idea that any time some image is shown, that there’s going to be this terrible faded thing next to it to illustrate what it turned into.

MISRACH: Can I just jump in on that?

O’TOOLE: Yeah.

MISRACH: But there’s the crux of the problem, which is we can’t keep replacing the prints. And in the collections— And the two prints here, they came from private collections, and you can see they’ve been in light for a long time and they’re— You know, there’s degrees of fade. It’s horrible. So it is kind of museum’s role in this. I mean, I feel like it’s their charge, ultimately, to try, whenever they can, to preserve these things. And I think including faded prints on occasion— Sarah Meister was saying that you have three or four different versions of Ansel Adam’s print. I think Moonrise. Okay, so that would— You know, you don’t do it with everything; you take key things, if you want examples of things. But I do think they could keep refreshing and reprinting over the years, fifty years now, sixty years. They have the potential to do that, where— I don’t know, if our estates, if they exist, I don’t know— We’re not going to be around to do it. You know what I mean? It’s like it’d be really nice if the museum took on that role, because we have a unique opportunity here.
37:25: O’TOOLE: So I just wanted to show a couple—Oops. Oh, yeah, sorry. I missed that one. So we paired a few before and after shots. And again, with the caveat that these are projected. And actually, the difference is much more stark when I saw them on my computer than when I saw it projected up here. And I just thought it would be instructive to actually look at what we’re talking about. So John, you’re up first here. And I will say that the print that is on the right hand side is from our collection. It was acquired in the eighties. It was a part of the portfolio *New California Views*, which might be familiar to some of you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Sorry, right?

O’TOOLE: Sorry, right.

DIVOLA: Left. [inaudible; inaudible voice] Your left. [inaudible].

O’TOOLE: Right, okay.

38:24: DIVOLA: The faded one [inaudible].

O’TOOLE: Sorry, yeah.

MISRACH: The faded one [inaudible].

O’TOOLE: Yeah, the faded one. But the thing I will say is that I looked at that on my computer without a reference. And because that’s what I know, I thought, oh, it’s shifted. And then John sent me this one and I went, “Oh, my God.” I had no idea how much it had shifted. You know, so when you don’t have a reference point and what you’re seeing on the computer or in the gallery—It can be very stark, the difference. So I
O'TOOLE (Cont.): don't know if you have anything you want to say about it or if it's just for illustration purposes, this is what we're talking about.

DIVOLA: No, I don't. It speaks for itself.

O'TOOLE: It speaks for itself, yes. And then Janet supplied this pair, which— It's harder to tell the difference, but you can see a little bit with the print on the left, you can see the border. You know, the color of the border is very instructive. Do you have anything you want to say about it?

39:39: DELANEY: Well, you can see the really warm tone that everything had. I mean, in preparation for today, I started pulling out prints, which I try not to do. And they were kind of lovely, in a certain way. There's a kind of sharpness and there's a kind of liquid-quality almost depth to them that you don't get with a digital print. But the kind of overarching warm, deep quality wasn't in the original print. This was exactly how I had perceived of the image when I made it and originally printed it. So to my mind, it's shifted dramatically.

O'TOOLE: And Richard— And this, the one on the left here is this print here on the stage.

O'TOOLE: Yeah, see, that's the problem. And one thing that we didn't get to is this idea of the size of the prints. We talked a little bit about this, and you were talking about the problems with enlarging the work.

40:47: DIVOLA: Well, yeah, when you're working from a negative and you're working analog, you're projecting it through a lens across the room, basically, to make a larger print. And they're never really super sharp. And this is where digital really pays off, is at scale. When you make little eight by ten digital prints, it never looks that impressive. But
DIVOLA (Cont.): you make like a four by six foot digital print, and it’s incredible because it’s just as sharp as it was at eight by ten, along as you’ve got the data from the scan. You know, it can be just as sharp. So when we’re doing stuff, the payoff is at scale.

O’TOOLE: So before we open it up for questions, do you guys have any other things you want to add that we didn’t address, any other issues? Okay. So maybe we’ll bring up the lights and see if anybody has any questions or comments.

41:42: AUDIENCE MEMBER: So I’ll just shout it out. So I love John’s comment about creating the digital file, and that’s what’s archived, not the artifact.

DIVOLA: Right.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Not the print’s artifact. And so let’s assume that photographers and museum folks and institutions that actually house photographers’ archives come up with these protocols on the front end that allow a means by which that digital file is created, and it in effect, becomes a key, the key. Because you can’t call it a key print, it sort of becomes the key image. As photographers and as a curator, what types of protocols would you like to see on the back end, on the production side? After the artist is deceased, after the curators who collected the work have passed on, the archive still has that digital file. What are their responsibilities, and what sort of arrangement would you like to have made with the institution to ensure that your vision continues to be realized?

43:04: DIVOLA: Well again, I think it would be up to the individual artist to specify, for example, scale. Like, do I want to say this print could only be printed this particular size? Do I want to say that you need to print it at the maximum DPI, as represented in the file? Do I say that I don’t want it on a matte paper; I only want it on a semigloss paper? I
DIVOLA (Cont.): mean, I can make a lot of specifications that would apply, even as the technology evolves, if we’re talking about prints. And I can say, do I— So I can stipulate. Okay, I don’t want it to be in a light box, be rear projected. I can put parameters on its production. Or I can say it needs to be linked to the original print. That is, it can only be reprinted— If an institution has, let us say, a thirty by forty print, it must try to, to what degree possible, replicate the original materials that this was printed on. That to what degree possible, to make it a facsimile. But every different photographer could stipulate to what degree they want the parameters with which that file can or should be used.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: But what if the parameters that you establish, in a sense, deny the actual possibility of a future even increased realization of your work, in the same way that you didn’t realize how much detail was in those little negatives until you scanned them?

44:46: DIVOLA: Well, again, I’m not talking about the negative; I’m talking about the scan. So I know what’s in the scan.

DELANEY: I think the issue there is we’re alive.

MISRACH: Well, and actually to that point, so we could set up very strict protocols or— And again, this is why— It’s a small enough group of artists, really, at least from the seventies—and you know, then there’s always future generations. But I might say, ‘You know what? I don’t care. In the future, if there’s no longer Paper Strata to print on and they have twenty-foot light boxes and the work looks great, I don’t care if you want to— You know, I entitle you to have total flexibility if you decide you want to do that.’ Do you know what I mean? In other words—
45:33: DELANEY: Like Steichen did with *Family of Man*.

MISRACH: Yeah. I mean, Mark Rothko's faded paintings, one of the ways they correct for that is they project light onto it to try to simulate what the original color was. I mean, if anything, we have a richness of ways to do much better than that. But your question is well taken. After we're gone, do we put limitations on what can be done? Even though lightboxes of the future are going to be much, much better, and they might be extraordinary. And you know, if I was alive, I might decide to do that, but— So trying to anticipate that, each one of us kind of has to say—and this is with your families or our archive or our foundation or with the museums—don't go beyond this. Or the sky's the limit and leave it up to the museum. But it's an unknown.


DIVOLA: Well, I mean, right now, it's like nobody is in, right?

MISRACH: But I'm just saying that there weren't that many people. In the bigger picture, there just weren't— I don't know. Pick a number.

DELANEY: I'm just giving you a hard time, because it would be an issue at some point, were this wonderful, amazing thing to happen. And I don't want to hinder that conversation.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Richard, it's really interesting that you brought up those Rothko paintings, because of course, so these Rothko paintings are installed at Harvard
AUDIENCE MEMBER (Cont.): in the dining room, where they’ve faded terribly. And when they wanted to restore them to the correct color, what do you use to figure out what the correct color is?


AUDIENCE MEMBER: A photograph. And what are those photographs? They’re Ektachrome slides. So what they had to do was to mathematically calculate what the Ektachrome slides would have looked like at the time they were taken, using a film that’s color balanced, as you said, to make white skin look golden. So already, not necessarily an accurate reflection of reality. It’s this fascinating sort of hall of mirrors that goes back. So the idea of trying to reconstruct what something looks like, or looked like, is a hugely fraught enterprise.

47:59: MISRACH: There are some new technologies. And again, if Henry has a moment, he can maybe briefly explain it. But that he was explaining, there’s brand new technologies that are used right now to figure out what the sea scrolls are, the Dead Sea Scrolls are, and I don’t know, a couple other important historical documents. They’re not being used yet for photographs, as far as I know. I think they’re megapixels, but you could put maybe larger— These things are actually much more sophisticated, mathematically able to do— What you’re saying is exactly what it does, but not in the old-fashioned crude way that we’re used to up until right now. But this moment is changing right now, as we speak.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Not, it’s true. But I was just saying that there’s a market incentive. I mean, that these materials that people use are not neutral materials; they’re sold on the market. And so therefore, the manufacturers’ motivations are built into their manufacture. So like, the Dead Sea Scrolls are one thing, but Ektachrome film is
AUDIENCE MEMBER (Cont.): something completely different, because it was marketed with a particular purpose in mind.

48:59: DIVOLA: But I think what Richard’s saying is if you did something right now, if you made a print right now—I shoot a digital photograph, I make a print. You can take this thing and you can make a kind of numerical standard for its reproduction, so that you know exactly where everything was.


49:21: HENRY WILHELM: Well, first, this has been a marvelous discussion. And I think what Richard—actually all three panelists—have really focused on is this era of color photography, which started in earnest—In my mind, the color negative, the introduction of the color negative and photographers making prints—Stephen Shore, but really, 1970, which continues to this day. It didn’t stop somewhere along the way. And keeping in mind that all three of you panelists were making color prints at a point within a larger contact printing, where you had no control over saturation—We just take that for granted, even on your iPhone. And no control over contrast, per se, if you mask. So basically, it was overall color balance and light and dark and dodge and burn. With every photographer I talk to—and I’ve gotten to know many from that era—[they] speak about the print they’ve wanted to make. And they knew it at the time, but couldn’t quite get it. But now you can. And I think that the role of the museum to document, collect this entire period and its many iterations, all three of you are really good examples of that. And the fact that you’re still alive, that’s key, in terms of—

MISRACH: We’re trying.

O’TOOLE: Eat your Wheaties, guys.
50:48: WILHELM: So as Richard said, the technology is available now, with very high-resolution multispectral imaging, including in the UV and IR, to make a precise copy of your preferred print right now, and automatically in software, detect changes in dark aging, display, at many, many thousands of points on the print. And for the future, then to match it and even translate it. Like, I think the next few years, that backlits, LED-backlits will become very popular amongst artists, because of the increased dynamic range. No need to light them. And ultimately, electronic displays. And I’m really glad that you guys are thinking about use of your images after you’re dead, because it can be done precisely. The technology’s here now to do it. But you need to collect the originals, you need to talk to the artist. And the artist’s preference is key. I certainly always give the artist the prerogative to decide what their images look like. And actually, I’m personally offended when a museum wants to display, against the artist’s wishes, a faded print. I mean, that thing is just gross. And I think the artists deserve respect. And then with cold storage, you can preserve anything as long as you want. So that’s a quick summary.

52:09: O’TOOLE: Thank you. Do we have any other questions? Jeffrey?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: This morning, Monica gave the example of Rineke Dijkstra seeing a print of hers in a museum, feeling that it had shifted, and telling the museum that she wanted to make a new print, larger than the original. I’m not sure exactly how that ended up, but I’m wondering if any of you—what your perspective on that is. Have you ever experienced anything similar? Been told, “No, we do not want the print that you are proposing”?

DIVOLA: I personally have never proposed that a museum replace my prints—Because I’m always delighted to do it. Informally, I’ve run into people from museums and say, “If
DIVOLA (Cont.): you ever want me to, I’d be happy to.” And I’m happy to replace it at whatever scale the original was. But I’ve never gone to an institution and made the proposal that they change it.

53:14: DELANEY: Well, I think I’m repeating myself here, but I know that when my work was brought into the museum, I was in between processes. I didn’t really know the work. I didn’t really have the capacity to print my own work at that moment. And I hadn’t really mastered digital printing, and I had a third party print for me, and I wasn’t happy with the results. I didn’t realize I wasn’t happy until I saw it on the wall, which was within a year or so. And I just recoiled. But there I was. And then I started pestering people and they just kept putting me off. And now here I am on the panel.

O’TOOLE: We were waiting for the policy that we were developing.

DELANEY: Right. So I understood after a while I should just be patient and it’s a long process; it’s a museum. So yeah.

54:06: MISRACH: I’ll just answer. And no, I’ve not run into the problem, but I have—Over time, older prints that have faded, and if I’ve had an opportunity—You know, in an edition, if I’ve had an opportunity to replace those in that edition at a larger size, I have. And so far, I haven’t run into anybody saying, ‘Not thanks.’

JEFF ROSENHEIM: Just some musings, just a little bit. Janet, I don’t think you’re going to put an X on your family picture that has faded interview he album. Don’t put an X on the pictures that you’ve replaced. I think we don’t know what the future is. I think just keep them as they are. I think that the larger issue, which I think is one that Richard brought up—and others, maybe John, as well—that is troubling me, not because of the panel or anything, is this idea that there’s all that information and we should use it
ROSENHEIM (Cont.): somehow in the scan of the original, whatever size—thirty-five, two and a quarter, eight by ten, whatever it is. We don’t know what that is, in the same way that I think we thought we know what it was before. And I think the question about what is the use, what is the purpose of the negative in the archive, is a really interesting question, especially for institutions that are collecting archives. And I happen to have the responsibility for trying to understand what to do with Walker Evan’s 10,000 transparencies, a third of which are Kodachrome, which I think look maybe close to what they used to look like. And the majority is Ektachrome, which looks terrible. So what do I do with them? And I don’t know. I’m waiting. I’m here to understand that. So yeah. Go.

56:08: MISRACH: Okay. So this is sort of askew to that, but it’s the same problem to conform[?]. So in 2001, I was invited by the Center for Creative Photography to curate a show of Garry Winogrand photographs, with four other curators. I was the only photographer. And I went through 30,000 eight by ten contact sheets of 35 millimeter black and whites. And then I discovered his color work and I went, “Oh, my God, there’s like 30,000 transparencies.” And so what I ended up doing is I had some of those scanned; I had prints made for the show. And I was really excited about it, and none of it had ever been published before. I think in the original Social Documents show, there was a slide carousel projection of them that went on a couple of days, and then I think the carousel crashed and burned.

ROSENHEIM: That was New Documents.

56:54: MISRACH: New Documents, thank you. But outside of that, he wasn’t really known for doing color work. And I just found all these gems. And so at the time, I actually wanted to do a book of the work. Aperture agreed to do it. The curator and people there changed and it just kind of crashed. But I did tell them at the time that
MISRACH (Cont.): they needed to at least scan those transparencies, just to preserve them. And so I don’t think they ever did that. I know there’s a show now at the Brooklyn Museum, and I think there’s a book in progress right now that’s late for the show. But they’re having trouble now getting rights to scan and all that. But the question is— And you know, someone like Garry might’ve welcomed another photographer curating a show, where another photographer would say, ‘I don’t want a photographer to do it; I want a museum curator.’ So it’s tricky. It’s almost by individuals. But in a way, you have this responsibility to decide whether any of those pictures are worth seeing the light. Maybe there’s real gems there. But it’s a weird responsibility, but I don’t know— It’s been left with you to kind of have to make an executive decision, which is— There’s no right or wrong answer, right?

58:12: O’TOOLE: And it goes back to— What you guys were talking about is the fact that you could print in color and you could control it yourselves, and that these previous generations— The thing that a lot of people don’t know is Ansel Adams, Edward Weston, Walker Evans, all these people were also shooting in color, but they couldn’t get color prints that satisfied them. And so they weren’t printing. You know, Ansel Adams talks about that. And so there were efforts made. I mean, there were the Eliot Porters and people like that. But so there does exist a lot of this material that they never felt like they could print because the prints would end up being vulgar, in those words, because they couldn’t control them.

58:58: DELANEY: But I would just say you have an incredible responsibility to scan all those slides. Because once you’ve scanned them, you can take those Ektachromes and start to bring them back a bit to what was probably a baseline.

DIVOLA: Well, I would say that you can’t possibly scan all the slides.
ROSENHEIM: Thank you. [laughter]

DIVOLA: Yeah. And certainly not at the level of quality you’d want to scan.

ROSENHEIM: Right. A scan is not the same as [inaudible].

DIVOLA: But if you’re alive—You know, if you look at one of us, it’s what we’ve scanned is already the edit. Right? Because we’re alive and we could scan the things we wanted to print. So we’ve made an edit. But what’ll be very interesting is the people that are digital artists. Like, I saw the guy that was Obama’s official—

DELANEY: Peter, Peter Souza.

59:47: DIVOLA: Yeah. 1 million exposures, he made.

DELANEY: Yeah.

DIVOLA: So somewhere, there needs to be an edit, right? A final edit by that person, so that his archive knows...

DELANEY: Very much[?].

DIVOLA: ...that somebody doesn’t go in there and just wade through a million and make their own decisions, right? That the edit is a huge component of the process. And even in conventional photography, a lot of times you push a button and worry about it later, right? And so.
MISRACH: The only thing I would say about that is that posthumously, it’s up to people like you guys in the museums to make a decision whether something needs to see the light of day. I would argue the Winogrand was a really good example for me. There were some great photographs there that to this day, most people don’t even know that he did. And they’re going to finally see the light of day. But that’s because somebody took that responsibility. And a lot of stuff was crap. So you have to look through, see if there’s stuff that’s not— If there is great stuff there, he’s not around to make that decision. You kind of have to do that. And I think it’s not something to just say, ‘Well, it wasn’t done in his lifetime, so it shouldn’t be done.’ I think now that we can print these things and do stuff, I think it’s an important challenge.

DELANEY: For me personally, all of Public Matters was work that I had totally just put in a box and put away and hadn’t thought about at all. So you don’t know when work is going to start taking on meaning. So I think that there’s— You know, I was just thinking, who among us has thrown out our photographs that we thought weren’t good enough? You know, there’s always that hope, I guess.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I’d like to ask if you have thoughts about as artists, now that you’re older, how well you feel like you can remember what you expected that photograph to look like in the seventies, if you’d been able to do it, and whether your current processes or things that you’re doing in your art, which obviously has matured over the years, might influence what you look back to and say, ‘Oh, this is the way I wanted it to look,’ or ‘This is what it should have looked like.’

DIVOLA: Well, I think this has come up. I think Richard brought it up. Which is that— Well, first of all, no. God knows I can’t remember what I thought in 1978. But again, there were three— Henry brought this up. You had three parameters: lighter/darker, yellow/blue, magenta/green. You had these three choices. And you
DIVOLA (Cont.): would make these three choices and that’s the way the print looked. And you were stuck with that, and you didn’t worry too much about anything else. You made the best print you could make from the negative and you moved on. And so no. If I scan a negative from 1978, I’m not worried about what I thought in 1978. I say to myself, ‘Okay, what is the most interesting print I can make from this scan today?’ So I’m not thinking back about what it might’ve looked like then.

O’TOOLE: Well, and you were also saying to me earlier that it’s, in some ways, not even possible; that it’s a different medium and that the way that the negative reacts is different, and the way that the—

01:03:13: DELANEY: I think the tonal range is quite different. I think it’s much more—If you were to make a color chromogenic print today, the gradation between tones seems so much smoother than it does with digital. I’m always, like, struggling between. But for me personally, I always went for a very neutral palette. So I would assume that I can feel pretty consistent with how I used to work with how I work today.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you. I just wanted to follow up on that last statement from John. If you’re revisiting a negative made in 1978 and making these different decisions, would you be interested in the public dating it or understanding the time lapse between those two prints and decision-making processes for the future?

DELANEY: Am I interested that they understand that I made the print today as opposed to back in 19— Well, I think it’s a given, but yeah, I don’t care one way or another, frankly.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: You wouldn’t care if it were to be dated 2019?

01:04:21: DIVOLA: No. I’m alive, I made the print. I don’t know.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Dating the scan.

DIVOLA: Oh, dating the scan?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: That editing process, the decision-making process.

DIVOLA: Oh. Interesting question. No, it never occurred to me. But you’re right, at some point I did make a decision about what to scan. And indeed, I probably added images that I had not originally printed, when I made the decision of what to scan. And that was probably—That was quite a while ago that I did, but probably—I don’t know, fourteen years. We have a drum scanner at the university, so I scan all kinds of stuff. But yeah, that’s an interesting question because there was a slightly different edit at that point, yeah.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: It’s a decision-making process, like a traditional artist going back to a concept and recreating it.

DIVOLA: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, it doesn’t occur to me that it’d be interesting to anybody, but maybe.

WILHELM: Again, I think what’s so fascinating here with you three or the mystical twenty or fifty photographers who worked in color in this era is that you’ve transitioned every process. And I assume all three of you are now shooting digitally, so film is behind you. And—Still film?

DIVOLA: I still shoot some black and white film. I don’t shoot color film.
WILHELM: Oh, that doesn’t count, black and white.

01:05:43: DELANEY: I’m still shooting film. But when there’s not enough light, I’ll shoot digital. The goal is to make a photograph.

WILHELM: Right. So you’ve adopted the next better technology at every single stage. And you’re the only group in history, or this age group here, that that’s true. And that’s one reason this is so important. Second comment, I’m worried about the Walker Evans Ektachromes, especially large numbers of images. And this applies equally to color negatives, as well as transparencies. It’s very simple. Just put them in zero degrees. Then you’ve got a couple thousand years to contemplate what to do with them. And in the future, again, getting back to multispectral imaging and the kind of analysis at high-resolution of dye decomposition products, it will be possible—and other wavelengths—to restore much more effectively, faded originals than is now possible. And that will transition to the motion picture field, as well. So the important thing is, save everything and stop it where it is. Don’t let it go further. And don’t worry about scanning it. That’s too much work.

01:06:59: MISRACH: And the key is to store it at zero degrees, not forty-five degrees, right?

WILHELM: Mm-hm.

MISRACH: That’s the key.

WILHELM: And that gives you several thousand years of essentially [inaudible].

DELANEY: Guess we should buy a refrigerator.
MISRACH: If you can live that long...

DIVOLA: Plugged in.

DELANEY: [inaudible]. Yeah, right. Solar power.

WILHELM: So what it does do, it takes the urgency out of it. And revisiting— Like, imagine, Richard, a thousand years from now, someone will revisit all of your unprinted photographs.

MISRACH: I want to be there for that.

O’TOOLE: Unfortunately, we’re at time. But we can talk a little bit more about this at the very end, when we open it up for more questions. So thank you to the three of you and—

DELANEY: Thank you.

MISRACH: Thank you.