

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Haran, B. (2020). Documenting an 'Age-Long Struggle': Paul Strand's Time in the American Southwest. *Art History*, 43(1), pp.120-153. which has been published in final form at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1467-8365.12472>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

'Documenting an "Age-Long Struggle": Paul Strand's Time in the American Southwest'

Barnaby Haran

When Paul Strand was preparing to travel to Mexico in 1932, he asked his friend Harold Clurman, the director of the Group Theatre, to write on his behalf to the Guggenheim Memorial Foundation for funding for a photographic series on the country's people and places. Although Strand had been a critically feted photographer for a decade and a half since his emergence within the 'Stieglitz Circle', the group of photographers, artists, and writers presided over by Alfred Stieglitz, he was unsuccessful in this application (a 'crime', wrote Clurman), but Clurman's tribute was nevertheless a perceptive characterization of Strand's photography towards the end of his 'transition years', as Steve Yates's terms them, when he spent the summers of 1930, 1931, and 1932 extensively photographing American Southwest from his temporary base in Taos, New Mexico.¹ Clurman wrote:

Paul Strand's photographs are things of beauty, and they have the signal virtue of being devoted and true records of the objects they reflect. These objects moreover are nearly always symbolic of the majesty and permanence of life or of man's age-long struggle to live in harmony with it even amidst its fiercest rigors. Thus Strand's favourite models are the simple phenomena of nature itself—trees, rocks, vegetation—or the brave little dwellings of the fisherman by the sea and the stern adobe dwellings of the south-western mesas. In the last analysis, Paul Strand's work might be considered a record of heroism, and more particularly perhaps the heroisms inherent in the American's effort to

master his continent. This we have seen in unforgettable photographs—which one day will be held as priceless historical documents—photographs of New York, Maine, Canada, Colorado, New Mexico. The inevitable scene for the completion of this picture of the continent is old Mexico. No artist is more naturally endowed to record that scene than Paul Strand. The Guggenheim Memorial Foundation will be serving a truly indigenous art in affording him the opportunity to make that record.ⁱⁱ

In this article, I argue that Clurman’s curt and acute, yet hitherto unattributed, statement provides a compelling early portrayal of Strand’s mature idiom as a sustained examination of objects, people and environments, and their interconnectedness, constituting a multi-faceted record of a place, formed in an ‘age-long struggle’. Clurman was not simply a mentor for Strand’s politicization but also a lodestar for the photographer’s crystallizing conception of his work, a process that started with his profile of Strand in *Creative Art* in 1929.ⁱⁱⁱ

Strand’s time in the Southwest has been the subject of two solid narrative treatments, Yates’s aforementioned ‘The Transition Years: Paul Strand in New Mexico’ essay and Rebecca Buselle’s compendium *Paul Strand: Southwest*, which is generously appended with letters and other primary texts.^{iv} Making extensive use of Strand’s papers, I undertake a more thematic approach in examining this ‘age-long struggle’, and argue that in the Southwest his photography crystallized as his conception of his work clarified. From his earliest exhibitions at Stieglitz’s 291 gallery and portfolios in *Camera Work*, Strand’s photography consisted of a matrix of people, objects, and places, though notably his attention shifted over the 1920s and into the 1930s from ciphers of modernity, such as New York’s streets or machine parts, in particular close-ups of his Akeley movie camera, to natural objects, older

manmade structures, and non-urban Americans and Canadians. Instead of modernity's changes and, from 1929, the troubles of the times, Strand sought a longer narrative that espoused an 'age-long struggle'. The photographs of Mexico would mark a logical continuation of this trajectory—and moreover shift the emphasis of the 'American's effort to master his continent' towards a continental Americanism, invoking the heroism of the Americas, and by extension mankind, rather than national particularity. Such images of human struggle would constitute important 'historical documents' in 'a record of heroism'. But what species of document were Strand's pictures of dwellings, of assorted, disparate people, and of 'trees, rock, and vegetation'? Were Strand's Southwest images 'documentary'?

In this article I offer a new perspective on Strand's photography by arguing that foregrounding his dialogue with Clurman at this crucial moment of his career concerning his aesthetic, in conjunction with his politics, reveals a non-topical documentary mode that comprehensively engaged temporality in relation to a myth of struggle permeating human experience. Strand operated in the interzone between the putative realms of Pictorialism's rich aestheticism, Modernism's experimental analysis of the metropolis and the machine, and the social determinates of radical photography and reformist documentary, incipiently questioning their integrity as silos of photographic métiers. Until the 1990 publication of Maren Stange's *Paul Strand: Essays on His Life and Work*, much of the literature on Strand presented him as the Modernist master who extended Stieglitz's experiments in form into the Machine Age, becoming swept up in the radical culture of the Red Decade, before settling upon expressive photo-books celebrating signifiers of the humble humanity permeating in areas of New England, France, Scotland, Italy, and Ghana.^v Essays in Stange's volume such as Mike Weaver's 'Dynamic Realist', which argued that the

oeuvre was governed by a 'socialist vision', and Anne Tucker's treatment of 'Strand as Mentor' to the radical Photo League reoriented Strand's work around his 1930s politicization rather than deeming it an aberrant decade of his career. More recently, articles in a special issue of *Oxford Art Journal* on 'Modernism After Paul Strand', edited by Stephanie Schwartz, have exploded both mythologies by investigating the intellectual correlates of Strand's mode and its discursive contexts of its production and dissemination as a model for to uncover the 'social embeddedness of both the work and the artist'.^{vi} For instance, Jorge Ribalta's 'The Strand Symptom: A Modernist Disease?', which I consider below, attends to the retardataire technologies of Strand's production in juxtaposition with the revolutionary urgency of 'worker photography'.^{vii} The present article does not mount a defence of Strand, but shifts the emphasis to examine the temporalities of his photography to determine that he was striking for a different type of radical documentary, one that looked to the radix of struggle itself, in a way that was admittedly of limited instrumental value.

At this time, the term documentary was still fresh and not yet tethered to a shorthand notion of didactic realism. Clurman's 'historical documents' trope did not propose Strand's photographs as instrumental images that might function as illustrative ethnographic data or as polemical reportage. Therefore, William Stott's distinction, in *Documentary Expression and Thirties America*, of 'social documentary' as a subcategory of 'human documents' (defined as emotionally engaging in contrast to literal documents, such as legal texts) that 'encourages social improvement' does not apply.^{viii} If Clurman was the principle conversationalist in Strand's fomenting radicalization, then he did not espy political cant in these pictures, or pitch them as responses, literal or metaphorical, to the unfolding Great Depression, marking no distinction between pictures made before or after the Wall Street Crash.

Clurman's 'historical documents' is more redolent of John Grierson's seminal statement about Robert Flaherty's film *Moana* that this 'visual account of the daily life a Polynesian youth [...] has documentary value'.^{ix} By 1934 Grierson opposed the Flaherty-type 'romantic documentary', which poeticized the 'noble savage', to 'realist documentary', the social variant.^x If the latter 'requires not only taste but also inspiration, which is to say a very laborious, deep-seeing, deep-sympathizing creative effort indeed', the basis of Grierson's 'creative treatment of actuality' slogan, then Strand's photography bore traits of both of these romantic and realist categories, and thereby disrupted this binary.^{xi}

Clurman's coterminous appellation of 'historical documents' and 'things of beauty' indicates that he divined both aesthetic and 'documentary value', in Grierson's original sense, in Strand's photography. Strand's early forays into photography in the early 1910s coincided with the fragmentation of the Stieglitz Circle's coalition of Pictorialists, who proclaimed that photography was a valid form of artistic expression but diverged on the issue of largely unmediated 'straight' versus 'fuzzytype' pictures made with scuffed lenses or retouching. His experiments in abstraction from 1915 onwards distilled straight photography's prioritizing of precision and composition over additive atmospherics. Yet as a former Ethical Culture School student of the self-styled 'social photographer' Lewis Hine, whose expository reformist pictures for the Russell Sage Foundation and the National Child Labor Committee anticipated 'social documentary', Strand's candid shots of New York's street people intimated analogous sociality. Allan Sekula deconstructed the difference of Stieglitz and Hine pace Pictorialism and documentary by citing respectively a 'symbolist folk myth' and a 'realist folk myth', pitching Strand pejoratively more within the former's province of artistic genius.^{xii} In my reading,

Strand conflated these myths, belonging fully to neither, but espoused another—a folk myth of human struggle over time.

If Olivier Lugin has termed documentary a ‘fluid concept’ rather than a monolithic category then the nascent discourse of the early 1930s had many cross-currents and could encompass Strand’s South West pictures.^{xiii} Indeed, Lincoln Kirstein’s definition of Walker Evans’s ‘perfect documents’ of Victorian architecture in New England, shown at the Museum of Modern Art in 1933, is also apposite to describe Strand’s work: ‘Photography is in essence a scientifically accurate process for the reproduction of objective appearances, a stationary magic that fixes a second from time’s passage on a single plane. Its greatest service is documentary’.^{xiv} In the early 1930s, a second was a long time in photography—1/1000th second shutter speeds were available—but Strand often fixed even longer moments, with exposures lasting sometimes two minutes. His photographs are more timeworn than timely, concerned more with duration than a particular instant. These photographs took time—carefully choosing a subject, Strand used long exposures, followed by a patient printing process, and a ‘slow’ form of dissemination in portfolios and exhibitions, in contrast to the avant-garde strategy of hyperactively snapping the provisional everyday for rapid reproduction to a mass audience.

Strand’s photography eschews topicality for a rich engagement with an ‘age-long struggle’ manifested in the textures and tones of its objects formed over time, which Clurman deemed ‘a record of heroism’. I argue that Strand’s Southwest pictures of ghost towns, churches, houses, landscapes, and figures coalesce into a multi-faceted portrayal of a place that is an emphatic meditation upon temporality. (Fig. 1) Contemporary commentators remarked on the potent temporality of Strand’s photographs. In a *Creative Art* profile on Strand, an article of 1931 that paired

Southwestern photos with pictures from the Gaspé and Maine, Lola Ridge wrote that: 'the Strand world is one in which there is no death as the children of Adam regard it. In it time is no more a bright suspicion of the brain at which the mind leaps only to fall back frustrate and mowing at itself from a clock's face, but a tranquillizing certainty'.^{xv} In the catalogue for the 1929 Intimate Gallery show, the sculptor Gaston Lachaise wrote how Strand's images of 'fragments of driftwood, rotted trees, and in particular the photographs of stones and rocks reveal with true grandeur the persistent life within these bits of the universe'.^{xvi} (Fig. 2)

I wonder if an unexpected analogy might be found in Salvador Dali's seemingly absurd 'antiartistic' quip calling for a 'documentary of the long life of the hairs of an ear, a documentary of a stone, or that of the life of an air current in slow motion'.^{xvii} Rather than chronicling or diagnosing the times, Strand's photography seems to instance 'deep time', as conceived by geologist John McPhee's to explain the sublimity of geologic temporalities, derived from the 18th Century Scottish scientist John Hutton. McPhee writes that 'the human mind may not have evolved enough to be able to comprehend deep time. It may only be able to measure it [...] Primordial inhibition may stand in the way. On the geologic time scale, a human lifetime is reduced to brevity that is too inhibiting to think about. The mind blocks the information'.^{xviii} Strand's pictures of the Southwest conflated people, buildings, objects, and landscapes as equivalent traces of deep time processes, the 'age-long struggle' over centuries manifesting in the present.

Strand clearly considered Clurman's reference to be an apposite assessment, because the note appeared in published form, sans the first and last sentences and translated into Spanish, in the catalogue to an exhibition of his photographs at the Sala de Arte in Mexico City in February 1933.^{xix} Organized by the Mexican composer

Carlos Chávez, who Strand met in Taos, this exhibition marked the first presentation of Strand's work since a bitter dispute with his mentor Alfred Stieglitz, following the lacklustre support of a 1932 joint exhibition of Strand's photographs and paintings on glass by his wife Rebecca Salsbury. Afterwards Strand returned his key to An American Place, which as Nancy Newhall relayed, was his 'way of telling Stieglitz he was through. Bitter for many years.'^{xx} If Stieglitz had not even produced his customary handwritten pamphlet, then Chávez's attractive catalogue, which also included tributes from the painter Gabriel Fernández-Ledesma and Silvestre Revueltas, also a composer, further accompanied by a poster campaign around the city to publicize the show, stood in marked contrast. Although the two exhibitions presented much the same work—primarily pictures of the Southwest with a selection of images of Maine from 1927-28 and the Gaspé peninsula in Canada from 1929—they framed these photographs in quite different contexts. Clurman enthused to Strand about this new context of dissemination:

I was happy to hear about your show in Mexico: it seemed as if it were worth two in N.Y. (I can't explain why!) And I was very flattered to read myself in Spanish [...] I reread my *Creative Art* article the other day, and I still think it's pretty fine, by which I mean that what I said still holds good for me, and still remains true to you and your photographs.^{xxi}

In Strand's early 1930s correspondence with Clurman and the critic Elizabeth McCausland, there is a mutual opinion that the 'Stieglitz Circle' and An American Place constituted a rarified enclave sealed-off from America's travails. Clurman wrote to Strand in 1933: 'I admire them all, but I have a feeling that they are not living in the same world that I am. Maybe it's a better world: it certainly appears removed—and not one which I care to travel in these days'.^{xxii} McCausland complained to Strand

that Stieglitz's 'going about the world (paradoxically in the narrow confines of An American Place) as the evangel of a great spiritual awakening and regeneration' clashed with her view that 'a fundamental reconstruction of society' must occur 'before the artist can have a fair deal'.^{xxiii} In 1933 Strand himself wrote pointedly to Ansel Adams that 'these are critical years for anyone who is alive—aware—had not insulated himself in some "esthetic" rut—away from the world—The world itself in a profound process of change—social change, as it appears to me'.^{xxiv}

For Stieglitz, Strand's departure from An American Place was a rejection of 'The Idea': 'I don't forget the many years of Paul's loyalty not only to me personally but to something beyond all of us—to The Idea—and The Idea is as alive as ever. That I know'.^{xxv} 'The Idea' was a constellation of principles around art, love, and life that amounted to a generic attitude rather than a clearly defined set of tenets, an amorphous array of ideals and strictures with a fin-de-siècle secessionist spirit that constituted a liberatory, quasi-spiritual sensibility. The supplanting of 'the Idea' with the 'Group Idea' provided a new framework for Strand. He wrote to Kurt and Isabel Baasch how 'The Group is a true beginning of the collective idea felt in America. 291 was partly that too but I feel that Stieglitz's own egoism is constantly in conflict with his collective feeling'.^{xxvi} From 1931, Strand began regularly visiting the Brookfield, Connecticut, where the Group Theatre trained during long summer retreats, attracted to its collective ethos and as much as its theatrical innovations. Clurman and his acting director Lee Strasberg strongly admired Soviet theatre, and especially the theories and techniques in creating naturalistic performances pioneered by Konstantin Stanislavsky's Moscow Art Theatre, in producing plays such as Sidney Kingsley's *Men in White* (1933) and Clifford Odets' *Waiting for Lefty* (1935). It is possible to connect Strand's deep examination of objects with Stanislavsky's 'affective memory'

exercises in understanding character motivation, but there is little tangible evidence of any influence of Group Theatre methods on developments in his photography. Rather, it was participation in the Group's society that appealed, serving as a replacement of the Stieglitz circle, and his intimate, exploratory dialogue with Clurman, through which analogies between Group principles and Strand's camera work emerged. Writing to Strand in 1934, in a manner that demonstrates his mentorship supplanting of Stieglitz, Clurman reminded him:

You were attracted to "291"—because it was a movement of the spirit against alien forces in NY, a refuge and a new world away from any other, tho not denying it unnecessarily. But "291" became only Stieglitz—did not become a group—with each part of it either clinging to Stieglitz (Rosenfeld, Seligmann etc.) or going its separate, individual way, a little lost or a little ineffective (Waldo Frank). You were enthusiastic over the Group Theatre, even tho it was only a theatre, because you saw in it, a movement towards a real group, that might grow, expand, and really go forward into the world, really do battle with it.^{xxvii}

The method superseded subject matter, evident in Clurman's (under the nom de plume Harold Edgar) explanation in the *Daily Worker* about *Men in White* as an exemplar of 'the Group's collective technique' but also noted that 'the play is not distinguished by any particular social comment or definite intellectual value'.^{xxviii} Clurman articulated the aptness of the 'Group Idea' to Strand's political emergence:

You went away to Mexico (because the Group Theatre which held you as a symbol did not, being a theatre, give you a function or a form) to find something different than "291", something like the Group only in your own

“line”. You became interested in “Communism”—as a philosophy which makes of the Group idea a whole political, economic, social method of practical action and historically justified necessary struggle.^{xxix}

To a degree this struggle equated the Revolution—Strand saw in the Soviet Union (which Clurman and Strand visited in 1935) ‘the impulse and struggle to build a socialized community’, although acknowledged that ‘there are many compromises, many failures, many weaknesses’.^{xxx} Strand’s interest in Communism did not involve extensive theoretical immersion. He found that:

Marx himself is hard to read—very technical. I have one book called *Introduction to Marx* by Sidney Hook—very clear and good. I am told *The Struggle to Power* by John Strachey is very good also. Then the “Communist Manifesto” by Marx and Engels is not hard reading I believe. The latter two books I haven’t read, but would like to.^{xxxi}

If Strand’s Leftism involved extensive engagement with cultural activism, then he largely reframed an extant vision with political terms. Andrew Hemingway has traced Strand’s intellectual formation back to the radical culture of the 1910s, and notes the influence of the *Seven Arts* milieu, in particular Waldo Frank, on his ‘Romantic anti-capitalist’ world-view.^{xxxii} In 1933, Strand described Communism as ‘a philosophy of action, to be tested by action and one which accepts the machine as a part of human life, never to be rejected, but to be controlled’.^{xxxiii} In doing so, he adapted the theme of his 1922 *Broom* article ‘Photography and the New God’, in which he claimed that Stieglitz’s photographs humanized Machine Age modernity, constituting ‘a highly evolved crystallization of the photographic principle, the unqualified subjugation of a machine to the single purpose of expression’.^{xxxiv}

Applying Strand's own term, I contend that Strand and Clurman's dialogue marked a 'crystallization' of the former's conception, based upon the recognition of the affinity of his idiom with the Group Theatre's methods. Strand's 'transition years' did not witness a Damascene shift in his work but a realization of its significance, along the lines of John Dewey's explanation of Semiotic signification: 'every one has experienced how learning an appropriate name for what was dim and vague cleared up and crystallized the whole matter. Some meaning seems almost within reach, but is elusive; it refuses to condense into definite form; the attaching of a word somehow...puts limits around the meaning, draws it out from the void, makes it stand out as an entity on its own account'.^{xxxv} There was much continuity in Strand's thinking about photography as he radicalized during the 1930s and developed his mature idiom, except regarding one key factor—for a few years, he stopped taking photographs. For the latter part of the 1930s Strand suspended still photography, excepting a 1936 return to the Gaspé, preferring to engage the movie camera as a political weapon. In Mexico he made *Redes (The Wave)* (1934, released in the USA 1936), a tale of oppressed Mexican fishermen, thereafter returning to the United States to join film the outfit Nykino, and in 1936 co-founded Frontier Films, collaborating with Leo Hurwitz on *Native Land* (1942), a Popular Front anti-fascist, pro-labor dramatized documentary. He also served as a cameraman on Pare Lorentz's *The Plow that Broke the Plains* (1936), a Resettlement Administration documentary about the causes of the Dust Bowl. When Strand returned to photography, he resumed his early 1930s mode, first by publishing images of Mexico as a limited edition set of photogravures entitled *The Mexican Portfolio* in 1940, and then photographing the Northeast for his first photo-book, *Time in New England* of 1950, a collaboration with Nancy Newhall. In 1943 Strand defined this latter project, in another failed

Guggenheim application, as ‘a portrait of a particular American environment in terms of the character of the land itself, the people who live on it, the things which they have made and built’.^{xxxvi} He had developed this practice of sustained examination of a region in New Mexico and Colorado, a body of work that was a prototypical ‘time in the Southwest’. As Newhall wrote in the 1945 Museum of Modern Art retrospective catalogue, Strand’s ‘search for the fundamentals that shape the character of all that rises from a land and its people reaches symphonic proportions in the New Mexico series, 1930-1932’.^{xxxvii}

Strand first visited the Southwest in 1926, staying mainly in Taos but also traveling to Colorado to photograph the Indian ruins at Mesa Verde. (Fig. 3) He opposed the idyllic environment of New Mexico to the sullied, stifling metropolis of New York, writing to Stieglitz: ‘NY, a distant and disagreeable ant heap, everybody crawling over each other. Perhaps I insult the arts, you, your spirit, is an entity, the paradox that make NY, living, and it is never distant, for as one travels away from NY its deadness and cheapness, standardized mediocrity, in towns and towns trying to be cities’.^{xxxviii} In contrast the Southwest was pure, primitive, and Edenic: ‘here the mountains are untouched, fine and wonderful, great [...] The variety here is infinite, snow mountains, great towering rock hills, pine covered moraines, and in between meadows of exquisite greens pine dotted’.^{xxxix} The mythology of the Southwest depended upon this antithesis to American urban modernity—as McCausland put it, ‘a mesa is more miraculous than a metropolis’.^{xl} The sublime landscape of mountains, canyons and mesa, the expanse of sky and the brilliant light, the turbulent weather, the rich ethnic variety of pueblo-dwelling Native-Americans, Mexicans, and white settlers, drew numerous cultural tourists to the region. The appeal was the atavistic otherness of a region that the writer and explorer Charles Lummis had portrayed as

the ‘wonderland of the Southwest’ (he also claimed to have coined ‘Southwest’), a land of ‘poco tiempo’ (pretty soon), of ‘sun, silence, and adobe’.^{xli} Lummis wrote that ‘New Mexico is the anomaly of the Republic’, being ‘a century older in European civilization than the rest, and several centuries older still in a happier civilization of its own’.^{xlii} The wild and remote landscape stood out even amidst America’s great wildernesses because of the added element of brilliant sunlight: ‘“Picturesque” is a tame word for it. It is a picture, a romance, a dream, all in one. It is our one corner that is the sun’s very own’.^{xliii}

The appeal of the region for artists was considerable. Since the 1890s, when Joseph Henry Sharp first depicted the Indians of Taos, an artistic community developed, most notably taking shape in the Taos Society of Artists, which ran from 1915 to 1927. In the 1920s a cabal of displaced metropolitan modernists arose around the eminent soiree host Mabel Dodge Luhan, including diasporic Stieglitz circle members Georgia O’Keeffe, Marsden Hartley, and John Marin, and sympathetic figures such as McCausland, Chávez, and D. H. Lawrence and his wife Frieda. Although initially enthusiastic, Strand’s appreciation of the Taos art scene diminished during subsequent sojourns—like Lawrence, he raptured about the environment and railed against fellow pilgrims in equal measure. By 1932 Strand’s weariness of the gossipy Taos milieu was pronounced—Clurman wrote to him: ‘I spoke to Stieglitz about you one day and he suggested that he felt you ought to be in N.Y. since you didn’t care for the people in Taos or Santa Fe. I felt inclined to agree with him (as Betty McCausland had said you didn’t like the New Mexican colonies) but I am sure your own instinct on the matter is better’.^{xliv}

The people in Strand’s Southwest pictures of the early 1930s are mainly friends and acquaintances, rather than representative types or notable personages. He

produced numerous portraits of Salsbury, typically against the sky and dressed in dark colours, a sober series that for Belinda Rathbone mapped onto the final years of their marriage, betraying the ‘waning of their intimacy’.^{xlv} (Fig. 4) Other portrait subjects included his old friend Marin, new acquaintances such as Chávez, the Irish republican Ernie O’Malley, Barbara Hawk, who was briefly Strand’s lover, and locals such as Cornelia Thompson and her daughter Nancy, Gina Knee, Ward Lockwood, and Irish poet Ella Young. Strand was minimally focused on Taos cultural cliques, but also avoided an ethnographic approach to photographing the oft-depicted pueblos and the Taos Indians, and found the touristic culture unappealing—‘at Taos pueblo most of Indians pay a fine rather than dance and those who don’t pay are just as pathetic’, he wrote, a little ungenerously.^{xlvi} He did, however, produce a handful of images of an Apache fiesta in Colorado, alongside assorted pictures of a rodeo and a white rancher, although these images of a huddled group covertly made from behind were symptomatically distant. (Fig. 5) He did not comment on the Apaches that he photographed, but he wrote to Stieglitz in 1930 concerning the Taos Indians about an invisible ‘barrier’:

I must admit that the Indians are not very much a part of the summer for me. I know I can’t do anything for them, nor can I live with them and possibly in time get to know something about them—to penetrate that barrier that Lawrence so quickly sensed, when their life feeling takes form as it does in the dances, it’s wonderful, but it doesn’t happen often in the summer and of course it is all doomed.^{xlvii}

Unlike the idealized ‘vanishing race’ mythology of ethnographic Pictorialist Edward S. Curtis or the more responsible Laura Gilpin, an acquaintance who contemporaneously documented the Navajo people, though he later recalled to Milton

Brown that ‘there were some things I didn’t do out there but I never got to do. Which were some photographs inside the churches portraits of the people who lived there, who were indigenous; not the artists colony but some of the people indigenous to New Mexico. But I never got to do it.’^{xlviii} In the end, Strand concentrated more on the place more than the populace: ‘the only thing that is intensely living for me here is the country itself’, he told Stieglitz.^{xlix}

Though far from a sociological or anthropological analysis of the place, Strand’s engagement with the Southwest was historically oriented, in the sense of viewing the region’s present forms as receptacles of long temporal processes. The most well-known subject in these images is the San Francisco de Asis Mission Church of Ranchos de Taos, which he photographed several times during each visit, as did Ansel Adams, in 1929, and many artists, including O’Keeffe and Salsbury. (Fig. 6) For Strand and others, this simple yet graceful sun-baked adobe structure emblemized the region’s blend of ethnicities and the symbiosis of populace and environment, evident in Mary Austin’s observation, in 1930’s *Taos Pueblo*, which featured Adams’s photographs, that ‘the Church...has the deep-rooted, grown-from-the-soil look of Pueblo buildings’.¹ Strand’s photographs singularly explore the building in semi-abstract fragments against the landscape, emphasizing varieties of illumination in an analogous manner to Stieglitz’s coeval skyscraper pictures. I focus rather on the pictures of ghost towns in New Mexico and Colorado, which also register the heroic struggle that Clurman cited in the textures and forms of the ruins, but provoke particular questions the historical dimension of Strand’s temporal investigation of the Southwest. (Fig. 7)

In a handmade booklet about Strand, McCausland connected his photography to a Southwestern temporality. The visitor did not ‘take refuge in Nature as an ivory tower’ in this ‘inscrutable and self-contained land’:

This is the sense that is conferred by the photographs of those deserted and tragic old mining towns, Red River and E-town, —that living gives what nothing else can, the wealth and richness of existence, the births, the deaths, the ravages of time, wooden doors into which the years have poured their abundance, blind-eyed windows winking at eternity.^{li}

In a review of the 1932 *An American Place* show, McCausland wrote how: ‘the weathered ruined buildings of Red River [...] show [a] power and strength, homes abandoned and fallen into decay, pool halls no longer repaired to, general stores whose merchandise is ghostly now, the whole wreck and ruin of a frontier civilization’.^{liii} Also reviewing the exhibition, Katherine Grant Sterne wrote in *New York Times* of Strand’s images of ghost towns in relation to their history: ‘The parched timber facades of Main Street, Red River; a St. Elmo pool-joint abandoned to sheer decay; all the dry cracked relicts of one of the most romantic episodes in American history are interpreted with an extraordinary sense of their historic impact’.^{liiii} The 1931 photograph ‘American House, Colorado Ghost Town’ of an abandoned hotel—surely the picture listed in the *Sala de Arte* catalogue as ‘Hotel en una Población Minera Desierta’—encapsulates these qualities.^{liv} (Fig. 8)

‘American House, Colorado Ghost Town’ depicts the tattered frontage of an abandoned though largely intact hotel. Strand’s composition situates the building at a gently oblique recession, partially indicating only one side so that its full scale is difficult to determine, though he includes a small section of the pavement planking

and rudimentary street below, whereas the undulating mountainscape with a cloudy sky above occupies about a quarter of the image. The picture consists of several horizontal bands—the sky, the mountains, the upper storey, the ground floor, and the walkway and the street—that are complemented by the verticals of planks and window frames. Strand's technical acumen in maximizing fluid lighting conditions to obtain a clear and detail negative reveals sophisticated gradations of tone and complex nuances in textures of cloud, stone, scrub, wood, glass, and fabric. His attention to the faded writing, broken windows, and frayed timber highlights the process of dereliction afflicting the untended building, but conversely registers its resilience in a climate of extremes. The photograph is emphatically dispopulous but a partially open window in the centre and the remnants of curtains on the lower floor are haunting traces of occupation; hence McCausland's anthropomorphic 'winking at eternity' metaphor.

In concert with these evocative surfaces and details, the relationship of the building to the town and the landscape, of figure to ground, is crucial to the photograph's potent invocation of time. The strata of the image—the sky, the mountains, the hotel, and the street—connote several discrete yet harmonious temporalities. The passing clouds, pierced by sunlight, indicate the ephemeral against the mountains' ancient geologic span, albeit smattered with trees and scrub of a shorter cycle, framing the pastness of the American House and the presentness of the photographic perspective from the street via the (extended, as I shall discuss) now of the exposure. The deep time of the mountains provides the bass note, sounded by the rocks whose sublime ancientness exposes the provisionality of the human structure, whilst conveying the courage of such endeavours in its ragged endurance, so that the imagined former life of American House is concentrated into a myth of 'man's age-

long struggle to live in harmony with it even amidst its fiercest rigors', thus constituting a 'record of heroism' residing in this failed, yet fearless, settlement.

Although the town is usually unidentified, I can confirm that this picture shows the American House Hotel in St Elmo in Chaffee County, Colorado, a mining community in the Chalk Creek region.^{lv} (Fig. 9) St Elmo was one of numerous such communities that developed in the mid 19th century, its inhabitants lured to this inhospitable outer reach by the prospects of gold or silver. At its peak in the 1890s the population was a sizeable 2000, and the town boasted a newspaper, a telegraph office, a station on the Denver, South Park and Pacific Railroad. A photograph from this time shows a rough but established town with storefronts such as 'G. D. Kinnear general Merchandise', 'True Fissure Billiard Hall', and 'G. N. Francs Groceries & Miners Supplies'.^{lvi} By the 1920s the town was in decline as the resources of mines such as the Mary Murphy, the Molly, and the Pioneer were exhausted, and so the townsfolk departed, although when Strand visited there were still a few remaining occupants (the Saint Elmo Post Office remained open in 1952). The untended buildings either fell into ruin or burned down. As well as 'American House', Strand also photographed its City Hall and some of the surviving houses, most of which appear to have since been destroyed in the intervening years (a 2002 fire destroyed the City Hall and several other buildings).

Strand was more interested in the abundance of forms and surfaces of the St Elmo buildings and their desolate grandeur as traces of a resilient frontier spirit than their historical specificity, and although he was radicalizing politically he did not represent these places as sites of real social struggles. Ghost towns were not just relics of failed speculation but also the remnants of industrial conflict. Colorado's mining industry was a site of major unrest, as Stewart H. Holbrook charted in *The Rocky*

Mountain Revolution, in events such as the Cripple Creek Strikes of 1894 and 1903, and most pointedly the Ludlow Massacre of 1914, where twenty-one strikers, women, and children were shot or burned to death by militiamen hired by the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company.^{lvii} Ludlow itself was abandoned and quickly became a ghost town. More recently, *Labor Defender* devoted its December 1927 issue to strike action in Colorado, relaying how ‘The Colorado Battle Line’ had seen five miners shot dead at the Columbine mine.^{lviii} A tantalizing remark by McCausland indicates that Strand at least contemplated the particular histories of these communities: ‘A wild idea I have had for some time is a development of what you said in New Mexico about doing a social history of the Kentucky mining districts done by the writers who went down there. It would be swell if ever you tried your hand at subjects like that’.^{lix} If Strand and McCausland tentatively confronted the social histories of the ghost towns, then his images invoked not the ‘class war in Colorado’, as the Socialist magazine *The Masses* contextualized Ludlow, but rather belonged, in Strand’s rationale, to a less contingent struggle.^{lx} The images do not constitute a social history of the mining communities—a symptom of Strand’s limited anchorage through vague captioning that eschews information, an abstraction further established when the pictures appeared in the two exhibitions alongside rocks, landscapes, and people, as facets of the Southwest and other regions.

Strand discussed the ghost towns as repositories of a Southwestern mythology that borders on tropes of the nascent Western, such as the 1932 film *Haunted Gold*, featuring a young John Wayne, in which a comically spooky ghost town serves as the hiding place of a villainous gang’s loot. Indeed, an American House hotel was a site for one legend of the lawless Wild West—the outlaw John Wesley Hardin shot and killed a cattle herder through the wall of his room at the American House Hotel in

Abilene, Kansas, as popular myth would have it, for snoring.^{lxi} Strand wrote stirringly to John Marin of August 1931 about New Mexican sites:

I spent a day in Elizabethtown and Red River working with those old deserted houses that are fast being torn down to build tourist cabins—a false front with dignity sounds like a paradox [...] these last traces of life that was lived and lived hard in America—the old man who runs the hotel in Red River—an old timer, 79, tells of the days when there were 15 saloons and the people were eight deep in the gambling joints, trying to get their money on the table—in Red River—Well, I would like to have seen that town or Cimarron in the old days.^{lxii}

He wrote to Herbert Seligmann in 1931 about the ‘mining towns of Red River’: ‘I would have liked to have seen that town in its heyday and that lopsided life—so raw and brutal, I suppose—with a dash of romantic sentimentality—but with a kind of courage and not slavish’.^{lxiii} He also worried about the vulnerability of these sites: ‘Red River, the old houses are falling down and one whole side of the street has recently been burned to the ground—Incendiary out of spite against someone who had started a gambling joint. So my beautiful door is gone—there is little left’.^{lxiv}

For Wolfgang Kemp, Strand’s pictures of ghost towns belong to a tradition of photographic images of decay: ‘torn and tattered tar paper, nail-studded lath strips, and rough lumber [which] come together [...] to form abstract compositions’, which constitute a specifically American picturesque motif.^{lxv} In this reading, the ghost town pictures evoke Romanticist ruinography, a factor heightened by their emptiness. Andreas Huyssen argues that ruins provoke an exaggerated sense of the expired life in obverse relation to degrees of ‘absence’, the vacancy drawing attention what has vacated, although ‘it is the imagined present of a past that can now be grasped only in

its decay'.^{lxvi} Huyssen writes that in the disorientations of modernity 'romantic ruins seem to guarantee origins. They promise authenticity, immediacy, and authority'.^{lxvii} George Steinmetz writes of this nostalgic sensibility concerning ruins: 'as the sense of having lost an entire socio-historical context and the identifications that accompany it, and the related desire to experience that social past'.^{lxviii} Although he expressed such sentiments in correspondence, Strand pictured the Southwest ghost towns as traces of heroic struggles in an unforgiving climate (as well as a fund of formal interest), and so these places were more ciphers of epic geological processes, thereby mitigating platitudes about an idyllic Southwestern past.

Strand's temporal study of the Southwest was not restricted to subject matter, but was also embedded in his technique. He equated the 'nobility' of the Southwest with the principle models for his photographic method. In 1931, Strand celebrated the nobility of the 19th Century Scottish pioneer David Octavius Hill, in a 1931 review of a translation of Heinrich Schwarz's *David Octavius Hill: Master of Photography*. Strand saw the nobility in the synergetic techniques and content of Hill's photography: 'Through the direct and austere arrangement of large masses of dark, broken by the head, the hands, or some part of the dress (built though it was upon the chiaroscuro of the old masters) Hill gives the eye at once an impression of simple grandeur and of true human nobility'.^{lxix} (Fig. 10) Strand's comments on these people echoes his thoughts on the ghost towns' erstwhile inhabitants: 'possibly these men and women were not torn by inner conflict as most of us are today. For they appear sure of their direction in life to this extent—that they seem to have known what life meant to them and what was truly of value to them in it. This kind of inner strength Hill saw and recorded.'^{lxx} In this review, Strand also cited the Parisian photographer Eugène Atget as 'a man much more naive than Hill, yet whose work is just as pure,

just as direct, whose pictures of the shops, buildings, and markets of Paris are informed with the same nobility of spirit'.^{lxxi} This observation chimes with Revueltas's statement in the Sala de Arte catalogue:

[Strand's] photographs are poems of a very profound sensitivity, which one rarely encounters in works of their kind. They do not seek admiring visual astonishment. They are full of silence. His themes, apparently so simple, have an intimate poetry. Paul Strand's intellectual serenity, so comprehensive, so full of delicate compassion, makes him one of the most noble of contemporary artists.^{lxxii}

Furthermore, Clurman wrote that a Mexican audience would engage with quiet nobility of Strand's photographs of the Southwest, more than visitors to *An American Place*: 'I have a feeling too that the Mexicans (the non-artist as much as the artist), should be able to "understand" your photographs. Because your photographs are very simple, strong and quiet'.^{lxxiii} (Fig. 11) Revueltas and Clurman saw the same quality of nobility and quietude in Strand's work that he himself divined in Hill and Atget.

A triadic lineage of Hill (always bisected from his working partner Robert Adamson), Atget, and Stieglitz permeates Strand's statements on photography from 1931 onwards, even after his break with the latter. Strand wrote to Stieglitz from Mexico City in May 1933 in a wary recommencing of communications: 'what I wish is that Mexico could see your work, of which I tell in rather bad Spanish—Hill too and Atget but yours most of all'.^{lxxiv} He had known Hill's work for decades, but was only recently acquainted with Atget. Strand retained this core set even as he politicized during the 1930s, and made more explicit his own placement as the next photographer in this putative canon. In a 1937 letter to the Communist magazine *Art Front*, Strand

complained about a recent article by Louis Aragon that stated that ‘Man Ray embodies to perfection the classical in photography’.^{lxxv} He countered: ‘the best examples of D.O. Hill, Atget, of Stieglitz or of my own work are the classical standards. Within the considerable body of each man’s work can be found, not an escape from reality, but an enrichment of human experience which the materials of photography have been inevitably compelled by the artist to record’.^{lxxvi} Strand thereby conjoined an impulse to ‘record’ with the transhistorical ‘classical standards’ of Hill, Atget, Stieglitz, and himself, socially reframing this lineage within the ambit of the Popular Front.

From his first published statement on photography onwards, in *Seven Arts* in 1917, Strand had lionized Hill, writing that his ‘portraits made in 1840 have never been surpassed’, and were a ‘living photographic tradition’ from which the Photo Secession sprang.^{lxxvii} If Strand’s debt to Hill is well-known, then few commentaries have explored the ramifications of his engagement with Atget in the early 1930s. It is difficult to ascertain precisely when, before the 1931 review, Strand first encountered Atget’s work. Atget was largely unknown in America prior to his death in 1927, when Berenice Abbott, Man Ray’s former assistant, persuaded gallery owner Julien Levy to acquire and thus rescue 10,000 negatives.^{lxxviii} Strand was surely aware of Abbott’s profile in *Creative Art* in September 1929 (the edition prior to Clurman’s Strand article) or the monograph she helped compile in 1930, *Atget: Photographe de Paris*, published under the auspices of the Weyhe Gallery.^{lxxix} Strand told Naomi Rosenblum in 1975 that he had first seen Atget’s prints in an exhibition at the Weyhe Gallery in 1927—he presumably meant the December 1930 show, put together by Carl Zigrosser with Levy and Abbott.^{lxxx} John Raeburn cites the rash of interest in Atget ensuing this exhibition as influential in the toppling of Stieglitz’s preeminence in American

photography and formative in the germination of the new documentary movement, led by a younger generation of gallery owners and curators (Levy and Lincoln Kirstein) and photographers (Abbott and Evans).^{lxxxii} Clearly piqued, Stieglitz himself rejected any connection to Atget in a letter to the *New York Times* in 1932, after Edward Alden Jewell had clumsily placed him in the ‘great tradition of the Frenchman, Atget, and others’.^{lxxxiii} Conversely, Strand’s Southwestern period witnessed an increase in his photographs of places and objects that reveals much commonality with Atget, although this is more affinity than influence. After all, his photographs of vernacular architecture in the Southwest in the summer of 1930 predate the Weyhe show in December (though he may previously have seen Atget’s work), but more significantly he had periodically represented old buildings in New York, the Southwest, Maine, the Gaspé, and Lake George from the mid-1910s onwards, focusing on their spare and sober forms. Yet, from 1930 these scenes became more prevalent, and increasingly redolent of Atget’s photographs, and, coincidentally though significantly, map onto his growing estrangement from Stieglitz.

Some photographs closely match images from *Atget: Photographe de Paris*, indicating a mutual interest in the rich textures of the buildings, whether the old houses and shops of Paris or the abandoned mining communities of the Southwest. ‘American House, Ghost Town, Colorado’ resembles Atget’s ‘Figaro Populaire’ in terms of camera perspective, the gentle oblique recession, the attention to the frayed and dilapidated surfaces, and the compositional, tonal, and textural effect of the antique signage—though Strand’s inclusion of the mountainous horizon diverges compositionally and contextually. (Fig. 12) Likewise Strand’s 1932 ‘Shop Window, Colorado Ghost Town’ is notably analogous to the frontage in Atget’s 1901-2 ‘Enseigne, quai de Bourbon, 38’. (Fig. 13 and Fig. 14) Many of Strand’s Southwest

and Mexican photographs feature arches, doorways, or windows, an Atget-esque technique of creating multiple pictorial spaces through these immanent apertures. A photograph by Strand of a Mexican staircase closely resembles Atget's representations of Parisian interiors in *Atget: Photographe de Paris*. The ubiquity of arcane statuary in Atget's photographs corresponds with the antiquated, often rudimentary, craft objects in Strand's Mexican photos, often religious in subject. In his notes for a 1944 lecture at the Museum of Modern Art, a survey of photography entitled 'Photography and Other Arts', Strand wrote that Atget 'produced some of the most aesthetically complete photographs we have. In them he distilled the very last drop of lovely essence out of the Paris he loved—from the streets, its store windows, the not always very good statues in the parks, and its people'.^{lxxxiii} However, although Strand and Atget were comparably drawn to vernacular architecture and objects, the pictorial oddities that the Surrealists prized in Atget's images, those instances of photographic parapaxis such as accidental window reflections, peering shopkeepers, or eerie mannequins, do not appear in Strand's works.

Ironically for a modernist photographer, Strand shared with Atget an almost obtuse commitment to a vision attained through antiquated means. David Company writes of Atget: 'he was a man out of time. We ought not to forget that even in the 1920s Atget's glass plates and prints of Old Paris were a living anachronism'.^{lxxxiv} Ribalta writes of Strand's comparable resistance to photographic novelty: 'The American fixation on the plate camera was anachronistic. The view camera's neoclassic stasis stood in opposition to the rise of small-format camera technologies in the mid-to-late 1920s and the incorporation of photography into the illustrated press'.^{lxxxv} Thus despite pioneering the modern mode of abstract photography in composition through cropped, angular depictions of objects and thereby predating the

'New Vision' of the 1920s, Strand's technique and methods eschewed speed and provisionality for extended duration and a deeper temporality. Ribalta diagnoses Strand's increasing fetishization of the vernacular and residual faith in the ideal of the expressive photographer as a bourgeois 'modernist disease' in opposition to the 'worker photography movement', the international documentary network affiliated with the Comintern that mobilized the camera as a 'weapon in the class struggle', using small handheld cameras such as the Leica to expose the myriad injustices of everyday modern life for mass reproduction.

Strand liaised with the latter phase of the American wing of the worker photography movement, which oriented around the Workers Film and Photo League. By the mid-1930s when Strand connected with them, the two media parts were fragmenting into Nykino, which he joined, and the Photo League, a larger group favouring a less militant social documentary mode, which he was affiliated as a 'mentor'.^{lxxxvi} Ribalta writes 'the point is to recognize the impossible or unviable coexistence in Strand, and by extension in the Photo League, of an ahistorical, somewhat regressive and bourgeois (if not aristocratic) understanding of art production (anti-technical, anti-mass-media, etc.) together with historical materialism and a defence of proletarian culture'.^{lxxxvii} Ribalta's argument bespeaks technical necessity and teleological determinism that risks Strand's in reducing Strand's work to the straw man of aesthetic solipsism that worker photography aimed to eradicate. Importantly, Strand did not attempt to emulate the ideological invective of worker photography, excepting his infamous anti-fascist swastika cum crucifix for *TAC*, which echoed John Heartfield's photomontages for *Arbeiter Illustrierte Zeitung* but symptomatically forsook the latter's clinical suturing of images from mass media for a handmade (he even commissioned the cross) straight photographic protest.

Strand's cinematic work might counterpoise this image of a photographer out of time in the 1930s, resolutely persisting with old and slow means, finding a more expedient means, which didn't necessitate significant recalibration of his still photography, for polemical topicality, but even in this medium he betrayed a habitual disposition towards longer narratives. Strand's participation in Nykino and co-founding of Frontier Films witnessed his fullest engagement with radical camera work. Although Strand incorporated the new strategies of the Soviet 'camera eye', especially montage editing, and addressed cinema's mass audience with *Redes*, he foregrounded a traditional community with few trappings of modernity. Strand's lingering camera close-ups portray the Mexican fishermen with the exoticizing fascination of Flaherty's *Moana* (1926) and *Man of Aran* (1934).^{lxxxviii} As a member of the Nykino camera team on Pare *The Plow that Broke the Plains*, Strand's contributions picture the Dust Bowl as an encroaching desert consuming farmhouses that now resemble the ruins of ghost towns. By contrast the avowedly topical *Native Land* was so historically specific that its Popular Front ideology was out-of-date when eventually released to a post-Pearl Harbor America. Yet even this film looked down the centuries to the democratic ideals of the Founding Fathers in its opening and closing montages of stock footage of landscape, statues, and cityscapes, mourning the nation's forsaken freedoms, anticipating the extended chronology of *Time in New England*, which conjoined facets of the region with snippets from assorted texts from the Puritans to the present.

If his suspension of still photography for radical filmmaking involved investment in a dynamic mass form, albeit with his signature longeurs, then his resumption of photography in the 1940s returned him to his customary speed. Before and after his photographic cessation, Strand was committed to a slow mode of

photography predicated upon archaic apparatus. He typically used a large format 8 x 10, producing large negatives made through long exposures of seconds and even minutes, after extensive preparations. Peter Barberie describes how Strand took his time: ‘people who encountered him photographing nearly always recall waiting as thus maddeningly patient, methodical man tinkered and adjusted and then himself waited for exactly the light he wanted’.^{lxxxix} Strand’s use of long exposures enabled an accretion of detail over time. Later in life he reflected to Calvin Tomkins:

Cartier-Bresson has said that photography seizes a direct moment [...] that’s true, except that it shouldn’t be taken too narrowly. For instance, does my picture of a cobweb in the rain represent a decisive moment? The exposure time was probably three to four minutes. That’s a pretty long moment. I would say that the decisive moment was the moment in which I first saw this thing and decided I wanted to photograph it. Many of Cartier-Bresson’s photographs are capturings of moments that were exceptional [...] but with me it’s a different moment.^{xc}

John Berger compared Cartier-Bresson’s ‘instant’ to Strand’s ‘moment’: ‘the photographic moment for Cartier-Bresson is an instant, a fraction of a second, and he stalks that instant as though it were a wild animal. The photographic moment for Strand is a biographical or historic moment, whose duration is ideally measured not by seconds but by its relation to a lifetime’.^{xcⁱ} In 1936 Strand praised Cartier-Bresson in his letter to the editor of *Art Front* because he ‘drives the best reportage beyond momentary interest’—his rapidity served a sustained vision.^{xcⁱⁱ} In 1939 Strand celebrated Photo League member Morris Engel’s work: ‘by the quickness of his vision not of his shutter, he has been able to seize this expressiveness of the person as he or she moves down an avenue or street, amid the welter of city movement’.^{xcⁱⁱⁱ}

(Fig. 15) Because of Engel's deep interest in human subjects, Strand argued, he 'sees people with compassionate understanding', avoiding the 'characteristic weakness of documentary photography' for 'generalization' by looking 'very specifically and intensely'.^{xciv}

Strand by contrast looked 'specifically and intensely' at still subjects, far removed from the city streets, for a long time. Apart from some photographs of New York in the 1910s, Strand's pictures rarely show metropolitan life or frozen movement. He did however vary his photographic speed, and in the Southwest often used a smaller 4 x 5 hand-held Graflex rather than his customary 8 x 10 because it was more portable and quicker (from 1931 he settled on a medium format 5 x 7), as he told Kurt Baasch, for capturing shifting cloud patterns in landscapes:

I went on with the small camera, where I left off with the Canadian landscapes. A Graflex certainly makes one lazy and unanxious to haul the 8 x 10 around. But chiefly the reason I have used the small camera so much is because I have been working fast with skies that are no longer there by the time the big camera is set up. If I came out here again I would like to have a large reflecting camera with a shutter that would give exposures of ½ a second or a second.^{xcv}

Strand's idea of a quick exposure was ½ second was still lengthy, given that since the mid 1920s cameras such as the Ernox had offered shutter speeds of 1/1000th of a second (although the Leica III in 1933 offered a slow speed of one second, as well as 1/1000th second, for longer exposures). In concert, he also discussed using Defender Panchromatic Extra Fast nitrate film, as a means of replicating the detail of longer exposures with the smaller Graflex whilst capturing cloud formations.^{xcvi}

If the visual effect of a long exposure time was important to Strand, then it also intrigued Walter Benjamin, whose 1931 'Little History of Photography' essay used Schwarz's and Abbott's monographs on Hill and Atget respectively as principle sources (despite this coeval interest, there is no evidence that Benjamin and Strand were aware of each other). Benjamin wrote: 'the way light struggles out of darkness in the work of a Hill is reminiscent of mezzotint: Orlik talks about the "coherent illumination" brought about by the long exposure times, which "gives these early photographs their greatness"'.^{xcvii} In 'Photography and the New God', Strand wrote how Hill pioneered the medium's expressive potential: 'despite the primitive machine and materials with which he was compelled to work, the exposures of five to fifteen minutes in bright sunlight, this series of photographs has victoriously stood the test of comparison with nearly everything done in photography since 1845.'^{xcviii} For Benjamin too, the long exposure time of Hill's early calotypes was a technological constraint that determined the specific character of the images. He contrasted this quality with contemporary journalistic images: 'The procedure itself caused the subject to focus his life in the moment rather than hurrying on past; during the considerable period of the exposure, the subject as it were grew into the picture, in the sharpest contrast with appearances in a snapshot.'^{xcix}

Paradoxically, these emphatically still images register temporal movement. The quietude and stasis in 'American House', for instance, heighten attention to its internal time currents and to the moments of exposure of its facture. In a sense, the snapshot is more static because in showing split seconds of motion time is frozen, whereas the exposure image is a residue of moments—a 'still-moving picture', as it were. Forsaking the fast-paced momentary snapshot, Strand's time exposures convey periods of duration. The time exposure has a particular type of photographic

temporality—a duration of multiple seconds that nonetheless appears as a singular image. To use Roland Barthes's terms, the habitual fixity of the time exposure arguably invokes the 'this-has-been' differently to the 'unary photograph' (for example, the blunt news image) by insisting upon stillness and therefore ossifying objects, whilst providing a sense of 'this continues', of the *tableau vivant*, because these are condensed moments of duration, instead of time suddenly stopped. The time exposure image of a static object stills temporality into a glacial movement that is more animated than a snapshot of dynamic action. For Ridge, the pictures were dynamic registers of an 'organic life' whereby 'plants, stones, the age-old fragments of trees, all appear as the living parts of some vast and moving whole that seems to have drawn measurably nearer'.^c Thierry de Duve counterpoises the consoling continuity of the time exposure with the snapshot: 'only in time exposure (portrait, landscape, still life, and so on) may photography appear with the continuity of nature'.^{ci} He writes that 'this particular surface temporality is congenial with the ebb and flow of memory'—as if time's currents stirred residually in the limpid print surface.^{cii} As well as exposure duration, the temporality of the photograph is also registered in printing time. From the outset of Photo Secession Stieglitz proclaimed that the photograph could become an artwork only through skilful and sensitive printing. For Sekula, this commitment to the laboriously crafted print, 'an almost Pre-Raphaelite celebration of craft in the teeth of industrialism', epitomized their eschewal of increased mass reproducibility.^{ciii} Strand wrote in 'Photography and Other Arts': 'For Stieglitz, printing was one of the most critical and exciting parts of the whole creative process, one which called for great concentration and artistry. The quality of a print was an integral part of the photograph's fullest meaning'.^{civ} Printing took time, unlike the increasingly rapid commercial press, and this patient effort was

obligatory, as only in individual prints or limited editions, on platinum paper or photogravure, could photographs become complete aesthetic objects. For instance, in 1931 Stieglitz and Strand refused permission to Samuel Kootz to reproduce his works for a survey of American photography. Strand told the author: ‘there are a great many of his most important photographs—and this is true of many of mine—which are built upon values which the ordinary methods of reproduction simply kill and nothing is left.’^{cv}

Strand’s conception of photography necessitated time-consuming printing methods, and when radicalized he reframed it with a social rationale. In applying (again unsuccessfully) for Guggenheim funding in 1940 he proposed extending the photogravure project of *The Mexican Portfolio* to many of his previous series, including ‘Photographs of Wood, Rocks and Flowers’, and the Southwest and Gaspé, as a socially oriented project: ‘the purpose of publication is to make this work which for the most part exists in one platinum print of each negative available to people—especially through museums and libraries’.^{cvi} Strand’s ideal vision of a demotic photography imagined an archive of folios in which reduction of print quality was minimal—he explained to the Guggenheim that his experiments in lacquering gravures had enabled ‘something close to a replica of the original one, that held the full gamut of its quality’, a still laborious hand printing method (taking many months to produce the 250 editions of *The Mexican Portfolio*) that was ‘the only way in which my many years’ work can really reach people’.^{cvi} Reviewing *The Mexican Portfolio*, McCausland wrote that it ‘is his bridge to the public, as his work in films is proof of his desire to reach ever wider audiences’, and conjoined this project with his ‘work on a documentary movie on civil liberties’, *Native Land*, which Strand called ‘a document of America’s struggle for liberty in recent years’.^{cvi} Yet, a limited-edition

subscription only portfolio of 250 gravures remained an archaic means of communication, and Strand eventually capitulated to modern commercial printing with *Time in New England* and subsequent photo-books, attaining a considerably wider audience (by the end of 1950 it had sold 3,500 copies, albeit half of the projected volume).^{cix}

Throughout his career, Strand's photographs resisted topical relevance and engaged a comparatively small audience, in contrast to the photography of the Historical Section of the Resettlement Administration (1935-37) and Farm Security Administration (1937-42). Strand's work did not match the documentary criteria McCausland's definitions in a 1939 lecture at the Photo League—she situated Strand amidst masters such as Brady, Hill, Atget, Stieglitz, and Edward Weston, whilst locating Abbott and the Resettlement Administration within 'the vanguard of the present' which 'is documentary, by which we mean that it presents a well defined content, in a context of contemporaneous reality'.^{cx} Though McCausland's statement 'nor do I care for "print quality" in an esoteric religious signification' tacitly rebuked the crafted photograph as a product of the Stieglitzian Idea, equivalent to 'the school of f.64 limited to a frozen world', rather than Strand, his commitment to printing over audience maximization meant he occupied a problematic position within the documentary discourse.^{cxii} If Strand admired the photographers of the Historical Section, he found that their works suffered due to poor printing:

Perhaps because of the urgency of those years the organization of this vast work did not permit the photographers to print their own negatives, to make at least a master set of prints. I think this was a weakness. A photographer who never makes a print or an etcher who never pulls a proof is only half an artist, whose creative gift will react adversely to such restriction.^{cxii}

However, Photo League member Aaron Siskind derided Strand as ‘basically a Pictorialist’ although ‘he felt that he was a documentary photographer—or he pretended he was, or said he was. And I felt that his aesthetic was distorted’.^{cxiii} Yet Strand was fully aware that his photographs did not adhere to the agendas and tendencies of the League’s documentary work. In ‘Photography and Other Arts’, Strand praised the ‘vital documentary movement in photography’ of the 1930s that ‘far outstripped the other arts in scope and effective communication, in this period’.^{cxiv} He commended this ‘so-called documentary in photography that came out of the crisis’, which ‘was, in reality, the turning of many cameras towards the lives of people’, but did not situate himself within this company.^{cxv} Rather, he positioned himself tellingly between Stieglitz and Evans and Abbott. The latter two photographers also undertook a photographic ‘exploration’ of places, and their works, especially images of New York, drew from Atget’s urban documents.^{cxvi} Atget’s famous deadpan summation of his work as ‘simply documents that I make’ is clearly divergent from the expressivity of the Stieglitz circle.^{cxvii} Nevertheless, Strand had long argued for a type of document-oriented photography, in which Stieglitz’s legacy remained preeminent.

In 1921 Strand wrote in tribute called ‘Alfred Stieglitz and a Machine’, which accompanied an exhibition at the Anderson Galleries that brought the ‘Georgia O’Keeffe Portrait’ to the public, that: ‘He has given portraiture in any medium, the new significance of a deliberate attempt to register those forces of today whose sum constitutes an individual, whose sum therefore *documents* [my italics] the world of that individual [...] These photographs are the objective conclusions of that inquiry’.^{cxviii} In ‘Photography and the New God’, Strand claimed that the photographer as ‘the intuitive seeker of knowledge [...] has evolved through the

conscious creative control of this particular phase of the machine a new method of perceiving the life of objectivity and of recording it.’^{cxix} In the Southwest, Strand directed this inquiry towards documenting the facts of a region through its correlating facets. He began to think in terms of a project, an in-depth analysis of a place examining the equivalent residues of human and mineral life manifested in simple objects, people, and landscapes, which was a form of documentary. This project evaded the instrumental and topical variants of documentary, namely social documentary’s polemical reporting on the now. If there were more parallels with the quasi-ethnographic, Pictorialist documents of Curtis and the filmmaker Flaherty, then Strand delimited Edenic idealism, even when his covert camera with a prism lens lingered on unsuspecting and therefore ‘natural’ Mexicans, by striking a consistently sombre tone in his photographic connections—whereby a roughly rendered wooden Man of Sorrows equated the struggle of the correlating Mexican people.

If the covert camera, which Strand had first used photographing street people in New York in the 1910s, effectively rendered the photographer invisible for the moment of exposure, then Strand’s photographs were, for Clurman, fundamentally ‘impersonal’. In his 1929 *Creative Art* profile, Clurman wrote that Strand fostered an ‘impersonal’ idiom less by depicting objects ‘without comment’ but rather through an affective immersion by which the photographer merges with the photograph: ‘The artist, by a sort of sensuous sympathy with the body of his material has somehow become one with it’ and the depicted object becomes animate, ‘calmly exultant in the knowledge of its own consummate organism’. The American House silently and nobly weathering in time amidst the indifferent, indestructible Rockies faces the viewer as ‘a record of heroism’ in an ‘age-long struggle’. The paradoxical ‘impersonality’ and ‘heroism’ of Strand’s photography, as impersonal and

unsentimental yet sensuous and deep, and suffused with sadness.^{cxx} In Strand's works, '[...] there is something in these photographs that no definition of their aesthetic qualities can state. A sadness emanates from all, a sadness that seems a very part of their composition, and which Strand has given its most direct visual expression in his photographs of rocks'.^{cxxi} It was the melancholy recognition of the fundamental distinctness of an object, of forces impervious to the life and times of an individual.

In 1971 Strand explained to Milton Brown how Clurman's Group Theatre had mentored the Nykino film outfit: 'stimulated by the Group Theatre, [Nykino] had been brought into contact with the theories and methods of Stanislavsky and found them useful in trying to work out some of the problems of film which they had been running into in the documentary form'.^{cxxii} I suggest that a similar process had occurred in the early 1930s, when Clurman helped Strand to clarify his conception of photography, as he broke from the Stieglitz Circle, as a topological, temporal form of documentary that imparted no dogma but imputed a type of 'revolt'. In a letter of 1934, Clurman defined the difference between Stieglitz and Strand:

In Stieglitz there is no revolt, no social attitude: always spontaneous acceptance, unquestioning, for what is there. In you (your photographs) the object is seen as having a distinct but separate life of its own—and a very powerful immovable life, untouched and untouchable by man. This may lead to a view of the object as a kind of gloomy fate—and create a kind of hopelessness, which you never never whine about, but which leads to a kind of "morose heroism" (as I put it in the note in *Creative Art*).^{cxxiii}

Clurman conjoined this 'morose heroism' with Strand's need for collective engagement, and remarked that Strand's Group engagement involved understanding

that ‘Art as a means in the struggle, as an integral part of the struggle’—albeit absenting particular struggles, such as the forces that formed ghost towns or the ongoing crises in Southwestern mining communities.^{cxxiv} The trading of the everyday for an emphatic presentness as a condensation of history, the deep time richly manifested in the materiality of the print, might help render the pictures timeless, or less ‘dated’ than, say, photojournalism. They are nonetheless curious historical documents, offering scant information about the places, but resonate their essences through close scrutiny of details of diverse yet equivalent objects forged over time, as constellated elements within a group. In the Southwest, and other environs thereafter, Strand sacrificed momentary trenchancy, and with it instrumentality, to expose time’s effects in the constituent parts of a place, as analogues of an ‘age-long struggle’.

I would like to thank Dawn Wilson for comments on a draft of this article. Thanks also to Leslie Squyres and Emily Una Weirich at the Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, Arizona, and the staff at the Beinicke Library, Yale University.

ⁱ Harold Clurman to Paul Strand, 16 June 1933. Paul Strand Papers, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, A.Z., AG17 14/15; the term ‘transition years’ refers to Steve Yates, ‘The Transition Years: New Mexico’, in Maren Stange, ed., *Paul Strand: Essays on His Life and Work*, Millerton, N.Y., 1991, 87-99.

ⁱⁱⁱⁱ Harold Clurman, Untitled Manuscript, Paul Strand Papers, Box 7 AG 17 11/6. The text is unattributed with a verso note stating ‘writer not remembered’, though the text was certainly by Clurman, as it appears in the 1933 Sala de Arte catalogue. See note 5.

ⁱⁱⁱ Harold Clurman, 'Photographs by Paul Strand', *Creative Art*, October 1929, 735-737.

^{iv} Rebecca Buselle, ed., *Paul Strand: Southwest*, Millerton, N.Y., 2005.

^v See *Paul Strand: A Retrospective Monograph, the Years 1915-1968*, New York, 1971; Calvin Tomkins, *Paul Strand: Sixty Years of Photographs*, Millerton N.Y., 1976.

^{vi} Stephanie Schwartz, 'Writing After', 'Modernism After Paul Strand', *Oxford Art Journal*, 38:1, 2015, 8.

^{vii} Jorge Ribalta, 'The Strand Symptom: A Modernist Disease?', *Oxford Art Journal*, 38:1, 2015, 55-72.

^{viii} William Stott, *Documentary Expression and Thirties America*, New York, 1973, 21

^{ix} John Grierson, 'Flaherty's Poetic *Moana*', *The New York Sun*, 8 February 1926, reprinted in Lewis Jacobs, ed., *The Documentary Tradition*, New York, 1979, 25.

^x John Grierson, 'First Principles of Documentary' (1934), in Forsyth Hardy, ed., *Grierson on Documentary*, London, 1966, 151.

^{xi} Grierson, 'First Principles', 151.

^{xii} Allan Sekula, 'On the Invention of Photographic Meaning', in Victor Burgin, ed., *Thinking Photography*, London, 1982, 106.

^{xiii} Olivier Lugon, '“Documentary”: Authority and Ambiguities', in Maria Lind and Hito Steyerl, eds., *The Green Room: Reconsidering the Documentary and Contemporary Art*, Berlin, 2009, 29.

^{xiv} Lincoln Kirstein, 'Walker Evans' Photographs of Victorian Architecture', *Museum*

of *Modern Art Bulletin*, December 1933, 4.

^{xv} Lola Ridge, 'Paul Strand', *Creative Art*, October 1931, 313.

^{xvi} Gaston Lachaise, 'Paul Strand: New Photographs', New York: The Intimate Gallery, ex. cat., 1929, Alfred Stieglitz/Georgia O'Keeffe Archive, Yale University, Box 118 Folder 2404, n.p.

^{xvii} Salvador Dali, 'Review of Antiartistic Tendencies', *L'Amic de les Arts*, 31 March 1929, reprinted in Haim Finkelstein, ed. and trans., *The Collected Writings of Salvador Dali*, Cambridge, 1998, 104.

^{xviii} John McPhee, *Basin and Range*, New York, 1982, 21.

^{xix} *Fotografía Paul Strand: Exposición de la Obra del Artista Norteamericano*, ex. cat., Mexico City: Sala de Arte, 1933, n.p.

^{xx} Nancy Newhall, 'Paul Strand', unpublished interview notes, 1944, Beaumont and Nancy Newhall Papers, 1843-1993, The Getty Research Institute, 5.

^{xxi} Harold Clurman to Paul Strand, 28 February 1933, Paul Strand Papers, AG17 14/15.

^{xxii} Clurman to Strand, 28 February 1933.

^{xxiii} Elizabeth McCausland to Paul Strand, 8/4/32, Paul Strand Papers, AG17 17/22a.

^{xxiv} Paul Strand to Ansel Adams, 14/9/1933, in Buselle, ed., *Paul Strand: Southwest*, 96.

^{xxv} Alfred Stieglitz to Rebecca Salsbury, 22 December 1933, Stieglitz/ O'Keeffe Archive, Box 26 Folder 614.

^{xxvi} Paul Strand to Kurt and Isabel Baasch. 17 December 1933, Kurt and Isabel Baasch Papers, Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, A. Z., AG137, Folder 2.

^{xxvii} Harold Clurman to Paul Strand, 2/1/34, Paul Strand Papers, AG17 14/14b.

-
- ^{xxviii} Harold Clurman, 'The Group Theatre', *Daily Worker*, 3 October 1933, in Marjorie Loggia and Glenn Young (eds.), *The Collected Works of Harold Clurman: Six Decades of Commentary on Theatre, Dance, Music, Film, Arts, and Letters* (Tonbridge, 1994), 1022.
- ^{xxix} Harold Clurman to Paul Strand, 2 January 1934. Paul Strand Papers, AG17 14/14b.
- ^{xxx} Paul Strand to Kurt and Isabel Baasch, 17 December 1933, AG137, Folder 2, Kurt and Isabel Baasch Papers.
- ^{xxxi} Strand to Kurt and Isabel Baasch, 17 December 1933.
- ^{xxxii} Andrew Hemingway, 'Paul Strand and Twentieth-Century Americanism: Varieties of Romantic Anti-Capitalism', *Oxford Art Journal*, 38:1, 2015, 37–53.
- ^{xxxiii} Strand to Kurt and Isabel Baasch, 17 December 1933.
- ^{xxxiv} Paul Strand, 'Photography and the New God', *Broom*, November 1922, 255.
- ^{xxxv} John Dewey, *How We Think*, Lexington, M.A., 1910, 173.
- ^{xxxvi} Paul Strand to Henry Allen Moe, Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, 15 October 1943, Paul Strand Papers, Box 7 AG 17 11/6.
- ^{xxxvii} Nancy Newhall, *Paul Strand: Photographs 1915-1945*, New York, 1945, 6.
- ^{xxxviii} Paul Strand to Alfred Stieglitz, 13 July 1926, Stieglitz/ O'Keeffe Archive, Box 48 Folder 1143.
- ^{xxxix} Strand to Stieglitz, 13 July 1926.
- ^{xl} Elizabeth McCausland, *Paul Strand*, Springfield, M.A., 1933, n.p.
- ^{xli} Charles Lummis, *The Land of Poco Tiempo*, New York, 1893, 3.
- ^{xlii} Lummis, *The Land of Poco Tiempo*, 3.
- ^{xliii} Lummis, *The Land of Poco Tiempo*, 4-5.
- ^{xliv} Harold Clurman to Paul Strand, 21/11/1932, Paul Strand Papers, AG17 14/15.

^{xlv} Belinda Rathbone, 'Portrait of a Marriage: Paul Strand's Photographs of Rebecca', *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal*, vol. 17, 1989, 97.

^{xlvi} Paul Strand to Alfred Stieglitz, 24/8/1930, Stieglitz/ O'Keeffe Archive, Box 48 Folder 1145.

^{xlvii} Strand to Stieglitz, 24 August 1930.

^{xlviii} Paul Strand, Interview with Milton Brown, typescript, 1971, Paul Strand Papers AG17/37, 24-5.

^{xlix} Strand to Stieglitz, 24 August 1930.

^l Mary Austin, *Taos Pueblo* [1930], Boston, 1977, 4.

^{li} Elizabeth McCausland, *Paul Strand*, self-published, 1933, n.p.

^{lii} Elizabeth McCausland, 'The Camera's Vindication: Paul Strand's Photographs Show Medium's Possibilities', *Springfield Sunday Union and Republican*, 17 April 1932, Paul Strand Papers, AG17/ 7.

^{liii} Katherine Grant Sterne, 'Film Overtones', *New York Times*, 16 April 1932, p. 13.

^{liv} *Fotografia Paul Strand*, n.p.

^{lv} I base this deduction on a photograph in Denver Library of St. Elmo, Colorado that marks out the American House Hotel:

<http://digital.denverlibrary.org/cdm/singleitem/collection/p15330coll22/id/12518/rec/>
15.

^{lvi} See:

<http://digital.denverlibrary.org/cdm/singleitem/collection/p15330coll22/id/12456/rec/>
14

^{lvii} See Stewart H. Holbrook, *The Rocky Mountain Revolution*, New York, 1956.

^{lviii} George J. Saul, 'The Colorado Battle Line', *Labor Defender*, December 1927, 179.

^{lix} Elizabeth McCausland to Paul Strand, 15/4/ 1932, AG17 17/22a, Paul Strand

Papers.

^{lx} Max Eastman, 'Class War in Colorado', *The Masses*, June 1914, 6.

^{lxi} Leon Metz, *John Wesley Hardin: Dark Angel of Texas*, El Paso, T.X.: Mangan Books, 1986, 69-70.

^{lxii} Paul Strand to John Marin, 7 August 1931 in Busselle, *Paul Strand: Southwest*, 95.

^{lxiii} Paul Strand to Herbert Seligman, 29 July 1931 in Busselle, *Paul Strand:*

Southwest, 97.

^{lxiv} Paul Strand to Philip "Ted" Stevenson, Taos 1932, in Busselle, *Paul Strand:*

Southwest, 101.

^{lxv} Wolfgang Kemp, 'Images of Decay: Photography in the Picturesque Tradition',

trans. Joyce Rheuban, *October*, 54, Autumn, 1990, 131.

^{lxvi} Andreas Huyssen, 'Authentic Ruins: Products of Modernity', in Julia Hell and Andreas Schönle, eds., *Ruins of Modernity*, London: Duke University Press, 2010, 20.

^{lxvii} Huyssen, 'Authentic Ruins', 20.

^{lxviii} George Steinmetz, 'Colonial Melancholy and Fordist Nostalgia: the Ruinscapes of Numibia and Detroit', in Hell and Schönle, eds., *Ruins of Modernity*, 299.

^{lxix} Paul Strand, 'A Picture Book For Elders', *The Saturday Review of Literature*, December 12 1931, 372.

^{lxx} Strand, 'A Picture Book For Elders', 372.

^{lxxi} Strand, 'A Picture Book For Elders', 372.

^{lxxii} *Fotografia Paul Strand*, n.p.

^{lxxiii} Harold Clurman to Paul Strand, 28 February 1933, Paul Strand Papers, AG17 14/15.

^{lxxiv} Paul Strand to Alfred Stieglitz, 5 February 1933, Stieglitz/ O'Keeffe Archive, Box 48 Folder 1145.

^{lxxv} Paul Strand, 'To the Editor of *Art Front*', draft letter 1937, Paul Strand Papers, AG 17 7/3.

^{lxxvi} Strand, 'To the Editor of *Art Front*'.

^{lxxvii} Paul Strand, 'Photography', *Seven Arts*, August 1917, 525.

^{lxxviii} Strand might have read about Atget in the *New York Times* in articles from December 1928 onwards: R.G.H. (Ruth Green Harris) 'Photography in Paris', *New York Times*, 16 December 1928, XX, 13; Anna Herendeen, 'Paris and its Soul: A Magical Record', *New York Times*, 30 June 1929, V, 13 and 23.

^{lxxix} Berenice Abbott, 'Eugène Atget', *Creative Art*, September 1929, 651-656; *Atget: Photographe de Paris*, Henri Jonquieres/New York: E. Weyhe Gallery, 1930.

^{lxxx} Naomi Rosenblum, 'Paul Strand: The Early Years, 1910-1932', PhD Thesis, New York: City University of New York, 1978, 196.

^{lxxxii} John Raeburn, *A Staggering Revolution: A Cultural History of Thirties Photography*, Chicago, 2006, 21.

^{lxxxii} 'The Week in New York: A Roster of Recently Opened Shows', *New York Times*, 21 February 1932, 148; 'To the Art Editor', *New York Times*, 28 February 1932, 160.

^{lxxxiii} Paul Strand, 'Photography and Other Arts', Museum of Modern Art lecture notes, 1944, Paul Strand Collection, AG17 4/10, 8.

^{lxxxiv} David Company, 'Eugène Atget's Intelligent Documents', *Atget, photographe de Paris*, reprint *New York: Errata*, 2008, n.p.

^{lxxxv} Ribalta, 'The Strand Symptom', 60.

^{lxxxvi} Tucker, 'Strand as Mentor', in Stange, ed., *Paul Strand*, 122-136.

^{lxxxvii} Ribalta, 'The Strand Symptom', 70.

^{lxxxviii} See Stephanie Schwartz, 'Paul Strand's Living Labor', *ARTMargins*, 2:3, 2013, 3-30.

^{lxxxix} Peter Barberie, 'Paul Strand's Modernity', in Peter Barberie and Amanda N. Bock, eds., *Paul Strand: Master of Modern Photography*, Philadelphia, P.A., 2014, 2.

^{xc} Paul Strand, quoted in Calvin Tompkins, *Paul Strand: Sixty Years of Photographs*, Millerton, N.Y., 1976, 35.

^{xcⁱ} John Berger, 'Paul Strand', 1972, *Selected Essays of John Berger*, Geoff Dyer, ed., New York: Vintage, 2001, 285.

^{xcⁱⁱ} Strand, 'To the Editor of *Art Front*'.

^{xcⁱⁱⁱ} Paul Strand, *Photographs of People by Morris Engel: A Statement*, exhibition flyer, New York: New School for Social Research, 1939, n.p.

^{xc^{iv}} Strand, *Photographs of People*, n.p.

^{xc^v} Paul Strand to Kurt Baasch, 1930s, Paul Strand Collection, AG137, Folder 2.

^{xc^{vi}} Paul Strand to Kurt and Isabel Baasch, 29 June 1931, Kurt Baasch Papers, AG137, Folder 3.

^{xc^{vii}} Walter Benjamin, 'Little History of Photography' (1931), *Selected Writings: Volume 2 1927-1934*, Michael W. Jennings, Howard Eiland, and Gary Smith, eds., Rodney Livingstone, trans., Cambridge, M.A, 1999, 517.

^{xc^{viii}} Strand, 'A Picture Book for Elders', 372.

^{xc^{ix}} Benjamin, 'Little History of Photography', 514.

^c Ridge, 'Paul Strand', 313.

^{ci} Thierry De Duve, 'Time Exposure and Snapshot: the Photograph as Paradox', *October*, vol. 5, 1978, 118.

-
- ^{cii} De Duve, 'Time Exposure', 119.
- ^{ciii} Sekula, 'On the Invention of Photographic Meaning', 93.
- ^{civ} Strand, 'Photography and Other Arts', 4.
- ^{cv} Paul Strand to Samuel Kootz, 11 September 1931, Stieglitz/ O'Keeffe Archive, Box 48 Folder 1145.
- ^{cvi} Paul Strand, 'Plans for Work', Application to the Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, 1940, Paul Strand Collection, Box 7 AG 17 11/16.
- ^{cvi} Strand, 'Plans for Work'.
- ^{cvi} Elizabeth McCausland, 'Paul Strand's Series of "Photographs of Mexico"', *The Springfield Sunday Union and Republican*, July 7 1940, 8.
- ^{cix} Nancy Newhall to Paul Strand, 6 March 1951, Paul Strand Collection, AG17 18/10.
- ^{cx} Elizabeth McCausland, 'Documentary Photography', Manuscript, Lecture Delivered at the Photo League, New York, 27 July 1938, in *Jorge Ribalta (ed.), The Worker Photography Movement (1926–1939): Essays and Documents, Madrid, 2011, 341.*
- ^{cx} McCausland, 'Documentary Photography', 343.
- ^{cxii} Paul Strand, 'Photography and Other Arts', 11.
- ^{cxiii} Barbara Shikler, 'Oral history interview with Aaron Siskind, 1982 September 28–October 2', <https://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/interviews/oral-history-interview-aaron-siskind-13045>.
- ^{cxiv} Strand, 'Photography and Other Arts', 11.
- ^{cxv} Strand, 'Photography and Other Arts', 10.
- ^{cxvi} Strand, 'Photography and Other Arts', 8.

Formatted: Font: (Asian) Times, Italic, Complex Script
Font: Times New Roman, 10 pt, English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: Font: (Asian) Times, Complex Script
Font: Times New Roman, 10 pt, English (United Kingdom)

Formatted: Font: Italic

^{cxvii} Cited in Ian Walker, *City Gorged with Dreams: Surrealism and Documentary Photography in Interwar Paris*, 2002, 98.

^{cxviii} Paul Strand, *Alfred Stieglitz and a Machine*, New York, 1921, n.p.

^{cxix} Strand, 'Photography and the New God', 257-8

^{cxx} Clurman, 'Photographs by Paul Strand', 736.

^{cxxi} Clurman, 'Photographs by Paul Strand', 736.

^{cxxii} Strand, interview with Milton Brown, 34.

^{cxxiii} Harold Clurman to Paul Strand, 2 January 1934, Paul Strand Collection, AG17 14/14b.

^{cxxiv} Clurman to Strand, 2 January 1934.