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PROLOGUE

In the summer session of 2013 I took part in Kent State University’s Blossom program in printmaking. A large part of the program provides interaction with visiting artists who come in specifically to work with enrolled students. During the summer of 2013 two contemporary artists; Guillermo Trejo and Stefan Hoffman were present in the Van Duesen printshop.

Hoffman, a German born artist who currently resides in the Netherlands, takes inspiration from his immediate environment. He seeks out symbols, pictographs or well-known local architectural features from the area surrounding where his installation is to take place and then reconfigures them to confound their use value. These images are serigraphed on walls or windows which get painted over or scraped off when the exhibition is over.

Trejo utilizes imagery that references common styles of monuments or signage. These images or phrases transform as one moves through the exhibition space. Their usual meaning changing into a new, often wry, one. Trejo at times prints pieces on unarchival paper and discards the work at the exhibition’s end.

Close contact and individual consultation with both of these artists definitely influenced the way in which I viewed my own art practice. The value of establishing and coopting pictographs was something I set out to explore. Additionally, as an individual who moves often and who pays monthly rent on a storage space which is 90% full of artwork, the idea that one could be a serious and successful artist without what I had come to accept as the ballast of production was very appealing. It became a personal goal to incorporate that detachment from the physical product of my work into my larger scale installation pieces.

For the Blossom program I created a series of 20 anti-technology propaganda posters, titled P.S.A. [Figure 1] which are still displayed on some of the buses that run in Portage County.
While only a portion made the cut for the buses, over 75 were created and still circulate. The method of monotyping with stencils that I established for these posters would be carried forward into /100.

Prior to the start of Blossom I had made a reservation for the Minneapolis/St. Paul International airport’s Freedom of Expression booth. I had traveled to this airport several times to visit my brother and felt a pull to utilize this available but seldom used space, just I had been drawn to the advertising area on the bus. I had gone through the various steps to reserve use of the space without having any sort of plan as to what I would do there.

These two circumstances, a surplus of cheeky monotypes and the reservation of a very public space, came together to form a singular idea. It was decided that I would take the prints with me to Minneapolis and give them away at the booth. Since art has value, I did not want to give them away for free. Eventually I concluded that it would be appropriate to distribute a poster in exchange for a response to a two-question survey.

The survey asked which color the respondent preferred, red, green or blue. These colors corresponded directly with the three main color schemes for the poster and determined which of the three they would receive. The second question inquired as to how many digital devices the person had with them at that exact moment. The experiment did not go exactly as planned, but I did distribute posters to and gather responses from 20 persons.

A few months later, as part of my candidacy review, I created twenty simple monotypes based on the experience. Each monotype represented the response of a single person. It had a background color corresponding to their preference and silhouettes of digital devices, as many as the person had claimed to have with them. These prints were arranged on the wall in a grid, as seen in Figure 2. This piece became the sketch for what is my thesis project.
Since a residency in Venice, Italy in 2011 my work has been an ongoing study of the increasing saturation of digital devices and internet presence in the daily life of a person living in the first world. Much of the work is figurative in nature, sourced in photographs I take of unsuspecting persons interacting with their devices. Some of the work, however, moves into a more conceptual realm while still retaining the same ethos, and this project falls into that category.

While moderating the panel discussion titled Beyond Big Data at the recent College Arts Association conference, writer Jacob Gaboury characterized the current trend in data collection stating, “Much like the US National Security Agency the museum is indiscriminate in what it hoovers up, collecting all under the assumption that more data is good data, and that…all data might be made meaningful when viewed through the appropriate filter or interface.” My starting point was a small, simple survey. The next logical step was to gather more data through a more complex survey with more respondents. The filter through which to view it could be determined after the results had been collected.

The presentation of objective data as a stand-in for a subjective opinion has a certain safety. Although I have total control on what data is gathered and how the data is presented, the use of data as source always has at least some aspect of the inarguably factual. Persons who may disagree with my point of view cannot disagree with the facts that are part of the exhibition, lending an air of unquestionable authority to my voice.

The Guerilla Girls utilize this tactic to strong effect in the posters they create and display. In some works they question the lack of female presence in the professional art world by citing
statistics, such as the fact that less than 5% of artists in the modern art section of the Metropolitan Museum are women but 85% of the nudes in the museum overall are female. This statistic supports the goal the artists state for themselves on their website, “We want to be subversive, to transform our audience, to confront them with some disarming statements, backed up by facts – and great visuals – and hopefully convert them.” This is undertaken with a similar spirit of subversive and playful irony stemming from a colorful presentation of data.

There is historical precedent for survey as a generative exercise within the fine arts. Artist Hans Haacke conducted many in gallery surveys, with the both the act of surveying and the results themselves each having a turn at being the final art piece. In an interview with Molly Nesbit, Haacke stated, “I often work with the specific context of the place for which I produce a piece – both the physical as well as the social and political context. They’re part of the materials I work with, like bronze or paint on canvas.” (Nesbitt, 278.) /100 sought a similar local relevance. Hence, the survey was conducted on the campus of Kent State University.

Russian émigrés Komar and Melamid conducted a nationwide survey in the 90s which sought to define the artistic tastes of our nation. The result was America’s Most Wanted and America’s Most Unwanted paintings. The project was so popular that it was repeated in many other countries. At the time the definitive book on the project was published in 1998 the artists, with the help of a professional polling firm, had surveyed almost two billion people. (Wypijewski, 2)

The trend towards data gathering is not limited to the visual arts. Jim Bianco conducts surveys via his website and uses the results as the basis of his songwriting. The Cookie Cutter Project consists of 69 separate questions, ranging from if the respondent has a nickname to their best summer memory. In contrast to my goals as well as Haacke’s and Komar and Melamid’s,
Bianco does not combine results to get a generalized idea of the public, but rather seeks out the most interesting respondents and composes a song about the individual.

What were the transgressive actions of critical art have mellowed into the corporate and every day. The Tate Modern counts amongst those cultural institutions that actively court critique through social media response to survey questions (Skrebowski, np.) Many websites entreat a quick survey in return for the chance at a paltry prize upon logging off. In the new spirit of capitalism we relinquish our opinions without any measurable value to ourselves.

In all the prior examples the artist or data gatherer has very little direct contact with the respondent. A different approach was taken in /100. A large part of the ritual of my practice is labor. As an editioning printer, precise, repetitive action resulting in quantifiable iterations of a single idea is the core of my skill set. By applying the same competence and dexterity to the execution of the survey I made an edition. This edition is in itself part of the contemporary conversation around printmedia. It exists as 100 sheets of paper printed through a copy machine with hand drawn elements. Sourcing those elements in the answers of the public brings the creation of the edition into a performative space.

Beyond caressing the fringes of performance public intervention was also best practice. In leaving a set of instructions for participants to follow, Haacke consistently returned a percentage of uninterpretable results (Haacke, 16.) Research shows the most accurate surveys are those that are conducted in person (Salant, 40.)

Out I ventured in search of the average person to ten distinct outdoor locations on the Kent State University campus. A total of 100 were sought, found, tabulated. I spoke with each of them individually, leading them through the following questions and answering any of theirs while doing my best to maintain an air of neutrality.
Are you a student, faculty, staff or guest at Kent State?

If a student, grad or undergrad?
If student or faculty, which department do you teach in, or what is your major?

What year were you born?

Which of the following websites do you have a public profile on?
- Facebook
- Tumblr
- Google Plus
- Pintrist
- Twitter
- Myspace
- Youtube
- LinkedIn
- Instagram
- Vine
- Deviant Art
- Personal Website
- Personal Blog
- None

Which of the following electronic devices do you have with you right now?
- Smartphone
- Dumbphone
- Laptop
- Tablet
- MP3 Player
- EReader
- All
- None

Are your devices PC, Mac, Android or a mixture of these?

Prior to taking this survey, what was the last action you took with one of your electronic devices?

Approximately how much do you spend on your data plan every month?
$  
Don’t know  
Family Plan

What is your favorite color?
I’m going to list some ways of making art. Let me know which ones you are familiar with. It is okay if you have not heard of them
- Lithography
- Intaglio
- Screenprinting
- Monotype
- Woodcut
- Letterpress
- All
- None

Approximately how much money have you spent on art in the last year, and by art I mean anything you personally consider to be art?

The phrasing of the very last question, where I allowed the respondent to determine what art is to them, was borrowed from the survey conducted by Komar and Melamid. (Wypijewski, 17.) In an interview, the artists explained that to them the idea that one requires historical knowledge in order to know what is art is false, because art exists amongst our daily surroundings. Hence, the average person should be able to recognize what art is. (Weingrod, 18)

This struck me as an important distinction, that between the artist as declarer of what art is, and the consumer deciding what out of the items they consume falls into the category of art. This question garnered some of the most interesting unintended results when a portion of respondents vocalized exactly which items they had spent money on in the last year they considered art.

When inquiring as to which art making techniques the individual was familiar with, the questions direct the art conversation specifically at printmaking. A simple hierarchy of dominance is established by limiting the choices of what constitutes art to methods used in my current practice. In this way I am declaring printmaking interchangeable with all art.

The respondents consisted of the following; 1 faculty member, 5 staff members, 7 persons who had no direct affiliation with the college, 5 graduate students and 82
undergraduates. In categorizing them by age, they can be broken down thusly, 42 teenagers, 46 persons in their twenties, 3 persons in their thirties, 3 persons in their forties, 4 persons in their fifties and 2 persons in their sixties.

A careful study of the gallery which had been reserved for the show led me to separate it into 7 different quadrants, each one of which would host a separate data set. The first two quadrants were reserved for exposition. One wall was designated for a series of three charts illustrating the percentage breakdown of respondents.

It was important to me to be very clear in the source of my data and it seemed the best way to do so was to plainly present to the viewer information such as that 82% of all respondents were undergraduates, 46% of all respondents were in their twenties, and the most common majors were science, medicine and business. This way as the viewer entered into pieces that more specifically represented individual respondents they would not make untrue links between the preponderance of science majors that preferred the color blue, as they would know that the majority of respondents overall were studying science. Conversely, they could also effectively wonder, as I did, at the fact that out of the 100 respondents, only two were studying athletics, and both of them cited teal as a favored hue.

The responses to the survey were scanned for the largest and most complex points of difference. Two direct data comparisons were chosen; the 83 persons who had active profiles on Facebook against the 6 persons who knew what intaglio was; the amount of money each respondent had estimated to have spent monthly on having internet access against their last year’s monthly spending on art. [Figure 3]

The wall with the highest ceiling was chosen to represent respondent’s favorite colors, from most popular to least popular. [Figure 4] Despite a general lack of involvement with the
arts, color is something that all but one respondent understood (that one insisting that they had no favorite color and did not care for colors at all) and were able to choose their preference immediately. The tallest ceiling was imperative for this particular data set as it was my desire for the most popular color to tower over the viewer, for them to in fact feel slightly diminished in the face of so much saturation. Although the internet won every available comparison of data gathered, the universal appeal and childish simplicity of love of a specific color could still represent the power of art within the confines of my exhibition.

As explained in the introduction to Jude Stewart’s book about the culture of color, Roy G. Biv, “You can bring color and words into closer proximity, on the page or on a canvas, but you can’t make them fully merge.” (Stewart, X) That is to say, although 31 persons told me their favorite color was blue, I could not know, even if I had engaged in further conversation about it, which specific blue they were referring to. This concept is also a point of discussion in Albers seminal Interaction of Color, where he states that even when a specific red is noted, like the red of the Coca-Cola brand, it still has a different incarnation in each individual mind. (Albers, 3) It was my subjective choice then, where there were enough prints required to allow it, to vary the hue of the intended color slightly, to present not what I thought was blue, or what pantone says is blue, but rather a range of blues, from which one might, or might not, find the blue that was held in their mind. [Figure 5]

As this was the only wall where art was not in a matchup with the internet I did not want its power lessened by it being in competition with color near it. The color choices in the exhibition are extremely deliberate, and made to fit within the logic of the show itself. Black is used to balance the extreme intensity of presented colors. It also references printmaking history
in *Facebook vs Intaglio*, [Figure 6] where up until the previous century color was the exception, not the norm.

In other works a scheme of blue for art and red for internet is established. The choice of these colors has many sources. The colors together, when combined with the sprinkling of white shapes that result from the stencil block outs, harken to our nation’s flag. In a study published in the journal *Science* in 2009 it was demonstrated that people working in a red room increase in their caution and accuracy, and a blue room amplifies their creativity. (Stewart, 35.) Within the context of the exhibition, on the one wall where art, as symbolized by color, is uncontested, blue is the most popular color and red, although not the least popular, is quite far down the list.

A singular system was devised to have consistent representation of each respondent throughout the gallery. An individual would come to be represented by a series of no more than four and no less than two symbols from a grouping of 26. The individuals are anonymized by their inclusion in a group valuable only for its number. They are simultaneously specified by their inclusion within categories.

In the 1970s, before computers were such an everyday part of our life, the artist Matt Mullican was applying a similar streamlining of meaning with his own vocabulary of graphics. He also employs a symbolization of color to deepen the interpretation of his signs, which are often repeated and recombined to extend the implied narrative. (Molesworth, 99-101)

Mullican’s inspiration may have come from the pictographs which suffuse many regulated areas like airports, where symbols must exist in a way that is understandable to persons of diverse native tongues. In an article by Allan McCollum about Mullican, the author explains the usefulness of this type of symbology, “It is to a very primitive level of understanding that these kinds of pictographs appeal, by necessity of their purpose, which is to be universally
recognizable.” Whereas Mullican seeks to represent somewhat arcane ideas of the artist’s inner life, my pictographs are intended to distill objective ideas of age and status into a single symbol.

This same sort of essentialization of image is employed in numerous aspects of a digital experience. A current computer or smartphone interface is filled with a combination of skeuomorphs and icons. The skeuomorphic trashcan or recycling bin on the computer desktop tells us its purpose, to eliminate a file or program we no longer need, by utilizing the design of an object we already understand. However, the actual function of the algorithm which is activated by sending something to the “trash” does not operate in the same way as disposing of physical refuse (Hoelscher, np.) Additionally, individual programs are represented by simplified icons which often do not reference any related existing idea. The four colored circle upon which one clicks to open the google chrome web browser does not connect to a pre-established idea but rather forges a new connection between a new symbol and its meaning. The human brain quickly accepts the connection between the new pictograph and the function or program it represents. In this context, the form of the easily interpretable pictographic signs at an airport is coopted by a more complex idea or function.

One part of my original goal for the exhibition, and hence the symbols, was to keep a light and playful tone throughout. This desire was an outgrowth of the impossibility of creating a scientifically sound comparison of art and the internet, two things which are not mutually exclusive. To that end, the symbols I sought were to be comic where possible.

The employment of levity or whimsy does not have to undermine the sincerity of an artistic endeavor. A jocose presentation of that which has the potential to be generally uninteresting (the data resulting from a survey) can entice the viewer to spend more time in the gallery. The Guerilla Girls announce on their FAQ page that they “use humor to convey
information and provoke discussion.” As artist Alexander Melamid has said, “Don’t forget, there is a truth in every joke.” (Weingrod, 15)

Romanian artist Dan Perjovschi uses humor in his drawings to make bold points about a variety of both broad and precise current political issues. The drawings are simple, executed in a black line style which evokes both children’s sketches and the aforementioned pictographs and skuemorphs. Through their simplicity and irony they charm the viewer into confronting complex ideas about inequality and misrepresentation (Faria, np). The drawings themselves can act as symbols, whether on a white museum wall, or distributed via the internet to be used on protest banners and shirts (Stefan, np).

The most repeated symbol throughout the entire exhibition is that of instant noodles, which is used to represent students. It is both a cultural joke and a large percentage of truth that students generally rely on inexpensive sources of nourishment. This association is backed up by an article published in the Daily Kent Stater which confirms, “Ramen has long been a staple of the university diet.” Amongst those items available at a grocery store, you would be hard-pressed to find anything as inexpensive as instant noodles, for which a single serving can cost as little as ten cents. To distinguish graduate students from undergraduates, I added an icon of a bag of frozen broccoli, which increases the nutritional value of ramen to more than zero. A similar associative thought process was used to develop icons for staff, faculty and other.

Developing a symbol set to represent the ages came from the first that I felt confident in. The red solo cup has become a symbol itself of a frat style party, and is available as party lights and even as a miniaturized version for shot glasses. The cup seemed fitting for those who were in their 20s, when the first taste of freedom often leads to at least one crazy keg fueled evening.
With that having been decided, it seemed natural to extend the metaphor of beverage of choice into all the age groups.

The biggest challenge in this stage of development was that of the various majors for the students and one faculty member that responded. To my delight I had gathered responses from a large variety of majors, to my horror this required me to develop a large variety of symbols. As I embarked on the task it started to seem wise to combine individual majors which had similar properties. For example, a student who is majoring in nursing and someone who is premed will both end up working in the same final industry – medicine. Utilizing this sort of logic to create groupings, I was able to winnow the fifty some odd individual majors down into a grouping of 15. They consist of art, architecture, athletics, business, computers, education, exploratory, fashion, journalism, language, law, medicine, politics, science, and visual communication design. A few of these, such as law and journalism, had very few respondents, but still felt distinct enough from other majors to retain their individuality.

The thought process which had been utilized for the previously established symbols was again entered into. For some I was able to develop something quite humorous, a “gridlock” for those in politics, a carpal tunnel wrist-brace for those studying computers. For others the symbol was more straightforward, and while still understandable, lacked comic effect, such as the pencil for education and the T-square for visual communication design. All of the symbols were presented and explained in a legend printed directly onto a wall of the exhibition as shown in Figure 7.

A brief survey took place at the reception for the exhibition. It is sourced in the spirit of Hans Haacke’s 1970 MOMA Poll, where gallery attendees were asked to choose between two options, whether or not the respondent would vote for Nelson Rockefeller for Governor based on
the fact that he had not denounced then President Nixon’s Indochina policy. The various status of the responders, whether they paid full admission, were a member of the museum, held a courtesy pass or came to the museum on free day, was signaled by the color of the piece of paper with which they cast their votes. Haacke had two clear ballot boxes with digital counters on top, by which those visiting the museum during the run of the survey could both visually register the accumulation of ballots for one side or the other, and could also know the exact number of persons who voted yes or no. (Haacke, 9-11)

Attendees of the reception for /100 were invited to add to the conversation of the show itself. They were asked, “If you could only have one for the rest of your days, would you choose Facebook or Intaglio?” This represents a rivalry already established in the show to a new audience of persons. It also serves as a distribution system for the individual works in the show itself, as each participant received a voucher for one print to be claimed after the show was deinstalled.

The query is a far less political and far more esoteric than anything ever posed by Haacke. My intent is not one of provocation but rather one of bemused rumination bordering on absurdity. It does, however, involve an aspect of his work which is not present in the other pieces, that of others witnessing an individual’s choice. Luke Skrebowski, lecturer at Cambridge, has theorized that, “People are more likely to vote the same way as others in a public forum.” (Skrebowski, np) It was my personal theory that in the context of an art opening, with the majority of those in attendance assumed to be dedicated in some way to art, that less than 10% of respondents would choose Facebook.

Those 84 persons who chose to participate created their own print in the exhibition space by selecting a red or blue colored paper to emblematize their choice. They then utilized stamps
that had each of the already established symbols on them to create a print which signified their demographic identity. These prints operated in a way similar to Haacke’s colored paper, by which a respondent could remain individually anonymous but their demographic status was still clear. The paper that had then been stamped was affixed to the smallest wall in the gallery. The end result was approximately 20% choosing Facebook, with the majority, as predicted given the art school environment, selecting intaglio. [Figure 8]

The voting portion of the exhibition reception was managed by two persons employed specifically for the purpose. One person posed the question to participants and assisted them in choosing the stamps which best represented them [Figure 9]. Another person stapled the results to the designated wall in the manner of their own choosing. It was important for there to be human interaction, both for accuracy and to encourage participation. It also was in keeping with the style that the original survey was executed. Additionally, by allowing persons other than myself to oversee the completion of the project I subverted my experience as a master printer, where I made the work of other artists, and brought in another level of personal detachment from the product.

Stamps, a simplified form of relief printing, were but one of the techniques present in the show. They are perfect for their intended purpose as they require no equipment beyond the ink pad to complete their task. They are also a familiar enough item that most participants, even those with no background in art or craft, will likely have previously encountered them and be able to use them without additional instruction. They also represent a transition between the digital and hand crafted in the show itself. The stamps were produced by machines from digital files created as an interpretation of my drawings. They are manufactured and digitized but require the action of the hand to complete their purpose.
For the majority of work presented, a monotype technique using paper stencils was employed. As most prints created were individual and unique, presented in a size determined by the wall and with a combination of symbols exclusive to the respondent, it was unnecessary to make a complicated matrix for the literally hundreds of individual prints produced. Monotyping allowed me to create individual pieces relatively quickly. Using flat color rolled out on Plexiglas strategically blocked with reusable paper stencils cut into positive or negative shapes of the established pictographs allows for consistency in presentation of the information itself.

For the wall segment representing those six persons who had familiarity with intaglio, the intaglio process was utilized. [Figure 10] The execution of the medium, however, is consistent with the aesthetic of the monotypes. The same stencils used for the monotypes were used to create the images on the intaglio plates by adhering them to the surface of the plate and then using spray paint to block the area outside of the stencil. A layer of aquatint was then applied to the open area left by the removal of the stencil, resulting in the stencil shape in a tonal black. On a few plates deep biting was also used to help define the edges of the shape. Also, rather than create six distinct matrices, one for each involved respondent, each symbol has its own smaller plate that is printed in combination to represent the respondent. This approach mirrors the method used on the monotyped prints.

Serigraphy, a fourth printmaking method, was employed to apply the pictographs directly to the wall for the legend. Lastly, in acquiescence to the dominance and convenience of the digital age and to engage with it in a way not possible by completely denying it, three pie charts showing the percentage of respondents that fall into the various available categories were printed digitally on a commercial banner substrate. They were in effect “signs,” information leading to the substance of the show. [Figure 11]
The prints were affixed to the wall by staples. As each individual print itself is only a component of the art piece, rather than a completed piece, I was not concerned with the integrity of the non-archival paper on which the symbols were printed. The entire show, the works made for it and the relevance of the data gathered had a very short expiration date. To reinforce the impermanence of the display and its reach, the preciousness of each print was undermined by a disregard for the surface of each individual piece of paper when displayed. Additionally, the prints themselves were not signed - but rather the wall they were affixed to held the signature, which was also painted over when the exhibition was deinstalled. Much of this speaks to the goal, inspired by Hoffman and Trejo, to practice detachment from the physical pieces that make up any given installation. The art was in the way the entire room came together for the less than 24 hours it was on display. As the data presented was specific to the gallery and its viewers, it will lose part of its relevance as soon as I leave Kent State University.

The concept, however, remains relevant, and is something I plan to continue to pursue in other venues. The basic framework of /100 (a survey executed amongst the potential audience for the show, points of largest difference identified, icons created to represent demographics of respondents, size of prints and number of questions addressed determined by exhibition space) can be easily customized.

A number of the decisions made for the original exhibition can be carried forward into future sites. I feel the survey itself would require only minor changes. Adding a final question of, “Which items that you purchased in the last year do you consider art?” would allow that interesting variable to be more thoroughly explored and quantified. The demographic queries of campus status and major could be adjusted to reflect an individual execution site. The existing icons can stand with a few minor revisions and others being added in as needed.
Although it would be possible to compare the responses of future survey groups to those of Kent State University, I would prefer, at least in the near term, to allow each data set to exist on its own. My one exception to this is in the display of favorite color. Although the 15.5 foot tower of blue was literally taller than any person who attended the exhibition, the overall intensity of that wall when installed did not fulfill the grandiose vision of my mind’s eye. By continuously aggregating the favorite colors of all respondents from every survey, thereby growing the total number of respondents to that question, the power of color can be more fully emphasized. The simple addition of a symbol to represent which data set the individual respondent belongs to can act as a distinguishing factor, such as adding a stylized golden flash to the prints representing respondents from Kent State University.

/100 started with the idea of asking questions directly of the public, not knowing where the answers would lead. Some of my suspicions were confirmed, some of my assumptions were quashed and all of my interest was piqued. My own language of printmaking was extended conceptually, through the execution of survey as edition and by allowing others to be the vehicle through which my work was created. Perhaps most importantly, a new way of generating work was established that can be used as a starting point for many exhibitions to come.
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