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INTRODUCTION

Although the writing of this text has been accomplished in a brief amount of time, my investigation of photography has involved several years. In that time my interest has not waned, and will probably not in the future. Max Kozloff's book title of Photography and Fascination is personally apt. My own fascination with the medium began some eighteen years ago when my parents sent me my first camera for a Christmas present while I was an undergraduate in a foreign land. My initial fascination with photography had to do with the camera and what it could do, and do so easily. After I later had become an art major I became fascinated with what I could do with a camera and an enlarger, particularly in comparison with what I could not do with a pencil or paint brush. That was in the late 1960's before photography swept the college art departments of this nation. Being in a small liberal arts college with no faculty photographers, a few of us taught ourselves the medium through trial and error, successes and failures. After working professionally with photography for a few years, I moved to a large university and learned, through some formal instruction, more about the medium and its history, and also began teaching about it as I continued to use it. Throughout, periodic intuitions would surface.
and submerge and surface again, while my fascination remained constant.

I felt, based on personal knowledge, that photography was different than other artforms. I knew it was easier for me. Art making is difficult, whether one attempts the endeavor with brush or camera, and the intent to make art is intimidating. But with a camera in hand I had never to face a pristine piece of paper, or an elaborately prepared, large, but empty canvas: the viewfinder of my camera, given any amount of light, was always filled, never empty. As a working artist this was to me a radical difference.

In teaching with and about photography, I would have people talk about photographs. Their talk about photographs was qualitatively different than their talk about other artforms, although both discourses needed development. Some tended to predominantly discuss the subject matter pictured rather than the subject matter as pictured. It seemed to me that they saw photographs differently. Now, in Kendall Walton's and others' terms, I would say that they "saw through" them in ways that they did not see through paintings, prints, or drawings, even stylistically realistic ones. Some others, with their previous art learning biased by formalism, tended to predominantly talk about form no matter how dominant was the subject matter. The desire to improve discourse about photographs lead me to investigate photography criticism for a Master's thesis. I found that Minor White, the prominent photographer and educator, also found that discussion of photo-
photographs among his students was at a primitive level. He also claimed that the professional photography criticism then current was mundane. In the late 1950's he, Henry Holmes Smith, Walter Chappell and others attempted to improve the situation by their "Reading" approach to photography criticism, but without much success. After my thesis work I continued to teach photography in the context of art education, to make photographs, to think about them, especially to think about whether they were different from other pictures, and if they were, how they were, how it mattered, and how to get people to think better about them and talk more intelligently about them. This text is a result of those beginnings.

The text is in five chapters but the five chapters form two sections. The first three chapters distinguish photography from other picturing media and photographs from other pictures. Based on this discourse, Chapters 4 and 5 are more particularly concerned with interpreting photographs. The entire text is a theoretical discussion of photography and our experience of it and offers a conceptual framework for understanding photographs. The first section explores the phenomenon of photography asking and answering what photographs have in common with each other and how they, as a class of pictorial objects, differ from other two dimensional images. Photographs are held to be and argued to be unique among pictures. The unique characteristics of photographs are "selectivity," "instantaneity," and "credibility."
Chapters are devoted to each of these. Each one of these characteristics distinguish photographs from other pictures, and all photographs are, to greater or lesser extents, selective, instantaneous, and credible; but with different photographs not all three hold with equal weight. Because photographs are selective, instantaneous, and credible, in Chapter 4 it is argued that photographs logically require contextual interpretation. Three senses of "context" are distinguished: "internal," "original," and "external." Chapter 5 presents an overlapping category system into which photographs fall when interpreted. It is recommended that photographs be seen as if they functioned analogously to various types of language statements: "descriptive," "explanatory," "interpretive," "ethically evaluative," "aesthetically evaluative," and "theoretical." These categories are not discrete, but are overlapping, and variously combine. The category system is held to be descriptively accurate of photographs, but its primary use is as a heuristic device to prompt interpretive thought about photographs.

It is assumed that all pictures, not just photographs, need interpretation, but because of the "credibility" characteristic intrinsic to photographs, it is especially important that photographs be interpretively examined. Use of the categories is dependent on contextual information: to accurately place any photograph in one or more of the categories, one must justify such placement with evidence drawn from contextual sources. The need for contextual interpretation
of photographs is, in turn, a logical need based on the nature of photography.

Today, the attempt to determine uniqueness among media is suspect by some as "Modernist" and thus outdated, aesthetically misguided, and politically corrupt. This text should not be read as an attempt to further the tenets of Modernism. Proponents of Modernism, past and present, claim autonomy for art, and non-referentiality to the physical, social, and political world: art has transcendental and universal as opposed to local or topical significance for Modernists. This text is not Modernist in any of these senses. This text deals with all photographs, and it is not exclusively concerned with the art of photography. When photographs have been displaced from their initial non-art presentational environments to artworld environments, the text recommends that viewers be aware of and consider implications of such displacements. The text is preeminently supportive of a contextual understanding of any given photograph, and not just an understanding of it in the context of art history or of the contemporary artworld, but also in the context of the historical and political world. Few photographs are non-referential to the physical, social, and political world, and to read the many referential photographs as if they in fact referred, or as if they should be read as referring, exclusively or primarily to the history of art, is to mis-read them.

In attempting to identify the unique characteristics of the medium of photography, I am attempting to understand
photography so as to better understand photographs and how and why photographs effect us differently than paintings, for example, or drawn illustrations. A clearer understanding of photography, I think, will also yield a clearer understanding of pictures done in other media. Of course, in the larger realm of two dimensional images, distinctions between photographs and paintings blur. In the context of the contemporary artworld, photographs and paintings tend to unite in a vast continuum; and in the context of a contemporary magazine, so do photographs and illustrations. But in the first three chapters of this text I have attempted to concentrate on clarifying the grounds for distinguishing photographs from other pictures, rather than stressing their commonalities, but hopefully without leaving such a gap between excessive claims and modest performances that disappointments are the result.

When photography is contrasted with another medium in this text, the other medium is painting, since this is the medium to which aestheticians traditionally refer. Little mention of the medium of film is made in this text, although some film theorists are cited for support of some theses. Although films and video tapes share much with photographs since both are made by means of camera and light sensitive materials, they are also significantly different in many respects. Movement and stillness are obvious differences. Single images and sequential images are another difference: the feature film projected at 24 frames per second for an
hour and a half presents some 129,000 pictures to the viewer for assimilation. Paintings and photographs, however, share stasis and both are silent. The photograph is typically a frozen instant whereas film is temporally linear, showing developments unfolding in time. The film director has control of the viewer's time, pacing it quickly or slowly by the length of shots, making filmic time eminently plastic. The photographer has no such control over the viewer's time. Presentational environments for photographs and films are also different. One's experience of a photograph or a painting on a wall, or one's experience of a reproduction of a photograph or of a painting in a book, is radically different than experiencing a feature film in a theatre or watching a televised film in a living room.

Although painting and other traditional artforms are sometimes contrasted to photography in this text, the text is informed by art theory. Art theory presently, however, does not adequately account for photography. There are many more photographs to be considered than art photographs. Apart from art photographs, there is a tremendous variety of photographs made for a multitude of purposes. We have photographs made generally in the service of science for applications in medicine, space exploration, geography, physics, archeology, sociology, anthropology, and so forth. There are tremendous numbers of photographs being made daily for the advertising industry and the fashion industry.
Photographs are routinely used for mundane utilitarian functions of society such as the identification of persons and property. There is a large pornography industry dependent on photographs. Photographs for reportage in the print media are obviously numerous, as are snap-shots for the family album. It is these, as well as art photographs, with which a theoretical treatment of photography ought be concerned.

Before leaving these non-art examples of photographs, however, an important point to be made is that no matter what the original purposes of the photographs were when they were made, whether for the immediate purpose of deciding the winner of a horse race or discovering the characteristics of bullets in flight, many photographs from each of the groups just mentioned end up in the collections of the Museum of Modern Art and other major institutional and private art collections, on the walls of commercial art galleries, and on the pages of coffee table art books. In other words, some photographs are made as art and received as art; some photographs are made as non-art and are used as non-art and are then presented and received as art. Others are made as non-art and remain non-art, but there is no guarantee that they will never be presented and received as art. Fashion photographs by Richard Avedon made for Harper's Bazaar and Vogue are in the collections of New York's Metropolitain and Modern museums as well as other collections
nationally and internationally, as are Irving Penn's anthropological studies of different persons of different primitive cultures. A large retrospective show of photographs from Ohio at the Columbus Museum of Art included documentary photographs, made under the auspices of the Ohio Penitentiary Board, of condemned prisoners strapped into electric chairs before their executions. The "Artists Snap-shot Invitational" exhibited in a St. Louis art gallery contained several photographs excerpted from family snap-shot collections.

At issue here is not whether these photographs deserve the honorific title of "art," but that photographs made as non-art are granted the conferred status of art in at least the descriptive sense by individuals recognized within the artworld as connoisseurs, collectors, and curators. George Dickie's institutional analysis of art applies here, at least in the sense that art curators have designated some photographs made as non-art to be candidates worthy of aesthetic attention, and further, that they have been accepted as such by the official artworld, and in this sense are works of art. To adequately deal with these examples I think they ought to be accounted for as both art and as non-art. An adequate theory of art which attended to photography would be able to account for these photographs as art, but not necessarily as non-art.

To my knowledge, however, we have no general theories
of art which explicitly claim to adequately account for photographs. Among fairly recent theories of art, Suzanne Langer acknowledges the importance of the "emerging" art of film and adds an interesting appendix about film to *Feeling and Form*, but pays no particular attention to photography. Ernst Gombrich makes use of photographs in supporting his theses in *Art and Illusion*, and Nelson Goodman occasionally mentions photography in *Languages of Art* and *Ways of Worldmaking*, but he is not specifically attempting a theory of art in either, and in illucidating different systems of representation, pays no extended attention to photography, nor does Gombrich. Dickie's institutional analysis could certainly be applied to an accounting of how photographs come to be art, but would allow little beyond that. Arthur Danto's theory of art holds promise if it were to be applied to photography, but he does not make the application, and applying any given aesthetic theory to the medium of photography is another point.

If photography is significantly different from, and unique among, the other artforms, then more than a general theory of art is needed to adequately account for photographs. I believe and am arguing that photography is significantly different and unique. A general theory of art which is applied to photography will not be adequate for photography. If photography is simply subsumed into a general theory of art by a conflation of photographs with other two dimensional
artforms such as paintings, prints, and drawings, then photography's unique characteristics will be obfuscated. Similarly, I think any general theory of aesthetics which would attempt to account for all the arts, including music, dance, drama, literature, art, architecture, film, video, and photography might well be beneficial in giving us coherent insights into the general nature of art, but that it also ought to guide our investigations of the specific artforms under its umbrella and adequately correspond to the actual practice of these artforms in their various manifestations. Perhaps I am too influenced by our recent past, but I am skeptical that such an encompassing theory would do justice to the variety of arts without doing disservice to their differences. I believe we need some guiding generalizations, but I have more trust in aesthetic theorizing which seeks several answers to questions about art depending on which art is being discussed.

In theoretically treating photography, and treating both photographs which are made as art and photographs which are not made as art but which may or may not become art, we have choices. On the premise that photographs are significantly different than other artforms, we could ignore theories of art in favor of developing new theories of photography which were freed from the confines of the older and different artform of painting. Edward Weston made this decision earlier in this century because he saw that photographers were being guided in practice by painters to the extent that
whatever unique capabilities the camera had were being surrendered to "photo-painting" which was resulting in "a great many horrors perpetrated in the name of art, from allegorical costume pieces to dizzying out of focus blurry."

Similarly, today there are some who see photographers scrambling to be on the cutting edge of the New York art scene to the extent that they have abandoned the great, but brief, independent tradition of photography which Alfred Stieglitz, Paul Strand, Edward Weston, and others established, with the claimed consequences that photographers are turning out boring and trivial non-photographic pieces of conceptual art. Or, taking a less extreme and nostalgic stance, we could choose to be informed about traditional aesthetic theories, but still choose to ignore them as distracting and misguiding our attempt to formulate new theory for the new and unique medium of photography. A third choice, based on the premise that while photographs are unique they are nevertheless frequently art, would be to have our theoretical efforts guided by a theory of art, at least when reflecting on photographs which are made as art and presented as art.

I think it is difficult to choose among these options. The more courageous might be the more radical choice of discussing photographs as photographs and not as "art" at all, leaving the art talk to aestheticians and art critics while we independently pursued photography theory and photography criticism. Weston, Adams, and White were ignored by the art historians and art critics and the art museums for a
long time while they were doing some of their best work, and responded by ignoring them and their debates about whether photography was art or not art. They went about their business of making good photographs, and Beaumont Newhall, admittedly trained in art history, went about writing photography history, and photography galleries opened and struggled and succeeded, and photography critics fumbled with words and concepts until they got fairly articulate and insightful. Now Weston and White are dead but their photographs are auctioned to museums for thousands of dollars, and Adams' work is in such demand that he is only printing, on a very expensive and prepaid basis, those same old negatives he was making when those same old museums were ignoring him.

But the more radical choice of determined ignorance may be foolish. There is a lot to be ignorant of in the past and present writings of aestheticians. Those who have written from within the confines of the photographic community have not produced all that much literature, and that which they have produced is not all that enlightening. Roland Barthes' is the only theory of photography I know of and his is an outsider's view, and a valuable one. Film theory has been more plentiful than photography theory even though film is younger than photography. This text is informed by aesthetic theory but does not construe all photographs as art and does not conflate photographs and paintings, or
photographs and texts, or photographs and films.

There are other choices to face. In theorizing about photographs, we can theorize about all photographs as one type of image among other types of images, or we can divide them into two categories, art photographs and non-art photographs. In this division, art photographs would be those made by photographers to be shown as art; non-art photographs would be those made for any number of reasons other than the reason of making art. With this bi-partite division, elusive groups remain, namely those photographs made as non-art but shown and received as art, and also those photographs made as art but used as non-art by non-art investigators such as anthropologists, sociologists, and historians. We could decide to only consider art photographs seen as art and ignore the rest, leaving them for others in the sciences to worry over. But I am not choosing this option because I want to account for all photographs. If we want to account for all types of photographs and their various functions, and if we go with this division of art and non-art, we may well need two accounts, one based in aesthetic concerns and one based on informational concerns. Unless, of course, a theoretical account which is guided by a theory of art can account for non-art photographs as well as art photographs. I am doubtful that a theory of photography preeminently guided by a theory of art might be responsive to both the demands of the scientist working with scientific photographs
as well as aestheticians working with art photographs.

I think the better approach in thinking about all of photography is from the start to consider general questions of meaning rather than to be overly guided by aesthetic concerns. For the moment let us consider the division of real-world objects, photographic artifacts, and photographic art. In this division, photographic artifacts are all non-art photographs. The important difference between photographic artifacts and their real-world referents is that the photographic artifacts are about their real-world referents. How photographic artifacts are different, and what they are about, and how they are about what they are about, and how they effect our experience of what they picture need explication, and the kind of explication that is needed by social scientists, for instance, who use photographs in the course of their investigations. The important differences between art photographs and other two dimensional art objects are experiential differences. Or, more completely, paintings and photographs are different from their referents. Their differences effect interpretive and aesthetic differences. Paintings and photographs are also different from each other in their means of picturing; these differences effect interpretive differences which are crucial to non-art investigations; and these interpretive differences also implicitly make our aesthetic responses to photographs different than our responses to painting. The role of theorizing in relation to art
photographs, as it is in respect to non-art photographs, is also to explicate the differences between the art photograph and its real-world referent, but further, to explicate the differences between experiencing the photograph and other artforms, making explicit how the experience of photographs is different from the experience of paintings, prints, drawings, films, and so forth, so as not to diminish the differences of each.

This text, then, begins with a discussion of and arguments for a special status for photography. The unique characteristics of photography are claimed to be "selectivity," "instantaneity," and "credibility." The influence of each of these in combination with each other on our engagements with photographs is explored. The stress is on the viewing of photographs, but statements of past and present photographers are cited as evidence for the plausibility of the claim that these characteristics are essential to the medium and our understanding of it. The perspective of those working with the medium to make pictures are deemed important, though the majority of supporting citations are of aestheticians and photography theorists, past and present. Throughout the first three chapters, ramifications for interpretation based on these three distinguishing characteristics are discussed, and an interpretive thrust is continued in the second section, Chapters 4 and 5. Because it is of the nature of photographs to be selective, instantaneous, and credible, that is, all
too briefly, because photographs are excised from physical real-world space and temporality with mechanical origins which result in a high degree of stylistic realism which tends to convince, photographs ought to be interpreted contextually. Chapter 4 is an argument for contextualism regarding photography and distinguishes three sources of contextual information: "internal context" refers to what is visually present in the photograph; "original context" refers to what may have been present in the world to the photographer at the time the photograph was made; and "external context" refers to the environment in which the photograph is shown and the discourse which has accrued around the photograph since it was made.

Because there is such a diversity of photographs which range from scientific to artistic endeavors, a category system which renders this diversity more conceptually manageable, without diminishing the differences among photographs, is deemed desirable. Chapter 5 is an overlapping category system which posits that photographs are analogous to various types of language statements, namely: "descriptive," "explanatory," "interpretive," "ethically evaluative," "aesthetically evaluative" and "theoretical." The claim is not that photographs constitute a language, but that photographs do function similarly to language statements and that it is interpretively beneficial to view them in such a way. To ask of a photograph if it functions primarily as
a description or as an ethical judgment is to ask important interpretive questions, question more important and yielding greater insight than to traditionally ask if it is in the category of "nude" or "landscape," "straight or manipulated," "Purist and Pictorialist." Chapters 4 and 5 are integral to each other. Interpreting one photograph by an unknown photographer is intellectually risky. The interpretive placement of a photograph in one or more of the categories requires the marshalling of evidence in support of the interpretive claim, and this evidence is of a contextual sort. The two chapters also make it evident that photographs are often made to function one way but are used to function another by being placed in various contexts by advertisers, editors, and curators. It is important to sort out the various functions due to the fact that photographs appear "credible" and anonymously authoritative in a range of situations and uses, even contradictory ones. Several examples make these distinctions clear and significant.

The overall conception guiding this text is original, as are the individual sections with their various distinctions. Past and present writing about photography, as is shown and referenced, is concerned with issues of photographic selectivity, or photography and time, or the halo of credibility surrounding photographs, but these and other considerations which have been posited here have not been combined and distilled as they have been in this text. Some theorists
call for contextualist criticism of photographs and others
decry it preferring to "let the photograph speak." This
text supports contextualism based on the claimed uniqueness
of photography, and offers original distinctions and recom-
mendations regarding contextual information. Similarly,
the overlapping category system is original. Support for the
text and its components, however, is drawn from many authors
including aestheticians, photography historians and theore-
ticians and critics, and photographers, and all are carefully
cited. I've employed an integrative review of the literature
so references to it are interspersed at relevant points
throughout. To do otherwise would have been very awkward to
read and to write: no other comprehensive theoretical treatment
of photography exists that I know of and an introductory
review of the literature that relates to the different concerns
of this text would have been very diverse and less than co-
hesive as unrelated parcels.

A wide range of photographs are discussed throughout the
text. As often as appropriate reference has been made to
those photographs which have the best likelihood of having
been seen by those not professionally involved with photog-
raphy. Descriptions of photographs rather than reproductions
have been offered for several reasons. The treatment of
photography here is broad and does not rely on detailed
analyses of particular photographs. The reader of this
text can fill in the visual blanks with photographs from
his or her own mental catalogue of images, either from
family albums, popular magazines, or artworld repositories. Referring frequently to photographs but not reproducing them has caused me to be careful to state clearly in language what it is I am trying to communicate rather than to point to examples and to presume that "the photograph speaks." I am writing from within the photography community as an art educator interested in teaching about photography. I have tried to present a readable text in ordinary language.
CHAPTER 1: SELECTIVITY

If photographs are not significantly different from other pictorial representations, then a sound theory of visual art would adequately account for photographs. If photographs are very much like paintings, prints, and drawings, then much of what we have come to know of paintings, prints, and drawings ought to be applicable to photographs. If such were the case and if we wanted to increase awareness and understanding of photography, the most that would be required to understand and appreciate the newer medium would be increased familiarity with a larger number of photographs, an awareness of the medium's history, and some factual knowledge of photographic technology. But if photographs are significantly different from other types of two dimensional visual representations, and if we treated them as if they were essentially similar, then we would be denying the uninqueness of photography at the peril of misunderstanding photographs and losing appreciation for their differences.

Photographs are different from other kinds of visual representations in matter of degree and kind. One
characteristic which distinguishes photographs is "selectivity." Another is "instantaneity" and a third is "credibility."
Each of these distinguish photography from other media of visual representation, and all photographs share these characteristics to a greater or lesser extent. It is these three characteristics which make our experience of photography qualitatively different than our experience of other two dimensional visual representations. Those photographs which share in these essential determinants of selectivity, instantaneity, and credibility to a greater degree are those which we implicitly and correctly consider to be more "photographic," and those which share in each of these to a lesser extent are those which we implicitly and correctly consider to be more "painterly."

Certainly painters select. They select both subject matter and manner of presentation, as do photographers. But different kinds of selection are involved. Painting is an additive process and photography is a subtractive process. Painters come to blank canvases, whereas photographers' viewfinders are never empty given any amount of light. Painters add to the blank canvas and perceive emerging forms as they paint and paint over, typically adding imagery to former imagery, mark to mark, stroke to stroke, brushing paint on top of paint. Photographers, however, are essentially engaged in a subtractive process, one of taking away, distilling. They select from the entire universe which is available to them, choosing a broad or narrow field
of view, from very close to very far, and make the exposure which typically results in a single instant of time from a single point of view. The viewfinder is always filled with visual information, or stuff of the world. The photographer moves the camera, the subject matter in front of the camera, or both, until the viewfinder is deemed to be appropriately filled and the visual clutter seen in it has been satisfactorily distilled. This manner of working is different in kind than the manner of adding paint to a blank surface.

The photographer's problem of making a conceptually or aesthetically coherent image is more difficult than it might seem when one considers that the camera impartially records whatever falls within its view, much as a tape recorder indiscriminately picks up the voice of the lecturer as well as the rustling of the audience and the sounds of the room ventilator as equally significant. The photographer's problem is one of selecting the significant from the insignificant and making that choice apparent in the picture through positioning, angle of view, distance from the subject, depth of focus, lighting, and other means before the exposure is made, and through darkroom choices after the exposure is made.

Photographers are also more selective in degree than are painters. In the course of each of their respective careers, photographers make many more pictures than do painters; and they make many more pictures than they ever present publicly than do other picture makers. While analyzing a photograph
made by Russell Lee, photography curator of the Museum of Modern Art and writer John Szarkowski imaginatively reconstructs and lists several pictorial options which were available to Lee even after he had already selected his site, subject, and equipment, and states that:

The simplicity of photography lies in the fact that it is very easy to make a picture. The staggering complexity of it lies in the fact that a thousand other pictures of the same subject would have been equally easy. (1)

Photography is an easier and quicker method of image making than its historical precendents. Arago claimed ease as one of the major assets of the new medium as early as 1839, when the medium was much more difficult than it is today:

Daguerreotype calls for no manipulation which anyone cannot perform. It presumes no knowledge of the art of drawing and demands no special dexterity. When, step by step, a few simple prescribed rules are followed, there is no one who cannot succeed as certainly and as well as can M. Daguerre himself. (2)

Painting, particularly representationally accurate or photo-realistic painting, is not as easy as making photo-realistic photographs. Nor is it as quick. Painters, as did Russell Lee, also have thousands of pictures that could poten­tially be painted, but they would find it very difficult to actualize these thousands of potential pictures, particularly if they attempted them in stylistic realism. But because of the ease of photographic picture making, many photographers do make many, even thousands of pictures of the same subject matter, only selecting afterwards the ones they deem acceptable. Sports photographers, for instance, using motorized film
advance mechanisms, literally shoot thousands of frames of the same subject matter and afterwards select from those thousands which are then typically given to a picture editor who then makes further selections for publication.

A drawn out example from another, and crasser, commercial venture in photography, Playboy magazine, illustrates the selection processes typical for many types of commercial photographic ventures. For Playboy, assuming technical excellence in photographing and printing, the important choice is the selection of models. Playboy's "playmate of the month" is selected from some fifty candidates. Five or six staff photographers roam beaches, streets, and campuses looking for women who have the willingness, face and figure to be Playboy centerfolds. The ideal "playmate" is a woman between eighteen and twenty-one years of age, with conventional prettiness, exceptional figure with large firm breasts, preferably unmarried, definitely without children, with an innocent and virginal look of a quintessential "girl next door."

One hundred nude test shots of prospective "playmates" are made and sent to Playboy's editorial offices along with a fifty item questionnaire which the candidate fills out in reference to her socio-economic status, biography, interests, and so forth. These test packets are circulated among twelve editors. About twelve of the fifty candidates are approved through a majority vote and sent to publisher Hugh Heffner
who may select two or three from those twelve. Apart from
desirable faces and figures, *Playboy* strives for geographic
variety and a proper mix of blondes, brunettes and redheads
with an occasional Black or Eurasian thrown in for variety.
Care is taken to have an equal amount of horizontally and
vertically positioned centerfold photographs: whether the
model is to be posed lying down or standing up is determined
by the size and strength of her breasts.

Once Heffner has decided upon the month's "playmate,"
one to three weeks of photographing begins. The model is
flown to the studio and made-up and costumed. A set is
designed, and daily shooting sessions lasting four to five
hours commence. All centerfold photographs are made with
8 x 10" color sheet film. Some two hundred to four hundred
prints are given to Heffner who makes the final selection of
one picture. Then the model and a photographic crew are flown
to an appropriate location for a week of shooting candid
supporting pictures. Some one thousand to three thousand
35mm black and white and color pictures are made. The
editors initially select two hundred of these and eventually
winnow a photo essay of about fourteen pictures.

If *Playboy*, *Penthouse*, or another such magazine were
to hire an illustrator rather than a photographer, they might
well provide him or her with a choice of models or a pre-
selected model, and conceivably they might fly the model and
illustrator and technicians with equipment to some exotic
location, but the illustrator would not render three thousand illustrations from which editors would select fourteen.

Playboy's shooting ratio of some thirty-two hundred photographs taken to fourteen published is not unique; nor is the quantity of Playboy's store of photographs out of the ordinary; Jay Maisel, a successful commercial photographer, has over one million of his photographs on file for sale in his New York studio, and this number does not include his rejects which he also saves in order to prevent thefts.

The care, expense, and extravagance exemplified by the Playboy enterprise in producing photographs for publication is relatively common in photojournalism. Sports Illustrated magazine's 1982 annual February bathing-suit feature entailed the selection of big name models and the sending an associate editor to Kenya for three weeks to scout locations, then back to New York to procure bathing-suits, then to Kenya once more with the models, a photographer, and eight hundred pounds of camera equipment.

The reader may begin to imagine the choices available to the knowledgeable and experienced photographer with eight hundred pounds of equipment. An eight by ten inch camera, the largest camera one might use on such an assignment, does not weigh more than twenty pounds, and the smaller format cameras are considerably lighter. The photographer on this assignment would have a large variety of cameras, lenses, filters, variously sized and sensitized films in color and black and white, strobe lights, fill lights, umbrellas, scrims, and so forth.
Different cameras give different effects. Given any one camera, the photographer must choose aperture and shutter speed deciding whether to freeze or blur the action, deciding on what distance and angle to photograph from which determines what will be in the frame and what will be out of the frame. Having already decided to work under the natural light of Kenya, the photographer must also decide whether to add artificial light and to what degree and whether it will be filtered, bounced, screened, or direct, and whether to use it as fill, back, or key light. Another series of choices are faced in the darkroom concerning size and shape, density and contrast, color balance, and so forth. More options are open in preparing the photographs for the printing press.

Although commercially sponsored photographers have access to considerably larger budgets than do most independent artist photographers, and although artist photographers routinely are not likely to have command of technical staffs, locations scouts, and other advantages from participation in the business world, their process of selection is qualitatively similar to that of their commercial counterparts. Independent artists may or may not have access to as much equipment as commercial staff photographers, but they certainly make the same kinds of technical choices mentioned above, all of which effect the look and feel of the picture. They also have more aesthetic freedom because they are usually not restrained by editors, publishers, and publication policies, and are culturally motivated to experiment, to be original, and to
make new choices which break old aesthetic boundaries.
Likewise, their selection process of choosing which finished picture to include in exhibition or publication is similar.
In discussing his preparation of a body of his recent work for exhibition, independent photographer Nathan Farb comments:
Then there are the stages of making the rough cut and then the final smooth edit, terms which are much more frequently used in film. Simply put, that means taking two hundred pictures out of two thousand and trying to make them say what the two thousand did and then bringing it down to a final eighty or ninety. (8)
Artists working in other media typically would not have two thousand recent prints, paintings, or drawings from which to choose eighty or ninety for exhibition, and typically would not be exhibiting eighty or ninety pieces unless they were mounting a large retrospective show. Terrence Pitts reinforces this point about the quantitative selectivity of the photographic process in his catalogue introduction to an exhibition of the work of Harry Callahan, a recognized master of art photography:
Customarily, photographic exhibitions are chosen from a group of prints that has already been edited by the photographer from the much larger corpus of negatives. The process of repeatedly narrowing the work tends to produce something like the proverbial iceberg, concealing the rejected bulk and creating "masterpieces" out of the few that remain. (9)
Photographers would typically exhibit, or publish in book form, a large number of photographs and typically would have a much larger body of pictures from which to choose, even if they worked ponderously and slowly with large view cameras and single sheets of film, and particularly if they worked with small format cameras and roll film.
Regarding his process in photographing with roll film, art photographer Robert Adams states:

With roll film I spend as much time studying the contacts* as I do taking the pictures. I wish I were able, of course, to get things right when I make exposures, but when I use small cameras it's because the subject is elusive and has to be shot first and thought about later. (10)

The contact sheet serves the photographer similarly to how the quick sketch serves the artist; though the two are quickly gotten, the contact, unlike the quick sketch, is very complete in its rendering of precise, sharply focused information in finely graded tones of blacks, white, and grays, or in full color. It is a complete picture, though small. Artists may use the quick sketch as a process of generating or refining their ideas before making a commitment on a lithography stone or with paint, whereas photographers viewing contact prints are already evaluating prior decisions and are selecting or rejecting images to which they have already committed themselves.

Also reflecting on his involvement with contact sheets, photographer Ray Mortenson states: "Given time, peace of mind, and the right attitude, looking through contact sheets

*The "contact" to which he refers is a contact sheet. A contact sheet is a print of a negative or group of negatives actual size. In making a contact sheet of roll film the entire roll is printed actual size on one sheet of paper. If using 35mm format a photographer would typically have thirty-six small photographs on one sheet of paper. Photographers usually make contact sheets and then select from them negatives to enlarge.
can be as exciting as looking through the camera itself." Looking at contact sheets, for Mortenson seems not too dissimilar to looking through the viewfinder. It seems a matter of working with the given that is common to both processes. The photographer works with the stuff of the physical world, selecting, rejecting; with the contact sheet the photographer works with the givens of his or her prior decisions, further selecting and rejecting.

Commercial and art photographers who use large format equipment, which gives them four inch by five inch negatives, use their contacts more as proof prints or as first prints. Because of the size and clarity of the image on the ground glass of their cameras' viewfinders these photographers are better able to more carefully study the scene before they make exposures; and due to the relative awkwardness of setting up the heavier and larger cameras which are usually mounted on tri-pods and due to the resulting slowness of setting up for a picture, these photographers are usually more restrained from overshooting in the present and over-editing in the future than those who use lightweight, motor driven cameras. The selection process is modified to a degree depending on what equipment is used but remains the same kind regardless of the use of various cameras. Photographers using large cameras and photographers using small cameras both pre-select before making their exposures and post-select or edit the exposures they have made once they view them as prints.
Photographers have taken various positions on over-shooting and variously prescribe about the matter. Henri Cartier-Bresson, the recognized master of small format photography, cautions that "you shouldn't overshoot. It's like over eating, over drinking," but also adds: "You have to milk the cow quite a lot and get plenty of milk to make a little cheese." Although Bresson typifies his method of working as compulsive and intuitive, he also talks forcefully about the need to develop patience and a strong sense of formal organization in selecting images from the world. His manner of working, and that of many other "street photographers" who usually use lightweight, small format equipment, is compatible with Robert Adams' attitudinal posture mentioned earlier of shooting first and thinking later.

Minor White, a very influential photographer and teacher, and strong advocate of large format equipment, counters Robert Adams' attitude:

I have heard Edward Weston say that he strove to eliminate all accidents from his work and I copied his striving. I submitted to that discipline by which one earns the elimination of all accidents. I have made enough pictures so that now I see like a lens focused on a piece of film, act like a negative projected on a piece of sensitized paper, talk like a picture on a wall. (15)

White promoted an approach to photography which would eliminate accidents and which would give photographers more control over the medium. He referred to his approach as "previsualization," and did much to popularize Ansel Adams' "Zone System," a technically sophisticated method of producing fine photographic
prints. White's conception of previsualization was in the service of more accurate selection with the camera at the time of the initial exposure of the film in the camera. Selectivity was a large part of what photographic creativity was about:

Previsualization refers to the learnable power to look at a scene, person, place or situation and "see" deep in the mind or body, the various ways photography can render the subject. Then out of all the potential renderings select one to photograph. Such selection makes up a large share of the photographer's creativity. (16)

Creative selectivity was to be at the moment of exposure, after all the potential pictures that could be made of the chosen subject were considered, and not in the darkroom, nor in the editing room.

There is not a difference of kind here between photographers such as Robert Adams and Cartier-Bresson and others who seem to work quickly and intuitively and Minor White, Ansel Adams, Edward Weston and others who seem to work more slowly and studiedly. All of them select, and attempt to select carefully, but some of them engage in a more studied pre-selection process while others are content with the likelihood of a higher number of rejects.

There is a conceptual split, however, in the history of photography regarding what is photographic and what is not, which bears directly on this discussion of selectivity. Sides of the schism have been referred to as Pictorialism and Purism, or Pictorialism and "straight photography," or manipulated and straight photographs. The positions of each
revolve around what is held to be properly photographic and what is held to be misguided photographic painting.

In the immediate decades following the invention of photography, some photographers actively pursued "art photography." In the 1880s and after, American and English photographers made allegoric photographs of such subjects as the Lord's Prayer, and tableaux vivants of people dressed in monk's garb and armor acting out passages from the novels of Sir Walter Scott. Photographers used lenses which would render their pictures in soft-focus, combined different negatives to make one picture, did preliminary sketches, and were generally inspired by Pre-Raphaelite paintings and the paintings of their day. Oscar G. Rejlander and Henry Peach Robinson are two historically prominent British photographers who worked in this manner in the latter half of the nineteenth century. The work was met with negative criticism for its artificiality and sentimentality, but was also championed by proponents.

In the 1890s, French and English photographers, particularly Robert Demachy, exhibited gum-bichromate prints which were made by a mixture of water color pigment and light sensitive material which was brushed onto drawing paper and exposed to negatives. The resulting pictures look very much like paintings and drawings, with the handwork of brush strokes quite evident. These too were met with pro and con arguments which centered around what was and was not properly photographic. Just prior to the turn of the century in
America, photographers such as Clarence White exhibited lyrical plate, or iconotypes of genre scenes, and Edward Steichen made impressionistic soft-focus landscapes, while Frank Eugene exhibited photographs made from negatives which he altered with etching needles.

By the turn of the century, articles appearing in the photographic press praised "pure photography." In 1904 art critic Sadakichi Hartman advocated "straight photography" and offered his notion of how it ought to be done:

"And what do I call straight photography," they may ask, "can you define it?" Well, that's easy enough. Rely on your camera, your eye, on your good taste and your knowledge of composition, consider every fluctuation of color, light and shade, study lines and values and space division, patiently wait until the scene or object of your pictured vision reveals itself in its supremest moment of beauty, in short, compose the picture which you intend to take so well that the negative will be absolutely perfect and in need of no or but slight manipulation. (22)

He went on to condemn brush marks and lines and other handwork which was "not natural to photography," and promoted the recognition of photography as a fine art but was convinced "that it can only be accomplished by straight photography."

Alfred Stieglitz championed some photographers who manipulated their negatives and prints, especially in his early years, but in his latter years he preferred to work in a "straight" manner, sticking closely to the basic properties of camera, lens, and emulsion. The organizers of the famous Armory Show of 1913 consulted Stieglitz, but he chose not to participate as an exhibitor and instead mounted his own work in his 291 Gallery. He exhibited portraits and
photographs of railroad yards, boats, ships, and buildings which were made directly, with simple equipment. According to historian Newhall, Stieglitz's 291 show was "a demonstration of what painting is and photography is not." Of Stieglitz's work of that time it was said: "Just plain, straightforward photographs. But such photographs!"

Paul Strand took up the reorientation in photographic aesthetics toward straight photography and in 1917 wrote:

The photographer's problem is to see clearly the limitations and at the same time the potential qualities of his medium, for it is precisely here that honesty no less than intensity of vision is the prerequisite of a living expression. This means a real respect for the thing in front of him expressed in terms of chiaroscuro... through a range of almost infinite tonal values which lie beyond the skill of human hand. The fullest realization of this is accomplished without tricks of process or manipulation through the use of straight photographic methods. (26)

In the same essay he went on to condemn much of the work immediately preceded him by stating that "the introduction of handwork and manipulation is merely the expression of an impotent desire to paint."

Edward Weston began reevaluating his own photography around 1920 and came to reject his former soft-focus photographs and eventually echoed the positions formulated by Strand. An entry in his diary, Daybooks, echoes Strand's statements quoted above concerning an ethic and aesthetic of straight realism:

The camera should be used for a recording of life, for rendering the very substance and quintessence of the thing itself, whether it be polished steel or palpitating flesh....I feel definite in my belief that the approach to photography is through realism. (28)
By the 1940s Weston had his photographic aesthetic more fully articulated. In an essay called "Photographic Seeing" he derogatorily refers to earlier photographers' "horrors" of allegorical costume pieces and "dizzying out of focus blurs" which used ready-made rules of composition, textured screens and handwork on negatives, as "photo-paintings" and "pseudo-paintings." He appeals to the "nature of the image" and the "nature of the process" to determine the uniqueness of the medium and thereupon asserts his prescriptions for good photographic practice. What distinguishes the photographic image from other images, according to Weston, is the "amazing precision of definition, especially in the recording of fine detail," and "the unbroken sequence of infinitely subtle gradations from black to white." This is Weston's notion of "pre-visualization" which Minor White picked up on and promoted, as mentioned earlier. The photographer can control the image as much as he or she wants so long as the "optical and chemical nature" of the photographic process is not violated:

By varying the position of his camera, his camera angle, or the focal length of his lens, the photographer can achieve an infinite number of varied compositions with a single, stationary subject. By changing the light on the subject, or by using a color filter, any or all of the values in the subject can be altered. By varying the lengths of exposure, the kind of emulsion, the method of developing, the photographer can vary the registering of relative values in the camera..... (33)

Weston is preeminently important as a photographer and as a mentor in the history of photography. In his photographs and in his manner of working, as well as in his writing, he
crystallized the thinking of Stieglitz, Strand and others in the straight tradition before him and strongly influenced Ansel Adams, Minor White, and others after him who in turn were very influential. A host of photographers and photography teachers today are working under this aesthetic. John Szarkowski, the prestigious and powerful curator of photography at the Museum of Modern Art in New York and a persuasive and prolific writer, is also quite influenced by the straight aesthetic as evidenced by what he chooses for the museum's collection, as well as by his writing:

The first thing that the photographer learned was that photography dealt with the actual; he had not only to accept this fact, but to treasure it; unless he did photography would defeat him. He learned that the world itself is an artist of incomparable inventiveness, and that to recognize its best works and moments, to anticipate them, to clarify them and make them permanent, requires intelligence both acute and supple. (34)

Szarkowski's comments above deal less with explicit technique than do Weston's, but in these comments he aligns himself with the photographic ethic and aesthetic of Stieglitz, Strand, Weston, and White. Stieglitz, in his 1903 proclamation announcing the formation of the Photo-Secessionists, an informal society of photographers who would free photography from the strictures of academic painting, wrote of the medium with explicit spiritual overtones:

The attitude of its members is one of rebellion against the insincere attitude of the unbeliever....The Secessionist lays no claim to infallibility, nor does he pin his faith to any creed, but he demands the right to work out his own photographic salvation. (35)

For Strand, the photographic medium demanded "honesty no
less than intensity" and "a real respect for the thing in front of him"; for Weston, too, "Photography is basically too honest a medium for recording superficial aspects of a subject." In 1972 Minor White published Octave of Prayer which was a catalogue of a photography exhibition bearing the same title. In the text of the catalogue he prominently displayed a quote from fellow photographer Ralph Hattersley: "Photography has come closer to being a religion than anything else most of us have ever had." White also explicitly equated "camerawork" with "prayer." Although Szarkowski refrains from embracing White's mystical penchant, he does credit the world itself as "an artist of incomparable inventiveness" to which the photographer ought be subservient. All of this bears directly on "selectivity." According to this straight aesthetic, one is not to tamper too much with the thing in front of the lens, or its image recorded on the film: rather, one ought to be attentive, in awe of the world, and ready to recognize pictorial significance and render it clear through camerawork rather than through handwork. Weston offered the technical strictures of simple cameras and lenses, light and chemicals, with which the photographer could "see photographically" and present finely crafted images of what was seen. While the strictures were limited, the choices were not. Weston claimed that making food photographs "would be simplified if there were fewer means of control than there are." The dominant metaphorical language which unified the
straight aesthetic is typified by such phrases as "camera-vision," "seeing photographically," "previsualization," "the photographer's eye," "the selective eye," and so forth. The straight aesthetic was the dominant and only sanctioned mode of art photography from Stieglitz's latter day and has stayed that way until well into the mid-twentieth century, and although it is being challenged on several fronts remains important today.

Across the ocean and on the continent another major figure in the history of photography, Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, was formulating his photographic aesthetic contemporarily with but independently from Edward Weston. Moholy-Nagy, like Weston, used the terms "vision," "optically true," "purely optical," and especially "photographic vision," in promoting photography as an artform. Although much of Weston's and Moholy-Nagy's rhetoric was similar, Moholy-Nagy's ideal photographs were quite different from those imagined by Weston. The paradigm new image for Moholy-Nagy was not the straight photograph but the highly optically and chemically manipulated "photogram" which was produced in the darkroom rather than in the camera. In promoting the photogram he did not disallow the photograph, but in discussing it he stressed the new images photographers could produce through various selections of equipment and points of view. He enumerated eight types of photographic selectivity under the heading of "photographic vision": "abstract seeing" by means of photograms, "exact seeing" by means of
reportage, "rapid seeing" by means of snapshots, "slow seeing" by means of scientific apparati such as telescopes, "penetrative seeing" by means of x-rays, "simultaneous seeing" through photomontage, and "distorted seeing" through optically manipulating the image. It is somewhat ironic that for all his rhetorical similarities with Weston, Moholy-Nagy later became one of the forebearers to whom photographers would turn to in support of their return to montages and assemblages which Weston's straight aesthetic disallowed.

More contemporarily, and in the realm of theory apart from production, Rudolph Arnheim in 1974 sought to update his 1932 theory of film, *Film as Art*, by making applications to still photography in an article entitled "On The Nature of Photography" which appeared in the inaugural issue of *Critical Inquiry*. In *Film as Art* Arnheim attempted to refute the Baudelarean accusation that photography was nothing more than a mechanical copy of nature. His formulation of the nature of photography is directly supportive of the claim that selectivity is of the essence of the photographer's enterprise.

In Arnheim's view it is primarily the process of selection which distinguishes the photograph from the mere copy of the world which Baudelaire claimed it to be. Aligning himself with other film theorists Andre Bazin and Siegfried Kracauer, Arnheim adheres to the claim that "the photographic image is a kind of compromise product between physical
reality as it impresses its own optical image on film and the picture maker's ability to select, shape, and organize the raw material." He argues that the fundamental peculiarity of the photographic medium is that "the physical objects themselves print their image by means of the optical and chemical action of light." But the objects print themselves not simply as a reflection of reality, but through the agency of the "creative mind of man" - the photographer. Perceiving the world and perceiving the photograph are significantly different:

When the viewer looks at the world around him, these shapes are delivered to him entirely by the physical objects out there. In a photograph, the shapes are selected, partially transformed and treated by the picture taker and his optical and chemical equipment. Thus, in order to make sense of photographs one must look at them as encounters between physical reality and the creative mind of man - not simply as a reflection of that reality in the mind but as a middle ground on which the two formative powers, man and world, meet as equal antagonists and partners, each contributing its particular resources. (51)

What is important here is his stress on the photographer's transformation of the natural shapes of objects in the world into pictures through his or her ability to "select, shape, and organize the raw material."

Arnheim's concept of coproduction between photographer and nature may be helpful in making distinctions about the degree of "photographicness" which marks the difference between painterly photographs and "photographic photographs." The straight aesthetic advocated by Steiglitz, Strand, Weston and others, emphasizes a prevision by which photographers
using cameras are to select and organize scenes of objects from the world. The process is called by Szarkowski "the central act of photography, the act of choosing and eliminating." Through the selective process photographers are to render the objects of the world into pictures which not only evidence the vision of the photographer, but which are also supposed to evidence respect for the objects of the world. In Strand's words, photography demanded a "real respect for the thing in front of him," and in Szarkowski's words, "photography dealt with the actual; he (the photographer) had not only to accept this fact, but to treasure it." The straight aesthetic of photography stressed a balance between the photographer and the world, or, as Arnheim described it, the balance which occurs when "man and world meet as equal antagonists and partners."

During the time of the pre-straight aesthetic and contemporarily when the straight aesthetic is being challenged or ignored or directly refuted, it is the balance of co-production among photographer and world which is altered. The input of the photographer, or artist using photographs is given more stress than is the world. The relationship is unequal: the human agent is dominant and evidently so when one views the image. Often the photographer's "hand" or "mind" has been more evidently at work than his or her "eye." In the 1960s, photographers such as Jerry Uelsman returned to the nineteenth-century practice of combining negatives to make composite photographs. In the 1970s several photographers
returned to the older practice of hand-coloring their photographs, and others began activating the surface of their photographs with paint, pencils, sand paper and razor blades. Others, such as Les Krims and Duane Michals, actively and apparently altered the world before their lenses and recorded their fictions. All of these photographers ignored the straight aesthetic's earlier jibes of "too honest a medium," "impotent desire to paint," and "pseudo-painting." The photographers and the photographer's insights, desires, and abilities supercede respect for the physically and historically actual in the world.

In a review of several 1982 Fall photography shows in New York, New York Times critic Andy Grundberg distinguished "artists' photographs" from "photographers' photographs." In artists' photographs he included those photographs made by painters or sculptors or people who did not usually work in the medium of photography, and artists who used photographs as parts of their pieces, as well as those people who have mainly worked as photographers but who were more influenced by the art tradition than by the tradition of photography and who wanted to appeal to the artworld rather than to the "photography world." Their paintings, sculptures, or prints may have some photographic qualities, usually a degree of preciseness of rendering, but their works do not look like photographs. Grundberg considers the recent great increase of artists' photographs as "yet another of Modernism's loss
of authority in our age, since under Modernist imperatives all media are assigned unique qualities and advised against fraternization."

If Modernism is concerned with uniqueness of media then the straight photographic aesthetic is preeminently in line with Modernism. While Modernist critics, theoreticians, and artists, for instance, stressed the flatness of painting and the materiality of sculptural materials, proponents of the straight photographic aesthetic struggled with defining the uniqueness of the photographic medium and stressed viewing the world, selecting aspects from it, and revealing it with careful craft in precise detail and finely graded tones and colors. When people, whether artists or photographers, make photographs outside of or against the strictures of Modernism and the straight photographic aesthetic, they affront these characteristics. Some, particularly those doing conceptual art or political art, like John Baldessari or Vicki Alexander, affront the craft and the preciousness of the object. Those doing fictions, like Michals, Les Krims, and Arthur Tress, maintain high standards of craft and exhibit and sell their work as precious objects but disregard the actual world in favor of their fictive worlds. Those like Luciano Franchi de Alfaro who sand, cut, sew, and pierce the surface of their work, ignore prevision and camera vision in favor of the painter's sensibility for the surface quality of paint, actual texture rather than visual texture, and manipulation by hand
rather than manipulation by vision and compositional selection by camera.

The less the camera vision and the less the reliance on the actual world, the less, in varying degrees, the images made by these people look like photographs. Their concerns are less to make good "photographs" than to make strong "images."

The recent photographic fictions of Krims, Idiosyncratic Pictures, for instance, are immediately read as photographs but are also simultaneously read as documents of pre-staged happenings created by the photographer, rather than by the world, for the recording camera. Alfaro's pictures are visually ambiguous as to medium, and are obviously "images" or "pictures" rather than obviously "photographs."

The point here is not that these images are less good but the point is that they are less photographic. When photographic selectivity is deemphasized for anti-Modernist reasons, or whatever reasons, "photographicness" is deemphasized. Photographic selectivity is essential to photography, if not to art.

The implications of photographic selectivity are immense. Walter Benjamin offered one of the first Marxist critiques of the medium in 1931. He was quick to realize both the limitations of the photograph in revealing reality and its potential for distorting reality by means of its selectivity. His recently often quoted line is "A photograph of the Krupp works or of the A. E. G. reveals almost nothing about these
institutions." This thought prefaced his early call for captions to complete photographs, "captions which understand photography." In her recent social critique of the medium, On Photography, Susan Sontag pays her debts to Benjamin and furthers some of his thoughts. In a general statement about photography and its inherent segmenting of the whole she states that photographers presume that "One could get at it (reality) indirectly, by subterfuge - breaking it off into strange fragments that could somehow, by synecdoche, be taken for the whole."

Roland Barthes maintains that the photographer's choice of inclusion and exclusion is the means by which photographs mean in a culture. Photographic selectivity as it has been inclusively discussed here is central to Barthes' theory of photographic signification. In attempting to specify how the press photographs mean he realizes that while "the press photograph is an object that has been worked on, chosen, composed, constructed, treated according to professional, aesthetic or ideological norms" it is seen as pure denotation rather than as rhetoric. But the rhetoric, the persuasive power of any given photograph, is based largely on what the photographer selects to show and how he or she chooses to show it. The rhetoric of the photograph, its message, "is realized at the different levels of the production of the photograph (choice, technical treatment, framing, lay-out)." He lists six "connotation procedures
or rhetorical devices on which the press photograph relies, the first three of which are particularly relevant here: "trick effects," "pose," and "objects." In these three the connotation is produced by the photographer elusively modifying the reality itself either by selective framing or by intervening in the situation before the shot is taken.

In "trick effects" the connotation produced by the photographer utilizes the credibility of the photograph -- for Barthes its exceptional power of denotation -- in bringing things together in the frame of the photograph in such a way as to distort the actual situation. The rhetoric of a 1951 American press photograph which reportedly cost Senator Millard Tydings his seat was made through the photographer's "trick effect" of framing Tydings as if he were in an intimate conversation with the Communist leader Earl Browder. Actually the two were only in proximity to each other and not in conversation. Barthes offers another example from politics to illustrate "pose" as a rhetorical device. A photograph of John F. Kennedy widely distributed at the time of the 1960 elections shows him from waist-up in profile with hands joined and eyes looking upward. In Barthes' reading the message is Kennedy praying, and the message is achieved by the photographer drawing from a stock of stereotypic Western gestures which signify to members of the culture. "Objects" relies on the photographer gathering, arranging, or including objects which are culturally accepted inducers of associations of ideas. A Paris-Match photograph uses a window opening onto
vineyards and tiled roofs; a photo album, magnifying glass and vase of flowers are in front of the window. In Barthes' reading, the photograph connotes that we are in the country, south of the Loire (vines and tiles), in a bourgeois house (flowers) whose owner, advanced in years (the magnifying glass), is reliving his memories (album). The photograph is of François Mauriac in Malagar.

In his 1964 essay, "Rhetoric of The Image," Barthes analyzes a French photographic advertisement for Panzani tomato sauce. His intent is to understand the structure of the ad and how it signifies. His analysis is offered here because it further explicates his theory of photographic signification and stresses the significance of photographic selectivity. The ad shows some packages of pasta, a can, a sachet of spices, tomatoes, onions, peppers, and a mushroom all emerging from an open string shopping bag, in yellows and greens against a red background. Imposed on the photograph is the word "Panzani." Barthes identifies three parts of the structure of the ad: the linguistic message, the denoted image, and the connoted image. The linguistic message of "Panzani" is denotational and connotational: it denotes the brand name and connotes, by its assonance, "Italianicity." The linguistic device is dependent on its being a French ad for a French reader, since an Italian, for instance, would scarcely perceive the connotation of the name.

The image itself independently of the text provides a
series of connoted signs in addition to what is obviously denoted in the picture. We have represented in the scene a return from the market which implies two euphoric values: the freshness of the products and the home preparation for which they are destined. The tomato and pepper and the predominant colors of red, yellow, and green redundantly, in relation to "Panzani," signify Italianicity. There are two other signs. The variety of objects transmits the idea of total culinary service as if Panzani furnished everything needed for a carefully prepared dish and as if the concentrate in the can were equivalent to the natural products which surround it. The composition, focus, lighting, and color transmit the aesthetic signified of "still life."

Rudolph Arnheim rejects Barthes' theory of photographic signification as too lexical, too dependant on a set of standardized meanings of certain objects and actions that members of a society are held to possess. He replaces Barthes' lexicon with his gestalt psychology of perception and claims that visual perception is pattern perception and that when we see photographs we see the pattern of the shapes which have been selected, partially transformed and optically and chemically treated by the photographer. The shapes selected and organized by the photographer, not sets of conventional ideographs, yield the visual concepts that make photographs readable. Thus while Arnheim rejects Barthes' theory, both substantiate the importance of the selection process the photographer utilizes.
Issues relating to selectivity arise in relation to questions of truth, accuracy, and outright falsification in a and through photographs. The "trick effect" of photographically framing Senator Tydings with Communist leader Browder that Barthes cites calls to mind other distortions or outright falsifications through selectivity that are presented in photographs. In a kind of photographic post-visualization staff members of Playboy routinely airbrush out pimples, moles, some body hairs and other things considered to be blemishes from the photographs of their featured "bunnies" and models. Similarly, government censors had Czechoslovakian leader Alexander Dubcek carefully removed from a negative so that when the picture was published he would not be seen beside President Svoboda in front of an admiring crowd since Dubcek had fallen into disfavor following "Czech normalization" in the late 1960s. During World War II Japanese newspapers and magazines pictured the spectacle of the Japanese victory of Pearl Harbor from the air and did not show maimed victims. Similarly, Americans were shown the awesome mushroom cloud over Hiroshima and not the dead and maimed on the ground. It is only recently with the growing anti-nuclear sentiment that gruesome photographs of the victims of the bomb are being widely distributed. As an overt reaction to the selection decisions of curator Edward Steichen the Japanese added a large photographic mural depicting the victims of the bombings of Hiroshima and
Nagasaki when they received the "Family of Man" travelling photography exhibition from the Museum of Modern Art in the 1950s. The mural was to offset the simplistic humanistic optimism of the exhibition.

Publishers and government officials also strongly influence what photographers should and should not select while photographing. John Morris, the photography editor of Life magazine during World War II, wrote: "the faces of the severely wounded and the dead were taboo" and "the photographer did not show his side of the ghastly."

Although it is obvious that censorship or severe editing is likely to occur in any medium of expression, the impact of including some photographs and excluding others in a presentation, or the inclusion of some aspects of a situation and the exclusion of other aspects in photographs, may not be obvious if one does not consider the inherent halo of credibility which surrounds the photograph. When aspects of credibility are considered, as they will be in Chapter 3, the ramifications of misleading information or misinformation are more serious: a painting of Tydings and Browder in conversation would not have had the impact that the photograph of them had. It is also obvious that in addition to selecting subject, location, angle of view, manner of presentation and so forth, the photographer also, very importantly, selects particular segments of time. The subject of photographic temporality is the subject of the following chapter.
CHAPTER 2: INSTANTANEITY

Photographs are instantaneous in different senses: they show any unbroken time span as if it were an instant; they are made in an instant; they are made of instants; they are made instantly. Photographs are made in an instant because in exposing a piece of film to light in order to make a photograph the shutter of the camera is open to light for a certain duration of time. Photographs are also made of instants in the world because photographs are dependant on the reflection of light from objects in the world existing in time to the film. Photographs are also made instantly in the sense that they are made relatively quickly, and fairly easily, as compared to paintings, prints, and drawings.

The quickness of making photographs was cause for celebration in Daguerre's day. In Arago's address proclaiming the invention for France in 1839 he said "The rapidity of the method has probably astonished the public more than anything else." He expressed his own enthusiasm in saying: "In fact, scarcely ten or twelve minutes are required for photographing a monument, a section of town, or a scene, even in dull winter weather." Of course, it was not only this quickness but also the speed of the process with its "unimaginable precision"
which was cause for astonishment.

More recently a statement made by Harry Callahan concerning his frustrating first tries with color printing in the 1940s indicates one master photographer associating the speed of the photographic process with its *raison d'etre*:

> It seemed absolutely anti-photography to me to go in the darkroom, take an hour to make one print, just to see what it looked like....you can make a (black and white) print in a minute and a half and who wants to take an hour. If you're gonna take that long, maybe you could've drawn it. (4)

Callahan spends more time on a finished exhibition print than a minute or an hour, but not "just to see what it looked like." One of the astonishing things about photography is that one can get a stylistically very realistic picture in a minute, now with improved technology, in color as well as in black and white. One can then study it and then modify it until it is considered finished. Modifying the print is also relatively quick and easy compared to drawing in black and white or painting with color. The insertion of filters in the enlarger instantly alters the tonal range of blacks, grays, and whites, or alters the color palette of the color print. A painter would have to redo the entire painting to achieve such variations. If the painting were stylistically realistic the time expended would be comparatively great.

The ramifications of the speed with which photographs can be made are closely related to the ramifications of the ease with which they can be made, and these were discussed in the prior chapter. That photographs are made in an instant
and of instants are different points with new ramifications. The photographer chooses an instant when the film will be exposed. He or she has several lengths of exposure to choose among but whether the exposure is one sixtieth of a second, sixty minutes, or a micro-second, the resulting picture will necessarily be of that time interval, whatever its duration. This is an empirical necessity. Sometimes it matters greatly in viewing the picture and sometimes it does not. Hiroshi Sugiomoto, for example, makes still photographs of movies shown in theatres and determines his exposure time by the running length of the movie. The finished pictures do not reveal this; the text does. The finished pictures look like interior architectural views of theatres with white luminescent screens even though the photographs are of, in some sense, whole movies. When, however, Crawford Greenewalt uses an exposure of one thirty thousandth of a second to photograph a hummingbird's wings beating at eighty times a second the photograph's temporality is visually apparent. The hummingbird's wings are stopped. Time is essential to both of these photographs, one of which was made for the artworld and the other for the scientific community, even though in the first example the time span is not visually apparent.

The effect of many photographs is based specifically on temporality. The physicist Harold Edgerton has shown us in six sequential photographs what happens when a drop of milk falls and splashes into a saucer of milk by devising and using equipment which gives him some six thousand flashes
per second with each flash having an exposure duration of one
ten thousandth of a second. His photographs followed the
drop over infinitesimal distances along its path and pictorial-
ially stopped its action. Another of his single photographs
shows a .22-caliber rifle bullet, travelling at a speed of
twelve hundred feet per second, as it tears through and sheds
three balloons. Using multiple exposures on one piece of
film he has also photographed such actions as golf swings and
tennis strokes which show about fifty discrete instants of the
actions.

Photographers working with conventional equipment and
working for fashion, advertising, or the press have stopped
the action of competitive swimmers diving into a pool, the
watery trails from a woman's drenched hair as she tossed her
head, and so forth. We also have lyrical linear pictures
of long lines of light from head and tail lights of cars by
photographers using slow shutter speeds, or "time-exposures."
"Time-lapse" photographs have shown the transformation of
a rose from bud to flower. In all of these, and in Edgerton's
photographs, we have answered some of Moholy-Nagy's 1936
calls for "new visions": specifically, his calls for "rapid
seeing by means of the fixation of movements spread over a
period of time," and "simultaneous seeing by means of
transparent superimposition."

In all of these we have photographs whose impact is
inherent on time and on specifically discrete instants of time
which the photographs reveal. Also in all of these we do
have "new visions," or we have seen things we could not have otherwise seen. Any given position of a hummingbird's wings beating at eighty times a second is imperceptible to natural unaided human perception. Similarly, we cannot perceive trails of head and tail lights of moving cars.

In this we can mark a distinction between photography and painting. Painters see what they paint as they are painting; frequently photographers do not see what they photograph as they are photographing it. Often this is because of the speed with which the subject moves. More often it is because of the way cameras are built. With all but twin-lens cameras photographers do not see what is being recorded as it is being recorded because the viewfinder of the camera is blocked during exposure. With any camera, even cameras using instant Polaroid materials, photographers can not see the pictures they are making as they are making them since there is a time delay of at least thirty seconds or more with Polaroid materials and a minimum of about a half hour with conventional materials which require the developing of the film and the making of the print. With Kodachrome slide film there is the delay of mailing the film to Kodak for processing and the awaiting its return.

Painters paint and paint over, seeing and evaluating forms as they emerge and relate to other forms on the canvas. Photographers, however, must learn to see the world as if it were made up of instants. Photographers must see objects, often as they are moving, as they are
interacting with other objects, how the objects will be transformed into two dimensional forms, how the colors of the objects will be rendered in grays, or how the colors will be rendered in color film and print materials. Unlike painters who perceive emerging forms relating to other forms as they paint slowly, over days, or months or years, or quickly paint and paint on top of, photographers must acquire the ability to perceive all that is happening through the viewfinder as a would-be instant in an instant. It is not only the interaction of the visual forms which must be perceived, but also the implications of those interactions which must be perceived and evaluated in terms of expression and meaning.

Thus, despite all of Minor White's stress on pre-visualization and non-accidental photography, photographers are often surprised by their photographs in ways that painters are not surprised by their paintings. Photographer David Hurn spoke about aspects of surprise in discussing his photography:

It is impossible to predict the exact appearance of the image at the fraction of a second the shutter is open. There are too many randomly moving elements in the frame. It is important to shoot several frames in order to increase the chance that one of them will be "good" in the sense that all aspects of the flux are contributing to, and not distracting from, the final effect. (13)

Philip Perkins reinforces the point of the difficulty of seeing all the relationships and simultaneously evaluating them as he is photographing. In talking about his selection of one of a series of photographs from a contact sheet he said:

"I was attracted to the strong diagonal created by the metal
bar and the fact that the placement of the figures fell into place when I saw the print. That was the real surprise."

In fairness to Minor White, Hurn and Perkins were discussing photographs of rapidly changing situations. Photographs of still lifes, for example, ought not be surprising to the photographer in the way Hurn's and Perkin's were to them.

In some photographs of things and events other than falling milk, hummingbirds, bullets, and divers, instants of time are not particularly significant to the images or our appreciation of them. Some of Ansel Adam's photographs of mountains, or Edward Weston's photographs of nude torsos, or Aaron Siskind's close-ups of charred wood boards are not particularly dependent on instants for their effects or meanings, except in the sense that the mountain had certain qualities at a certain time, or that there was a torso of a boy of a certain age at a certain time.

To say that Adam's, Weston's, or Siskind's photographs are not particularly dependent on instantaneity for their effects is not to deny that these photographers are extremely aware of time in making their pictures. Adams waits for the hour, day, or season when the mountain will yield a picture he deems worthy. Elliot Porter, an established photographer of pristine, natural landscapes which are color equivalents of Adam's black and white works, says the following in a narrative about his photographs which do not readily appear to be dependent on time:

When one is photographing bigger things of nature, landscapes, you can't ever go back really, and get the
picture that you saw because when you go back it isn't there anymore. The sun is different. The atmosphere is different. So one should never put off taking the picture if you see something. I found that out. Nothing is stationary. Nothing is permanent. Everything is changing. So what I try to do is to capture the moment outdoors. (15)

Because photographs segment the world and its activities into bits of time, or instants, most photographers are extremely conscious of time. Burk Uzzle described finding an interesting fairground building and then waiting for people to enter the scene "in a hospitable and interesting place­ment." After hours of waiting and watching "it all came together, only briefly" and he made his picture.

Henri Cartier-Bresson is a recognized master of instant photography and is associated with the phrase "the decisive moment." He is very articulate in discussing temporality and photography. Recalling his first experiences with photog­raphy as a young man with a new Leica, a small camera, Bresson said:

I had just discovered the Leica. It became the extension of my eye, and I have never been separated from it since I found it. I prowled the streets all day, feeling very strung-up and ready to pounce, determined to "trap" life, to preserve life in the act of living. Above all, I craved to seize the whole essence, in the confines, in the confines of one single photograph, of some situation that was in the process of unrolling itself before my eyes. (17)

His point that the situation was in the process of unrolling itself before his eyes reinforces what was discussed earlier concerning the photographer's challenge of perceiving complex incidents as instants as they are in the process of changing. In Szarkowski's words which relate to this point, "An infinite
number of possibilities present themselves simultaneously, to be instinctively resolved, well or badly, in a moment, while the situation continues to change."

For Bresson the moment decisive to photograph is not simply when the action reaches its peak; it is an instant when, in his judgment, all the objects and events before his viewfinder coalesce in an aesthetically charged arrangement, "a visual pleasure." For him, "the greatest joy is geometry. That means a structure...it is a sensuous pleasure at the same time, to have everything in the right place." He adds: "you've got to be quick, quick, quick, quick. Like an animal and a prey."

.....for the world is movement, and you cannot be stationary in your attitude toward something that is moving. Sometimes you light upon the picture in seconds; it may also require hours or days. But there is no standard plan, no pattern from which to work. You must be on the alert with the brain, the eye, the heart; and have a suppleness of body. (22)

Although Bresson and most other photographers work within and embrace the time stricture of recording one instant of time in the single photograph, others attempt to break out of the limitation by making multiple exposures, or sequencing several single images. In her book of photographs, Real Time, Eve Sonneman attempted to show the passage of time by printing two spatially and temporally adjacent negatives onto one piece of printing paper:

At that time (1972), combining adjacent frames was the clearest way I knew to show the passage of time, location shifts, and my own involvement in image-making. I retained the bottom sprocket holes to show the connections between frames and the linear passage of time. (24)
Similarly, Duane Michals story-boards his ideas as a filmmaker would and then makes linear narrative sequences which clearly convey the passage of time. In his work, Jerry Uelsmann multiplely exposes several different and discrete instants onto one print so that any one of his pictures are composed of several different time frames. In some of his pictures, only one time frame is evident, and in others there is an eerie sense of a time warp.

That photographs are of instants is a significant aspect of our experience of photographs. John Szarkowski identifies "time" as one of five "issues" inherent in the medium of photography, along with "the thing itself," "the detail," "the frame," and "vantage point." Regarding time, he states:

......each (exposure) describes a discrete parcel of time. This time is always the present. Uniquely in the history of pictures, a photograph describes only that period of time in which it was made. (26)

The characteristic of describing only that period of time in which it was made is unique to photography. It is empirically necessary that it do so. Paintings do not necessarily depict the present during which they were made. William Larson has photographed people and situations so as to make them look as if they exist in the future, and F. Holland Day photographed people and situations to make them look like Jesus and his associates. But the future and past they depict are fictional; in knowing when photography was invented and when these photographs were made, we know that
the times represented are times imagined. Most photographs, however, are about the time they were made as well as descriptive of that time.

Wright Morris, an older photographer and recently a writer on photography, metaphorically refers to all photographs as "time pieces." With more conceptual substance, Roland Barthes calls the essence, or noeme, of photography "That has been." His definition of photography is inextricably linked with time. In viewing a photograph Barthes is aware of a necessary superimposition of reality and the past which is due, for Barthes, because of the causal interaction of light reflected from objects to light sensitive materials. "Every photograph is somehow co-natural with its referent." The real world referent of the photograph is the "necessarily real thing which has been placed before the lens, without which there would be no photograph," and as a consequence, Barthes "can never deny that the thing has been there." Since this constraint exists only for photography he considers it the very essence of photography. From this constraint there are several ramifications, for Barthes and for us, but these will be held for the following chapter. Barthes' concerns about our experiences of time in experiencing photographs are most relevant here.

For Barthes one of the piercing effects of photographs is "time, the lacerating emphasis of the noeme ("that has been")." This is always so, but particularly when the photograph is of people, and most of the photographs Barthes
reproduces and discusses in Camera Lucida are peopled. (His emphasis on peopled photographs is both the strength and weakness of the book: he is very insightful in discussing photographs of people, but virtually ignores all other photographs.) With his experience of time in relation to viewing photographs comes his experience of his and our future deaths. While looking at a nineteenth-century photograph of young Lewis Payne in his cell waiting to be hanged for his 1865 assassination attempt on Secretary of State W. H. Seward, Barthes realizes:

He is going to die. I read at the same time: This will be and this has been; I observe with horror an anterior future of which death is at stake. By giving me the absolute past of the pose (aorist), the photograph tells me death in the future. What pricks me is the discovery of this equivalence. In front of the photograph of my mother as a child, I tell myself: she is going to die: I shudder, like Winnicott's psychotic patient, over a catastrophe which has already occurred. Whether or not the subject is already dead, every photograph is this catastrophe. (33)

Barthes is one of the few who have eloquently and articulately expressed experiences of being photographed. His thoughts on this subject also relate to temporality and death and photography -- but from the perspective of the subject of the photograph rather than from the perspective of the photographer or the viewer of the photograph:

In front of the lens, I am at the same time: the one I think I am, the one I want others to think I am, and the one he makes use of to exhibit his art. In other words, a strange action: I do not stop imitating myself, and because of this, each time I am (or let myself be) photographed, I invariably suffer from a sensation of inauthenticity, sometimes of imposture (comparable to certain nightmares). (34)

Time also figures very prominently in Arnheim's thoughts.
on photography. At the beginning of "On The Nature of Photography" he identifies the snapshot quality of photographs as a unique character trait of the medium. Instantaneous exposures define an objective of photography, an objective that was totally new in the history of the visual arts:

Photography does something unheard-of when it catches motion in the act. The accidental shape of its appearance reveals the snapshot as a fragment, a small sample extirpated from an action whose integrity resides beyond the realm of the picture. (36)

Arnheim acknowledges that painters, too, particularly the impressionists, cultivated the fleeting moment, but claims that in comparing those paintings of washerwomen, smoke-filled railroad yards or milling street crowds with photographic snapshots, one realizes that those momentary painted poses had none of the incompleteness of the fraction of a second excised from the context of time. For Arnheim, Degas' paintings of trifling moments have a classical finality, whereas a photographic snapshot of a woman's tensely open mouth and the placement of her fingers applying makeup relies on the action of which it is a part for its validity.

Arnheim also acknowledges that viewers' questions about time are different for paintings and for photographs. He says that when we ask "When was this painted?" we are seeking information about the stylistic period of which the painting is a part, or that we want to know when in the artist's life the painting was made. Whereas when we ask "When was this photographed?" we typically want to know about the history of the subject of the photograph.
While Arnheim is rather enthusiastic about the medium's characteristic of excising fractions of seconds from the context of time, others recognize it as one of its important characteristics but one which troubles them. Walter Benjamin's early social evaluations of the medium and its consequences are ambivalent. In a point similar to Arnheim's about looking through a photograph to its subject matter, Benjamin observed that after a few generations, interest in the particular identities of people portrayed in family portraits subsides, and the painted portraits survive only as a testimonial to the art of the painter. Photographed portraits, however, "never perish into art": something remains of the individuality of the persons portrayed - the photograph has a "magical value that a painted picture can never again possess for us."

Benjamin redirected the early debate about whether photography was an art by calling attention to the social significance of the photographic reproduction of architecture, sculpture, and painting. He realized that the reproduction wrenched the original artifact from its specific historic and geographic moorings. He generally held this to be a positive attribute of reproductions because reproductions allowed art to be more physically accessible to people, and that these artifacts in reproduction could be grasped "more easily in photographs than in reality." However, in reproduction the work of art loses its presence in historical time and space, and thus, for Benjamin, it loses its authenticity which is
based on its being the original. Through reproduction the quality of "presence" of the original is always depreciated.

Although he was one of the first to consider the effects of photographic reproductions of artworks, his relative enthusiasm for this aspect of photographic technology is not matched by several contemporary art observers, particularly Andre Malraux who sees the negative effects of "the museum without walls" which the copy camera has built. One negative effect Malraux claims is that art has become over-intellectualized because relations between several artworks can be more easily drawn, resulting less in pleasure for the eye and more in knowledge of the relationships. Similarly, contemporary art critic Harold Rosenberg worries that these "substitute images" distort the substance and meaning of art objects, even though they have become the source material for most of our art historical, anthropological, and psychological investigations of art.

On the same topic of photo-reproductions of artworks, Susan Sontag sarcastically states:

'It is inevitable that more and more art will be designed to end as photographs. A modernist would have to rewrite Pater's dictum that all art aspires to the condition of music. Now all art aspires to the condition of photography.' (44)

Susan Sontag's book, in toto, is critical of photography, in toto. Her major complaint about photography in On Photography is Kracauer's 1927 complaint about Hollywood's "Tiller Girls" film, namely, that it is a "mass ornament" in
the service of capitalist production which both reflects the society's dominant mode of production and aestheticizes its detrimental effects by turning life into "spectacle." Regarding the photographer's use of instants, Sontag claims they "miniaturize experience, transform history into spectacle" through the "aestheticizing tendency of photography."

Picking-up on Brecht and Benjamin, and also referring to time and photography, Sontag states:

As Brecht points out, a photograph of the Krupp works reveals virtually nothing about that organization. In contrast to the amorous relation, which is based on how something looks, understanding is based on how it functions. And functioning takes place in time, and must be explained in time. Only that which narrates can make us understand. (47)

Its segmentation and particularization of the whole into discrete and single units prevents photography, according to Sontag, from narrating function.

Allan Sekula is another who criticizes photography, or some of the uses of photography, from a political perspective. He, too, faults some photographic practice regarding its presentation of the temporal, specifically because photographers tend to present an ahistorical view of reality. Regarding the huge documentary project of August Sander, for example, in which Sander attempted to rigorously and sociologically photograph the people of Weimar Germany, Sekula states:

.....Sander's compendium of portraits from the Weimar period and earlier possesses a haunting - and ideologically limiting - synchronicity for the contemporary viewer. One witnesses a kind of false stasis,
the appearance of a tense structural equilibrium of social forces. (48)

It is the synchronicity and false stasis which are faulted, and both of these claimed faults are due to the still photograph's presentation of the temporal.

John Berger, a contemporary British art critic who writes about photography, and the last of the social critics of photography to be cited here, suggests a contextual approach for discourse about photographs to offset the inherent characteristics of photography which segment and isolate particulars from an ongoing flux. Berger's call is to:

.....construct a context for photographs, to construct it with words, to construct it with other photographs, to construct it by its place in an ongoing text of photographs and images. (49)

The final chapter of this present text is sympathetic to Berger's wishes.

Thus far in this text, two essential determinants of photography have been identified: "selectivity" and "instan-
taneity." The claim that photography is distinct from other types of two dimensional picture making has been made and argued for on the basis of selectivity and instantaneous. At the risk of oversimplifying the several distinctions that have been posited in these first two chapters about photography that make it distinct from painting, summary notions of what has been said are that photography is a subtractive process, and painting an additive process. In other words, the painter adds to a blank canvas to make an image, whereas a photographer's viewfinder is never empty.
Secondly, photographs are instantaneous in ways that paintings are not and cannot be. Succinctly, a photograph shows an unbroken time span as if it were an instant, and a photograph is always of an instant of the time in which it was made, even if the connoted time is past or future time, in which case the photograph should be said to be about another time but necessarily made of and in a time present to the photographer at the time of the exposure. Painters are not necessarily limited in ways which photographers are.

In addition to arguing for a special status for photography, several aesthetic and interpretive consequences for it have been identified. These consequences will be further addressed through the text.

Selectivity and instantaneousity are two of three determinants which variously combine to make photography what it is and which effect our experience of photographs which are significantly different from our experiences of paintings, prints, and drawings. As has been mentioned previously, not all photographs rely equally for their effects on selectivity or instantaneousity. Edward Weston's famous series of photographs of peppers, for example, are instantaneous, but are not particularly effective because of their relationship to time. One would garner more interesting insights were one to consider aspects of the results of Weston's selection process in making these particular photographs.

When image makers use photographic techniques or
materials or processes, but deny or ignore the subtractive selection process of the photographer and the instantaneous nature of photography, their images are not less good or effective, rather they are routinely, and rightly, referred to as being "painterly" rather than "photographic." Also, these images, as we shall now see, are less "credible."
CHAPTER 3: CREDIBILITY

People believe photographs, whether for better or worse, and whether with or without proper justification. That is, in general, when viewing photographs people tend to grant to photographs more credence than they would to paintings, drawings, prints, or sculptures. In experiencing photographs, viewers blur distinctions between subject matter and pictures of subject matter and photographs tend to be accepted as reality made by a photographer through the instrumentation of the camera. In ordinary language I am likely to pull out of my wallet a school photograph of my son and say "This is Jesse;" whereas if I were to show a painting or a sketch of him I would be more likely to say something like "This is a picture of Jesse drawn by Tom." In the second case the original declaration is rather automatically qualified by "picture of" and "drawn by." In casual interactions with photographs, we rarely give these qualifications, whereas we routinely offer them in casual interactions with other kinds of pictures.

There are several complex reasons why we tend to put faith in photographs. As will be documented eventually in this chapter, from the inception of photography and throughout
its history, claims of representational accuracy and reliability and truth have been made on behalf of the photograph. Today the electronic and print news media, in their particular use of cameras, implicitly claim objective facticity and reinforce the public's credence in the photograph: "And that's the way it is on December 26, 1981" (Walter Cronkite). The conventions borrowed from painters by the inventors who fashioned the first cameras to fix a certain kind of pictorial image, and the conventions with which photographers work, and the determinations photographers make in taking their pictures are all deemphasized in favor of seeing the photograph as a transparent and natural reflection of reality made by a machine, so much so that the photographic image is accepted as nature as well as natural.

This chapter is written to persuade the reader that there is a halo of credibility which surrounds the photograph and that this halo has a significant effect on those who make, use, and view photographs for whatever purpose, and that "credibility" ought to be considered an essential, distinguishing characteristic of photography. It is "credibility" in combination with "selectivity" and "instantaneity" which distinguish photographs from other types of visual representations. It will be shown that several and various discourses surrounding photography inevitably touch on issues directly or tangentially related to photographic credibility. Three specific contemporary discourses are distinguished in the chapter, "realism," "conventionalism," and "social criticism,"
and each is shown to bear directly on credibility.

I am assuming people believe photographs to greater or lesser extents, with greater or lesser justifications for their beliefs which are sometimes offered explicitly and sometimes not. Whether people ought to believe photographs is not directly or extensively addressed although it will become obvious that belief ought to at least be qualified and that a general, naive, and uninformed belief would be interpretively foolish, although sometimes aesthetically rewarding. The main purpose of the chapter is to establish that issues of credibility are central to thinking about photography by highlighting that considerations about photographic credibility are current today in the writings of contemporary aestheticians and photography theorists as well as in the visual projects of contemporary photographers. Further, considerations about photographic credibility have surrounded the photograph in the past both explicitly in writings about photography and implicitly in the pictures made by photographers. The point is not whether Joel Snyder's thinking is wrong and Kendall Walton's is right, nor whether Nelson Goodman's is sophisticated and Paul Strand's is naive, but rather that in dealing with photographs we must be aware of the halo of credibility surrounding them or we will misunderstand them and miss some of the wonder that is photography.

Photography critic A. D. Coleman, in the course of defining a genre of fictional photographs he termed "the
directorional mode," briefly and succinctly posited three reasons why people tend to believe photographs. Photography institutionalizes Renaissance perspective, scientifically and mechanistically reifying an acquired way of perceiving. Second, even though the photograph is a deposit of silver on paper, the image does encode a unique chemical and optical relationship to reality. And third, the mechanical, non-manual aspects of the process combine with the verisimilitude of the rendering to make photographs appear to be nothing more than seeing, and seeing is believing. Basically, it is the photograph's assumed realism and its mechanical process which combine to convince.

Issues involving pictorial realism, faithfulness, truth, naturalism, transparency, and so forth, are current in the writings of such authors as Ernst Gombrich, Max Black, and Nelson Goodman; and specifically in relation to photography in the writing of Joel Snyder, Neil Allen Walsh, and Kendall Walton; while ideological implications of realistic photographic imagery are being drawn out by writers with a Marxist bias such as Susan Sontag, John Berger, and Allan Sekula. These are all complex issues handled in complex ways by a variety of methods and not all can be explicated with the thoroughness they might deserve; but some can be addressed, and will be in the following.

Gombrich, in his psychological work on pictorial representation and Goodman, in his epistemological work on symbol systems, nicely compliment each other in helping us
to understand how it is that we come to accept pictures as natural rather than as visual constructs invented by individuals. Their accounts also help to fill out Coleman's succinctly stated reasons for our credence in photographs. Although Goodman and Gombrich are in apparent disagreement over particulars in their analyses of realistic representation, they both argue strongly and convincingly that realistic representations are much less natural and much more conventional than we have formerly taken them to be. Artists work within conventions and pictures are deciphered by means of those conventions. Through familiarity which comes with repeated exposure to pictures utilizing a set of dominant conventions operant in any given culture, members of that culture so internalize the conventions that they no longer recognize those conventions as such but rather take the conventional representations to be natural.

In Gombrich's view, the history of Western pictorial representation is best understood as a series of discoveries about picturing which are the result of ceaseless experimentation on the part of artists. Representational artists have not "copied" the world, they have not offered mere "transcriptions" of what they have seen but rather have developed notational systems with which they could transpose light reflecting from foliage onto canvas by means of dabs of paint. Their "transpositions" or "translations," rather than their "copies," are in simple or complex "codes."

Gombrich's example of a simple two part code which uses a
digital "on/off" principle is sixteenth-century Venetian lacework in which the netting is filled in or left empty giving us images of men and animals. We consciously or intuitively decipher the code and see the stitches as men and beasts. In looking at flat Greek floor mosaics we see three dimensional forms in space by understanding the artisans' reliance on four graded tones of tesserae. We have learned to read, with great ease, a multitude of cross-hatched ink lines as the figures of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. As artists' techniques became more sophisticated and their notational systems became more complex in representing the world, we continued to adapt by learning their systems.

In Gombrich's contested concept we sense an "illusion" of reality in viewing representations which we call "realistic." Realism is relative to cultures. One historical style of realistic representation may give a sense of illusion for one particular culture which will not necessarily abide for another. But what remains constant is our ability to adapt and become fluent in changing notational systems of representation and our concommitant ability to decipher accurate information from notational systems. "True" or "correct" or "faithful" pictures are those from which we derive no false information, so long as we know the constraints of the system within which we are working.

Goodman typifies the copy theory of representation by this directive: "To make a faithful picture, come as
close as possible to copying the object just as it is."
He refutes this directive by showing it to be aimed at an
unrealizable goal and to be based on misconceptions of
perception and knowing. To copy the man before me just as
he is is an unrealizable goal because the man before me
is "a swarm of atoms, a complex of cells, a fiddler, a
friend, a fool and much more." If all these are the way
the object is, then none is the way the object is. All of
these cannot be copied at once, and the more that are copied
at once the less realistic will be the picture. He further
argues that in thinking that we can copy the object just as
it is, we are supposing that we can copy the object as it
looks to the "normal eye, at proper range, from a favorable
angle, in good light, without instrumentation, unpredjudiced
by affections or animosities or interests, and unembellished
by thought or interpretation." He rejects this idea,
along with Gombrich, because there is no "innocent eye,
perception is relative, and he adds that the innocent eye
is merely an accomplice of the mistaken notion that the world
is one way and that we know it as a given.

Although Goodman agrees with and furthers Gombrich's
arguments concerning the relativity of perception and de-
piction, they are opposed to each other on the matter of
perspective with Goodman holding that it too is merely a
convention. Goodman also rejects the notion that "illusion"
has anything to do with realistic representation. But
both generally agree that realism is a style which is culture
dependent, culturally relative, and conventional. The realism of any particular realistic style is not, for Goodman, dependent on the picture's resemblance to reality, nor its being mistaken for the real thing, nor on transfer of information. When pictures have the effect of realism, the effect is dependent on how easily information about the depicted reality ensues from the picture to the viewer. Ease of information retrieval is mistaken for pictorial accuracy only because the observer is blind to the representational system within his or her own culture.

I think Goodman's and Gombrich's reflections on realism in artistic representation go far in accounting for some of our credence in the photograph because of the "realism" of the pictures photography can produce. Our culture may well be blind to the conventions operant in photography. Gombrich and Goodman pay scant attention to photography in their writing, but Joel Snyder adamantly argues for the conventionality of the photographic medium. Snyder, with co-author Walsh, parallel the thinking and language of Goodman in regard to their refutation of an application of the copy theory of art to photography:

The notion that a photograph shows us "what we would have seen had we been there ourselves" has to be modified to the point of absurdity. A photograph shows us "what we would have seen" at a certain moment in time, from a certain vantage point if we kept our head immobile and closed one eye and if we saw things in Agfacolor or in Tri-X developed in D-76 and printed on Kodabromide #3 paper. By the time all the conditions are added up we are positing the rather unilluminating proposition that, if our vision worked like photography, then we would see things the way a camera does. (21)
They also give examples of where a specific system of notation is operant in several kinds of photographs, and that an accurate interpretation of them is dependent on the viewer knowing the system of notation. In infra-red and ultra-violet color photography, visible colors are assigned to invisible bands of the spectrum; the insides of a body look very little like the x-rays of it; in color photography used to analyze motions of gases and liquids, colors are arbitrarily assigned to directions; and when a scientist uses "ordinary" kinds of photography he or she is likely to rely on the inclusion of a stop watch or yardstick in the image to guide others in deciphering the photographs.

Despite common assumptions about realistic photographs' natural tie to the physical world, they point out some pictorial conventions operant within the style of realistic photography. Camera formats themselves conform to conventions of painting. The camera obscura had been used by painters and draughtsmen some two hundred years before early photographers learned to fix the camera image. The round lens which "naturally" created a circular image had already been modified to a square or rectangular format to conform to traditional expectations for paintings and drawings. Other examples of conventions operant in realistic photography are those which have been established to present things in motion in a still medium in a way that would convey a sense of motion. In photographing a horse running, for example, photographers ordinarily choose one of three conventions:
by keeping the camera stationary and using a slow shutter speed they render the horse blurred and the background stationary; or by panning the camera with the horse they render the horse sharp against a blurred background; or with a fast shutter speed and stationary camera they freeze both horse and background. Each of these pictures might seem natural enough to us now, but we have forgotten that photographers had to invent ways of conveying motion in their still photographs and that we had to learn their conventions for representing motion in order to read their pictures accurately. But had we been in front of the running horses we would not have seen a frozen horse or a blurred horse; we would have seen a horse moving.

Snyder has more recently dismissed the contemporary discourse about the ontological status of photography as "futile" and suggests attention be given instead to how it is that we ever came to think of photographs as natural phenomena. He argues that photography is no more privileged than language or painting in getting us to the "really real." In his account we have falsely come to believe that the camera gives us a privileged access to the world because of our ignorance of the historical developments in the invention and refinement of the camera, most importantly, that the camera was designed and refined to meet the pictorial standards set by Renaissance artists, which standards are, in turn, conventional rather than natural. In Snyder's view,
whether a stylistically realistic photograph is convincing about its accuracy of depiction is dependent on the convincing construals of Western pictorial realism which have lead us to believe that perspectival renderings are pictorially equivalent to vision.

Kendall Walton, a contemporary aesthetician, takes Snyder's "conventionalism" into account but argues for the uniqueness of photographs, claiming that photography is a different kind of picture making and that to obscure its difference is to obscure what is special and significant about it. In Walton's account, photography is special and significant because it gives us a new manner of seeing, a manner of "seeing through" photographs to the thing photographed. He does not claim that the camera gives us the impression of seeing reality, or the illusion of seeing reality, or that the camera supplements vision, or that photographs are duplicates, surrogates, doubles or reproductions of reality; he believes instead that "photography allows us to see things which are not in our presence" and that "the viewer of the photograph sees, literally, the scene that was photographed." Photographs are transparent because they allow us to have visual experiences of objects which caused what is presented in the photograph. Paintings are not necessarily caused by what they show and are not mechanically caused by what they show. In cases involving belief about the existence of what is shown by a painter, we must rely on the painter's belief concerning what
he saw while this is not the case in viewing photographs because regardless of what the photographer believes, the photograph shows what was before the lens. Although photographs are transparent, they are not invisible, are often subjective and expressive, and frequently rely on conventions of depiction borrowed from other media; but nevertheless they remain transparent.

In arguing for the difference of photography, Walton cites several others in the "realism" camp of film theory such as Kracauer, Panofsky, Bazin, Arnheim, Cavell, and Metz and finds himself sympathetic with their views, but for a variety of reasons, unconvinced. He does not cite Roland Barthes, which is surprising because Barthes' conclusion is so similar to Walton's, although their means of arriving at their compatible conclusions are quite different. Both are immensely impressed with the certainty photographs provide regarding the past existence of the things photographed because of the causal genesis of the photograph.

Barthes is an influential student and scholar of culture whose work is within the tradition of European structuralist semiotics. Among his varied and many writings are two significant essays from the 1960s on how photographs come to mean which will be referred to later in this text. In *Camera Lucida*, his last book before his death in 1981, Barthes sought, with a personal phenomenological account, to determine by what essential feature photographs were to be distinguished from other images. He declared that photography
was "a magic; not an art." The magic of photography, for Barthes, was that it emanated past reality and authenticated the past existence of that which it represented. For Barthes, in photography "the power of authentication exceeds the power of representation." This power of authentication is a property of the essence, or "Noeme" of the photograph. In Barthes' pronouncement, "The name of Photography's noeme will therefore be: That has been, or again: the Intractible. In Latin this would doubtless be said interfuit: what I see has been here." This is so for Barthes because in the photograph the referent is always present in the picture. Because of the causal interaction of light reflected from variously lighted objects and the light sensitive materials of photographs, "every photograph is somehow co-natural with its referent."

In this the photograph, for Barthes, is different from other systems of representation. The photographic referent is not the optionally real thing to which an image or sign refers, as in painting or language, but "the necessarily real thing which has been placed before the lens, without which there would be no photograph." Contrary to the "imitations" of painting or language, "in Photography I can never deny that the thing has been there. There is a superimposition here: of reality and of the past. And since this constraint exists only for Photography, we must consider it, by reduction, as the very essence, the noeme of Photography."
The photograph ratifies what it represents since it is literally an emanation of the referent. No writing could give Barthes the certainty of the photograph; for him it was the misfortune and the pleasure of language not to be able to authenticate itself: language invents, but photography authenticates. "Photography never lies: or rather, it can lie as to the meaning of the thing, being by nature tendentious, never to its (the referent's) existence."  

Although in the above statement Barthes does not seem to be particularly overwrought with concern for the potential of photographic lies, his earlier work on the press photograph helped set the conceptual stage for others who are quite concerned with "photographic lies," especially those photography critics and theoreticians who approach the photographic phenomenon from a political point of view. In "The Photographic Message," written in 1961, Barthes identified the photograph as the "perfect analogon" and argued that because of the photograph's exceptional power of descriptively accurate denotation, the press photograph utilized the "special credibility" of the photograph "in order to pass off as merely denoted a message which is in reality heavily connoted." Because photographs have such "analogue plentitude," and because photographs are granted the prestige of complete and accurate denotation, the press photograph "allows the photographer to conceal illusively the preparation to which he subjects the scene to be recorded." In other words, the rhetoric of the press photograph is hidden behind its
meticulous description of reality so that it is read as if it were divested of values, as if it were pure denotation, as if it were "natural" rather than "cultural." In this essay on the press photograph and in one on advertising photographs that followed in 1964, Barthes began the work of "decoding" these "photographic messages."

From Barthes' analyses on "decoding" photographic images in the 1960s, some authors and photographers are now "deconstructing" photographic images. In general their concern is the political project of unmasking hidden ideologies universally imbedded invisibly in cultural practices, and specifically imbedded in photographic media which they see as serving to perpetuate the dominance of the powerful. Their roots of intellectual lineage are generally the social criticism of Walter Benjamin, the linguistics of Ferdinand de Saussure, the structural anthropology of Levi-Strauss, the neo-Marxism of Louis Althusser, the archeology of Michel Foucault, the neo-Freudianism of Jacques Lacan, and the grammattology of Jacques Derrida, as well as the work of Roland Barthes who in turn shares many of these influences.

In general, writers on photography such as John Berger, Susan Sontag, Allan Sekula, Rosalind Kraus, Abigail Solomon-Godeau, Douglas Crimp, and others stress the invisibility of the medium as do Gombrich, Goodman, Snyder, and Walton, but their concern is much more political and much more directed to the ideological implications of photographs used by the privileged of society, namely, the white,
heterosexual, American male who is said to use the medium for the suppression of others. Some, such as Rosler and Sekula, accept a special status for photography, drawing on C. S. Pierce's distinctions about signs in which photographs are placed under "index," a sign which refers to the object that it denotes by really being affected by that object. Others of the social critics are less concerned about such concepts and focus more keenly on political issues surrounding photography and its uses.

Susan Sontag is an influential writer among the social critics, and advances a major theme commonly shared by them in her important book On Photography:

A capitalist society requires a culture based on images. It needs to furnish vast amounts of entertainment in order to stimulate buying and anaesthetise the injuries of class, race, and sex. And it needs to gather unlimited amounts of information, the better to exploit the natural resources, increase productivity, keep order, make war, give jobs to bureaucrats. (49)

A few lines later in her text, she advances another major theme shared by these writers, that of photography's role in promulgating hidden ideologies:

Cameras define reality in two ways essential to the workings of advanced industrial society: as a spectacle (for masses) and as an object of surveillance (for rulers). The production of images also furnishes a ruling ideology. Social change is replaced by a change in images. (50)

In attempting to expose the mythology of photography as a universal language which is more natural than natural language, Sekula echoes some of the concerns expressed above by Sontag:

As symbolic practice, then, photography constitutes not a universal language but a paradoxical yoking of a
primitivist Rousseauian dream, the dream of romantic naturalism, with an unbounded faith in a technological imperative. The worldliness of photography is the outcome, not of any immanent universality of meaning, but of a project of global domination. The language of the imperial centers in imposed, both forcefully and seductively, upon the peripheries. (51)

Similarly, Solomon-Godeau champions those contemporary photographers who view the medium of photography not as an artform, but rather as "a mechanically reproducible image-making technology wholly assimilated to the apparatuses of consumerism, mass culture, socialization, and political control."

Thus, whether contemporary authors are examining photography as a pernicious tool used by the powerful to maintain their control, or as a cultural or natural means of realistic picturing, issues of the medium's credibility emerge as centrally significant. Without an assumption of the medium's power to convince a public willing to believe photography, the above worries of the radical left would be pointless. What is true of contemporary thinking also happens, not coincidentally, to be true concerning past thinking about the medium. The following is a historical account of issues of credibility surrounding the medium from its beginning to the recent work of some contemporary photographers in order to support the claim that the issue of credibility is part and parcel of the medium.

Claims of credibility were made on behalf of the photograph from its inception and continued to be made throughout
its history. In 1839, the year of the announcement of the invention of the fixed photographic image, Dominique Francois Arago, director of the Paris Observatory and Deputy of the East Pyrenees, argued before his colleagues in the French Chamber of Deputies that Louis Jacques Mande Daguerre and Isodore Niepce, the son of the deceased Joseph Nicephore Niepce who collaborated with Daguerre on the fixing of the image, be given a state pension in exchange for the state's ownership of the invention. In that address Arago made several claims about the benefits and wonders of photography for the arts and sciences, including claims of the "exactness" of the image in producing "faithful pictorial records" with "unimaginable precision."

In documenting his involvement with the invention of the process, Daguerre himself wrote that "art cannot imitate their (the daguerreotypes') accuracy and perfection of detail," and that "the daguerreotype is not merely an instrument which serves to draw Nature; on the contrary it is a chemical and physical process which gives her the power to reproduce herself."

Edgar Allen Poe was an early enthusiast of the invention and wrote three articles in 1840 on photography as a "triumph of modern science" which had "miraculous" and magical potential. He was particularly enthusiastic about photography's accuracy and stated that "the Daguerreotype plate is infinitely (we use the term advisedly) is infinitely more accurate in its representation than any painting made by human hands." He
also attributed to photography "a more absolute truth, a more perfect identity of aspect with the thing represented" than was ever before pictorially possible.

In America, another of the literati, Oliver Wendell Holmes, also wrote three early articles on photography. Holmes was particularly impressed with three dimensional illusionistic "stereographs" (his coined term) for which he invented a viewing device. Besides being an essayist and poet, Holmes was also a physician and was particularly interested in practical photography, even foreseeing the role photography would play in the advertising of goods. His view of the medium characterized the general mid-nineteenth century American belief in photographic objectivity. He described photography as a purely mechanical, objective, and passive copying procedure devoid of human invention - "a mirror with a memory."

By the 1880s press photography was becoming prevalent due to the technological developments of dry plates, faster lenses, roll film, and telegraphic transmission of photographs. Weekly and monthly magazines were publishing photographs by 1885 with daily newspapers to follow. Jacob A. Riis became a police reporter in 1887 for the New York Tribune and the Associated Press Bureau and soon after learned to be his own photographer. Appalled by the living conditions of immigrants in the lower east side he turned from reporter with a camera to a social critic and persistently photographed and wrote stories for the Tribune pressing for social reform.
Eventually he helped to bring about the Tenement House Commission (1884) and also influenced the young Theodore Roosevelt, then police commissioner of New York, to abolish the police lodging-houses which Riis had for years condemned as breeders of crime. How The Other Half Lives (1890) was the first and most influential of his five books of social criticism amply illustrated with photographs. The sociologist Lewis W. Hine followed Riis' example and photographed extensively for the cause of the poor and particularly for the need of child-labor laws. Of both Riis and Hine, Gisele Freund, in Photography and Society, states that they were amateur photographers who used the medium to give their writing more "credibility."

Hine's belief in the objectivity of photography was considerably more qualified than that of Oliver Wendell Holmes. Hine held that photography enjoyed more realism than traditional journalistic illustrations and knowingly stated that "the average person believes implicitly that the photograph cannot falsify" but quickly added that "you and I know (that) while photographs may not lie, liars may photograph." Hine was one of the first to use photography propagandistically as a weapon of social reform, but as a sociologist, he advised that photographs be backed with records of observations, conversations, names, and addresses.

Paul Strand initially learned photography in 1907 from Hine at the Ethical Cultural School where Hine taught.
Although Strand was politically conscious throughout his career, his interest in photography was primarily aesthetic rather than social or scientific, and his influence on art photography was to become significant. After his tutelage with Hine, Strand gravitated to Stieglitz's 291 Gallery and the Photo-Secessionists. Strand broke with the impressionistic style of the Secessionists but adhered to their philosophy of photography as a fine art. He advocated what eventually was known as a "straight" approach to photography. While rejecting his peers' impressionism he echoed some of his predecessors' beliefs in objectivity, but with a new twist: he declared that the "very essence" of photography is an "absolute unqualified objectivity." Strand's emphasis on photography's objectivity was in the service of art making rather than on scientific uses, and from his belief in what the nature of photography was came his aesthetic and ethical prescription that photographers capitulate to this claimed uniqueness of the medium, its objectivity, by approaching subject matter with "honesty" and "a real respect" for that which was to be photographed. These positions were shared by Edward Weston and later generally upheld by Ansel Adams and Minor White and their many followers.

Laszlo Moholy-Nagy of the Bauhaus, another influential artist photographer of quite different aesthetic persuasion than his contemporary Strand, also stressed objectivity in relation to the camera image but his stress was on what he called "objective vision." Moholy-Nagy also stressed
Strand's uniqueness of photography question but came up with the camera-less darkroom image, the photogram, as a paradigm example of the new objective vision photography could and ought provide. The essence and significance of photography was that it produced "optically true" images whereas the eye, working in conjunction with intellectual experience, produced a "conceptual image." Optically true camera and darkroom images where those which showed "bird's-eye views, simultaneous interceptions, reflections, elliptical penetrations," and "snapshots," prolonged time exposures, micro-photographs, infra-red photographs, and radiographs.

Walter Benjamin, the German literary critic and Marxist social critic, wrote two essays on photography in the 1930s, "A Short History of Photography" (1931) and "The Work of Art in The Age of Mechanical Reproduction" (1936) which have generated renewed and widespread interest since their translations into English in 1977 and 1968 respectively. Benjamin was generally interested in the impact of technology on the arts and in "A Short History" reflects on people's changing attitudes toward photography and examines the mutual influences which traditional art media and photography had upon each other. In "The Work of Art" he specifically addressed how the photographic reproduction of artworks changed their social effects. In both essays he developed and used his concept of "aura" which is relevant to this discussion of photographic credibility.

Benjamin's concept of aura is complex. Traditional
artworks such as paintings, frescoes, mosaics, and sculptures have aura and the photographic reproductions of these destroys their aura. Real world objects such as mountains and twigs have aura and photographs of these also destroy their aura. Stage actors also have aura, but their aura is also destroyed by the movie camera when their performances are filmed. If the camera universally destroyed aura, the concept might be simple enough, but some photographs also have an aura of their own, namely, those early photographic portraits made around 1850.

For Benjamin the aura of traditional artworks such as paintings is based on their uniqueness and their location in historical space and time. The introduction of photographic technology allowed for the reproduction of unique artworks and "that which withers in the age of mechanical reproduction is the aura of the work of art." For Benjamin the consequences of art as photography is much more significant than the long lasting debate concerning photography as art. Once the unique art object is transformed into multiple copies its uniqueness becomes insignificant. Secondly, the reproduced object "meets the viewer halfway": the frescoes come to the viewer rather than the viewer having to go to the frescoes. The consequences of this are that the frescoe's location in historical time and space is neglected and the reproduced object is displaced from its history. The photographic reproduction also emancipated art from its "cult value" which was eventually replaced by the artwork's
"exhibition value." That is, in his teleological account of art history, Benjamin holds that art was originally produced for magical ritual in the caves, and later for religious ritual in the churches, and still later, beginning in the Renaissance, for the secular ritual of l'art pour art and the concommitant denial of any social function of art. In the magical and religious phases of art production the importance of the object was its existence rather than its visibility, but with mechanical reproduction and widespread distribution the quantitative change brought a qualitative change: exhibition value replaced cult value.

Regarding the aura of natural objects, in Benjamin's account, their aura lies in their "distance" as well as their existence in physical time and specific space, and in their uniqueness. The camera and photographic reproductions bring things "closer." Whereas the mountain had uniqueness and duration, the camera renders it transient and reproducible, fragmenting its aura.

The stage actor's aura is dependent on his or her presence and "there can be no replica of it." When the actor is filmed, the camera is substituted for the audience and the aura that envelops him or her vanishes and is replaced by the artificial build-up of the personality of the actor outside the studio. We are given the cult of the movie-star who has been transformed into a commodity.

But some photographs do have an aura of their own, specifically the early photographic portraits of the 1850s,
when, "For the last time aura emanates from the early photo-
graphic portraits in the fleeting expression of a human
face." These early portraits are also a last vestige of
the cult value of pictures - "the cult of remembrance of
loved ones, absent or dead."

The years around 1850 embodied the height of photography
for Benjamin. Because of the slower photographic process,
subjects for portraits needed to assume lengthy poses which
"caused the models to live, not out of the instant but into
it; during the long exposure they grew, as it were, into the
image." Portrait photography declined rapidly for Benjamin,
however, with faster exposures, hand touching of photographs,
and the introduction into photographic portraits the props
conventional to painted portraits such as columns, draperies,
and palms. The aura of the earlier portraits was lost.
By the late 1800s, according to Benjamin, photographers
attempted and failed to simulate that aura by retouching photo-
graphs to return them to the duskier tones which had resulted
from the earlier and more primitive camera technology. "Aura"
in this sense is a result of formal characteristics - "the
absolute continuum from brightest light to darkest shadow,"
as well as the result of the attitude of the photographer
who "came to every customer as a member of the rising class
and enclosed him in an aura which extended even to the folds
of his coat or the turn of his bow tie."

At this point in his discussion of aura in relation to
photography, Benjamin seems to view photographic aura in a
nostalgically favorable way, as a special and magical quality which is tied to a magical presence in the portrait as a result of an attitudinal interaction between photographer and sitter, as well as the peculiar tonality resulting from early photographic technology. But he simultaneously praises Eugene Atget as a later virtuoso photographer who "began the liberation of the object from the aura." Atget's photographs without people free photography from its dependency on the cult value of remembering loved ones and take on exhibition value. Atget's photographs of deserted Paris streets were able to be seen as evidence of historical occurrences. Whereas free-floating contemplation was appropriate to portraits, Atget's photographs demand a different approach, one in which verbal directives in the form of captions are obligatory.

Thus, for Benjamin, it is primarily traditional, unique artworks which have aura, but an aura which perishes with the photographic reproduction of these artworks. The perishing of aura through photographic reproduction was viewed by Benjamin as a mixed blessing. On the one hand it advanced art from its ritualistic functions and rendered it accessible to a broader range of people, but it also displaced artworks from their historical moorings. Photographs, likewise negate the aura of reality, except in the case of the subjects of the early, pre-1850 portrait, where the person was given an aura by that early photographic process and by the attitude of the photographer. But, generally, in comparing painted
portraits to photographed portraits, Benjamin makes the point that after two or three generations the person painted will be forgotten and only the picture will survive as testimony to the art of the painter. But in the photographic portrait, the person remains; the photographed person, although long dead, "even now is still real and will never entirely perish into art." The photograph gives the portrait a "magical value" that the painted portrait can never possess, a thought later echoed by Barthes in his previously cited claim that photography is "a magic, not an art."

Several people less theoretically inclined that Benjamin and more practically involved such as politicians, editors, and advertisers, have entwined themselves with the issue photographic credibility.

The Farm Security Administration (FSA) emmassed one of the largest collections of photographs, over 150,000, ever attempted by a government agency. The FSA photographs were commissioned as and received by the public as documents under the rubric of "documentary photography." These photographs taken some fifty years ago are still commonly held as the paradigm cases of the documentary mode of photography. The directives to the FSA photographers from Roy Stryker, their director, unabashedly requested propaganda.

In fighting the Depression, Franklin D. Roosevelt established the Resettlement Administration as one of his many new agencies and charged it with the task of raising support for the
thousands of farm workers made destitute by the draught which resulted in the "dust bowl" and by severe competition from increased uses of agricultural mechanization. As head of the agency, which eventually became the Department of Agriculture, Rexford G. Tugwell, Undersecretary of Agriculture and former economist at Columbia University, appointed his former student and colleague Stryker to document the agency activities and, more importantly, to document American rural life. Stryker gathered several talented and now famous photographers including Walker Evans, Dorthea Lange, Russell Lee, Ben Shawn, and Arthur Rothstein. While the officially sanctioned commission was to "document," the daily instructions were often to propagandize:

We must have at once: pictures of men, women and children who appear as if they really believed in the U. S. Get people with a little spirit. Too many in our file now paint the U. S. as an old person's home and that just about everybody is too old to work and too malnurished to care much what happens....We particularly need young men and women who work in our factories.....Housewives in their kitchens or in their yards picking flowers. More contented looking old couples.....(91)

In a candid and sarcastic narrative, Edward Steichen, then prominent photographer and art adviser to Stieglitz and eventual director of photography at The Museum of Modern Art, wrote these comments upon seeing the first major exhibition of FSA photographs which was held at the Grand Central Building in New York in 1938:

He (Uncle Sam) became interested in the words "documentary," "story telling," and "propaganda" and then someone may have said to Uncle Sam, "You know, Sam, times are hard, among others, there are
some cracking good photographers hanging around having quite a struggle to get along; you ought to give them jobs." And according to the record, a man by the name of Stryker, who was then connected with one of the so called alphabet departments of the U.S.A., began lining up some of these photographers and putting them to work for Uncle Sam, who thus found himself in still another branch of the photographic business. (92)

Steichen's sarcasm is not directed at Uncle Sam, Stryker, or the FSA exhibition. That exhibition was very close in spirit to Steichen's own major group show of the 1950s, the "Family of Man." Rather, Steichen's jibes are directed at artists and intellectuals who might have been frowning on narrative and propagandistic photography with their "indignant condemnation." Steichen was very taken with the photographs and called them "the most remarkable documents that were ever rendered in pictures." My purpose in quoting the above passage is to point out that Steichen, like Riis and Hine before him, was aware of the advantages of cloaking propaganda in the garb of photographic documentary objectivity with its concommitant credibility as long as the causes were right. Stryker himself wrote retrospectively about his involvement with the FSA cause some forty years later, candidly admitting his subjective and persuasive influence on the documentary project:

Now at eighty I have the honesty to advance the somewhat immodest thought that it was my ideas, my biases, my passions, my convictions, my chemistry that held the team together and made their work something more than a catalogue of celluloid rectangles in a government storehouse. (95)

Life magazine was founded in 1936, one year after the start of the FSA project. Henry R. Luce, founder and publisher,
introduced the first issue of Life, one of the most successful illustrated magazines ever published, with an eventual forty million readers, with these words:

To see life; to see the world, to eyewitness great events; to watch the faces of the poor and the gestures of the proud; to see strange things — machines, armies, multitudes, shadows in the jungle and on the moon; to see man's work — his paintings, towers and discoveries, to see things thousands of miles away, things hidden behind walls and within rooms, things dangerous to come to; the women that men love and many children; to see and be instructed.(96)

The pun of the first phrase "to see life," and the intentional ambiguity of Life's title and the phrases "to see the world, to eyewitness great events" could be understood as an utterly naive belief in the ability of the camera to make the world directly accessible, without human mediation, to viewers of the magazine through its photographs. In Luce's rhetoric, to see Life is to see life, because to see photographs is to see the world and to eye-witness things thousands of miles away. In matters of publication Luce, who had founded Time magazine thirteen years earlier, could hardly be considered naive. His extensive use of photographs in Life and the rhetoric which preceded them seems better understood as clever word play designed to bolster the magazine with the mythological authority of authenticity the medium of photography enjoyed. In Freund's analysis, what made Life's world-view compelling was its extensive use of photography and the public's trust in the photograph:
what gave so much credibility to Life was its extensive use of photographs. To the average man photography, which is the exact reproduction of reality, cannot lie. Few people realize that the meaning of a photograph can be changed completely by the accompanying caption, by its juxtaposition with other photographs, or by the manner in which people and events are photographed. (97)

Advertisers have long been using photographs in promotion of their clients' wares. Successful American advertising director David Ogilvy in his book Confession of an Advertiser specifically advises his colleagues to persuade their clients to choose photographs for their ads precisely because of his conviction in the photograph's credibility factor: a photograph "represents reality, whereas drawings represent fantasy, which is less believable."

It is at first curious that the photograph which has been prized for its accuracy and objectivity has been and is so heavily relied upon by the advertising industry which is known for its exaggerations and misconstruals if not outright lies. But as Ogilvy suggests, the make-believe world which advertising fabricates in its promotion of greater and greater consumption of goods in our consumer society needs to be bolstered by the authority of the photograph. As drawings and paintings are more likely to be socially accepted as the subject of fantasy and imagination rather than of the real, the advertiser benefits from the public's acceptance of the authenticity of the photograph to help offset its general mistrust of the advertiser. The psychology of buying and selling is certainly complex as is the variety of uses photographs are put to in ads, but it seems certain that advertisers in particular
utilize the believability of the photograph very effectively, subtly playing on people's photographic gullibility, seducing them into believing that through compulsive consumption they too can share in the attractiveness, glamor, and happiness of the people pictured in the ads if they only purchase the products pictured.

Photographic art also benefits from photographic credibility. The photographic art of the nineteenth-century photographers such as Henry Peach Robinson and O. G. Rejlander, Julia Margaret Cameron, and F. Holland Day, and that of more contemporary photographers such as Clarence John Laughlin, Ralph Eugene Meatyard, Duane Michals, Les Krims, Jerry Uelsmann, Arthur Tress and others, is overtly and obviously fictional. But their fictions are enhanced by photographic credibility. These particular photographers have worked with a variety of photographic techniques and have dealt with a variety of subjects and themes, but their work is immediately recognizable as photographic and as having been set-up or directed or obviously manipulated in the darkroom. Photography critic A. D. Coleman has aptly termed their work as belonging to the "directorial mode" of photography. English photographer F. Holland Day has made stylistically realistic photographs of Christ on the cross with Roman soldiers; Duane Michals has made realistic sequences of spirits leaving bodies; and Les Krims is notorious for having produced a series of fictional scenes of raped and murdered women in a folio entitled "The Incredible Case of The Stack O'Wheats
Each of these photographers jolts viewers in more or less similar ways. Their works look believable because of the style in which they were made and because of their use of the camera with its associative authority. But history prevented the 19th century Englishman from being at and from photographing the crucifixion. Few of us have seen spirits leaving bodies, but apparently Michals has and has recorded them on film as his "true photographs" attest. Similarly, Les Krims permits us to see gruesome and sexually forensic photographs which public standards of taste disallow us from seeing, even though they are make-believe, the fact that they are photographed makes them easier to believe. The utilization of the camera and its mythological powers of revealing truths helps these images to have whatever impact they have in a way that is similar to the impact of the realistically presented dream worlds of some Surrealist painters have impact. The credibility of the photograph enhances the fiction of the images.

In several of his sequences Michals has gone beyond using the camera to make his fictions more credible and has directly and intentionally attempted to dissuade our belief in photographs by gently poking fun at our photographic gullibility. He follows one sequence of very distorted shape and size relationships, "Things Are Queer," with his words "People believe photographs. Don't believe what you see; your eyes know less than your mind, and your mind knows
nothing at all." In "The Illusions of The Photographer," he puns visually on his own method and on the photographic process, intensifying the camera's distortion of reality. On a single image of a couple sitting on a bed he handwrote the caption: "This photograph is my proof. There was that afternoon when things were still good between us, and she embraced me, and we were so happy. It did happen. She did love me. Look, see for yourself!" The image which includes the caption is as much about photographs as inconsequential proof as it is about a disillusioned lover.

Other contemporary photographers have worked with the theme of photographic credibility but have specifically addressed political and social ramifications they see associated with the medium of photography. Vicky Alexander and Barbara Kruger are two such artists. Both use pre-published mass media photographs made by others and rearrange them to suit their purposes which are generally political and feminist. In a very adept review of their work, Abigail Solomon-Godeau explains that both are artists who are intent on pairing away the deceptive guise of photographic neutrality, naturalness, and transparency that veils the ideology of the advertisers, or more generally, are intent on deconstructing the cultural mythologies of a mass consumer society as presented through electronic and print news media.

In Solomon-Godeau's reading, Alexander fixes on the desire and veneration of fashion models and by altering magazine photographs of them foregrounds their iconic heritage.
of tribal masks and their iconic status as priestesses of a consumer culture. In some of her pieces Alexander has montaged together high-gloss archetypal fashion models from Harper's Bazaar with high-gloss archetypal landscapes from National Geographic to have each play off the other's mythology. While Alexander seems concerned to unmask the conventional devices encouraging femininity, fashion, and glamorized sexuality, Kruger's work can be seen as an attempt to unmask mechanisms of power particularly in relation to the suppression of women. In one image Kruger combines a picture of long blond hair impaled on sharp spikes with the accusatory declaration "You have SEARCHED and DESTROYED." The phrase is made up of words cut out from newspaper headlines. This combination of picture and text simultaneously associates the American involvement in Viet Nam, from which we inherited the phrase "search and destroy" with the rape of women as suggested by the photograph of long blond hair penetrated by sharp steel spikes. In Solomon-Godeau's reading, Kruger has succinctly made an ideological link between man's violence against women and his violence against peoples.

The politicized art of these two photographers is directed both at the political targets of what they understand as sexism and male domination of women and minorities, and also at the target of the producers of mass media in the post-industrial consumer society who hide their ideologies in the mythological transparency of the photographic message. Alexander and Kruger have taken it upon themselves both to attempt to effect
political change and to deconstruct what they see as the ideologically wrong constructions of the powerful who control mass media communication. Photographic credibility is directly at issue because of the falsely assumed anonymity, transparency and naturalness of the photograph.

Thus while those involved on a theoretical level with photography throughout its history have variously claimed the truth of the photograph, or who have attempted to account for the photograph's credibility, practicing photographers and users of photographs have also involved themselves in the issue of photographic credibility in the past and in the present.

The FSA photographers and Riis and Hine before them were drawn to the persuasive powers of the photograph to propagandize for the elimination of rural and urban poverty. The photograph was ideally suited to their purpose of propaganda because of the public's faith in the truth of the photograph as an accurate document. Some of those more aesthetically inclined such as the early Day and the later Krims used the credibility of the photograph to enhance their fictions. Whereas Michals used the medium to question our belief in it in a light and playful way, Alexander and Kruger have used photographs in an attempt to expose and subvert our blind acceptance of the world as photographed and as presented by what they consider to be an ideologically perverse photographic mass media. Regardless of differing times and a diversity of purposes, photographic credibility
has been and is now at issue for theoreticians and practitioners since the inception of photography.

The major conclusion of this chapter is that credibility ought rightly be considered an essential determinant of photography, that a certain halo of credibility surrounds the photograph and effects our experience of photographs. The evidence offered in support of this claim is the weight of historical thinking and practice regarding the credibility of the medium as well as the weight of the contemporary discourse among aestheticians and photography theorists which also revolves around issues of the photograph's credibility. To approach photographs and to be ignorant of their attribute of credibility is to miss much of what makes photographs what they are and significantly reduces the richness that the medium has brought to our experience of existence through pictures.

The varying conventionalist positions of Gombrich and Goodman regarding realistic pictures and the conventionalist position of Snyder regarding realistic photographs are beneficial in three ways. First, these authors fill out our notions of pictorial realism in general and broaden explanations of how, why, and what is at stake in our having come to accept certain pictures as realistic. Further, they are corrective to a general cultural tendency to blanketly accept realistic pictures as totally natural rather than as culturally influenced. They also add impetus to the worries of the leftist writers who offer further caution to a naive belief
in accepting the photographed world as value neutral and natural. Both the conventionalists and the political critics reaffirm the desireability of submitting photographs to interpretive scrutiny.

Although Snyder's arguments about the essential conventionality of the medium are corrective and welcome, they are, for me, counter-intuitive and unconvincing: Walton's and Barthes' arguments for the uniqueness of photography are more convincing and in greater harmony with experience. But if it turns out to be the case that Walton's and Barthes' and others' arguments for the uniqueness of the medium are shown to be inconclusive or wrong, we are still left with a cultural assumption about the credibility of the photograph which will most likely remain a psychological condition which will continue to influence our experience of photographs as it does in the present and has in the past.

Finally, although the social critics are corrective to our cultural tendency to naively accept photographs as true or natural or the way things are or ought to be, I am holding that it is neither categorically good nor bad that the photograph is imbued with credibility: rather, credibility is simply a very interesting given that comes with the photograph that ought to be cause of wonder, reflection, interpretation, and evaluation. As with any unexamined belief, an uninformed belief in photographs might often yield effects disastrous to knowledge and sometimes ethically detrimental consequences.
CHAPTER 4: CONTEXT

Implications follow the identification of selectivity, instantaneity, and credibility as the unique characteristics that distinguish photography from other media, and photographs from other pictures. The interesting implications of the distinction bear directly on the interpretation of photographs. Photographs are inevitably selected from and linked to spatial and temporal aspects of real-world situations by their being causally dependent on light reflecting from objects to light sensitive materials. The credibility attributed to photographs influences viewing photographs in ways that minimize awareness of the photographer's selective process. But photographs certainly are not the same as the causal real-world objects or events on which they are, to greater or lesser extents, causally dependent. The differences between photographs and their real-world counterparts or referents are crucial to our understanding photographs. To know that the referent and the photograph of the referent are different is to know that one is about the other. It is not the photograph that "speaks" or reveals or is revealing; it is the differences between the photograph and its real-world
referent that allow the photograph to be about something. Comparisons between the referent and the photographed referent are necessary for interpretation, understanding, and evaluation, and such comparisons involve considerations of a contextual nature. This chapter considers contexts, in several senses, in relation to understanding photographs.

The meaning of any photograph is highly dependent on the context in which it appears. Gisele Freund discusses a photograph by Robert Doisneau which pictures a man and a woman drinking wine at a bar in a Paris cafe. Doisneau was fond of cafes and seeing the two together was charmed and asked if they would allow themselves to be photographed. They consented and his photograph of them appeared in an issue of Le Point devoted to cafes. Sometime later, without Doisneau's consent, the same photograph appeared in a small magazine published by the temperance league to accompany an article on the evils of alcohol abuse. Still later, and still without Doisneau's consent, the photograph again appeared, this time in a French scandal sheet with the caption: "Prostitution in the Champs-Elysees." All three presentations were convincing, so much so that the gentleman in the photograph sued the scandal sheet and was awarded recompense.

Freund offers other examples of radical shifts in meaning through the placement of various texts with the same photographs. Freund himself photographed a stockbroker of the Paris Stock Exchange. It was primarily a human interest photographic essay of the stockbroker's joys and stresses
under the pressure of frenetic dealing. Freund distributed the photograph to different European magazines, and, thereafter, received clippings from a Belgian newspaper which ran his photographs under the headline: "Rise in The Paris Stock Exchange: stocks reach fabulous prices." He also received clippings from a German newspaper which ran the same photographs but under this headline: "Panic at The Paris Stock Exchange: fortunes collapse, thousands are ruined." The photographs convincingly supported the two contradictory claims, and both uses were different than Freund's intended meaning.

These examples are clear cases of the text over-determining how the photographs are to be read. Freund presents a more subtle contextual, journalistic device of slanting the effects of photographs through juxtapositioning rather than through verbal labelling or mis-labelling. In 1936, Life magazine hired Freund to photograph economically distressed cities of England. In Newcastle-upon-Tyne he found and photographed abandoned shipyards and factories, unemployed men in rags, hungry families crowded in squalid rooms. In 1936, many Americans were offended by British public opinion which was raging against King Edward's love for an American divorcee, Mrs. Simpson. Victorian standards disallowed England having a divorcee for a queen. In Freund's view, Life chose to avenge Mrs. Simpson for liberal America by juxtaposing a full page photograph of England's Queen Mother with her two princesses against a page of his photographs
which showed the squalor of the economically distressed. On facing pages are Queen Mary and her princesses in white ruffles and jewels in an elegant sitting room, and a picture of a dishevelled mother and her two children, all dirty, shoeless, and in torn and ragged clothing. According to Freund, "the brutal contrast made any caption pointless."

Roland Barthes made a general point about the press photograph and the context formed by the magazine which surrounds it, namely, its "channel of transmission":

As for the channel of transmission, this is the newspaper itself, or, more precisely, a complex of concurrent messages with the photograph as center and surrounds constituted by the text, the caption, the layout and, in a more abstract but no less 'informative' way, by the very name of the paper (this name represents a knowledge that can heavily orientate the reading of the message strictly speaking: a photograph can change its meaning as it passes from the very conservative L'Aurore to the communist L'Humanite.) (4)

It is not hard to imagine the different orientations of reading a photograph of a slain deer would encumber if it were printed in both Sports Afield and Vegetarian Times magazines in this country, for instance.

Allan Sekula makes a similar point, stating: "the same picture can convey a variety of messages under differing presentational circumstances." He offers the photograph of Patty Hearst taken by a bank holdup camera as a supporting example, and elaborates:

Taken automatically, these pictures could be said to be unpolluted by human sensibility, an extreme form of documentary. If the surveillance engineers who developed these cameras have an esthetic, it's one of raw, technological instrumentality. "Just the facts, ma'am."
But the courtroom is a battleground of fictions...
What is it that the photograph points to? A young white woman holds a submachine gun. The gun is handled confidently, aggressively. The gun is almost dropped out of fear. A fugitive heiress. A kidnap victim. An urban guerrilla. A willing participant. A case of brainwashing. A case of rebellion. A case of schizophrenia. (5)

Similarly, and more generally, Martha Rosler also speaks to the relative indeterminacy of photographs and raises a series of questions relating to the interpretation of photographs:

Is it "about" what it shows concretely, metaphorically, representatively, allegorically? Does it refer to a moment alone? If so, how long a moment? Does it reveal only that moment, or does it indicate a past and future as well? Or, is a photo a record of sensibility, or, is it most specifically about photography itself? (6)

For Rosler, some of these questions are answered by photographs being placed within the context of the artworld. "Mis-placed" would be more accurate, for Rosler decries the appropriation of photographs, particularly socially oppositional photographs, into the realm of "high art." She confronts John Szarkowski, the curator of photography for The Museum of Modern Art, as "regnant photo czar," and claims:

The specifics of his influence on discourse affect the most fundamental relations between the work, the photographer, and the world. They include an insistence on the private nature of photographic meaning (its inevitable mysteriousness) and on the disjunction between the photo itself and the occasion for its making.... (8)

Her specific complaint about the practice of showing all photographs, especially photographs not made as art, as if they were art, is that the content of those photographs is changed into content about the artist.
More and more clearly, the subject of all high art has become the self, subjectivity, and what this has meant for photography is that all photographic practice being hustled into galleries must be reseen in terms of its revelatory character not in relation to its iconographic subject but in relation to its "real" subject, the producer. (9)

Susan Sontag can be read as adding specificity to Rosler's claim with her complaint against the Minamata photographs of W. Eugene Smith. In Sontag's view the cultural demand for aesthetically pleasing photographs has caused even the most compassionate photojournalist to satisfy two sorts of expectations, one for aesthetic pleasure and one for information about the world. The photographs that W. Eugene Smith took in the late 1960s in the Japanese fishing village of Minamata, most of whose inhabitants are crippled and slowly dying of mercury poisoning, move us because they document a suffering which arouses our indignation - and distance us because they are superb photographs of Agony, conforming to surrealist standards of beauty. (11)

Sontag also applies the claim to Lewis Hine's photographs of exploited children in turn-of-the-century textile mills and coal mines: "The lovely composition and elegant perspective" of his photographs "easily outlast the relevance of their subject matter."

Protected middle-class inhabitants of the more affluent corners of the world - those regions where most photographs are taken and consumed - learn about the world's horrors mainly through the camera: photographs can and do distress. But the aestheticizing tendency of photography is such that the medium which conveys distress ends by neutralizing it. Cameras miniaturize experience, transform history into spectacle. As much as they create sympathy, photographs cut sympathy, distance the emotions. (13)
The camera's penchant for aestheticizing what it photographs is not a new idea. Sontag pays her respects to Walter Benjamin who observed the same as early as 1934:

....(the camera) is now capable of photographing a tenement or a rubbish heap without transforming it. Not to mention a river dam or an electric cable factory: in front of these, photography can only say, "How beautiful." .....It has succeeded in turning abject poverty itself, by handling it in a modish, technically perfect way, into an object of enjoyment. (14)

Sontag and Rosler are in particular agreement about the detrimental effects of showing some photographs, especially political photographs, in the context of the art museum: "when viewed in their new context, the museum or gallery, photographs cease to be 'about' their subjects in the same direct or primary way; they become studies in the possibilities of photography."

Several curators choose to give as little contextual information as possible. Questioned on his attitudes toward helping viewers understand photographs, Van Deren Coke, curator of photography for the Museum of Modern Art in San Francisco, answered:

Some museums put up an awful lot of wall labels and I find people spending too much time on the labels and not enough time on the pictures. I'd rather give them a minimum amount of information and have them look at the pictures. (16)

In his view contextual information is unnecessary because:

"Everyone can understand photographs. That's no problem. It's just a matter of how deeply they can penetrate them. But anyone can understand them."
The attitude of letting the photograph speak for itself, or of giving little or no information about the photograph can be traced at least back to Minor White's policy for *Aperture*, the influential journal of photography, which he founded in the 1950s. On stark white pages only, the photographs were presented; even the minimal, traditional information of photographer, title, date where printed elsewhere so as not to distract from the experiencing of the photograph itself. This practice was upheld in a recent publication of photographs which was heavily criticized informally. The photographs were not of an *Aperture* art variety but were of victims and fighters of the Nicaraguan revolution. The publisher, reportedly against the wishes of photographer Susan Meiselas, printed the photographs by themselves holding all textual information for the back of the book rather than placing the text with the photographs. The result of the lush color photographs without any accompanying explanatory texts was, for many, an aesthetization of the war.

That photographs excise segments of space and instants of time from the broader contexts in which they originally appear also troubles some working photographers, particularly those who desire to make specific, unambiguous statements. Those working under a social theory who wish to persuasively communicate aspects of that theory through photographs find themselves both challenged and often frustrated by the
relative indeterminacy of individual photographs. One young photographer, Lynette Molnar, for example, is a radical feminist who has been trying to make photographs which vehemently and unambiguously condemn pornography. Her work is motivated by her belief that "pornography is the theory behind rape" and by her active involvement in counseling raped and battered women in crisis centers and by her work with sexually abused children. But to photograph examples of pornography to document its widespread place in culture is to proliferate it and advertise it. To photograph sexually abused women may be to provide more prurient experiences for those who already abuse or may desire to abuse. To show that pornography is readily available and in plentiful exchange is not to speak of its believed detrimental effects for women and society. In showing a large group of photographs of the pornographic industry of Times Square and its billboards of bound women in compromising positions beneath dominantly threatening males and the many clients of multicultural and economic groups who frequent the show and shops, Molnar found that her audience merely viewed her photographs as documents of night-life entertainment. Her current solution is to augment her photographs with texts that are integral visual elements of the images. The texts quote women who have been abused and whose abusers have referred specifically to what they have seen in pornographic materials. In effect Molnar is implementing the suggestion made by
Walter Benjamin in 1931 that "captions (will) become the essential components of pictures;" essential for pinning down otherwise indeterminate readings.

Those writers and photographers who are concerned for presenting a greater amount of contextual information with photographs run contrary to proponents of the belief that photography is a "universal language." August Sander, the influential German photographer working in the 1930s, helped popularize this myth in a radio broadcast series, one of the lectures of which was titled "Photography as A Universal Language." In that address he made several enthusiastic, unbridled claims such as:

Today with photography we can communicate our thoughts, conceptions, and realities, to all people on earth; if we add the date of the year we have the power to fix the history of the world. (24)

I believe that we can say that no national language anywhere could function as universally as photography, or could have greater significance. (25)

Contemporarily, similar naive claims about photography and language continue to be made, including such as: "pictures can translate word symbols," "pictures can clarify vague ideas," "pictures make verbal descriptions clearer," "verbal abstractions (are) translated (by pictures) into sharply defined visual images," "abstractions are intrinsically nonpictorial, but pictures can help represent them and prevent the development of inaccurate generalizations," and pictures "concretize verbalisms."

While Sanders seems to assume that photographs are a
global form of communication which transcends individual as well as cultural differences in presenting unmediated "realities," the later authors seem to be adhering to some form of a referential theory of meaning in combination with aspects of an ideational theory. The claim that "pictures translate words" seems to imply that words are being regarded as fundamentally the same as proper names and that the meaning of a word is that to which it refers. There seems to be an equation of picture to thing to word, or more directly, picture to word. More than that, ideas are factored in in the claim that "pictures can clarify vague ideas." There seems to be an implicit assumption at work here that the meaning of a word or an idea is the picture it produces in us, and that if we can match the right pictures to words or expressions we have meaning. The formulation is something like a word-to-thing-to-picture-to-idea interaction. William Alston, however, succinctly dismisses the pictures as ideas notion, and his refutation is accepted here:

There are difficulties even for those words that are most closely linked to sensory imagery. Even here there is no one-to-one correspondence between associated image and meaning. The same image can be associated with words of different meaning, and the same word in the same sense can have widely different images associated with it. The image of a sleeping beagle might well accompany the utterance of "beagle," "sleep," "home," "quiet," "peace," "hound," "dog," "spirit," or "animal," not to mention only a few of the possibilities. The word "dog" - accompanied by collie, terrier, dog sitting, dog standing, etc. Ideas are not distributed in the way required by the ideational theory. (31)
What I am proposing here is consistent with the Meaning as Use theory of language. One needs to consider how a photograph functions in use, and photographs function differently in different situations. Several examples have already been provided. Further, I am proposing that when one attempts to interpret photographs one ought to consider three different contexts, namely, "internal context," "original context," and "external context." By "internal context" I mean that which is given in a photograph, that which is evident. "Original context" refers, broadly, to that which was physically and psychologically present to the photographer at the time the photograph was made. A bit more specifically, to consider the photograph's original context might be to consider the photographer's intent if it is available, the photographer's biography; the intellectual, imagery and stylistic sources of the work; the relation of the photograph to others which are contemporary to it, both those of the photographer and those pictures by other photographers and artists; the social and political character of the times; and the philosophical and religious milieu of the times. "External context" is used to refer to what has happened to the photograph after it was made; how and where it is being presented, how and where it has been presented, how it has been received, how other interpreters have understood it, where it has been placed in the history of art if it has.

To explore all of the aspects just mentioned would be
thorough, but exhausting, and much of the information gathered in such a thorough contextual investigation might prove irrelevant. The work of some photographers, however, receives such investigation. The work of Atget is a case in point. Merely ten years ago Szarkowski wrote: "The life and intention of Eugene Atget are fundamentally unknown to us." Szarkowski's statement is no longer true due to the intense investigation of his work which several critics and historians have conducted within the past decade. They have pieced together his life, found and preserved many of his photographs, interviewed his associates, and so forth so that currently Atget's work is no longer understood as typical commercial work of the day but as one of the greatest bodies of work in the history of photography.

Some photographs, however, do not require for purposes of proper understanding such contextual investigation beyond what is presented in the picture. The press photograph which received the Pulitzer Prize in 1959 seems to me to be a photograph which contains within its borders all that is needed for one to understand it, as long as one is familiar with contemporary Western civilization. In its foreground are a crushed wagon on the pavement of the intersection of two streets, and a blanket draped over a small body shape. A policeman writing on a pad of paper stands next to the blanketed shape and a medic is walking away from it. Some children and two women and drivers of
passing cars are looking on. The photograph is about a child run over by a vehicle, and it is apparently and correctly so.

Similarly, Roland Barthes' analysis of the Panzani photographic advertisement which was reiterated in the Selectivity chapter was based primarily on the internal context of the magazine page, plus an insightful understanding of French and Italian cultures. Author Bill Nichols in Ideology and The Image analyzes a photographic cover of Sports Illustrated primarily by considering what is there before him. A September cover of that magazine presents a full page, game photograph of quarterback Rick Stager waiting for a hike of the ball from his center, and a smaller inserted photograph of his gesturing coach, Dan Devine. The superimposed headline reads: "Devine Week for Notre Dame." Nichols offers a reading of the cover based on structuralist "codes" from Barthes and others in combination with neo-Freudian psychoanalytic grounding ala Michel Foucault and others. Nichols picks up on the punning of "Devine" and "Notre Dame": "The coach, Dan Devine, has just come from the professional ranks: two forms of supremacy (of spiritual being and professional sport) coagulate in the red-framed, free-floating portrait of the coach alongside his team." He understands the relationship between the large photograph of the quarterback and the smaller insert of the coach as a depiction of an unspoken bond of looming brawn and diminished brain:
This unspoken bond invokes much of the lure football holds for the armchair quarterback - the formulation of strategy, the crossing of the boundary between brain/brawn - and its very invocation upon the magazine's cover carries with it a promise of revelation: within the issue's interior, mysteries of strategy and relationship will be unveiled. (39)

Although Nichols' reading draws significantly on pre-existing familiarity with American culture and current sporting events, it is nonetheless based primarily on the combination of images and text given on the cover.

When interpreting even the most straightforward and simple photographs on the basis of internal context alone, a working knowledge of codes is presumed. We are indebted to Gombrich and Goodman on this count, particularily because they remind us that we have become so inured to invented codes and systems of representations operant within our culture that we are likely to have internalized these to the extent that some pictures seem to be natural rather than conventional. A case in point is a photo-finish picture of a horse race. As the horses near the finish line an operator starts a motor on a camera which pulls film smoothly past a thin slit aperture. As the nose of the winning horse crosses the finish line it is recorded, and the motorized process continues as the horse's neck and legs cross, and all the other horses cross. The resulting picture is a still, single image which looks like an ordinary snap-shot. Ordinary snap-shots themselves are conventional, even though they are often seen as natural, but the photo-finish picture is
neither natural nor ordinary. These kinds of points were made earlier and more thoroughly in the Credibility chapter, but they ought not be overlooked here. Some codes or conventions are not cultural in a general sense but are specific to particular communities: although clear to members of the community, aspects of these codes may be opaque to the general populace. Infrared photography used in geological investigations, for instance, uses what is referred to as "false color." Invisible infrared wavelengths are visible as red in infrared color photographs. Black and white infrared materials have their own peculiar transformations. They simultaneously appear natural and highly coded. One needs access to the code for correct readings of these photographs if one is attempting to garner from them accurate geological information.

Titles ought to be considered part of the photograph's internal context, part of what is given by the photographer with the photograph, if not in the photograph. The importance of considering titles has been recently given new impetus by Arthur Danto. They often, but not always, give us clues as to what the photographer may have meant us to attend to, what he or she may have had in mind in making the picture: "A title is a direction for interpretation." Even to give a photograph a label of "Untitled" is, in modern conventions, to indicate that it is to be considered an artwork.

To be consistent, captions given by the photographer ought also be considered part of the picture's internal
context. However, in practice it is sometimes hard to determine if the caption has been provided by the photographer or by an author or editor. There is no difficulty in grouping texts in internal context for several works: Duane Michals often writes on the surface of his photographs, and photographers making books often provide text and identify it as theirs. When the authorship of texts is unidentified, it is interpretively safer to assume that they are part of the work's "external context." Not to do so in some cases, as with the various texts accompanying Doisneau's photograph of the couple at the Paris bar, for example, would be interpretively wrong.

The work of two contemporary image-makers provides interesting examples regarding contextual considerations. Cindy Sherman elaborately and carefully costuming herself as different women from early Hollywood films, strikes typical, dramatic, Hollywood genre poses in typical Hollywood genre settings, and photographs herself. Her other self-portraits portray attitudes of fear, anger, hauteur, and desire and get their charge from television situations. Sherrie Levine has copied and exhibited as her own pictures of Walker Evans' under the title of "After Walker Evans." Another group of Levine's photographs are copies of Mondrian's paintings. Of these, critic Andy Grundberg states: "clearly they are not paintings, yet it is not so clear what relationship they have to the originals, nor how Miss Levine has interfered with our reading of them." She calls these
"Trouble in Paradise." For an understanding which falls within a range of interpretive tolerability for any one group of these photographs, one needs information beyond that which appears in the pictures. This information I am calling "external" information drawn from the picture's "original context."

Cindy Sherman's theatrical self-portraits are grounded in early Hollywood and in contemporary television, but they are only theatrical rather than merely dramatic, if one can infer from them their theatrical sources. But one would be hard pressed to do this, to make the connection between a picture of a woman in 1930s or 1940s dress, in the case of the Hollywood portraits, without a good deal of familiarity with Hollywood films of that era. One would also have to recognize the pictured woman as being Sherman posing as another to appreciate her elaborate and careful costuming. Sherrie Levine's copies of Evans' pictures would be very misleading to a viewer who was ignorant of some history of photography. Even if one knew of the stature of Walker Evans one would also need to have a good knowledge of his specific photographs, of which there are several thousands, to realize that these are not recent pictures of southern share-croppers photographed in the manner of Evans, but are actually copies of his pictures. Similarly with her copies of Mondrian's paintings, comparisons between the copies and the originals are requisite, and in this case one is not directed to such
a comparison by the title "Trouble in Paradise." One would at least have to know of Mondrian's paintings and what they looked like to begin to interpret Levine's photographs if one wanted to know something of what her work is about.

Less conceptually elaborate examples which call for "original" contextual information are plentiful. Marc 48 Riboud's picture of a young woman holding a flower before a line of helmeted soldiers facing her with fixed bayonets has meaning based on the internal juxtaposition of flower and guns but has fuller and more specific meaning if one is cognizant of the politics of the late 1960s in America: the hippies, Yippies, and Weathermen. Phillipe Halsman's photograph of a man wearing sportscoat and tie jumping off the floor of a room with elegant decor is more humorous if one knows who it is who is jumping. It is Richard Nixon. 49

"Carter Campaign, 1976" by Mark Godfrey shows Carter in a middle class living room at the center of a group of middle aged women who look up at him admiringly. Carter, with hands raised and a solemn expression, readily takes on the look of a preacher. Without knowledge of who Carter is, where he is from, his born-again Christianity, and so forth, the photograph loses much of its impact. Then, too, James Friedman's contemporary color photographs of nine sites of the Nazi, World War II concentration camps as they are today require a knowledge of the Holocaust. Without a knowledge of the Holocaust, the viewer sees these pictures as mere slices of everyday life at banal tourist attractions.
His photographs of a colorful truck delivering soda pop to a concession stand at Mauthausen, Austria, and his photograph of a teenager directing his remote controlled, miniature racing car around the parking lot at Dachau, West Germany, have no poignancy if one is unaware of the concentration camps previously here and the prior extermination of their inhabitants.

Often it is difficult to interpret one photograph without knowledge of the other photographs made by the photographer, particularly because of the ease and quickness of the medium as discussed in the Instantaneity chapter. Photographers usually have made thousands of photographs in their careers. To find one and to offer an interpretation of it without benefit of the rest of the photographer's corpus of work is interpretively risky. Edward Weston's work is primarily of nudes, portraits, landscapes, and isolated pristine objects such as peppers and shells. He has, however, some atypical pictures: one of a billboard in a desert, for instance, and another of a gasmasked person, both of which, among others, are probably best understood as "ethically evaluative" rather than as "aesthetically evaluative" which is where most of his photographs would be placed. To find, per chance, the atypical photographs and to infer that they were about what Weston was about as a photographer would be a hasty, and errant, generalization. Conversely, not to know of his atypical works would be to have a less than full understanding of the breadth of Weston's work. Another photographer, R. Mapplethorpe, has
very divergent work. His early pieces are lushly printed, small, pristine still lives of flowers in vases, and the like. More recently he has been making highly charged, emotionally upsetting, large scale, brutal pictures of gay males in extremely sado-masochistic situations. To infer about the work of the photographer without the benefit of knowledge about the other would be unfortunate. These cautions could be said to relate to painting, or to literature, as well, but because of the ease and quickness or making photographs as compared to painting paintings or to writing books, the cautions are more appropos for photography than for other creative endeavors.

Edward Weston rewards the photography scholar with much information to peruse critically. His sons have maintained a thorough archive of his negatives which they reprinted; museums have extensive collections of his original prints; his two volume diary, The Daybooks, is published and readily available; some of his associates, and his sons, are available for conversation. There is a wealth of available information of a contextual sort which would be beneficial for one who wishes to gain insights into his work. More often than not, his work is dealt with by historians rather than by critics. Other living, nationally respected photographers whose work photography critics do write about, however, are readily accessible on the workshop circuit, the lecture circuit, in the classroom, or by telephone. Information about the persons who create the works which are critically scrutinized
is information of an "original" contextual nature which is available and ought not to be ignored. I do not advocate intentionalism as the critical criterion for the validity of interpretations, but I do, on the one hand, acknowledge that information about the photographer's life and articulated intents is difficult to avoid due to the contemporary communications network, and also acknowledge on the other hand that biographical and psychological information external to the work itself may be useful for one who is attempting to gain an understanding and appreciation of the work in question. The critic ought to have the discretion to sort the relevant from the irrelevant concerning contextual information of this sort in deciding what the work is about.

Several examples of photographs whose meaning changes due to the contexts in which they appear have already been given. These examples are relevant to what I am referring to as the photograph's "external" context. Doisneau's photograph of the couple at the cafe bar, mentioned at the outset of this chapter, takes on at least a different tone if not a radically different meaning when it appears either in Szarkowski's *Looking at Photographs: 100 Pictures from The Museum of Modern Art*, in a popular magazine article on French cafes, in a temperance league brochure, or in a scandal sheet addressing prostitution. A similar, if more trivial example not yet mentioned is the use of a photograph of Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis which was made by the infamous
paparazzi Ron Gallela. This case is similar to Doisneau's where the text overdetermines the meaning or more accurately, distorts the meaning. A photograph of Mrs. Onassis appears in Gallela's book Jacqueline and also appears in Photoplay magazine, but the Photoplay editors have cropped her pictured companion from the original and headlines the altered photograph with "Days and Nights Alone" to accompany a gossip piece about the supposed marital difficulties of Aristotle Onassis and Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis. The alteration of emphasis from a photograph's content to the sensibility of the photographer who made it when that photograph is shown within the artworld has also been discussed. Photographs made specifically for science find themselves eventually in art collections, or in the case of some NASA photographs, as an advertisement for Mobil Oil, or "Tang." Their "aboutness" is shown to be different and are usually seen as different than when they were made.

Douglas Crimp reinforces these points with an extensive example concerning the New York public library's recataloging several books of diverse subjects under the single category of "photography." Crimp decries the decision which he sees as based solely on photography's recently acquired economic status which is connected to "the value that is now attached to the great artists who made the photographs."

What was Egypt will become Beato, or du Camp, or Frith; Pre-Columbian Middle America will be Desire Charnay the American Civil War will now be Alexander
Gardner, Timothy O'Sullivan, and others; the cathedrals of France will be Henri LeSecq; Switzerland will be the Bisson Freres; the horse in motion will be Muybridge, while the flight of birds will be Marey.... (57)

He does not see this as an isolated case:

And thus our list goes on, as urban poverty and immigration become Jacob Riis and Lewis Hine, portraits of Manet and Delacroix become portraits by Nadar or Carjat, Dior's New Look becomes Irving Penn, and World War II becomes Robert Capa. (58)

His important conclusion is that "in order for this new aesthetic understanding of photography to occur, other ways of understanding it must be dismantled or destroyed." Here Crimp may be overstating his case in that one understanding need not necessarily negate another, but his points about the significance of context shifts for the interpretation of photographs is important.

To succinctly reiterate the distinctions of this chapter, "context" here is used in three senses: "internal context" refers to what is visible in the work; "original context" is what was beyond the frame and present to the photographer; and "external context" is that which has been done to the work in the history of its existence.

Contextual investigations of photographs are demanded by the nature of photography. Because photographs are segments excised from large real-world contexts, one ought to attempt to replace the segment as pictured back into the whole for several reasons. One needs to do this to understand what the photographer has done to the original situation
by his or her excision in order to posit what the photograph is about. An understanding of the differences between the picture and the reality from which it was made is essential to understanding the photograph. Without these distinctions considered, the photographer drops out and the photograph becomes transparent and the viewer is left mistakenly considering the photograph as a real-world object or event rather than considering it as a photographer's picture. Similarly, the appreciation of photographs is dependent on recognizing and understanding the transformations the photographer has made in excising the segment so as to make it aesthetically noteworthy rather than routine or mundane. The viewer who wants to understand and appreciate the photograph needs to see what fresh and significant relationships the photographer may have brought about, and the means selected to make them manifest. Nelson Goodman's remarks about "the eye" are appropos here when applied to the "photographer's eye" as evidenced in photographs:

It selects, rejects, organizes, discriminates, associates, classifies, analyzes, constructs. It does not so much mirror as take and make; and what it takes and makes it sees not bare, as items without attributes, but as things, as food, as people, as enemies, as stars, as weapons. Nothing is seen nakedly or naked. (60)

The cultural tendency, however, as was extensively discussed in the Credibility chapter, is to see photographs as mirrors, or windows, or the way it was, or as mere mechanical transcriptions unencumbered by knowledge and values. To miss
the differences between the photograph and the object or event photographed is to miss whatever contribution to knowledge and experience the photograph may contain.

Because photographs are also segments of time excised from a temporal flow, one is wont to reconstruct, at least imaginatively, the moments before and after that which is shown, much as if one were seeing one frame from a feature length movie. Just because photographs have a halo of credibility surrounding them, whether that be in their nature or culturally based, one ought to investigate whether or not belief is deserved. Because they seem transparent one ought to investigate what the photographer, or the editor, or the curator, has invested, covertly or overtly, in the image and through the placement of the image for viewing, rather than to naively accept photographs as the way it was. The general tenor of this whole chapter, indeed the whole text, is to put the makers back into the pictures so that photographs can be seen for what they are – more or less subjective views of how some take the world to be and how they would have us take the world to be. Considering context allows this.
CHAPTER 5: CATEGORIES OF PHOTOGRAPHS

There are systems by which photographs are categorized, but a better one is proposed in this chapter. Some are old and still in currency; while others are old and little referred to today. Some are almost as recent as the one proposed here. The oldest division, that of art and science, was implicit in practice from the earliest days of photography. At the time of the very birth of the fixed photographic image, Arago proclaimed that the invention would further both science and art. Arago's stress was on the potential utility of photography for both ventures. In the service of archeology, for example, "Daguerre's invention" would aid France's Egyptian Institute in copying the millions of hieroglyphics which cover the monuments of Thebes, Memphis, Karnak and others; and had the French had the invention at the time of their 1798 expedition to Egypt, they "would possess today faithful pictorial records of that which the learned world is forever deprived by the greed of the Arabs." At the request of Arago, the painter Paul Delaroche testified that even "the most able painters" would be able to use the invention for the realization of "certain essential requirements of art"; in particular, photography offered "unimaginable
precision," "accuracy of line," and "nicety of form." The categories of scientific and artistic remain implicit today.

Another time honored and bi-partite division is an explicit one which divided art photographs into "Purist" or "Pictorialist," and which today divides them into similar categories by similar criteria under the more contemporary labels of "straight" and "manipulated." In The Criticism of Photography as Art John L. Ward states that the premise of the Pictorialists was that a photograph can be judged by the same criteria by which one judges other pictures, whereas the Purists' premise was that the value of a photograph is based on its fidelity to the intrinsic character of photography. Ward cites Edward Weston as typical of the Purist position and contrasts his position, which was discussed in the Selectivity chapter, with that of the earlier Pictorialist, C. Jabez Hughes who stated in 1861:

If a picture cannot be produced by one negative, let him have two or ten; but let it be clearly understood that these are only means to an end, and that the picture when finished must stand or fall entirely by the effects produced, and not by the means employed. (5)

Ward succinctly states the opposing positions:

To the pictorialist, photography is the means, art is the end, to the purist, photography is both means and end, and talk about art is highly suspect. (6)

Although Pictorialism and Purism are approaches to photographic image making based on explicit criteria, "Pictorialist" and "Purist" came to be used as tags to divide photographs.
"Straight" was introduced around 1904 and eventually replaced "Purist," and "manipulated" followed to replace "Pictorialist." "Pictorialist" and "Purist" are mainly used now to identify historical photographs rather than contemporary photographs. Increasingly, however, "straight" and "manipulated" are becoming suspect as people become more conscious of the degree to which any "straight" photograph has been manipulated through the selective process in which the photographer engages when making any photograph.

Beaumont Newhall, in his 1964 edition of *The History of Photography*, identified four stylistic trends which he claims have dominated European and American photography since 1910: "straight photography," "the formalistic," "documentary," and "the equivalent." Stieglitz, Strand, Weston, and Adams are identified as the paradigm examples of those who use the straight style "in which the ability of the camera to record exact images with rich texture and great detail is used to interpret nature and man, never losing contact with reality." Man Ray and Moholy-Nagy are identified with the formalistic style which Newhall typifies as a means of isolating and organizing form for its own sake without the use of cameras. The pictures are characteristically produced accidentally, are seldom previsualized, are without concern for subject, and are highly conditioned by abstract painting without a concern for the photograph. Subject is paramount in "documentary" which is "essentially
a desire to communicate," "to record without intrusion, 11
to inform honestly, accurately, and above all, convincingly."
"Equivalent" is Stieglitz's term which he used to identify his photographs as metaphors. Equivalent photographs use identifiable subject matter, but only as a starting point:
"'equivalents' are charged with emotional significance and inner meaning, but (are) first of all, photographs." 12

In Newhall's next and current edition of The History of Photography these divisions are absent.

Newhall's divisions are similar to Minor White's: documentary, pictorial, informational and Equivalent. In the 1950s, Minor White and some other photographers developed an approach to photography criticism they referred to as "Reading." The method was informed by I. A. Richard's Guide to Practical Criticism for interpreting poems. Placing photographs in one of the four categories was part of Reading.

"Documentary photographs: were described as those which attempted pure recording, placed content above all, and took the viewer to some place or to some time. The "pictorial" photograph was identified as one through which the photographer stressed his or her way of seeing, rather than giving stress to the subject of a picture. The "informational" photograph was said to explain, report, and instruct the mind and was the result of applied or scientific photography. Examples included aerial photographs, photomicrographs, and architectural photographs. White also
took "equivalent" from Steiglitz but gave it a capital E and used the term honorifically and across the other categories: "Any photograph is an Equivalent, regardless of whether a pictorialist, scientist or reporter made it, that somehow transcends its original purposes." You recognize an Equivalent by "a feeling that for unstatable reasons some picture is decidedly significant to you."

Recently John Szarkowski established a new bi-partite division of photographs that is meant to improve the older straight and manipulated division. His division is by "mirrors" and "windows." In the late seventies he mounted a major travelling exhibition, "Mirrors and Windows," with an accompanying catalogue with an explanatory text. His metaphor of mirrors and windows is the basis of a model which utilizes a continuum with two poles. Of any photograph he would have us ask: "is it a mirror, reflecting a portrait of the artist who made it, or a window, through which one might better know the world?" In a shift which is strange in light of the history of aesthetic theory, he aligns mirrors with the romantic tradition. Windows are aligned with the realist tradition. Mirrors are associated with self-expression and windows are associated with exploration. He typifies romantics and realists as holding to these different views:

The romantic view is that the meanings of the world are dependent on our own understandings. The field mouse, the skylark, the sky itself do not earn their meanings out of their own evolutionary history, but are meaningful in terms of the anthropocentric metaphors that we assign to them. It is the realist
view that the world exists independent of human attention, that it contains discoverable patterns of intrinsic meaning, and that by discerning these patterns, and forming models or symbols of them with the materials of his art, the artist is joined to a larger intelligence. (23)

Windows imply an acceptance of fact, objective structure and the logic of process and present the photographer as a disinterested chance witness; mirrors imply autoanalysis or autobiographic content and suggest that the photographer is the photograph's ultimate subject. Mirrors are romantically self-expressive photographs which exhibit concern for formal coherence more than a desire for description, are generally made from a close vantage point for abstract simplicity and to reduce information, with favored subject matter of virgin landscapes, pure geometry, unidentifiable nudes, and social abstractions such as the Young. Windows are realistic explorations which are more concerned with description than suggestion, which attempt to explain more and dramatize less, and which usually deal with subject matter that is specific to a particular time and space, and can usually be dated by internal, iconic evidence.

because of the tag itself, one might expect that her category of "self-reflections" would be similar to Szarkowski's "mirrors," namely, reflections of the photographer. But her "self-reflections" are photographic optical illusions which "challenge our assumptions about visual perception."

Her "formalism" criteria are what one would expect, that is, coherent organizations of formal elements, but in that group she prominently places the work of William Eggleston which is of a mundane new realism which pictures dump trucks and bar room interiors. "Enchantments" are "romantic visions" but in this group she places David Hockney's "formal compositions."

There are several other anomalies which could be cited regarding her categories, criteria for category placement and her use of the categories which evidence confused thinking and result in a not particularly useful set of distinctions.

Finally, photographs have been and continue to be divided by subject matter. The Time-Life comprehensive series of books on photography includes a volume on The Great Themes, for example, and presents "the human condition," "still life," "portraits," "the nude," "nature," and "war."

The motivation for categorization is obvious. It is a desire to make more conceptually manageable the plethora of images which already exist and which continue to be made. Photography is born of both science and art, and both endeavors result in millions of images which end up on billboards, in galleries, books, newspapers, magazines, and photo albums as
well as in laboratories, libraries, and file drawers. Although photographs share, to a greater or lesser extent, inherent characteristics of selectivity, instantaneity, and credibility, they also exhibit a tremendous diversity which can begin to be imagined by multiplying potentially infinite numbers of subject matters by the number of idiosyncratic human beings who make pictures through the medium of photography. Although photographs are similar in being selective, instantaneous, and credible, they often are dissimilar in look, purpose, and use.

The category system which I am proposing is based on an analogy of visual images and verbal statements. I am positing that photographs are analogous to descriptive, interpretive, explanatory, ethically evaluative, aesthetically evaluative, and theoretical statements in language. The six categories are overlapping: a photograph falls into or is correctly placed into one or more of the above categories. Every photograph, for example, is descriptive, but many photographs are descriptive and evaluative. The categories direct the viewer to consider meaning in relation to photographs or to a photograph. To reasonably place a photograph in one or more of the categories, one has to offer reasons in support of that placement, and these reasons will entail one's thinking interpretively about the photograph which, as was argued earlier, requires contextual considerations. The overlapping category system presupposes that photographs
are more than mere things, natural or man made, in the world: a photograph of a table is more than the table, it is a photograph of a table and, in some sense to be discovered, about a table. The categories challenge the viewer to seek what the photograph is about and how it is about what it is about. The category system asks the viewer to consider if the photograph is functioning as a description only, or as a positive or negative ethnically evaluative judgment of what it pictures, and so forth. The category system demands that photographs be interpreted: it assumes that photographs are mental as well as physical and that photographs without interpretations are null, moot, or void.

This thrust toward interpretation is one of the benefits of this overlapping category system which makes it superior to the others mentioned. Division by subject matter such as "landscape" or "portrait" is a division by the obvious and offers little challenge to the viewer to consider aspects of meaning regarding a photograph. Rather, it gives the viewer a false sense of security through naming, and minimizes the important differences between the cutting commentaries of portraits by Diane Arbus and Avedon and the flattering, conventionally glamorized portraits made by commercial studio photographers.

Newhall's four stylistic trends are superior to White's four groups which collapse into two, namely, the traditional groups of scientific and artistic photographs. White's use
of "Equivalent" is not a descriptive categorization but a decree of praise for any photograph which somehow moves him emotionally. "Informational" and "documentary" are too similar to mark distinguishing characteristics and collapse into a scientific category. "Pictorial" remains as a category for art photographs, but the distinguishing characteristic of "pictorial" photographs is claimed to be their stress on the photographer's way of seeing as opposed to "documentary" photographs' "pure recording." This distinction is misleading to interpretation efforts because it reinforces the naive view of objective photography, or photographs free from the world view of the photographer who made them. Newhall's use of "equivalent" to identify metaphorical photographs is more descriptive than White's use of "Equivalent" which is totally subjective and arbitrary. It is difficult, though, to identify the differences between Newhall's "equivalents" and his "formalistic" photographs. Further, it would be more conceptually accurate to see all photographs as, more or less, metaphorical in the sense that a photograph always shows us x as y and attempts to have us see x as y. In a strong sense of metaphor, most photographs show us the subject as something; they show us a man as a laborer, for example, or as a beaurocrat, or as a father, and attempt to persuade us to see him as such. In a weaker sense, all photographs at least show us the subject as a photograph, usually showing us the subject at an instant of time in a
parcel of space from a specific point of view. Finally, the problem of "straight" as a descriptive label has already been discussed: most significantly, that all photographs are not so much "straight" as they are "manipulated," sometimes greatly and overtly, and sometimes less noticeably, but always importantly.

Szarkowski's continuum of "mirrors and windows" or "romantic to realist" is the favored of the cited categorizations because it does stress the photographer's sensibility and world-view. Despite his claim that his distinction is based on a continuum rather than a dichotomy, however, Szarkowski in fact uses the continuum as a hard bi-partite division. It can be seen as having the weakness which he claims the straight-manipulated division has, namely, that it "is based on a principle of mutual exclusivity only dividing the whole of photography into two parts and thus exhausting itself." Photographs can be beneficially placed into more than two groups, and do, in fact, fall into one or more of six categories: descriptions, explanations, interpretations, ethical evaluations, aesthetic evaluations, theoretical photographs.

DESCRIPTIONS. All photographs may be said to describe, in greater or lesser detail and clarity, within the constraints of various cameras, lenses, films, and other technical variables, and within the constraints chosen by the photographer, about the surfaces of objects. Some photographs,
however, are not meant to be more than descriptions. Paradigm cases of descriptive photographs are identification photographs, medical X-rays, photomicrographs, NASA space exploration photographs, and photographic reproductions of artworks. These photographs are analogous to statements of fact in verbal language, are visual recordings of empirical qualities and quantities, and are meant to be interpretively and evaluatively neutral. Their makers attempt no more than accurate recordings of objects and events onto photographic surfaces.

Whether descriptions can be interpretively and evaluatively neutral is an important question. The dicta that facts are theory bound, and that there are no facts without theory, are well taken. However, issues that arise in relation to understanding descriptive photographs and other categories of photographs will not be addressed again here as they were discussed in the previous chapter on context. The major point here is that some photographs are meant to be descriptive, and descriptive only, and in some cases are painstakingly produced to be accurately descriptive.

In an elaborate undertaking that harkens back to Arago's 1839 realization that photography would be of great service to art and to cultural anthropology, the Eastman Kodak Company, in 1982, in collaboration with Musees de France Research Laboratory, meticulously reconstituted the Bull Room of France's Lascaux Cave for exhibition at the Grand
Palais des Champs-Elysees in Paris.* The contours of the reproduced cave were constructed by theatrical set designers who used details from surveyors' photographs made by the Institut Geographique National with a pair of stereoscopic cameras. Twenty five other photographs of the paintings were taken with a photogrammetric camera and electronic flash. The photographs were printed in a 1:1 ratio on Ektacolor paper. The prints were assembled as a flat mosaic under the direction of a physicist who saw to it that they were fit together in such a way that distortions would be avoided when it was adhered to the contours of the overhanging concave sides of the cave walls. The print mosaic was placed on decalomania paper, separated from its Ektacolor base, and adhered to the artificial rock face and its myriad indentations.

_A Meeting with The Universe_ is a beautifully and carefully produced book published by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). In it are several astonishing photographs which serve as paradigm examples of descriptive photographs: two photographs of Jupiter, one taken from Voyager 1 and the other from Voyager 2. The first pictures Jupiter with its Red Spot and banded, turbulent atmosphere behind two of its moons, each of which is about the size of Earth's moon. The photograph was made from about twelve million miles.

*The celebrated 17,000 year old bison paintings on the walls of the Lascaux cave were closed to public viewing in 1963 to save them from environmental deterioration.
away but shows Jupiter's turbulent atmosphere. The second pictures a storm in Jupiter's atmosphere. The center of the storm is large enough to contain three Earths. In a counterclockwise motion the storm is shown producing highly contorted patterns. This photogrpah was made from about 3.7 million miles away. At another end of the size and distance scale is another photograph which shows a cosmic dust particle which is less than one-tenth of a millimeter across, photographed under an electron microscope.

EXPLANATIONS. Although many descriptive photographs, such as the NASA photographs just cited, are made to be used as the basis of explanations, some photographs are made to explain, or are made to function as visual explanations. Often they are descriptive answers to questions which seek explanations. Admittedly, the line between "photographic descriptions" and "photographic explanations" is thin, but the difference between an identification photograph on a driver's license and Muybridge's photographs of animals moving is sufficient to warrant different categories. Muybridge's Animal Locomotion photographs are paradigm examples of photographic explanations.

While employed as a photographic surveyor of the Pacific coast, Englishman Eadweard Muybridge was employed in the 1870s by Leland Stanford, a railraod magnate, lover of horses, and founder of Stanford University. Stanford was engaged in an argument with a man called Frederick MacCrellish over whether a trotting horse ever had all four of its hooves off the
ground at the same time. Stanford believed it did, Mac Crellish did not, and they wagered a $25,000.00 bet. Stanford used Muybridge's work to settle the dispute photographically and supplied him with whatever research funds he needed. Muybridge layed a rubber track to eliminate dust, hung a white cloth with numbered vertical lines as a backdrop to the track, and pointed twelve cameras at it. The cameras were devised to be electronically tripped in sequence when the horse broke a stretched thread. Muybridge's ensuing photographs showed all the different gaits of the horse, and showed that in the midst of its gait, trot, and gallop, all four of a horse's hooves were off the ground at the same time. Stanford won his bet; and to the chagrin of many, previously drawn and painted and sculpted representations of horses were shown to be inaccurate. Muybridge went on to improve his techniques, and eventually, with the support of the University of Pennsylvania, made over 100,000 photographs of moving animals, including ostriches and baboons, and of men, women, and children in a variety of activities.

Muybridge, in effect, offered an explanation of how horses move. A question was asked of him and answered by him through his invention of equipment and procedures that provided an explanation in photographs. Stimulated by the work of Muybridge, Etienne Jules Marey, a French physiologist specializing in the problem of locomotion, invented in 1883 a single camera that would take a series of pictures on a single
plate. He clothed men in black, painted white lines down their arms and legs, and photographed them moving against a dark background. The resulting pictures were linear graphs of motion of arms and legs, trajectory paths and oscillation patterns of movements. Marey's intent was clearly to explain:

> With the assistance of the graphic method, we determined to introduce accuracy into these studies, but it was chiefly by means of chronophotography that we arrived at a scientific interpretation of the various bodily movements. (38)

His and Muybridge's studies lead to more sophisticated time-motion studies in relation to efficient human industrial labor. Marey's photographs and diagrams are also claimed to be the visual springboard for Duchamp's celebrated paintings of a _Nude Descending A Staircase_ (1911-12) and other art of the Italian Futurists at the turn of the century.

Contemporarily, physicist Harold Edgerton has photographically examined the characteristics of bullets in flight and other fast moving objects with his invented stroboscopic equipment and techniques. By photographically stopping the action of bullets moving as fast as 15,000 miles per hour with strobe exposures of a millionth of a second he has discovered that as a bullet strikes a hard object the bullet liquifies for an instant, losing its shape as it compresses upon itself, then solidifies again in shattered fragments. Social scientists who are engaged in what they are now calling "visual anthropology" and "visual sociology" are also increasingly using photography as a research tool in
"exploring society photographically." The curator of the show and editor of the book *Exploring Society Photographically* typifies these investigations as using photography to understand the workings of the social world." The investigations include Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson's monumental study, *Balinese Character* (1942) for which they made over 25,000 photographs as well as movies, and more recent work by others of Arkansas prison life, the travels of migrant fruit pickers, a comparison of a family-run restaurant with a McDonald's, and the urban assimilation of American Indians. The photographers Howard Becker presented in an exhibition and book include both "scientists" and "artists":

The photographers represented here cover the full range of possibilities. Some are more concerned with the presentation of evidence than others. Some use conventional forms of artistic presentation; some have chosen instead to violate the conventional integrity of the single print. Some use text in larger quantities than others. They all leave us knowing more about some aspect of society than we did before we absorbed their work. (43)

This work of Muybridge, Marey, Edgerton, and the material in "Exploring Society Photographically" are included here as paradigm examples of "explanatory photographs." Most press photographs would be placed in this category, as would the book *East 100th Street* by Bruce Davidson who attempted to record the social life of Harlem. *Suburbia* by Bill Owens portrays suburban living in southern California and would probably be placed here although some might argue that it functions as an ethically evaluative piece. The photographers
making photographic explanations attempt objectivity in explaining how things are. To use Szarkowski's observation, many of these photographs deal with subject matter that is specific to a particular time and place, and can usually be dated by internal, iconic evidence. The photographs are falsifiable in the sense that they could potentially be empirically demonstrated to be true or false, accurate or inaccurate. These photographs are like empirical claims in language which seek to explain; all of them can be, or at least potentially could be, further verified or refuted through more testing procedures. In this respect, they are unlike another type of explanatory photographs, "interpretive photographs."

INTERPRETATIONS. Interpretive photographs are non-falsifiable explanations which are analogous to metaphysical claims in language in that their makers use them to make assertions about the world independently of empirically verifiable evidence. A clear example is Duane Michals' "The Spirit Leaving The Body," an eight image sequence made with double exposures which shows a semi-transparent man appearing and arising from out of a man lying on a bed and then disappearing, leaving the man on the bed as he was. Most of the pieces of Jerry Uelsmann also serve as clear examples. His complex images are composites of several negatives. An untitled pair of images made in 1972 show a young, pubescent, semi-transparent, nude girl
emerging alternately from a rock with angel-like wings on her shoulders and then emerging alternately from a body of water and receding into blackness with her hands covering her eyes. Arthur Tress has a book full of images of this type, *Theatre of The Mind*. His are single pictures made of single exposures. His "Hannah Stuart and Her Mother, Sag Harbor, New York" pictures an elderly woman, apparently dead, slumped back in a wheelbarrow with a younger woman standing on a path in the background gazing at her.

Photographs in this category depict an intentionally subjective understanding of phenomena and generally point up the world-views of the photographers who made them. Most of the images in this category are in the larger generic category of art photography, and most are historically grounded in the tradition of Pictorialism. They are generally fictitious even though they often look realistic. They are non-falsifiable in that in cases of dispute they cannot be confirmed or denied empirically: if, for example, Duane Michals asserts an afterlife in some of his sequences, the claim would be difficult to prove or disprove by appeal to empirical evidence.

This category has much in common with what photography critic A. D. Coleman has defined as the "directorial mode."

In this mode:

....the photographer consciously and intentionally creates events for the express purpose of making images thereof. This may be achieved by intervening in ongoing "real" events or by staging
tableaux - in either case, by causing something to take place which would not have have occurred had the photographer not made it happen. (52)

Coleman acknowledges that directorial activity plays a part in most photography, and adds a further distinction:

The substantial distinction, then, is between treating the external world as a given, to be altered only through photographic means (point of view, framing, printing, etc.) en route to the final image, or rather as raw material, to be itself manipulated as much as desired prior to the exposure of the negative. (53)

Despite this distinction, his mode is broader than my interpretive category in that it includes photographs which are explicitly or implicitly judgmental, either aesthetically or ethically.

ETHICAL EVALUATIONS. Photographs which function as ethical evaluations always describe, often attempt to explain, but also, and most importantly, imply moral judgments, generally depicting how things ought or ought not to be. Most photographic advertisements, for example, present us with aspects of the advertiser's conceptions of "the good life" or assert what products, life-styles, and attitudes ought to be desired.

The relatively recent and last book of the late W.
Eugene Smith, Minamata, is a paradigm example of work in this category. The book, coproduced with his wife Aileen M. Smith, prominently bears on its dustcover the inscription "The story of the poisoning of a city, and of the people who chose to carry the burden of courage." The first line of
the prologue states: "This is not an objective book;"
and later it is added: "This is a passionate book." The Smiths spent three years in the early 1970s in Minamata, Japan, a fishing and farming village on the island of Kyushu which had been plagued by a 'strange disease' since the early 1950s. The strange disease was eventually recognized as methyl mercury poisoning from the industrial waste of the Chisso Corporation's chemical factory. The Smiths lived and worked with the villagers, photographing their infirmities and their political struggle, actively involving themselves in the crusade to force the industry and government to take responsibility for the one hundred and three deaths and several hundred people who have been permanently disabled as a result of the willful pollution.

There exist other prominent examples of ethically evaluative photographic projects in the earlier history of photography, most notably the social criticism of Jacob Riis including How The Other Half Lives and the work of Lewis Hine, and the hugh FSA project, each of which has been discussed in the Credibility chapter. The overtly propagandistic photographs of the Nazi regime, and the anti-Nazi photomontages which John Heartfield made in the 1930s are other prominent and clear examples. Contemporarily Hans Haacke, the artist who is better known as a "conceptual artist" than as a photographer, has been producing photographic work which has been critical of a large range of
social issues, particularly on corporate policy in the arts.

AESTHETIC EVALUATIONS. All photographs can be apprehended aesthetically, and many photographs are made to be aesthetically pleasing even though they are made to condemn or explain. But some photographs are made primarily for aesthetic appreciation. These photographs function as visual notification that the photographer deems certain people, places, objects, or events as intrinsically worthy of aesthetic apprehension; or they function as notifications that the photographic presentation of people, places, objects, or events is worthy of aesthetic apprehension. In the case of *Playboy* or *Penthouse* photographs, it is primarily the body, rather than the photographic presentation, which is foregrounded as aesthetically meritorious. In Bill Brandt's photographs of nudes, however, we are aware of a woman's body, but the particularity of the body is displaced in favor of its extreme distortion by Brandt's choice of lens, light, and angle of view. But in Weston's photographs of nudes the particular body and the photographic arrangement are equally attended to and are equally brought to our aesthetic attention. Usually it is a combination of both the object and the object as photographed which are presented for our aesthetic sensibilities. In some of these photographs, however, the original subject matter is so radically displaced in favor of the way it is photographically presented that our attention
is directed only to the harmonious relationship of the photograph's elements. In a 1922 untitled platinum print by Paul Outerbridge, for example, the original subject matter seems to be a brick of some sort, although it is not visually determinable, and it does not seem to matter that it is; what actually seems to matter is the transformation of whatever the object was into a photographic play of lights, darks, edges, and shapes.

We see a large number of these in the history of photography, most readily and clearly exemplified in much of the work of Edward Weston, Eugene Atget, Minor White, Ansel Adams, Aaron Siskind, Paul Caponigro, and Gary Winnogrand. The work of Weston, Atget, White, Adams, Siskind, and Caponigro is generally pristine landscapes, solitary cityscapes, nameless nudes, and details of the world transformed into visually stimulating images, while the work of Winnogrand is "street photography." His book, Women Are Beautiful, for example, is of crowds of people on the street, at the beach or in a park, quickly composed in the viewfinder, and frozen in visually harmonious relationships which accentuate the women present. But they are particular, identifiable people in specific, identifiable locations. Henri Cartier-Bresson's photographs are similarly particular and many are also in this category. In Walton's term as specified earlier in the Credibility chapter, Bresson's and especially Winnogrand's might be termed "transparent" in that we are likely to see
through them to the subjects and overlook the artistry employed. But both the artistry and choice of subject make these aesthetically interesting and pleasing, which is primarily what they are about.

THEORETICAL PHOTOGRAPHS. Finally, some photographs are not about people, places, objects, or events in the world but are about art or about photography. They function similarly to meta-language in verbal language or meta-criticism in art discourse. They generally are made to address issues about photography, or issues about photographs, functioning as visual commentary or as visual art criticism. More simply, they are art about art or photographs about photography.

Les Krims' book, Making Chicken Soup, is a paradigm example. The small book is composed of a sequence of Krims' mother, dressed only in panty girdle, making chicken soup, step by step, from raw ingredients to the finished dish, in frontal shots similar to stills from a Julia Childs television program. Included in the book are two recipes, one for kreplach and one for matzo balls, a handwritten letter from "mom," and a dedication. The dedication reads: "Making Chicken Soup is dedicated to my mother, and also to all concerned photographers -- both make chicken soup." "Concerned" is the key term in the phrase "to all concerned photographers" and conventionally is used to refer to those concerned with social issues. For instance, The International
Center for Photography uses "concerned photographers" honorifically in reference to Cornell Capa, Don McCullin, Bruce Davidson, and W. Eugene Smith, each of whom is well known for his commitment to making photographs in support of various humane causes. In dedicating this book to concerned photographers, all of whom make chicken soup, Krims seems to be engaged in elaborate sarcasm pointed at these and any photographer who would attempt to solve social problems with photographs, as useless an effort as making chicken soup to cure infirmities: both photographs and chicken soup, in Krims' view are mere placebos.

Currently several photographers are making "theoretical photographs" as a reaction to and as a gesture against Modernism. Photography critic Andy Grunberg recently wrote the following in a New York Times review of several New York photography exhibitions:

Next to postmodernism, appropriation surely ranks as the most fashionable catchword in the lexicon of current art. Essentially the incorporation of someone else's imagery into one's own, appropriation is for some the hallmark of postmodernist art, since it calls into question modernist orthodoxy concerning originality as well as the entire notion of an avant-garde. (65)

An example of an artist "appropriating" another's images is Sherrie Levine who copies Walker Evans' photographs as discussed in the previous chapter. Vikky Alexander is another who incorporates others' photographs into her own to make critical statements about mass media photographs. Richard Prince has been photographing and exhibiting "rephotographs" of fashion
photographs published in the popular press. Others who have some work which is in this category of theoretical photographs are Kenneth Josephson, Thomas Barrow, John Baldessari, Wendy Snyder MacNeil, Jan Groover, Robert Cumming, James Welling, and Barbara Kruger. Some of this work has been labeled "conceptual art" and some "postmodernist."

My intent in designing this overlapping category system is certainly not to end thought and discussion of photographs through pigeon-holing; on the contrary, it is to open discourse about photographic meaning in order to increase understanding and appreciation of photographs and of the variety of statements photography carries and delivers. One could use the system as an exhibition matrix and present photographs to viewers by way of the categories or combination of categories, to aid the viewer in interpretively deciphering a complex variety of images. It might better be used, however, as a heuristic matrix of questions with which viewers could interpretively approach any photograph or group of photographs and question, for example, whether Bill Owens' Suburbia is descriptively accurate, if it presents objective explanatory data, or whether it is subtly imbued with negative value judgments. To place any photograph in a category, even those paradigm examples I have cited here,
requires decisions which need be backed with evidence of a contextual sort. The placement is always open to dispute, calls for argument, and is open to counter-argument. To engage in thought and discourse of this nature regarding a photograph is deemed eminently more worthwhile than comfortably labeling it "documentary."

The overlapping nature of the categories is an essential feature of the system. Sontag claims: "To photograph is to confer importance. There is probably no subject which cannot be beautified; moreover, there is no way to suppress the tendency inherent in all photographs to accord value to their subjects." Similarly, Szarkowski states: "Much of the reality was filtered out in the static little black and white image, and some of it was exhibited with exaggerated importance." The exaggerated importance of subjects photographed that Sontag and Szarkowski claim is an important thing to think about when one recalls the dictum of William Ivins: "At any given moment the accepted report of an event is of greater importance than the event, for what we think about and act upon is the symbolic report and not the concrete event itself." With these considerations in mind, given any photograph, it is important to sort out its content and expression, its denotations and connotations, its rhetoric about its subject. By considering how it is descriptive and what more it is by attempting to place it in a category, or by running it through the options of the categories, one is more likely to consider
important aspects of its meaning, or how it is functioning to mean something.

Given even a simple case of an identification photograph, for example, which is essentially descriptive in purpose, its descriptive powers and limitations can be qualified by recalling Snyder's Goodman-like reservations about a naive belief in a copy theory of photography:

A photograph shows us "what we would have seen" at a certain moment in time, from a certain vantage point if we kept our head immobile and closed one eye and if we saw things in Agfacolor or in Tri-X developed in D-76 and printed on Kodabromide #3 paper. (69)

We should also keep in mind that a simple identification photograph is only simple because we have learned the conventions of portraiture from exposure to the history of portraiture: we don't see a marble bust as an armless and legless man.

Also, some are quite reluctant to take any photograph as descriptive only, particularly identification photographs. The social critics of photography link identification photographs with surveillance and surveillance with social control of the weak by the powerful. Sekula observes that "any police photography that is publicly displayed is both a specific attempt at identification and a reminder of police power over 'criminal elements'." In a broader statement, Sontag claims that a photograph of a subject is "an extension of that subject; and a potent means of acquiring it, of gaining control over it." Surveillance, in fact, has grown
with photography from its early years, and sometimes the desire for surveillance has improved the technological capabilities of the medium. In as early as 1856 Nadar made the first military aerial photographs. 72 Nikon cameras and lenses are some of the finest in the world. The Nipon Kogaku K. K., makers of Nikon equipment, began production of cameras in 1917 as "special products designed solely for military purposes." It was only after the completion of World War II that the company began producing consumer products.

Placement of any photograph in one of these categories, particularly since the categories overlap, requires attention to detail and nuance. To misplace a photograph is to misunderstand it. Were one to see Sherrie Levine's copies of Walker Evans' photographs, and if on the basis of how they looked, one considered them to be traditional documentary photographs, or in the confines of this system as "explanatory photographs" rather than "theoretical photographs," one would misunderstand them. More than simply misunderstanding them, one would completely miss their points about appropriation, their anti-artistic genius and anti-originality stances and their anti-Modernist position. To accurately place them as "theoretical," one would need to have information of a contextual sort at least about Evans and his work. Attention to the surface appearances alone would not be sufficient for interpretive accuracy. Similarly, one could misplace
Eadweard Muybridge's historically old photographs of animals, or Marey's graphic movement studies, from their correct position in the explanatory category and place them in the theoretical category based on their appearances. A viewer cognizant of the contemporary artworld and conceptual artwork but ignorant of historical photographs could mistake their use of grids, their rigorous factual look, and their deadpan style as being similar to a contemporary artwork. Obviously, were one to see a fictional, "interpretive photograph" of Uelssmann's or Michals' and see it as a true "explanatory photograph" one would garner some rather bizarre notions about our empirical existence.

Classroom teachers, for example, are susceptible to making category mistakes of this type in their choice of photographs for instruction and are sometimes encouraged to do so by unwitting educational technology writers. Advertising photographs from the popular press, and from mailboxes, are in plentiful, free supply and are frequently used by teachers with children. They are encouraged to do so by several educational technology writers who promote the use of photographs as teaching aids. Serious problems arise when these photographs are presented as descriptive or explanatory. They are descriptive, but they are also highly, and often subtly but effectively, value-laden. Similarly, an intentionally close relationship exists between advertisements and editorial content, including pictorial content,
in popular magazines. Both editorial and advertising content are heavily weighted toward specific life-styles and world-views, particularly in magazines such as Mademoiselle, Vogue, and Harper's Bazaar. Magazine photographs from these end up on classroom walls, bulletin boards, and in students' "visual reports." The world as depicted by advertisers is generally quite different than the world we, as educators, would want depicted for children. If these differences were articulated by teachers and students some worthwhile education might take place with these photographs; but without such distinctions, some miseducation may well take place.

To intentionally and knowledgeably misplace photographs from one category to another can afford fresh perspectives and enjoyable experiences. The artworld increasingly does this. Photographs rigorously made in the service of the physical sciences are often exhibited as art for the aesthetic rewards they may yield. Photomicrographs made in genetic research may well end up displayed on museum walls, and may be seen and enjoyed as art. This seems a harmless enough gesture. Other photographs which are being placed in artworld contexts, however, are cause for concern. Currently an exhibition of turn of the century photographic records of the Joliet prison is travelling to art galleries around the country. Photographs of electrocuted prisoners still strapped to the electric chairs have also been mounted on museum walls.
Some, as was noted in the preceding chapter, vigorously object to such displacements as "aestheticizing" certain events and situations, and their points are well taken. Their criticisms point up the need for considering context in viewing photographs.
CONCLUSION: PUTTING THE PIECES TOGETHER

Sometimes is it beneficial to see that all representational, expressive, communicative media and objects of media share commonalities and belong to a large continuum. This text recognizes this, but attempts to do another task. It recognizes photography as a picture making medium but it strives to point up differences between photography and other media, and photographs and other pictures. Consistently throughout the text, differences have been stressed rather than likenesses between photographs and other pictures. The attempt has been made to find and point up differences so that photography's characteristics which distinguish it from other pictorial media are not obscured or diminished. The effort has been to show that photography is different in kind from other pictorial media. Certainly photographs share some conventions with other pictures, but photographs are not the same, and to see them only as items on a vaster continuum is to miss what photography provides and how it provides it differently.

There are three main conceptions in the text: the identification of selectivity, instantaneity, and credibility.
as the distinguishing characteristics of photographs, and an exploration of how these matter; a recommendation based on the nature of photography that photographs be interpreted contextually by an examination of three types of contextual information, internal and original and external; and that photographs fall into overlapping categories when they are seen as functioning analogously to language statements, namely, descriptive, explanatory, interpretive, ethically evaluative, aesthetically evaluative, and theoretical.

In outline form the text looks like this:

Commonalities of photographs:

Selectivity
Instantaneity
Credibility

Contextual considerations:

Internal
Original
External

Differences among photographs:

Descriptive
Explanatory
Interpretive
Ethically evaluative
Aesthetically evaluative
Theoretical

The conceptions here may be used heuristically as guides to interpreting any photograph, from family snap-shot to social document to artwork. In using these conceptions to guide interpretation one may choose to follow the order and
logic of the text, or to understand the logic but to dis­regard this order and begin with any of the components.

In following the order of the text, one might approach an exhibition of photographs, for example, and experience the photographs as photographs by attempting to distinguish them as a class from other classes of pictures. One might look at the pictures as if they were windows in the walls of the gallery, and see through them to the world beyond which they depict, and initially accept them as credible, natural, and transparent. Then one might examine how and why it is that they can easily be seen this way, and then go on to recognize the highly selective input of the photographer in choices he or she has made regarding the rendering of space on a two dimensional plane, and his or her manner of working with temporality in a still medium. One would seek to know how aspects of time and space have been selected to present more or less credible pictures.

To consider any of these aspects requires comparisons; comparisons of these photographs to other pictures, and comparisons of these photographs to the original subject matter they depict. Having considered the pictures as photographs, and having considered the differences between the photographs and other pictures and the differences between the photographs and the situations from which they might have originated, one would begin to think about what the photographs might be about. The viewer could mentally run the photographs through
the categories and combinations of categories to see where any one makes most sense, fits best, does its best job, or where it is seen to its best advantage. This interpretive activity, in turn, would lead the viewer back into contextual considerations for reasons to support one placement over another. These contextual considerations, in turn, would lead the viewer back into considerations of what and how the photographer selected regarding aspects of time and space and how convincing was the selection. One ought also consider the presentational environment in an attempt to determine how the show title, exhibition theme, textual information, picture placement and other factors influence one's category placement. If one chose to get more involved he or she could seek out additional information from historical and critical writings to see what has been said about the photographs and how they may have alternately been used.

This order need not be followed, however. The overlapping categories, for instance, may be used as the starting point. One might initially posit that a particular photograph was best understood as functioning as a judgment, say as a negative judgment about a social situation. To even tentatively posit such a claim one needs some basis for the claim. This tentative understanding might be based on what is given in the photograph, its internal context, or perhaps by the name of the exhibition or title of the book in which it appears, part of its external context. An intellectually curious viewer however, would be wont to compare the curator's
placement of the photograph in the show, or the author's use of the photograph in the book, with other information to test the plausibility of the curator's or author's decision. This testing would involve comparisons of several sources of information: how the photograph has been used by the photographer, how it fits within the larger corpus of the photographer's work, how it has been used by other curators and authors, and how it has been considered by critics or historians or other investigators. Short of such more or less thorough research of an art historical nature, one could at least mentally run the photograph through the other possible overlapping categories and wonder if the photograph functioned more convincingly as a judgment of an aesthetic type, or as a more or less value neutral description of a social situation. Of course, to do this requires the viewer to also consider the photographer's selections in relation to what might have been before the lens.

While the primary thrust of the conceptions of this text are toward understanding photography and toward interpreting individual photographs, the conceptions may also be used in relation to evaluation in the sense of determining worth or merit. The characteristics of photographs identified in Section I are descriptive, attempting to distinguish photographs from other pictures, but they could be used as evaluative criteria for determining the photographic-ness of pictures. One might use aspects of the described
characteristics in looking at pictures and judge on the basis of them that a given picture may be strong as a picture but weak as a photograph, or vice versa. Similarly, the overlapping categories might beneficially be used as a means of judging the worth of particular photographs. If, for instance, a photograph is made to, or used to, function primarily as a description, its worth as a descriptive object would be questioned. How descriptive is it? Could the object or event be described more clearly, more impartially, and with less embedded values? Is the instant of exposure the most revealing instant? Are the camera angle, the distance, the depth of focus, the framing, the printing the most appropriate? Would a drawn illustration rather than a photograph reveal more clearly what it is that is meant to be described? If the photograph functions or is used to function as a moral condemnation is there enough internal context given to allow the viewer to understand how the photograph is meant to function? How persuasive is it? Does it move one to act? Can the photograph function without text and still make its point, or is it dependent on text? Is the conception of the photograph applicable to treatment by the medium of photography, or would it better be done through other media or combinations of media? If a photograph, after careful interpretive scrutiny cannot be deciphered as to what it is about, is it simply too ambiguous?

Finally, although the thrust of the text is toward
dealing with photographs that have been made and that are shown, the conceptions may also be used as guiding the production of photographs and the teaching of the making of photographs. Aspects of the conceptions of this text have been used in the teaching of production and response at the college level with reported success. The unique characteristics that distinguish photography from other media could be highlighted through assigned production problems built around selectivity, instantaneity, and credibility. If photography is chosen as a medium of expression, and if photographs are unique in the ways described, one could follow the indentified characteristics as criteria for excellence regarding the photographic-ness of pictures made by means of photography. Although photography as one among other media for picture making ought to be stressed, gaining insights into the advantages and disadvantages, the abilities and limitations of the medium in comparison to others would be educatively worthwhile. Production problems could be formulated around selectivity, instantaneity, and credibility to experientially point up what was photographic about photography. For example, one might have students strive to make as convincing a photograph as possible of a fabricated situation to gain insights into the cultural tendency toward credence in the photographic image. Or, as some exhibiting photographers are doing, teachers might have students make photographs which reveal the persuasive rhetoric of photographs
made by advertisers and their influence on values. Similarly, one could ask students to choose aspects of life which they felt strongly enough about to use as a basis for photographs which clearly described or explained, or strongly condemned or persuasively promoted. The students' results could be evaluatively compared to paradigm examples drawn from recent and past professional work, thus teaching some history in relation to production. Dealing with problems such as these are more directive, and I believe, more educatively sound than asking for "beautiful" photographs, or still lives, or nudes, or portraits. The categories at least push one to consider what one is making a nude about or a landscape about. They also urge one to view photographs and search for expressed meaning. Such assignments have the advantage of getting would-be photographers and would-be photography appreciators to deal with issues of meaning and expression rather than with an inordinate concern for technique and equipment and state of the art technology. Such concerns plague the field of photography and photography education. This is so particularly because the manufacturers of the enlargers, cameras, films and papers are often the ones who bring us photographs in magazines and journals and exhibitions. It is in the manufacturers' best interests to keep the technology of photography in the forefront of consciousness so that they may continue to sell their latest wares. A result of their promotional efforts is the keeping of
photographers, particularly professionally young photographers, overly concerned with technique and technology rather than expression, communication, and commitment to ideas. If the conceptions of this text were integrated into photography curricula, technique would be measured only in relation to expressive function. To make photographs significantly about something significant enough to invite interpretation and contemplation seems a worthwhile goal for photography education, and one which this text supports and promotes.
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58. Ibid.


60. Trachtenberg, ibid., page 74.


65. Ibid., page 112.


67. Ibid.


74. Benjamin, ibid., page 852.
75. Benjamin, "A Short History," op. cit., page 211.
79. Ibid., page 860.
80. Ibid., page 856.
81. Ibid.
82. Benjamin, "A Short History," op. cit., page 204.
83. Ibid., page 207.
84. Ibid.
85. Ibid., page 209.
88. Ibid.
93. Ibid., page 268.

94. Ibid.


97. Freund, *op. cit.*, page 149.


104. Ibid.

CHAPTER 4: CONTEXT:


2. Ibid., pages 162-163.

3. Ibid., pages 165-167


8. Ibid.


11. Ibid.

12. Ibid., page 110.

13. Ibid.


15. Sontag, loc. cit.


17. Ibid.

18. From comments made by Susan Meiselas at a presentation of her work at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, April 29, 1982.


20. Comments by Meiselas, as above.

21. From personal conversations with the photographer, Columbus, Ohio, 1982-1983.


24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.


34. Ibid.


36. See the latter part of the Selectivity chapter of this text.


38. Ibid., page 61.

39. Ibid.


42. This example is drawn from Joel Snyder and Neil Allen, "Photography, Vision, and Representation," *Critical Inquiry*, Volume 2, Number 1, pages 157-159.


44. Ibid., page 119.


47. Ibid.


CHAPTER 5: CATEGORIES OF PHOTOGRAPHS:


2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., page 18.


9. Ibid., page 196.

10. Ibid., page 197.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid.


17. Ibid., page 162.

18. Ibid., page 163.

19. Ibid., page 164.

20. Ibid., page 171.


22. Ibid., page 25.

23. Ibid., pages 18-19.

24. Ibid., page 20.

25. Ibid., page 22.

26. Ibid., page 23.


34. Ibid., pages 10-11, 28-29.

35. Ibid., page 56.


40. Photography as a Tool, op. cit., page 34.


43. Ibid., page 11.


47. Szarkowski, Mirrors and Windows, op. cit., page 23.

48. Reproduced in The Photographic Illusion:


52. Light Readings, ibid., page 250.

53. Ibid., pages 251-252.


55. Ibid., page 7.

56. Ibid.,


59. A typical Brandt nude may be seen in The Great Themes, op. cit., page 143.


64. Most of this paragraph was taken from my article "The Offset Work of Les Krims: An Interpretive Critique," Terry Barrett, Camera-Lucida: The Journal of Photographic Criticism, Number 5, 1982. The article contains more examples of "theoretical photographs" by Krims.


72. Freund, Photography and Society, op. cit., page 44.


77. "100 Years of Ohio Photography," an exhibition at the Columbus Museum of Art, Columbus, Ohio, 1978.
CONCLUSION:


2. My colleague Kathleen Kadon Desmond has taught an introductory course at The Ohio State University at Newark based on the overlapping category system in this text and has reported that the quality of her students' production as well as the quality of their discourse was superior to what she had obtained in the past using other curricular conceptions. National Convention of The Society for Photographic Education, Philadelphia, March 18, 1983; and the National Convention of the National Art Education Association, Detroit, March 27, 1983.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


---------. "On The Nature of Photography." Critical Inquiry, Volume 1, Number 1, 1974, pages 149-161.


---------, and Pamela Linehan. "Photographic Criticism in


----------. "Duane Michals: Sequences." In his Light Readings:

Coke, Van Deren. An unpublished interview by Kathleen Kadon Desmond. The Ohio State University at Newark, Newark, Ohio, 1983.


10, 1982.


----------, and Walsh, Neil Allen. "Photography, Vision,


Walton, Kendall. "Transparent Pictures." Unpublished paper delivered at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, June 2, 1982.


