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Abstract

This text is concerned with the origin of documentary photography, and its relation to urban space and archival institutions. In order to examine the interrelations between the three, two conjunctures have been identified – that of Paris post-Haussmannisation in early 20th century and Glasgow mid-slam clearance in mid-19th century.

First, this project argues for the significance of the relationship between the structural logic of space and visibility in relation to photography. In order to demonstrate this, a notion of the photographic city is put forward as the idea that modern Western cities are constructed on principles of transparency, order, and legibility, which not only facilitated modern photography, but also, in turn, allowed it to reproduce the city as exemplary of those same principles. Second, a discussion of documentary photography, through the analysis of archived photographs by Eugène Atget of Paris (examined in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London) and by Thomas Annan of Glasgow (examined in the Mitchell Library in Glasgow), will be provided. The photographs comprising the two case studies will be examined in a threefold manner: first, as images; second, as material products of a practice; and third, as institutional documents. Third, the production of photographs as documentary will be related to a theoretical discussion of photography as a spatial practice by drawing on the work of Henri Lefebvre. It will be argued that documentary photography is a practice of producing knowledge of and meaning about the space being documented, and thus it will be demonstrated that both photographers engaged in practices of appropriating the space they are representing. Finally, a theoretical argument will be defended for the photographic production of space.

Ultimately, this project puts forward an argument for considering the spatial practices that constitute documentary photography, while engaging with photographs and their production, storage, and interpretation.
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Chapter One: Introduction

This doctoral research project originated in a concern with documentary photography and the open-ended questions of its practice. In the period of writing, however, the focus shifted to documentary photography itself as a question. Namely, what makes an image a documentary photograph? With this question at the core of the research, corollary concerns emerged. Having identified two significant points of origin, at which images were both called ‘documentary photographs’ and were made to do documentary work, this project’s scope expanded in order to take into account the importance of the city - the content to be documented - and the archive - the site that manages what is being documented, how, and for what reason.

At the core of this project is the question: how is an image produced as a documentary photograph? On a foundational level, it is assumed that photography is a practice, and it is a productive one. In other words, documentary photography consists of various meaning making practices that produce an image as a documentary photograph. In order to explore the network of meaning making practices of documentary photography, this doctoral project has identified two photographic collections of interest. The two photographers, Eugène Atget and Thomas Annan, are proposed as two case studies that can provide rich insight into the domain; these two cases studies are at the centre of the programme of research that makes up this doctoral project. These are the photographic works of Atget (1853-1927) in Paris, France and Annan (1829-1887) in Glasgow, Scotland. Due to the focus of the research on the two photographers and their practice of documenting the cities in which they worked, this project will also explore the relations between sociology and the modern city, documentary projects and urban space, and institutional curation and documentary photography.

The research undertaken is a sociological inquiry on archived photographic data. The archival photographic data that have been analysed are institutional documents, photographic prints, digital images, and online catalogues of the relevant archival institutions. The study was conducted in
an archival context at two institutions - the Victoria and Albert Museum in London and its collection of the work of Eugène Atget and the Mitchell Library in Glasgow and its collection of Thomas Annan’s work. In both cases, photographic collections have been the key locus of research, but emergent forms of data have also been analysed such as institutional documents. A more thorough discussion of the methodological concerns will be provided in the methodological chapter of this project (Chapter Three: Methodology).

This project seeks to understand the practices of meaning production involved in documentary photography from a sociological perspective. The link between the two fields of documentary photography and sociology is present in the literature (Becker, 1974; Harper, 2002; Hamilton, 1997), yet remains to an extent under-explored. Documentary photography is a field with many relations to social issues (Bogre, 2011) and has been, throughout history, linked with sociological inquiries (Becker, 1974; 1995; Harper, 2002; 2003; Freund, 1980). Sociology, due to its academic character, has been framed exclusively as a social science, thus effectively excluding non-textual forms of evidence for the majority of its existence (Prosser and Loxley, 2008). Unfortunately, this has led to a marginalisation of visual culture in the discipline, and what can be criticised as an under-utilization of its methods in the social sciences (Harper, 2002; 2003). The strongest bonds between the two fields appear to be the persistent borrowing and lending - most often expressed in documentary photography’s mobilisation of its sociological character as a claim for truth and in sociology’s selection of photography as an additional method for conducting its inquiries. This relationship, although apparently beneficial and without major conflicts (Bogre, 2011; Hamilton, 1997), has left certain elements of both unknown to the other.

It is this doctoral project’s goal to avoid approaches that focus only on particular elements of the practice of documentary photography. Rather than emphasising technology over aesthetics or vice versa, this project intends to examine the domain of documentary photography as a whole. In the frame of this project, this manifests in the exploration of the relation between documentary photography and the environment of an image’s
production, storage, and interpretation. This, in turn, results in a project that will examine the photographs as images, as material objects, and as institutional documents. Although by no means accounting for the entirety of the field of documentary photography, this project’s findings are intended to speak beyond their immediate context.

In addition to the tripartite structure of image-materiality-document, this project has engaged in a theoretical exploration of the relations between documentary photography and the city and archive. This is a theme that is evident throughout the thesis (for instance, see Chapter Two: Documentary Photography and the City), but is most clearly expressed in the penultimate chapter (Chapter Six: The Photographic Production of Space), where a theoretical discussion is provided of both photographers’ photographic practice in relation to Lefebvre’s work on the social production of space.

This doctoral project is a research programme that has been conducted in the field of sociology. It is indebted to several theoretical and methodological frameworks – such as that of urban cultural studies, archival research, and visual culture/studies; by borrowing and adapting from the different fields, the research conducted will contribute to debates in sociology, archival studies, urban cultural studies, and visual culture. Additionally, this project’s findings could also contribute to the field of documentary photography and the existing understanding of the field as a genre, paradigm, and sub-field of photographic theory.

In this chapter, I will first introduce the relation between sociology and photography. Second, I will provide a brief overview of the two photographers of interest. Third, I will note the importance of the city to both photographers through the particular examples of Paris and Glasgow. Fourth, I will note historical aspects of the two case studies. Fifth, I will introduce the problem domain in particular – documentary photography. Sixth, I will briefly speak to the Archives relevant for both case studies. Seventh, and finally, I will provide an overview of this project’s structure.

1.1. Sociology and Photography

The connection between photography and sociology has been often noted by researchers and photographers alike (Bazin, 1960; Becker, 1974;
At times, there is a tendency in writing on the topic to separate photography and sociology under the assumption that they are useful to each other, but compatible only in certain cases. For instance, Clive Scott (1999: 101) refers to sociology as a kind of deus ex machina when discussing media use of photography. According to Scott (1999), terms such as ‘psycho-sociology’ are used as vague evocations to a discipline outside the domain of photography, in order to delimit the explicatory power of an image or its use. In such cases, ‘sociology’ is cited as an external, but nevertheless valid and relevant, reference point that can add something to the photographic medium. Examples that are more classical include the work of Walter Benjamin (1979) or Susan Sontag (1979), both of whom have argued that captioning is the only way in which a photograph can be made to keep its political significance. At the core of such perspectives, lies an assumption of the ‘docility’ of the photograph (Barthes, 2001: 43) that needs to be reined in and delimited by an external boundary. Alternatively, the photograph must be made to function in a completely separate domain, where it is no longer only a photograph, but something else or more than itself.

Other perspectives outline the extension of sociology that photography can facilitate, or in other words, mediate (Couldry and Hepp, 2017). Such a perspective in one of its basic forms can be traced back to Marshall McLuhan’s work (1964) on media as sensory ‘extensions’ of an individual, thus providing one with access to information beyond a closed system of
knowledge. However, similar views can also be found in a modified form in contemporary writing on visual sociology. Examples include Douglas Harper’s work on photo-elicitation (2002) as a method for conducting sociological research. There is also the recurring comparison of documentary photography and visual sociology, more particularly visual ethnography (Rose, 2007; but also Becker, 1974; Mannay, 2010; Harper, 2002; and others). In such examples, there appears the implicit conviction that a visual element, once added onto sociological inquiry, could reveal hitherto unexplored depths. For example, photo-elicitation is perceived as an emancipatory research method that allows the researcher to:

‘evokes deeper elements of human consciousness [than] do words; exchanges based on words alone utilize less of the brain’s capacity than do exchanges in which the brain is processing images as well as words’ (Harper, 2002: 13)

Such an argument, however, does not seem to abandon the textual basis of sociology, but only proposes to extend or enrich it. As such, it perpetuates the discipline’s underlying presupposition of logocentrism, understood by Jacques Derrida (1997: 3) as ‘the metaphysics of phonetic writing’ and all that it carries. According to Derrida (1997: 3), logocentrism pertains to the concept of writing but also the history of metaphysics. In other words, logocentrism is at the very heart of:

‘the history of truth, of the truth of truth, has always been […] the debasement of writing, and its repression outside “full” speech.’

(Derrida, 1997: 3)

Moreover, logocentrism is related to the concept of science, i.e. logos, as well as what makes up logic. That is to say, at the risk of simplifying the complexity of Derrida’s argument for the purposes of this project, the concept of writing is intertwined with the historical process of writing things down, as well as the constitution of what is considered writable or valuable when written down (Peim, 2005).

The critique of logocentrism is pertinent here in relation to the historical privilege of text in the social sciences at the expense of the image and the visual. This tends to lead to putting the visual - or in this case photography -
at the service of the supposedly more scientific, more logical domain of written words. In the case of visual ethnography, photography is seen as a tool for visualisation, and therefore as a tool for providing evidence (for example, see Harper, 2003: 242). Other examples of this include framing certain thinkers as photographic. A good example of this is Susan Buck-Morss’ (1989) claim that Walter Benjamin writes in a photographic, vignette-like manner. Such claims are not unsubstantiated – they are highly indicative of the kind of relations seemingly separate fields have. Another example of this is Andreas Huyssen’s Miniature Metropolis (2015) in which he changes the direction of remediation originally formulated by Bolter and Grusin (2000). Huyssen (2015) argues that literature, at the time of photography’s peak in popularity, was emulating certain characteristics of cinema and photography, such as ephemerality, fragmentation, and the sensible. Such examples serve to show that photography, similarly to sociology, is often seen as a complementary tool, a method to fill in blanks and build on core knowledge of the respective discipline.

Lefebvre, however, has been persistently critical of photography and its potential for understanding social issues\(^1\) (1991a; 1991b). According to him:

“The predominance of visualization […] serves to conceal repetitiveness. People look, and take sight, take seeing, for life itself” (Lefebvre, 1991: 75-76, emphasis added)

In Lefebvre’s view, the visual, and this includes documentary photography, presents only images of the surfaces of things (1991a). For Lefebvre, photographs and photography can offer little to critical inquiry. Moreover,

---

\(^1\) Interestingly, Harper (2003: 242) goes through a list of social theorists, such as Engels, Durkheim and Simmel, who did not seem to consider using ‘the extraordinary potential of the camera to seek exemplification of theories in the observed world’, taking the assumption of the enriching potential of photography as a given. This perspective, unfortunately, tends to obscure the prevalent during the Enlightenment criticism of the image – for instance, Sontag cites Feuerbach (1979: 119) that society at his time ‘prefers the image to the thing, the copy to the original, the representation to the reality, appearance to being’.

\(^2\) According to Lefebvre (1991b: 32), photography is strongly connected to contemporary capitalism: ‘On a higher level, leisure involves passive attitudes. Someone sitting in front of a cinema screen offers an example and a common model of this passivity, the potentially ‘alienating’ nature of which is immediately apparent. It is particularly easy to exploit these attitudes commercially. Finally, on the highest level of all, leisure produces active attitudes, very specialised personal occupations, linked to techniques and consequently involving a technical element independent of any professional specialization (photography, for example). This is a cultivated or cultural leisure’ (emphasis added).
Lefebvre tends to understand photography as simply a tool that can be used to reinforce errors and illusions already existing in society and space. As such, documentary photography is central to what Lefebvre terms the modernist triad of ‘readability-visibility-intelligibility’ in which ‘many errors [and] many lies’ have their root (Lefebvre, 1991a: 96).

There is the issue at the core of the fields of sociology and photography. Sociology tends to consider photography as problematic in its ostensible transparency (see Sontag, 1979; Barthes, 2001), while documentary photography tends to understand social science as unnecessarily opaque (Bogre, 2011). However, both fields tend to identify their purposes as similar. For instance, there is a certain tendency to talk about the public aspects of both disciplines, as noted by Howard S. Becker (1974). If a public sociology can be understood as an effort to relate the discipline beyond the relatively small circle of practitioners, then it could be said that there is a clear element of communication to non-practitioners that is seen as important. Similarly, in the case of photography, there are many examples, in which innovations in the technical medium have been treated as scientific breakthroughs. Examples of this can be the multitude of lectures given in the original period of photography – such as those by J.L.M. Daguerre, William Fox Henry Talbot, Francois Arago, John Herschel, and others (see Marien, 1997; 2010). Other examples are those such as Eadweard Muybridge’s work (Solnit, 2004). Muybridge himself saw a need to lecture on his photographic discoveries of human and animal movement because of public curiosity (Solnit, 2004).

Additionally, many sources make their discussion’s starting point the fact that sociology and photography originate approximately in the same period (see Kracauer, 1960). The first form of photography as a codified, reproducible method is daguerréotypie in 1839 (Marien, 1997; 2010), and sociology dates back to Auguste Comte’s formulation (1988) of a positive philosophy in the 1830s and 40s. Furthermore, there are additional similarities that should be emphasised. First, there is the issue of Comte’s

---

3 This is not to say that they are not, but that there is significance to what knowledge is privileged as scientific and what is not.
glorification of positivism, what has been described as a view of ‘methodological monism’ (von Wright as cited in Adorno, 1977: xii). The view that Comte’s formulation of sociology and positive philosophy in general revolves around a strict codification of ‘methodological rules’ is common (Adorno, 1977). Furthermore, this ‘methodological monism’ (von Wright as cited in Adorno, 1977: xii) is in direct opposition to the eclectic and varied subject matter of sociology – namely, society, social agents, structures, and relations. This, according to Adorno (2000: 8), is at the root of sociology’s inherent ‘inhomogeneity’ and amorphousness. Photography is similarly placed in a singular position: in terms of technology, the camera; in terms of practice, the photographer is positioned alone against the environment to be photographed; and so on. From a sociological perspective, it is interesting to note the various genre-specific, as well as eclectic, aesthetic codifications inherent to photography that serve as a set of methodological rules (for example, see Campbell, 2014). Second, there is also the historical root of Comte’s formulation of positive philosophy. Sociology, as the latest and last science, is in a unique position to draw on all accumulated knowledge acquired through positive science (Comte, 1988). Such a view is clearly historicist and subscribes to a teleological view of progress, where the passing of time signifies a growth in complexity and accumulation of knowledge (Adorno, 2000; Kracauer, 1995). As Kracauer (1995) points out, it is no accident that photography and historicism date their beginning to the same period. The photograph, it has been noted, carries the illusion of ‘an absolute fidelity to everything and an emphasis upon nothing’ (Gilloch, 2015: 35).

The problems described in both photography and sociology could be said to arise out of the dual character of each discipline. As Adorno (2002) comments on the state of sociology in the work of Comte, the chief problem of the positive philosopher’s perspective is the reification of the subject matter of sociology – society itself. Due to its relatively unique subject matter as a discipline, it deals with society and the social as both object and subject. According to Adorno (2000: 32), the solution for this problematic perspective is a dialectical theory that allows the researcher to ‘engage with the subject matter itself’. At its core, such a theory requires
a perspective where society is not treated as an object, but as a subject. In other words, sociology and society are interwoven, and one cannot know one without the other – they dialectically mediate each other, as well as being mediated in a particular historical (Adorno, 2000), spatial (Lefebvre, 1991a; Soja, 2010), or social context (Bogre, 2011).

This opposition between subject and object is also present in photography, and several thinkers believe it to be central to the practice (Baudrillard, 2000; Burgin, 1982). This opposition of subject/object can best be understood from a perspective critical of its distribution of agency. Rosler (1982: 81) has aptly summarized the common notion of documentary photography as:

‘a fiery pencil that with flash and flare inscribed into the historical and journalistic record as well as into the consciences of the “comfortable” classes, the image of the previously unphotographed poor’.

It is on the basis of this that this research project will operate with the definition of documentary photography as a practice that is, according to Rosler (2004: 263), ‘[transmitting] (old) information about a group of powerless people to another group addressed as socially powerful’. Moreover, Solomon-Godeau (1991: 173) adds to this that documentary photography should be understood ‘within the framework of reformist or ameliorative intent’ and, as such, it encompasses issues such as ‘public address, reception, dissemination, […] etc’. Bogre (2011), more recently, has made the argument that documentary photography is the convergence of photographic practice with socially motivated activism. Interestingly, Becker (1974: 3) has noted that ‘[t]he American journal of Sociology routinely ran photographs in connection with its muckraking reformist articles’. Documentary photography is generally considered a reformist and activist practice (Bogre, 2011). In the case that it does not aim for direct reform or policy change, however, it still does borrow on the same liberal values, aesthetics of compassion, and access to a new form of knowledge (see Bogre, 2011; Rosler, 1982; 2004; Sekula, 2016). On the basis of this socially conscious and conscience-oriented definition, the domain
of documentary photography will be discussed, and the key literature on it will be outlined in Chapter Two: Documentary Photography and the City.

1.2. The Photographers

The two photographers examined in this project stand at the centre of the issues described above. As pioneers of documentary photography, their work was inevitably tied to the modern city, the archive, and the positivist underpinnings of the Enlightenment – just like Sociology. Each of these aspects mediate each other, and cannot be understood in isolation.

Eugène Atget’s work is significant due to its pioneering status in the domain of documentary photography. It has been noted that Atget ‘gave photography its full potential as an art in its own right’ (Abbott, 1964: vii), and that all photographers that came after him had to define themselves in reference to him (Nesbit, 1998). According to Walter Benjamin, ‘[w]ith Atget, photographic records begin to be evidence’ (2006a: 258). While most documentary photography at the time was toposographical in character and focused primarily on architecture (Perego, 1998; Sramek, 2013), Atget’s work included ornamental detail, churches, palaces, and the newly built boulevards of Haussmann. His fame grew only after his passing in 1927, leading to a series of reviews and commentaries that remain influential as first engagements with his work (see Desnos, 1928; Valentin, 1928; Mac Orlan, 1930; Benjamin, 1935). Photographers (Szarkowski, 1985), surrealists (Durden, 2013; Walker, 2002), and painters (Dyer, 2012a) were all reportedly influenced by him. Unsurprisingly, the interpretations of Atget’s work are multiple – he is attributed with feats such as being ‘the first surrealist’ or a proto-surrealist (Benjamin, 1979), creating the ‘artistic document’ (Walker, 2002; Nesbit, 1998); being inherently modern and modernist, as well as being naïve (MacFarlane, 2010; Walker, 2002), ingenious, and/or craftsman-like (Nesbit, 1998). He is an intriguing figure to use as a case study, precisely because of the discourse placing him as the pioneer in the domain of documentary photography (for example, see Nesbit, 1998; Freund, 1980).

Thomas Annan’s work is significant due to its pioneering status in several aspects of the domain of documentary photography. He was involved in
the documentation of the ‘slum clearance’ of the central area of Glasgow (Tagg, 1988). His work was tied to the Glasgow City Improvement Trust, and he was involved in the history of the city of Glasgow as well as the technological and aesthetic development of photographic practice in Scotland as a whole (Gossman, 2015; Stevenson, 1990). Despite this, Annan remains a somewhat under-explored figure and his presence in many books on documentary photography is limited to not more than one or two paragraphs on his work (see Marien, 1997; 2010; Frizot, 1998; Hacking, 2012). Nevertheless, Annan remains an important figure in the history of photography, both in his knowledge of novel photographic techniques at the time, his personal relationship with another pioneer, David Octavius Hill, and his son, James Craig Annan, who became a famous proponent of Pictorialism in photography (Edwards, 2008: 612). This project will demonstrate the extent of Annan’s pioneering work by bringing out the aesthetic, technological, and documentary choices, as well as their convergence, in his photographic practice. In particular, it will be shown that Annan’s photographic work occupied a central role in mediating the street-level experience of the built environment of the city to the abstract logic of the civic engineers responsible for the urban demolition and rebuilding.

1.3. The City

Both case studies in this project are located in the city. Moreover, the city has an active role in the creation and shaping of the documentary projects as well as the photographs’ content. The historic urban spaces of Paris and Glasgow are both mediated through photography as well as mediate the documentary practice of the two photographers. The discussion of the city is framed here from the perspective of the modern city (Choay, 1969) and its reliance on modern rationality (Foucault, 1995), state power, and the formal spatial order of urban planning (Scott, 1998). A key element of this is the notion of transparent space that arose out of Enlightenment thought (Vidler, 1993). According to Foucault, transparent space is largely based on the mechanism of panopticism as ‘a generalizable model of functioning’ (Foucault, 1995: 205), otherwise understood as the prevalence and power of a sorting gaze. In the cases of both Paris and Glasgow, this meant ‘the
surgical opening up of cities to circulation, light and air’ (Vidler, 1993: 84), which was central to the process of modernisation.

Both Paris and Glasgow are key instances of urban modernisation in the 19th century. Paris has infamously been declared the ‘capital of modernity’ in Harvey’s book of the same name (Harvey, 2005) as well as Benjamin’s essay with the subtitle of ‘the capital of the nineteenth century’ (Benjamin, 1969). Glasgow is widely understood as the ‘second city of the British Empire’ in terms of its ‘scale and speed of development’ (Devine, 1995: 402). Both cities underwent profound changes to their infrastructure. In Paris, the Prefect of the Seine, Haussmann, undertook a process of urban demolition, displacement of the working poor, and ‘amelioration’ on an unprecedented scale in the period of 1853-1869 (see Paccoud, 2012; 2016). Haussmann’s influence has been so far-reaching that that his name has become eponymous of such processes even during his life (see Engels, 1970). Paris was, according to Haussmann and Napoleon III (Choay, 1969; Berman, 2010), too medieval in its urban plan, lacked sanitation, and was impossible to police. According to Vidler, the city’s ‘dwellings [were] irregularly crammed together defying all rational plan’ (Vidler, 2011: 75; also see Choay, 1969; Benjamin, 1969). Glasgow, on the other hand, was a heavily industrialised city with a rapidly growing population, which relied on seasonal labour (Devine, 1995). Unsurprisingly, its central areas were small, overpopulated, and labyrinthine. In response to this, the City Council formed the Glasgow City Improvement Trust with the goal of clearing the central slum area of the city (Withey, 2003).

According to Foucault (2001: 351), this need for shaping the city into a formal spatial order that is legible and standardized is connected to the growing prevalence of modernity’s ‘governmental rationality’ of the state. James C. Scott (1998) has also commented on the modern state’s creation of an all-encompassing vision of its territory and resources, effectively simplifying the reality of its domain according to abstract principles of order and legibility. The point, however, is that the state needed to simplify the urban space in order to make it legible to itself, not necessarily to its inhabitants. More than that, the city needed to be recorded and incorporated into the various institutions of the ‘expanded state complex’
(Tagg, 1988: 63) - a key part of which was the archive (ibid). As such, the
time in which both photographers worked was a frantic period of the
production of space as reflective of society’s values. A very important part
of this project is the work of Henri Lefebvre on the social production of social
space (1991a). Particularly, Lefebvre’s triad of perceived-conceived-lived
space is central to Chapter Six: The Photographic Production of Space.

1.4. History

The ‘expanded state complex,’ according to Tagg (1988: 63), was primarily
an effort to manage the growing population of cities through the creation
of institutions that were responsible for the policing of the population and
making sense of its resources (see Scott, 1998). A key part of this moment
was the formation of institutions, practices, and forms of documentation⁴,
which were meant to surveil, discipline, and ultimately know of and know
about its population, territory, and resources. According to Tagg (1988: 9),
this resulted in a system that was:

‘seeking to instil in [its citizens] a self-regulating discipline and
to position them as dependent in relation to supervisory
apparatuses through which the interventions of the state
appeared both benevolent and disinterested’.

Unsurprisingly, this was concurrent to a process which constructed the
growing urban population into an abstract statistic and, ultimately,
transformed it into an ‘object of knowledge’ (Tagg, 1988: 11).

The archive is at the very centre of this project. According to Edwards (2009:
142), ‘the ordering of the archive was itself premised on homogenizing
ideas of historical significance, framing the desired mode of attention’. As
Sekula argues (1992: 352), at the time of its emergence (which coincided
with the developments outlined above) photography ‘promised to reduce
nature to its geometrical essence’, thus providing the longed for universal
language of the Enlightenment project. Both Atget’s and Annan’s
photographic projects of documentation occurred in this period, and both
were concerned with the phenomenon of the modern city. Not only this,

⁴This is not exclusively photographs, but they were a key part of this; for example, see Scott
but also both photographers were intimately connected to the collecting practices of archives. Furthermore, such projects are driven by the very logic of the archive’s ‘historiographical desires’ (Edwards, 2009: 131). Edwards (2012: 5) summarises this guiding principle as:

‘the same epistemological frames of encyclopaedia desire, positivist confidence, preservational impulse, and a concern with narratives of the past, present, and future that are entangled with similar discourses of photographic reliability and public utility’.

Sekula further adds that the ‘the model of the archive’ (1999b: 444) is inescapable both in photographers’ practice and the ‘truths and pleasures experienced in looking at photographs’ (1999b: 444). This status of the Archive results in a hegemony of historical narration, which becomes nothing more than ‘appealing to the silent authority of the archive, of unobtrusively linking incontestable documents in a seamless account’ (Sekula, 1999b: 444). Documentary photography, especially, is intertwined with the logic of the archive. This will be explored in more depth in **Chapter Two: Documentary Photography and the City**.

1.5. Documentary Photography

As a genre of photography (Rose, 2002: 20), documentary photography has its own particular aesthetic codifications, practices, and typified/typical content (Bogre, 2011). Rose (2007: 20) describes it as a photographic practice that aims ‘to picture life as it apparently is’. However, it does bear relation to several other genres of photography. Most notably, it is related to street photography (Rose, 2007) or visual ethnography in the field of social science methods (Harper, 2003). Interestingly, the link between the edifying purposes of both social science and documentary photography have been extensively discussed (for example, Becker, 1974; Harper, 2002; 2003; Rose, 2007; Bogre, 2011). The social uses of photography, as the history of documentary photography reveals, is quite closely connected to the modern state, the development of sovereign power into disciplinary power, panopticism and visibility, and hegemonic politics and representation (Hamilton, 1997). This also includes
the history of politically charged uses of images pertaining to social issues and various underprivileged social groups (Bogre, 2011). It is easy to make the claim that documentary photography is closely related to an ever-changing plurality of social issues. An example where this amalgamation is observable is in the photographic archive (Sekulla, 1999b). The archive is a nexus of political and hegemonic dimensions that are often implemented though bureaucratic procedures that are situated in a particular historic method of recording history and its visual traces (Wigley, 2005). It is in the archive that photographic documents and the archival converge (Enwezor, 2008).

1.6. The Archives

The purpose of the practice of documentary photography is a particularly interesting dimension of the domain. Mostly, this is so due to the fact that the history of documentary photography has a very strong connection with archival, state, and private institutions. This is the case with both photographers that make up the two case studies in this research programme. Both photographers were involved in their direct environment, but accessibility to both of their work is mediated through particular institutions. Throughout its history as a paradigm, documentary photography has continuously been involved in preservation and the subsequent establishing of photographic collections documenting that which is to be preserved (Vassallo, 2014a; 2014b; Bogre, 2011; Edwards, 2002).

It is on the basis of this that this doctoral project will explore two photographic collections in particular institutions – namely, the Mitchell Library and the Victoria and Albert Museum. The institutional context provides an additional dimension to the domain that allows the exploration of the historical dimensions of the domain and its practices. Particularly, considering the two photographers’ works are historic and of pioneering status in the domain of documentary photography, their work is inevitably curated to any contemporary observer.

It is on the basis of the interplays between city, history and archive, photography and sociology, that the problem domain of documentary
photography will be understood. It has already been highlighted that there is a prevalent tendency in writing on photography to emphasise the photograph as a more significant site of meaning than others. In contrast to these approaches, this doctoral project approaches documentary photography as a complex network of practices and relations. In order to accomplish this, the problem domain of documentary is not understood only in terms of its products i.e. photographs. Rather, it is also examined through the environment of its production (the cities of Paris and Glasgow – introduced in Chapter Two: Documentary Photography and the City and revisited in Chapter Six: The Photographic Production of Space), the photographers and their practice of image production (including aesthetics, technology, and the documentary function of the photographs – Chapter Four: Eugène Atget’s Paris and Chapter Five: Thomas Annan’s Glasgow), and the political significance of images (particularly in relation to social class – see 4.2.2. Analysing a Photograph and 5.2.2. Analysing the Street). Additionally, the archival and institutional storage of images and their production as documents will also be discussed in the two empirical chapters of this project.

1.7. Overview

This first chapter of the project serves as an introductory text into the research programme, its place in the literature, its findings, and its discussions and conclusions. In order to provide an introduction to the topic and research that makes up this project, I have set up the topic by defining the problem domain of documentary photography. I have also introduced the key contexts in which photography is produced, stored, and interpreted.

Chapter Two: Documentary Photography and the City is a review of the relevant photographic literature, and an overview of the historical urban context of the two case studies. First, it helps situate the research programme in the wider field of photographic theory, mostly by focusing on the works of Rosler, Solomon-Godeau, Sekula, Sontag, Tagg, and Edwards. The definition of documentary photography will be outlined in greater depth. This is an important foundation, on which to elaborate the
significance of the findings in the empirical chapters and the explicitly theoretical penultimate chapter. Moreover, literature on the modern city and modernity will be introduced with the purpose of outlining the interconnections between urban space, vision, and the development of documentary photography. The chapter will posit the notion of a photographic city, in which the historical desire of the archive, photographic technology, and the perspectives of the built environment in the spaces of Paris and Glasgow intersect. Overall, it will provide an account of relevant current knowledge on the topic of documentary photography.

**Chapter Three: Methodology** outlines the methodological concerns in this project in more depth and introduces the overall research project. The chapter will provide an account of the methodological rationale, the research design, the methods used and the analytical frameworks in which they will operate. Additionally, the research aims, questions, and objectives of the project will be defined. Overall, in this chapter the reader will be introduced to the processes of data generation and analysis, as well as their place in the methodological literature.

In **Chapter Four: Eugène Atget's Paris**, I will discuss the first case study, the work of Eugène Atget in Paris. The examination of Atget’s work serves as a starting point for the process of data analysis and collection. The chapter will provide a discussion of the visual analysis of the entire sample, as well as a more focused analysis of a single photograph in relation to theoretical issues that have been introduced in **Chapter Two: Documentary Photography and the City**. The examination of Atget’s photographic practice will be discussed in three parts: first, as images; second, as material objects; and third, as institutional objects. This way, the analysis will speak to both the practices of producing documentary photographs, as well as the sites of an image’s production, storage, and interpretation.

**Chapter Five: Thomas Annan’s Glasgow** provides an account of the second case study of the research programme, the work of Thomas Annan in the collections of the Mitchell Library in Glasgow. Similarly to **Chapter Four: Eugène Atget’s Paris**, an analysis of the emergent categories of visual
elements will be provided, as well as a more theoretically-informed analysis of a smaller number of photographs. The analysis will also follow the tripartite structure utilised in the previous empirical chapter of image-materiality-institution. An account of the ways in which Annan’s work constructs a documentary project will be given.

The penultimate **Chapter Six: The Photographic Production of Space** will provide a more theoretical discussion of the findings from **Chapter Four: Eugène Atget’s Paris** and **Chapter Five: Thomas Annan’s Glasgow**. Lefebvre’s work on space will be used as a form of spatial analysis to the documentary practices of the two photographers (1991a). Further to this, Lefebvre’s work (1991a) will be used as a tool for structuring the content of the chapter in keeping with his triad of perceived-conceived-lived space, where the photographers’ spatial practices, representations of spaces, and spaces of representation will be explored, respectively. Furthermore, a brief discussion of the Archive as an ‘other space’ (Foucault, 1986; 1989; Lefebvre, 1991a) will be used in order to reflect abstractly on the manner in which the Archive frames the preferred way of interpreting the photographs. Conclusions will be provided in relation to the practices of the two photographers, as well as a more general discussion of documentary photography’s production and appropriation of space. Moreover, the chapter outlines the ways in which documentary photography can be understood as a practice that produces space.

**Chapter Seven: Conclusion** will provide conclusive remarks on this doctoral project and the overall research programme. It will also serve as a summary to the separate chapters and their key findings. Additionally, a brief acknowledgement of the limitations of this project and research programme will be included. Finally, the main contributions of this project will be restated and some remarks on the potential for further explorations on the topic will be provided.
Chapter Two: Documentary Photography and the City

'The description of the photograph is given here with prudence, for it already constitutes a metalanguage.'

(Barthes, 1977: 33)

This chapter will focus on reviewing the relevant literature on the topics and themes of relevance to this research programme. The perspectives highlighted, themes discussed, and literature reviewed are those which hold promissory potential for the following chapters. In order to setup the empirical chapters (Chapter Four: Eugène Atget’s Paris and Chapter Five: Thomas Annan’s Glasgow), this chapter is structured around the relevant notions in the domain of documentary photography and the relevant historical and urban conjunctures in which it operates.

This chapter is divided into two main sections: first, on documentary photography; and second, on Modernity and the city. In the first section, I will first introduce the literature on the domain of documentary photography, by providing a discussion of the documentary photograph and practice. Second, I will examine the notion of a photographic document. Third, I will relate the photographic document to its properties of evidence. Fourth, I will discuss the importance of the photographic archive for the solidification of meaning of the practice and products of documentary photography. In this section, I will also introduce the literature on the archive, the notion of an authentic record, and discourse. Fifth, I will provide an overview of the problem domain, i.e. documentary photography, of this project.

In the second section of this chapter, I will first explore the context of the historical conjunctures of the cities of Paris and Glasgow, as relevant to the discussions in Chapter Four: Eugène Atget’s Paris and Chapter Five: Thomas Annan’s Glasgow, respectively. Second, literature on the notion of the modern city and its role in the development of documentary photography will be addressed. Third and finally, the notion of the photographic city will be introduced.
2.1. Documentary Photography

Since the invention of the first fully reproducible photographic technology in 1839 (Marien, 1997), the notion of the document has figured in some way in the discourse of and on photography (Steyerl, 2003). Documentary photography itself, in the period of nearly 200 years since photography’s invention, has undergone a series of changes, renamings, and reorientations in subject. Rosler (1982: 81) has commented on the problem of the definition of the domain, due to photographs being ‘instances of ideological combat’, let alone the term documentary itself and the struggle over its determination. For Rosler (2004: 179), documentary photography is a cultural expression of the ideology of liberalism, and, as such, it ‘puts a face on fear and [its function is] transforming threat into fantasy, into imagery’.

Nesbit (1992b: 16), in her monograph on Atget, provides an early definition of the notion of document - it was given at the Fifth International Congress of Photography in Brussels in 1910 - in which:

‘a documentary image should be understood for studies of diverse kinds, ergo the necessity of including the maximum possible detail’ (in Nesbit, 1992: 16).

However, the term ‘documentary’ is usually cited as having only emerged in 1926, when the critic John Grierson used it in order to describe a film (Lugon, 2006); according to him (Grierson, 1966: 147), documentary is ‘the creative treatment of actuality’. Since this definition, the meaning of the

---

5 According to Rosler (2004: 322), aesthetics are always ideological: ‘Government support, foundation support, and corporate support differ in their effects on the art system. The government, by ideological necessity, has had to adopt standards that seem disinterested and depoliticized - that is, that appear firmly aesthetic - and has supported work that satisfies the criteria of newness and experiment. Nevertheless, those who do not share the associated assumptions about the meaning and direction of life - assumptions, say, of egalitarianism, cultural and personal pluralism, social progressivism or liberalism, and scientism - perceive the ideological character of art and reject the claim of sheer aesthetic worth’.

6 Grierson coined the term in a review of Robert Flaherty’s film Moana, published in the New York Sun in February 1926. According to Hardy (1966: 13, emphasis in original), ‘it derived from documentaire, a term applied by the French to their travel films. Grierson used it to describe Robert Flaherty’s Moana, which, he wrote, “being a visual account of events in the daily life of a Polynesian youth, has documentary value”. Later he defined it as “the creative treatment of actuality”. It came to represent in the next twenty years a vast and far-reaching use of the film for social comment.” Additionally, in 1942, Grierson presented the first Academy Award for documentary, and in his speech he claimed that his work on
term has been applied easily and frequently to work that preceded Grierson. Examples include photographers such as Eugène Atget, Thomas Annan, the sociologist Lewis Hine, the reporter Jacob Riis (Becker, 1974; Rosler, 2004; Sekula, 2016). As well as photographers who succeeded Grierson’s definition such as Berenice Abbott (Tagg, 1988), the Magnum Agency (i.e. Robert Capa, Cornell Capa, Henri Cartier-Bresson, David ‘Chim’ Seymour and others – for example, see Turner-Seed, 1971), and Vivian Maier more recently (Bannos, 2017). The most frequent use of the term has been on the work of photographers associated with the New Deal government in the USA7, particularly in work with the Farm Security Administration - such as Russell Lee, Walker Evans, Gordon Parks, Dorothea Lange (Figure 1 below, respectively) among others.

Figure 1: (from left to right) Bill Stagg turning up pinto beans, Pie Town, New Mexico by Russel Lee, WikiCommons, 1944; Allie Mae Burroughs by Walker Evans, WikiCommons, 1936; American Gothic by Gordon Parks, WikiCommons, 1942; Migrant Mother [Florence Thompson] by Dorothea Lange, WikiCommons, 1936.

Tagg (1988: 8), when discussing the field of practices that Grierson first identifies as documentary, comments:

‘Focused in specific institutional sites and articulated across a range of intertextual practices, it was entirely bound up with a particular social strategy: a liberal, corporatist plan to

---

documentary originated in his collaboration with Walter Wanger (a film director) in 1925 (Deacon, 2005: 150-153).

7 Here, largely understood as the federal programmes, reforms and regulation of finance and public work that were enacted in the United States circa 1933-1938 in response to the Great Depression. For instance, Becker (1974: 2) describes the following: ‘The impulse to photographic social exploration found another expression in the work produced by the photographers Roy Stryker assembled for the photographic unit of the Farm Security Administration during the 1930’s (Hurley 1972, 1973; Stryker and Wood 1973). Dorothea Lange, Walker Evans, Russell Lee, Arthur Rothstein, and others made it their business to record the poverty and hard times of Depression America, their work very much informed by social science theories of various kinds’.
negotiate economic, political and cultural crisis through a limited programme of structural reforms, relief measures, and a cultural intervention aimed at restructuring the order of discourse, appropriating dissent, and resecuring the threatened bonds of social dissent'.

It is this historical fluctuation in the use of the term and its reflection in photographic practice and images that has led Solomon-Godeau to assert that the term documentary photography does not possess an ontological definition, but rather a historical one (1991). In other words:

‘[the term ‘documentary’ and its] permutations are testimonial to the way photographic uses, and the meaning ascribed to them, are constantly in flux, repositioned and reoriented to conform to the larger discourses which engender them’ (Solomon-Godeau, 1991: 170).

2.1.1. The Documentary Photograph

The specific permutations that Solomon-Godeau is referring to are unclear, but one has the entire history of the practice from which to draw for illustration. For example, the work of Henri Cartier-Bresson with its romantic, at times surrealist, and often decontextualized or abstract images stands in stark contrast to his friend and colleague Robert Capa’s work, with its tendency towards reportage of conflict and war; Cartier-Bresson himself has already commented on this (Turner-Seed, 1971). Roland Barthes (2001: 43) famously remarked on the ‘docility’ of the photograph and its openness for appropriation to foreign contexts. Similarly, Sekula (2016: 4) has referred to photographs’ indeterminate meaning, arguing that ‘any photographic message is necessarily context determined’. In the same manner, Sontag (1979: 82) has called the photograph ‘an object in a context’. Further to this, Tagg (1988: 63) has asserted that photography has no identity of its own, and any understanding of it would inevitably vary according to the power relations that invest it (also, see Edwards, 2001: 11).

Other writers on the topic have similarly commented on the domain’s, not only the term’s, change of meaning (for example, see Rosler, 2004; Sekula,
2016). Rosler (2004: 268), for example, makes the important point that an ontological, and thus ahistorical, definition of the domain is likely:

‘... to ignore the fact that historical interests, not transcendental verities, govern whether any particular form is seen as adequately revealing its meaning – and that you cannot second-guess history’.

The significance of Rosler’s point is twofold. First, she is pointing to the dimension of documentary photography that is guided by forces and discourses that may not traditionally be associated with the practice of documentary photography itself. For example, urban planning is taken to denote an entirely separate domain of activity from documentary photography. However, both cases in this research project will show that the historical process of urban planning has played a significant role in the criteria of legibility and transparency posed to the domain of documentary practice. Second, the ‘historical interests,’ to which Rosler alludes (2004: 268), are also influential in the determination of ‘the conditions [under which] the photographic images would appear “realistic”’ (Tagg, 1988: 156).

Furthermore, according to Solomon-Godeau (1991), the term ‘documentary’ only came about in the 1920s, because in the almost century-long period that preceded it, photography had already been understood as inherently documentary, realistic, and its mode of representation had been taken for a given. From its very invention in 1839, photography has been understood as a medium that is to be valued in terms of its capability for reproducibility, veracity, and indexicality (Marien, 1997; 2010; Steyerl, 2003). In terms of its technological reproducibility, in the 1930s Walter Benjamin (1978) famously described the photograph’s superior capabilities, in comparison to painting, to transmit information, both in terms of speed of production and quality of representation. William Fox Henry Talbot, on the other hand, has emphasised photography’s capability to capture reality, going so far as to call his photographic process of the calotype as ‘nature’s pencil’ (Frizot, 1998). However, in documentary photography, much more so than other sub-fields, the
'authenticity' in both production and reception of a photograph has been the major concern (Bogre, 2011). This has often taken a didactic connotation. The photographer Edward Steichen, commenting on the FSA photographers, has emphasised ‘the feeling of a lived experience’ and the general effect on the viewer of the photographs (as cited in Bogre, 2011: 2); similarly, in 1938 Beaumont Newhall famously defined documentary photography as ‘a means, not an end—an approach to a photograph, not the photograph itself’ (Bogre, 2011: 2).

In order to address this exact problem, Allan Sekula (2016: 6-20), in his famous essay on photographic meaning, contrasts the work of two photographers with very different purpose in their practice – Alfred Stieglitz and Lewis Hine. By comparing two photographs that were taken in more or less the first decade of the 20th century, one by each photographer, Sekula provides an insightful discussion of the debate between pictorialist and documentary photography. Although he does not phrase the comparison of the two photographers in those exact terms, the ‘art photography’ of Stieglitz with its aesthetic leanings towards a decontextualized photograph that is abstract to the point of mysticism is quite similar to other indictments of Stieglitz’s work that make use of the term ‘pictorial’ (c.f. Sontag, 1979). Furthermore, Sekula emphasises the difference in the potential for political criticism of the two photographs – while Hine’s, being a sociologist and documentary photographer, is ‘immediately liable to a criticism that is political, just as [Stieglitz’s] The Steerage is immediately liable to a criticism that is political’ (2016: 17, emphasis in original). Sekula (2016: 21) further contrasts the two photographs by taking them as indicative of the two poles of meaning towards which a photograph might tend to in any given context. The oppositions, according to Sekula (2016: 21), are:

8 As Bogre points out (2011: 2), the word document comes from the Latin root - doc, doct, or docere - meaning ‘to teach’ or ‘to instruct’. Moreover, the root of the word implies a certain distribution of roles, as well as power relations and assumptions about the transmissibility of knowledge. Namely, the term assumes that one teaches another. In an institutional context, it must be noted that Stoler’s observations (2002: 91) are apt concerning the ‘[…] turn back to documentation itself, to the “teaching” task that the Latin root “docere” implies, to what and who were being educated in the bureaucratic shuffle of rote formulas, generic plots, and prescriptive asides that make up the bulk of a colonial archive.’
‘… the photographer as seer vs. the photograph as witness, photography as expression vs. photography as witness, theories of imagination (and inner truth) vs. theories of empirical truth, affective value vs. informative value, and finally, metaphoric signification vs. metonymic signification’

With this subtle and nuanced comparison, Sekula demonstrates the indeterminacy of photographic meaning, as well as the fluidity of semiotics and hermeneutics. Moreover, Sekula points to a trend in discussing photography that engages insightfully with the discursive dimensions of photography and photographs. Sekula’s comparison (2016) emphasises the importance of subjectivity in photographic practice – it is not only the photographs that are compared, but also Stieglitz’s Christian and aesthetic influences in pictorialism and Hine’s sociological background and activist work towards labour rights and aesthetic influences in realist literature.

It is no surprise then that with its superior capabilities for transmission of information and didactic proclivity, photography found itself as:

‘a fiery pencil that with flash and flare inscribed into the historical and journalistic record as well as into the consciences of the “comfortable” classes, the image of the previously unphotographed poor’ (Rosler, 1982: 81).

It is on the basis of this that this research project will operate with the definition of documentary photography as, according to Rosler, ‘[carrying] (old) information about a group of powerless people to another group addressed as socially powerful’ (2004: 263). Moreover, Solomon-Godeau adds to this that ‘the genre is defined within the framework of reformist or ameliorative intent, encompassing issues such as public address, reception, dissemination, the notion of project or narrative rather than single image, etc’ (1991: 173). Bogre, more recently, has made the argument that documentary photography is the convergence of photographic practice with socially motivated activism (2011). Based on this socially conscious and conscience-oriented definition, the domain of documentary photography will be discussed, and the key literature on it will be outlined, in this section.
2.1.1.1. A Document

According to Chevrier (2005), a documentary photograph is an ambiguous term, since all photographs are already documents. For Chevrier (2005), the ambiguity of the term lies in the domain’s emphasis on actuality and authenticity. For instance, a documentary photograph, following the definition of the field outlined above, would be ‘actual’ and ‘authentic’ so long as it is representative of the technology, social issue, and real-life subject in front of the camera. In Enwezor’s words (2008: 11), all photographs, by virtue of being documents, are always already a ‘photographic record’. From this perspective, all photographs are documents because they are an actualisation of a, or any, photographic practice to a degree. In Chevrier’s words (2005: 47), documentation is a product of ‘the simple fact that the virtual image has been actualised (put down, printed, fixed), then to the fact that it renders visual data which is contemporary with the shooting of the picture’. Chevrier (2005: 48) further adds that:

“"Documentary” photography is a category of picture production if not a specific genre, but it implies prior definition of the document. And document and fact are closely related and complementary notions: the document provides facts and is a fact in itself. The idea of documentary photography appeared and developed in a culture that valued facts and documents by relating art to knowledge, and by considering art itself as a subject of study.’

Solomon-Godeau (1991) also points out that any possible understanding of a photograph as a ‘documentary’ presupposes a definition of a document, as well as concomitant notions of empirical evidence, truth, and, inevitably, ideological formulations of permissible agency; understood this way, as a historical, as well as historically determined, practice, it can be characterised as:

‘...a sign system possessed of its own accretion of visual and signifying codes determining reception and instrumentality’ (Solomon-Godeau, 1991: 170).
Importantly, the idea of the meaning of a photograph being historically constituted – a photograph is meaningful in relation to other photographs that have attempted to do the same thing, etc – also presupposes a way of reading the photograph that must already exist. Solomon-Godeau (1991: 182) refers to this as ‘the contingency and historical relativity of the category documentary’. Namely, each documentary photograph takes its meaning from a project or narrative on a purely photographic level, which, in turn, is determined by the social context of the production of the given photograph or project.

Furthermore, the social context of the production is also determined by a variety of factors such as:

‘…distinct historical circumstances and milieus, [...] agendas both open and covert, personal and institutional, that inform their contents and, to a greater or lesser extent, mediate our reading of them’ (Solomon-Godeau, 1991: 182).

Ever since its definition in Grierson’s (1966) film review, the notion of ‘documentary’ has been ideological and one that fits ‘a general aim of developing an educated, electorally active public’ (Rosler, 1982: 81). Understood this way, ‘documentary,’ and the matter of its authenticity or realism, does not necessarily denote a practice that is concerned with an actuality that is ‘out there’ in a positivist sense (Rosler, 1982), but rather with the process of mediation to a desired public.

Moreover, it is this exact mediation, and the message it carries (or the message that it is), that is inevitably ideological. In Pierre Bourdieu’s words, the discourse of photography as a whole, but documentary more so, has constructed the practice as an objective reflection of actual reality:

‘In stamping photography with the patent of realism, society does nothing but confirm itself in the tautological certainty that an image of reality that conforms to its own representation of objectivity is truly objective’ (Bourdieu as cited in Solomon-Goudeau, 1991: 171)

More often than not, the purpose of this mediation has been a ‘realist’ representation, one that is objective, factual, and positivist. The content of
the representations in the domain of documentary photography demonstrate this particularly well. As Rosler (1982: 81), rather cynically but nevertheless accurately describes this, the original intended meaning of socially conscious photography, such as the one practiced by the FSA photographers described briefly above, was that:

‘…if you could see the working poor, you would apprehend a dignity held in common in spite of poverty and degrading circumstances’.

This is no surprise, since the period in which documentary photography originated, not the term, was the mid- to late 1800s. It was during this period that cities, as well as nations, were experiencing a large-scale process of industrialisation, and the consequential urbanisation and immigration. With this in mind, Solomon-Godeau (1991: 175) accurately identifies ‘the dense matrix of bourgeois social anxieties and the need to assuage them’. In other words, the large number of poor working people, often of immigrant status, that would not assimilate carried with it the prospect of social unrest. It is at this point that ‘the use of photography as a part of the larger enterprise of surveillance, containment, and social control’ was mobilised (Solomon-Godeau, 1991: 175; also, see Tagg, 1988; Sekula, 2016; c.f. Foucault, 1995).

Understood this way, the documentary photograph is not only constructed as an ideological and cultural object in the strict sense of its hermeneutic and semiotics – in Sekula’s words (2016: 3): ‘the meaning of a photograph […] is inevitably subject to cultural definition’ and ‘photographic discourse’. Documentary photography is simultaneously an ideological discourse that is intimately involved in the social distribution of power, as well as the delimitation of permissible action. The affluent, recipient classes are the ones whose affective engagement is managed and exercised through the proxy of the document, while the exploited and documented classes are reified and objectified as an image to be sold. The subject/object relations in the practice, as evident in a given photograph, are particularly evocative of this issue. Considering that the presupposed ideological
hermeneutic of the documentary photograph, as well as the underlying assumption of its production, is, and has been:

‘[t]he expose, the compassion and outrage, of documentary fuelled by the dedication to reform has shaded over into combinations of exoticism, tourism, voyeurism, psychologism and metaphysics, trophy hunting – and careerism’ (Rosler, 2004: 263)

The example of Rosler’s description demonstrates both the affective nature of the representation and the already distributed positions of power – unequally so between the photographing and the photographed, as well as the recipients of the photograph and the photographed. It is this that has lead Solomon-Godeau (1991: 176) to claim that the notion of the documentary, and its practice, involves a double act of subjugation:

‘[F]irst, in the social world that has produced its victims; and second, in the regime of the image produced within and for the same system that engenders the conditions it then represents’

This is also intimately tied to the connotation of the camera as linked to ‘mastery, possession, appropriation, and aggression’ (Solomon-Godeau, 1991: 181). Sontag has also written on the violence of the camera and its use (1979), as well as a series of other writers have pointed out photography’s role in the entrenchment of colonialism (Edwards, 2016; Pinney, 1992; Rosler, 1982; 2004), class (Tagg, 1988), gender (Berger, 1972), and race (Berger, 2011).

2.1.2. The Photographic Document

It is important to note that a photograph is also a material object that possesses material properties and is produced by a particular technology. This merits a more focused discussion. As Edwards and Hart point out (2004: 1), a photograph is a three-dimensional object, not only a two-dimensional image. Batchen (as cited in Sassoon, 2004: 200) further points out the

---

*One cannot help but think of Theodor W. Adorno’s (2005; 28) statement in *Minima Moralia*: ‘In the end, glorification of splendid underdogs is nothing other than glorification of the splendid system that makes them so.’*
importance of considering photographic images as possessing ‘volume, opacity, tactility and a physical presence in the world’. It is on the basis of this, it is possible for a person to have an interaction with a given photograph that is subjective, embodied or sensuous (Edwards and Hart, 2004: 1). For example, a daguerreotype could only be viewed through some form of manipulation or bodily adjustment in order to find the right angle to see the image on the reflective surface of the image (see Edwards and Hart, 2004).

Elizabeth Edwards points to the often overlooked materiality of photographs as a significant problem (2001; 2009a; 2009b; 2009c; Edwards and Hart, 2004). On one level, the materiality of the image tends to, at times, remain unacknowledged due to its transparency as a medium (Bolter and Grusin, 2000) by working as ‘a neutral support for images’ (Edwards and Hart, 2004: 2), thus making way for the image. This perspective is quite prominent in writing on photography, including the works of luminaries such as Roland Barthes (2001) or Susan Sontag (1979), and is part of what Edwards and Hart (2004: 2) describe as ‘the indexical appeal’ of ‘that brief moment of exposure of the real world in front of the camera’.

However, treating photography as an abstract practice of images is liable to omit the multiple dimensions of the material and social conditions that produce the images as objects, store and organise or exhibit them. For instance, Edwards and Hart (2004: 2) point to the need to ‘take into account that signifying role of photography in relation to the whole nature of the object and its social biography’, since the very framing of a photograph as more than, or not only, an image carries implications. For instance, ‘[o]bjects, including photographs, are [...] not just stage settings for human actions and meanings, but integral to them’ (Edwards and Hart, 2004: 4), since the same ‘material influences [could] contain or perform the image itself (Edwards and Hart, 2004: 2). In other words, a great part of ‘the indexical appeal’ mentioned above can only be understood through a consideration of the materiality of photographic practice and photographic objects; to quote Edwards (2014: 181), more recently, at length:
‘But if we consider photographs as things, inscribed bits of paper, it becomes clear that their effects are not necessarily grounded in their content, but their material condition of “being a photograph”, carrying the marks of their own historicity and their uses. This might help us to begin to understand more clearly what these images do, or do not do.’

However, this has several implications. First, there is the issue of how, who, and what agencies are imbricated in the practice of production of photographs. Namely, Edwards and Hart (2004: 15) point to the importance of: ‘What things are made of and how they are materially presented related directly to their social, economic and political discourses and their function as documents’. Granted, the archive is only one element of this, albeit a prominent one.

Second, this leads to another dimension of the photographs’ materiality – their presentation and reception, which inevitably would possess some affective element; the physical characteristics of a given photograph, its colours, dimensions, etc ‘engage subjectivities around the image’ (Edwards and Hart, 2004: 15). This dimension also leads one to reflect on the issue that photographs, as much as any other object, could belong to a multitude of discourses, since:

‘Photographs have a performativity, an affective tone, a relationship with the viewer, a phenomenology, not of content as such, but as active social objects’ (Edwards and Hart, 2004: 18).

Third, the materiality of photographs, as well as the technology of their production, is tied to the field of political economy. Put simply, photographs are more than simply ideas, they are:

‘material items produced by a certain elaborated mode of production and distributed, circulated and consumed within a given set of social relations; images made meaningful and understood within the very relations of their production’ (Tagg, 1988: 188).
For example, the technological aspects of photographic practice throughout history, although often lauded as democratic, have been ‘in the hands of specialist technicians,’ themselves at the mercy of the owners of the photographic means of production (Tagg, 1988: 17). If the technology were made available beyond this limited circle, then the knowledge required to operate it would not have necessarily been (ibid.). Furthermore, the practice of photography, in a more abstract sense, has been largely determined by ‘pre-emptive ideas of property, meaning and cultural value’ (Tagg, 1988: 20) that would privilege the interests of capital and the notion of an independent artist or creator. Meanwhile this ignores ‘the actual ‘operatives’ and makers of photographic images, like print workers and studio technicians’ (Tagg, 1988: 20).

All of this is to say that the notion of the photographic document is a complex one. As much as it is a discursive phenomenon, as shown previously, it is simultaneously a material one. However, it should be acknowledged that as much as the materiality of the medium of photography is often transparent at the expense of the indexical qualities of an image (Edwards and Hart, 2004), the same can be said of the medium’s discursive qualities. With regards to this latter point, Sekula (2016) discusses photographs as discursive entities, with discourse denoting ‘a bounded arena of shared expectations as to meaning,’ as well as ‘a system of relations between parties engaged in communicative activity’ (Sekula, 2016: 3), while simultaneously ‘the overall function of photographic discourse is to make itself transparent’ and self-evident (2016: 6). Having established this, it is necessary to advocate for a more nuanced understanding of photographs and photography. Photographs cannot be reduced to either signifiers of a reality outside their material existence, or simple products of a given socio-political discourse, since they are, ultimately, ‘active and potent, as both makers and sustainers within these discourses’ (Edwards, 2001: 3). On the basis of this, this project has set out to conduct a study in an informed grounded theory methodological framework that will not impose presuppositions on the photographs examined, but instead make the photographs the starting point (see Edwards, 2001) - since ‘when objects are assumed to be trivial and not to
matter that they are most powerful and effective as social forces’ (Edwards and Hart, 2004: 6). Meanwhile, this research will do this while considering ‘the entangled histories and their significations [by looking] for an intelligible structure that will recognise both possible closures of meaning, and open space for articulation (Levi, 1999:98)’ (Edwards, 2001: 2).

2.1.3. Social Biography and Evidence

The primary site at which the discursive and material dimensions of photographs and photography converge is that of the archive, the museum, or the generalised historicising state institution. However, in order to discuss this important aspect of the domain of documentary photography, it is important to introduce the model of the social biography of photographs. The social biography model is a site in which the materiality and discursive dimensions of a photograph, or photographs, converge.

As much as a given photograph possesses a particular materiality that, as discussed above, determines the potential for engagement with it in an affective or sensuous manner (Edwards and Hart, 2004), it is also located in the ‘bounded arena’ of expectations of a given discourse (Sekula, 2016: 3). However, as Edwards claims (2001: 13), ‘things have cumulative histories that draw their significances from intersecting elements in their histories’. That is to say, a photograph is more than simply a material object, more than simply an embodiment of a discourse, and more than both at the same time, since each photograph is inevitably a particular object that will be seen at different times, in different places, and by various observers. The significance of this to an understanding that posits each image to have a ‘social biography’ is:

‘[...] the way in which the meaning of photographs, generated by viewers, depends on the context of their viewing, and their dependence on written or spoken ‘text’ to control semiotic energy and anchor meaning in relation to embodied subjectivities of the viewer’ (Edwards, 2001: 14)

Importantly, the notion of the social biography of an object, or photography as a whole, is important in its implications. The notion of a photograph travelling across contexts implies a ‘series of micro-
engagements’ which, in turn, ‘threaten to destabilise the homogenising instrumental desires of meta-discourses’ (Edwards, 2001: 13). This perspective points to the importance of the context in which one interacts with a given photograph, as well as the cumulative history of the photograph as a material object with which people have interacted. Furthermore, the social biography perspective does not neglect ‘the subjectivities of photographic effect,’ and it takes into consideration the ‘inscription’ of photographs; where, in the instances of the latter, the very ‘pasts [of a photograph] are made in both inscription and archiving’ (Edwards, 2001: 2).

Furthermore, the model of social biography points to a bigger field in which the domain of photography operates – that of a visual economy of access, meaning, and inscription. Poole (1997) has defined the visual economy as the patterns that guide the production, circulation, use and possession of photographs as determined by political, economic, and social factors, both in terms of individuals and the photographs’ mode of production (see Poole, 1997: 9-13; Edwards, 2001: 15). Edwards (2001: 15) further adds that ‘crucial to this model are the material forms of photographs; the way images are viewed, their affective tone, the way their material forms engage subjectivities around the image’, since photographs themselves are embodiments of cultural discourses. To put this simply, the type of photographs with which one engages is largely determined by other structures such as social groups (e.g. class, the family, gender), economic factors (e.g. quality of technology, prints, etc), or politics (e.g. differing encoding/decoding paradigms, see Hall, 2006). This can include, for example, a family album and its place in a particular class position, gender relations, and status of non-professional image-making. Photographs, seen from this perspective, become ‘symbolic structures, [as much as they are] reifying culturally-formed images as observed realities, rendering the latter as visible ‘objects’ in space’ (Fabian as cited in Edwards, 2001: 8). This is significant since the ways in which photographs circulated before having entered an institutional discourse contribute to their place in the meta-discourse; Edwards describes this as ‘a cultural expectancy [which] brings together appropriate forms of the photographic object and cultural
In other words, a family album can only be made to speak on the issues of that context in which it was produced, for whom it was produced, how it was used, and so on. Tagg (1988: 156), when writing about the work of Berenice Abbott, commented on an important issue in retrospectively attempting to understand a photographer’s practice:

‘We must historicise the spectator, or, to make this more precise by returning to Abbott, we must also take care to specify to whom and under what conditions she thought her photographic images would appear realistic’ (emphasis in original).

This ‘cultural imperative’ (Edwards, 2001: 15) described by Tagg (1988) is tied to the material qualities of the photographs, since the photographs’ functions, as already established, are largely determined by ‘their social, economic and political discourses’, which in turn have contributed to the material practices (Edwards, 2001: 15). Moreover, these discourses are always a product of a particular historical conjuncture. Any claims regarding a photograph’s qualities must then be understood as only a single perspective in a network of various practices that are all engaged in meaning-making.

2.1.4. The Archive

It is in the Archive (or Museum, or Library) that the issues discussed above converge and can be found at their most complex. From the early decades of photography’s invention, photographs have been utilised as documents for various purposes, such as policing (see Tagg, 1988: 9), archiving (see Herschel as cited in Marien, 1997: 16-17), or colonial control (see Edwards, 2016). However, in order to understand the effect of the Archive on the social biography of the photograph, as well as its supposed evidentiary value, it is necessary to discuss the context of its emergence.

The Archive as a concept has been traced to the origin of the ancient state (Derrida, 1996), but for the purposes of this dissertation, it is necessary to examine its origins in the modern period - particularly, to the invention of photography in 1839. As early as 1839 the astronomer, photographer, and inventor of the cyanotype method, John Herschel, saw a future of
improved classificatory systems, archiving, and organisation of knowledge due to the prospect of photographic records (Marien, 1997; 2010). Tagg (1988) further points to the work of Alphonse Bertillon in the 1870s and his application of photographic records, for example using mugshots, in the criminal justice system and policing. Edwards (2016) has also pointed to the role of photography in enacting colonial governance in the period of the late 1860s to 1870s in the Colonial Office of the British Empire (also, see Edwards and Mead, 2013; Edwards, 1992; Pinney, 2011). Tagg (1988: 63) describes this development in the use of photography as the rise of the ‘expanded state complex’ of modernity. It is not surprising that the rapid institutionalization of photography was occurring in a period of growing ‘struggles of urban, industrialized societies’ (Tagg, 1988: 9). With the rise of the expansion of the state in order to manage the rising overpopulation of cities through forms of charity, policing of the population, and social welfare, a large-scale reformulation of the role of the state was necessary:

‘Central to it […] was an emergent formation of institutions, practices and representations which furnished means for training and surveilling bodies in great numbers, while seeking to instil in them a self-regulating discipline and to position them as dependent in relation to supervisory apparatuses through which the interventions of the state appeared both benevolent and disinterested’ (Tagg, 1988: 9).

This, in turn, worked towards constructing the new urban population into an abstract statistic and, ultimately, transforming it into an ‘object of knowledge’ (Tagg, 1988: 11). It is no surprise either that in this process certain groups were constituted as passive objects of study – ‘the working classes, colonised peoples, the criminal, poor, ill-housed, sick or insane’ (Tagg, 1988: 11). This context, however, is more than a passing criticism on the history of photography and its application by various state institutions. Rather, it is a criticism that needs to be incorporated in all exploration of photographs. For example, what Barthes refers to as the ‘evidential force’ of images (2001), or the ‘indexical appeal’ as defined by Edwards and Hart (2004), is very much an issue of perspective. Namely, every photograph is the result of ‘significant distortions which render its relation to any prior
reality deeply problematic’ (Tagg, 1988: 2). This, in turn, raises questions of the role of the material technology and apparatus (Tagg, 1988), and the social or institutional practices that shaped the photographic image (Edwards, 2014; 2016; Edwards and Mead, 2013).

For example, the legal record is more than a document with a particular function. It is produced according to a set of formal rules that have been determined by a given institutional network, and the degree of adjustments or manipulations that are permissible or illegitimate have also been codified (Tagg, 1988). Furthermore, because of this, a certain class of interpreters is necessary in order to ‘draw inferences from them, on the basis of historically established conventions’ (Tagg, 1988: 2-3). Moreover, as Tagg asserts (1988: 3), it is only in such an institutional framework that ‘otherwise disputable meanings’ can be made to ‘carry weight and can be enforced’. Campbell (2014) has pointed out this in the domain of contemporary documentary photography and photojournalism with a meta-study of World Press Organisation editorial practices. A key finding of Campbell’s study (2014) was the codified difference between adjustment and manipulation, where the former is a change of something in the frame of the image, whereas the latter is a breaking of that same frame – through either removing an object, or bringing in an object. Although occurring in a network of practitioners, the meta-study reveals something important about the ‘bounded arena’ of aesthetic and technological expectations. For example, to come back to Tagg (1988: 160-161) once more:

‘[…] we must also be aware that the hypothetical “brute photo (frontal and clean)” is itself locatable within a historical typology of photographic configurations: it is the characteristic format of photographs in official papers and documents, and also predominates in that purer strain of pedigree photographs – “straight photography” – said by so many critics and ideologues to embody ‘universal truths’ about existence, about “being-ness”, about the “stasis-in-continuum”.'
This brings up the issue of the formal discourse of criticism institutionalised by curators in the Archive or Museum. Rosler (1982) points to the gradual dissolution of documentary practice from a moralising, conscience-oriented practice towards a stylistically aestheticized endeavour as connected to the institutionalisation of photographers such as Eugène Atget, Berenice Abbott, Edward Steichen, and Ansel Adams among others in the collections of MoMA. Tagg (1988: 14) further adds that the issue lies in:

‘the historicist reduction of complex practices to stylistic streams, defined, opposed or reconciled by a privileged criticism and gathered in the transcendent space of the Museum [sic], typified the strategic attempt to impose a corporatist hegemony in a reasserted cultural hierarchy.’

Kracauer (1995), much earlier than Tagg, has also pointed out the historicist10 trouble that lies with the generalising aspect of documentary photographs and their tendency to obscure, as much as reveal (Gilloch, 2015). Central to historicism’s ‘claims to present a complete, all-encompassing “universal history”’ (Gilloch, 1997: 107) is photography and its role in the production of ‘those whom “historicism” has consigned to silence’ (Gilloch, 1997: 114).

Sekula (2016: 57), echoing the work of Rosler, has focused on the genre’s contribution to ‘spectacle, retinal excitation, to voyeurism, to terror, envy and nostalgia, and only a little to the critical understanding of the social world’ despite its ‘amassed mountains of evidence’. The stylistic emphasis identified by Rosler (1982), Tagg (1988), and others only exacerbates this, where the observer’s attention is diverted towards the sensibility of the artist, the difficulties of accomplishing the project and gaining access to the story or subjects. This aestheticization of the documentary domain drains it of its social conscience and supposed goal since ‘documentary is thought to be art when it transcends its reference to the world [thereby occluding the

10 In terms of a definition, historicism here is understood as ‘that form of historical enquiry that claims, following Leopold von Ranke’s precepts, to (re)present the past “just as it was”, with an absolute fidelity to everything and an emphasis upon nothing, as a completely faithful inventory and utterly banal stocktaking of the “there and then”’. (Gilloch, 2015: 35)
issue it is supposed to document], when the work can be regarded, first and foremost, as an act of self-expression on the part of the artist’ (Sekula, 2016: 58). This creates a documentary photography that, despite its liberal and left wing sympathies, operates on an aesthetics of compassion rather than collective struggle, where ‘an appreciation of “great art” […] supplants political understanding’ (Sekula, 2016: 67).

The institutionalisation of the documentary photograph is also linked to the growing proliferation of the panopticon model of power, as identified by Foucault (1995). The nineteenth-century saw the rise of a series of disciplinary institutions such as ‘the police, prisons, asylums, hospitals, departments of public health, and even the modern factory system itself’ (Tagg, 1988: 5). Productivity, safety, health, and order were all meant to be ensured and enforced through the principle of visibility. This took a variety of practical mechanisms and implementations from Bentham’s actual Panopticon model through Alphonse Bertillon’s mugshots (see Clark, 2015; also, Tagg, 1988), Duchenne’s electro-physiognomy experiments (Parent, 2005) or Charcot’s images of ‘hysteria’ (Didi-Huberman, 2003) to Haussmann’s total restructuring of the city of Paris along lines of sight, visibility, and hygiene11. Understood this way, the notion of ‘evidence’ is not a simple one and definitely not one that can be understood in isolation. Rather, ‘evidence’ or ‘document’ can be understood as objects that may or may not have originated in an institution, but having been enmeshed in its discourse and practice they have been made to fulfil a function of evidence or documentation.

According to Cook (1997: 45), the ‘archive’ is understood as a practice of ‘record-keeping’ with its own archival theory that reflects ‘the dominant strains of public discourse in [the archival thinkers’] time and place’ (1997: 46). Put generally, archival study, being an umbrella term for archival theory, archival practice, and archival data, is understood as reflective of ‘archival history’. Cook (1997: 47) describes ‘archival history’ as a:

11 It is necessary to mention that the nature of one of the first large scale photographic projects by ‘the great Nadar’ was a thorough documentation of the Parisian sewer system (Gandy, 2004), effectively merging photography, mapping (geography), and hygiene.
... rich collage of overlapping layers, of contradictory ideas existing simultaneously or even blended together, of thinkers exhibiting differences of emphasis more than of fundamental ideas, of individual thinkers changing their ideas in light of new circumstances, of old ideas appearing in new guises in new places'.

Furthermore, it is this archival history that informs the understanding of archival study as 'an analysis of the functions, processes, and transactions which cause documents to be created' (Cook, 1997: 47), rather than analysis solely of the contents, attributes, and characteristics of individual documents. The notion of 'archival history,' in addition to indicating the historical approach to the field of archival study, implies the historical dimension of the things being studied (i.e. the archived photographs).

In terms of photographs being forms of a 'photographic record' (Enwezor, 2008: 11), the operative understanding in this project is in the sense of a photograph being both 'documentary evidence' and 'archival record' (ibid: 12) of photography’s ‘capacity for mechanical inscription’ (ibid: 11). In this sense, photographs are treated as 'image archival documents' that are integrated into the context of archival collections (Lopez, 2009). On the basis of this, one can also define photographs as historical, institutional, and arising out of a practice external to that of the collecting institution. It is in this sense that photographs are treated as archival photographic data – as individual images (Enwezor, 2008), but also as parts of documents (for example, see Lopez, 2009 on photographs as parts of 'dossiers'; also, see Sekula, 1999bb: 445) of certain institutions (Enwezor, 2008).

Edwards (2001: 4) defines the main way that the Archive manifests its 'multidimensional fluidity of the discursive practices of photographs' is though inscription. Inscription, according to Edwards (2001: 7), can be seen as a way of establishing 'a system of visual equivalence' in relation to 'The Archive'. Since photographs lack the 'constraining narratives of film, still images contain too many meanings (Pinney 1992: 27)' (in Edwards, 2001: 5, emphasis in original). Since photographs are ‘context determined’ (see Sontag, 1979; Sekula, 2016), and there is an inevitable ‘incompleteness and
 unknowability of photographs’ (Edwards, 2001: 5), the role of the Archive has been to provide ‘the historically specific legitimation’ (Edwards, 2001: 7) of a given photograph or photographer. This, in turn, has been implemented through the practice of inscribing photographs with the role of ‘linking objects between past and present, between visible and invisible’ (Edwards, 2001: 4). This linking role has been the very foundation on which the total logic of the Archive has been sustained, since a cultural history should be understood as an ideological project that always already relies on a particular material apparatus (Tagg, 1988).

Foster (2004), Godfrey (2007), Enwezor (2008), Tagg (2009), and Rolnik (2011) among others, have all emphasised the importance of the archival, as a general notion, in relation to understanding artistic and photographic practice. In particular, work on artistic archives tends to focus on the importance of political significance and imbalances of power (Sekulla, 1992; Ketelaar, 2008; Rolnik, 2011), proposals for novel understandings of both contemporary and historic projects (Godfrey, 2007; Enwezor, 2008), as well as general inquiries into memory and record-keeping (Hammersley, 1997; Foster, 2004; Wigley, 2005; Rolnik, 2011; also, for non-art based accounts see O’Toole, 1993; Gilliland and McKemmish, 2004). However, a discussion of archival data in relation to the meaning-making practices of the domain of documentary photography requires more exploration.

There is not a sufficient amount of work done on the intersection of sociological inquiry, documentary photography, and archival study. Sociological inquiries into the field of documentary photography are common (Becker, 1974; 1995; Rose, 2007; Barthes, 2001), but they tend to omit considerations of the archive. There is also a significant in size literature on the intersection of sociological and archival study (on documents, see Prior, 2003; 2008; in terms of writing on archival data, see Hammersley, 1997; Gilliland and McKemmish, 2006; Carusi and Jirotka, 2009), but rarely is photographic theory and practice included. As noted above, there is also a large amount of work on photography and the archival, be it theory, study, or history.
Sociological inquiries, such as this one, that address the field of documentary photography in the sense of archival collections are sparse. When the three fields do converge, it is often the case that certain elements of the field of documentary photography are privileged over others. For example, photographs are understood either exclusively as ‘archival documents’ (Lopez, 2009) or their role as records and/or evidence is overly emphasized (Enwezor, 2008; Becker, 1974; 1995). This results in oversight of supplementary issues such as practice, production, or provenance. Although the literature described above is illustrative, there is an identifiable gap in terms of the combination of method and topic that this project is addressing.

This project operates with the notion of the ‘archive’ (Cook, 1997) as an institution whose functions are to '[r]ecord creation, appraisal, acquisition, arrangement, description, preservation, [and] accessibility' (Gilliland and McKemmish, 2004: 151). Furthermore, the archive will be understood primarily through the notion of a ‘photographic record’ (Enwezor, 2008: 11). Both of the key concepts - archive and photographic record - intersect in ‘the idea of the photograph as an archival record’ (Enwezor, 2008: 11). It will be demonstrated that the Archive is more than a privileged site of storage and collection of photography, but of their interpretation. As such, it exercises control over the possible interpretations of documentary photographs.

2.1.5. The Problem Domain

Documentary photography is strongly connected to the discipline of sociology (Bazin, 1960; Becker, 1974; 1995; Rose, 2007; Sontag, 1979; Burgin, 1982; Bogre, 2012; Bourdieu, 1990; Faulkner, 2017; Azoullay, 2008; 2011; 2012), thus, indicating its relevance to sociological inquiry. While the majority of work focuses on particular aspects of the field, the boundaries of the field of documentary photography have often been historically re-negotiated (Bogre, 2011). For instance, Solomon-Godeau asserts that the term ‘documentary photography’ was not commonly used before the 1920s (Solomon-Goudeau, 1991). The term ‘documentary’ only emerged in 1926, when the critic John Grierson (1966) used it in order to describe a film.
Since 1926, the meaning of the term has easily and frequently been applied to the work of photographers such as Atget or Annan, both of whom preceded Grierson.

Considering the fact that photography as a whole is a practice concerned with ‘translating the actual into the pictorial’ (Solomon-Godeau, 1991: 169), it has been considered historically ‘as innately and inescapably performing a documentary function’ (Solomon-Godeau, 1991: 170). According to Solomon-Godeau, the term ‘documentary photography’ is a recent invention belonging to the 1930s (1991; also, see Tagg, 1988) – this, in turn, indicates that the term is not ontological, but rather historical (Solomon-Godeau, 1991). Furthermore, Rose asserts that there is an overwhelming agreement that documentary photography is a genre of photography, which has as its aim ‘to picture life as it apparently is’ (Rose, 2007: 20), or in Lugon’s words, to capture ‘things the way they are’ (2006: 65; also, see Brückle, 2015). However, it does bear relation to several other genres of photography. For example, it could be related to street photography (Rose, 2007; 2014), or visual ethnography in the field of social science methods (Harper, 2003; Becker, 1974). Overall, in terms of the prevalent literature, documentary photography is acknowledged as closely related to a multitude of social issues (Bogre, 2011), in addition to political (Hall, 1997; Sontag, 1979; Mcquire, 2013) and historical ones (Bogre, 2011; Vasallo, 2014a; 2014b), as well as generally photographic ones (Steyerl, 2009).

In terms of a definition, this project operates with the notion of documentary photography as a practice of producing images which are intended to include ‘the maximum possible detail’ (in Nesbit, 1992b: 16). However, these documentary photographs operate on a logic of interrelation, rather than a single image; as such, a documentary photograph is part of a project (Solomon-Godeau, 1991: 173). In both case studies, it will be demonstrated that documentary photographs tend to rely on additional documents such as registers, labels, captions, maps, or other photographs in order to determine their specific documentary meaning. Furthermore, the notion of a document assumes a viewer, someone who is capable of extracting the relevant detail captured (Nesbit, 1992a). Even more so, it is the case that documentary photography is actively involved in producing
its viewer (Rosler, 1982: 81), since it relies on ‘a notion of proximity to and verification of an original event’ (Sekula, 1999b: 447, emphasis in original), which will ‘control [its] semiotic energy and anchor meaning in relation to embodied subjectivities of the viewer’ (Edwards, 2001: 14). As an integral part of this construction of an image as document, as well as the contemporaneous production of a ‘viewer’, is the privileging of the position of photographer, or viewer, at the expense of the photographed. This, in turn, is at the core of Modernity’s privileging of the subject through the faculty of vision. Moreover, the city is the site par excellence in which Modernity enacted its ideals of visibility, as it is to be shown below.

2.2. Modernity and the City (set the stage for photography)

Similarly to the Ancient Greek polis, the city has been the central point of origin for the modern archive (Derrida, 1992). It was in the modern city that one could find the peak of the Enlightenment ideals of instrumental reason - as seen in the formation of the modern state (Adorno and Horkheimer, 1997), the technological efficiency of the Industrial Revolution (Berman, 2010; Anderson, 1984), and the placing of Western Man, both in an anthropocentric and androcentric sense, at the centre of the imagined universe. In the works of the pioneering critical thinkers of the 18th and 19th century remains the same preoccupation with the Enlightenment, defined by Kant as ‘mankind’s [sic] exit from its self-incurred immaturity’ (Kant, 1784: 58). In fact, sociology itself is coterminous with Modernity (see Jameson, 201212; Osborne, 1995). For the early pioneering sociologists that meant an engagement with the growing rationalisation of Western Societies (Weber13, 1949), the maintenance of social harmony (Durkheim14, 1982), or

---

12 See Jameson’s A Singular Modernity (2012: 7), in which he claims the following in his discussion of postmodernity: ‘Even if you distrust periodization as such, the concept of modernity, which traces its lineage back to the founding fathers of sociology - and with which indeed sociology itself is coterminous as a field of study - seems respectable and academic enough.’

13 Weber (1949: 34) asserts that ‘The explanation of this rationalization and the analysis of related phenomena is one of the chief tasks of our disciplines [i.e. the social sciences]’ (emphasis added).

14 In fact, Durkheim (1982: 124-125) formulates the question of sociology so: ‘[…] to provide a satisfactory explanation of social life we need to show how the phenomena which are its substance come together to place society in harmony with itself and with the outside world’ (emphasis added).
the acknowledgement of the exploitative and dehumanising developments of capitalism (Marx, 1982). Ultimately, Enlightenment thinkers, and their successors, were concerned with the issues of implementing the very ideals, which they advocated.

This resulted into an idea of Modernity as a historical epoch unlike others. Since it was the period in which industrialisation, urbanisation, and individualisation, all of which on unprecedented scale, had occurred, modernity envisioned itself as consisting of a ‘radical break’ with the past (Harvey, 2005: 1). In response to Kant’s infamous answer to the question ‘What is Enlightenment?’ Foucault claimed modernity to consist of a ‘consciousness of the discontinuity of time,’ where the new and the modern see ‘a break with tradition, [as much as brings] a feeling of novelty, of vertigo in the face of the passing moment.’ (Foucault, 1984: 39). Foucault further adds to this vertigo of novelty, the fear of the growing power of the state apparatus, the inescapability of systems and discourse, the inevitable exercise of power and its aftermath in the answers to the key questions we face as modern subjects:

‘How are we constituted as subjects of our own knowledge? How are we constituted as subjects who exercise or submit to power relations? How are we constituted as moral subjects of our own actions?’ (Foucault, 1984: 49)

Berman (2010: 15), in contrast to Foucault, views ‘being modern’ as an experience that offers ‘adventure, power, joy, growth, transformation of ourselves and the world’ while simultaneously ‘threatens to destroy everything’. Understood this way, Berman (2010: 5) poses modernity as a problem of navigating the dangers of becoming ‘subjects as well as objects of modernization’. Rather than emphasising the dangers, as did Foucault (see 2000), Berman focused on the promises of liberation that can be found at the contradictions of modern society. It is common to see the period following the promises of the Enlightenment as consisting of contradictions. Primarily, this has occurred through the opposition of freedom and autonomy with security. According to Wagner (2003: 5), a key characteristic of Modernity is this very paradigm of ‘interpret[ing] and
reinterpret[ing] observable social practices in the light of this imaginary signification’ of freedom and autonomy. This new ‘discursive rupture’ of Modernity and modernization brought about a new way of understanding ‘both individuals and society, and as such, it instituted new kinds of social and political issues and conflicts’ (Wagner, 2003: 4). Specifically, the idea of ‘being modern’ was guided by the growing prevalence of science and its reliance on rationality, ultimately resulting in the idea of ‘the infinite progress of knowledge and in infinite advance towards social and moral betterment’ (Habermas, 1987: 4). According to Habermas (1987: 9), this took shape in the 18th century Enlightenment philosophers’ ‘efforts to develop objective science, universal morality and law, and autonomous art according to their inner logic’.

On the basis of the growing archive and accumulation of scientific knowledge, philosophy, and the inception of Comte’s positive philosophy i.e. social science, the very same philosophers worked towards the application of this accumulated knowledge into all aspects of modern life with the ultimate goal of ‘the rational organization of everyday social life’ (Habermas, 1987: 9). Osborne (1995) refers to exactly this when he asserts that modernity is a ‘quality’ rather than simply a chronological category. Namely, modernity:

‘designates the contemporaneity of an epoch to the time of its classification; yet it registers this contemporaneity in terms of a qualitatively new, self-transcending temporality which has the simultaneous effect of distancing the present from even that most recent past with which it is thus identified’ (Osborne, 1995: 13-14)

Even more than this, Osborne (1995: 11) asserts that this ‘abstract temporality of qualitative newness’ becomes ‘extrapolated into an otherwise empty future, without end, and hence without limit’. As such, Modernity, as much as it is based on breaking with the past by virtue of cataloguing and archiving it, is also a project, a development, and ultimately – a process of interminable modernisation (see Berman, 2010; also, Jameson, 2012).
As Foucault has already pointed out, modernity consists of a supposedly clear break with tradition; it is the same radical break that Harvey (2005), Jameson (2012), Berman (2010), or Wagner (2003) describe each with their own emphasis. The key drivers of this break with tradition have been technology, the Industrial Revolution, and the concomitant ideas of progress (Jameson, 2012: 7; also, see Berman, 2010). Each of those has contributed in some way to situating tradition as something past, outmoded, or lost. Furthermore, what was seen as outmoded also came to be seen as potentially dangerous, not of the times, and unsuitable for the modern age of newfound maturity and rationality. In the case of cities, this meant that the old city had to be reined in, sometimes forcefully. This, in turn, meant that it was supposed to be done by means of the newly available technology (for example, see Fraser, 2011; Choay, 1969), thus once again revealing the city itself to be the site for a project of modernisation. Gilloch argues (1997: 75) that the modern city endeavoured ‘to present itself through its monumental façades and structures as the zenith or culmination of progress’. As Scott comments (1998:55), the Enlightenment ‘fostered a strong aesthetic that looked with enthusiasm on straight lines and visible order’, since ‘the city laid out according to a simple, repetitive logic will be easiest to administer and to police’. Feldman frames this issue from a perspective that is closely related to history and power, resulting in an:

‘...ideological environment [which] promotes a ‘police concept of history’ (Rancière 1998), that is, the reframing of historical process into the eminently visual dichotomy of ideal safe space and dystopic, duplicit and risk-laden space. In this scopic regime, visible spaces of order are undermined by invisible yet impinging spaces of disorder. This concept of history advances the normative sociology and visual culture of the profile, which assigns political subjects to differential spaces: who belongs to and who is out of place or who is ‘infra-political’ (Rancière, 1998: 177-8)’ (Feldman, 2004: 333)

As much as modernity had as its task the shaping of cities into images of rationality, it also had to make sure to address the already existing problems
of having modern technological, political, economic, and social relations in either medieval settlements or recently industrialised towns (Choay, 1969). Modernity saw the old cities grow exponentially and at unprecedented rates. Sociologists have pointed out the unforeseen significance of urbanisation on the modern individual and society as a whole (see Frisby, 2013; Gilloch, 1997; Simmel, 1903). However, the cities in which the modern individuals and societies found themselves were often ancient, unfit for the new technologies of the 18th and 19th centuries – the railways, the carriage, gaslight, sanitation, etc. It is unsurprising that the old cities were quickly found to be unsafe, unfit, and unhealthy. Foucault described the fear so common to the Enlightenment of ‘darkened spaces, of the pall of gloom which prevents the full visibility of things, men and truth’ (as cited in Vidler, 1993: 84). Vidler comments on Foucault's claim and asserts that:

'It was this very fear of the dark that led, in the late eighteenth-century, to the fascination with those same shadowy areas what Foucault calls the “fantasy-world of stone walls, darkness, hideouts and dungeons” - the precise "negative of the transparency and visibility which it is aimed to establish."' (Vidler, 1993: 84)

In response to this fear, transparency was seen as the desired goal in the field of urban planning. Vidler (1993: 84) sees Jeremy Bentham’s, as much as Foucault’s, Panopticon as one such example of ‘that transparent space theorized as a paradigm of total control’ (emphasis in original) described by Foucault as ‘a generalizable model of functioning’ that is interwoven with observation, discipline, and analysis of subjects occupying the said transparent space (1995). Vidler aptly describes (1993: 84) the extent of the phenomenon of transparent space and how it has been:

'... recuperated under the guise of “hygienic space” by modernists led by Le Corbusier in the twentieth century. Transparency, it was thought, would eradicate the domain of myth, suspicion, tyranny and above all, the irrational. The rational grids and hermetic enclosures of institutions from
hospitals to prisons; the surgical opening up of cities to circulation, light and air; the therapeutic design of dwellings and settlements; these have now all been subjected to analysis for their hidden contents, their capacity to instrumentalize the politics of surveillance through what Bentham termed "universal transparency"."

Foucault’s prognosis has proven accurate, the ‘political anatomy’ of panopticism ‘could be operated in the most diverse political regimes, apparatuses or institutions’ (Foucault, 1995: 211); it is this that Tagg has referred to as the ‘expanded state complex’ (1988), of which the archive, as well as the police, the hospital, the prison, etc are key parts. However, in order for these institutions to function properly in keeping with the principles of transparency, rationality, and minimising of danger, the city itself had to be reshaped in order to better provide the lines of communication between institutions, as well as dealing with the inevitable issues of industrialisation and rapid urbanisation.

Commenting on the poor conditions that needed to be eradicated through the modernisation project, Mumford (1970: 168-169) drew parallels between the majority of Western European and US cities’ working class housing, and described the following:

‘But they are united by certain common characteristics. Block after block repeats the same formation: there are the same dreary streets, the same bleak alleys, the same absence of open spaces for children’s play and gardens; the same lack of coherence and individuality to the local neighborhood. The windows are usually narrow; the interior light insufficient; no effort is made to orient the street pattern with respect to sunlight and winds. The painful grayish cleanliness of the more respectable quarters, where the better-paid artisans or clerks live, perhaps in a row, perhaps semi-detached, with a soiled pocket-handkerchief of grass before their houses, or a tree in the narrow courtyard in the rear - this respectability is almost as depressing as the outright slatternliness of the poorer
quarters: more so indeed, because the latter often at least have a touch of color and life, a Punch-and-Judy show in the street, the chatter of the market stalls, the noisy camaraderie of the public house or bistro; in short, the more public and friendly life that is lived on the poorer streets.'

2.2.1. The Modernised City: Haussmann’s Paris and Industrial Glasgow

Key cities in this process of modernisation were Paris and Glasgow, the two cities of interest in relation to the two photographers making up the case studies of this project. However, before exploring the photographic implications of the urban planning and the urban experience of each city at the time of the photographers, a more thorough discussion of the urban plans of the cities themselves is necessary. In Paris, Haussmann initiated a process of urban demolition and displacement on a grand scale (1853-1927), because of which his name has become eponymous of such changes (see Engels, 1970; Harvey, 2005; Merrifield, 2014). The reason for Haussmann’s actions are complex, but a key factor was that large part of its central areas were dating back to the Middle Ages (primarily the central area of the Île de la Cité) and consisted of ‘dwellings irregularly crammed together defying all rational plan’ (Vidler, 2011: 75; also see Choay, 1969; Benjamin, 1979). Glasgow, on the other hand was a rapidly growing industrial city with a large influx of immigrants for seasonal labour (Devine, 1996). Because of this, its central areas were crowded and consisted of labyrinths housing the poorer populations, while courts and straight streets dominated the newer areas.

In both Paris and Glasgow, ‘the surgical opening up of cities to circulation, light and air’ (Vidler, 1993: 84) was central to the process of modernisation. The understanding of the city at the time, both in the cases of Paris and Glasgow, was largely through the metaphor of the body (see Sennett, 1976; Choay, 1969; on Paris, see Jordan, 1996; on Glasgow, see Gossman, 2015). A city could be ‘sick, moribund, or suffocating’ (Jordan, 1996: 185) and, as such, it would warrant at times extreme measures such as antisepsis (i.e. the mass scale demolition, deprivation, and displacement of individuals from a given area), the introduction of discipline and regulation where it was
missing, and, ultimately, regeneration for the healthy bodies\textsuperscript{15}. In his book on the topic, Sennett (1976: 324) has commented that 19\textsuperscript{th} century urban planners and designers drew inspiration from their Enlightenment predecessors ‘who conceived of the city as arteries and veins of movement’. In the case of Paris, Choay (1969: 17) points to Haussmann’s intention to achieve ‘the effective unity of the city’ through the novel means of ‘a circulatory system and opening a system of ventilation’ through the technology of the ‘boulevard’ (also, see Fraser, 2011: 185). Beyond the violence of the metaphor itself, the real violence of displacement and demolition was stark. In fact, the language of Haussmannisation was one of transparency, visibility, and panopticism, of percements (or percée) [openings] and éventrement [disembowelling] (Jordan, 1996). Jordan addresses this directly regarding Haussmann’s conflation of amelioration and cleansing, treating it as ‘further evidence of the transmutation of the language of hygiene into that of strategy’ (1996: 192). Further reporting that ‘[t]he prefect was obsessed with urban hygiene, which he understood in social as well as medical terms’ (1996: 192). In order to examine fully the implications of these changes, it is necessary to explore the actual changes in each city.

2.2.1.1. Paris

Paris has continuously been discussed as the modern city par excellence. Its grandiose restructuring in the period of the Second Empire and the iconic figure of Haussmann are at the centre of numerous monographs (see Harvey, 2005; Berman, 2010; Vidler, 2011; Jordan, 1996). The history of urban change in Paris is complex and a lot of it predates Haussmann. However, for the purposes of this project, the work of the photographer Eugène Atget occurred exclusively in the late period of Haussmannisation. With this in mind, there are several important elements of Haussmann’s instituted changes that this section will outline.

The Paris of the 1850s consisted of a medieval centre in the historic Île de la Cité, and a concentric circle of urban development pouring out (see

\textsuperscript{15}See Maxime Du Camp’s (1875) Paris, ses organes, ses fonctions et sa vie [Paris, its organs, its functions, and its life].
Hazan and Beaumont, 2014: 484). As a result of this, the areas on the banks of the river in proximity to the central island consisted of narrow streets, overpopulated houses, and a characteristic lack of any sanitation infrastructure or gaslight. Choay (1969: 16) has referred to the layout of the Paris of 1853, the year Haussmann became the Prefect of the Seine, as ‘a collection of juxtaposed parts’. In the period from 1830 to the end of the 19th century, Paris’s population grew from one million to two (Choay, 1969). Haussmann’s plan for modernization consisted of an almost complete overhaul, or disembowelling, of the Île de la Cité, a carving out of a series of boulevards in the spirit of Regent Street in London, as well as a construction of a series of squares, parks, and green spaces. In the process of doing so, Haussmann successfully destroyed the communities of working-class neighbourhoods at the centre of the city. He did so intentionally, with an often acknowledged consideration for the prevention of urban political unrest (see Benjamin, 1999; Choay, 1969: 15; Jordan, 1996); of particular significance had been the recent June Days of unrest in 1848 at the time of taking the position of Prefect of the Seine. As described by Haussmann himself, a key part of his plan was:

‘to cut a cross, north to south and east to west, through the center of Paris, bringing the city’s cardinal points into direct communication’ (as cited in Choay, 1969: 18)

This ‘great cross’ [grande croisée] was the Prefect’s inaugural project, and it fulfilled both symbolic and practical purposes (Jordan, 1996: 186). This was the case in all of Haussmann’s work: a straight street would be carved into a working-class neighbourhood with the purpose of destroying the insulated area that had in the past proven easily defendable from the army (see Hazan, 2011; 2015; Ross, 2016) as much as opening up the street to businesses and commerce. Moreover, Haussmann’s plan consisted of a uniform aesthetic of, as Choay describes it (1969: 19), ‘uniform frontage lines along broad, straight streets. [and it included] research into perspective effects and location of monuments on a perspective axis’. Often, modern functionality and technology would be thinly aestheticized (according to Choay, 1969, as an afterthought only) with reference to an imperial past. As Jordan (1996: 186) describes the ‘great cross’:
‘The great cross was to be the north-south, east-west axes of the new city: respectively the boulevards Strasbourg-Sebastopol and Champs-Elysée-Rivoli (the former continued by the boulevard St. Michel, the later by the rue St. Antoine), and made reference to the Roman foundations of Paris as well as the city’s medieval heritage. Myth and reality were loosely intermingled’ (emphasis added; also, see Gilloch, 1997).

Both surpassing and succeeding the outmoded past, Haussmann’s new Paris consisted of a narrative of legibility and transparency of space. The already existing, and to an extent implemented, ‘principles of axial symmetry and vistas for monumental effects’ (Moses, 1942: 58) were ‘further emphasised and expanded’ in Haussmann’s work. The ‘strategic lines of the boulevards’ (Haussmann as cited in Vidler, 2011: 95) were seen and treated as forms of technology for redoing the city. All secondary streets were constructed in reference to the boulevards. At the end of each boulevard, Haussmann considered it necessary to have a monument of some kind, often a church – if there was none, he would build one16. Boulevards themselves were treated as monuments – at their reveal the boulevards Strasbourg-Sebastopol, the central part of the grande croisée then known as Boulevard du Centre, were veiled and uncovered to an audience with a ceremonial opening (see Benjamin, 1979). Ultimately, Haussmann’s efforts created a ‘holistic vision of an entire city brought into line’ in a manner typical for the Enlightenment through the combination of technical knowledge and research with a conviction of achievable progress through amelioration (Vidler, 2011: 94-95). In fact, Haussmann’s project relied to a great extent, and ‘had waited’, on the development of modern photography and cartography (Vidler, 2011: 95). As Foucault has noted, the term horizon, on which the perspective of a boulevard relied heavily, ‘is a pictorial, but also a strategic notion’ (1980:68). The aesthetic, pictorial dimension of Haussmann’s Paris consisted of:

16 ‘Boulevards were, in keeping with their monumental status, far from being lines to infinity; at each end was the proper culmination of the axis: “In effect I have never ordered the tracing of any way whatsoever ... without concerning myself with the point of view that one could give to it”’ (Haussmann as cited in Vidler, 2011: 102)
‘...beautiful perspectives, by the disengaging of ancient monuments and the isolation of new ones: by the opening of planted avenues, vast promenades, parks and public gardens, filling the eyes with a luxury of greenery and flowers without parallel’ (Haussmann as cited in Vidler, 2011: 101-102)

Haussmann has been both lauded and vilified in equal measure for the urban modernisation project he undertook by imperial mandate of Napoleon III (see Jordan, 1996; also, Berman, :150). He has been referred to as ‘the Attila of the straight line’ (Choay, 1976: 15), as well as a ‘planner […] schooled in the mechanisms of reason and order’ of the Enlightenment (Vidler, 2011: 92). Robert Moses, in many ways New York’s successor of Haussmann (Berman, 2010), has referred to him as a genius (Moses, 1942). Haussmann himself has been reported to have referred to himself as a ‘demolition artist’ (Benjamin, 1979). Regardless of the sentiment regarding the restructuring of Paris, Harvey’s claim that Haussmann ‘bludgeoned the city into modernity’ is undeniable (Harvey, 2005: 2).

Haussmann’s name has become so notorious that it is now a symbol of the callous demolition of central working-class urban areas, the modernisation of infrastructure with the purposes of introducing contemporary technology such as railways and sanitation, and the displacement of working-class populations to temporary housing at the periphery of the city (see Merrifield, 2014). In 1872, at the end of Haussmann’s career, Friedrich Engels (1970: 70) has remarked that:

‘By “Haussmann” I mean the practice, which has now become general, of making breaches in the working-class quarters of our big cities, particularly in those which are centrally situated, irrespective of whether this practice is occasioned by considerations of public health and beautification or by the demand for big centrally located business premises or by traffic requirements, such as the laying down of railways, streets, etc.’
Figure 2: Plan de Paris, avec indication des rues nouvelles et des travaux en cours d’exécution - Paniconography by Firmin Gillot (b 1820, d 1872) - Engraving by F. Delamare, WikiCommons, 1853.

Comparing Paris pre- (figure 2, above) and post- (figure 3, below) Haussmann reveals a stark contrast.

Figure 3: Plan d’ensemble des travaux de Paris à l’échelle de 0.001 pour 10 mètres (1/10 000) indiquant les voies exécutées et projetées de 1851 à 1868 by E. Andriveau-Goujon, Gallica – Bibliothèque Nationale de France, 1868 (see Paccoud, 2016).
Merrifield has described Haussmannisation as a ‘process of divide and rule, of class expulsion through spatial transformation, of social polarization through economic and political gerrymandering’ (2014: 29). Haussmann worked by mobilising public money to support private entrepreneurs and builders (Merrifield, 2014), effectively commercialising the city of Paris on a scale that was unprecedented at the time (Jordan, 1996). One example of this is the line of the Champs-Elysée – Rivoli and the adjacent Tuileries Gardens. The boulevard, originally designed by Napoleon I, was made so that:

‘A continuous height of four stories plus attic floors combined with the sloping roof, unbroken lines of balconies with uniform fenestration, arcaded sidewalks which protect shoppers and conceal the commercial obtrusiveness of shops, have brought about a simple dignity and charm which have been widely copied elsewhere. [...] A typical “tenement” of uniform facade without arcaded walks on the Boulevard de Sebastopol includes shops on the ground floor, a mezzanine, three main floors with apartments for upper middle class tenants, and two attic floors in the sloping roof for servants and tenants of the poorer classes.’ (Moses, 1942: 61)

Haussmann’s ‘holistic vision’ was so thorough that, in addition to uniform façades, due to the large-scale expropriation of property and partial demolition, the typical layout of a Parisian bourgeois apartment was changed completely (Pinon, 2002). The expropriation of property often had a stark classed dimension where the poorest population in the central areas were moved to temporary housing at the periphery of Paris (The Zone). The newly built boulevards and central area, however, were almost exclusively bourgeois in nature, consisting of multiple cabarets and cafes. Ironically, Berman points out (2010) that it is the invention of the boulevard, and the concomitant disembowelment of the working-class areas, that led to the creation of the first truly public urban spaces in Paris, where bourgeoisie and proletariat could encounter each other on the boulevard.
This new commercial city utilised new technology, such as the macadam road surface and gaslight (Berman, 2010), and was:

‘carefully planned to separate pedestrian, stroller, loiterer, ambling service vehicle, and rushing carriage, planted with rows of trees to ensure shade in summer, provided with underground piping for rain water, sewage, and gas, cleaned with the aid of scientifically designed gutters faced by the uniform height of the residences and stores of the nouveau bourgeoisie, and carefully sited to point toward a monument or vista as the object of civil pride or aesthetic pleasure, the Haussmann’s boulevard was in effect the epitome and condenser of Second Empire daily life: the modern artefact par excellence’ (Vidler, 2011: 100).

In every part of Haussmann’s Paris, form and function, aesthetics and bourgeois capitalism, panoptic principles and transparent order were made to ‘remind the citizen of one, uniformly governed Paris’ (Vidler, 2011: 100). The public pissoir, the railing, tree guards, or gas lights were all standardised and typified to an extreme; as Vidler evocatively summarises (2011: 100), a ‘bench in the Faubourg Saint Antoine was the same as that in the Champs-Élysées’. According to Jordan (1996: 11), Haussmann was convinced that ‘administration could and should confront and solve the great questions of the day’; as a true bureaucrat, he believed government and bureaucratic administration to be the same.

In 1853, it is important to emphasise, good government meant being concerned with the dangers of working-class revolt. As already mentioned, the streets of the new Paris were strategic in intention. The examples of the boulevard Richard Lenoir or the canal St. Martin were intentionally redesigned with the prospect in mind to prevent the events of the June Days of 1848 possible repetition (Jordan, 1996: 188). Often, this type of urban restructure was double in function, both military and bourgeois, making Haussmann’s Paris a markedly classed city:

‘...at exactly the same time [when] Haussmann constructed a barracks near the Place de la République, he was building the
gardens of the boulevard Richard Lenoir. In truth, gardens and barracks were compatible. […] Imperial urban politics was to contain the working-class quarters, not transform them, to preserve private property while assuring the stability of the authoritarian state’ (Jordan, 1996: 191).

The boulevards carved through the city, often through the old working class neighbourhoods, were similarly manifold and inherently political in their function: they connected areas, divided and segregated areas, aestheticized the city space as well as facilitated military access and the use of police force, simultaneously commercialised the centre and made it uniform, recognisable, and legible. Jordan (1996) provides a clear example of this when discussing Haussmann’s restructuring of the Left Bank in relation to the boulevard Strasbourg-Sebastopol. In order to continue the axis of sight from the Gare de L’Est to the boulevard St. Michel and the infamous St. Michel fountain, Haussmann had the task of legibility and the conveyance of significance:

‘To continue the illusion that his great north-south axis ran in a straight line through the center of Paris, Haussmann had the architect, Davioud, design the St. Michel fountain, which occupies a triangular space created by the convergence of the boulevard St. Michel and an unimportant street, the rue Danton. One final trompe l’oeil was needed. Looking at the place St. Michel from the Île de la Cité, one notes that the boulevard St. Michel and the rue Danton seem of equal size and significance. In fact the former is a major new boulevard,
the latter a minor little street. Haussmann emphasized the important street by the trees lining the boulevard St. Michel and the clever use of hierarchical architecture. The whole system works: the individual parts are incoherent' (Jordan, 1996: 197-198).

2.2.1.2. Glasgow

In the 19th century, Glasgow underwent a rapid industrialisation, and as a result, in the space of a century, it more than quintupled its population. Whitehand asserts (1992: 419) that Glasgow was ‘Britain’s second city’, and Devine clarifies that this was due to ‘the scale and speed of the city’s development’ (Devine, 1995: 402). However, this development meant that, in the first part of the 19th century, Glasgow was ‘par excellence, the classic working-class industrial city’ (Devine, 1995: 412). Its claim to the status of ‘the second city of empire’ a major aspect of the city’s identity (Engels, 1969: 71). Osman and Englander (1981: n.p.) pointed out the darker side of ‘The Age of the Great Cities’ by describing ‘the ubiquitous back-to-back [of] the perilous backlands of urban Scotland’.

Furthermore, Glasgow differed significantly from the other large city in Scotland, Edinburgh, by having a much larger working-class population (Devine, 1969). As early as 1845, Engels (1969: 69) pointed out the ‘the same wynds, the same tall houses’ like those in Edinburgh, but quoting The Artisan, remarked on the percentage of the working-class being approximately 78% of a population of roughly 300,000 people. More recently, Devine has commented on the same period of the city and provided the numbers that about 73.92% of men and 64.59% of women were in industrial occupation, while about 4.53% and 0.50% in professional work associated with the middle classes (Devine, 1995: 411). Out of these industrial occupations, around 40% were in the textile industry (ibid.). The class makeup of the city had a profound effect on the social conditions of the city. For example, in cities like Edinburgh around 70% of women worked in domestic labour in contrast to 30% in Glasgow – this is so, according to Devine (1995), because the professional classes were relatively small in number in Glasgow. This, in turn, put a pressure on working-class housing, since domestic labour often
provided the worker with housing at the employer’s property (Devine, 1995: 412). Furthermore, in terms of the type of labour that was most prevalent among the working-class immigrant population that made up the closes, wynds, and vennels documented by Annan it would have likely been for the most part seasonal work that relies on the peaks and lows of the textile industry, particularly wool (Devine, 1995). The textile industry remained the chief employment of labour until the 1840s, after which the city went through a period of rapid development of its port- and maritime related industries (Devine, 1995; for the role of shipbuilding on the urban layout of the city, see Checkland, 1964: 46).

On the same closes, wynds, and vennels, Engels, quoting The Artisan, described the following conditions:

‘Such localities exist most abundantly in the heart of the city – south of the Irongate and west of the Saltmarket, as well as in the Calton, off the High Street, etc– endless labyrinths of narrow lanes or wynds, into which almost at every step debouche courts or closes formed by old, ill-ventilated, towering houses crumbling to decay, destitute of water and crowded with inhabitants, comprising three or four families (perhaps twenty persons) on each flat, and sometimes each flat let out in lodgings that confine – we dare not say accommodate – from fifteen to twenty persons in a single room. These districts are occupied by the poorest, most depraved, and most worthless portion of the population, and they may be considered as the fruitful source of those pestilential fevers which thence spread their destructive ravages over the whole of Glasgow’ (as cited in Engels, 1969: 69)

It is this that made up the geographical focus of the modernisation project of interest to this dissertation, both in terms of Annan’s photographic record (see Gossman, 2015) and the City Improvement Trust’s demolition and renewal plans (see Morgan, 1996: 21). Namely, this was the Glasgow Cross – a major intersection of the key thoroughfares consisting of Saltmarket,
High Street (seen in figure 5, below, lined with blue squares – each marking a photograph by Annan), Trongate, and Gallowgate (Maddox and Stevenson, 2017). In terms of territory, Annan’s documentation spanned the densely populated immigrant working class neighbourhoods that ‘radiat[ed] two to five hundred yards east, west, and north’ from the aforementioned Glasgow Cross (Chisholm as cited in Maddox and Stevenson, 2017: 155).

**REDACTED**

Figure 5: Partial screenshot of ‘Plate Locations’ by Vladimir Rizov, National Library of Scotland, 2016, [https://digital.nls.uk/learning/thomas-annan-glasgow/historical-maps/].

Much like the examples of Paris above, Glasgow was a city of significant class segregation – its class makeup was so disparate due to the migration of the gentry to the city’s periphery, unlike the case of Edinburgh. Checkland comments on the ‘repulsive power of industry’ (Checkland, 1964: 41), describing the spatial distribution of class following a strict pattern:

‘The wealthier the family the more successful it was in moving ever westward; the poorer the family, the more likely it was to remain near the old heart of the city, in a state of indigence’ (Checkland, 1964: 42).

This, according to Ward (1975: 143), resulted in a ‘zonal arrangement’ of the city, which resulted in the ‘concentration of the poorest people in the oldest and most centrally located housing’. This arrangement, in turn, meant that the concentration of one group in a particular area was relying on a process of ‘upward social mobility of sufficient magnitude’ so as to adequately satisfy the needs for housing of the seasonal and immigrant population seeking the cheapest housing (Ward, 1975: 143). At the same time, it was the central area of Glasgow that was affected the highest by
disease due to the lack of sanitary infrastructure (Gossman, 2015). In 1841 Glasgow had a higher crude-death rate (31.5%) than Aberdeen, Dundee, and Edinburgh, and more than three times that of London (8%); the rate only went on to increase in the following decades due to typhus, fever, and the general unsanitary conditions of the industrial metropolis (Devine, 1995: 404).

According to Engels’ research, the poor areas of the Glasgow Cross consisted of anywhere from 15,000 to 30,00017 people at a given moment at the time of his writing (1845 – Engels, 1969: 70-71; also, see Devine, 1995: 406). This is not surprising, since ‘[I]the number of [Glasgow’s] inhabitants rose from 77,385 in 1801 to 274,533 a mere four decades later’ (Devine, 1995: 406) – so much so that by 1871 (the first publication date of the volume of The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1867-1871) the population had grown to 477,732, which by 1901 (which is the publication date of the final version of the same volume) had grown to 761,709 people (Withers, 1996: 142). Furthermore, in the period of 1861 to 1871 the population of the city of Glasgow had risen from 395,503 to 477,732 – this is particularly significant since the first edition of the volume of interest to this dissertation consisted of photographs taken during the period of 1868-1871, which was markedly a period of continuous and rapid growth (Withers, 1996: 142). Moreover, the rise of Glasgow’s population during the 19th century was intimately connected with immigration. Although the largest part of people moving into the city were Scottish born, there was a considerable Irish minority that at the time of 1861 was 15.61% of the city’s population (Withers, 1996: 149). As a result of the immigrant status and the lack of available housing, the central area of the city i.e. the Glasgow Cross was continuously overpopulated throughout the 19th century. So much so that Glasgow saw a significant homeless population, in response to which

17 ‘The splendid town mansions of the city’s grandees and the impressive squares and new streets being laid out to the west of the core of the old burgh were all integral parts of the new Glasgow. So too, however, were the “wynds and closes” of the High Street, Gallowgate and Saltmarket area, the very heart of the burgeoning slum district. Here there lived, around 1830, more than 20,000 people with numbers rising rapidly on an annual basis as migrants continued to pour into the city’ (Devine, 1995: 406).
the Glasgow Night Asylum for the Homeless, one of the first of its kind, was established in 1838 (Devine, 1995: 408).

The problem of the rapid population growth was made even more unmanageable at the period of activity following 1866 with the creation of the City Improvement Trust, created by a private Act of Parliament with the purpose of handling the very problem; however:

‘The difficulty was compounded by the clearance during this time of large numbers of working-class families, first for railway lines and stations, and then for new streets and developments under the 1866 City Improvement Act. As the railways moved into the heart of the city, many of the wynds and closes of Bridgegate, Saltmarket and High Street were demolished. The creation of St. Enoch Station alone involved the demolition of 433 tenements, which had previously housed 6,142 people. Altogether, an estimated 20,000 were displaced by railways developments in the centre of Glasgow during the 1860s, with the majority of the displaced having no alternative but to lodge with other families because of the housing shortage.’
(Hamish Fraser and Maver, 1996: 365)

Furthermore, the demolition and reconstruction of the City Improvement Trust was so comprehensive that at the time of 1881, out of the total 119,000 extant houses, according to Hamish Fraser and Maver (1996: 365), 38% had been built since 1866. Although John Carrick, the City Architect of Glasgow, was aware of the work of Haussmann in Paris, Hasmish Fraser and Maver (1996: 415) point to the significance of the work of the City Improvement Trust in the context of the urban history of the United Kingdom - this ‘was the first time a city in the United Kingdom had taken on such powers of development’.

2.2.2. The Photographic City

It is part of this project’s argument that the modern city is inherently a photographic city. Modernisation of big cities was based to a large extent on the Enlightenment and the fears of darkness and desire for order and visibility that it brought into modernity. This chapter has focused on some of
the key literature on the topic in order to demonstrate that the process of modernisation of cities has been one of making them transparent spaces according to the principle of the inspecting gaze of panopticism. The central slum areas of Glasgow with their darkness and disease needed to be ‘opened up’ (Young, 1900) to the fresh air and light just as much as its large population of migrants occupying a virtually unpolic ed area needed to be controlled. Similarly, the entire city of Paris with its labyrinthine streets had to be cut into separate parts with identifiable functions, thus becoming a singular aesthetic totality that reinforces class privilege and the power of the state. It is not surprising that the state had to become able to see into its territory, make visible its subjects, and legitimise itself through a discourse of privileged knowledge-production in specific institutions.

According to Foucault (2001), this need for the ordering of the city marked a change in understanding space – from the 18th century onwards, ‘the cities [of a state] served as the models for the governmental rationality that was to apply to the whole of the territory’ (Foucault, 2001: 351). Moreover, this came hand-in-hand with another discovery in political thought – ‘the idea that a society not only has to deal with a territory, with a domain, and with its subjects – it also has to deal with a complex and independent reality that has its own laws and mechanisms of reaction, its regulations as well as its possibilities of disturbance’ – society (Foucault 2001: 352, emphasis added). Mumford (as cited in Scott, 1998: 56) also points to the modern city’s logic of urban space being based on the city-state of the Italian Renaissance, thus linking state power and urban space. James C. Scott (1998) has also commented on the modern state’s proclivity for constructing a dominant vision of its territory and resources, effectively simplifying the reality of its domain according to abstract principles of order and legibility. The point, however, is that the state needed to simplify urban space in order to make it legible to itself, not necessarily to its inhabitants. This, in turn, was a strategic solidification of power – territory itself becoming
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18 Territory here is taken to mean both Elden’s definition of a ‘political technology’ for ‘the extension of the state’ (2013: 322) and Foucault’s use of the term in relation to sovereignty: ‘Territory is no doubt a geographical notion, but it’s first of all a juridico-political one’ (Foucault, 1980: 68). Also, ‘[T]he modern meaning of territory is closely related to the legal concept of sovereignty’ (Paasi, 2003: 110).
a ‘political technology’ (Elden, 2013: 322) which ultimately had as its goal ‘the extension of the state’ (Elden, 2013: 322). De Certeau (1988: 46) further adds:

‘Through a cellular space of the same type for everyone (schoolboys, soldiers, workers, criminals or the ill), the techniques perfected the visibility and the gridwork of this space in order to make of it a tool capable of disciplining under control and “treating” any human group whatever.’

This is at the core of the archive. The modern state not only wanted order and legibility, but also, very much in the spirit of modernity, possessed its own ‘entropic anxiety’ and ‘historical desire’ (Edwards, 2009a; 2009c). Gilloch (1997: 77) also points to the fact that in cities ‘a particular, persuasive version of the past is constructed and elaborated’, since ‘in the metropolis, the past is to be eradicated, catalogued, or glorified’. Thus, it is no surprise that at the core of the issues discussed in this chapter are the notion of the historical imagination and the desire to record the processes of modernisation into the Archive. After all, the archive is a key institution for the government of the historical imagination, as well as the Foucauldian notion of ‘governmentality’ – namely, ‘how the modern sovereign state and the modern autonomous individual co-determine each other’s emergence’ (Lemke, 2002: 2-3). Institutions such as the Museum, or the Archive, are, according to Bennett (2005: 522), ‘machineries that are implicated in the shaping of civic capacities’. Such institutions are ‘technologies that, by connecting specific forms of expertise to programmes of social management, operate in registers that are simultaneously epistemological and civic’ (Bennett, 2005: 522). Furthermore, the Archive is the privileged site par excellence, in which photographs are collected (Edwards, 2009a). As such, the archive is the site in which photographs are most at the mercy of ‘significant distortions’ (Tagg, 1988: 2). As Sekula has asserted (1999b: 444), the ‘model [of the archive] exerts a basic influence on the character of the truths and pleasures experienced in looking at photographs’. It could even be argued that ‘archival ambitions and procedures are intrinsic to photographic practice’ (Sekula, 1999b: 444).
Even if this is not always the case, the archive inevitably exercises its power on photographic objects after the fact of their creation. According to Edwards (Edwards, 2009a: 142), ‘the ordering of the archive was itself premised on homogenizing ideas of historical significance, framing the desired mode of attention’. This, in turn, has resulted in a reduction of ‘all possible sights to a single code of equivalence [which is] grounded in the metrical accuracy of the camera’ (Sekula, 1992: 352). Sekula (1992: 352) further adds that the significance of this should not be underestimated:

‘For nineteenth-century positivists, photography doubly fulfilled the Enlightenment dream of a universal language […] Photography promised more than a wealth of detail; it promised to reduce nature to its geometrical essence.’

This ‘archive fever’ (Derrida, 1996), widely equated with ‘historical desire’ (Edwards, 2009a; 2009c) and Foucault’s ‘will to knowledge’ (1978: 73) is inherently photographic. Edwards (2009a: 138) points to the Archive and its ‘concern with the loss of the potential of photographs to provide historical evidence’. In the historical imagination of modernity, it is unthinkable to imagine Haussmann’s project or Glasgow’s slum clearance without any accompanying evidence. Edwards (2016) has provided examples of the British Colonial Office and its desire to produce photographic documents without having a particular reason or need for them. More recently, Edwards (2014: 138-141) has referred to this fear as ‘entropic anxiety’, which is at the centre of topographical surveys integral to the domain of documentary photography:

‘their material practices can be seen as a battle against forces that were relentlessly and increasingly perceived as random and disordered: against the frailty of human memory, against the forces of disordered modernity, and against cultural and material disappearance’ (Edwards, 2009a: 138).

Furthermore, it has been noted that Haussmann’s city planning is centred on perspective, vision, and order. According to Rubin (2008), it can be argued that Haussmann’s Paris ‘at some level itself embodies the vision of the city propagated by photography’ with its focus on ‘vistas, focal
monuments, light and open spaces’ which were all ‘constructed for the gaze’ (Rubin, 2008: 49). With its ‘cannonshot boulevard, seemingly without end’ (Giedion as cited in Rice, 2000: 43), Paris is ‘the site of modernity, the place where modern vision was developed’ (Rubin, 2008: 17). Similarly, John Carrick, Glasgow’s City Architect based his urban plans of slum clearance on mid-Haussmannisation Paris (Withey, 2003).

On an abstract level, the modern city is photographic exactly due to its architecture and urban planning. Eric Hazan (2011) has noted that for early photographers there was a clear connection between architecture, urban space, and photography. The very first photographs were of cities and relied on urban architecture and infrastructure. Perego (1998) has commented in an essay exploring the work of Charles Marville, that quite often the words edifice and machine were used interchangeably in urban environments. This indicates a deep connection between photography and architecture. For example, Foucault (1980) has already pointed out that, although based in architecture, the Panopticon is much more than a type of building. Photography itself traces its roots to the panoptic principle; in his comparison between the photographs of Charles Marville and Eugène Atget, Sramek (2013) argues that Marville’s work was not in line with the Panopticon, as it did not document the entirety of a street, area, or Paris. However, panopticism is not literal, it works in principle – it is the potentiality of seeing all as much as it is the power associated with the subjective feeling of being able to see all (1980: 71).

Foucault’s famous treatise (1995: 197-198) on the matter points to this exactly, the ‘panoptic mechanism arranges spatial unities that make it possible to see constantly and to recognize immediately’. Put succinctly and aptly by Foucault, ‘visibility is a trap’ (1995: 198). Walter Benjamin (2002: 531), however, has taken Bentham’s Panopticon in a historical direction,
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19 For instance, in an interview on the topic of geography, Foucault (1980: 71) has commented the following: ‘By the term ‘Panoptism’, I have in mind an ensemble of mechanisms brought into play in all the clusters of procedures used by power. Panoptism was a technological invention in the order of power, comparable with the steam engine in the order of production. This invention had the peculiarity of being utilised first of all on a local level, in schools, barracks and hospitals. This was where the experiment of integral surveillance was carried out. People learned how to establish dossiers, systems of marking and classifying, the integrated accountancy of individual records’.
one directly aligned with both aesthetics and the archive, where he compares it to a wax museum, ‘not only does one see everything, but one sees it in all ways’. Saisselin (as cited in Gilloch, 1997: 145) has argued that ‘the city expanded the range of the seeable,’ but this ‘panopticism’ has resulted in ‘the unseeing stare, for the metropolis demands that one appear to look without seeing’ (Gilloch, 1997: 145).

This tension is at the core of the first two empirical chapters (Chapters Four and Five) – the newly built modern cities and their panoptic visibility resulted in an obfuscation of the reciprocity of gaze. The city thus became a space of disquiet and tension, where any reciprocity possesses a shock-value and is capable of disturbing the established order. The distribution of the visible in the city is a recurring issue in this project, and it will be shown to possess a political significance, since:

‘The modern city is not only the site of the disappearance of the poor in the present, but also the space in which they become imperceptible in the past’ (Gilloch, 1997: 92)

It is in this understanding of the city as photographic that emerges the convergence of this panoptic model with modern urban planning, the ‘historical desire’ and ‘will to knowledge’ to combat ‘entropic anxiety’, and the development of photographic technology. This triad of photography, history, and the city will be at the centre of the analyses in the following chapters. The cities of Paris and Glasgow, documented by Atget and Annan respectively, will be shown to be at the core of discourses of evidence and document, social class, and urban space. Ultimately, the analyses will build on the discussions provided in this chapter and echo Lefebvre’s statement that ‘[o]ur towns may be read like a book’ yet at the same time, unlike a book, ‘towns and rural areas “are” what they signify’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 233). It is through documentary photography that a hermeneutic of the city will be provided, thus providing a ‘resubjectivization of the objective culture of the metropolis’ (Reeh, 2004: 17). In the following two chapters, the discussion provided here will be illustrated through the two case studies. Furthermore, the problem of documentary photography as a practice that both produces and re-produces space will be addressed
(in Chapters Four and Five). In the penultimate chapter, the potential for documentary photography to appropriate space will be acknowledged (Chapter Six).
Chapter Three: Methodology

This research project is a sociological study of archival photographs and documents that pertain to the genre of documentary photography. The project is situated in understandings of the notion of the 'archive' (Cook, 1997) as an institution whose functions is to '[r]ecord creation, appraisal, acquisition, arrangement, description, preservation, [and] accessibility' (Gilliland and McKemmish, 2006: 151). In the framework of this research, the archive and the photograph intersect in 'the idea of the photograph as an archival record' (Enwezor, 2008: 11).

There is an identifiable gap in the literature in terms of the combination of method and topic that this project is addressing. Approaches at the intersection between the field of photography, sociology, and archival study tend to take for granted the assumption that photography is archival in its essence (for example, see Sekulla, 1992; Enwezor, 2008; McQuire, 2013), which can result in an under-exploration of one of the three perspectives. While seen as important, the historical interweaving of documentary photography and specific archived collections is underexplored (Enwezor, 2008; Vassallo, 2014a; 2014b). The same approaches tend to omit archival data from their discussion (in particular, Wigley, 2005; Azoulay, 2012; McQuire, 2013; Vasallo, 2014a) and, instead, discuss the nature of archives and their relevance to the particular field in which the inquiry is situated.

There are some notable exceptions, such as Rose (2000) and Steyerl (2009), in whose work archival data is positioned on equal footing with the sociological concepts being discussed. It is in this context that this research project is a novel contribution to the discipline of sociology. Particularly, this research project addresses documentary photography as a practice that is interwoven with space, in terms of material production, storage and knowledge of photographs, and interpretation and meaning. The overall aim of this project is to understand the practices involved in the production of an image as part of the field of documentary photography.

As already established, this research project focuses on the work of Eugène Atget and Thomas Annan; the rationale behind the choice of focus is
outlined in detail below. For the purposes of this chapter, the work of Atget has been identified as being of a pioneering status in documentary photography (Hambourg and Szarkowski, 1982; Lederman, 2008; Sramek, 2013; Pound, 2013; Vassallo, 2014a; 2014b). Being of such status, his work can be identified as central to what Solomon-Godeau (1991) asserts is the historical character, in contrast to ontological, of the definition of documentary photography. Namely, Solomon-Godeau argues that what constitutes documentary photography is subject to change. In Rosler’s terms (2004: 186), a photograph is always a product of ‘the conventional “aesthetic-historical” moment’. In Atget’s case, this should be understood in the sense of his work becoming a keystone of documentary photography, while at the time of his practice it was barely acknowledged (Nesbit, 1998; Hambourg and Szarkowski, 1982).

Furthermore, Atget’s work has been identified as sociologically significant (Benjamin, 1969; 1979; Gilloch, 1997; 2002), as well as still bearing relevance to contemporary documentary photographic practice across a variety of contexts (Rauschenberg, 2007; Koh, 2015; Reese, 2015). As Vassallo asserts (2014a: 23), Atget’s work stands in the unique position of being the ‘first documentalist’, and is particularly useful in terms of the research aims of this research project. With regards to the work of Thomas Annan, his work is both situated in a contrasting historic context, as well as in a historically rich tradition of government-commissioned photographic work (see Tostões and Braga, 2013; Vassallo, 2014a; 2014b). Additionally, Annan’s work continues to take a central position in contemporary discussions on cities, social inequality, and documentation (Tomey, 2013; Rose, 2014; Vassallo, 2014a; 2014b). Both photographers were chosen at the outset of this project due to the literature pointing the high quantity of the photographs produced while commissioned by a government institution. However, the analysis of institutional documents and relevant literature has revealed that neither of them was, in fact, commissioned by an institution for their photographic work (for Atget, see Nesbit, 1998; Hambourg and Szarkowski, 1982; for Annan, see Stevenson, 2017; Maddox and Stevenson, 2017).

According to Vassallo (2014a; 2014b), there are four pioneering photographers of the late 1800s that were involved in this type of
documentary photographic work that is engaged with architecture, urban change, and local government. Those photographers were Eugène Atget and Charles Marville in Paris, Thomas Annan in Glasgow, and Georg Koppmann in Hamburg (Vassallo, 2014a; 2014b; Nilsen, 2011). Additionally, Nilsen (2011) claims that Koppmann’s photographic project of documenting the areas of Hamburg that were to be replaced by a new city centre and free port in the 1880s was the one with highest number of photographs (over 10,000 according to Nilsen, 2011). Besides these mentions, there is no in-depth study of Koppmann’s work in English. Additionally, Koppmann’s work does not figure in any collection that is based in the United Kingdom. On the basis of this, Koppmann’s work was discarded as a potential focus for this study. Similarly, the work of Charles Marville was discarded due to an inability to access a major collection of his work physically. Due to this, references to Marville’s photographs will be used only as supplementary evidence and context.

There are several similarities and differences between the two case studies that need to be acknowledged and justified. The differences are meant to work as providing grounds for the comparison in Chapter Six, as well as accounting for a different environment of an image’s production, storage, and interpretation of documentary photography. At the core of this project is a consideration of documentary photography’s capability to produce space, as well as appropriate it. A more detailed account of the application of the methods, as well as the analytical frameworks, in which they will be operationalised, will be presented in the sections of this chapter below. Each case study aims to provide grounds for the examination of the
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20 The works of Beniamino Facchinelli in Cairo, Germaine Krull in Paris and Berlin, or Ara Güler in Istanbul also are of interest, but could not be accessed during this project. Other photographers, such as John Thomson and his work in London, were discarded due to their much stronger focus on urban inhabitants, rather than urban environments (Tagg, 1988). In terms of other British photographers, Edwards’ work (2009a) has pointed to the photographs of Sir Benjamin Stone, the instigator of the national survey project and a documentary photographer of the city of Birmingham. It was not possible to attain sufficient access to his work. Although there are other British photographers, who were engaged with similar projects – Arthur Watson in Hull or Francis Meadow Sutcliffe in Whitby, among others (see Englander and Osman, 1981) – none of them engaged with a city close to the scale of Glasgow or Paris, nor in such sustained quality and quantity of output (Englander and Osman, 1981).
problem domain as a confluence of different practices of meaning production.

In terms of general context, the choice of the two photographers reveals a difference of scale in several dimensions. Atget’s work outnumbers that of Annan. In terms of urban scale, the city of Paris is much bigger, more central to the historic period, and generally more marked by urban restructuring. However, Glasgow allows for an understanding of urban documentary photography dealing with issues of restructuring, demolition and displacement on a smaller scale – yet still on the metropolis level of as a city of the British Empire. There is also a difference in the relationship that the archive examined has in relation to documented city. The work of Atget is housed in an institution foreign to the photographer that does not have much to do with the city of Paris. Annan’s work, however, is housed in a library that is quite central to the archiving and preserving of Glaswegian and Scottish heritage. That being said, both cities are unique contexts in the development of photography. Namely, both were homes for photographic pioneers and an environment which supported photographic development, entrepreneurship, and practice. In the case of Glasgow, David Octavius Hill and Robert Adamson were central figures to the development of the practice as a whole, as well as locally, and in relation to the practice of documentary and socially oriented work (Stevenson, 2012; 2017). Thomas Annan is widely recognised as a protégé of the photographic duo, and was, in fact, a close personal friend of Hill (Stevenson, 2017). Atget’s work is similarly understood as a successor to the work of Charles Marville, the photographer commissioned by Haussmann to document the urban changes of Paris. Furthermore, Atget is understood as a pioneer in scale, endeavour, and influence. It has been noted that Atget’s foremost achievement is his rise to the status of a pioneer, regardless whether understood as a naïve and amateur or a deft and aesthetically proficient sage-like figure (Nesbit, 1992a; 1992b; To a lesser extent, Atget’s work can be understood to be a successor to the French Commission des Monuments Historiques in 1851, which resulted in the commissioning of five photographers, collectively known as Mission Héliographique (Hippolite Bayard, Henri LeSecq, Auguste Mestral, Gustave Le Grey, and Édouard Baldus). Each was sent to different regions of the country to document valuable monuments and construct a catalogue of visual information on their condition (Vassallo, 2014a).
Szarkowski, 1985; Desnos, 1928). So much so that it has been commented that he is the central figure of contemporary photography as well as photographic history – and that all photographers since his rise to prominence have defined themselves, or been defined, in relation to him (Nesbit, 1998; Szarkowski, 1985). Both photographers engaged in a systematic documenting of their city in an independent fashion, without any prior commission. Additionally, both Annan and Atget possessed a particular style that was deeply interwoven with the reality of the city in which they lived, the places they documented, and the historic period in which they lived, as well as the inevitable political issues of these aforementioned factors. Moreover, this project will demonstrate that both photographers were engaged in a practice of appropriating the spaces of the city through their photographic documentation.

3.1. Research Aims, Questions, and Objectives

The overall aim of this research project is to explore the domain of documentary photography through two key case studies. The research outlined below intends to make a theoretical contribution to the field of sociological inquiry by conducting an empirical study on the intersection between documentary photography, the archive, and urban space in the cases of the two photographers.

3.1.1. Research Questions

The aims described above can be expressed in the following general research question of the research project:

How is an image produced as a documentary photograph?

This general research question can be broken down into the following specific sub-questions:

1. What are the practices involved in the production of a photograph as documentary?
2. What is the relation between documentary photography and the environments of an image’s production, storage, and interpretation?
3.1.2. Research Objectives

The general objective of this project is greater understanding of the genre of documentary photography and the practices of meaning production in it. As an objective, in terms of the research question defined above, the research will provide a theoretical and empirical contribution to the understanding of the processes involved in the construction of an image as a documentary photograph. This outcome can be broken down into several more specific contributions to the field corresponding to the sub-questions:

- A theoretical and empirical contribution to the study of the origins of documentary photography and its relations to the city.
- A theoretical and empirical contribution to the study of the practices of production of visual documents in terms of textual and visual contents.
- A theoretical and empirical contribution to the understanding of the documentary photograph as a visual document.
- A theoretical and empirical contribution to the research of visual documents in an archive.

3.2. Methods

The programme of research outlined in this chapter is a study on archival photographic data that utilises a multi-method approach, as well as two complementary analytic frameworks. On the basis of existing academic literature, the archived photographic data of interest have been defined as photographs, institutional documents, and online catalogues. The archival study was conducted at two archival institutions, the Victoria and Albert Museum (VAM henceforth) in London and the Mitchell Library in Glasgow; in both cases, photographic collections were the key site of research, but emergent forms of data, such as catalogues and other institutional documents, have also been consulted.

3.2.1. Methodological Framework

Grounded Theory is a methodological framework (Grounded Theory Methodology, henceforth GTM), in which data analysis and data collection are simultaneous and iterative (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). It is based on
systematic reflection and it aims to generate conceptual ideas from a systematic analysis of data, rather than attempt to verify preconceived ideas’ relevance to the data (Strauss and Corbin, 1997). As a process, it can be characterised by three key components (Charmaz, 2014). First, coding can be divided into three stages, open, axial, and selective, where the researcher respectively defines categories, details relationships and subcategories, and forms concepts in a theoretical model (Charmaz, 2014). Second, grounded theory involves theoretical sampling in which emergent themes guide data choices. Third, grounded theory utilises a method of constant comparison, where categories are elaborated and refined until they are exhausted of their descriptive and explanatory power. Further to this point, properties of the categories are developed by continual comparisons of people, places, events, data sets, conditions, phenomena, etc (Charmaz, 2014).

Throughout the analysis in this project, GTM’s emphasis on ‘openness’ has been utilized (Charmaz, 2014; Sbaraini et al., 2011). Namely, this has manifested in an inductive analysis, which, in contrast to deduction, moves from the particular to the general. This move is also reflected in the progressions of the contents of the two empirical chapters (Chapter Four: Eugène Atget’s Paris and Chapter Five: Thomas Annan’s Glasgow), as well as the two empirical chapters’ transition into the penultimate theoretical chapter (Chapter Six: The Photographic Production of Space). Namely, both empirical chapters begin with examining photographs as images, as material objects, and then as curated institutional documents; Chapter Six, in turn, moves further towards abstraction whereby the defined empirical findings are related to existing theory. Throughout the analysis, the data have been analysed continuously and immediately upon collection to the extent, that data analysis and data collection have been practically simultaneous. Additionally, codes were also compared continuously and iteratively to each other in order to account for variation in data. Codes were eventually combined, related to one another, deepened and were constructed as explanatory concepts. Moreover, during the analysis I wrote out short memos – on separate images, patterns in images, cases, codes, or relationships between categories. Memos were descriptive,
comparative, and/or theoretical. On the basis of this process, the analysis in the two empirical chapters was developed.

Following this analysis, the work of Lefebvre was brought into relation with the findings from the two empirical chapters. Lefebvre’s work is seldom used empirically (see Elden, 2004; Kipfer, 2008; Kipfer et al., 2008; Milgrom, 2008; Nadal-Melsió, 2008; Stanek, 2011; Butler, 2012; Schmid, 2012), and when it is – it is rarely done through the use of Lefebvre’s triadic practices of production of (social) space (see Pierce and Martin, 2015). According to Pierce and Martin (2015: 1290):

‘Empirically probing (social) space [...] might lead to examination of representations of the city over time in maps and promotional materials, or interviews documenting people’s changing reactions to [a city] over time. But these empirical explorations, while inspired by an understanding of spatial production as complex and multifaceted, are difficult to integrate back into a holistic Lefebvrian analysis: tracing representational spaces, or representations, or spatial practices, of produced space through empirical investigation cleaves each spatial moment from the others, eliding the ways that they are always produced together’ (emphasis added).

In order to circumvent this problem in the application of Lefebvre’s theory to the already examined data, ‘the social and historical-material relationships that helped to create the city’ (Pierce and Martin, 2015: 1290) had to be introduced in Chapter Two. This way, this project fits into the GTM framework by utilising grounded theory methods – coding and memoing – in the form of Informed Grounded Theory (Thornberg, 2012). In Thornberg’s formulation of IGT, ‘the original idea of pure induction’ (Thornberg, 2012: 243) is problematized. Namely, the analysis, although based on and emergent from the data, has been informed by relevant theoretical literature.

The theoretical difference between Chapters Four/Five and Chapter Six is telling of this process. For instance, the concepts developed in Chapters
Four/Five of ‘documentary function’, ‘aesthetic adjustment’, ‘technological use’, and ‘institutional curation’ have emerged out of the data without any consideration of Lefebvre’s theoretical work. In Chapter Six, however, the theoretical work of Lefebvre was related to the concepts discovered in Chapters Four/Five. The result was a constructed theory ‘supporting what was already known’ from the data (Heath, 2006: 520) in the case of the two empirical chapters, while in the theoretical chapter – an existing, abstract theory was empiricised and tested. Moreover, according to Thornberg (2012: 246), ‘[e]mpirical observation could never be totally free from theoretical influence because seeing is already a “theory-laden” undertaking’ (emphasis added), as this project has demonstrated in Chapter Two. This way, the existing abstract theory outlined by Lefebvre (1991a) has been applied to the empirical findings of the two case studies, but it has also been abductively expanded through the evaluation of its power to explain the data (Thornberg, 2012; Schurz, 2008). In particular, Lefebvre’s view of photography has been further expanded on the basis of the empirical analysis of this project. In summary, this project’s GTM framework can be described as:

’a product of a research process [...] in which both the process and the product have been thoroughly grounded in data by GT methods while being informed by existing research literature and theoretical frameworks’ (Thornberg, 2012: 249).

As a major point of contention, it should be noted that grounded theory is often simplified as an approach without pre-suppositions (i.e. pure induction), where the researcher is assumed to be a clean slate with regards to their knowledge of the problem area (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Strauss and Corbin, 1997; Charmaz, 2014). This so-called ‘suppositionless’ approach is not treated as a given premise in the case of this project. In other words, this application of the GTM does not explore the domain of documentary photography blindly; rather, it relies on pre-analysis knowledge derived from several sources local to the domain, which have helped identify relevant sites in which practices integral to the domain can be found; this is also the case for the choice of analytic frameworks. The
The historical basis of documentary photography has been kept into consideration during the process of data collection and analysis.

The application of the GTM lies in the use of GT methods (coding and memoing), as well as in the simultaneous data collection and analysis in an iterative process of emerging issues. The problem domain of documentary photography is not explored sufficiently - neither through sociological approaches nor through archival ones; because of this, emergent concepts will be best suited to the exploration of the complexity of the domain as a first stage of analysis. Informed Grounded Theory is particularly useful to this inquiry into documentary photography, because it allows the generation of a theoretical model that arises out of the data, while remaining informed of relevant theory. The method of constant comparison allows for a continuous exploration of emergent issues in the domain, as well as an uninterrupted process of testing their relevance to already analysed data, as well as emerging groups and types of data.

The multi-method design consists of a combination of grounded theory methods with visual framing analysis and spatial analysis; the combination of methods is applied to the two case studies of the photographic works of Eugène Atget and Thomas Annan. The main reason for a project that relies on more than one type of research method is that single methods are insufficient for understanding some of the problem domain’s key elements. For example, visual analysis can only understand the visual dimensions of photographs, while grounded theory provides a methodological approach, which allows for the generation of concepts that emerge out of the data. These concepts have then been related to Lefebvre’s explicitly abstract theoretical work.

3.2.2. Data Collection

Data collection was conducted at two archival institutions’ photographic collections – the Victoria and Albert Museum (henceforth, VAM) and the Mitchell Library (henceforth, ML). Each institution’s photographic collection of photographs by Atget and Annan were used to construct the case study of each photographer in this project.
The VAM’s photographic collection consists of 300,000 images dating from 1839 (The Victoria and Albert Museum, 2018), the majority of which are available in the institution’s digital catalogue (vam.catalogue.co.uk – an example page of which can be seen in the Appendix). Atget’s photographs in the VAM’s collections are 481 in number. The majority of the photographs (448) have been added to the VAM’s collection through direct purchase from Atget himself. In terms of Atget’s work as a whole, the VAM’s collection is only a small fraction. The estimations of writers vary, but Atget’s total photographic output is estimated as higher than 10,000 (for example, see Abbott, 1964 [1977]; Nesbit, 1998; Hambourg and Szarkowski, 1982). The ML’s Special Photographic Collection consists solely of Annan’s photographs, which include 191 volumes (many of which are repeated, or different editions of the publication), 388 photographic prints, and 15 books pertaining to Annan’s work or Scottish photography in general. In the VAM, the data analysed were 283 individual photographic prints and all of the 481 digital images of Atget’s photographs, and 3 registers of acquisition belonging to the VAM pertaining to Atget’s work. In the ML, the data examined were 50 photographic prints, 5 volumes, and the library’s own finding aid (see the Appendix); altogether making up 351 images. Access to both institutions’ collections was gained through email correspondence with the respective institution’s curators and librarians.

In terms of the chronology of the project, first were consulted 283 of Atget’s photographic prints on location in the VAM’s Print and Drawing Study Room. In order to gain access to examining the photographs in person, a declaration of research interest was submitted through the VAM’s website in the photographs of Eugène Atget and Thomas Annan. Photographic prints were examined through a randomly curated selection of storage boxes (each containing approximately 15-20 prints) by the VAM’s curators. At this stage, 283 photographs taken by Atget were examined (all of which individual prints) and one volume by Annan (The Old Streets and Closes of Glasgow, 1868-1871 (published in 1900) comprising 100 photographs). The visits in-person to the VAM’s collection were five over a period of two months. Each visit consisted of 14 hours of being in the Print and Drawing Study Room, where photographs were examined, re-examined, and
described in writing. In-between visits, notes would be consulted, systemized, and related to each other. At this point of the research, coding was initiated on the basis of notes and the iterative examination over the period of in-person visits.

Following this, the digital catalogue was consulted, and the total number of Atget’s photos were examined; the examination of photographs consulted in-person was reiterated. Over a period of four months, a coding process of the images comprising the catalogue was conducted. The coding was done in five iterations. Moreover, with each iteration, coding was refined and categories possessing explanatory power were generated. In the process of examining the VAM’s catalogue, the images were downloaded, organized by the sorting categories in the catalogue, and logged according to categories present in the catalogue as metatags. The total number of potential images (481) in the VAM’s collection and catalogue were analysed. Additionally, biographical information of Atget, geographical information, labelling, and storage location provided in the catalogue were noted down and coded according to the emergent coding framework (see Appendix). Certain images were copyrighted at the time of writing and examination; for the purposes of analysis, they were screenshotted. After two iterations of the examination of the catalogue, nVivo 11 software was utilized for the coding of the images in the subsequent iterations. Throughout the iterations of the analysis, memos were written, adjusted, and codes were refined.

With regards to the examination of Annan’s photographs, the initial stage consisted of two visits, each for a period up to three days. The finding aid (see Appendix) was examined prior to the in-person visits (acquired through correspondence with ML staff). In order to acquire access to the ML’s Special Photographic Collection, a declaration of interest was expressed through email correspondence. The total number of potential images to be examined was 388 individual prints and 191 volumes. In contrast to the first case study, only a part of the total number of photographs in the ML’s Special Photographic Collection were examined. The selection of

\[22\text{ At the time of analysis, the version of the nVivo software used was 11, but following the release of the newer version (nVivo 12), it was also utilized for working with the data.}\]
photographs and volumes to analyse was done on the basis of the coding framework developed in the analysis of Atget’s photographs at the VAM, as well as the initial notes taken on Annan’s volume consulted at the VAM’s Print and Drawing Study Room. This expressed itself in an initial examination of 351 photographs, of which 50 were individual prints and 301 were part of five volumes. The volumes varied in size, photographic method, year of production, and provenance; those examined were:

- **Photographs of Glasgow College** (1866, 20 images, 20 pages, no text);
- **Memorials of the Old College of Glasgow** (1871, 41 images, 99 pages);
- **University of Glasgow, Old and New** (1891, 77 images, 146);
- **The Old Country Houses of the Glasgow Gentry** (1878, 101 images, 289 pages);
- **And The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow** (1900, 50 images, 23 pages preface).

In keeping with the principle of theoretical sampling, the existing coding framework developed on the basis of Atget’s work and the five volumes and 50 prints, another three iterations of the analyses were conducted on the single volume of **The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1868-1871 (1900)**. This selection of a smaller data set was due to the defined research focus of this project in urban space and the documentation of its development and restructuring. The three iterations of analysis on the single volume were conducted on the basis of digital resources: the National Library of Scotland (nls.gov), the virtual portal of the ML (http://www.mitchelllibrary.org/virtualmitchell/), the website of Thomas Annan’s family firm and gallery (https://www.annanart.com/). During the final iteration of analysis, the examination of Atget’s photographs was reiterated. These iterations were conducted over a period of two months, in which the entirety of the volume was re-examined. As was the case in the analysis of Atget’s photographs, memos were written on Annan’s photographs. Memos were descriptive, analytical, and conceptual rising in complexity with the refinement of the coding framework; all memos were
comparative, both across each case study and in relation to the other case study.

Permissions for access to the VAM’s collections and the ML’s Special Photographic Collection were acquired through email correspondence. Certain images are restricted by copyright at the time of writing this project. With regards to both case studies, all images are presented in the examination copy of this project, while an edited version will be submitted after examination. Prior to analysis, The University of York’s Economics, Law, Management, Politics and Sociology Ethics Committee approved this project’s research (see appendix).

The relevance of both photographers’ work to the inquiry into the problem domain was defined in the literature. On the basis of sources relevant to the domain of documentary photography, the collections of both Atget’s in the VAM and Annan’s in the ML were identified as key sites of the origin of documentary photography. Considering the simultaneous involvement in data collection and analysis of photographs, additional institutional documents emerged as relevant data, such as registers of acquisition and indexing systems, as well as framing and/or protective technology (mounts, cellophane, printing processes, etc) of the images themselves.

3.2.3. Analytical Frameworks

In order to address the multitude of elements that tend to be overlooked in the problem domain, two analytical frameworks have been used. These are visual photographic analysis in conjunction with document analysis (Rose, 2007), and spatial analysis (by drawing on arguments from the work of Lefebvre, Foucault, Benjamin, and Kracauer). Each analytic framework has served to address different aspects of the domain, making their use complementary. For example, while Rose’s work on visual culture and methodology (2007) provided a rich framework for visual analysis of the content of photographs, it did not provide the necessary tools for the study of photographs as documents in a network of relations that Prior (2008a; 2008b; 2008c) or Edwards (2009a; 2009b; 2009c 2011; 2012; 2013; 2014; 2015a; 2015b; Edwards and Lien, 2014; Edwards and Mead, 2013) have
been able to deliver. In this sense, the sum of the frameworks is greater than each on its own.

3.2.3.1. Visual Analysis

The framework for visual and document analysis of photographs is inspired on a fundamental level by Rose’s work (2007) on visual methodologies. Rose systemises the majority of visual methodologies according to three ‘sites’ - ‘the site(s) of the production of an image, the site of the image itself, and the site(s) where it is seen by various audiences’ (Rose, 2007: 16). All three are identified as sites (not necessarily spatial or geographical) of meaning production, each having technological, compositional, and social modalities. Rose claims (2007) that work on visual data tends to privilege a particular site, as well as emphasising a particular modality at the expense of the others. For example, she cites (Rose, 2007) the work of John Berger on oil painting (see Berger, 1972). In Ways of Seeing, Berger (1972: 88) argues that oil painting reveals a significant difference between an average work and a masterpiece that is not as defined in other visual cultures. It is his claim that the importance of ‘skill or imagination, but also of morale’ in oil painting (Berger, 1972: 88) is due to the particular ‘site of the production of an image’ (Rose, 2007: 16) and its particular technological modality (oil based paint). The example from Berger’s work on oil painting demonstrates an account that privileges the site of the production of the image and its technological modality.

Furthermore, the type of visual content analysis used in this study draws on visual framing analysis (VFA) (Parry, 2010) as seen in work on news photography and media representation (Fahmy, 2010; Perlmutter and Wagner, 2004; Schwalbe, 2006; Parry, 2010; Cantrell Rosas-Moreno and Straubhaar, 2015). In relation to Rose’s framework, VFA is concerned with the site of the image itself and the site of its reception by an audience. In terms of the separate modalities, visual framing analysis is an exploration of the visual elements, their relationship, their meanings and composition. The use of the term ‘frame’ in this project, albeit different in application and context, remains informed by VFA work done on media representation in press photography. Framing, in the context of this project, has been
understood as pertaining to the image itself primarily, but on a secondary level emerged the significance of the role of material production of the photograph and its subsequent interpretation, as well as the material and interpretive production of a photograph as an institutional document.

The material production of the images has been examined by engaging with two different case studies, in which the photographers use different photographic technology. By analysing the visual meanings and composition, the question of how technology affected a given image has also been addressed. The form of visual analysis used in this project has also examined both visual non-textual and textual information, both ‘in-frame’ and in the supplementary documents relevant to the given image.

The visual framing analysis in this research project has aimed to address Rose’s (2007) three sites of meaning production in documentary photography. However, unlike Rose, this project does not posit a ‘site of the image itself’; instead, a photograph is understood to be ‘an object in a context’ (Sontag, 1979: 82) and the ‘photographic message [as] context determined’ (Sekula, 2016: 4). In order to account for this, the project will draw on the work of Elizabeth Edwards (2001; 2002; 2009a; 2009b; 2009c; 2012; 2013; 2014; 2016; also, Edwards and Hart, 2004). Edwards (2001) argues for the necessity of examining photographs as more than simply images. Rather, they are objects that have a particular history of interactions with institutions, persons, or social groups. In other words, photographs have their own ‘social biography’, and as such are situated in a network of practices, including technology use, which has produced them. Edwards (2001: 14) emphasises the ‘social biography’ of photographs:

‘in which the meaning of photographs, generated by viewers, depends on the context of their viewing, and their dependence on written or spoken ‘text’ to control semiotic energy and anchor meaning in relation to embodied subjectivities of the viewer.’

Edwards’s anthropological work and its emphasis on the materiality of photographs will be complemented with social research on documents in
the sense of work done by Prior (2008a; 2008b; 2008c). Prior’s work (2008a) on the use of documents in social research is important: first, he provides a critical view on treating documents as ‘inert containers;’ and second, he proposes an alternative where ‘documentation [is seen] as a key component of dynamic networks rather than as a set of static and immutable “things”’ (Prior, 2008a; 821). This describes a framework, in which documents are to be understood as ‘active agents’ (Prior, 2008a: 821) that have functions and are part of social interactions (2008b). In this sense, John Tagg’s (1988) work on photographic meaning and material practices of production in relation to institutions is important. Particularly, Tagg’s assertion (1988: 188) that photographs are neither simply images or ideas, but,

‘…material items produced by a certain elaborated mode of production and distributed, circulated and consumed within a given set of social relations; images made meaningful and understood within the very relations of their production.’

In the context of this project, the treatment of documents as agents in networks of meaning will be applied to the study of photographs, as instances of visual documents, which are situated as central to the network of meaning that is documentary photography. In addition to photographs, institutional textual documents are also seen from this perspective. The framework of social research with documents is intended to complement the content-focused approach of visual framing analysis (Parry, 2010) and the anthropological approach emphasising the materiality of photographs (Edwards, 2001). Edwards (2002: 69) has pointed to the issues of ‘the semiotic turn’ that ‘has subordinated the object qualities and privileged representational’ aspects of the image, which effectively omits the central to documentary photography connotation of authenticity and performance of historicity. Edwards (2002: 70), again, has summarised this issue aptly:

‘In other cases scientific photography required a print form adequate to the performance of precise visual information, namely a clean sharp paper as opposed to a textured paper
the desire for legibility being materially expressed’ (emphasis added).

3.4.3.2. Spatial Analysis

The spatial analysis framework that has been developed is indebted to several critical thinkers who write on the topic of urban space - the works of Henri Lefebvre (1976; 1991a; 1991b; 2003; Elden, 2004; also, see Soja, 1989; 1996; Borch, 2002), Walter Benjamin (Benjamin, 1968; 1978; 1979; 1969; 2002; 2006; Buck-Morss, 1989), and Siegfried Kracauer (Kracauer, 1960; 1969; 1995; Reeh, 2004; Gilloch, 1997; 2002; 2015). It also relies on, in a more general sense, the work on space by Michel Foucault (1977; 1978; 1980; 1984; 1986; 1989; 1995; 2001; 2002; 2008).

On a fundamental point, Lefebvre (1976: 31) has asserted that:

‘Space is not a scientific object removed from ideology and politics; it has always been political and strategic.’

In the context of this project, the cities of Paris and Glasgow are central to the examination of the photographic documents. The two cities are central to the institutional operation and discourses mobilised around the photographs. As it has been shown in Chapter Two: Documentary Photography and the City, the rationalised destruction and subsequent remoulding and restructuring of modern cities is central to both the history of documentary photography, and more particularly to the work of the two photographers of interest – Eugène Atget and Paris, and Thomas Annan and Glasgow. With this in mind, it is important to refer to Lefebvre’s claim (1991a: 7) about the danger of omitting the politics and history of space, and the reading of it:

‘When codes worked up from literary texts are applied to spaces – to urban spaces, say – we remain, as may easily be shown, on the purely descriptive level. Any attempt to use such codes as a means of deciphering social space must surely reduce that space itself to the status of a message, and the inhabiting of it to the status of a reading. This is to evade both history and practice’ (emphasis in original).
Understood this way, it is important to assert that the very notion of space as ‘the epitome of rational abstraction’ (Lefebvre, 1976: 31) means that space has been ‘occupied and used, and has already been the focus of past processes whose traces are not always evident in the landscape’ (ibid: 31, emphasis added). Space has its politics and history, and, as such, it is ‘filled with ideologies’ (1976: 31). According to Lefebvre, the prevalent ‘science of space’ is a discourse that ‘represents the political [for Lefebvre, capitalist] use of knowledge’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 8), while simultaneously consisting of ‘an ideology designed to conceal that use, along with the conflicts intrinsic’ to it (Lefebvre, 1991a: 9). Finally, it embodies ‘a technological utopia’ based on ‘a knowledge which is at once integrated into, and integrative with respect to, the mode of production’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 9).

Complementing Lefebvre’s argument are Foucault’s discussions of the concept of ‘transparent space’ and panopticism (Foucault, 1980; also, see Vidler, 1993). Transparency is understood by Foucault as a paradigm of complete control (Foucault, 1995; 2001), and hence stands in contrast to the Enlightenment’s fears of the unknown city, characterised by poor hygiene and a lack of visibility. As Foucault (1980: 70) has asserted:

‘Endeavouring [...] to decipher discourse through the use of spatial, strategic metaphors enables one to grasp precisely the points at which discourses are transformed in, through and on the basis of relations of power’

Annan and Atget’s photographs are understood here as instances of this process of making space transparent and an object of knowledge. The urban photographs of Annan in the ML and the streetscapes in Atget’s work in the VAM Museum are to be understood through Benjamin’s use of ‘the phenomenological hermeneutic’ of the profane and the street (a term defined by Buck-Morss, 1989: 3). Namely, the images of streets will be understood by relying ‘on the interpretive power of images that make conceptual points concretely, with reference to the world outside the [visual] text’ (Buck-Morss, 1989: 6). Put simply, the ‘phenomenological’ aspect of reading the images has to do with their interpretation as more
than images, but as pertaining to the lived experience of the spaces they document. This way, a photograph is to be understood as consisting of information about material objects – railings, stairways, benches – and physical spaces – streets, churches, closes. Moreover, a ‘phenomenological hermeneutic’ is applied here as an approach that allows the interpreter to read those spaces and their social production. This will be operationalised in the analysis of the spaces that the two photographers have documented, and, particularly, the ways that these spaces have an impact on the lived experience of people inhabiting them. As Pierce and Martin have noted (2015), Lefebvre’s theory of space (1991a) has an inextricable phenomenological aspect that should not be overlooked, especially in empirical considerations.

This approach is further complimented by what Reeh (2004), in reference to the work of Kracauer and Simmel, has described as ‘the so-called resubjectivization of the objective culture of the metropolis’ (Reeh, 2004: 17), understood here through the form of the photograph. Moreover, this is done in keeping with Benjamin’s formulation of the task of the critic, which according to Gilloch (2002: 203) can be described as an intervention ‘in this tradition so as both to read the image of the past afresh and to develop it anew’. This way, “[the] city is […] transformed, not into a text to be read, but into a plethora of overlapping texts, a palimpsest to be deciphered’ (Gilloch, 2002: 222; also, see Huyssen, 2003).

The city, either in its physical form as urban space or in its visual representation as an urban image, consists of social relations. It is not the case that the city simply consists of social spaces, roles, and relations, but that one’s experience of it is largely determined by the nature of these spaces, the role one undertakes or is given, as well as the relations into which one enters. Being in the centre of old Paris as a photographer, using old technology, reading pacifist anarchist press publications are all significant factors in understanding the images that Atget produced (Nesbit, 1992a). With this in mind, the analysis will include not only for whom the documents were produced (see Nesbit, 1992a), but also by whom and in what context. It is here, that the work of Rancière (2005; 2011) on ‘the distribution of the sensible’ will be related to the photographs that have
been examined (Rancière, 2011: 12). According to Rancière (2011: 12), the concept refers to:

> ‘a distribution of spaces, times, and forms of activity that determines the very manner in which something in common lends itself to participation and in what way various individuals have a part in this distribution’ (emphasis added).

Edwards (2016: 52) further adds that the political significance of the photograph, in terms of Rancière’s concept of the ‘distribution of the sensible’, ‘revolves around what is seen and what can be said about it, around who has the ability to see and the talent to speak’. For Rancière, the term is connected to his theorisation of politics and police, where the former is concerned with emancipation and self-determination of a previously unacknowledged social group and the latter is the entrenchment of established social order. Furthermore, police refers to a distribution of the sensible, in which a de facto existing inequality cannot even be acknowledged as existing, due to a distribution of visibility, ability to speak, talent of doing so, or even ability. One example of this is Rancière’s image of a street protest, in which the police’s function is ensuring that a street is not a place for such activity, effectively asserting ‘that the space of circulating is nothing other than the space of circulation’ (2001: n.p.). However, the role of politics is the transformation of this space into a stage in which a political subject can be demonstrated by ‘refiguring the space, of what there is to do there, what is to be seen or named therein’ (Rancière, 2001: n.p.). In the context of Atget’s and Annan’s photographs, ‘the distribution of the sensible’ has to do with what is both present and absent in the image. Primarily, this will be understood as the interweaving of space and photographic representation with social class.

Furthermore, a photograph can easily be coded as an image of a Parisian street or boulevard, or a Glaswegian wynd. However, that does not contribute much to an analysis besides the literal geographic location, which is likely to be either approximate or no longer existent. Rather, ‘street’, ‘boulevard’, ‘wynd’ are:
‘[…] terms of everyday discourse [that] serve to distinguish, but not to isolate, particular spaces, and in general to describe a social space. They correspond to a specific use of that space, and hence to a spatial practice that they express and constitute. Their interrelationships are ordered in a specific way’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 16).

The purpose of this analytical framework is to build on the visual and document analysis of the photographs by adding the historical and political context of the urban space that has been documented. Furthermore, the spatial analysis would also build on the grounded theory-inspired approach by situating the photographs, through the work of Henri Lefebvre (1991a), to the ideological dimensions of the particular conjunctures of Paris and Glasgow to actual events, places, and their inherent spatial politics and practices.

3.2.4. Analytic Strategies

The research context, its data collection and generation, and the analytical frameworks of this project have already been defined, but the application of the analytic strategy requires further discussion. This section will begin by outlining the systematic process of data generation step-by-step, and finish with an overview of the analytic strategy.

In both case studies, data collection at its primary moment consisted of analysis of photographic prints – standalone in the case of Atget, and both standalone and as part of a volume in the case of Annan. The two empirical chapters (Four and Five), however, have not engaged with an analysis of photography’s relation to the real in any strict sense. However, the threefold focus of this project can be summarised as follows: the visual contents of photographs and their production as constitutive of meaning in the photograph i.e. the photograph as image (sections 1-3 below); the choices and affordances of practice behind the production of said visual contents i.e. the photograph as a material product of practice (sections 4-6 below); and the ‘institutional framework within which [photographs] are produced and consumed’ (Tagg, 1988: 157) i.e. the photograph as an institutionally curated image-object (section 7 below).
The following coding schema was developed in the process of conducting the visual framing analysis of the contents of the photographic prints in a GTM framework:

1. **Visual Elements**

The first step of analysis consisted of breaking down the image-content of each photograph into its visual elements. At this stage, the photographs analysed were 283 physical copies of Atget’s prints and 100 photographs comprising one volume of Annan’s. At this stage, codes were single elements of the image such as people, architectural elements (doorway, balcony, close, church, etc), or type of environment. At a later stage, the sample analysed increased to 481 of Atget’s photographs and 351 of Annan’s photographs.

2. **Date, Labels, Title**

Simultaneously to identifying visual elements, the textual data attached to the image was also coded. This included labels pertaining to the subject theme of the photograph (e.g. ironwork, portrait, or architecture), titles usually referring to a physical address of a building or street, and date. Additionally, museum numbers, stamps, and other institutional elements, both textual and visual, were noted down.

3. **Composition**

At this stage, on the basis of the defined visual elements in the data set of each case study (section one above), an iterative process of systematisation of the elements into patterns was conducted. This followed a logic of expanding from the particular to the general; for example, in section one a door became coded as doorway, then as belonging to a church, then as belonging in a category of ‘element of architecture’. The arrangement of the various elements in the image-content of the photographs was analysed in terms of aesthetic codifications in order to determine the semiotic content of the images on a structural level.
For example, a compositional element can be either: particular, such as a doorway, commercial sign, the presence of people, a close, etc; or abstract such as a line, shape, foreground/background, or depth of field. By breaking down an image into its elements in terms of composition, the emphasis was placed not on the frequency of occurrence, but on the various relationships between the elements, their continuity, perceived value, or perceived institutional significance.

4. Photograph subject/theme

Following the establishing of both photographers’ adherence to particular aesthetic codifications, the patterns were interpreted in terms of thematic frames, or subjects. For example, Atget’s photographs of partial elements or ornaments were understood as ‘overlooked details’ of the city’s architecture. Similarly, the analysis of the compositional patterns in Annan’s photographing of closes and streets allowed for the definition of a difference between the two categories that is still theorised as essential to the theme of ‘urban image’.

5. Photographic Framing

Following Parry (2010: 73), the role of the photograph’s frame was analysed. Namely, the question was posed whether the photograph’s image-content ‘reinforces’ or ‘undermines’ the frame. For example, issues of technology, image format, and print manipulation were noted and interpreted along this line of questioning. A particular example of this is the presence of clipmarks on Atget’s photographs, which indicate the original frame of the image – their presence or lack was interpreted in terms of Atget’s reflective practice of material production of the photograph, both as material object of photographic practice and as image with a content intended to communicate a message. Similarly, Annan’s manipulation of image-content was analysed in order to determine the importance of the visual elements identified, the photographic subject established, and ultimately – the purpose of the photograph itself and the photographer’s practice.

6. Spatial Framing

Following the definition of photographic subjects that are tied to the city and urban space, an analysis of the type of spaces was conducted.
Namely, the type of spaces were coded in a similar fashion to the process of identifying visual elements, and then were interpreted in relation to each other. For example, the contrast between close and street in Annan’s work was used as a basis for determining the representation of urban space and the subsequent theoretical analysis. Similarly, Atget’s framing of single elements isolated and seemingly devoid of a strictly urban context were analysed by drawing on relevant literature and the work of Lefebvre, Benjamin, Buck-Morss, and Rancière.

7. Documentary Framing

Finally, the established textual information was used as basis for an examination of the manner in which the two institutions frame the photographs and the photographers’ work. The online catalogue of the VAM Museum and a companion website to the National Library of Scotland were analysed with a focus on the relationship between visual and textual elements. After the establishing of key patterns in both case studies, the photographs were examined as more than images, but as material objects as well. On the basis of this analysis, inferences were made with regards to the practices that led to the creation of the images by examining material traces and qualities of the photographs. Building on this, at the next stage of analysis, in addition to the site of the photographs itself (its image-content and materiality) and the site of the practices behind the photograph (such as composition and use of technology), a third site was posited – that of the photographs’ storage, or the archive.

This manifold understanding of the photographs has informed the structure of the two empirical chapters (Chapter Four: Eugène Atget’s Paris and Chapter Five: Thomas Annan’s Glasgow), where the first section of each chapter addresses primarily the image-content of the photographs, the second engages with the material practices that led to their production, and the third consists of a discussion of the institutional curation of the photographs. Similarly, Chapter Six also follows this tripartite structure when relating photographs to space.

On the basis of this determination, the three types of framing (image-photograph-document) were defined as separate, but interconnected,
sites. Each site has also been assigned the meaning of a key practice corresponding to it. For example, the site of production places the emphasis on practice, technology, and the photographer’s choice, but each of those are ultimately seen as driven by other factors such as the engagement with the technology of production, a desired image-content, and an intended site of reception, or an awareness of potential interpretations. The three sites, and their constituent practices, emerged to be closely connected to a discourse of Modernity and spatial analysis. On the basis of this interpretation of the data, a theory of the photographic city has been developed in Chapter Two: Documentary Photography and the City. It is at this stage that theoretical sources were used to account for the intersection of urban planning, the archival impulse for creating records, and photography.

Overall, the analysis consisted of multiple iterations and revisittings of the data once a new concept or aspect of documentary photography emerged. The analysis started with a purely visual analysis, it subsequently expanded into a material document analysis, and eventually led to an abstraction of the emergent findings from the two case studies into a theory of the photographic city, in which perceived, conceived, and lived experiences of urban space are continuously constructed and reinterpreted at various sites of meaning-production. Ultimately, the implications of this project point to the importance of understanding documentary photography as deeply interwoven with space and the archival, as well as stressing the political tensions of interpretation and their associated power relations.

3.3. Conclusion

Overall, this chapter has provided the methodological foundation for the research programme that makes up this doctoral project. First, an account of the problem domain in terms of the research context was given. The domain was shown to be underexplored in terms of empirical archival studies on the topic from a sociological perspective. Second, it provided a more thorough discussion of the methodological framework in which the multi-method research design and analytical frameworks operate.
Additionally, the methodological rationale was outlined. Third, a discussion of methods was provided and their suitability to the problem domain and the data set. Finally, an indicative account of the data collection and analytic strategy was given. In terms of the logic of the overall research programme and the doctoral project, this chapter serves as a methodological overview, which builds on the preceding Chapter Two: Documentary Photography and the City. Moreover, this chapter sets up the subsequent empirical Chapters Four and Five.
Chapter Four: Eugène Atget’s Paris

‘Out of photography, one can make passport pictures, weather photographs, pornographic pictures, X-rays, wedding pictures, and Atget’s Paris.’

(Sontag, 1979: 116)

‘But Atget’s work—and it must be looked upon as a whole—is the most remarkable photographic record of Paris ever created.’

(Newhall, 1937: 66)

This chapter will focus on the first case study of this doctoral project – the documentary photographs of the city of Paris by Eugène Atget in the early 20th century. On the basis of an analysis of 481 photographic prints taken by Atget, I will describe the visual content of the images, the patterns in the images that speak to photographic processes through the images’ materiality, and the process of producing the images as institutional documents. Atget’s work is numerous and varied (Nesbit, 1998). In this chapter, I will focus primarily on photographs that bear relevance to urban space.

First, I will introduce the institutional and historic context of the data. Following this, I will introduce the key findings of this case study by describing the visual contents of the images. Namely, this project argues that Atget, through a practice of documenting overlooked details and partial elements of the built environment, has engaged in a practice of appropriating the space of the city by cutting it up into fragments, which are subsequently sutured together in novel ways. This will be situated in relation to the notion of the photographic city, introduced in Chapter Two (see section 2.2.2. The Photographic City). Namely, Atget’s documentation of overlooked details and strange views will be analysed in contrast to
Haussmann’s ‘cult of the axis’ of sight in the boulevard. Atget’s use of repetition will also be shown to bear significance in producing photographs that engage their viewer with the lived dimensions of the environment being documented. In addition to an analysis of the total sample, I will provide an analysis of a single image as demonstration of the theoretical understanding this project has developed. Second, I will describe the significant elements that have emerged from the analytical process – particularly, the images’ materiality and the practices behind it. Third and finally, I will discuss the significance of the institutional practices on the images. This tripartite structure of image-materiality-institution can also be understood to reflect the first research question:

What are the practices involved in the production of a photograph as documentary?

4.1. Introduction

Eugène Atget’s work is significant due to its pioneering status in the domain of documentary photography. In Berenice Abbott’s words (1964: vii), Atget ‘gave photography its full potential as an art in its own right’. According to Walter Benjamin (2006: 258), ‘[w]ith Atget, photographic records begin to be evidence in the historical trial’. Atget’s work became prominent in a period of photographic discourse where photography fitted into one of two styles – the pictorial or the documentary23. While Atget was clearly interested in practicing the latter, his use of the documentary style remained somewhat different from most photography produced at the time, and thus proved formative in the style itself. While most documentary photography at the time, which was not utilised in an intra-institutional manner (late 1800s), was focused primarily on architecture, Atget’s work brought into focus both miniscule ornamental detail (i.e. of doors, statues, fountains, churches, etc), grand doorways of churches and palaces (incl. Versailles itself), and the newly built boulevards of Haussmann. However, he

---

23 A discussion of the two styles has already been provided in reference to Allan Sekula’s influential essay (2016) on the topic in Chapter Two: Documentary Photography and the City. Also, the fact that the notion of documentary photography is an invention of the 1920s has been addressed in Chapter Two (cf. Lugon, 2006; Brückle, 2015; Rosler, 1982; Solomon-Godeau, 1991; and others).
did so in such a manner that photographers\textsuperscript{24}, surrealist\textsuperscript{25} artists, and painters\textsuperscript{26} recognised him. Being considered the ‘first documentalist’ (Vassallo, 2014a: 23), as well as figuring in discourse at the centre of the domain’s origin, his work is unsurprisingly ambiguous and rich in meaning. To quote Barthes’s description of all photographs – Atget’s work can be seen as particularly ‘docile’ (2001: 43). It was exactly at the time of Atget’s rise in popularity that the use of captions became necessary in illustrated magazines (Benjamin, 2006: 258). This ‘docility’ is a quality of photographs that writers, Sontag (1979) and Sekula (2016) being among them, have referred to as a photograph’s indeterminacy of meaning and the necessity of context for any kind of semiotics or hermeneutics. This is evident in Atget’s work, the varying interpretations are multiple – he is attributed with feats such as being ‘the first surrealist’ or a proto-surrealist (Benjamin, 1979), creating the ‘artistic document’, being inherently modern and modernist, as well as being naïve (MacFarlane, 2010), ingenious, and/or craftsman-like (Nesbit, 1998). He is an intriguing figure to use as a case study, precisely due to the unanimity surrounding his position as the pioneer in the domain of documentary photography (for example, see Nesbit, 1992a; 1992b; Freund, 1980; Szarkowski, 1985; Benjamin, 1979; Kracauer, 1960).

A somewhat underexplored aspect of Atget’s work is his politics. Out of the multitude of monographs and treatises on Atget, it is only Nesbit (1998) that makes a brief comment on his left leanings in passing. Nesbit (1998) reports that he was a subscriber to ‘the Socialist press’ of his time. Warner (1993) further clarifies that Atget was subscribed to both La Guerre Social, an ultra-left and pacifist-anarchist newspaper founded by Gustave Hervé\textsuperscript{27} (see Loughlin, 2001), and Le Bonnet Rouge - an anarchist publication (Warner, 1993; also, see Loughlin, 2001). Atget also delivered lectures to working-

\textsuperscript{24} Photographers such as Berenice Abbott (Campbell, 2015: 256), Man Ray, Brassai, Henri Cartier-Bresson, Walker Evans (Campbell, 2015: 256), and August Sander (Szarkowski, 1985) are reported to have been inspired by him.

\textsuperscript{25} Andre Breton used one of his photographs for the cover of the first surrealist manifesto – La Révolution surréaliste (MacFarlane, 2010; also, see Walker, 2002).

\textsuperscript{26} Atget provided reference photographs, a lucrative aspect of his photographic work, to many Parisian artists (Freund, 1980).

\textsuperscript{27} Hervé, ‘an obscure French history professor’ (Loughlin, 2001: 5), was an anti-militarist and socialist advocating for revolution at the beginning of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, who subsequently shifted towards fascism in the 1930s (see Loughlin, 2001).
class schools (Nesbit, 1998: 402), and, as a contemporary of the Dreyfus Affair, he ‘collected a large dossier of press cuttings’ on its development’ (Nesbit, 1998: 402). With this in mind, Atget was a ‘passionate Dreyfusard’ (Warner, 1993: n.p.). It is important to mark that, according to Arendt (1942: 198), ‘the term anti-Dreyfusard could still serve as a recognized appellation of all that was anti-republican, anti-democratic and anti-Semitic’, making Atget the opposite of those characteristics. This, in turn, bears potential significance on Atget’s representation of the city, since the areas he worked in would have been primarily working class. His political commitments would then imply an engagement with the people of the spaces he documents and their struggles. However, unlike the bourgeois leanings of the surrealist movement in Paris at the time, the ultra-left anarchist leaning of Atget is currently absent in publications in the English language – despite meriting further exploration. Unfortunately, the scope of this project does not allow for this.

Atget remains a photographer, whose practice is unique in three distinct ways. First, he undertook a large-scale project of more than 10,000 photographs taken for a period of over 30 years by his own initiative (Nesbit, 1998), only briefly taking commission (and often on his own terms – see Szarkowski, 1985), and only selling his photographs as a freelancer (Nesbit, 1998; Hambourg and Szarkowski, 1982). Second, Atget is a figure of widely recognised pioneering status, with reputed photographers such as Berenice Abbott, Walker Evans, August Sander, Henri Cartier-Bresson citing his work as a primary influence (Szarkowski, 1982) – and with non-photographic figures such as Walter Benjamin (1979), Gisele Freund (1980), Andre Breton (Walker, 2002), and Georges Bataille (Durden, 2003) also lauding him as a key figure. Third, he is continuously cited as reluctant to describe his photographs as artistic or artful, instead preferring the phrase ‘documents for artists’ (Walker, 2002). This last point, in conjunction with his numerous work and influential status identifies him as a key figure in relation to the development of documentary photography in the city of Paris and Modernity as a whole.

Most importantly, the plurality of discourse surrounding Atget’s work will be shown here as indicative of the new mode of representation of which he
himself has become representative. In Hudgins words (2013: 11), although applied to a different context, the appeal of Atget’s work is the ‘new sense of “camera vision”’ that he was elaborating through a transformation of what might have, until that point, been considered ‘unpicturesque’ – doorways, balconies, ruins, and streetscapes. The very way in which he approached the photographing of important landmarks, such as the Pantheon, have been noted as unconventional for its time (MacFarlane, 2010: 23). This note can easily be illustrated by comparing Atget’s street view (figure 6 below - left) with that of his predecessors - Charles Marville (centre) and Pierre Emonts (right). While both Marville and Emonts follow the perspectivising effect of the boulevard, Atget’s image differs considerably in its aesthetics. Atget relies on stark contrast, partial detail of buildings, and dramatic framing in order to produce an image that appears odd as if it is a composite of two photographs.

REDACTED

Figure 6 (from left to right) - The Pantheon by Eugène Atget, Getty Museum, 1924; Rue du Haut-Pave (Pantheon in Distance) by Charles Marville, WikiCommons, 1865–69; Rue du Haut-pavé by Pierre Emonts, Musée Carnavalet, 1869-1902.

The data used in this case study are photographic prints and institutional documents. In the process of analysis, further distinctions in the data emerged: for instance, photographic prints were divided into three layers of meaning: image; materiality of the image; and institutional curation. The purpose of this distinction is threefold: first, it has been applied to the structure of this chapter in order to introduce the reader to the visual contents of the comprehensive photographic oeuvre of Atget; second, to demonstrate the practices that produce an image as a documentary photograph i.e. the photograph as image, the photograph as a technological and practical product, the photograph as document, etc; third, in order to address the first research sub-question and prepare the
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foundation for the discussion of the second in Chapter Six: The Photographic Production of Space:

1. What are the practices involved in the production of a photograph as documentary?
2. What is the relation between documentary photography and the environments of an image’s production, storage, and interpretation?

John Tagg (1988), in his collection of essays The Burden of Representation, has undertaken a similar, albeit more discourse-centred, approach. Tagg (1988: 157) positions at the centre of his account the fourfold distinction between:

‘the relationship of photography to the real; the process and procedures which constitute meaning in the photograph; the social utility of photographs; and the institutional frameworks within which they are produced and consumed’

First, the photograph-as-image is to be understood as the visual, non-textual, in-frame content of either a photographic print or a digital image. This could include, in the case of Atget: churches, boulevards, doorways, windows, statues, palaces, gardens, etc. The second distinction that emerged from non-textual data, the photograph-as-object, is pointing in some way to the process of production of the image. Moreover, the very materiality of the images emerged as important. Examples of this are clip marks on the edge of the frame, an underexposure vignette on the top corners, or scratched-in numbers on the negative that are visible mirrored on the print. While the first distinction points to the second - the image has to be based on some material basis that has come out of a practice - the second points to the third – the materiality of the object points to the ‘social biography’ (Edwards, 2001) of the photograph and its provenance and travel across institutions, uses, and ownership. The third distinction is the integration of the photographic print into an institutional object through the practice of curation.

These three distinctions within the data set were also reflective of the process of data analysis and collection. At first, only the visual content of
an image was coded; notes were made on labels, museum numbers, and classifications, for which context was lacking and were therefore only partially legible in their content besides their function as metadata. Memos were written on the potential significance of visual elements in the image that were pertaining to the source negative of the print, or in the case of digital images the source being the photographic print itself. On the basis of the visual in-frame content alone, 283 images were coded in location at the Print and Drawing Study Room\(^{28}\) at the VAM Museum over the duration of a week. Following this, codes and memos were revisited and expanded; the emergence of an understanding of the photographic prints as more than images, but also as institutional objects, i.e. forms of documents, became more defined. Thus, this resulted in a second iteration of the data analysis and collection, where the data sample of 283 images was revisited in their digital form as available on the online catalogue of the VAM Museum. For the coding of the images at this iteration, both categories regarding the in-frame, i.e. image aspect of meaning, and material aspect of meaning, were fully coded. Additionally, revisiting notes and memos from the in-person visit to the Print and Drawing Study Room, the entire online catalogue of the VAM was examined in relation to all three distinctions – image, materiality, and institutional curation - a total of 481 photographs (45 of which were either in storage or had no image and therefore not accessible). Four additional iterations of coding the entire sample of 481 photographs were conducted using nVivo 11 software.

This chapter will describe the process of data analysis and collection by outlining the emergent categories and concepts – starting from an account of Atget’s photographs as images on the basis of visual, non-textual, in-frame content alone in section 4.5. Conclusion and Summary

4.2. The Photographs as Images. Following this, the discussion of the emergent concepts relevant in relation to the materiality of the images and the elements of photographic practice that have emerged will be outlined in section 4.3. By following this structure, the chapter will introduce the reader first to the visual content of the images, the types of images, their

\(^{28}\) The Print and Drawing Study Room is accessible only for research purposes.
format, patterns, and composition. The following section will then discuss the concepts that emerge out of the process of the iterative reading of the images across varying contexts (both physical and virtual/online) that can inform the reader about the materiality of the photographs and photographic practice, the practice of Atget in particular, and the technological uses, affordances, and barriers with which he dealt and faced. Following this, a description will be given of the institutional practices identified in the VAM and their role in producing photographs as institutional documents in section 4.4. Finally, this chapter will provide an overview of the analysis of Atget’s work and its relation to the research objectives of this project in section 4.5. Conclusion and Summary

4.2. The Photographs as Images

In this case study, a total of 481 images have been examined. Out of these 448 were printed by Atget himself and were directly purchased by the VAM from him in the period of 1903-1905; all 448 are albumen prints from gelatine dry plate negatives, which, due to age, are all sepia toned; also, a total of 49 are damaged in some way – fading of colours or scratches. In addition to the 448 prints purchased directly from Atget, the VAM possesses 20 prints acquired through a sale by the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) following an international exhibition of Atget; all are printed from original negatives by the photographer Berenice Abbott; these photographs are gold-toned gelatine silver prints from Eugène Atget’s original 18 x 24 cm glass negatives. The colours are characteristically gold-toned and the contrast is higher; Abbott herself printed the bulk of the prints in 1956, while Atget took the negatives in 1923-4; and the VAM acquired all of them in 1974. In addition to these prints, the VAM possesses a small collection of 13 gold-toned albumen prints from gelatine dry plate negatives printed by Joel Snyder in 1978 (most of the negatives were taken in 1915 by Atget) and acquired by the VAM in 1980. In figure 7 below, the difference can be seen

---

29 Actual dates of negatives vary from 1900 to 1905 for the photographs printed by Atget.

30 Abbott has played a key role in the rising popularity of Atget’s work, both in Paris and abroad. Most notably, it is she who introduced Walker Evans to Atget’s work (Abbott, 1964[1977]; Szarkowski, 1985). A photographer herself, her sociological and urban focused photography was undoubtedly inspired by Atget and similarly played a role in the formation of the domain of documentary photography.
between the types of prints, from left to right – Atget, Abbott, and Snyder. In addition to the printing method, the photographs also differ in their content. The majority of the photographs printed by Atget are sepia toned, possessing a yellowish character typical to albumen prints. The ones printed by Abbott are black and white, and tend to have a higher contrast (darker hues of black) than the ones printed by Atget. Finally, the ones printed by Snyder are particularly sharp images, possessing a defined brown hue. In terms of content, the photos printed by Abbott and Snyder are taken much later than the ones acquired by the VAM from Atget himself (the 1920s) – they feature images that Atget had not documented before such as shopfronts, workers on the streets, and fairs.

REDACTED

Figure 7: (from left to right) Staircase, Hotel le Charron, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900; Nenuphars by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, 1923-4 (photographed) and 1956 (printed by Berenice Abbott); Cour de Rouen by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, 1915 (photographed) and 1978 (printed by Joel Snyder).

Out of the 481 images in total, only 8\(^{31}\) were not analysed in terms of visual content since there was no image provided in the online catalogue. Additionally, 37 images were classified as ‘in storage’ on the VAM online catalogue; out of these images, all seemed to be affected with fading colours. Furthermore, a large proportion of the ‘in storage’ images lacked metadata in the catalogue; some even lacked a museum number, name, or date of acquisition.

Due to a very high degree of variety in the types of images Atget took, an analysis of the various visual contents in the entirety of the collection was conducted. Table 1 (see below) presents the number of types of visual

\(^{31}\) None of which were available for examination during the in-person visits to the V&A’s Print and Drawing Study Room.
elements identified and percentages per category across the 3 data sets of this case study. The most frequent major category was ‘architecture,’ which totalled 351 cases and made up 73% of the occurrences (see table 2, below, for a breakdown of the frequency of the categories with regards to visual content with a breakdown of the category architecture into subcategories). The most prominent visual content in the sample has been the category of ‘doorways’ (as a subcategory of ‘architecture’) and ‘streetscape’, both with 120 occurrences in the data, each making up 25% of the visual content of the images. Following this, at 116 occurrences, at a 24% frequency, was the category ‘non-commercial or residential’ (as a subcategory of ‘architecture’). The least frequently identified visual elements were ‘balcony’ with 2% (n=10) and ‘ruins, derelict buildings, and construction’ (both as subcategories of ‘architecture’). Outside the major category of ‘architecture’, most infrequent were ‘ornament’ with 9% (n=43; including both ironwork and stonework, as well as detail on monuments, fountains, etc) and ‘fountain, obelisk, monument’ with 9% (n=44).

The following breakdown of detail can be understood as a catalogue of Atget’s work and its documentary value and currency. According to Nesbit (1998: 405):

‘Technical rather than aesthetic considerations prevailed. Documents were dissected and the required information extracted from them. Any pleasure was practical; this culture was a culture of work.’

With this in mind, the following list of categories (table 1 below) on the basis of the visual elements of the photographic sample can be understood as a preliminary step towards understanding Atget’s photographs as documents that operate in a particular way, as images, as located in an archive, and as representations of a city.
4.2.1. Visual Analysis

This section will introduce the breadth of Atget’s work that has been analyzed. While doing so, the relation between Atget’s photographs and the environment of their production, i.e. the city of Paris, and the image’s interpretation will be continuously discussed.

In terms of visual contents, the most frequently occurring category, ‘architecture’, comprised eight subcategories of visual elements pertaining to buildings, their surroundings, and/or structural elements of the city’s built environment. The category ‘interior’, although related to architecture, is separate and will be discussed at length in a further section (4.2.1.3. Interior). Table 2 (below) presents a summary of the visual elements identified in this category, which were conceptually arranged into two subsections – ‘elements of architecture’ and ‘ornament’. The distinction emerged with regards to the conceptual work that the two types of images do – namely, how Atget documented elements of buildings and structures
in order to reflect on the urban experience of being in the city, as well as the minutest elements, such as ornaments, and their often overlooked presence. It will be argued that by combining those images with ones of ‘interior’ and more broadly ‘urban images’ that Atget sutured varied and different pieces of the city in order to reflect it back in a novel and strange manner.

Table 7 ‘Architecture’ subcategories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBCATEGORIES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 : ARCHITECTURE (BALCONY)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 : ARCHITECTURE (CHURCH)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 : ARCHITECTURE (COMMERCIAL)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 : ARCHITECTURE (DETAIL OR ISOLATED ORNAMENT)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 : ARCHITECTURE (DOORWAYS)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 : ARCHITECTURE (NON-COMMERCIAL OR RESIDENTIAL)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 : ARCHITECTURE (STAIRWAY)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 : ARCHITECTURE (RUINS, DERELICT BUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it has been introduced in Chapter Two, the historical conjuncture in which Atget practiced photography is one of great urban change, commercialisation of the public spaces of Paris, and more particularly – the creation of a large network of thoroughfares consisting of wide boulevards lined with cabarets and salons (Huddleston, 1928), cafés (Haine, 1999), and department stores (Harvey, 2005). As Rubin (2008: 17) points out, this was also a period, in which Paris became ‘the place where modern vision was developed’. Architecture in Paris, during the period of Atget’s practice, was central to the experience of the city – the old buildings would constantly be disappearing in order to make space for the new (Harvey, 2005).

As Hazan notes (2011), for the first photographers - the daguerréotypistes - there was a connection between architecture, urban space, and photography from the very beginning. The first image taken by Daguerre, in fact, was taken from the roof of his diorama on Boulevard du Temple (see
Hazan, 2011; Jacobs, 2006); the practice of using building roofs for vantage points was popular among the early daguerréotypistes (Hazan, 2011).

Furthermore, photography and architecture have been in dialogue since the invention of photography (Perego, 1998). Perego (1998: 197) has referred to this as the role the modern photographer at the time played of ‘mediator between the outside world (that is, the new fields of perception) and contemporary society’. Especially since with Haussmann’s changes:

‘there arose the idea of a perfect match between the city and the photographic style with which it was documented, a style totally dedicated to the “cult of the axis” as the ordering principle of urbanism and this of the formal structure of the photographic approach.’ (Perego, 1998: 199).

4.2.1.1. Elements of Architecture

In Atget’s work, on the basis of the category ‘architecture’, a theme was identified that deals with isolated parts of a given building or its construction. This theme has been called ‘elements of architecture’. Key examples of this are Atget’s photographs of balconies, stairways, or doorways. In all cases, the given photograph clearly singles out the architectural element as central to the photograph’s meaning.

The subcategory of ‘balcony’, although infrequent (2%, n=10), emerged as significant, since ironwork and ornamentation on balconies were emphasised in certain photographs (see figure 8, above), as well as due to the compositional value in the set of images of balconies, doorways, and stairways, which, as seen in the images provided in pages 105-108 dominate the image not only as ornamentation, but as architectural elements as well.
The ‘doorway’ subcategory occurred at a frequency of 25% (n=120) and is most frequently cross-coded with the most categories in ‘architecture’. Additionally, the analysis of images in the subcategory of ‘doorway’ contributed to an understanding of the presence of people in-frame.

Namely, the presence of people, in addition to their occupation, e.g. a gatekeeper could be understood as a tool for establishing the scale of an architectural visual element.

Moreover, doorways are symbolic visual and architectural elements that make up a building’s façade. Furthermore, understood from a social perspective, the doorway fulfils an important social function. As MacFarlane points out:
'As another important critic of Atget, John Szarkowski observed "[Atget] loved doorways [...] they define a meeting ground between domestic and civil life, the innermost plane of the private person’s public face".‘ (MacFarlane, 2010: 21-22)

The subcategory 'stairway' occurred only at a frequency of 5% (n=23). The presence of stairways in Atget’s work demonstrated an artistic sensibility in the act of documentation. The labels and names, i.e. the metadata provided by the VAM catalogue or institutional documents, pointed to these photographs as significant in terms of being documents of the intricate ironwork of the parapets of the stairways, similarly to balconies. With this in mind, the composition, framing, and artistic use of in-frame visual elements, namely the stairways themselves, appear as an equally significant dimension of the documentary practice of Atget’s work.

Figure 11 (from left to right): Doorway, rue de l'Orangerie, Versailles, France [2426-1903] by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900; Doorway, rue de l'Orangerie, Versailles, France [2238-1903] by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900; Doorway, Musee de Cluny, Paris, France [263-1903] by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900.

Figure 12: Staircase, rue Poissoniere, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900.
Literature on Atget’s work often tends to emphasise the presence of multiple and varied elements of architecture in his photographs (see Nesbitt, 1998). Regarding an image called ‘Cabaret au Tambour’, Nesbit (1998: 408) has commented on the multiple layers of meaning inherent to the document that Atget produced:

‘There were signs for historians of Paris, who were interested only in the drum [tambour in French]; there were signs for metalworkers, looking to see just how the grille and sign had been made; and there were signs of modern life – the distorted figures in the doorway’ (emphasis in original).

This demonstrates the way Atget would produce documents that were targeted to more than one type of client; he would often simultaneously produce documents for ‘artists, builders, set designers or historians’ (Nesbit, 1998: 405). Clear examples of this would be exactly these elements of architecture being described here – stairway railings, stonework doorways, or ornamented wrought-iron balconies. It is this that Nesbit (1998: 402) refers to as the document containing ‘grains of knowledge that would […] be used to produce more advanced knowledge’. Namely, the photographic documents that Atget produced were not only created for particular clients in mind (and often more than one type of client), but also for a particular type of reading that the intended client would likely exercise over the image. For example:

‘a document of old Paris would inform an antiquarian’s account of a seventeenth century political event; a
document from a lampshade salesman’s catalogue might inform a genre painting meant for exhibition at the Salon and so on’ (Nesbit, 1998: 402).

Moreover, it is:

‘[Atget’s] views of undistinguished facades, and of articles displayed outside or just inside storefronts, [that] were perhaps the first works of art to direct attention to the commercial (not industrial) environment in a completely artistic way – in a way, that is, which was distanced’ (Greenberg, 1964: 131).

Arguably, it is Atget’s same treatment of the everyday objects of the city and elements of its architecture that is significant. It is these unassuming places and unpicturesque landscapes that have been described by Valentin (1928: 20-21), in one of the first ever reviews of Atget, as ‘decidedly strange places where there appeared to be nothing of the slightest interest’ until he photographed them. The surrealists thought of Atget’s work as intriguing precisely because of these qualities – the use of the readymade, the strangeness and distance of perspective and choice of subject, and the everyday (see Walker, 2002: 88). It is this that Benjamin (1931: 518) defined as aura, the unique experience of a specific place – a ‘strange weave of space and time: the unique appearance or semblance of distance, no matter how close it may be’. In his monograph on the city, surrealism and photography, Walker (2002: 88-96) describes an intriguing example of one of the four images of Atget’s that was published in Andre Breton’s La Révolution surréaliste:

‘This is one of his photographs of prostitutes; the woman is small in the centre of the frame, standing in front of a large doorway […]. Again, there is a connection between the image and the surrounding text by Réne Crevel, which is set in a seaside port peopled by, among others, prostitutes. However, the multicultural environment that Crevel evokes is very different

32 All four images were published without credit to Atget, as per his request. Reportedly, Man Ray claimed that in reference to those images and their eventual publication that Atget asserted his photographs are only documents (see Walker, 2002).
from that depicted in the photograph, which is simply entitled “Versailles”. Atget’s bluntly factual caption had caused Man Ray some amusement at what he considered Atget’s naivety. […] 

How Atget himself thought of such a structure can be surmised from the text accompanying a similar image in his own album L’Art dans le vieux Paris [The art of old Paris]: “Rue Charlot, 83 (3rd Arrt) – Hotel Marquis de Mascarini (disappeared). Splendid extension, wrought iron, of the Hotel staircase”. The caption is tersely factual, with hints of delight (“splendid”) and regret (“disappeared”).’ (Walker, 2002: 91-92)

The examples of Atget’s caption for the image and its ‘terse factuality’ is indicative of Atget’s commitment to the old architecture of Paris, often being only parts of a building, that due to being in a state of disrepair would, if not documented, disappear from the urban landscape. Sramek (2013: 19) points to the numerous instances in which Atget returned to certain sites that were undergoing or would go through demolition. Understood this way, his album Vieux Paris [Old Paris] is a project tinged with loss and the disappeared. Sramek (2013: 19) further asserts that while Atget would follow the progression of demolition of certain sites, he was not interested in photographing the new architecture in order to contrast it with the old. Moreover, the stark contrast of the descriptions in Walker’s example (2002), and in interpretation, is often taken to imply a certain naivety in Atget’s work, a taste for the outmoded, and a lack of aesthetic complexity. In keeping with Benjamin, Gilloch (1997: 123) has argued that the ‘obsolete object reveals the truth of the fetishized commodity; the old-fashioned discloses the reality of the fashionable’ in a dialectical manner – and it is this, granted, that the surrealists supposedly found appealing in Atget’s work (Walker, 2002). Furthermore, according to Benjamin (who also linked Atget to the surrealists, going as far as calling him a proto-surrealist – Benjamin, 1979), this abstraction of elements of architecture, places, and objects of the everyday life of the city was a commendable invention by Atget (Benjamin, 1931: 518):
'When avant-garde periodicals like Bifur or Variete publish pictures that are captioned “Westminster,” “Lille,” “Antwerp,” or “Breslau” but that show only details, here a piece of balustrade, there a treetop whose bare branches crisscross a gas lamp, or a gable wall, or a lamppost with a life buoy bearing the name of the town – this is nothing but a literary refinement of motifs that Atget discovered’ (emphasis added).

These motifs, as described by Benjamin, are something that often figures in the description of Atget’s work. Hazan (2011: 359) talks of ‘the series of door-knockers taken for maniacal decorators in search of ‘grand siècle’ motifs, or the details of the buttresses and roofs of Saint-Sevèrin’. In one of the first reviews of Atget, Robert Desnos (1928: 16) describes the ‘bourgeois homes, homes of workingmen, homes of luxury including that of Mlle. Sorel’, the booths of street fairs, grocery store windows, barbershops, stairs, stocks of street merchants, etc’. Similarly, Sramek (2013: 22) lists the ‘excised design details in the manner of Atget, who created many collections of door knockers, stairway railing and other such designed items’. Teige (1931: 316) emphasises Atget’s failed career as a painter, while he also singles out ‘the streets and corners of Paris, its byways, oases, and store windows – in short, the motifs [Atget] wanted to paint’.

However, from a more pronounced urban perspective, one can reflect on how much Atget’s practice is interwoven with the city of Paris itself. As it has already been discussed, Haussmann’s Paris followed a consistent and continuous logic that combined both form and function, aesthetic sensibilities and capitalist interests, all the while resulting in a panoptic space that is structured on the basis of lines of sight. This was also true of the minute elements of the city – the railings, tree grilles, gas lights, lamp posts, façades, and benches were all standardised; Vidler (2011: 100) even comments that a ‘bench in the Faubourg Saint Antoine was the same as that in the Champs-Elysée’.

33 According to Szarkowski (2000: 80), perhaps Atget himself (being an actor) knew Cecile Sorel, ‘the celebrated actress of the Comédie Française, whose apartment was perhaps the fanciest of those [Atget] photographed’.
It is here that the documentary function of Atget’s photographs can be found. As Greenberg has commented, photography works best when it is at its most transparent and ‘lets the almost “practical” meaning of the subject come through’ (Greenberg, 1964: 131). Atget did so by capturing a variety of architectural elements central to the urban space of Paris. As Nesbit (1998) has commented, he did so with particular viewers in mind, but most of his images included documentary information for multiple types of viewers – metalworkers, architects, urban planners, artists, surrealists, etc. By doing so, Atget, in fact, lived up fully to the phrase used by Pierre Mac Orlan (1929: 33) in introducing his work in the first ever publication – Atget: Photographe de Paris – ‘a perfectly organized witness’.

4.2.1.2. Ornament

Atget’s scope of documentation also included the minute and the ‘excised detail’ of the city (Sramek, 2013: 22). The subcategory of ‘detail and/or ornament’ occurred at a frequency of 16% (n=79), but in its theoretical significance constituted a theme of its own. Due to its framing of a close-up on a particular ornamentation, detail, doorknocker, etc, it was not always possible to ascertain what the nature of the detail or

Figure 14: Ornamental detail, Austrian Embassy, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900.
ornament’s provenance was. In some cases, certain details could be identified as belonging to another kind of visual element, e.g. a door, due to the sequence of the images and their museum numbers. Considering that images in this theme were close-ups of details, it was easy to ascertain the formal qualities of Atget’s composing practice, as well as what was determined as the most valuable visual element in the composition of an image. For example, in figure 15 (below, left) the gargoyle detail is framed as more significant than the detail directly above it simply due to its integrity. In another example (figure 15 and 16 below and figure 14 above), the arrangement of ornamentation was used in the composition of the image in order to communicate visually significance – either through the integrity of the visual element (above), or through its framing as a central element (above and below).

REDACTED

Figure 15 (left): Door Knocker, The Louvre, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900; (right) Ornamental panel, Hôtel de Lauzun, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900.
Atget’s work documenting ornaments, in addition to the surrealist parallel of the everyday that has already been noted, marks a strong relation to the work of Siegfried Kracauer (1995) on the importance of the ornament in the modern city. For Kracauer (1995), the ornament is a ‘figural principle’ that is vital for the world of images of the city, as well as an element of urban architecture. It is through this ‘particularity of the single thing’, the overlooked ‘small elements of a building […] ranging from grave railings and skylight and window latticework to banisters and balcony railings’ can be seen to shape ‘the distinctive character both of the individual buildings and of a city or region’ (Reeh, 2004: 64-65). Understood this way, the ornamentation and isolated detail that Atget captured in such number are not to be seen as trivial and lacking context. Rather, through the documentation of the particular, understood through Kracauer’s perspective, Atget is working towards the documentation of the character of the city itself. Furthermore, Atget also challenges the viewer to interpret what is seen (Benjamin, 1935: 6). As Gilloch (2002: 179) notes, Atget ‘ensures that the viewer directly confronts the unembellished countenance of the object world’.
It is these ornaments of the city and its architecture that Atget has captured that are at the centre of the mediation between the individual and society (Reeh, 2004: 17). The ornament, the small element or the detail, with reference to Kracauer’s work, can be understood as the opposite of Haussmann’s ‘cult of the axis’ of sight in the boulevard; in his autobiographical novel Ginster, Kracauer further emphasises the violence of ‘the avenues’ “perspectivizing effect” (Reeh, 2004: 45). For Kracauer (1995), as well as Benjamin (2006b) and Simmel (1903), the act of seeing in a city is intimately tied with the experience of the space (see Reeh, 2004: 110). As Benjamin (2006b: 207) has highlighted, ‘[i]nterpersonal relationships in big cities are distinguished by a marked preponderance of visual activity over aural activity’. With regards to Kracauer’s critical urban analysis, the observer’s field of vision is ‘explicitly determined by being demarcated from consciously produced urban images: buildings, street perspectives, fine squares, and so on’ (Reeh, 2004: 110). Understood this way, architecture itself becomes ‘urban images’:

‘Where masses of stone and streets converge […] an urban image arises that has never been the subject of any interest. It has been shaped as little as nature has and resembles a landscape in that it asserts itself unconsciously.’ (Kracauer as cited in Reeh, 2004: 110)

According to Reeh (2004: 112), Kracauer’s urban criticism that focuses on the ornamental seeks to displace both ‘that which is observed’ and ‘the way in which observation takes place’, thus displacing the observer’s very point of view in relation to the city. Since it is the large architectural urban images and the large thoroughfares and boulevards that exercise a ‘perspectivizing effect’ on individuals, an emphasis on the ornamental can explode the particular into the general. This disinterested and naturalizing gaze that focuses on the small and overlooked does not ignore the social and historic context of the city, but exposes its elements ‘as material for urban reflection’ (Reeh, 2004: 112). Kracauer (as cited in Frisby, 2013: 136) refers to this when he asserts that ‘[k]nowledge of cities is bound up with the deciphering of their dream-like [i.e. ornamental] expressive images’. According to Zohlen (as cited in Frisby, 2013: 136-137), Kracauer challenges
the observer’s idea of the everyday urban experience and point of view through these ‘urban images’, thus making the city once again unfamiliar.

Atget’s photographs reveal the building blocks of the ‘urban images’ described by Kracauer – be they ornaments or ‘small elements’, elements of architecture like the stonework of doorways or the wrought-iron stairway railings. By doing so, Atget’s photographs work towards the same exact ‘making strange’ of the city of Paris by exposing what is overlooked. In close proximity to Atget, Gilloch (2002: 125) cites both Benjamin and Louis Aragon when describing Paris as ‘a dreamscape, as the chimerical site of the proliferation of phantasmagorical forms and deities’. Walker (2002: 88) describes the Atgetian aesthetic as ‘the everyday recorded with such understated directness that it comes to seem haunting, somehow inexplicable’. This is a sentiment that echoes Desnos’ (1928: 17) description of Paris as ‘the dream capital, created by Atget’. Contemporaneously to Desnos’ comments, Valentin (1928: 20) described Atget’s photographs of Paris as ‘that cerebral landscape […] which maintains an equilibrium between fact and dream’. Notably, Mac Orlan (1930) referred to ‘the fantastique social’ in Atget’s work – the type of sensibility that can be found in the ‘profoundly everyday’ and its ‘mysterious elements’ (Merrifield, 2014: 47). Thus, through a mixture of the partial (i.e. elements of architecture) and the overlooked detail (i.e. ornaments) Atget sutures disparate pieces together, effectively turning the everyday into a strange experience.
4.2.1.3. Interior

Atget’s work also included the interior spaces of ‘bourgeois homes, homes of workingmen, homes of luxury’ including those of actors and artisans (Desnos, 1928: 16; also, see Szarkowski, 1985). This category is particularly broad in its scope and it encompasses a wide range of interiors – from commercial venues such as cabaret bars (see figure 17 above, left) through palatial residences (above, right) to churches and temples (see figure 18 below, left), and private bedrooms (figure 18 below, right). The theme ‘interior’ is relatively average in terms of frequency in comparison to the other major categories, but it has been deliberately distinguished from the category ‘architecture’ due to its different use of framing, visual elements, and in-category variance, and it has been distinguished from the theme ‘elements of architecture’ due to the different theoretical principles in Atget’s practice.

For example, the compositional practices (as seen in figures 17 and 18) differ from the framing of images coded in ‘architecture’. The images coded in ‘interior’ that are also ‘portrait (format)’ are considerably more frequent (at 80%) than images in ‘architecture’ and ‘portrait (format)’ (at 67%); as well as, the frequency of ‘interior’ exceeding considerably the
general frequency of images in ‘portrait (format)’ (at 63%). On the basis of this, the category ‘interior’ was considered distinct from ‘architecture’; the difference in format is carried over as difference in composition and use of framing (in particular, the frequency of an underexposure vignette and its significance will be discussed at greater length below).

REDACTED

Figure 18 (left): Interior, Church of St Gervais, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900; (right) Intérieur de Monsieur T., négociant, rue Montaigne by Eugène Atget (printed by Joel Snyder – 1978), Victoria and Albert Museum, 1910.

Interesting elements of Atget’s practice, further to the discussion so far, are his somewhat untruthful portrayal of spaces. For example, Szarkowski (1985) points to several images that Atget labelled differently on several occasions, in addition to omitting either his name or that of others. In the case of one image, Atget photographed his own home and captioned it as the home of an actor, which although not false, can be seen as a misdirection (see Szarkowski, 1985: 172\(^{34}\)). In

REDACTED

Figure 19: Interior, Austrian Embassy, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900.

\(^{34}\) In Szarkowski’s words (1985: 172): ‘…fifty-two pictures were identified by an anonymous initial, an occupation, and the street on which the resident lived. At least six of these were made in Atget’s own apartment, five of which are identified as the place of an artiste dramatique, which is true if misleading, who lived on the Rue Vavin, which is false. The sixth
other cases, he would provide an address in a completely different area of the city, seemingly in order to portray a different image of where the home is. Szarkowski points to two examples where he did this with images of his own home (1985). It can be said that Atget’s photographic practice was engaged with urban space in a variety of ways, and that even in the case of his smaller project on interiors, he actively engaged in interpretations of the urban space he was occupying and the city as a whole. For instance, the false geographical placement of interiors seems to point to an assumed equivalence, either implying a knowledge on Atget’s part of the lack of difference between apartments in differing areas of Paris or an assumed lack of knowledge on the part of the viewer. This interpretative aspect of Atget’s practice is also evident in a photo, which Atget has captioned referring solely to a climbing rose bush, thereby completely omitting ‘the structure on which [the roses] climb, which appears to be a latrine’ according to Szarkowski (1985: 172). This further emphasizes the point that the documentary function of Atget’s photographs is determined by Atget’s own interpretation of what is being photographed.

In general, the photographs of bourgeois interiors (see figure 19 above) are significant for several reasons. First of all, ‘the bourgeois interior is a loathsome, desolate refuge from social activity in the public sphere’ (Gilloch, 1997: 79). According to Gilloch (1997: 79), this is in keeping with the ‘hallmark of the modern bourgeoisie [of] the public denial of sensuality, of the reciprocity of gaze, of human interactions and relationships’. Prior to the invention of buses, railways and trams, people, according to Simmel, ‘had never been in a position of having to look at one another for long minutes or even hours without speaking to one another’ (as cited in Benjamin, 2006b: 38). According to Benjamin (as cited in Gilloch, 1997: 140), the expansion of the interior (especially so in the arcades) was a means ‘to minimize and destroy this disquiet’. Understood this way, the apparently intended documentary function of Atget’s photographs is documenting more than the built environment of the city of Paris, but the social processes at play in his historical epoch as well.

is identified as the room of a worker (also true and misleading) who lived on the Rue de Romainville, which is geographically even further from the truth than the Rue Vavin’.
The theme of ‘urban images’ can be seen in categories such as ‘church’ (sub-category of ‘architecture’), ‘non-commercial or residential buildings,’ and ‘commercial buildings.’ The second in frequency (16%, n=75) subcategory in the case study was ‘church.’ The subcategory also included instances of doorways and interiors. In one sense, the interior of the church is both significant in the fact that it is an image of the internal architecture of the building, but also that it is one which is clearly readable as belonging to a church. In other cases, the doorway of a church (such as the one below in figure 21, left) can clearly be identified as both, and can even be identified as the entrance to Beauvais Cathedral, just outside the contemporary borders of the city of Paris.

Churches are important to the city of Paris, both in terms of architecture and in terms of urban planning (Jacobs, 2006). As a city with a long religious history, Paris has a large number of medieval churches that are impressive architectural landmarks (Hazan, 2011). However, it should also be mentioned that Haussmann often constructed churches at the end of a
street or boulevard in keeping with what Perego (1998) has described as Haussmann’s ‘cult of the axis’. With this in mind, the presence of churches is central to the ‘urban image’ of the city – regardless whether in the background of an urban streetscape (see figure 21 below, left) or as an important architectural landmark featuring exquisite detail (see figure 21 below, right).

Figure 21 (from left to right): Doorway, Beauvais Cathedral, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900; Church of St Le Pauvre, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, ca.1900; Rail, Church of St Severin, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900.

Figure 22 (left): House in Rue St Laurent, Beauvais, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900; (right) House of Francis I, Abbeville, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900.

The subcategory consisting of ‘non-commercial or residential buildings’ was the second most frequent (24%, n=116) in ‘architecture’. Mostly, ‘non-commercial or residential buildings’ consisted of buildings that could not be identified as non-urban, palatial residences (such as Versailles, for example), nor as commercial venues, nor as churches or parks. On the basis of this, the sub-category would appear to be mostly urban in its occurrences. This subcategory, in particular, revealed the importance of
metadata to the reading of a given image. For example, in figure 23 (below) without the metadata, it would not have been possible to determine that the image is of the Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF) in Paris (currently, the Rue Richelieu building of the BnF).

The subcategory of 'commercial buildings' (7%, n=35) emerged as significant because it was the only one in the major category of 'architecture' that required a reading of textual information in-frame of the image i.e. shop signs, advertisements, and names of commercial venues. In addition, at a frequency of 35% the images in this subcategory included people (the second highest frequency in the category of 'architecture'). In terms of cross-coding, most images of 'commercial buildings' included doorways, of shops and cabarets mostly, and streetscapes. For example, in figure 25 (below, left), the shopfront signs can be read as ‘sellerie’ on the right side of the frame – meaning ‘saddlery’ in French, hence a shop specialising in saddles and equestrian equipment. In other cases, such as figure 25 (below, right), people would be seen framed in the windows of shops – most likely as employees (e.g. waiters, door guards, etc). It is in these images of shopfronts that the clearest depictions of people can be found, either posing in front (figure 24 above) or inside the venue as employees – what Nesbit (1998: 408) has referred to as ‘signs of modern life’.

Figure 23: Shop front, Au Soleil d’Or, 84 Rue St Saveur, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900.

Figure 24: Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900.
According to Fraser (1968: 205), these types of photographs show Atget’s dedication to a project of documenting the city ‘as a place in which one moves around, consumes things, seeks mental refreshment, and rest’. In other words, the photographs of various types of urban environments Atget documented the city in the form of ‘urban images’. This theme encompasses shopfronts, doorknobs, uninhabited streets, and repetitive vistas leading to churches. Despite the fact that Atget’s work was rarely concerned with a ‘peopled city’, his work captures the ‘urban images’ of the city ‘as they impinged on someone actually living in [Paris] in an ordinary daily way’ (Fraser, 1968: 204-205). Kracauer (as cited in Frisby, 2013: 138) has added that it is such a view of the city that affords a perspective which does not take away agency from people’s everyday life in the city and shows an experience ‘that is hardly harmed by the architectural perspective of the king and the enlightened haute bourgeoisie’. Fraser (1968: 205) further points to the few instances in which Atget took candid photographs of Parisian workers, and claims that these images can be seen as artefacts of an epoch, a feeling of ‘quaintness’ that is inevitably accompanied by a feeling of loss and nostalgia. Further to this point, Sramek (2013: 22) points out that, in his photographic practice, Atget ‘moved along the street, framing at an angle to focus on a building or a
particular doorway and [...] he included interior courtyards’ as well. According to Sramek (2013: 22), Atget’s interest was not in the street plan, but in buildings – ‘façades, architectural and decorative details’. This, in turn, has resulted into a documentary project that captures ‘the configuration of streets’ (Sramek, 2013: 22), but does so with an effect that is ‘a continual visualization of the walking areas that [Atget] presents’ (Fraser, 1968: 207). It is this that has allowed Atget to provide, what Susan Buck-Morss has referred to, as ‘the phenomenological hermeneutics’ of the street (Buck-Morss, 1989: 3).

This hermeneutic is understood as the basis for an approach to utilise ‘the interpretive power of images’ in order to ‘make conceptual points concretely, with reference to the world outside the text [i.e. image]’ (Buck-Morss, 1989: 6). According to Buck-Morss (1989:3), Benjamin’s use of this ‘phenomenological hermeneutic’ is a way of bridging everyday life with ‘traditional academic concerns’, as well as taking ‘materialism [...] seriously’ (1989: 3-4). For Benjamin (1999), even ‘corsets, feather dusters, red and green colored combs, old photographs, souvenir replicas of the Venus di Milo, collar buttons to shirts long since discarded’ are remnants that can act as ‘concrete, historical referents’ (Buck-Morss, 1989: 4). In this project, Buck-Morss’s definition (1989: 3) of Benjamin’s ‘phenomenological hermeneutics’ is applied to the ‘old photographs’ taken by Atget, as much as their content (architecture, urban space, or merchandise – see figure 26 above). Moreover, the intermittent presence of people in Atget’s photographs is another element of this ‘phenomenological hermeneutic’
(see section 4.2.2. Analysing a Photograph). In fact, the presence of people can demonstrate this ‘phenomenological’ or lived aspect of the spaces and objects that Atget documented.

The presence of people in this subcategory can be further understood by drawing on the political and historical context of the city of Paris, in which the photographs have been taken. In the 19th century, Paris was undergoing a series of urban changes that have already been outlined to some extent (see Chapter Two: Documentary Photography and the City). However, it should be emphasised that the majority of urban changes meant that the newly constructed spaces were likely to be of commercial nature. Moreover, the changes introduced by Haussmann had changed the city of Paris to such an extent that:

‘The Napoleon-Haussmann boulevards created new bases - economic, social, aesthetic - for bringing enormous numbers of people together. At the street level they were lined with small businesses and shops of all kinds, with every corner zoned for restaurants and terraced sidewalk cafes.’ (Berman, 2010: 151)
4.2.2. Analysing a Photograph

Considering the types of images and the visual elements that have emerged as significant have now been introduced, and some links between Atget’s photographs and the city of Paris have been established, this section will engage in a more direct semiotic exercise. The image to be explored is one that touches on most, if not all, of the visual elements that have been discussed. The L’homme armé (figure 27) photograph, taken c.1900 and acquired by the VAM in 1903, has originally been labelled in the National Art Library, now part of the VAM Museum, in the categories of ‘architecture’ and ‘ironwork’, and has been labelled in the online catalogues as pertaining to the subject of: metal-work, canons, swords, grilles (barrier elements), storefronts, men, shop signs, and body armour.

Figure 27 A l’Homme Arme, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900.

In order to understand the photograph, however, a different hermeneutic is necessary than simply listing the visual elements present in the image. As Barthes has noted, such a list would be a naïve analysis and it would lack any explanatory power (1977: 37). Walter Benjamin (1935: 6) has commented that Atget’s photographs appear to depict a crime scene:
‘The scene of a crime, too, is deserted; it is photographed for the purpose of establishing evidence. With Atget, photographs become standard evidence for historical occurrences, and acquire a hidden political significance. They demand a specific kind of approach; free-floating contemplation is not appropriate to them. They stir the viewer; he feels challenged by them in a new way’.

What would it mean then to treat the ‘L’homme armé’ as an image of a crime scene, what would the crime be, and how would the image be able to reveal something to an observer? Even more so, what is the origin of the stir caused by Atget’s photographs? In order to answer these questions, I will provide a reading of the photograph that highlights its political significance. First, I will relate the image to the work of Marshall Berman (2010) and Shelley Rice (2000) on Baudelaire’s prose poem ‘The Eyes of the Poor’, draw on Susan Buck-Morss’ (1989: 3) concept of the ‘phenomenological hermeneutic’ of images, and finally provide an analysis that is inspired by Jacques Rancière’s (2011) concept of ‘the distribution of the sensible’.

In his influential discussion of cities, modernity, and the work of Baudelaire on Paris, Berman explores the prose poem ‘The Eyes of the Poor’ in some depth (2010). It is an influential poem and, despite its brevity, it manages to touch on class conflict and privilege, modern social relations, and the urban environment of mid-Haussmannisation Paris. Baudelaire writes (2009: 51-52), quoted in its entirety:

REDACTED

35 It should be noted that, for Benjamin (2006: 72), this crime was inextricably tied to the city and its spaces: ‘No matter what traces the flaneur may follow, every one of them will lead him [sic] to a crime. This is an indication of how the detective story, regardless of its sober calculations, also participates in the phantasmagoria of Parisian life. It does not yet glorify the criminal, though it does glorify his adversaries and, above all, the hunting grounds where they pursue him [sic]’ (emphasis added; also, see Gilloch, 1997: 141)
We had spent together a long day that had seemed short to me. We had indeed promised that we would share all of our thoughts with one another, and that our two souls would henceforth be one—a dream that isn't the least bit original, after all, if not that, dreamed of by all men, it has been realized by none.

In the evening, a bit tired, we wanted to sit down in front of a new café that formed the corner of a new boulevard, still strewn with debris and already gloriously displaying its unfinished splendors. The café was sparkling. The gaslight itself sent forth all the ardor of a debut and lit with all its force walls blinding in their whiteness, dazzling sheets of mirrors, the gold of the rods and cornices, chubby-cheeked page-boys being dragged by dogs on leashes, laughing ladies with falcons perched on their wrist, nymphs and goddesses carrying on their heads fruits, pies, and poultry, Hebes and Ganymedes presenting in outstretched arms little amphoras filled with Bavarian cream or bicolored obelisks of ice cream—all of history and all of mythology at the service of gluttony.

Right in front of us, on the sidewalk, a worthy man in his forties was standing, with a tired face, a greying beard, and holding with one hand a little boy and carrying on the other arm a little being too weak to walk. He was playing the role of nanny and had taken his children out for a walk in the night air. All in rags. The three faces were extraordinarily serious, and the six eyes contemplated fixedly the new café with an equal admiration, but shaded differently according to their age.

The father's eyes said: "How beautiful it is! How beautiful it is! You'd think all the gold in this poor world was on its walls."

—The eyes of the little boy: "How beautiful it is! How beautiful it is! But it's a house only people who aren't like us can enter."

—As for the eyes of the smaller child, they were too fascinated to express anything other than a stupid and profound joy.
There are several important elements in the poem that can be used to reflect on the photograph by Atget. First, it should be noted that Baudelaire paints a clear image of the urban changes going through Paris in the 1860s, during which Paris Spleen was written. It has already been noted that Baudelaire’s writing is concerned both with the urban gaze of modernity, and the gaze on the urban (Rancière, 2017). Furthermore, the role of the gaze, or sight, for critical theory has been discussed in depth (see Gilloch, 2002). The new boulevards were the technology that opened up the space of the city to all its inhabitants, and more importantly created the space for the new bourgeois culture of cafés, in contrast to the old cafés being local to a neighbourhood (Berman, 2010; Haine, 1999). Second, the new café is the place of a large amount of ornamentation and luxury, revealing the new city to be not only going through increasing commercialisation and embourgeoisement of the new ‘public’ spaces, but also posits the problem of social interaction in such an environment. The ornamentation and luxury are not to be understood as mere details, but as key parts of the role that space has in mediating class conflict and privilege (see Kracauer, 1995; Reeh, 2004). The ornamented detail, the gold, mirrors, and gaslight (one can imagine intricately ornate railings and ironwork on the doorway) are both an effect of the new wealth and growth of the city, but also a medium
for communicating class privilege and exclusivity. In Kracauer’s terms (1995: 75), the ornamentation and luxury of the café can be seen as the epoch’s ‘inconspicuous surface-level expressions,’ which, according to Gilloch (2015: 37), allows for ‘the dialectics of depth hermeneutics – recognizing and reading surfaces as the essential manifestations of what lies below’.

Furthermore, Baudelaire (2009), both in the title and the text, emphasises the role of the gaze in social interaction in the modern city. It has been already noted that Benjamin and Kracauer argued that the modern city is increasingly based on vision; the sociologist Georg Simmel (1903) has also noted this development. As much as the ornamented interior of the new café is important it is only revealed to be class privilege through the encounter with the gaze of the ‘family of eyes’ (Berman, 2010). Rice (2000: 37) comments that Baudelaire’s poem is:

‘[…] a scene of multiple and shifting perspectives: of viewpoints as unstable as a city that disappears and is rebuilt, and as isolated as the eye of a man or a woman behind a camera.’

As Rancière argues (2017), this is indicative of modern urban experience, where Baudelairean ‘modern beauty’ is ‘that of the anonymous multiple’ (ibid: 109). Most importantly, however, Rancière (ibid: 110) notes a similar scene of spectatorship and spectacle so typical to Baudelaire:

‘[T]he window that shows and hides, the encounter with singular beings whose faces bear a history but, since Balzac, have lost the power to tell it and the exchange of gazes that opens an infinite vanishing line in the everyday space of the city. It is important that the window first and foremost opens only onto a world of other windows, behind which stands, for example, that wrinkly woman leaning over something indefinable and whose face, clothing and confused gesture permit a story to be made up.’

The gaze is at the centre of this scene, in the same way it is in ‘The Eyes of the Poor’. With Rice’s photographic reference (2000) and Rancière’s metaphoric ‘window’ (2017), the role of the gaze and its political effect can
be applied through a hermeneutic of the photograph by Atget (for a literary example of this approach, see Jameson, 2016: 44-56; also, Gilloch, 2002 on Baudelaire and Benjamin; also, Berman, 2010 on Baudelaire only). First, the direct gaze of the person in it might make an impression to an observer of the photograph. However, it is important to note that the photograph was sold to the VAM Museum as a document of ‘ironwork’ and ‘architecture’ – very much like the ornamented luxury of the café in the poem. According to Lederman (2008), a curator at the VAM, the person in the photograph is a waiter, or the maître d’. The photographic technology that Atget used means that the waiter would have had to stand still for a prolonged period of time (Nesbit, 1992a; 1998). Lederman (2008) also points out that other blurry silhouettes can be seen inside the cabaret/café; the fact that other people are invisible, while the waiter is visible, would, in turn, further solidify the reading that the person has the job of standing at the door in order to greet new patrons. It could also be added, that this reveals a difference at play that is not unlike the class conflict at the centre of Baudelaire’s poem. Namely, the people moving inside the café are likely to be the patrons, the ones who are, in a commercial sense, free to move in the space, while the waiter is required to stand still and fulfil a function that is tied to the doorway (see Rizov, 2016).

Understood this way, the meeting of the waiter’s gaze is quite significant. Following what has so far been called a ‘phenomenological hermeneutic’ (Buck-Morss, 1989), the gaze of the waiter appears to be in tension with the architecture surrounding him. Considering the lack of people in Atget’s images, his presence appears almost coincidental. Furthermore, if one’s understanding is based solely on the institutional inscription of the photograph as ‘ironwork’ and ‘architecture’, there appears to be a process of omission at play as well. His presence is not only coincidental, but not of value. Although unlike the ‘family of eyes’ exactly, and unlike Baudelaire’s couple, the waiter is revealed as something else than the ‘maître d’’ of the poem; he is not simply the channel of power that can dispel the unwanted patrons of the café, rather – he is at the mercy of the same reifying logic of commercial relations that is mediated by the ornament. It could be said that the photograph transforms the very
presence of the waiter into an ornament of the cabaret. In other words, the camera is not being used to represent anything, but only to present ‘a salutary estrangement between [a person and their] surroundings’\(^{36}\) (Benjamin, 2002: 518), that is, nothing other than capitalist modernity (Emerling, 2012: 178).

The gaze of the waiter and its role in the image, in addition to being understood as an example of the overlooked ‘small elements of a building […] that make up an ‘urban image’] ranging from grave railings and skylight and window latticework to banisters and balcony railings’ (Reeh, 2004: 64-65), can further be elucidated by Rancière’s concept of ‘the distribution of the sensible’ (2011). According to Rancière (2011: 12), ‘the distribution of the sensible’ is:

> ‘the system of self-evident facts of sense perception that simultaneously discloses the existence of something in common and the delimitations that define the respective parts and positions within it. [It] establishes at one and the same time something common that is shared and exclusive parts. This apportionment of parts and positions is based on a distribution of spaces, times, and forms of activity that determines the very manner in which something in common lends itself to participation and in what way various individuals have a part in this distribution’ (emphasis added).

Understood this way, the waiter, his fixed nature (both as occupation and photograph), and his gaze can be seen as inherently political. For Rancière, politics is ‘is first and foremost an intervention upon the visible and the sayable’ (2001: 21), as well as a transformation of the visible and sensible into a space ‘for the appearance of a subject: i.e., the people, the workers, the citizens’ (2002: 22). Furthermore, the ‘sensible’ is inherently connected to activity and the ability ‘to have a share in what is common’ (Rancière, 2011).

\(^{36}\) The quotation in its entirety: ‘Empty is the Potre d’Arceuil by the fortifications, empty are the triumphal steps, empty are the courtyards, empty, as it should be, is the Place du Tertre. They are not lonely, merely without mood; the city in these pictures looks cleared out, like a lodging that has not yet found a new tenant. It is in these achievements that Surrealist photography sets the scene for a salutary estrangement between man [sic] and his [sic] surroundings. It gives free play to the politically educated eye, under whose gaze all intimacies are sacrificed to the illumination of detail.’ (Benjamin, 2002: 518).
As Edwards (2016: 52) has summarised Rancière’s concept, the political significance of the photograph ‘revolves around what is seen and what can be said about it, around who has the ability to see and the talent to speak’. As Rancière (2005: 14) points out elsewhere, the worker, in terms of distribution of the sensible, is the one ‘who has no time to do anything but his [sic] own work’, and whose work consists of ‘a form of visibility that is equated to […] public invisibility’ (Rancière, 2005: 13). This leads to the worker ending up ‘without being counted as part of the symbolic order of the city’ (Rancière, 1992: 61).

Furthermore, the photograph is not only a photograph, or only a document – it is not simply a ‘surface’ consisting of various visual elements such as ironwork, waiter, or sign – rather, it is a certain ‘distribution of the sensible’ (2011: 15) and as such it bears an inscription of political realities such as social class. However, it is important to clarify what this distribution additionally entails. If one thinks back on Baudelaire’s poem, the role of the gaze there was a communicative act – Baudelaire’s lyrical ‘I’ was actively involved in reading the eyes of the family as it was gazing on the luxury of the café; the lyrical I was doing the same with their lover. Thus, the gaze entails a relationship that is mediated by the material, ornamented reality of overlooked ‘small elements […] ranging from grave railings and [wrought iron] window latticework to banisters and balcony railings’ that nevertheless create ‘the distinctive character both of the individual buildings and of a city or region’ (Reeh, 2004: 64-65). Rancière (2017: 112) has noted that the gaze has a clear mediational function:

‘The wealthy man’s joy is miserly when it has not been infinitized by the poor man’s gaze, stretched toward the café’s lights and decorations.’

On one hand, the person primarily implicated in the relationship of the gaze, and its distribution of the sensible is Atget himself; according to one

---

37 The poem by Baudelaire can be read along similar lines. For example, the quote ‘I can’t stand those people over there, with their eyes wide open like carriage gates! Can’t you tell the head-waiter to send them away?’ (Baudelaire, 2009: 51-52) is telling of ‘a distribution of the sensible’, as well as a distribution of actions pertaining to gender, class, labour, etc.
institutional description (Art Institute Chicago) the photograph ‘also reflects, like a ghost, the likeness of the photographer himself’\(^\text{38}\). The gaze of the waiter then can be made to reveal an interaction with the current observer of the photograph. This way, the interaction with Atget’s photograph allows for a genuine experience of the modern city, described by Gilloch (2002: 101) as ‘the fleeting, unexpected encounter with the stranger in the crowd’ (also, see Gilloch, 1997: 143; also, see Simmel, 1903, on the urban figure of ‘the stranger’). In a more in-depth reading in keeping with Benjamin’s dialectics of seeing, the gaze of the waiter reveals his ‘aura’, making the interaction an authentic one. ‘Aura,’ defined by Gilloch (2015: 37) as, ‘the individual quality of the sitter which emanates from his or her eyes and which meets the gaze cast upon it’. This ‘enduring silent conversation’ is telling, and speaks of Benjamin’s claim (1935: 6) of ‘a hidden political significance’ in photographs that resists ‘free-floating contemplation’.

This, in turn, can only enrich the understanding of documentary photography. Nesbit (1998: 403), when discussing Atget’s work has noted that ‘a document could not exist alone – it needed a viewer and a task’. Understood this way, a document is an entity that is defined dialectically, through an active interpretation and engagement with the content of the image – as Nesbit (1998: 403) asserts this is done:

‘by a viewer extracting a certain kind of technical information from the picture and by the picture’s ability to display just that technical sign. Both were needed for the document to become a document.’

---

\(^{38}\) The full quotation being: ‘He focused here equally on the emblem of “the armed man”—a title (and a tavern) dating to the medieval crusades, rendered in word and image to assure its familiarity to a partially illiterate clientele—and on the maitre d’, who gazes back through a glass window that also reflects, like a ghost, the likeness of the photographer himself.’

\(^{39}\) Dyer (2012b: 66), in reference to Atget’s influence on Walker Evans, comments the following: ‘One of many instances of the way that Atget seems entirely embodied in his photographs – which were, Evans noted, “the projection of Atget’s person” – this tendency of the pictures to be somehow about themselves, to be, in a nonderogatory sense, self-regarding, is part of their allure. (Those occasional glimpses of the reflected camera in shop windows are, in this respect, clues, evidence.)’
Furthermore, the document itself is not ‘a source of power’ (Nesbit, 1998: 402), but its meaning is determined by a certain aesthetic regime (Rancière, 2011: 33-34). According to Rancière (2011), this understanding of Atget’s photograph as a political interaction can be understood as an aesthetic issue, not necessarily strictly in photographic terms. That is, he argues, because ‘in order for a technological mode of action and production,’ such as photography, to become art ‘it is first necessary for its subject matter to be defined as such’ (Rancière, 2011: 33). Thus, photography was not established as an art on the basis of its technology, but its subject content. This posits an understanding of documentary photograph as a practice of carrying ‘(old) information about a group of powerless people to another group addressed as socially powerful’ (Rosler, 2004: 263). This further fits with what Rosler calls the ideological content of documentary photography - its ‘general aim of developing an educated, electorally active public’ (Rosler, 1982: 81). Sekula (2016: 67) also adds that this results into a documentary photography that privileges an aesthetics of compassion instead of collective struggle, effectively making documentary photography a practice whose ‘bounded arena’ of discourse is that of a privileged class (Sekula, 2016).

In summary, this analysis of a single photograph has worked to demonstrate the twofold manner in which Atget’s photographs fulfil a documentary function. First, Atget’s photographs document the material reality – the ornaments, the boulevards, cafes, ironwork, etc. By doing so, however, they also document the social reality of the urban-historical conjuncture. As such, the second way that Atget’s work is documentary is that the photographs allow for an interpretation of their social and class conditions.

4.3. The Photograph as Object

While the previous section of this chapter mapped out the relation between Atget’s photographs and the environment of their production, a more thorough consideration of the practices involved in this production are necessary. In the process of conducting the content analysis of the photographs taken by Atget, a major element of photographic practice emerged out of the examination of the relationship between the various
visual elements in-frame – technology. In this section of the current chapter, technology used by Atget will be explored briefly, and will be related not only to visual content of the image, but also to the practices that directly produced a given photograph as a material object. This way, the semiotic and hermeneutic already established in the previous sections will be expanded by moving past the ‘image content’ of the photograph and acknowledging its ‘physical attributes [...] that influence content in the arrangement and projection of visual information’ (Edwards and Hart, 2004: 2). Understood this way, photographs are products of a whole network of material practices. As such, each photograph is a product of various practical choices and affective decisions that ‘construct and respond to the significances and consequences of things and the human relations with which they are associated’ (Edwards and Hart, 2004: 6). As Edwards and Hart emphasise (2004: 6), photographs are made ‘in relation to certain objectives’ but are not those objectives themselves, rather they are ‘a specifically articulated use and function of the photographic image’. This section will attempt to reconstruct those objectives with regards to Atget’s practical choices and affective decisions. The readings presented below are ways for reimagining the material affordances of practice that went into the production of an image as a product of photographic practice with its own historical, social, and individual context.

4.3.1. Technology

Atget’s photographic practice is greatly influenced by the technology that he had at his disposal. A consideration of his practice would provide ground for the examination of the documentary function of his images, as well as the technological practices that have a role in the production of an image as a documentary photograph. For instance, Atget was using dry plate negatives that were 18x24cm. He also used a tripod and his camera was in no means handheld, weighing about 20lbs (Szarkowski, 1982). This, in turn, meant that Atget could not tilt his lens at all times. The times that he did, due to the position of lens and the negative plate on different planes, meant that whenever the field of view was at a level not parallel to the ground the lens would not project the image onto the entire negative, thus resulting in an underexposure vignette. This can vary in degree, and can be
distributed unevenly depending on the tilt of the camera; however, there is a pattern in its occurrence, the vignette is only visible in the top corners of an image – meaning that the camera’s lens has always been pointed upwards. In figure 28 (below), for example, the comparison between the two landscape images can be used as an illustrative example. First of all, the image on the left has a more or less equal in size vignette and, with some knowledge of the technological affordances of Atget’s camera or alternatively photographic expertise, it can be determined that Atget tilted the lens upward – probably in order to capture the top of the bell tower of the church. This points to a reading of the image on the left, and Atget’s photographic practice, as privileging the integrity of the building – both vertically and horizontally – even at the expense of the loss of the vignette top corners. Such technological considerations reveal Atget’s concern with the visual contents of the images. As such, they are quite telling that Atget used his technology’s strengths and weakness in order to support the intended documentary function of the photographs.

REDACTED

Figure 28: (left) Town hall, La Rochelle, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900; (right) View of Palace, Versailles, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900.

Interestingly, the image on the right is slightly different in the sense that the vignette is unequally distributed. This, in turn, can be used as a tool when it comes to establishing a reading of the visual content of the image. Namely, the fact that the camera’s lens must have been tilted at a sideways angle establishes the statues as potentially more significant than the building; also, in turn, making the building not the central visual element but a secondary one pertaining to the environment of the statue.
Table 8 Vignette and Format Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>W/ VIGNETTE</th>
<th>W/OUT VIGNETTE</th>
<th>CUT OUT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPE</td>
<td>41% (n=36)</td>
<td>34% (n=133)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>2% (n=2)</td>
<td>0% (n=3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTRAIT</td>
<td>56% (n=49)</td>
<td>65% (n=251)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is another element of this use of format in Atget’s photographic practice. Overall, in 18 occurrences ('landscape', n=4 and 'portrait', n=14), the top corners of an image were cut out in the mount of the photograph to the cardboard, as seen in figure 29 in the three images below. Despite being low in frequency (occurring less than 4% in the overall sample), this has great explanatory power with regards to Atget’s photographic practice, his own readings of the images, and the purpose behind taking them. All three images below (figure 29) reveal something about what is valuable in-frame and what is not; for instance, considering the introduced technological knowledge of the vignette, it is clear that the vertical elements of the images are seen as more valuable than the horizontal – or, at the very least, they are seen as necessary to be in their integrity. Both the image on the centre and on the right have as a visual element in-frame a church’s bell tower, and in both cases the towers are placed right in the centre of the image (indicating that Atget made sure this part of the frame won’t be vignette). Moreover, both images are taken from a distance, which further enhances the reading that it is not detail that Atget sought in the images but structural integrity (i.e. close-up means detail, while distant architectural shot means structural integrity). However, the images in the centre and on the right are fairly liberal in their use of negative space or lack of detail – for example, in the centre image the wall on the left side of the frame does not possess any detail and appears to only serve a framing function of emphasising the line of sight following the street leading up to
the church bell tower. In the image on the left, in contrast, there is almost an overwhelming amount of detail. Due to the cut-out vignette, though, it is possible to claim that the emphasis in the images does not lie in the structure itself as a whole as it did in the other two images, but rather on the vertical ornamentation above the doorway.

**Figure 29:** (from left to right) Hotel Lavalette, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900; Church of St Sulpice, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900; Lycee Henri IV, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900.

4.3.1.1. Format

Overall, with regards to the format of the images, the majority fitted into the two subcategories of either ‘landscape’ or ‘portrait’ (n=469); however, a small minority occurred in the subcategory ‘medium’ with a frequency of 1% (n=5). The name of the category ‘medium’ refers to the term ‘medium format’, otherwise known as 120 film, its size being historically 6x6cm, 6x4.5cm, 6x9cm, or 6x17cm (panoramic). The name of the subcategory is in reference to the square 1x1 aspect ratio of the photographic frame, and has no bearing on Atget’s actual photographic technology. On the basis of its low frequency, the subcategory ‘medium’ has been omitted from table 4 below detailing the distribution of the number of occurrences and frequency across the major categories pertaining to the visual content.

The frequency of the ‘portrait’ subcategory was nearly double (63%, n=300) that of ‘landscape’ (36%, n=169) across the total number of images examined. This pattern was visible throughout most visual content categories with the exception of the ‘architecture’ subcategory ‘balcony’ (60% ‘landscape’ – 40% ‘portrait’), ‘parks and gardens’ (64% ‘landscape’ – 35% ‘portrait’), and ‘statues’ (58% ‘landscape’ – 42% ‘portrait’).
Furthermore, ‘commercial buildings’ and ‘detail or isolated ornament’ (subcategories of ‘architecture’, which as a major category occurred at 31% ‘landscape’, n=110 - 63% ‘portrait’, n=237) more or less matched the average distribution, whereas ‘doorways’ (79%, n=95), ‘stairway’ (83%, n=19), and ‘interior’ (80%, n=48) occurred even more frequently in the subcategory of ‘portrait’.

Table 9 Format across Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Portrait</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE (BALCONY)</td>
<td>60%* (n=6)</td>
<td>40% (n=4)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE (CHURCH)</td>
<td>24% (n=18)</td>
<td>74% (n=55)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE (COMMERCIAL)</td>
<td>37%** (n=13)</td>
<td>63% (n=22)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE (DETAIL OR ISOLATED ORNAMENT)</td>
<td>37% (n=30)</td>
<td>63% (n=50)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE (DOORWAYS)</td>
<td>18% (n=22)</td>
<td>79% (n=95)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE (NON-COMMERCIAL OR RESIDENTIAL)</td>
<td>38% (n=44)</td>
<td>60% (n=70)</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE (STAIRWAY)</td>
<td>17% (n=4)</td>
<td>83% (n=19)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUNTAIN, OBELISK, MONUMENT</td>
<td>32% (n=14)</td>
<td>68% (n=30)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERIOR</td>
<td>18% (n=11)</td>
<td>80% (n=48)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK[S] AND GARDEN[S] (PALATIAL AND NON-URBAN)</td>
<td>64% (n=67)</td>
<td>35% (n=37)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATUE[S]</td>
<td>58% (n=41)</td>
<td>42% (n=30)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREETSCAPE</td>
<td>27% (n=32)</td>
<td>73% (n=87)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL* (WITHOUT MEDIUM)</td>
<td>36% (n=169)</td>
<td>63% (n=300)</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Frequencies marked in bold are significant deviations from the general distribution of format across the case study. ** Frequencies (underlined) that more or less correspond to the average Distribution of format across the case study.

On the basis of these frequencies, some claims can be made regarding the significance of format in relation to visual content. First, it can be claimed that the categories that defy the general distribution of occurrences with regard to format do so to some extent due to the nature of what was
photographed. For example, the balconies Atget photographed would have been captured in more detail in a wider horizontal format, such as ‘landscape’, since it would mean that the frame would be much closer to what is photographed. A similar claim can be made in relation to the stairways photographed by Atget – since it is not stairways that he was actually documenting, according to metadata, but the steel and ironwork railings, which are mostly vertical. Even more so when it comes to the category ‘interior’ which has the highest frequency of occurrences in ‘portrait’. This can be explained through the secondary visual elements captured in such images. Namely, the ornamented ceilings of churches or the ornamented walls of residential buildings, which would be more easily captured in their entirety in a ‘portrait’ format.

With regards to the format of the images, it should be mentioned that the discussion of the code ‘format’, what is meant is solely the distinction between photographic prints. However, Atget used exclusively 18x24 glass-plate negatives. This means that Atget has reframed all images that are in the ‘medium’ format. On one hand, such a choice could be interpreted positively - in terms of composition i.e. a particular relationship between the visual elements was sought by Atget that was only possible in a square format. On the other hand, it could be read negatively - as Atget reframing an image in order to remove something from inside its frame. Both perspectives emphasise the element of Atget’s photographic practice that is concerned with the images’ documentary function. Additionally, considering Atget’s use only of 18x24 negatives, it should be noted that not all prints are the same size even in the same format subcategory. Across the 473 images, there are slight variations in each ‘format’ subcategory making images inconsistent in the exact height-width ratios (see figure 30 below, the image on the left is wider than the one on the right). This points to Atget’s photographic practice of adjusting his negatives in order to produce a photographic print through a particular choice (cutting out an element from the original negative, or adjusting a composition).

This, in turn, points to an element of Atget’s photographic practice that is both concerned with technological affordances and aesthetic considerations. The choice of format for a given category, as well as its
subsequent adjustment, point to a technological use of the medium in order to organize the visual contents of the image in a particular way. Moreover, as the discussion of photographs as images has shown (see section 4.2. The Photographs as Images), Atget’s practice is concerned with a documentary function of capturing multiple types of information for a varied audience. The aesthetic and technological considerations further reinforce this.

REDACTED

Figure 30: (left) Interior, Church of St Severin, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900; (right) Flying Buttresses, St Severin, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900.

4.3.2. Elements of Photographic Practice Emergent from Images

Through examination of the images, technology as a factor in the production of the photographs has been discussed as possessing explanatory power. For example, the vignette in a significant number of images could only be accounted for by analysing Atget’s photographic technology and his use of it.

The elements of photographic practice highlighted in this chapter so far – documentary function, aesthetic adjustment, and use of technology – are to be understood in relation to each other. Technological affordances have an effect on the final image that is produced. However, Atget’s practices of manipulating the frame and format of images reveals that he was not always satisfied with photographs as they were taken by his camera – and made the deliberate choice to manipulate them through the process of making the print, or adjusting the print after the fact. Such a choice can be understood as the convergence of aesthetic considerations, use of technology, and Atget’s interpretation whether the
images fulfil a documentary function, defined by Nesbit as a photograph that has ‘a job to perform’ which has to do with the image entailing ‘as much detail as possible in the given subject area’ (Nesbit, 1998: 401). In summary, the analysis of the photographs indicates that Atget was not at all naïve in his photographic aspirations, and was clearly either concerned with how the image looked, i.e. the photographs’ adherence to aesthetic codifications, or what they were communicating, i.e. their ability to fulfil a documentary function.

Furthermore, a key dimension to Atget’s work that has emerged from examining Atget’s photographs both as images and in terms of the practices that have produced them is the logic of a project. Atget has famously remarked in a letter to the VAM Museum that ‘I now possess the entirety of Old Paris’ [Je puis dire que je possède tout le Vieux Paris] (Guichardet, 1999: 421). Supposedly, Atget ‘had the ambition to create a collection of all that which both in Paris and its surroundings was artistic and picturesque’ (Calmette as cited in Abbott, 1964: xi). Similarly, the historian Beaumont Newhall has remarked that ‘Atget’s work—and it must be looked upon as a whole—is the most remarkable photographic record of Paris ever created.’ (Newhall, 1937: 66). Solomon-Godeau (1991: 173) has commented that the genre of documentary photography, among other things, is defined by ‘the notion of project or narrative rather than single image’. Understood discursively, this is quite often applicable to work on Atget’s photographs. It is common that critics would discuss Atget’s work in general and rarely analyse a particular image in detail (see Nesbit, 1992a; 1998; Fraser, 1968). This is even the case with the very first reviews of Atget’s work – neither Desnos (1928), Valentin (1928), Mac Orlan (1929), or Benjamin (1931) mention a single particular image of Atget’s. There are, however, a few exceptions (with the exceptions of Walker, 2002 and Harris, 2003, for example), as it has been done in section 4.2.2. Analysing a Photograph of this chapter. It appears that Atget has been assumed to be a photographer of totalities (Newhall, 1937). The few examples, in which his work has not been understood as a singular project, have instead emphasised his albums as projects in themselves (Abbot, 1964). This tendency has resulted in discussing Atget’s photographs as possessing a
particular aesthetic (Walker, 2002) or a style (c.f. Lugon, 2006; Brückle, 2015). However, this perspective is often liable to omit the complexity of Atget’s work. For instance, an often overlooked aspect of Atget’s work is that he photographed a small number of nudes; another example is that, despite the frequent description that Atget is not interested in the ‘peopled city’ (Fraser, 1968), he did in fact engage in a short-lived project of Parisian workers (see Fraser, 1968). Despite this, Sontag (1979: 105) has famously, in the few times she singles out Atget, commented:

‘Even after knowing [the photographs] were all taken by Muybridge, one still can’t relate these series of pictures to each other (though each series has a coherent, recognizable style), any more than one could infer the way Atget photographed trees from the way he photographed Paris shop windows’ (emphasis added).

Echoing Greenberg’s claim that in Atget’s documents ‘the practical’ meaning is what always shines through (Greenberg, 1964: 131), Sontag (1979: 105) has also commented that – ‘In photography the subject matter always pushes through, with different subjects creating unbridgeable gaps between one period and another of a large body of work, confounding signature’. While the current chapter has so far engaged in discussing exactly this, the institutional inscription of Atget’s work in the VAM Museum needs to be discussed.

4.4. The Photograph as a Document - Eugène Atget and the Victoria and Albert Museum

This section will provide a brief discussion of examples of ways in which documentary photographs are constructed as institutional objects in an archive. This will point to a richer understanding of photographs than what has been shown in the preceding sections. First, an overview of Atget’s photographs in the VAM will be provided. Second, the manner in which Atget’s photographs are made into legible photographs will be outlined. Third, the practice of institutional curation will be defined as a practice producing the right way of reading a photograph. Fourth and finally, the Archive’s general practice of curated seeing will be discussed and this
section will be related theoretically to the urban context of the photographs’ production.

Once a photograph has been constructed as an institutional object it is not only its image-content, nor is it only a material object - it becomes a document. Once a document, it bears in itself an inscribed manner of viewing it and interpreting it, all of which is framed by the discourse of the Archive. As a document, it becomes isolated from its former meaning to a certain extent and is abstracted from its former uses (Sekula, 1999b: 444); so much so that ‘this naturalization of the cultural’ requires the intervention of criticism (Barthes as cited in Sekula, 1999b: 447) and concepts such as Edwards’ ‘social biography’ in order to ground it in some context as either an object or image.

The photographic prints by Eugène Atget in the VAM Museum’s collection are constructed as institutional objects. There are several ways in which this is done: first, through the materiality of the print; through the inscription of a curatorial practice onto the object; and through their place as institutional documents that are ‘component[s] of dynamic networks rather than as a set of static and immutable “things”’ (Prior, 2008a: 821).

REDACTED

Figure 31: Photograph by author of ‘Church of St Maclou, Pontoise, France’ (by Eugène Atget, ca.1900). The Victoria and Albert Museum.

Atget’s photographs in the VAM collection are, as mentioned, albumen prints. Each print is in an archaeological mount - as seen in figure 31
The back of each print is glued to a cardboard sheet, which serves as a back cover to the print; the cardboard sheet has a fold and it covers the empty space around the print on the side of the sheet on which the print is glued. In the empty space on the sheet that is covered by the front fold there is bibliographical information used internally by the institution of the VAM (for archiving and curatorial purposes). Each image consists of three textual elements – a name, a label, and a museum number (all three of which are visible in figure 35 below, left). Each textual element occurred in a repetitive layout – labels are in the top right corner of the cardboard sheet; names are in bottom left corner; and the museum number is immediately under the bottom right corner of the print. Understood literally, the archive renders its images into a standardised object that is legible to a curator who may not be aware of Atget’s work.

Edwards (2009a) has commented on the institutional layers of meaning added onto photographs in the process of producing them as documents. According to her:

‘Labels, and their spatial relations with mounts, marked out the contained space of useful historical knowledge, aligning and cohering disparate disciplinary approaches, yet embodying the potential for expanding or contesting knowledge, expressed by layers of surface markings, from the laying down of photographic chemical to additions and crossings out in captions’ (Edwards, 2009a: 146).

Tagg (1995: 293) similarly notes the significance of such labels, commenting on the multitude of practices that have to do with ‘this little slip: how much it should say; to whom it should speak; to what code it should summon both object and viewer’ (Tagg, 1995: 293; also, see Edwards, 2009a: 146). These ‘little tools of knowledge’ (Edwards, 2009a: 146) ‘constitute a coherent
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40 The museum number, however, is illegible to an observer not possessing knowledge of the indexing system of the VAM Museum. In order to read this, an observer must be given access to the registers of acquisition, to which the museum numbers were referring. With this information, a viewer that is external to the practices of the VAM is able to consult the register of acquisition for the year 1903, in which figures the purchase of a photograph under the number ‘394’ – signifying that it is the 394th purchase of a photograph in the year 1903. Similarly, in the online catalogue of the VAM, the print is indexed as ‘Ph.394-1903’, where ‘Ph.’ is an abbreviation of photograph.
embodiment of historical and archival desire played out materially’ (Edwards, 2009a: 145). Even more so, the labels, captions, museum numbers, etc:

‘also marked historical significance, constraining the photograph in both time and space, giving a sense of exactness and of specificity and legitimacy as a historical statement, while simultaneously integrating it into the larger narrative of the archive’ (Edwards, 2009a: 144)

Other textual forms of information are added onto a photograph in the context of the online catalogue of the VAM. This includes a brief biography of Atget that is present in the page for each photograph (see the Appendix). Inconsistently across images, there is also a brief narrative of the photographic practice involved in the production of the photographs (see the Appendix). In terms of metadata in an extra-textual sense, in the cases of photographs that have a specific address, the position is provided superimposed onto a contemporary map of Paris. In all textual data of this kind, discourse utilised has been made to position Atget’s work in the VAM Museum. This will be demonstrated below with reference to practices of curating documentary photography.

In addition to the textual elements on the photographic mount, there is another key element that is not primarily textual – the National Art Library stamp (referred to in the VAM’s online catalogue as a ‘blind stamp’). As seen in figure 32 in isolation (see right), all of the 448 photographs printed and sold to the VAM by Atget himself had the stamp; photographs printed by Abbott and acquired through MoMA possessed a MoMA stamp; the prints done by Snyder did not possess a stamp – likely due to not being associated with any institution.
Out of the analysis of the inscription of institutional layers of meaning onto a photographic print emerged the practice of curation. The curators of the VAM’s photographic collections have procured, categorised, and presented to the public for a period longer than a century and a half (Haworth-Booth and McCauley, 1998). As an element of curatorial practice, the initial acquisition should be understood as significant in terms of the power to determine both what is in a collection and what is the photograph pertaining to – for example, a photograph demonstrating ‘architectural ironwork (civil and domestic) in Paris’, rather than a waiter at work. Second, the images, once procured, although framed by the initial reason for acquisition, are subject to categorization and the ongoing, interminable process of interpretation.

Atget’s work is part of the collections of several museums and galleries located globally. With regards to issues concerning access to his work, the Victoria and Albert Museum (VAM) in London is one of the few places globally that houses a large portion of his original photographic work (see Haworth-Booth, 1997). Moreover, the VAM is the only Anglophone institution with which Atget was directly in touch while he was alive and practicing photography. As such, bar the Bibliotheque Nationale de France and the Musée Carnavalet, with which Atget worked, the VAM is the primary Anglophone and UK based institution in which it was possible for the scale and geographical location of this project to conduct a study on original photographic prints by Atget. Although the Museum of Modern Art (henceforth, MoMA) possesses one of the largest collections of Atget’s work, this occurred through the donation of Berenice Abbott’s own collection; as such, MoMA has not had any contact with Atget himself. With regards to the history of the VAM and its photographic collection, it fits closely to the parallel developments in Parisian museum institutions such as the Bibliothèque Nationale, Archives Nationales, the Musée Carnavalet, and the Bibliothèque Historique de la Ville de Paris – all of which implemented a policy of acquiring photographs and incorporating them into their collection in the late 19th century. In the case of the VAM Photographic collection, this started in the late 1800s as well (see Haworth-Booth, 1997; Haworth-Booth and McCauley, 1998). Additionally, this is also
reflective of the concurrent developments in other public institutions in the United Kingdom such as the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (Edwards, 2001) and the Glasgow City Improvement Trust (Withey, 2003; also, see Grossman, 2015; Tagg, 1988). Considering this, the VAM, as an institution dealing with photography, is a suitable research context for a more general photographic study as well. It is both an important location for Atget’s work and its institutionalisation, as well as a key site for the institutionalisation of photography as both a museum art-form and archive in the United Kingdom.

4.4.1. Legible Photographs

The reading of the photographic prints as images by the curators emerged in two forms from the analysis. First, there is the evidence of curators reading the photographic prints in a particular way. The meaning of this is twofold: 1) curators have read the images by relying on an emergent code; 2) the images have been understood, and subsequently codified, to possess a specific meaning. That is to say, the reading has produced a meaning, rather than discovered it. First, this process largely consisted of the curators interpreting the photographs as images with visual contents of elements with varying significance. Second, through this initial interpretation, there are several ways in which it becomes the legitimate institutional way of reading the photographs. Mostly, this is done through the incorporation of institutional information such as labels and museum number on the physical photographic print, or the biographical, geographical, and photographic data provided in the online catalogue.

In the process of examining the photographs by Atget, patterns emerged in the location of the National Art Library (NAL) stamp on images. The quantification of the observed occurrences (n=44041), in which a stamp was identifiable, supported this (see the Appendix). In total, the location of NAL stamp was on the right side of the image (i.e. the viewer’s right) making up 79% of occurrences (n=350); 16% on the left (n=70); and 5% of images (n=20) had some sort of deviation from the observed patterns, since the
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41 Excluded are entries in the catalogue which had no image available, the stamp was not identifiable, or belonged to the group of prints by Abbott and Snyder.
deviation was located at centre of the image on the very top. All stamps were placed only at the top of the images. On the basis of this, it can be argued that there seems to be a generally agreed\textsuperscript{42}, albeit informal, practice of placing the stamp at the top of the image.

This led to positing the interpretive practice of the curators. On the basis of this observation, selective coding was done with the goal of exploring the exact location of the stamp in relation to the visual content of an image. Two patterns emerged, the stamp is: 1) on an empty part of the image (either overexposed or underexposed i.e. blank, negative space), or 2) on a visual element.

These patterns can be interpreted as curators systematically choosing the top corners of an image, due to several reasons. First, Atget’s images quite often have vignettes (as discussed in section 4.3.1.1. \textit{Format}), which are in the top corners. This would have facilitated curators, since a stamp would not be obscuring an element of the composition. Second, Atget’s use of a centred perspective supports the curators preferring corners as parts of the image that would not disturb the detail of the centre of attention. Third, in terms of composition, the corners (both top and bottom) carry the bibliographic connotation of framing. An obvious example of this is the codification of pages where title of a publication, author, or page number is provided in-frame of a document, but still symbolically out-frame. In other words, while the photograph is in one way flattened into a document, its depth, or its in-frame content, is acknowledged in the act of flattening – put simply, the photograph communicates the fact that it is framed as something more than a photograph.

\textsuperscript{42}In an informal query to a VAM curator, who also works at the National Art Library, regarding the existence of any codification of placing the stamp, the curator replied that it is informal and arbitrary, where each curator places the stamp as per their habit and/or preference. There is no reason to assume that the lack of codification is new, and a formal stamping requirement has existed in the VAM at the time of the acquisition of Atget’s photographic prints.
Once the distinction between ‘on element’ and ‘on over- and under-exposure’ is added into the discussion, an important dimension of the reading practices of the curators is made evident. As noted already, the stamps are more often on a part of the image where there is no visual element whose detail would be damaged or obscured. As seen from figure 33 (above) and figure 34 (below), interpreting the visual contents of an image is significant in understanding the relation of the stamp. In figure 33 (above, left), the position of the stamp on the left top corner (on the underexposed foliage) can be read in direct relation to the railing in the top right corner. It is similar on the photograph below it; the placing of the stamp on the underexposed dark glass of the window leads the viewer to infer that its placing, as not being strictly in the top right corner, is a result of a deliberate choice that was made on the basis of reading the image. In figure 34 (below), two more examples of contextual placing on a photograph. In the image on the left, considering the high frequency of the top right corner, the left corner does not provide a valid alternative – neither does a deviation in the centre top part of the image. In the image on the right, similarly to the image above in figure 33 (right), the stamp is placed in the negative space nearest to the top right corner, rather than simply in the corner.
On the basis of these inferences, the curatorial practice of placing a stamp can be understood as a complex hermeneutic process of photographic prints as images. Moreover, this process of reading is done in conjunction with a process of producing these prints as more than visual images, but as acting on them as material objects and thereby producing them as institutional documents. The stamp, in very much the same manner of repetitious spaces (Lefebvre, 1991a), as it will be shown in Chapter Six: The Photographic Production of Space, works to bring about a homogenizing system, in which identity is produced through a practice of repetition. As Edwards notes (2002: 71), ‘[t]he regularity of the physical arrangement of image, text and object unify the collection’, effectively demanding ‘the preferred reading of the photograph’ (ibid.). Furthermore, in reference to Rose’s terminology of ‘the sites of meaning production’ (2007: 16), the Archive works towards obscuring its role as a site in which ‘it is seen by various audiences’ (Rose, 2007: 16) by utilising a configuration of devices to control the interpretation of the visual content i.e. ‘the site of the image itself’ (Rose, 2007: 16). This can be demonstrated by the manner in which the Archive, in this case the VAM, constructs the ‘right way of reading’ a photograph in its collection.
Figure 35: (centre) House, 25 Rue St Laurent, Beauvais, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900; (left) Photograph by author of House, 25 Rue St Laurent, Beauvais, France (by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900); (right) Screenshot of the Victoria and Albert Museum’s catalogue page for ‘House, 25 Rue St Laurent, Beauvais, France’ (by Eugène Atget, ca.1900), Victoria and Albert Museum, 2017.

Curatorial practice emerged as significant also in relation to differences between the physical photographic prints examined in the VAM’s Print and Drawing Study Room and the digital presentation of the same photographs in the online catalogue of the VAM (https://collections.vam.ac.uk/). Several dimensions of metadata that are present in the online catalogue are not accessible through the physical photographic prints alone. These are the equivalents of labels (incl. category, subject, style, name, place, gallery, collection); summary; additional information; map; name and date of taking the photograph; name of printer; type of print; copyright status. In figure 35 (above), the example of ‘Ph.3654-1903’ can be seen as physical photographic print (with the front fold of the passe-partout open), digital image taken from the catalogue, and catalogue layout.

The catalogue (as seen in figure 35 above, centre and right) shows the photographs as images only. The labels and names are missing since they are rendered obsolete by the catalogue itself. This, in turn, reveals a semiotic equivalence between catalogue page and the ‘little tools of knowledge’ (Edwards, 2009a) that are labels, captions, etc. However, the museum number and stamp (if the observer selects the option ‘enlarge image’ available) are visible. With this in mind, the photograph is shown not only as image, but also as an image belonging to a particular catalogue – the VAM’s, and as an object that is part of a collection – again, the VAM’s.
Clearly, the museum number bears indexical meaning only in the system of
the VAM’s operation. The purpose of the stamp is the same – it signifies
ownership. As Sekula asserts, ‘the unity of an archive is first and foremost
that imposed by ownership’ (1999: 444).

As Edwards has pointed out (2002), the online catalogue brings up a
significant issue in terms of the materiality of the photographic object, its
performativity, and the interaction with the viewer. However, the way this is
done in the VAM Museum reveals an interesting practice of reconstructing
the material qualities of the object digitally, as well as inscribing the
institutional layer of meaning digitally. Edwards aptly describes the issue:

‘[...] the experience of looking at a historical image on a
computer screen is profoundly different in the understandings
it might generate from the experience of, say, looking at the
same image as an albumen print pasted in an album or a
modern copy print in an archive file, for the ‘grammar’ of both
images and things is complex and shifting’ (Edwards 2002: 68,
emphasis added)

REDACTED

Figure 36: Fireplace, Austrian Embassy, 57 Rue de Varenne, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and
Albert Museum, ca.1900.

The element of curatorial practice that is concerned with this shifting of
meaning is most evident in figure 36 (above). The provision of a second
image, this one with a colour calibration palette, in the online catalogue
demonstrates a distribution of what is seen and how, that is explicit in the
Archive’s hegemony of meaning. Namely, the image of the print as it is
(figure 36 above, left) is not deemed sufficient by curatorial practice and
an alternative is provided with a codified instruction of how to see the ‘print
as it is’. This negation of the original image (on the left) is effectively positive in its mechanism, since the instructional image (on the right) functions only in relation to the original image, thus reinforcing its meaning. Thus, the instructional image, ostensibly being the right way to see the image, constructs the original image as something detached and, ultimately, original. This way, the online catalogue itself is revealed to be functioning only in relation to the archive – it provides images to the viewer as they should be seen – but by doing so, it constructs the authentic image that cannot be currently seen (i.e. the physical photographic print) as well as the way it should be seen (e.g. through the Print and Drawing Study Room at the VAM Museum).

4.4.3. Legibility, Curated Seeing, and the Archive

Another important dimension of curatorial practice is the production of the legibility of images. This is done through framing. The framing of the images by Atget in the collection of the VAM as an archive lends them a certain kind of legibility that each image, on its own and without that framing, would inevitably lack. Understood this way, curation is a way of producing the meaning of an image or a collection, not only presenting, categorising, and preserving it. For example, the placing of the stamp in the top left corner of an image on the basis of a reading of the visual contents of the image is, in effect, a reification of that reading - acting on one’s interpretation, let alone having institutional authority, lends credence to the object of action.

A key example of metadata in the online catalogue is the summary, which is the first tab in the catalogue, and as such is open and visible by default. Due to its brevity, it can be quoted in its entirety:

“Eugène Atget (1857-1927) took up photography as a professional in the late 1880s. Details of his earlier life are shadowy. He is known to have been a sailor and then an amateur actor, which may account for the ‘stage set’ quality of many of his images. He seems to have lived a largely secluded life in his apartment in Paris.

His project to record ‘Old Paris’ began around 1897 and continued until the 1920s. In it, Atget was driven by the disappearance of
buildings as schemes of modernisation swept the city. Ignoring the grand new vistas, he set out to record the character and details of the timeworn streets. He made a stock of prints for sale to artists, museums and libraries, in France and abroad, selling some 600 prints directly to the VAM.

Today, however, Atget is admired less as a record photographer and more as a forerunner of Surrealism and of modern approaches to the art of photography. His urban scenes - featuring snatched glimpses, tangential perspectives, odd reflections and bizarre details - convey a distinctly modern experience of the city. In 1936, critic Walter Benjamin described how these images operated beyond their ostensible purpose, appearing unintentionally, but uncannily, like the ‘scene of a crime’.

This shift in perception about Atget’s work began in the last years of his life, when he met Berenice Abbott, a young American working in Paris for the photographer Man Ray. After his death, Abbott bought the remains of his archive and began to promote his work. She was entranced by the strangeness of Atget’s photographs, seeing in them a Surrealist vein as well as a ‘relentless fidelity to fact’ and a ‘deep love of the subject for its own sake’.

The summary can be easily summarised in four parts, each corresponding to its paragraphs. The first paragraph is primarily concerned with biographical information; as such, it introduces the reader to who Atget was through anecdotal and evocative fragments – which are immediately related to his photographic work. In this way, biography is not at all superfluous, but explicitly made relevant to the images one is exposed to in the catalogue. The second paragraph begins with situating his ‘project’ in his life, and provides a very brief overview of his most frequent subjects. It does so while simultaneously placing Atget in relation to the VAM. As such, the observer is introduced to the overall work of Atget (whose framing has been initiated as possessing ‘a “stage-set” quality’ in the first paragraph) as ‘stock’ and ‘record’ intended for sale to ‘artists, museums and libraries, in
France and abroad’. With these two paragraphs, both the author and the recipients are invoked as relevant to the understanding of the images.

In the third paragraph, certain authorities are cited – Walter Benjamin, Berenice Abbott, and Man Ray – all of which are used to triangulate an approach to reading the images that is not fixed, but ‘beyond their ostensible purpose’. With this the images are explicitly framed as something more than they appear to be i.e. more than ‘stock’, ‘record’, or ‘forerunner’ examples to Surrealism and ‘the art of photography’. However, by doing so, an intricate act of framing is implemented. The deliberate choice of curatorial practice that has produced this particular text through the very framing of the images lends itself a position of authority. This is evident in the final paragraph, where the authority of Berenice Abbott on Atget’s work is invoked (‘[buying] the remains of his archive and [...] promot[ing] his work’) both as an act of borrowing some of her authority by the VAM and an act of emphasising the importance of ‘his archive’ and the danger of its potential entropy if left uninstitutionalised. This way, the brief summary directly places itself as an inheritor to ‘[Atget’s] archive’; the use of the possessive is itself significant in the construction of a discourse of authenticity that is continuously, yet mutely, made relevant through naming, stamps, indexing, and in general – through curatorial practice. As such, it can be summarised that the most significant aspect of curatorial practice that have emerged in the narration of Atget’s photographs in the VAM Museum’s online catalogue is the preoccupation with authenticity.

The other instance of metadata provided in the catalogue is a tab ‘more information’, which provides physical description, place, date, ‘artist/maker’, and an ‘object history note’ provided by a curator (published as Lederman, 2008). The note further reinforces the framing of the summary tab by a descriptive account of Atget’s life and practice, ultimately emphasising Atget’s engagement with ‘archive’.

Overall, the institutional curation of Atget’s photographs has been shown to be a productive process, in which the original photograph is made to become an institutional document. Similarly to the structure of this chapter, the curators appear to have read the photographs first as images, then as
material objects. Both ways of reading have been incorporated into the production of said photographs into institutional documents. Moreover, in the process of producing such documents, the Archive also produces a series of ‘little tools of knowledge’ in order to legitimize its own reading of the photographs in its collection. It has been noted that the Archive is based on ownership (Tagg, 1988), however, the role of interpretation needs to be discussed further (see Chapter Six: The Photographic Production of Space). Moreover, the documentary function of the photographs seems to be merely an addendum to the performances of the past that Atget’s photographs can manifest through the Archive. In other words, actual documentary content appears to be substituted with an abstract appeal to historicity.

Understood this way, the documented spaces are presented through the Archives as abstract spaces and, as such, have little bearing of what it would have meant to live in those spaces. The shopfront or waiter do not reflect the experience and dynamics of living in the city, but are rather presented as abstract details of the material structure of the city, of its buildings and streets. Such omission of life from the photos create other spaces, since they do not reflect and no longer relate to the experience of the actual space. This omission of meaning in the photograph can be understood through the spatial metaphor of ruination (Stoler, 2002; 2008). In fact, Ecchevaria has remarked that ‘the archive [can be understood] as both relic and ruin’ (as cited in Stoler, 2002: 97). In another sense, the detachment from the photographs’ use and the historic context of their production can be seen as a function of transforming the documented spaces into already ruins, i.e. non-existent, other spaces that are no longer relevant. After all, the archive’s function is to produce significance and importance when it comes to its objects (Stoler, 2002; 2008), as well as, according to Edwards, (2002: 71), demanding ‘the preferred reading of the photograph.’ This way, through the omission of the phenomenological, lived dimensions of the photographed spaces, they become remnants of the physical spaces even before being demolished. Through the Archive, the documented spaces becomes other spaces (in Foucault’s sense – heterotopias – Foucault, 1986; 1989) as older, less true, or relevant, versions
of the city. By being photographed and stored in the Archive, the buildings, streets, and ornaments are already preserved from the entropic anxiety in the form of an image. This, in turn, facilitates the physical demolition. This way, all photographs taken by Atget, even at the time of their taking and archiving can be understood as ruins. As Stoler (2008: 194) describes this:

‘In its common usage, “ruins” are often enchanted, desolate spaces, large-scale monumental structures abandoned and grown over. Ruins provide a quintessential image of what has vanished from the past and has long decayed’ (emphasis added).

In other words, the photographs are made to represent detached, unused spaces, half-finished and half-destroyed. As Martin has described this (2014a: 1103), ruins ‘anticipate nascent forms of the social, offering suggestions of the future suspended within the present”. In other words, ruins occupy many tenses (see Stoler, 2008) – just as they are evocations of a past, they are an invocation of what could have been, as much as a reflection of what now is. The nostalgia for ruins, just like photographs, is premised on an idea of a place that does not exist - a non-place, a utopian imaginary in which States, Empires, and Archives have always traded (Richards, 1992).

This ‘ruination’ has a practical effect. First, if Scott’s term of ‘state simplifications’ (1998) is applied here, then the archive simplifies the past, where an actual space with its inhabitants, experiences, etc is reduced to a historical document. This way, the archival impulse is revealed as much about collection, i.e. creating a record, as it is about obscuring and destroying traces. Since to ruin is to turn ‘into stasis, into inert object, passive form’ (Stoler, 2008: 195), the archive is very much a factory for such inert objects. Gilloch (1997: 129) has noted that ‘[i]n the museum the past is catalogued and transformed into an object of contemplation, robbed of its power’. This introspective contemplation of ruins, either photographs or structures, is a nostalgic, and, ultimately colonial one. As Stoler (2008: 199), citing Renaldo Rosaldo, has aptly noted that:
‘[...] imperialist nostalgia is not a postcolonial pleasure but a concerted colonial one, a mourning contingent on what colonialism has destroyed’ (emphasis added).

Most importantly, ruins are made (Stoler, 2008: 201). That being said, it is important to note what kind of ruins are made and what discourse or apparatus they serve. The ruins of Old Paris, for example, produce Paris as an old, other place than it supposedly is, that can only house romanticism, nostalgia, or imagination. As Weizman has noted (2011: 110) ruins can be understood as having the capability to:

‘store and, with some help from their “interpreters”, also transmit information about the effects of historical process’ (also, see Martin, 2014b).

By becoming other spaces, ruins, both photographs and archives, remain simultaneously inaccessible and evocative. Mainly, they are inaccessible because: first, part of an institutional context that privileges certain readings (as it produces them) and delegitimizes others, while simultaneously controlling access to the objects themselves; second, through the ruination of the actual space which the photographs were supposed to represent. This second point can also be seen in the omission and coincidental presence of people, which is rarely, if at all, acknowledged as significant in the Archive. This omission of people can be seen as yet another form of the ruination of the photographs as documents of actual spaces in which people lived. Ultimately, the ‘simplification’ initiated by the State, implemented by documentary photography, and then stored and interpreted in the Archive is a system of information that, according to Richards (as cited in Stoler, 2002: 97), is a ‘prototype for a global system of domination through circulation, an apparatus for controlling territory by producing, distributing and consuming information about it’.

 Moreover, concerning history, and by this it is meant global history, Trouillot (1995: 55) has remarked that ‘historical narratives are premised on previous understandings, which are themselves premised on the distribution of archival power’.
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4.5. Conclusion and Summary

This chapter has aimed to address the first research sub-question question of this project, namely:

1) What are the practices involved in the production of a photograph as documentary?

The practices involved have been identified as 1) the production of the photograph as possessing a documentary function i.e. as a means of recording a set of identifiable visual elements; 2) the following of aesthetic codifications and use of photographic technology that build on and match the defined documentary function of the photographs; and 3) the reading of the photographs, seen both through the analysis of a photograph as politically significant (see section 4.2.2. Analysing a Photograph) and through an analysis of institutional curation of Atget’s photographs in the VAM. In the case of institutional curation, the photograph, in addition to being read, is also inscribed in a particular manner that guides future reading.

In order to provide an answer to the first research question, this chapter has examined 481 prints by Eugène Atget from the photographic collections of the VAM Museum in London. The photographs have been analysed visually by relying on an approach of Visual Framing Analysis that identifies the visual elements in the images, defines patterns, systemises patterns in explanatory categories (section 4.2.1.), and posits a set of practical considerations, technical and aesthetic, on the basis of visual contents (section 4.2.2.). Additionally, the discussions of the production of photographs as documentary ones has been undertaken with the twofold consideration of examining both practices (the first research question) and the environments of production, storage and interpretation. This chapter has briefly engaged with the environments of an image’s production – the city of Paris (section 4.3. The Photograph as Object); an image’s interpretation – both this project and the Archive (section 4.2. The Photographs as Images); and an image’s storage – the Archive (section 4.4. The Photograph as a Document - Eugène Atget and the Victoria and Albert Museum), as defined in the second research question:
2) What is the relation between documentary photography and the environments of an image’s production, storage, and interpretation?

The visual analysis has determined several key categories that account for the bulk of the photographs in terms of their documentary function. First, Atget has continuously documented a series of elements of architecture, details of ornaments, interiors, or urban images such as streetscapes. These have been understood in relation to a practice of knowledge production that aims to select certain visual elements to be recorded in particular. These visual elements, in turn, can be described as simultaneously everyday and outmoded. They are everyday since their existence is often overlooked and considered insignificant. In terms of aesthetics, however, Atget’s images of this type have been incorporated into the discourse of surrealism and the ‘readymade’ (see Walker, 2002); for example, evidence of this can be found in Atget’s photographs of interiors. Their outmoded characteristics are to be understood as indicative of the photographs’ ‘practical meaning’ (Greenberg, 1964) and Atget’s choice of subject content – buildings in disrepair or about to be demolished, or dated architectural detail.

Second, Atget’s work has emerged as significantly engaged with both minute, overlooked detail and the perspectivising effect of the street and boulevard. The quality of everyday life in the city has been documented with an emphasis on vision, either bringing into vision a detail that might be overlooked, or a documentation of what Kracauer calls an ‘urban image’ i.e. a physical view that is determined by the layout of the city. It was argued that Atget’s photographs continuously engage with the built environment of the city and its visual content is largely determined by the urban architecture and the streetscape. Furthermore, from analysing the images it emerged that Atget documented the city in a way that opens up the photographs for a ‘phenomenological hermeneutic’ i.e. an embodied, everyday life reading of the city itself through its material environment. By documenting aspects of the city that are overlooked or too small to be important, as well as documenting the way the urban edifice shapes the very ‘urban image’ that the photograph ends up being, Atget has, similarly
to theorists like Kracauer and Benjamin, engaged in an interpretation of the urban space. As Kracauer (as cited in Frisby, 2013: 136) has pointed out, ‘[k]nowledge of cities is bound up with the deciphering of their dream-like [i.e. ornamental] expressive images’. Considering Benjamin’s claim that ‘the entire city space as an ensemble that produces the concrete constellations of cultural images and action’ (Miller, 1996: 104-105), Atget provides a gaze that focuses on the small and overlooked, yet does not ignore the social and historic context of the city, but exposes its elements ‘as material for urban reflection’ (Reeh, 2004: 112). It is this way that Atget’s documents can be seen to not only record the city’s environment and everyday experience, but also capturing its ‘quaintness’ and strangeness (Fraser, 1968: 205).

By analysing the photographs as more than simply images, but as material objects with particular qualities, this chapter has identified a set of practices that have been involved in the production of the photographs. Upon the iterative examination of the images, it has emerged that the photographs are both material products of a technologically determined practice and images that can be understood in terms of formal aesthetic qualities.

It has been shown that Atget followed a set of composing rules on the level of a given image, thus singling out an element or recording an environment; for example, it has been shown how a given image’s format is determined by its contents. Furthermore, Atget’s use of technology also shows how he adapted the prints of his images according to their content in terms of both aesthetics and function. A clear example of this is his manipulation of format, thus effectively determining both what is in the frame of the image and how the image’s visual contents are related to each other.

In addition, an analysis of the institutional curation of Atget’s work has revealed that in the process of curation, Atget’s photographs were being read both as images and as material objects. Both ways of reading emerged to be central to the manner in which the production of photographs as institutional documents is done. Simultaneous to this, it emerged that the Archive was engaged in the production of tools that
legitimise its authority to read photographs, thereby producing a right way of reading the images. A telling example of this has been shown by examining the VAM’s online catalogue and its curation of original photographs. Moreover, the institutional curation of Atget’s photographs has been shown to omit certain aspects of the image, mainly the urban actual space being documented, in the process of producing the image as an institutional document.

Additionally, in contrast to the trend of discussing Atget’s work in terms of its totality or single projects (which are nevertheless significant in size), this chapter has engaged in the analysis of a single image by relying on relevant theory. In this visual analysis of a single photograph, a ‘phenomenological hermeneutic’ of the image has been used (Buck-Morss, 1989) with the purpose of relating the photograph to the environment and context of its creation and subsequent potential for interpretation.

First, by analysing Atget’s L’homme armé photograph, the material environment documented in the photograph emerged as significant. As discussed above, the documentary function of Atget’s photographs tends to involve an engagement with all aspects of ‘urban images’ and the built environment – both grand vistas and overlooked details. In the case of the particular photograph, the material environment and its overlooked details and ornaments (the wrought iron shopfront, the shop sign, and ornamentation) were interpreted as mediating the social and lived experience of the space; thus indicating how ornaments can be understood through ‘a shift from things in space to [being part of] the actual production of space’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 37, emphasis in original).

Second, the photograph was interpreted on the basis of a reading of Baudelaire’s prose poem ‘The Eyes of the Poor’ (2009) based on the work of Marshall Berman (2010) and Shelley Rice (2000). In particular, the gaze of the only visible figure in the photograph was constructed as politically significant by relying on Rancière’s concept of the ‘distribution of the sensible’ or what, drawing on Edwards, has been emphasised as the photograph’s qualities - ‘what is seen and what can be said about it, […]
who has the ability to see and the talent to speak' (2016: 52). Namely, the question was posed - what does the presence and visibility of the waiter reveal about the place and the photograph?

Finally, the interaction between the photographed and the photographer, and between the waiter and the viewer of the photograph was interpreted as constituted through the gaze and the material environment – but also as telling of class privilege, and its manifestation in urban space. The waiter’s inability to move, both in the past due to his necessary labour and in the present due to the photograph, was understood as a lack of power and agency, where the photographer/viewer is the one who ‘has the ability to see and the talent to speak’ (Edwards, 2016: 52).

The practices and relationships discovered in this case study have been shown to speak to the relations between a photograph and the environment and its production, storage, and interpretation. However, a more thorough discussion of the two case studies in relation to the second research question will be provided in Chapter Six: The Photographic Production of Space.
Chapter Five: Thomas Annan’s Glasgow

‘... and yet a paradise compared with the wynds of Glasgow, where there was little more than a chink of daylight to show the hatred in women’s faces.’

(George Eliot – Felix Holt, The Radical – 1866: 268)

This chapter will focus on the second case study of this doctoral research programme – the photographic documentary work on the city of Glasgow by Thomas Annan in the mid- to late 19th century. On the basis of an analysis of 5 photographic albums and individual prints comprising 351 photographic images, taken in part by Annan himself and in part by his family firm, I will describe the visual content of the images pertaining to urban space, the patterns in the images that speak to photographic processes, and the emergent concepts that possess explanatory power in the domain of documentary photography. In this chapter, I will focus primarily on a single volume - The Closes and Streets of Old Glasgow, 1868-1871 – which was identified as the most significant in relation to the urban focus of this doctoral project.

First, I will introduce the data - its institutional, state, and historic context - and the analysis used in this case study. Following this, I will provide the key findings of this case study by introducing the data in some depth through an overview of the visual content of the images. In this project I argue that Annan, through a practice of documenting streets and closes in a contrasting manner, has engaged in a practice of appropriating the space of the city by bridging together urban spaces that would have otherwise be seen as completely opposite. Moreover, Annan provided through his photography a guide through these spaces by constructing his images in a navigable cartographically informed manner. This will be further situated in relation to the notion of the photographic city, since Annan’s photographs documented urban spaces in terms of their visibility and transparency.
Similarly to Chapter Four (section 4.2.2. Analysing a Photograph), in addition to an analysis of the total sample, I will provide a brief analysis of a single image as demonstration of the theoretical understanding this project has developed. Second, I will describe the significant practices that have emerged from the analysis of photographs as material objects that are shaped by technological and aesthetic considerations. Third, I will provide a discussion of the manner in which the Mitchell Library has curated Annan’s photographs. Similarly to Chapter Four, this tripartite structure of image-materiality-institution can be understood to reflect the first research question:

What are the practices involved in the production of a photograph as documentary?

5.1. Introduction

Thomas Annan’s work has been belatedly acknowledged as significant due to its pioneering status in the domain of documentary photography, the history of the city of Glasgow, and the development of photographic practice in Scotland as a whole (Gossman, 2015; Stevenson, 2012). Despite this, in contrast to Eugène Atget, Annan’s work has been largely neglected in scholarship on the origin of documentary photography or the city. Some historians, such as the influential Beaumont Newhall (1937) have not even mentioned him as a significant figure (while his son J. Craig Annan often figures as a key figure due to his presence in Alfred Stieglitz’s (2013) Camera Work). When cited, Annan is commonly referred to as a pioneer, but explorations of his work tend to limit him to a rather narrow context of national discourses of history and photography, whereas Atget’s work tends to be extrapolated to much more wide spread international discourses of surrealism and modernism, while remaining inextricably tied to the French national milieu. Being primarily known as a state-commissioned photographer who documented poor working-class areas in Glasgow, Annan’s work is similarly contradictory and ambiguous in meaning to Atget’s.

Annan was a lithographer and a painter before becoming a photographer. With this in mind, his work occupies an interesting position in
the dichotomous discourse of pictorialist and documentary photography of the time. While Annan is known for his practice of the latter style of photography, his actual practices were indicative of the former to a great extent; not to mention that his son, James Craig Annan, became a famous proponent of pictorialism in photography (Marien, 1997; also, see Stieglitz, 2013). Namely, while documentary photography is concerned with documenting reality as it is, Annan did not have issues with aestheticizing his images by emphasizing contrast or adding certain elements, such as clouds, or drawing over elements of the image that lack detail.

Annan’s work brought into focus the living conditions of Glasgow’s poorest in the years 1860-1890 in the city’s old closes and lanes. At the time, those areas were notorious for their squalor and the Glasgow City Improvement Trust was interested in dislocating the inhabitants of the area in order to demolish and reconstruct the neighbourhoods in a more acceptable form. Stevenson (2012: 13) points to Glasgow as an example of ‘Adam Smith’s prophecy of the brutalising of society through industrialisation’. Glasgow, at the time, was commonly referred to as ‘the second city of empire’ (Devine, 1995: 402). Osman and Englander (1981: n.p.) further shed light on the ‘The Age of the Great Cities’ and ‘the ubiquitous back-to-back, [...] the perilous backlands of urban Scotland’ that followed the exponential population growth of major industrial cities in Britain since the 1820s. However, Annan documented these areas of the city in a way that omitted its immigrant working class inhabitants and cannot be said, according to Stevenson (2017), to be ostensibly sympathetic. Unlike John Thomson’s photographs of London in the 1870s (Thomson and Smith, 1969), which feature portraits of London’s destitute and deprived, Annan’s oeuvre features portraits only of the local gentry and academics. Maddox and Stevenson (2017: 158) point to the complexity of Annan’s work, and its openness to interpretation,

‘as sentimental records of sites on the verge of disappearance, as social documents representing the plight of the working class, and as harbingers of progress achieved by the efforts of the Improvement Trust.’
Moreover, Gossman (2015: 6) describes Annan as ‘quick to adopt the latest technical innovations in photography’. Moreover, Annan would take advantage of Scotland’s unique position as outside the boundaries of English patents and purchase rights for various methods, going so far as to arrange for his son to learn the photogravure process in Austria in 1883 (Steel, 2003; Gossman, 2015; Stevenson, 2017). Unlike Atget, Annan practiced several kinds of photography – copies of paintings, portraiture both in carte-de-visite and cabinet format, landscapes, buildings and public works, as well as ‘the modern triumphs of industry and engineering’ (Gossman, 2015: 7). A key example of the latter is Annan’s commissioned documentation of the Loch Katrine Waterworks; notably, on the event of their opening in 1859 Annan photographed Queen Victoria herself (Maddox and Stevenson, 2017). Annan’s work, as a professional photographer, was rich and varied in its subject matter. However, Lionel Gossman (2015: 7), in the most extensive work on the photographer so far, notes that the ‘photographs of buildings and public works, usually commissioned by well-to-do property owners or local authorities [are] the field of activity for which Annan is best remembered’.

In 1866, Glasgow City Council passed an Act through Parliament ‘to purchase and clear slums at the heart of the old town’ (Gossman, 2015: 214; also, see Tagg, 1988). This led to the formation of the Glasgow City Improvement Trust. Annan began work to document the slums of the old town before and during their demolition, about two years after the passing of the Act. It has been assumed that the Trust has commissioned Annan (Tagg, 1988), as well as argued that Annan was hired by the city architect directly, rather than the Trust itself (Gossman, 2015). However, Stevenson (2017), in the most recent account on the issue, has rejected both on the basis of limited evidence. The only evidence is the payment for printing of photographs, but not for the photographic work itself (Maddox and Stevenson, 2017). Regardless of the details of its origin, it is his work with the City Improvement Trust for which Annan is most known (Maddox and

---

44 Gossman (2015) details this development, noting that Annan purchased the rights for the photogravure process from its inventor Karl Klič for the state of Scotland. This also led to James Craig Annan to publish a second edition of his father’s Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow in the form of a photogravure publication in 1900 (see Steel, 2003 for more detail).
Stevenson, 2017; Gossman, 2015), commonly known as the Old Closes and Streets in Glasgow, 1868-1871. As a document, in fact a folio volume of 32 photographs, it was presented to the Trust in 1871 without any text to accompany it. Annan is primarily known as the photographer of the City Improvement Trust, despite his long history of working as a professional photographer and as a pioneer of photographic processes in Scotland.

The City Improvement Trust’s urban restructuring process had to go through several barriers to its implementation. First, the project needed an extension, for which the Trust had to appeal to Parliament – and for which the first official use of the volume of photographs occurred (Tagg, 1988). Second, the process was halted by the crash of the City of Glasgow Bank in 1878 (Gossman, 2015). As a result, or perhaps despite these issues, the photographs of Glasgow’s old closes and streets in parallel to Annan’s photographs of the Loch Katherine Waterworks were exhibited in the City Museum as evidence of the city’s pride of achievement (Gossman, 2015). Stevenson (2017) notes that the audience would have been primarily a working-class demographic. An interesting dimension, considering that the high cost of the production of the albums meant that the volume was produced in a very limited print of 250 copies – distributed primarily to Trustees, thus unavailable to those photographed (Gossman, 2015).

The geographical focus of the project, both in terms of Annan’s photographic record and the City Improvement Trust’s demolition and renewal plans, was the Glasgow Cross – a major intersection of the key thoroughfares of Saltmarket, High Street, Trongate, and Gallowgate (Maddox and Stevenson, 2017). In terms of territory, Annan’s documentation spanned the densely populated immigrant working class neighbourhoods that ‘radiat[ed] two to five hundred yards east, west, and north’ from the aforementioned Glasgow Cross (Chisholm as cited in Maddox and Stevenson, 2017: 155). Due to the sequence and ordering of the photographs in the folio volume, it can be argued that order itself is intended to introduce the viewer to the spatial relationships. Losch (as cited in Maddox and Stevenson, 2017: 157) has pointed to this in reference to Annan’s photographs of the Tontine buildings and the Tolbooth as intended
to ‘situate his viewers... at a focal point particularly familiar to a civic administrator’.

Currently, the majority of Thomas Annan’s photographic work is held in the Thomas Annan Photograph Special Collection at the Mitchell Library in Glasgow. As a Glasgow Library, it contains over 100 volumes, most of them being multiple duplicates. Additionally, there are several albums credited to James Craig Annan, a son of Thomas who was involved heavily in the photographic business. Most of the volumes include some kind of text. In the case of The Old Country Houses of the Glasgow Gentry, each of the 100 photographs has a text on a given building, its history in relation to the city of Glasgow, and its owners’ history. In other cases, albums include an introduction such as The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1868-1871. The volumes would most often be leather-bound and the pages of an A4 size (see figure 37). In addition to the volumes, the Mitchell Library possesses 389 individual prints. All of the prints, it should be noted, originated as part of different volumes and their existence as individual prints is due to damage of the given volume of which they were part. The prints can be albumen, carbon, or photogravure. Some prints and volumes are currently unavailable (at the time of writing) in the Mitchell Library due to an exhibition, the first outside of Scotland, on the work of Annan in the Getty Museum, where they were exhibited in the summer of 2017. It should be noted that none of the texts are written by Annan himself, despite reports of him being an educated and eloquent writer due to his apprenticeship

At this point, a brief note should be made about the nature of Annan’s photographic business. At first, Annan worked as a photographer in partnership. Later on, Annan’s brother and son, Robert and James Craig respectively got involved. While Robert was responsible for the business side of the photographic studio, James Craig was a photographer in his own right with a rich career as a picturesque portraitist (see Stevenson, 2012; 2017; Maddox and Stevenson, 2017; Gossman, 2015).

The three methods differ significantly in terms of technique, as well as type of photographic product. First, an albumen print is ‘characterized by a smooth, shiny surface, which is the result of a coating of egg whites [albumen]’ (US Library of Congress, 2017a) and it is a photo-chemical process, where a photosensitive chemical substance is exposed to light when printing the image. Second, the carbon print use ‘gelatin layer (called a tissue) coated with light sensitive carbon pigment’ (US Library of Congress, 2017b). Third, photogravure is a photo-mechanical process where a plate is made photosensitive, exposed to a negative, and then etched in acid (US Library of Congress, 2011). The albumen prints possess the characteristic brownish dark colours, while the carbon prints have richer shades and are described as more intense (US Library of Congress, 2017b), while photogravure prints are favoured for their consistent quality across multiple printings (US Library of Congress, 2011).
with Joseph Swan as ‘lithographer, writer, and engraver’ (Stevenson, 2017: 2).

In this case study, the data examined was 5 volumes and 50 photogravure prints. The volumes were *Memorials of the Old College of Glasgow* (1871), *Photographs of Glasgow College* (1866), *University of Glasgow, Old and New* (1891), *The Old Country Houses of the Glasgow Gentry* (1878), and *The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow* (1900). The prints examined were from a damaged volume of *The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow* from 1900. Of most interest has been the volume *The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1868-1871*, which will be the primary focus of this chapter.

This chapter will describe the process of data analysis and collection by outlining the emergent categories and concepts – starting from image and visual, non-textual, in-frame content alone; then moving onto discussing the emergent concepts relevant in relation to the practices behind the images while treating photographs as material objects. By following this structure of the account, this chapter will introduce the reader first to the visual content of the images and the types of images. The next section will then discuss the concepts that emerge out of the process of iterative reading of the images across varying contexts (both as single prints and as part of a folio album) that can inform the reader about photographic practice, the practice of Annan in particular, and the technological uses, affordances, and barriers that he faced and dealt with. Finally, the penultimate section will discuss the production of photographs as documents in an institutional context. The comparative analysis in the following chapter (*Chapter Six: The Photographic Production of Space*) will build on the basis of this chapter and the preceding chapter exploring the work of Atget.

5.2. Photographs as Images

Through the treatment of Annan’s photographs as images, the manner in which they can be interpreted can be posited, as well as considerations of the image’s environment of production can be inducted. On this basis, this section will begin by introducing the visual contents of the images.
In this case study, a total of 351 images have been examined; the total consists of 5 volumes and 50 individual prints. The volumes vary in size, photographic method, year of production, and provenance. Currently, all are housed in the special collections of the Mitchell Library. The first three albums are on the same theme and issue. (A curator at the Mitchell Library described them as different copies of the same album.)

Figure 37: (left) Glasgow City Improvement Trust: Old Closes and Streets, A Series of Photogravures, 1868-1889 (Close no 61 Saltmarket) by Thomas Annan, Victoria and Albert Museum, 1900; (right) Glasgow City Improvement Trust: Old Closes and Streets, A Series of Photogravures, 1868-1889 (Broad Close no 167 High Street) by Thomas Annan, Victoria and Albert Museum, 1900.

The main volume of interest explored is the one for which Annan is most famous – The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1868-1871. While originally the album presented to the City Improvement Trust in Glasgow was printed in 1871 and consisted of 31 albumen prints, the volume examined was one from 1900 that consists of 50 photogravure prints and a lithograph of Trongate in 1774 (the same one mentioned above but in slightly larger format). This volume was issued after Thomas Annan’s death and was thus printed by the authority of James Craig Annan. The credit on the title page reads ‘Engraved by Annan from Photographs taken for the City of Glasgow Improvement Trust’, published by James Maclehose and Sons (credited as publishers to the University), and an introduction by William Young, R.S.W. This volume has a list of plates, but unlike the other volumes, each plate (i.e.
photogravure print) has a year attached to it. The images from #1 to #38 are taken in 1868, #39-45 in 1897, #46-49 in 1899, and #50 in 1885; on the basis of this, it is evident that 11 images, those taken in 1897 and 1899 (#39-49), are taken by James Craig Annan, while the rest are taken by Thomas Annan.

Overall, the different photographic processes are recognisable in the different levels of contrast and printing. As seen from the previous chapter, albumen prints bear a yellowish tint and are printed on a thin (albumen) paper that is subsequently attached to a thicker paper. Carbon prints are printed by contact transfer on paper that is treated with gelatine; as such it is not a silver-base photographic process (a carbon print can be seen in figure 37 above, left). Photogravure is a photo-mechanical printing process, where a positive is made on gelatin paper that is then etched into a copper plate, and finally printed via an intaglio press onto paper (a photogravure print can be seen in figure 37).

Table 5 (see below) presents the number of types of visual elements identified and percentages per category across the 2 data sets (both volumes and prints). The most frequent major categories were ‘country house’ and ‘urban,’ where each totalled 100 cases and made up 29% of the occurrences. The following sections will detail each major category by keeping to the volume in which the category has been observed. The theme of ‘urban image’ is only one and main one as it concerns the visual contents of Annan’s image. It was chosen as a primary focus, as it matches better this doctoral project’s research goals.
Figure 38: (left) Plate 10: Close no 37, High Street, 1868 by Thomas Annan, WikiCommons, 1868; (right) Close No. 28 Saltmarket (#25) by Thomas Annan, WikiCommons, 1900.

Table 10 Case Study 2 Annan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: URBAN SPACE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: ARCHITECTURAL</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: COUNTRY HOUSE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: PORTRAIT</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Category 1 is based on one volume and 50 prints; category 2 on three volumes; category 3 on one volume; and category 4 on two volumes.

5.2.1. ‘The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1868-1871’

The individual prints examined from The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1868-1871 pertain exclusively to the main theme of this case study - ‘urban image’. The analysis followed the organising principle of the volume, and has been divided into two subcategories of ‘closes’ and ‘streets’. At this point of the account of the case study, no distinction is made between the images in a volume and the ones that are unbound and from a damaged volume; a discussion of this issue will be provided in section 5.4. Institutional Curation – Thomas Annan and the Mitchell Library.
5.2.1.1. ‘Closes’

This subcategory is the most frequently occurring in the theme ‘urban image’ at 60% (n=30). As a subcategory, it is inspired by the name of the small streets in Glasgow enclosed by buildings on both sides, where there is not much light and visibility is poor. Despite its name, it includes wynds, lones, vennels and other types of passageways between the gables of two buildings. As such, closes, lones, wynds, and vennels are minor streets that are primarily encountered in urban spaces. Because of the lack of light, the images are more often with very high levels of contrast, scarcely populated, and dense with visual information (see figure 40 below). Considering the images of this category occurred more frequently, an argument can be made that the old closes were of higher interest to Annan’s documentary project, which would make sense considering their intended demolition by City Improvement Trust as part of its plan for urban renewal. In fact, when mapped out on an ordnance survey map from the 1850s, Annan’s photographs seemed to follow exclusively the areas
defined as due for urban redevelopment by John Carrick, the city architect responsible for the implementation of the City Improvement Trust’s plans.

Figure 40: (left) Glasgow City Improvement Trust: Old Closes and Streets, A Series of Photogravures, 1868-1889 (Close no 193 High Street 1868) by Thomas Annan, Victoria and Albert Museum, 1900; (right) Glasgow City Improvement Trust: Old Closes and Streets, A Series of Photogravures, 1868-1889 (Close no 83 High Street 1868) by Thomas Annan, Victoria and Albert Museum, 1900.

Considering the urban environment and its social and class dynamics at play in the 1860s and 1870s, it is unlikely that the majority of Glasgow’s population would know these closes, despite their central locations. As it has been noted in Chapter Two: Documentary Photography and the City, the gentry of Glasgow tended to live outside the city, effectively resulting in a poor, immigrant, and working class population to reside in the central area of the closes. Although social mobility was common in Victorian industrial cities, Glasgow followed the trend of the vacated, already overcrowded flat quickly being filled with new tenants due to the high rate of urbanisation (see Ward, 1975: 143). The influx of seasonal workers from the rest of Scotland (Ward, 1975: 143) and immigrants from Ireland, which in 1861 made up nearly 16% of the city’s population (Withers, 1996: 149), also contributed.
5.2.1.2. ‘Streets’

This subcategory occurred at a frequency of 40% (n=20). Its naming originates from the title of the eponymous volume. In contrast to the preceding subcategory, the images depict much larger spaces, light is present in much higher degree, and more often than not they are populated with people.

As a significant distinction, the two subcategories differ greatly in their use of formats. While 90% of instances in ‘closes’ (n=27) are in format ‘portrait,’ 75% of instances in ‘streets’ are format ‘landscape.’ This contrast further adds to the visual difference between the two categories. All photographs in this category show long and wide thoroughfares that are populated, well lit, involve commerce, or depict movement. However, the photographs of the closes are high in contrast due to lack of light. Due to the lack of light, the people present in those photographs tend to pose and look directly into the camera (something that is rare in Annan’s images of larger streets). In addition, while the photographs of closes involve people that are blurred by motion, they tend not to move through space, but in the place itself. There is also evidence of personal possessions such as laundry or handcarts, thus making the contrast that of public space of the street and the more private space of the close.

Accounts of the central Glasgow Cross area’s disrepair and poor condition are numerous (see Gossman, 2015; Stevenson; also, see Tagg, 1988), a famous example of which is by the writer Nathaniel Hawthorne (as cited in Gossman, 2015: 91, then the US Consul in Liverpool:

---

Figure 41 Glasgow City Improvement Trust: Old Closes and Streets, A Series of Photogravures, 1868-1889 (High Street from College Open) by Thomas Annan, Victoria and Albert Museum, 1900.
‘The Trongate and the Salt-Market [...] were formerly the principal business streets, and, together with High Street, the abode of the rich merchants and other great people of the town. High Street, and, still more, the Salt-Market now swarm with the lower orders to a degree which I have never witnessed elsewhere; so that it is difficult to make one’s way among the sullen and unclean crowd, and not at all pleasant to breathe in the noisomeness of the atmosphere. The children seem to have been unwashed from birth.’

Figure 42 (left) Glasgow City Improvement Trust: Old Closes and Streets, A Series of Photogravures, 1868-1889 (Saltmarket from Bridgegate 1868) by Thomas Annan, Victoria and Albert Museum, 1900; (right) Glasgow City Improvement Trust: Old Closes and Streets, A Series of Photogravures, 1868-1889 (Bell Street from High Street 1868) by Thomas Annan, Victoria and Albert Museum, 1900.

Although the closes seem to have been the focus of the City Improvement Trust’s work, as well as Annan’s work judging by the number of photographs, their poor conditions seem to have been connected with those of the larger thoroughfares. It is likely that the two categories were not only intended to work as contrasting types of the spaces – the ideal of the street and despicableness of the close – but to also demonstrate a relationship between the two of interdependence. Considering the bourgeois ideals of modernity at the time, this would have been a rather controversial idea. Namely, the photographs taken by Annan showed areas of the city i.e. the closes of which the city’s middle classes would have had no knowledge. Understood this way, the matter of Annan’s omission of taking photographs of the interior of the dwellings of the people living in the closes is not that significant. It is the environment and its complete novelty for the bourgeois citizen that is of interest. As Engels (as cited in Vidler, 2011:73) described the
phenomenon in Manchester: those are areas that ‘conceal from the eyes of the wealthy men and women of strong stomachs and weak nerves the misery and grime which form the complement of their wealth’. The very act of unveiling this environment is a political one, because it forces the bourgeois viewer to confront the so-called ‘complement of their wealth’.

5.2.1.3. The Framing of the Volume

In addition to the two types of images identified when examining the volume and individual prints, the introduction written by William Young is of great significance. Throughout the volume, there are various references to the city of Glasgow. First, there is the Glasgow city emblem with the motto\textsuperscript{47} of ‘Let Glasgow Flourish’. Second, the introduction of the volume features almost no references to the photographs themselves until the last page and a half (23 pages in total). For the most part, the introduction provides a historical overview of the changes in the city of Glasgow. Starting with the myths of Fergus and St Mungo, various asides about the etymology of the term ‘high street,’ ‘saltmarket,’ or ‘bridgegate’ (alternately spelled as ‘briggate’), as well as accounts of urban change:

‘Beyond the immediate precincts of the city, a lone (formerly called Cow Lone, now Queen Street) ran north from St Tenu’s Gait to the lands of Wester Common. From it in an easterly direction branched another issuing in the Schoolhouse Wynd,

\textsuperscript{47} This is still visible in contemporary Glasgow – one can see it on the doors of cabs in the form of eco-friendly youth campaigns as ‘Let Glasgow’s Children Flourish.’ Furthermore, Maddox and Stevenson (2017) point to the fact that this motto is a truncation of the much older ‘Let Glasgow flourish by the preaching of the Word’.
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and to north of that still another, merging in the bottom row. From the line of the present Castle Street, which led to the Church of St Roche (St Rollox), and at a point a little to the north of the Castle Yard, a path afterwards known as Dobbie’s Lone ran north-easterly in the direction of Wester Common’ (Young, 1900: 11-12).

Following this, a historical overview is given of the various disasters that have befallen the city, both natural and manmade, including: pestilence, conflagration, and floods, as well as Glasgow City Council’s own bailies. Such a lineage of affinities between disasters and social structure is not unheard of in documentary photography. Rosler (2004: 263) has commented on the discourse of ‘liberal documentary’ and its tendency to equate the misfortunes of the poor, the immigrant, and the working in terms of a ‘causality [that] is vague, [where] blame is not assigned, [and] fate cannot be overcome.’

Continuous references are made in relation to heritage and its material manifestation in the city in the form of urban planning (non-existent streets) and architecture (burnt down picturesque houses). However, the references to disasters are to the early and mid-17th century with regards to fires (1601 – ‘a great conflagration laid waste a considerable part of the town’ (Young, 1900: 13) and 1652 again, where ‘nearly a third of the city’ was lost (Young, 1900: 13); floods are also accounted for as well. Such incidents are quite common to big cities in the historical period and have often played a key role in the formation of cities as modern urban centres; for example, Lisbon’s earthquake in 1755 (Mullin, 1992; Serdoura et al., 2009), or London’s great fire in 1666 (Henderson, 1979; Hanson, 1989), following both of which the cities were almost completely restructured and rebuilt.

Directly preceding the historical period at the time of writing, Young (1900: 19) briefly describes the ‘compurgators’ employed by the magistrates of the city to maintain control and adherence to social order and religious practice on Saturdays. ‘Compurgators’ would patrol the streets, disperse gatherings, and instruct any ‘stravaigers’ to go home. As such, they are
direct precursors to ‘bum-bailies’ who enforced the magistrates’ orders and some forms of gentry militia in the 19th century (1900: 21). With such examples, Young makes a shift from a distant history of the city that is largely to do with the elements and nature, and moves onto the formation of the contemporary form of the city as an explicitly rational, controlled, and planned space.

It is at this point that the work of Annan and its context is introduced:

‘The value of many of the plates embraced in this volume consists in their true presentation or suggestion of the seamy side of the city’s life; in their depicting with absolute faithfulness, the gloom and squalor of the slums. They afford a peep into dark and dismal dens unvisited by the great purifying agencies of sun and wind, and in surveying them, we instinctively feel that human life born, bred, or led within their shades is sorely handicapped, and that the day of their extinction is more than due.

The City Improvement Trustees acquired, by act of Parliament, in 1866, the right to alter and reconstruct several of the more densely built areas of the city, and these operations, it was foreseen, would remove many and interesting landmarks. Before entering upon their work, therefore, the Trustees arranged with the late Mr. Thomas Annan to take photographs of a series of views of the closes and streets more immediately affected, and a few copies were presented to members of the Corporation and a few others. Within recent years the Town Council have added a number of views, and the whole pictorial record is now submitted in this volume. In the opening up of many of these

---

48 According to the Collins English Dictionary, compurgator means (formerly) ‘one who testifies in a compurgation’, where compurgation is ‘a method of trial whereby a defendant might be acquitted if a sufficient number of persons swore to his or her innocence’; stravaig means ‘to wander aimlessly’ in Scottish and Norther England dialect; and bum-bailies is a dialect spelling of bumbailiff, which means (formerly) ‘an officer employed to collect debts and arrest debtors for nonpayment’ (Collins English Dictionary).

49 In fact, Withey (2003) comments that the month that City Improvement Trust acquired the permission to go ahead with the Glasgow Improvement Act, a delegation had visited mid-Haussmannisation Paris with the purpose of gathering ideas.
insanitary sections, the work of the Improvement Trustees has been powerfully supplemented by extensive and contemporaneous railway operations’ (Young, 1900: 22, emphasis added).

There are some immediately obvious elements of the two paragraphs quoted above that need to be examined. First, there is the language used to describe Annan’s photography. Through phrases such as ‘true presentation or suggestion’ and ‘absolute faithfulness,’ the viewer of the volume is afforded a ‘peep into,’ or ‘surveying,’ the ‘pictorial record’ of Annan’s work (Young, 1900: 22). In other words, a discourse of photography as a documentary practice that needs to be read in a particular way is invoked (cf. Tagg, 1988). Second, the documentary discourse is reinforced by the language used to describe the ‘the seamy side of the city’s life [and] the gloom and squalor of the slums’, and the ‘opening up’ of the space (Young, 1900: 22). The panoptic discourse of seeing, viewing, and surveying is made to work alongside a framing of urban space understood as closed and/or open. This way, the physical and material decision to ‘alter and reconstruct’ these particular urban spaces is visually represented through the opposition of open spaces i.e. streets and closed spaces i.e. closes. Furthermore, Young’s language echoes a common trend of the time to discuss urban space as a biological body (see Sennett, 1976; Choay, 1969) that requires air and light in order to avoid disease and prosper (Urbano, 2016).

Baillie’s Institution first procured the particular volume examined. Originally planned as an educational institution with its own public library, it opened in 1887 only as a public library due to insufficient funds. In 1981, however, the library shut down due to financial pressures and its collections were transferred to the Mitchell Library.

5.2.1.3.1, The Urban Space

The detailing of the space provided by Young often includes references to past street names or directions of an imaginary gaze or traversing urban space. As such, the account can be understood as positioning the reader as more than a simple dweller in Glasgow, but a possessor of embodied...
knowledge of its geography. The introductory text appears to be providing a ‘phenomenological hermeneutic’ of the space, without actually making references to the photographs themselves. Despite this, the photographs further reinforce the phenomenological-geographical aspect. For instance, in addition to the photogravure prints, number 18 is a lithograph bearing the inscription ‘Trongate in the Olden Time’ (see figure 43 below). It depicts central Glasgow as a lively and commercial open-air space. It is an idealised representation of a city’s public centre - different types of labour and social classes are clearly identifiable, all framed by recognizable architecture of the Glasgow city centre. Interestingly, the image is directly preceded by a photogravure print of ‘Trongate from the Tron Steeple’ and is succeeded by ‘Tontine Building Trongate’ (see figure 43, below, in sequence). In other words, the documentary function of Annan’s photographs has to do with both documenting the types of urban space (closes and streets) and their relationship as shown through the lived experience of the city. In keeping with Nesbit’s claim about documentary photographs (1998), Annan’s photographs also have an intended viewer – that of the social engineer or the bourgeois member of the City Improvement Trust.

Figure 44: (above) Glasgow City Improvement Trust: Old Closes and Streets, A Series of Photogravures, 1868-1889 by Thomas Annan, Victoria and Albert Museum, 1900 – (left) Saltmarket from the Tron Steeple; (centre) Trongate in the Olden Time; (left) Tontine Building, Trongate; (below) Partial screenshot of ‘Plate
All three images can be positioned in a clear line of sight on the 1850s ordnance survey map of the city. The Tron Steeple is the square (with a cross inside it) on the bottom part of the street (figure 43 centre of map), the steeple itself is visible in the lithograph, and the Tontine Buildings can be seen at the end of Trongate (on the lower right of the map). This way, the volume further builds on the established geographical and embodied knowledge of the city described by Young in the introduction to the volume. Furthermore, the sequence of images follows what in previous chapters has been discussed as the perspectivising effect of the Trongate Boulevard. This way, the volume constructs the space of the boulevard as a linear axis of vision that is transparent and legible.

5.2.1.3.2. Layout

The use of text and the page layout of the volume is also significant. As mentioned above, none of the text was written by Annan. However, the majority of the text is intended to either situate historically the volume in the development of the city, or provide an almost street-level orientation to the reader of the city and its surroundings. In some cases, such as the Country Houses of The Glasgow Gentry folio volume, the text predominantly relies on Glasgow’s gentry as ostensibly well-known reference points. As a whole, most volumes, but The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1868-1871 more so than others, rely on a documentation of environments that have either been demolished, or are in the process of being demolished, in relation to images that are seen as emblematic of Glasgow city life. However, the Old Closes and Streets… volume is the only one without text in its original, first edition. As Gossman (2015: 94-95) describes this:

‘The photographs in the first two albums of The Old Closes and Streets (1871 and 1878) are unaccompanied by any text at all, other than simple identifying captions. The 1878 album was to have contained “an introductory and descriptive letterpress,” but, in the event, it was put together without the planned text, which, in any case, would again not have been by Annan himself, but by the City Architect,
John Carrick, an influential and energetic figure with strong ideas of his own. A volume published posthumously in a limited edition by Annan’s son, James Craig Annan, did contain an introductory text by the local antiquarian and artist William Young, but it dealt mostly with the history of Glasgow and its various quarters and streets and had nothing to say about the photographs themselves [...] Annan’s silence, whether deliberate or fortuitous, places the burden of interpretation entirely on the viewer.’

Gossman further points to the unique position of Annan’s work at the time. Both Jacob Riis’s (Riis, 2010) photographs of New York in the 1880s and John Thomson’s (Thomson and Smith, 1969) photographs of London in the 1870s relied to a great extent on text to situate their photographs – they either did so through description or evocative appeals. Annan’s photographs are unique due to their significance to the city of Glasgow, their seeming disengagement with the inhabitants of the deprived areas, and the silence of the photographer. It is important to note that Gossman’s point that ‘the burden of interpretation [is placed] entirely on the viewer’ (2015: 95) omits both the phenomenological hermeneutic identified by this project and the considerable institutional framing of the photographs and volumes – either by their possessing libraries, or the City Improvement Trust.
5.2.2. Analysing the Street


Considering that the general visual analysis of Annan’s The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1868-1871 has been introduced and the framing of the volume has been outlined, this section will follow the structure of Chapter Four: Eugène Atget’s Paris (see section 4.2.2. Analysing a Photograph). Namely, I will engage in a brief semiotic exercise on the basis of a single photograph in order to provide an analysis of Annan’s photographs in relation to the construction of urban spaces as malleable. The analysis will build on the already introduced elements of Annan’s photographs. The photograph that serves as starting point to the discussion (figure 44) is ‘Saltmarket from Bridgegate’, taken in 1868, and it shows the main thoroughfare of Saltmarket looking north towards the Tollbooth Steeple at the centre of Glasgow Cross (visible as a partial outline in the background of the image).

In this section, I will start with a brief reading of the photograph of Saltmarket from Bridgegate with an emphasis on the presence of people in relation to
Ranciere’s ‘distribution of the sensible’. First, I will argue that the presence or lack of people contributes to the meaning of the photographs, as well as supports the ideological goals of the City Improvement Trust – i.e. the lack of people, or the urban crowd as movement, render the space to appear malleable. Second, I will demonstrate how this is done in parallel to opening up the spaces Annan documented to the strategic gaze of the Trust. Moreover, it will be shown that the strategic gaze in Annan’s photographs has a markedly phenomenological aspect, as well as a material foundation. Third, and finally, the political significance of Annan’s work will be argued on the basis of the developed understanding that Annan’s work supported the Trust’s strategic goals.

A key example that demonstrates Ranciere’s ‘distribution of the sensible’ is the presence of people in Annan’s photographs. Similarly to Atget’s photographs, the observer can see ghost-like figures and silhouetted shadows of people on the streets and closes (see figure 45 above). However, in Annan’s photographs, one can also witness the phenomenon of the metropolitan crowd. For example, there is a large number of people on Annan’s photographs of streets - so much so that they appear as a singular blur. According to Baudelaire (Benjamin, 2006b), the urban crowd offered new and ambiguous promises of attraction and danger (Gunning, 1997; Gilloch, 1996). In fact, according to Gunning (1997: 25), the crowd is at the centre of ‘the changing relation between the modern metropolis and the practice of urban spectatorship’. In Annan’s photographs, people appear in two ways – either as blurry silhouettes or as a posing group. The former appears coincidental and unplanned, while the latter implies a collaboration with the photographer and thus a deliberate intention. Furthermore, the former tends to emphasise the public nature of the street, while the latter tends to highlight the private environment of the close. Both types of depictions can be understood as indicative of the ‘anonymous multiple’ of modernity that Ranciere (2017: 109) has described as central to modern aesthetics.

However, both types of crowds bear different meaning, precisely because of the spaces they occupy. The crowd of the street is inevitably blurry (see figure 44), even when posing, since the street is supposed to be the
epitome of movement (see figure 42). In contrast, people in closes appear as ghosts and private hauntings; in the case they do pose, the photographs’ material environment tends to suggest an intimate and private collaboration (see figures 39 and 41). In the case that closes do appear devoid of people, Benjamin’s description of Atget’s photos as those of crime scenes appears apt in Annan’s case as well. Namely, modern urban spaces, which to a large extent can be characterized by the crowd (Gunning, 1997; also, see Le Bon, 2011), once devoid of it, appear lacking. On one hand, this points to the extent that the crowd is characteristic of urban space. On the other hand, this could support Scott’s argument (1998) regarding ‘state simplifications’, since the rendering of space as uninhabited allows for the state to act upon it much more freely. Moreover, the rendering of space as empty or ‘ruined’ (in the sense of Stoler’s work - 2002; 2008), is an abstraction of space from its lived context. Understood this way, the role of the lived experience of the street in Annan’s photography comes to the front – even when Annan deprives the city from its inhabitants it appears significant, since it is the presence of people on a mass scale that makes the metropolis such a novel experience for its time (Simmel, 1903). By stripping the crowd from spaces or rendering it as a single blur, the photographs participate in a ‘distribution of the sensible’ that appears not to leave space for people in the city’s streets. This way, Annan’s photograph of Saltmarket from Bridgegate becomes an image made up of abstract details of the material structure of the city, of its buildings and streets. Annan’s photographing of Glasgow’s slums is central to opening them up for the strategic gaze of the bourgeois Glasgow City Council, and thus it is essential to the conceptualization of space as malleable.
The ordering of the images in the volume further supports the opening up of the city for the strategic gaze of the social engineers. Particularly, the order of the photographs in the volume is further oriented around the Glasgow Cross (see figure 46). In fact, the first photograph is High Street from the Cross followed by 15 images of closes off of High Street or the street itself. Following this is the sequence of three images (including a lithograph) of the Tron Steeple, then an image of Gallowgate which Trongate’s continuation past the Cross, and then a series of closes or streets off of Saltmarket which is the continuation of High Street past the Cross. Images from 39 to 50 in the 1900 version of the volume, however, vary – potentially indicating that as late additions they were not made to fit into the overall logic of the project. It could be speculated that due to the pattern being present in the first 30 images only, which were taken by Annan himself (and the other 20 were not all by him), that the pattern was envisioned by Annan; since the only change from the first to the 1900 edition was Annan’s death, but the publisher remained the same.

With this in mind, the Glasgow Cross can be understood as an organising principle for the volume, and as a key for a phenomenological hermeneutic of the urban space – effectively performing a walk through the spaces of interest. In a more theoretical sense, Annan’s photographs appear to be engaging closely with the material arrangement of space in the city of Glasgow. In other words, the documentary function of Annan’s photographs appears to be in the strict representation of the formal spatial order of the map on street level. Moreover, Annan’s photographs document more than the presence of photographic principles in the city.
of Glasgow (i.e. its quality as a photographic city), but rather document their effect to the experience of being on the streets.

Understood this way, the perspective effect of the boulevard is counterpoised with that of the close, both of which are simultaneously pertaining to the documentary function of the photograph and its aesthetics. This results in an aesthetics of contrast, where the street appears to be a manifestation of the desired order and the close is the deviation from it. Moreover, although photography is frequently understood as a depiction of time – in the sense that a photograph is ‘confronting us with the passage of time and the stillness of that which has gone’ (Dant and Gilloch, 2002: 6; also, see Kracauer, 1995; Barthes, 1977; 2001; Sontag, 1979), it can be inferred that Annan’s photographs are documents of more than the Zeitgeist, but of Glasgow’s Raumgeist as well (see Soja, 1996). The places one encounters by looking at the photographs, and one does primarily through the volume in sequence, take the viewer on a walk. Moreover, this walk is inscribed with opportunities for pedagogical encounters with the environment that has been documented. For example, the viewer can learn to identify the Tron Steeple, the Glasgow Cross, etc. and thus engage in a ‘phenomenological hermeneutic’ that speaks to the lived experience of the spaces. This pedagogical aspect of the gaze further empowers its power to exercise strategic control and determine the meaning of space. By representing the experience of walking through the city, Annan appears to have documented more than the material environment by capturing both elements of the experience of the space.
Figure 47: Partial screenshot of ‘Plate Locations’, National Library of Scotland, 2016, [https://digital.nls.uk/learning/thomas-annan-glasgow/historical-maps/].

Figure 48: (left) Plate 14: Princes Street from King Street, 1868 by Thomas Annan, National Library of Scotland, 2016; (right) Plate 13: Laigh Kirk Close, 1868 by Thomas Annan, National Library of Scotland, 2016.

This reading can be further extended by a ‘material hermeneutic’ (Edwards, 2009c) of the built environment that the photographs document. Namely, the spatial relationships between the photographs operate on a similar logic of material ornamentation to that discovered in Atget’s work –
that of suture of apparently disparate parts. This can be shown with the material relations in two photographs. On figure 47 (see above), a scaled up section of the map of Glasgow’s Princes Street can be seen with three blue squares. The blue square on the very left and at the end of Princes Street is Plate 14 titled Princes Street from King Street, 1868 (figure 48 above, left); the blue square in the middle is Plate 13 and is titled Laigh Kirk Close 1868 (figure 48 above, right).

The interactive map provided by the National Gallery of Scotland allows the viewer to place the two photographs in relation to each other cartographically. However, there are limitations to this. On a general level, the map only locates the first 20 plates from The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1868-1871; as such, it does not include the 20 others that have either been part of the original 1868 volume, or the 30 additional ones in the later 1900 edition. On a particular level, the blue square for Laigh Kirk Close is positioned at the middle of the close itself. The examination of the two photographs next to each other, and in relation to the map, reveals this to be incorrect and merely an approximation. First of all, the map reveals that the close is accessible through a passage from Trongate (the main thoroughfare at the top of the map), which is visible in the photograph on the other end of the close. Second, on the bottom right corner of the photograph of the close, there is a lamppost, which is identical to the one on the bottom left corner on the photograph of the photograph of Princes Street. Lighting in the closes was a big element of the problematisation of the areas, and going by the photographs provided by Annan alone it can be determined that there were different types of lamps in closes and streets. For example, in figure 49 (see below) the difference between a lamp in a close (on the left) and on a main street (on the right) can clearly be seen; one is attached to a wall due to the narrowness of the close, the other one is on a post. On the basis of this, it can be asserted that Plate 13 is not actually taken from the middle of the close as the map on figure 47 shows; rather, the photograph has been taken from a position on Princes Street itself. This interpretation can further be strengthened by acknowledging the lack of commerce in the closes;
this means that the building façade visible in the lower left corner of the Laigh Kirk Close photograph is, in fact, a street.

**Figure 49:** (left) Plate 3: High Street from College Open, 1868 by Thomas Annan, National Library of Scotland, 2016; (right) Plate 8: Close no 80 High Street, 1868 by Thomas Annan, National Library of Scotland, 2016.

Furthermore, the close/street divide is starker than the lack or presence of commerce. About 60% of the photographs are of closes, and thus places that would not be familiar or even known at all neither to the civic engineers responsible for the urban project nor the bourgeois gentry class of the city that would fund it (Losch as cited in Maddox and Stevenson, 2017: 157). Because of this, the photographs need to be rooted in something familiar and identifiable, and it appears that the Tollbooth Steeple at the centre of Glasgow Cross and Tron Steeple (now known as the Tollbooth Tower) is the clearest point of reference (also seen in figure 49, left), on the basis of which a knowing observer can read the images and navigate through their virtual space. This, in turn, creates a form of space that speaks to both the material environment of the city and the abstract formal order of it seen on the map, as well as the lived experience of navigating the streets. However, this constructed transparency is not reciprocal and it favours the privileged observer of the photographs i.e. the social engineer of the City Improvement Trust. Understood this way, Annan’s photographs demonstrate the transparency of space in its clear strategic aspect of having achieved access to a place that would otherwise be unknown. To put it in abstract terms, Annan’s photographs
should be understood as a complement to the slum clearance, rather than simple representation of its stages of progress.

On another level, the photographs themselves are the ‘opening up’ here. In the case of Paris, the urban changes were what allowed for space to ‘open up’ through Haussmann’s carvings and disembowelling and subsequently for Atget to document the new spaces. For Annan, the photographs could only be taken after the process of modernisation. In Annan’s case, however, the photographs themselves are what allows the panoptic principle to be applied to the urban plan of the city of Glasgow.

For Benjamin, the principle according to which reality was stripped from its aura in photography was through the incisions that the camera inflicts on the world. In his essay The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction, Benjamin (1968) compares a camera operator to a surgeon, who, in order to operate, must break apart a person’s body, penetrate into it, and, ultimately, does not address the one operated on otherwise than through the very operation (see Gilloch, 1996: 186). The already established comparison between the human body and the modern Western city is thus revealed as striking (Sennet, 1976; Choay, 1969). Understood this way, Benjamin is describing the operation as a medium of knowing, both of accessing and enacting knowledge. In other words, the City Improvement Trust must cut into the Glasgow’s slums in order to gain knowledge of them – and photography was the medium to do so.

This last aspect further established the political dimension of documentary photography and its reification of social relations, and, similarly to Atget’s L’homme armè, social class. Namely, Annan’s work quite clearly fits into Rosler’s (1982: 81) description of documentary photography’s discourse of being:

‘a fiery pencil that with flash and flare inscribed into the historical and journalistic record as well as into the consciences of the “comfortable” classes, the image of the previously unphotographed poor’ (emphasis added).

The photographs of closes are exactly ‘images of the previously unphotographed poor’ that are meant as both evidence and justification
for the urban modernisation undertaken by the ‘comfortable classes’. Furthermore, this can also be related to documentary photography’s basis on access (see Bogre, 2011, on documentary: 4; 27; 101; on war: 17) – the more difficult it is to see a space, the more valuable it is for photography. This, however, more often than not results in the photographic gaze constructing the people and environments documented as other. The photographer, the viewer of the photograph, and the institution are the ones in power. They are the ones who gaze upon the object in the ‘bounded arena of shared expectations as to meaning’ that is discourse (Sekula, 2016: 3). As Sekula observes (1999b: 446), ‘the archival perspective is closer to that of the capitalist, the professional positivist, the bureaucrat and the engineer – not to mention the connoisseur – than it is to that of the working class’, let alone that of the colonial other (for example, see Stoler, 2008). Ultimately, this results in what Sekula describes as an aesthetics of compassion with a distant Other. Thus, once again evoking Rosler’s description of documentary photography as a practice that carries ‘(old) information about a group of powerless people to another group addressed as socially powerful’ (2004: 263); in fact, documentary photography appears to be this very address. If, as it has been argued so far, documentary photography is about transparency and making a certain issue visible, then Homi Bhabha’s (1994: 155-156) definition appears fitting in all of its aspects:

‘Transparency is the action of the distribution and arrangement of differential spaces, positions, knowledges in relation to each other, relative to a discriminatory, not inherent, sense of order’ (emphasis added)

5.3. The Photograph as Object

The focus of this case study has been the 50 photographs that make up the volume of The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1868-1871. In this section of the current chapter, Annan’s work will be examined not only in terms of understanding the photographs as images, but by exploring the practices that directly produced a given photograph as a material object.
As it was the case in Chapter Four, this section aims to build on the semiotic and hermeneutic already established in the previous sections by moving past the ‘image content’ and acknowledging the photograph’s ‘physical attributes […] that influence content in the arrangement and projection of visual information’ (Edwards and Hart, 2004: 2). Throughout this project, as it has been noted, photographs are understood to be products of a whole network of material practices. Understood this way, each photograph is a product of various practical choices and affective decisions that ‘construct and respond to the ‘significances and consequences of things and the human relations with which they are associated’ (Edwards and Hart, 2004: 6). As Edwards and Hart assert (2004: 6), photographs are made ‘in relation to certain objectives’ but are not those objectives themselves, rather they are ‘a specifically articulated use and function of the photographic image’. This section will attempt to reconstruct those objectives with regards to Annan’s practical choices and affective decisions.

5.3.1. Technology

Thomas Annan was involved in a number of technological developments – both in his own professional practice and in his position as a Scottish photographer. Annan was a close friend of David Octavius Hill, the famous pioneering Scottish photographer who worked with Robert Adamson on a variety of projects (Stevenson, 2017), among which is the iconic documentary project of the Newhaven fishing village50. Annan, born in 1829 in Fife, had a rich and varied career in the visual crafts and arts. From 1849 until 1855, he had worked as a lithographic engraver with a Joseph Swan, owner of a lithographic business (Stevenson, 2012).

The decrease in popularity of lithography and the growing number of photographic studios (about 30 studios operated in Glasgow alone in the 1850s - Gossman, 2015: 6) led Annan to open a studio as a ‘collodion calotypist’ (Gossman, 2015: 6) with a partner called Berwick in Woodlands Road, outside of Glasgow (Stevenson, 2017). Stevenson claims that Swan’s monopoly on lithography might have necessitated Annan’s change of

50 Walter Benjamin (1978) famously wrote about Hill’s photographs of Newhaven in relation to aura and the reluctance of the photographic subject to give away their agency to the photographer.
profession following the latter’s quarrel with the former’s son (2017). Furthermore, Annan himself was ‘among the many individuals displaced from the country to the cities by the industrial drive and social distress of the 1840s’ (Stevenson, 2017: 13). A clear example of this is his lithographic trade made redundant by the industrial mechanisation of photography, thus making him part of the second generation of industrialisation in Glasgow (Stevenson, 2017). In this period, Stevenson (2017) points to Annan’s photography having followed in the tracks of the more established firms of George Washington Wilson in Aberdeen and James Valentine in Dundee.

By 1857, Annan had disbanded his partnership and opened an independent studio on 116 Sauchiehall Street in the centre of contemporary Glasgow (Stevenson, 2017). In 1859, Annan moved his studio to 200 Hope Street, less than 50 meters from the former studio on Sauchiehall Street (Gossman, 2015); by 1861, Stevenson reports (2017), Annan was employing one man and one boy, thus pointing to the growth of his business. All of this is to show that Annan was a lifelong photographic professional and his business exponentially grew. As much as Annan was a leader of Scottish photography, it can be argued that his entire career is intertwined with the growing industrialisation of mid-18th century Glasgow.

Annan’s work has been noted for its artistic leaning and his propensity for novel applications of photographic technology. The latter is, perhaps, most evident in his photograph of Dumbarton Castle, which, in 1865, won him his first medal from the Photographic Society in Scotland; he merited the medal, because ‘his prints were bigger and had involved greater technical difficulties’ (Stevenson, 2017: 12). It is in 1866 that Annan purchased the rights for Joseph Wilson Swan’s carbon printing process, a much more lasting printing method that produced images with higher degrees of contrast (Stevenson, 2017). In the same year, Hill reported that Annan had already used Swan’s carbon process in his reproduction of Hill’s historical painting of the founding of the Free Church (as cited in Stevenson, 2012: 6). Finally, in 1869 Thomas Annan purchased the property of Rock House, the building owned by David Octavius Hill – considered a landmark in Scottish

51 Joseph Wilson Swan (1828-1914) not to be confused with Joseph Swan (1796-1872).
and worldwide photographic history (Stevenson, 2017. In terms of technology, in 1866 Annan acquired the Scottish rights for James Wilson Swan’s carbon printing process (Steel, 2003); and in 1883, Annan and his son, James Craig Annan, travelled to Vienna in order to learn the photogravure printing process from its creator Karl Klič (Steel, 2003; Stevenson, 2017); Annan also obtained the British rights for the process in the same year (Steel, 2003). Overall, Annan’s photographic practice involved a sustained engagement with novel photographic methods and technologies, as well as a noteworthy application of their novel aesthetics.

5.3.1.1. Photographic Technology, Closes and Streets

With regards to his work on The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1868-1871, Annan relied on a wet collodion process, which required a ‘great deal of equipment, considerable preparation, and further work immediately after the pictures had been taken’ (Gossman, 2015: 100). The volume was first released in 1871 as a series of 31 albumen prints in an edition of four to five volumes (Gossman, 2015). Following this, it was re-released in 1878, by request of the Glasgow City Improvement Trust, in approximately 60 copies with the addition of nine more photographs, this time utilising the carbon printing process. Finally, James Craig Annan, Thomas’s son, re-released the volume with additional photographs taken by Thomas and Robert Annan & Sons (i.e. photographs taken by J.C. Annan) in 1900, this time utilising the photogravure process; the copies numbered a 100 and were released by the T. & R. Annan Company.

52 Steel reports on the details: ‘The original contract drafted by Klič’s lawyer had meanwhile been modified. Despite the differences in personality Klič and the Annans had been drawn to one another, the artist appreciating the integrity and earnestness of the Scotsmen, the Annans warming to the wit, humanity, eccentricity even, of a Czech of genius. It was agreed now that no more than two persons might be told about the process either by Klič or by the Annans for a fee of not less than 2500 florins (c. £250 of the day). Such persons were neither to sell on or disclose the secret to others under penalty of 10 000 florins. 16 In the event some misunderstanding occurred. On his return to Scotland Annan sold on the method to W. and A. K. Johnston, Lithographers of Edinburgh, for the sum of £250. The contract of 10 May 1883 stipulated that Johnston should further disclose the technique to no-one. Annan himself reserved the right to pass on the method for a sum of no less than £250 to up to five firms, these firms bound under penalty of £500 not to further disclose the secret. For each firm instructed by Annan he was to pay Johnston £50. A letter from Dr Nirenstein, followed on 1 December 1883 by a letter in English from Klič written by another hand but with a cordial postscript and greetings in German in Klič’s own handwriting, recalled to the Annans’ attention the clauses of the agreed contract based on the modification of the February draft.’ (Steel, 2003: 169)
additional 150 copies were published by James MacLehose, the University of Glasgow publisher\(^\text{53}\). With regards to the use of photographic technology, Gossman (2015: 100-101) describes Annan’s process:

‘Even from a technical point of view, photographing in the dark closes of Glasgow must have required close attention to the conditions of light at different times of day and, in view of the long exposure times needed, to controlling the movement of people in order to avoid excessive blurring. In addition, the wet collodion process made necessary by the generally poor light conditions required a great deal of equipment, considerable preparation, and further work immediately after the pictures had been taken. The pictures were thus necessarily composed with care, and while it was not Annan’s brief to depict the universally denounced squalor of the old closes and streets but only the closes and streets themselves, it is striking that, in the view of many (though by no means all) commentators, the photographs do not, on the whole, convey a deeply disturbing sense of squalor or degradation.’

To put it simply, Annan’s use of technology is reported to have been masterful and impressive both in terms of its technicality and in terms of accuracy of representation. In more practical terms, Annan would have had to consider the following affordances of his camera and purpose of producing images:

- direct the camera at a source of light and do so at the appropriate time of day;
- have knowledge of the places before taking the photograph;
- use the wet collodion photographic process which allowed the greatest sensitivity to light considering the dark conditions of the closes (Stevenson, 2012; 2017);

\(^{53}\) Gossman (2015) points to a disagreement among historians with regards to the correct number of copies. It is possible that the printing was equal in number, and both Annan’s company and MacLehose published 100 copies each.
• centre the most significant element of the composition, since a large format camera is likely to have much higher focus in the centre of the frame and poorer detail towards the edge;
• assumedly, pose or guide the people in the images (whether that would mean instruct them to be still or to interact with the camera cannot be determined);
• document the ‘built environment’ (cf. Gossman, 2015) as per his supposed commission from the Glasgow City Improvement Trust (whether this includes the presence of people cannot be determined);
• produce photographs that are both accurate and ‘like pictures’ (Gossman, 2015);

The depth of field at time is at the expense of the foreground and it is common to see blurry buildings to the sides of the close in the foreground. In some images of closes, one can see only a small section of a main street; as such, these image do important work in establishing the relation between ‘street’ and ‘close’, even if they do so subtly. Furthermore, the narrowness and lack of light in the close is contrasted with the small rectangle of street that is visible due to its higher degree of light.

Due to Annan’s technological affordances, an area that is well lit was necessary in order to make sure that enough light reaches the camera in the dark closes. However, the way Annan has achieved this is particularly significant in terms of the visual relationships it reveals. In general, however, the difference in detail with regards to fore- and background is quite prominent. Due to the physical context of the narrow lanes in which little light enters, the foreground is considerably darker and more detailed in contrast to the much brighter background (often being a glimpse of a main thoroughfare, or an urban landscape with taller buildings in the distance).

Annan’s practice of composition is evident outside his photographs as well. Stevenson comments (2017) that it was common for Annan to visit a place prior to taking a photograph in order to establish both a composition and appropriate lighting or time of day. For example, On the basis of Annan’s hand drawn sketches, such as that of Linlithgow (Stevenson, 2012; 2017;
Gossman, 2015), ‘[i]t can be presumed that Annan went out to consider composition, angles, and lights before he brought out his weighty equipment’ (Stevenson, 2017: 10). Furthermore, Stevenson (2017: 10) points to:

‘Annan’s concerns for the effects of perspective and distance and the problem of relating foreground to middle and background, which was, surprisingly, no easier in photography than it was in painting, emerges in a quotation written out below the sketch of Linlithgow: “Mr Burnet says Objects with distinct outline have a tendency to advance. Wilson’s idea was, that no foreground ought to be painted nearer than thirty feet, for this reason the plants in his foreground are broad and blunt”’.

Stevenson (2017: 11) also argues that Annan was willing to ‘sacrifice miniature effects and detail for breadth and coherence’, further reinforcing the interpretation that Annan continuously engaged with the visual contents of the frame and that the printed photographs available in the volumes examined were intentional in their aesthetic and practical choices.

Overall, due to Annan’s work on the volume as a supposedly commissioned photographer (see Maddox and Stevenson, 2017), there are clear intentional dimensions for the photos to be considered. However, this is more complex than it might seem; the fact that Annan was producing photographs for an institution that presumably had a set of requirements for his work, does not exclude the option of Annan subverting those requirements and the institutional agenda. As Edwards points out (2009a: 131), ‘the material practices of photography [speak to] how the makers of the photographs themselves saw the potential of their images’. Moreover, Edwards adds (2009a: 131) that the material practices of photographers also included ‘the subjects of these photographs [which] were themselves physical or material traces of the historical past’. This aspect of Annan’s work will be discussed at more length in section 5.4. Institutional Curation –.
5.3.1.2. Manipulation and Adjustment

Another element of the technological practice in Annan’s photography that has to do with the visual content of the images was his tendency to manipulate and adjust the images. As a former painter and lithographer, Annan possessed the requisite skills to adjust the photographic prints. Gossman (2015) points to Annan’s tendency to lighten the drying clothes and linen hung up in the dark and narrow closes; to add clouds from other negatives; and to paint over and add detail to poorly lit images (also, see Stevenson, 2012). The best examples of painting on a photographic image from the volume The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1868-1871, is Close no 28 Saltmarket (see figure 50 below, left). Manipulation is understood as a technological issue as it has emerged as a practice that deals with the technological affordances of the camera. Namely, the defects or lacks of detail that Annan aimed to correct or aestheticize were located in the negative. Thus, any correction would be only possible on the print. This, in turn, further reinforces the indexical qualities and appeal of the photographs – or, in other words, their documentary function. Edwards and Hart (2004: 13) comment that practices of ‘[o]verpainting and collage are integral to the meaning of the photograph’. From this perspective, such practices of manipulating the photographic print can be understood as extending and enhancing the indexical, effectively ‘revealing a form of inner self through material surface additions to the photograph itself’ (Edwards and Hart, 2004: 13-14; also, see Pinney, 1997: 137). Moreover, since the contrast between close and street has been revealed as central to the documentary function of Annan’s work, it can be added that the aestheticizing of this contrast reveals the technological use and aesthetic consideration that further supports the documentary aspect of the photographs.

This can be seen in the comparison below (see figure 50). On the left is a digital copy of a print from the National Library of Scotland (through the Mitchell Library) and on the right is a print owned by the Getty Museum. The print on the left is the manipulated one, with some drawing on top of the chimneys of the building in the foreground. Clouds also have been added on the negative – through the use of another negative exposed over the
same print. Annan’s use of composite images preceded the publication of the Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1868-1871, having exhibited a composite image, printed out of two negatives, as early as 1855, while still in his partnership with Dr George Berwick (Stevenson, 2017). Furthermore:

“The British Journal [of Photography] talked of his composite photographs in the summer of 1862: ‘In these, the picture does not abruptly terminate at the horizon, leaving a blank white space of paper, but has its crowning charms of melting cloud and aerial space, printed in separately, it is true, but in thorough keeping with the general effect’” (as cited in Stevenson, 2017: 12)

Figure 50: (top) Plate 15: Close no 28 Saltmarket, 1868 by Thomas Annan (and detail) National Library of Scotland, 2016; (bottom) Close, No. 28 Saltmarket, 1877 by Thomas Annan (and detail), The J. Paul Getty Museum.

This can be further exemplified by the proliferation of different prints and their difference in colour, physical condition, digital scan, as well as, at times, composition, quality, and overall effect. This further points to the importance of the context in which photographs are seen and experienced (to be expanded in section 5.4. Institutional Curation – Thomas
Annan and the Mitchell Library. Below can be seen four different prints of Close No 28 Saltmarket, each from a different institution, in order from left to right: National Library of Scotland, Getty Museum, National Galleries of Scotland, and Princeton University. The print from the National Library of Scotland is a carbon print, since clouds were added by Annan only through that particular printing method, due to its high contrast and level of detail (Gossman, 2015: 96).

5.3.2. Photographic Practices Emergent from Photographs

Overall, this section has described interpretations of the documentary function of Annan’s images, tied to the intent of capturing the lived experience of the built environment. Additionally, through examination of the images, technology emerged as a factor in their production that possessing explanatory power in terms of the photographs’ composition and content. For example, manipulation and adjustment in a certain number of images has been shown as a conceptual tension between photographer and institution for analysing the purpose behind the produced photographs.

The elements of photographic practice highlighted here – aesthetic adjustments, documentary function, and use of technology – are understood in relation to each other. Technological affordances have an effect on the final image that is produced; however, Annan’s practices of manipulating the content of images reveals that he was not always satisfied with photographs as they were taken by his camera – and made the deliberate choice to manipulate them, as well as utilise different
techniques for printing, or adjusting the print. The inference given above for such a choice is the convergence of aesthetic considerations and documentary function. Put simply, the analysis of the images indicates that either Annan was concerned with how the image looked, i.e. their adherence to aesthetic codifications, or what they were communicating, i.e. their ability to fulfil a documentary function. If in keeping with Nesbit’s (1998: 401) claim that a documentary photograph has ‘a job to perform’, and this means capturing ‘as much detail as possible in the given subject area’ – then Annan’s manipulation is telling of his aesthetic and documentary judgement with regards to what information and detail should be present in the photograph. In summary, the analysis of the photographs indicates that Annan’s photographic practice was complex, and was clearly concerned with both how the image looked, i.e. the photographs’ adherence to aesthetic codifications, and what the image would be communicating, i.e. its ability to fulfil a documentary function.

Furthermore, Annan’s The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1868-1871 clearly fits the definition of a self-contained project. It was published as such in all three of its editions. Moreover, the project contains an internal logic of contrasting two types of visual content that can be understood in relation to the type of built environment, it is built on a singular aesthetic of a central axis of sight, a narrative in the introduction, and a contrast that is reinforced through format, as well as through the photographs’ cartographic and phenomenological hermeneutic demonstrated in this chapter. As such, Annan’s work fits Solomon-Godeau’s comment (1991: 173) on documentary photography’s attachment to ‘the notion of project or narrative rather than single image’.

5.4. Institutional Curation – Thomas Annan and the Mitchell Library

The Mitchell Library’s Special Photographic Collection consists primarily of folio volumes. The photographs by Annan are constructed as institutional objects in three main ways. First, through the sequential organisation of the volume. Second, through the inscription of a curatorial practice onto the object. And third, through their place as institutional documents that are
'component[s] of dynamic networks' – particularly ones that can travel across different institutions and their constituent networks (Prior, 2008a: 821). As folio volumes, Annan’s photographs occupy a different position in the ML’s collection. There is no need for a stamp on each print, nor is there a need for labelling or indexing of the images. However, the volume itself is indexed according to the Dewey decimal classification system, and a stamp of the institution is present in the first page to demarcate its ownership. It has been demonstrated in section 5.2.1.3. The Framing of the Volume that folio volumes organise the photographs into a set of interrelations. As Edwards (2009a: 147) has commented on this very issue:

‘Albums locked images into specific narratives created through their ordering in the volume.’

The specific narrative here being that of the Glasgow City Improvement Trust, as well as the cartographic logic identified in the sections above. However, as Sekula (1999b: 445) notes, a book is only slightly more resistant than a print to the Archive’s clearing of original context:

‘[…] the specificity of “original” uses and meanings can be avoided and even made invisible, when photographs are selected from an archive and reproduced in a book. (In reverse fashion, photographs can be removed from books and entered into archives, with a similar loss of specificity)’ (emphasis added).

In fact, the Mitchell Library owns nearly 400 individual prints of Annan’s work, all of which are from disbanded volumes. Such prints bear material marks of some use, often appearing to have been torn out from a copy of a folio volume. As Edwards (2002: 73) has noted, such physical traces of use (or abuse) should serve as a basis for understanding photographs as ‘socially functioning objects, [since] the scars on photographic objects are testimony to their historicity and social biography’. That is to say, photographic documents ‘should be understood as belonging in a continuing process of meaning, production, exchange and usage’ (Edwards, 2002: 68); the archive being only one instance of this process, or even only one institution. Furthermore, the Mitchell Library relies on the
Annan Collection Finding Aid, a catalogue of individual prints, volumes, and a bibliography relevant to Thomas Annan’s work. The catalogue includes a documents’ accession number, its title, photographer, author/contributor, a physical description, publication date, number of volumes, Dewey number, provenance, photographic process, and linked documents. As noted above, the Mitchell Library utilises similar ‘little tools of knowledge’ – labels, print size, mounts, registers, and finding aids. It is this type of multiple agencies that the Archive draws together in a configuration, ‘on which claims of the evidential depend’ (Edwards, 2009a: 146).

Furthermore, the Finding Aid was created by the Getty Museum curators in preparation of the first international exhibition of Annan’s work in the J. Paul Getty Museum exhibition titled ‘Thomas Annan: Photographer of Glasgow’, May 23–August 13, 2017, at the Getty Center. Furthermore, a number of objects were marked as absent from the Mitchell Library’s Finding Aid – they were loaned to the J. Paul Getty Museum for the duration of the exhibition. The ability of the documents to travel is indicative of their position as archival documents that have been produced as ‘docile’ (Barthes, 2001: 40-43) and open for re-contextualisation; since the archive works on a logic of homogenisation, migration from one to another is hardly a reconfiguration of meaning. The case is similar with the photographs by Atget bought by the VAM Museum from MoMA.

5.4.1. Legible Photographs

The examples of ways in which documentary photographs are constructed as institutional objects in an archive point to a richer understanding of photographs than what has been shown in the preceding sections of this chapter. Once a photograph has been constructed as an institutional object, it is not only its image-content, nor is it only a material object - it becomes a document. Once a document, it bears in itself an inscribed manner of viewing and interpretation, all of which are framed by the discourse of the Archive. Furthermore, the historic performativity of the given document is limited to the agency ascribed to it through the Archive. As a document, it becomes isolated from its former meaning to a certain
extent and is abstracted from its former uses (Sekula, 1999b: 444); so much so that ‘this naturalization of the cultural’ requires the intervention of criticism (Barthes as cited in Sekula, 1999b: 447) and concepts such as Edwards’ ‘social biography’ in order to ground it in some context as either an object or image.

Criticising both Tagg and Sekula, Edwards points to the lack of understanding of material performances that such photographic documents elicit, enact, and ultimately contribute to discourse (2002). For example, Tagg (1988: 145) points to the material presence of survey documentary photographs being in the hands of officials, but ‘he does not use the performative qualities of those photographs as active participants in the discourse’ (Edwards, 2002: 69). With regards to Sekula, Edwards (2002: 69) notes that:

‘[i]he “archive” in Sekula’s model is depended not only on the repetition of style and iconographical form but on the affective tone of systematic material presentation, premised on material proximity’ (emphasis added).

Furthermore, the construction of photographs as documentary objects further fits them into ‘culturally specific expected or appropriate forms’, this way dictating ‘the embodied conditions of viewing, literally performing the images in certain ways’ (Edwards and Hart, 2004: 11). The various inscriptions, both legible and illegible, mounts, and manipulations (such as stamps) effectively create a new object, rather than simply transform an existing one. Moreover, it is an object that is inscribed with the way in which it should be read. From a Foucauldian perspective of power, the illegibility of the object, in fact, is productive, since it does not take away the meaning of the photograph, but rather places it in the Archive. In terms of Rancière’s work, the production of a photographic document is indicative of a given aesthetic order and a concomitant ‘distribution of the sensible’ (2011). Namely, what is sayable about the photograph is determined, as well as distributed unevenly across sites and agents (Rancière, 2011) – those of the archive being the privileged ones (Edwards, 2009a; 2009c).
Both the VAM and the ML were involved in multiple processes of constructing photographs into institutional documents. In the case of Atget’s mounts, the archiving of the image in a configuration with labels, a museum number, a title, and a frame effectively enabled ‘historical information, visual and textual, to be integrated in one embodied visual act’ (Edwards, 2009a: 144). In the case of Annan’s volumes, the viewer is afforded the opportunity to experience different material performances, as the different editions of his books relied on a different photographic method, thus allowing a viewer to experience:

‘[...] the instrumentation of cameras and printing papers [as]
a central hermeneutic device, as the camera, photographs,
and archive, and the spaces between them, become sites
where things are made readable’ (Edwards, 2009a: 137)

In both institutions, the Archive provided the viewer an opportunity in which photographs can be interacted with as traces of the past – both historical events and chemical traces (Edwards, 2009a: 149) – while simultaneously determining what that past is.

In addition to rendering the space of the city empty and malleable (as shown in section 5.2.2. Analysing the Street), Annan’s photography also makes the city legible. It has already been demonstrated that certain prominent visual elements such as the Tron Steeple were framed both textually and visually to be understood not only as significant but important to understanding the urban geography of Glasgow – what Sekula (1999b: 448) has described as ‘a condition of imaginary temporal and geographical mobility’ that photographs afford. The case is not different in Saltmarket from Bridgegate, the photograph can be read through a ‘phenomenological hermeneutic’ in several ways. As it has been noted, there is the cartographic element. It provides a visual way of navigating the city of Glasgow, but it does so through a process of equating the viewer of the photograph with the photographer.

With regards to the identified sequence of three images on the Trongate boulevard, the thoroughfare is organized similarly to a Parisian one - according to ‘the vistas that were supposed to channel the vision of the
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promeneur as effectively as the lens of a camera’ (Rice, 2000: 43). However, the sequence of the three images can easily be examined from a map of the city (see figure 52 below, each blue square marks a photograph taken by Annan for the volume as overlaid on the historical map of central Glasgow). As Rice (2000: 44) has remarked on the Parisian boulevards, ‘the aesthetic order […] could only be grasped on a map’. In addition to the street-level visibility of both steeples, the Glasgow Cross is right at the centre of the photographs taken by Annan. In fact, the photographs, although primarily documenting closes, do so in a pattern that follows the axis of Saltmarket/High Street. With this in mind, Annan’s photographs follow closely the grid plan of the Glasgow Cross.

Figure 52: Partial screenshot of ‘Plate Locations’, National Library of Scotland, 2016, [https://digital.nls.uk/learning/thomas-annan-glasgow/historical-maps/].

Scott (1998) highlights several implications of the formal order of the modern city’s grid urban plan. First, since it is based on the flat perspective of a map, it is detached from the lived experience of the city. A person on the street, in the middle of the grid, cannot easily perceive the ‘larger design of the city’ (Scott, 1998: 57). Moreover, Scott (1998) argues that the formal order is one that is imposed form the outside, since what a state, or
a city council, might see as chaos can, in fact, be part of already existing social and family relations for a person who inhabits the space. Furthermore, formal spatial order brings sanitation, police, commerce, or easier management of crises, both natural and political. The social and lived experience of the space, however, might perceive the same changes as:

‘[…] the absence of a dense street life, the intrusion of hostile authorities, the loss of the spatial irregularities that foster coziness, gathering places for informal recreation, and neighborhood feeling’ (Scott, 1998: 58).

This legibility of the formal spatial order, however, is not a reciprocal one. Most importantly, the gaze that finds such urban spaces legible is the strategic look of the social engineer. The inhabitants of the spaces have little to do with such a strategic gaze, but a lot to do with the street-level, lived experience of the city. Moreover, understood from this perspective, the formal order further facilitates the embourgeoisement of the city by facilitating commerce, and, as Scott (1998) points out, the commercialisation of space itself. Namely, the ‘homogenous, geometrical, uniform property [becomes] a standardized commodity for the market’ (Scott, 1998: 58). Thus, once again showing that the formal spatial order is an abstraction of space that has little to do with the lived dimensions of it.

5.4.2. The Right Way of Reading

A similar example to the discussion of curation and the establishing of a right way of reading in 4.4. The Photograph as a Document - Eugène Atget and the Victoria and Albert Museum can be seen in the case of Thomas Annan’s work. The Mitchell Library houses the City Council public library system, and is associated with the National Library of Scotland (NLS) in Edinburgh. In fact, in the NLS’s digital catalogue there is an entire website that is dedicated to Thomas Annan. The site is pedagogical in its intention
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54 This is not uncommon - for example, Ildefons Cerdà’s ambitious plan for a significant part of unbuilt, green space in the extension of Barcelona in 1854 was eventually disregarded as soon as the prospect of selling the space became viable (Urbano, 2016).
and it affords the viewer an opportunity to explore 18 plates from *The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1968-1871*, read a brief description of Annan’s work and his biography, a map (the one already used in this Chapter with the locations of the plates), and a document consisting of ‘learning activities’ with regards to Annan’s photographs.

The curation here can be read as constructing Annan’s photographs in a twofold manner: 1) as bearing geographical (i.e. cartographical) significance (which has been introduced in section 5.2.2. Analysing the Street), and 2) as an instance of Scottish heritage. First, the photographs are directly mapped out onto an 1850 survey map of Glasgow, thus contributing to a reading of the photographs as representations of the central area of the Glasgow Cross, as a systematic and thorough project, and as images that can be interpreted. For example, the ‘learning activities’ document provides three tasks intended for children under the age of 12. The first task includes a fact sheet of Annan’s life. The second and third task, however, do a considerable amount of work towards constructing Annan’s photographs as objects with important image-content that requires a certain amount of interpretation and contemplation. The second task is about choosing three favourite photographs, and then interviewing a partner with regards to their choice of images. The questions provided are as follows:

1. What important things can you see in my chosen photographs?

2. What adjectives would you use to describe the scene for each photograph?

3. Imagine you are in each of the photographs, what would you feel, smell, see and hear?’ (National Library of Scotland, 2016)

The task prescribes a set of steps in which a semiotic process can be undertaken. First, the task prompts one to identify significant visual elements. However, considering this is the second task, the first task has already contextualised and introduced the work of Annan, effectively setting up a ground on which hermeneutic or semiotic processes can be
built. Second, the task prompts the viewer to describe the photograph, thus building on the identified visual elements and qualifying them in some manner. This, in turn, can be understood either as a semiotic process, where relationships between visual elements are constructed, or, as an affective one, where the viewer is prompted to establish some kind of reaction or relationship with the given images. Finally, the last prompt directly asks the viewer to engage in a process similar to, what in the previous two chapters has been called, a ‘phenomenological hermeneutic’. Namely, a hermeneutic, in which the viewer engages in imagining what the embodied or lived experience of being in the photograph would entail. All three prompts in the second task work towards establishing some kind of affective or interpretive engagement with the photographs – through selection, reading, description, or imagination. The effect of constructing the photographs as documents of pertaining to an indexical reality of some past moment is tied to the notion that the suggested interpretative process has access to that past moment. Furthermore, the emphasised affective dimension to the hermeneutic task can be understood as a strategy for both legitimising one’s interpretation, thereby omitting the third and final task of the ‘learning activities’ document:

‘Choose one of Thomas Annan’s photographs that features one person or a group of people. Write creatively considering the point of view of one of the people featured in the photograph.

Imagine you are that person. What would they think, feel, see, hear, smell, taste? Plan these ideas in note form first.

Then, choose to EITHER [sic] write a diary entry in 1st person narrative from that person’s perspective OR [sic] write the opening for a short story in 3rd person narrative which features that person as your main character.’ (National Library of Scotland, 2016)

The third task further builds on the lived experience of the people captured in the photographs. By inviting reflection, the task prompts the viewer to reflect and engage in a speculative interpretation. In addition to being
pedagogical tools, the tasks outlined here also work as a form of curation of the photographs to a viewer. The tasks do not simply ask the viewer to look at the photograph and to treat them as valuable documents; rather they teach the viewer how to determine the value of the photographs and work towards establishing a hermeneutic based on affect and lived experience. As Stoler (2002: 199) has observed, citing Rosaldo, affective nostalgic engagements with Empire’s ruins are colonial in nature and they consist of ‘a mourning contingent on what colonialism has destroyed’. As established earlier, photographs, archives, and ruins have significant commonalities.

Moreover, such an affective engagement with the past can easily occlude understanding. As it has been noted, this occlusion is a key component of documentary photography. The conception of documentary photography as an ‘ahistorical realm of purely affective expression and experience’ (Sekula, 1999a: 118), albeit naïve, is a prevalent one. As Sekula has defined documentary photography in other places, it tends to be constructed as an aesthetics of ‘compassion and outrage’ rather than collective struggle, where ‘an appreciation of “great art” […] supplants political understanding’ (Sekula, 2016: 67). Furthermore, this affective engagement with the photographs further aestheticizes the photographs, by making them correspond to what Rancière describes as ‘the modern beauty […] of the anonymous multiple’ (Rancière, 2017: 109). The prompts for narration and sensory perception further fit into the appeal of this ‘aesthetic of knowledge’ (Rancière), where each nameless person ‘leaning over something indefinable and whose face, clothing and confused gesture permit a story to be made up’ (Rancière, 2017: 110). Ultimately, the issues pertaining to ‘the anonymous multiple’ (Rancière, 2017: 109) are not resolved, and are reduced to compassionate, yet sentimental, acknowledgement that precludes their actual addressing.

This, in turn, is in stark contrast to the legibility inscribed into the photographs by Annan. For instance, the Steeple serves as the guiding principle through which a viewer can read their position in the city and imagine the place from which a photograph has been taken. Moreover, the cartographic curation of Annan’s photographs also reinforces Gilloch’s claim that ‘[i]n
the museum the past is catalogued and transformed into an object of contemplation, robbed of its power’ (1997: 129). Namely, the lived experience of walking through the city, encountering difference, danger and opportunity (the very contradictions of Modernity – see Berman, 2010) are omitted. Through the Archive’s cataloguing of Annan’s photographs, the street is ‘robbed of its power’ by being rendered as an inert, immobile, and lifeless object of contemplation.

This, in confluence to the cartographic pattern that can be mapped of the series of images, further reinforces the interpretation that the viewer of the documents would be unfamiliar with the area and thus have no lived experience of it. As Nesbit (1998: 403) has commented on Atget’s photographs, ‘a document could not exist alone – it needed a viewer and a task’. Furthermore, Scott (1998) has commented that the abstract logic of the map and its use in urban planning can be understood as one of the modern state’s ‘simplifications’, which aims to make an illegible space legible. This constructed legibility intends a viewer that is not familiar to the physical space and the built environment, and it has tended to be done by an outsider to the place (Scott, 1998: 53-54). As Scott comments (1998: 53), the map’s order was a construction that privileged one type of experience - that of abstracted and impersonal order, rather that of embodied living:

‘The fact that the layout of the city, having developed without any overall design, lacks a consistent geometric logic does not mean that it was at all confusing to its inhabitants. One imagines that many of its cobbled streets were nothing more than surfaced footpaths traced by repeated use’

The slum clearance project in Glasgow that Annan documented was, after all, the successor to the project of Haussmann in Paris. Scott (1998: 55) points out the following ‘[m]ost of the major cities of France were […] the subject of careful military mapping55 (reconnaissances militaires), particularly after
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55 Walter Benjamin (as cited in Weizman, 2007: 185) has already evocatively written on the role of the map and its power for understanding the city: ‘I have long, indeed for years, played with the idea of setting out the sphere of life - bios - graphically on a map. First I envisaged an ordinary map, but now I would incline to a general staff's map of a city centre,
the Revolution’. The only other case that is similar to Haussmann’s scale of urban change in Western Europe is its contemporary project of Eixample [extension] by the engineer Ildefons Cerdà in Barcelona. In both Barcelona and Paris, the modernisation projects were preceded by a large scale urban uprising – the June Days of 1848 in Paris, and the industrial workers’ strike in 1855 in Barcelona (the most industrialised area of Spain at the time). In the cases of projects like Cairo, Brasilia, or Istanbul, the construction of legible space was from its very beginning a means for control (Scott, 1998). As Scott asserts (1998: 55), ‘[o]ther things being equal, the city laid out according to a simple, repetitive logic will be easiest to administer and to police’.

**REDACTED**

Figure 53: (left) Plate 17: Main Street Gorbals looking North, 1868 by Thomas Annan, National Library of Scotland, 2016; (right) Main Street, Gorbals, Looking South, 1868 by Thomas Annan, Museum of Modern Art.

Moreover, this is expressed in the panoptic principle of perspective effect of the boulevard. In addition to understanding Annan’s photographs from the perspective of the map, Annan depicted streets from both perspectives along the perspective of the axis of a boulevard or street. This is another way that Annan’s documentary photographs equate the viewer with the camera. By providing both perspectives (such as in Main Street Gorbals figure 53 above, left – looking north and right – looking south), Annan creates a position of seeing that is occupied by him as a photographer and by the viewer vicariously through the image. Such images point to Annan’s construction not only of a virtual walker to whom no place is barred, but ultimately – a gaze that is panoptic. Affective if such a thing existed. Doubtless it does not, because of the ignorance of the theatre of future wars.'
engagements such as the one prompted by the NLS do little to illuminate this political and strategic aspect of Annan’s – instead, such learning activities work towards the romanticisation of photographs as ruins, something gone, lost, and ultimately other.

5.4.2. Legibility, Curated Seeing, and the Archive

In the case of Annan’s work and its curation in the digital catalogue of the NLS, a paragraph stands out from the rest of the information provided in the brief information on Annan and his photography. Namely, the following:

‘In the absence of proper sanitation and clean drinking water, the population were hit by major outbreaks of cholera in the 1830s and 40s. Typhus and typhoid fever were also major killers of people trapped by poverty in dark and damp housing, breathing in a smog-laden atmosphere and eating an inadequate diet. Annan’s job was simply to photograph the Old Town of Glasgow before it was destroyed forever. He chose to go beyond his remit of creating a record of old buildings for posterity. Like many other religious and relatively wealthy people in Victorian society, Annan probably felt deeply uncomfortable about the huge inequalities in contemporary society and he had a strong urge to help those living in poverty. In the early 1850s he had even contemplated working as a teacher in the poor areas of Glasgow.’ (National Library of Scots, 2016, emphasis added)

The quoted text above demonstrates an important discursive framing of the content of the photographs. The description goes in depth with regards to the terrible conditions in which people lived, but it does so by emphasising an embodied lived experience, rather than an abstract historical one. It appears that the construction of photographs as objects that are to be read as containing information with regards to the conditions of life at the time of their capture is constructed both through narration and the ‘learning activities’ tasks which prompted for reflection. Furthermore, if, following the discussion in Chapter Six, both photographs and the archive
are understood as spaces, then Lefebvre’s comments regarding the reading of space bear relevance. Namely:

‘When codes worked up from literary texts are applied to spaces – to urban spaces, say – we remain, as may easily be shown, on the purely descriptive level. Any attempt to use such codes as a means of deciphering social space must surely reduce that space itself to the status of a message, and the inhabiting of it to the status of a reading. This is to evade both history and practice.’ (Lefebvre, 1991: 7, emphasis in original)

Overall, it appears that the NLS’ curation of Annan’s work, works as a discursive mechanism for constructing Annan’s photographs as documents that are significant in terms of their evocative effects and potential for affective response – ultimately working in an aesthetic framework of compassion, rather than critical understanding. Similarly, the VAM Museum’s online catalogue has been shown to work towards producing an authenticity of reading (in the sense of Lefebvre’s quote above), while simultaneously reducing photographs to codes determined by the institution. Furthermore, the documentary function of the photographs that has been identified in this Chapter seems to be almost completely omitted for the sake of eliciting a reaction to the photographs’ performance of the past.

5.5. Conclusion and Summary

Overall, this chapter has followed in the structure of the preceding Chapter Four on the work of Eugène Atget and Paris. Similarly, this chapter has aimed to address the first research sub-question question of this project:

1) What are the practices involved in the production of a photograph as documentary?

The practices involved have been identified as 1) the construction of the photograph as possessing a documentary function i.e. through the systematic documentation of a particular built environment in the form of
bounded project; 2) the following of aesthetic codifications and their post hoc manipulations through technology; 3) the establishing a logic of cartographic and phenomenological interrelations between the photographs; and 4) the institutional curation of photographs as documents. The first three practices have been understood as complementary, with the exception of the archival production of photographs as documents that are largely deprived of their documentary function.

In order to provide an answer to the research question, this chapter has focused on 50 photographs by Thomas Annan from the special photographic collections of the Mitchell Library in Glasgow. The photographs have been analysed visually by relying on an approach that identifies the visual elements in the images, defines patterns, systemises patterns in explanatory categories (section 5.2.), and determines a number of material practices that produce the images (section 5.3.). Additionally, an analysis based on a ‘phenomenological hermeneutic’ of several images (section 5.2.2.) has been undertaken with the goal of addressing the second research sub-question, namely concerning the urban environment of the photographs’ creation and their interpretation in the Archive:

2) What is the relation between documentary photography and the environment of its creation, storage, and interpretation?

The visual analysis has determined several key categories that account for the bulk of the photographs in terms of their documentary function as a project. First, the project of the Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1868-1871 is setup, in the 1900 edition that has been examined, by an introduction written by William Young. The introduction not only introduces the city of Glasgow, but also prepares the reader through a geographical account that emphasises a lived experience of the city, that matches the City Improvement Trust’s strategic goals. Furthermore, the significance of the built environment as heritage is demarcated, and contrasted with the
City Improvement Trust’s urban planning project, which is understood as ameliorative as well as driven by an upper-class bourgeois ideology.

Second, the aesthetics of the volume are consistent and based around the opposition of closes and streets – both in terms of the evoked lived experience and in its visual representation e.g. through format. The two types of built environment are further coded as interrelated and the viewer of the photographs is provided with various cues that can help one determine the connections. For instance, names of photographs include both street and close that is documented, but also the position from which it is located. Furthermore, the interrelations between the closes and streets have been shown to be encoded in the structure of the volume itself. Throughout the project, the visual contents of Annan’s photographs are largely determined by the urban architecture and the streetscape; as such, it follows the ‘perspectivising effect’ built into the modern city that has been discussed in Chapter Two: Documentary Photography and the City.

By analysing the photographs as material objects with physical qualities, this chapter has identified a set of practices that have been involved in the production of the photographs. Upon the iterative examination of the images, it has emerged that the photographs are both material products of a technologically determined practice and images that can be understood in terms of intended aesthetic qualities.

First, the patterns in which Annan composed his photographs was shown as a significant factor of his practice. It was shown that Annan’s practice is a reflective one and he would plan his photographs prospectively and as a result he had to engage with the environment in which he was creating the photographs. Second, it was shown that Annan’s photographs followed aesthetic codifications in keeping with an intended documentary function. This was clearest when examining Annan’s practices of manipulating prints and adding visual elements to the photographs, or creating composite photographs. Furthermore, Annan followed a set of composing rules on the basis of which he constructed a series of interrelations between the photographs, in terms of the contrasting of the experience of being in that
space, use of format, and use of novel technologies with the purpose of ensuring longevity of the print.

Finally, both the practices involved in making the photographs fulfil a documentary function and those involved in the aesthetic and material production of the images have worked on a higher level of ensuring the documentary project possessing a singular logic based on the urban space it documents. This has been achieved in a twofold manner; first, on the basis of a logic of a formal spatial order reflecting the vertical vision of a map; and second, through street-level seeing the city and simulating an embodied traversal of its central spaces.

The cartographic dimension has been shown to be more than aesthetic, but rather containing the class difference inherent to the project. Namely, that the volume was intended in its initial creation at the very least for a privileged class that has no embodied experience of certain areas of the city of Glasgow that are being documented. Thus, the city is represented in the volume as a legible space that one can see in a strict order and where each image is connected to another that it is physically in proximity. This seeing through a map, according to Scott (1998), further reinforces the claim that the volume is intended for an outsider to the spaces shown.

The phenomenological embodied experience that the photographs perform is complementary to the cartographic dimension. As noted, the viewer of the photographs is not only afforded the experience of a walk through the city, but is also given cues so as to be able to locate their location. Furthermore, this has been shown to be telling of Annan’s engagement with the built environment of the urban space and, what Rice has referred to as ‘the vistas that were supposed to channel the vision of the promeneur as effectively as the lens of a camera’ (Rice, 2000: 43). Ultimately, Annan contributed to constructing a viewer for which the triad of the ‘the perceived, the conceived, and the lived’ aspects of urban space converge (Lefebvre, 1991). This final aspect of Annan’s practice will be discussed in the following Chapter Six.
Chapter Six: The Photographic Production of Space

‘The predominance of visualization [...] serves to conceal repetitiveness. People look, and take sight, take seeing, for life itself’

(Lefebvre, 1991a: 75)

This chapter will focus on the theoretical comparative exploration of the two case studies, Atget and Annan, in relation to urban space, the city of their work, and the Archive. The work of Henri Lefebvre (1991a) will serve as the basis for the structure of the chapter. On the basis of the arguments put forward in the preceding two chapters, I will engage with the spatial dimensions of documentary photography practice that emerged out of the analysis of the photographs. By doing so, I will provide a discussion of the more explicit urban dimensions of the two case studies in a comparative manner. Overall, this chapter will explore the more explicitly urban aspects of documentary photography.

First, I will introduce Lefebvre’s work on spatial analysis. Following this, I will provide a critique of Lefebvre’s treatment of images and photography in his work on space. In this project I argue that Lefebvre’s triad of perceived-conceived-lived space can be applied to the understanding of photography as practice, in general, and as a practice that produces space. Second, I will discuss Lefebvre’s triad by devoting a section on each element of the triad (sections 6.1.1., 6.1.2., and 6.1.3. respectively). While doing so, I will continuously make references to the practices of Atget and Annan as outlined in Chapters Four and Five, respectively. Third, I will provide a discussion of ‘other spaces’, thus effectively problematizing and expanding on Lefebvre’s spatial analysis in order to account for the Archive as context for the production, storage and interpretation of documentary photographs. Similarly to Chapters Four and Five, the tripartite structure of image-materiality-institution can be identified here as well, but defined in an alternative formulation, i.e. Lefebvre’s triad, in order to address the second research question:
What is the relation between documentary photography and the environments of an image’s production, storage, and interpretation?

Furthermore, the potential for the documentary photographic practice of Atget and Annan as a practice of appropriating space will be discussed.

6.1. Spatial Analysis

The influence of urban space, and its built environment, on the production of certain images as documentary photographs has already been noted in Chapter Two. This chapter will acknowledge the importance of interpretation of photographs in relation to space, as well as Lefebvre’s writings on the production of space. Although it can easily be argued that urban space is not always a factor in documentary photography, it has emerged as possessing significant explanatory power in the two case studies examined. The discussion of the city that has been provided so far has drawn considerably on the discourse of modernity, and its emphasis on transparency, panopticism and vision, as much as on the expansion of the state’s power through the creation of a network of institutions (Lefebvre, 1976a; 1976b). This section will build on this understanding and further draw on Henri Lefebvre’s work on the production of space (1991) in order to further build on the findings in Chapters Four and Five.

According to Lefebvre, ‘(social) space is a (social) product’ (1991a). However, this fact is obscured by a double illusion, which has tended to inform understanding of space and anything spatial (see 1991a: 27-30). The first illusion is that of ‘transparency’ – the notion that space is intelligible, and that it gives ‘action free rein’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 27). In such a view of space, ‘everything can be taken in by a glance from that mental eye which illuminates whatever it culminates’ (1991a: 28). The illusion of transparency tends to privilege the Subject and its view on space, its faculty for interpretation, and its ability to deploy itself in the process of creating space (in the sense of design or urban planning). The second illusion is that of ‘realism’, substantiality and opacity. Understood this way, space is full of things which have their own substance, which can be discovered and known; it is things and their material reality that matter rather than the
Subject (Butler, 2012: 59). Lefebvre (1991a: 30) does not claim that one illusion is better than the other, nor that they are opposites, rather ‘each embodies and nourishes the other’ and ‘the shifting back and forth between the two […] are thus just as important as either of the illusions considered in isolation’. Furthermore, these illusions tend to be intimately interwoven with particular subjectivities. As it has been noted, the person on the street might be faced with the everyday opacity of buildings and lack an understanding of the cartographic logic of the city’s formal order, despite having dwelled in it for years. Conversely, the cartographer might lack the everyday knowledge of walking in the city – due to which, perhaps, one becomes capable of rendering the city transparent in line with a formal spatial order. After all, the transparency of public spaces is a characteristic accessible primarily to the state (Scott, 1998; also, see Weizman, 2007) and the police order described by Rancière (2001) – a street is only a street for the inhabitants of the city, but it can be a strategic tool for the police. Thus, Lefebvre’s theoretical lexicon provides conceptual tools that are useful for the expansion of this discussion of documentary photography from the particular towards the general.

For instance, Lefebvre points to one of the issues at the heart of modernity and the city: ‘wherever there is illusion, the optical and visual world plays an integral and integrative, active and passive, part in it’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 97). In order to understand space and its relation to the documentary photography of both Atget and Annan, it is necessary to be aware of this constant shift between treating space and its representations as either intelligible or opaque. In keeping with Lefebvre’s work on space this chapter intends to explore ‘space itself, with a view to uncovering the social relationships embedded in it’ (1991a: 89), rather than enumerating the things and various objects that space contains, thus avoiding the fragmentation of space and cutting it into pieces. By doing so, a more thorough theoretical account of documentary photography’s environments of production, storage, and interpretation will be given.

According to Lefebvre (1991a), in the process of the production of space, there is a triad at play. Namely, this is the triad of spatial practice, representations of space, and spaces of representation (or
representational spaces). This new triad that Lefebvre proposes, is an understanding of space as something being produced and done so through the perceived, the conceived, and the lived spaces, respectively. As Zhang points out (2006), Lefebvre’s triad is not one of slicing space apart into three parts, but of understanding it in terms of ‘the three moments of social space’ (1991a: 40), where a moment, according to Elden, is ‘the attempt to achieve the total realization of a possibility’ (2004: 172). The ‘possibility’ here being that of the totality of the city, or, in photographic terms, a documentary photography project. An understanding of Lefebvre’s triad that fragments space according to their logic might be able to explain ‘the interactions among the three elements’, but by doing so would also simultaneously be quantifying space in a positivist manner (Zhang, 2006: 221). In order to avoid this line of thinking and engage with all ‘three moments’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 40), this section will discuss the triad as a way of understanding the totality of space, in the case of both case studies – urban space. This will be done through the contextualisation of Lefebvre’s work to the case studies of Atget’s photographs of Paris and Annan’s photographs of Glasgow. Furthermore, the photographers’ work will provide a way to ground the theory, since the triad of the perceived-conceived-lived ‘loses all its force if it is treated as an abstract model’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 40).

By positing the problem of space in terms of this particular triad, Lefebvre works towards moving away from the older, modernist triad of ‘readability-visibility-intelligibility’ in which ‘many errors [and] many lies’ have their root (Lefebvre, 1991a: 96). Between these two positions, according to Lefebvre, is photography – and this project argues documentary photography especially – since it is concerned primarily with the production of readable, intelligible, visual documents (as it has been argued in sections 4.4. The Photograph as a Document - Eugène Atget and the Victoria and Albert Museum and 5.4. Institutional Curation – Thomas Annan and the Mitchell Library). Photography56 is present in Lefebvre’s writings (see 1991a: 92-93; 96).

56 Interestingly, Lefebvre (1991a:4) cites Lenin making a relevant comparison: ‘Lenin resolved this problem by brutally suppressing it: in Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, he argues that the thought of space reflects objective space, like a copy or photograph’.
96-97; 372; 1991b: 32), but mostly in passing, and often when using the term photography, Lefebvre mostly means photographs.

In his view, ‘images fragment; they are themselves fragments of space’ (1991a: 96-97). Even more than that, Lefebvre (1991a: 96-97) considers photography to be an ‘incriminated “medium”’ (1991a: 96) - obfuscatory, falsely reifying of space, and full of errors and illusions. For him, images do not expose any ‘errors concerning space’, and they are ‘likely to secrete [any error or illusion] and reinforce it than to reveal it’ (ibid: 96). There is a violence inherent to images in Lefebvre’s description (ibid: 96-97):

‘Cutting things up and rearranging them, decoupage and montage - these are the alpha and omega of the art of image-making. As for error and illusion, they reside already in the artist’s eye and gaze, in the photographer’s lens, in the draftsman’s pencil and on his blank sheet of paper. Error insinuates itself into the very objects that the artist discerns, as into the sets of objects that he selects’.

In Lefebvre’s view (1991: 96-97; also, see Tormey, 2013), an image (i.e. a photograph) ‘fetishizes abstraction and imposes it as the norm’57. Images supposedly detach the ‘pure’, according to Lefebvre (1991a: 96-97), form of space from its ‘impure’ contents - ‘from lived time, everyday time, and from bodies with their opacity and solidity, their warmth, their life and their death’ (ibid: 96-97). This ‘cutting things up’ is problematic according to Lefebvre, because, for him, photography remains representational and mimetic in its essence (1991a: 376):

‘Mimesis has its role and function in this domination of space: imitation and its corollaries; analogy, and impressions to a greater or lesser degree informed by analogy; resemblances and dissimilarities; metaphor (substitution of one term for
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57 As Tormey observes (2013: 91): ‘Lefebvre doubts that photographs can expose the real problems that are represented by the appearance of specific places, and says, for example, that because photographs fragment space, they are more likely to reinforce illusion than reveal underlying practical realities.’
another) and metonymy (use of a part to refer to the whole).

This has already been demonstrated in this project in relation to documentary photography. Atget’s ‘making strange’ of Paris relied heavily on metonymy in its documentation of ornaments, partial elements, or unusual views. This way, Atget used signs of the space, analogical images through repetition, the emphasis of resemblances, etc. Annan, on the other hand, seemed to have relied on metaphoric construction of his photographs – he would emphasise dissimilarities between streets and closes, and make use of substitutive signs such as streets becoming a public space of gathered people and closes becoming private interiors covered in laundered linen and children playing. Sekula (2016) has already commented on the centrality of metonymy and metaphor in documentary photography (see section 2.1. Documentary Photography).

For Lefebvre (1991a: 376), however, this mimetic quality of photography and images is at the core of substituting space with an abstract, fetishized version of it. Namely:

‘[…] mimesis makes it possible to establish an abstract ‘spatiality’ as a coherent system that is partly artificial and partly real. Nature is imitated, for example, but only seemingly reproduced: what are produced are the signs of nature or of the natural realm - a tree, perhaps, or a shrub, or merely the image of a tree, or a photograph of one. In this way nature is effectively replaced by powerful and destructive abstractions […] Mimesis, on the other hand, pitches its tent in an artificial world, the world of the visual where what can be seen has absolute priority, and there simulates primary nature, immediacy, and the reality of the body.’

Lefebvre’s example of nature, and the production of its signs, is relevant in the practice of documentary photography in the city as well. Are the photographs taken by Atget or Annan of streets, closes, or boulevards merely signs of the city or of the urban realm? Lefebvre himself appears to
offer an answer to this question, despite neglecting to follow it through in its implication when it comes to photography. For instance, Lefebvre (1991a: 92) describes his own approach of spatial analysis as a kind of critique that needs ‘to rip aside appearances which have nothing particularly mendacious about them’. To illustrate this, he uses the image of ‘a house, and a street, for example’ (ibid: 92-93):

Now, a critical analysis would doubtless destroy the appearance of solidity of this house, stripping it, as it were, of its concrete slabs and its thin non-load-bearing walls, which are really glorified screens, and uncovering a very different picture. In the light of this imaginary analysis, our house would emerge as permeated from every direction by streams of energy which run in and out of it by every imaginable route: water, gas, electricity, telephone lines, radio and television signals, and so on. Its image of immobility would then be replaced by an image of a complex of mobilities, a nexus of in and out conduits. By depicting this convergence of waves and currents, this new image, much more accurately than any drawing or photograph, would at the same time disclose the fact that this piece of ‘immovable property’ is actually a two-faceted machine analogous to an active body: at once a machine calling for massive energy supplies, and an information-based machine with low energy requirements. The occupants of the house perceive, receive and manipulate the energies which the house itself consumes on a massive scale (for the lift, kitchen, bathroom, etc.)’ (emphasis added)

In the above quote, with regards to photography, Lefebvre commits the same mistake he accuses existing work on space that tends to reify it or merely enumerate its contents. Namely, he reifies photography in the form of ‘the photograph’ thereby omitting the practices that constitute it and produce it. If ‘(social) space is a (social) product’ (1991a), then documentary photography surely is as well. Furthermore, when he argues
that photography is simply an image, he treats it as an image of space i.e. a representation (in his view a mimetic one). This way, he posits an ontological difference between an image and space; a difference that he criticizes in a parallel example of the falsity of treating ‘a house, or a street, for example’ (1991a: 92-93) as an immobile object contained in space. If, following Lefebvre, one applies a truly Lefebvrean perspective on photography, then an image, just like a street or a house, should be treated as ‘a complex of mobilities, a nexus of in and out conduits’ that is itself ‘analogous to an active body’ (1991a: 92-93) – something that Edwards has already discussed as the ‘social biography’ of a photograph. Moreover, as Chapter Two has argued, photography does more than only represent mimetically (either through metaphor or metonymy) the city, but is actually interwoven with it. Perhaps, the mistake here is that Lefebvre assumes photography occurs in space, where one should be paying attention to the photographic production of space. As it has already been argued theoretically in Chapter Two, in the same manner that the panoptic is not merely a prison model, the photographic is not only a camera-based principle of visibility – it can just as easily be applied to the production of the city, thereby making a boulevard a product of photographic practice. It is this ‘transcendence of “the limits of the image”’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 97) that this chapter will discuss below. Namely the photographic production of space through Atget’s and Annan’s photography and their subsequent archiving.

6.1.1. Spatial Practice

The first element of the triad, ‘spatial practice,’ is defined by Lefebvre as that which ‘ensures continuity and some degree of cohesion’ in space (1991a: 33). It produces space as it simultaneously appropriates it. Moreover, a society’s spatial practice is ‘revealed through the deciphering of its space’ (1991a: 38). According to Lefebvre (1991a: 50), ‘in spatial practice, the reproduction of social relations is predominant’. Spatial practice is what is perceived and material (1991a: 38); as such, it can easily be linked to the illusion of opacity. If understood as a perspective, the conceptualisation of spatial practice is able to speak to issues of the everyday. For instance, an example of ‘modern’ spatial practice can be
‘the daily life of a tenant in a government-subsidized high-rise housing project’ (1991a: 38) as much as that same person’s interaction with, and reliance on, a public transport network.

In terms of Atget’s and Annan’s work, photography has already been implicated as a form of spatial practice. This can be seen in Atget’s ‘interminable perambulations throughout Paris and its outskirts’ (Valentin, 1928: 20) as much as Annan’s preparatory visits and studies of the space with the purpose of composing an image (Stevenson, 2017). Both photographers practiced in the urban environment of their respective cities, as well as both of them produced their photographs on the basis of the existing spatial relations and practices – be it the perspectivising effect of a boulevard or close, or the cartographic and topographic logic of a map. Moreover, both photographers have been shown to engage in practices of observation of and walking in the city (see Tormey, 2013: 92; De Certeau, 1988), as visible in their photographs. Put this way, a large part of the discussions in Chapters Four (see Chapter Four: Eugène Atget’s Paris) and Five (see Chapter Five: Thomas Annan’s Glasgow) have been about the ‘deciphering of [a photographic practice’s] space’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 38). In other words, the documentary photography of Atget and Annan is a practice that produces space as it appropriates it. The spatial practice of photography that has been described is concerned with those aspects of the everyday that ‘propound’ and ‘presuppose’ space (Lefebvre, 1991a), or its most material aspects (Zhang, 2006) i.e. its built environment, as well as its ‘overlooked details’. As Elden points out (2004: 184), for Lefebvre the term production should be understood from a Marxist perspective in terms of a combination of material and mental processes – as ‘broader than the economic production of things (stressed by Marx) and [including] the production of society, knowledge and institutions’.

On another level, spatial practice is the element of Lefebvre’s triad that is concerned with perception and perceived space. An important example of this, according to Lefebvre (1991a: 99), is the façade:

‘A façade admits certain acts to the realm of what is visible, whether they occur on the façade itself (on balconies,
window ledges, etc.) or are to be seen from the façade (processions in the street, for example). Many other acts, by contrast, it condemns to obscenity: these occur behind the façade.’

From this perspective, Atget’s photographs too can be understood as telling of the spatial practices that presuppose and propound the ornaments, railings, and balconies in his photographs, as well as their eventual transformation into archival categories (see section 4.2.2. Analysing a Photograph). Perception, being based on visibility, is inevitably a process of demarcation and boundaries, and ultimately difference. Certain things remain seen while others are made to appear invisible. The linen in Annan’s photographs is just as telling of spatial practice as a building’s façade is – it demarcates the ‘interior’ of the close, its distance, if not physical then semiotic (or, in Lefebvre’s terms, perceived-conceived-lived), from the street or the public square. Annan’s photographs have notably not included the interior of the dwellings he photographed. Lefebvre’s concept of spatial practice proves explanatory here - the closes themselves, as foreign places to the outsider’s gaze, appear as an interior of sorts – a space that the outsider and their gaze has already entered into. Understood this way, Annan’s photographs seem to reflect the notion of ‘spatial practice’ in their phenomenological aspect, where a gaze is equated to physical presence. Namely, through the emphasis of the encounter of the photograph as more than an aesthetic image, but as a space inhabited by people. This is further reinforced by: the quantity of light; the portrait format’s emphasis on the lack of space in the closes; or contrasted with the blur of the moving crowd on the main street. It is this way that Annan constructs a viewer of (a walker, as much as an observer) the city. Through the depiction of the closes as this type of ‘interior’, or façade, that ‘admits certain acts to the realm of what is visible’ inside it or ‘are to be seen from’ it (Lefebvre, 1991a: 99), the close is produced as a container, something that is full of people, but also something that can be emptied of people. To draw on Rancière once again, the photographs of the closes seem to be political in the manner that they distribute the sensible (2011).
It is only a partial view to consider a photograph as the product solely of a spatial practice, or as a purely visual, transparent object of an opaque environment. Lefebvre (1991a: 143) has warned of the danger that comes with this illusion, since what is perceived must first be conceived. As much as the lamppost, the bench, or the boulevard are material and can be perceived, their function is largely dictated by an abstract logic that is omitted through the illusion of transparency. However, before exploring this abstract logic further, the manner in which it is made manifest in perceived space merits exploration.

**Figures 54**: (from left to right) Shop front, Au Soleil d’Or, 84 Rue St Saveur, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900; Grille of a shop window, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900; Shop front, Quai Bourbon, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900.

The façade, as an example of the perceived space of a city, is central to the photographic work of Atget (see figure 54 above). It has already been noted in Chapter Three, that Haussmann’s restructuring of the city of Paris to a great extent included the construction of uniform façades (Moses, 1942: 61; Pinon, 2002). A key element of this is repetition – the repetition of discourse as well as that of spaces. As Lefebvre notes (1991a: 75-76), spaces, but façades especially so, ‘are made with the visible in mind: the visibility of people and things, of spaces and of whatever is contained by them’; one can think of Atget’s numerous shopfronts as well as Annan’s open streets with their endless linear perspective. However, this is done through a dual logic: phenomenological on a street-level and cartographic on the level of abstract conception. This can be seen in the interplay between the illusions of transparency and opacity, which have been addressed so far through the discussion of the panoptic principle of construction of the city. The abstract logic of a city, its syntax, is evident on the level of the map, but it still requires the panoptic principle of legibility.
and transparency on street-level to justify its existence. As Milgrom points out (2008: 269), the ‘harmony and social integration’ in living spaces have often manifested in ‘the similarity of the accommodation provided for residents in particular neighborhoods’ and ‘difference is tolerated only insofar as it fits within the overall vision of the designer’. This accommodation of similarity and difference, in turn, is at the core of segregation (see Peach, 1996).

Figure 55: (from left to right) Doorway, Musee de Cluny, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900; Doorway, Musee de Cluny, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900; Doorway, Church of St Paul, Paris, France by Eugène Atget, Victoria and Albert Museum, ca.1900.

Atget’s photographs of Paris show this very repetitiveness of space in more than their depiction of façades. For instance, Atget’s work includes the repetitions of urban forms such as doorways (see figure 55 above) and churches (see figure 56 below). Both examples demonstrate the repetitive form of composition that Atget utilised for a particular urban element or streetscape. However, the difference between the two types reveals the effect of repetition. First, the photographs of doorways are characteristic of what Tagg refers to as ‘straight photography’ or ‘the hypothetical “brute photo (frontal and clean)”’ (Tagg, 1988: 160-161). Any variation or difference in this type of photo is in the subject matter, rather than a product of the photographer’s choice. The second type, however, although similarly consistent in Atget’s photographic work as a whole, reveals a different function of repetitious spaces. Since the façade admits ‘certain acts to the realm of what is visible […] and] other acts, by contrast, it condemns to obscenity’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 99), the perspective that
documents the façade is central to the function of the repetitive, uniform façade. As Lefebvre notes (1991a: 273):

‘Façade and perspective went hand in hand. Perspective established the line of façades and organized the decorations, designs and mouldings that covered their surfaces. It also drew on the alignment of façades to create its horizons and vanishing-points’

Furthermore, the photography of Atget has been shown as central to the depiction of the lived experience of everyday life in the city of Paris, even if done so through strange perspectives in juxtaposition to small ‘overlooked details’ and the ‘inconspicuous surface-level expressions’ of the city (Kracauer, 1995: 75). This aspect of Atget’s work results in a depiction of different ways of experiencing the city – either through the façade and perspective of the boulevard, or through the fragmentary, the overlooked, and the partial. Meyer (2008: 154), drawing on Lefebvre’s work, asserts that a space consists of rhythms and the ‘interaction(s) of these varied rhythms, the repetitive and the alternating, make up, as it is said, the animation of the street or the quarter’. These rhythms can be understood photographically through the alternation between macro and micro, the partial and the whole, and the continuous use of the illusions of either opacity or transparency. The presence of advertisements, posters, and placards in Atget’s and Annan’s photos also point to another form of experience of space that is intimately tied to the visual and to perception. Moreover, according to Kipfer (2008: 199), everyday life and the reproduction of capitalism are ‘saturated by the routinized, repetitive, familiar daily practices that make up the everyday in all spheres of life: work, leisure, politics, language, family life, cultural production’. Understood this way, the repetition of practices is in a dialectical relationship to repetitive spaces.

As Gilloch asserts (2002: 178), ‘[f]or Benjamin, Atget’s images are, above all, those of repetition and reproducibility, of object and settings left by humans as traces of their existence’ (emphasis added). This reproducibility is a levelling out of the city on a perceptual level, which has as its centre Atget’s
aim to ensure ‘that the viewer directly confronts the unembellished countenance of the object world’ (Gilloch, 2002: 179). As Kipfer et al. point out (2008: 4), ‘the commodity fetish establishes itself through the worship of the marginally new but structurally repetitive’. Furthermore, Atget’s repetitious perspectives (for example, of churches – see below, figure 56) serve to reinforce a ‘phenomenological hermeneutic’ (Buck-Morss, 1989: 3) not only of ‘the object world’ (Gilloch, 2002: 179), but of the very act of seeing in the city and its production.

In addition to this, it has been noted that Atget’s Paris is a surreal space (Walker, 2002). As such, it is ‘a dismembered city that can be understood only in paratactic terms, in patterns of substitutions, of repetitions’ (Nadal-Melsió, 2008: 160). As Vidler has pointed out, repetition is present all throughout the city of Paris – a ‘bench in the Faubourg Saint Antoine was the same as that in the Champs-Élysée’ (Vidler, 2011: 100). This repetition has a dual function, according to Lefebvre. On one hand, repetition is central to the formation of identity and his notion of isotopy i.e. ‘places of identity, identical places’ (Lefebvre, 2003: 128). In another place, Lefebvre goes so far as to oppose ‘repetition vs difference’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 129) at the expense of the more typical philosophical formulation of identity vs difference. On the other hand:

‘[t]he predominance of visualization [...] serves to conceal repetitiveness. People look, and take sight, take seeing, for life itself’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 75).

This dual function, elaborated here, points to a duality of production and understanding. First, repetition is utilised in the production of space with the purpose of producing a particular identity opposed to a difference. Second, the produced repetition is used to obscure differences. If photographs were merely observed, rather than critiqued or analysed, it would appear that they are images and, as Lefebvre described a house (from the example discussed above in section 6.1. Spatial Analysis) - ‘the epitome of immovability, with its concrete[ness] and its stark, cold and rigid outlines’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 92). In other words, Lefebvre’s mistake regarding photography is only treating it as a practice
that is only concerned with what is already visible, rather than a practice of making things visible.

6.1.2. Representations of Space

However, the elements of space that are perceived and which Lefebvre describes as ‘spatial practice’ are not able to speak to space as a totality. That is why Lefebvre adds the notion of ‘conceptualized space’ or representation of space, which is tied to ‘the relations of production and to the “order” which those relations impose, to signs, to codes’ (1991a: 33). In this element of the triad, conception is at the centre. For the most part, representation of space is linked to urbanism, to planning, and to design. It is here also, that what is lived and what is perceived is identified with what is conceived. The abstract representation of space is made to rule over the details of lived experience, or the perceived demarcations and boundaries of a material environment. In specific terms, representations of space can be exemplified by the city map with its urban grid just as much as the built environment itself or the perspectivising effect of the boulevard.

As much as the representation of space in Paris is about a panoptic city, in which threat and security, autonomy and danger are managed by a complex of institutions either making up or associated with the state, it is also about the synoptic experience of detail – where an ornament from a bench in one area of the city is identifiable in a lamppost somewhere else. Kracauer (1995: 77) describes this ornamental gaze as follows:
‘The ornament resembles *aerial photographs* of landscapes and cities in that it does not emerge out of the interior of the given conditions, but rather appears above them. Actors likewise never grasp the stage setting in its totality, yet they consciously take part in its construction’ (emphasis in original).

The representation of space in Glasgow is both similar and different to Paris; for instance, the major difference of the scale of the urban demolition and reconstruction is quite telling. Namely, it is Glasgow’s migrant, recently urbanised, working-class, and labour-dependent population that is deprived of its own space on the basis of a formal spatial order. The representation of space conceived in the case of Glasgow is not necessarily one of amelioration, but of control and order, their implementation and construction. The fact of the unsuitability of the space for habitation does not negate this, but only reinforces control further by reducing the space’s inhabitants as mere content in a container, as objects on which the state can act. As Lefebvre has noted (1991a), products of representations of space tend to be symbolic and thus reductive in their abstraction.

A key element of this process, according to Lefebvre (1976), is the production of centrality, since ‘*[t]*o say “urban space” is to say centre and centrality’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 101). Namely, ‘*[s]*tate capitalism and the state in general need the “town” as centre (centre of decision-making, wealth, information, of the organisation of space)’ (Lefebvre, 1976: 17). This centrality is generated through a strategic logic that consists of a discourse of growth (of finance, space, knowledge, etc) and the construction of a bureaucratic, institutional rationality as its necessary manager:

The centre organises what is around it, arranging and hierarchizing the peripheries. Those who occupy the centre and hold power, govern with the benefit of effective knowledge and principles. The centre-periphery relation only emerges indirectly, out of the previous struggles of classes and peoples. It gives birth to apparatuses which
seem rational and coherent, and which were so, originally.

[...] The centre attracts those elements which constitute it
(commodities, capital, information, etc), but which soon
saturate it. It excludes those elements which it dominates
(the “governed”, “subjects” and “objects”) but which
threaten it.’ (Lefebvre, 1976: 17-18)

Understood this way, space is something that is actively produced by the
‘expanded state complex’ (Tagg, 1988), in which photography has found
itself enmeshed since its very beginning. However, a key issue is ‘the
question of controlling centrality [as much as] that of centrality becoming
an instrument of control’ (Stanek, 2011: 76).

Centrality is one example of the direct way that photography contributes
to the production of space. Both Atget’s and Annan’s photographs
reinforce Lefebvre’s claim regarding the city and its reliance on a complex
logic of centrality – both city as centre, and the centre of the city. In both
case studies, the majority of what emerged significant to the city has been
in relation to the central areas of Paris and Glasgow. A key locus of each
project has been the grande croisée of Paris, envisioned by Haussmann,
and the Great Cross of Glasgow. Furthermore, both photographers
documented, to much less scholarly regard (especially in the case of
Annan), the outskirts and peripheries of the two cities. Atget documented
the Zone (see figure 57 below), the peripheral area of Paris, to which the
majority of people deprived of housing by Haussmann had to relocate.
Additionally, Atget also documented spaces such as Versailles and its parks
and gardens (see figure 57 below, right). Versailles is a clear example of the
centralisation of absolute power through architecture and planning.
According to Lefebvre (1991a: 233), the bourgeoisie is the only class that
has ‘given its buildings a single, over-obvious meaning, impoverished,
deprived of reality’ – that of ‘abstract wealth and brutal domination’.
Annan documented the houses of the Glasgow bourgeoisie in a volume called *The Old Country-houses of the Glasgow Gentry* (see figure 58 below), consisting of about 100 photos – each fitting more or less to the aesthetic and technological practices defined so far, with the exception of each having a name in-frame on the print. The photographs are, for the most part, devoid of people and are accompanied by accounts of the patrilineal patriarchal history of a given family and its relation to the city; at times, the physical distance to the city is given explicitly. Both Atget’s and Annan’s example of urban periphery illustrate the logic of what Lefebvre describes as *heterotopy*, or a space of difference (2003). A heterotopy can be described by exclusion, often ‘marked by [a city’s] ramparts as well as the transition to suburban areas’ (Lefebvre, 2003: 11); it is also political:

‘Like the people who are responsible for and inhabit them, these places are at the outset excluded from the political city: caravansaries, fairgrounds, suburbs.’ (Lefebvre, 2003: 6)
The construction of the logic of centrality in relation to the modern city is evident in both examples cited above. On one hand, Atget’s photographs contrastingly evoke the edge of Paris and its splendours, the lack of cafes, ornaments, and even permanent construction. On the other hand, Annan’s photographs demonstrate the grandeur of the Glasgow gentry, including an introduction by William Buchanan that praises the privileged class for its contribution to the growth of the city. As such, both photographers’ works not only reinforce the class privilege of the viewer of the photographs, but also reinforce the centrality of the city as existing, reified and real. As Lefebvre notes (1976), centrality carries with itself a dialectical opposite – periphery. Furthermore, Schmid (2012) argues that centrality should not be understood as possessing a ‘concrete content,’ i.e. as the monuments and urban planning that make up a city, but as ‘the possibility of an encounter’ (Schmid, 2012: 48). This interpretation will be further addressed in the following section (6.1.3. Spaces of Representation).

In both Paris and Glasgow the city map is, as a representation of the city, a conception of space according to an abstract and strategic logic based on signs, codes, and messages – boulevards, closes, addresses, façades, etc – not unlike Kracauer’s description of the function of ‘aerial photographs’ (Kracauer, 1995: 77). Understood this way, the conception of the cities as maps prior to the urban changes exercises a power over the very people occupying the spaces about to be demolished. The map becomes a mechanism of conceiving space, as much as producing space, in which, through metonymy, the built environment is equated with the whole of the space (including the social space of relations, interactions,
etc). Ultimately, this results in the omission of the space’s inhabitants. The urban project of Glasgow becomes a project of controlling a particular demographic, this way constructing the population into an object of knowledge for photography (as well as the archive, the state, and so on), but also constructing it as a group that should be documented, since it can be policed (in the richest sense of the word possible). Having been turned into an object of knowledge, they have been appropriated into a particular ‘distribution of the sensible’ (Rancière, 2011) in which they are deprived of the validity of their lived experience, and thus of any possible politics (in the sense of the term put forward by Rancière, 1992; 2001; 2004; 2005; 2011; 2017). As Scott (1998) has noted, the formal spatial order of the map does not reflect at all the social experience in the urban space. The conceived, as much as it enforces itself onto the perceived and the lived, remains separate, abstract, and detached from them. Nevertheless, representations of space still have a practical impact, they ‘intervene and modify spatial textures which are informed by effective knowledge and ideology’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 42, emphasis in original). As Lefebvre further adds (1991a: 42), this intervention occurs through construction – an example of this being architecture – but not in the sense of a single structure, but ‘as a project embedded in a spatial context and a texture which call for “representations” that will not vanish into the symbolic or imaginary realms’. Put simply, representations of spaces can also be understood as pertaining to the practices of production of knowledge about space (Schmid as cited in Stanek, 2011: 129). Put in terms relevant to documentary photography, Atget’s and Annan’s photographs can be understood as products of evidence and witness. Even when representations of space become more concrete than a map, they nevertheless retain a coherency based on what Scott (1998) refers to as a ‘state simplification’. Put in Lefebvre’s terms, the conceived space relies on a logic of repetitiveness that is evident in perceived space. However, this can be deceiving, since:

‘The predominance of visualization [...] serves to conceal repetitiveness. People look, and take sight, take seeing, for life itself’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 75-76, emphasis added)
Repetition then becomes a problem, since it does not say much beyond enumerating the signs of the city – its streets, closes, pissoirs, benches, boulevards, or doorways. This is where the abstract logic of the formal spatial order of the state or the homogenizing logic - of stamps, volumes, and labels - of the archive comes to structure the elements repeated throughout the photographs or the city. This way, space is produced through photography, the same way that the map and its logic of the grid facilitated the parcelling out of space in a commercial manner, photography allowed space to extend itself into the visual and the visible in an unprecedented manner. Elden (2013: 326) refers to this as ‘a calculative grasp of the material world, what Lefebvre calls abstract notions of space, or indeed abstract space’, eventually resulting in a concept of territory, which:

‘[...]can be understood as the political counterpart to this notion of calculating space, and can therefore be thought of as the extension of the state’s power’ (Elden, 2013: 322, emphasis in original)

As Elden further adds, citing Corner, ‘space only becomes territory through acts of bounding and making visible’ (Corner as cited in Elden, 2013: 326). Lefebvre (1991a: 147) describes this in terms of the manner in which ‘the visual space of transparency and readability has a content – a content that it is designed to conceal’, where ‘[p]roduced, occupied space becomes the point of the reproducible, of the perfect repetitive’ (Lefebvre, 1976: 32). Ultimately, the repetitious spaces of the city are produced as a manifestation of an abstract logic that can only be ‘passively experienced’ through its signs, codes, and messages – boulevards, closes, addresses, facades, etc (Lefebvre, 1991: 39) – something that both Annan and Atget point to in their photography.

In Rancière’s terms, this repetition is central to:

‘symbolising the community as an ensemble of well-defined parts, places and functions, and of the properties and capabilities linked to them, all of which presupposes a fixed distribution of things into common and private – a distinction
which itself depends on an ordered distribution of the visible
and the invisible, noise and speech, etc’ (Rancière, 2004: 6)

In other words - a distribution of the sensible (Rancière, 2011) that is central to
determining what is to be seen and what to remain unseen, what is message and
what is interpreted as noise. Namely, the repetitive is
coded as identity and as message, where the different
is understood as noise and disturbance – just as urban
graffiti are discarded from one’s vision as visual noise
(see figure 59, right). The example of graffiti is telling,
since it raises the questions of
meaning in relation to intention, and more explicitly – whose intention is
considered as meaningful or worthwhile.

This interplay between repetition and difference can be understood as a
‘form of symbolising the common [on the basis of] the principle of
distribution and completeness that leaves no space for a supplement’ that
Rancière refers to as ‘the police’ (2004: 6). The Archive operates on this very
logic in its use of stamps, labels, and museum numbers. How is a stamp
different from graffiti? Mainly, in the agency and the legitimacy, or lack
thereof, ascribed to each. In the case of Annan’s volume of The Old
Country Houses of the Glasgow Gentry, numerous corrections in spelling,
dates/years, or references to particular persons were found. The fact that
the volume is a document (even more so, a historical one) has not stopped
someone from adjusting its meaning. This practice of adjustment has
already been shown in relation to both Atget (see section 4.3.1.1. Format)
and Annan (see section 5.3.1.2. Manipulation and Adjustment). Such
practices of adjustment and manipulation point to the fact that these documents are producing knowledge and meaning, rather than that they are documents merely containing knowledge and meaning. Through the act of adjustment, the right to the meaning of the document is expressed in the right to produce knowledge. Namely, both photographers reveal that they do not treat a photograph as a static object, or simply a container of elements. Rather, both treat a photograph as a tool that extends beyond its immediate context and as a product of a practice that is understood as ongoing.

In the Archive, through abstraction from the former use or context of production, a photograph is made into a document. This way photographs, once abstracted from their original context, become homogenous, repetitive objects whose meaning is located outside of them in the ‘bounded arena of shared expectations’ that is discourse (Sekula, 2016). As described by Gilloch, ‘in the museum the past is catalogued and transformed into an object of contemplation, robbed of its power’ (1997: 129). Ultimately, the photograph becomes legible, but only passively so, through the mediation of signs, codes, and messages produced by the Archive. The relevance or meaning of these signs, codes, and messages depends on the ‘ordered distribution of the visible and the invisible, noise and speech’ (Rancière, 2004: 6), or, in Lefebvre’s terms, the already ‘conceptualized space’ (1991: 33). By becoming an inert container of such signs, the photograph becomes similar to a ruin (Stoler, 2008) that is deprived of all aspects of lived experience. For example, one can take a photograph of a staircase (see figure 60), but without the Archival inscription it remains only that. Through the Archive (The Victoria and Albert Museum, 2017), one can find out that it is a photograph of a staircase located in Hôtel Le Charron ou de Vitry, on the Île Saint-Louis and built in 1637-40 (Ministère Français de
la Culture, n.d.). However, this too leaves out the meaning of the space – who lived in it, why, when, etc?

6.1.3. Spaces of Representation

If the perceived and the conceptualised aspects of the triad can be understood as more or less the poles of a spectrum – the material and the ideal – then the final aspect is that of the lived. It is the space occupied between the poles that is determined to a large extent by both material and abstract dimensions of space. According to Lefebvre (1991a: 33), ‘representation spaces’ embody complex symbolisms and are ‘space as directly lived through its associated images and symbols, and hence the space of “inhabitants” and “users”’ (1991a: 39). Furthermore, this aspect of space is ‘the dominated’ and ‘passively experienced’ – ‘which the imagination seeks to change and appropriate’ (1991a: 39).

Both Stanek (2011) and Milgrom (2008) cite Lefebvre’s work in relation to Pessac, a suburb in Bordeaux to illustrate this. Originally designed by Le Corbusier, Pessac consisted of uniform façades, stripped down of decoration – clearly indicative of the abstract conception of houses as ‘machines for living’ typical for Le Corbusier’s ‘urban surgery’ (Le Corbusier, 1986: 4) – as clear an example of abstract conceptions of space (i.e. representations of space) as Haussmann’s own work. However, the inhabitants of the newly constructed spaces of Pessac went against the architect’s plan. As Lefebvre reports (as cited in Milgrom, 2008: 275), the inhabitants added a number of ‘decorative elements’:

‘Instead of installing themselves in their containers, instead of adapting to them and living in them “passively,” they decided that as far as possible they were going to live “actively.” In doing so they showed what living in a house really is: an activity. They took what had been offered to them and worked it, converted it, added to it. […] They built a differentiated social cluster.’

The final aspect of the triad is an important one, since it bridges both the material and the abstract by emphasising a more phenomenological dimension of subjective experience. As Roberts (2010: 139) points out, one
of the chief merits of Lefebvre’s work is its grounding in ‘discussion of space as a problem of power – of access, of autonomy and relationality – and not as a question of [only] hermeneutics or poetics’. As Schmid (as cited in Stanek, 2011: 129) points out, if perceived space is about material production and conceived space is about the production of knowledge, then lived space is about the production of meaning. Stanek describes lived space as consisting of the ‘everyday practices of appropriation’ (2011: xii) and links it to Lefebvre’s concept of dwelling, which can be described as:

‘For an individual, for a group, to inhabit is to appropriate something. Not in the sense of possessing it, but as making it an oeuvre, making it one’s own, marking it, modeling it, shaping it. This is the case with individuals and with small groups like families, and it is also true for big social groups that inhabit a city or a region. To inhabit is to appropriate space, in the midst of constraints, that is to say, to be in a conflict—often acute—between the constraining powers and the forces of appropriation’ (Lefebvre as cited in Stanek, 2011: 87, emphasis added)

This points to an understanding of Lefebvre’s representational spaces as spaces that involve something being added, shaped, increased, or expanded – very much like the adjustments that Atget and Annan did on their photographs. That is to say, appropriating space is a continuous activity, and it is primarily an activity that has an effect. Moreover, this understanding of appropriated space as an activity (just like the example of living in a house provided by Lefebvre as cited in Milgrom, 2008: 275), is diametrically opposed to ‘dominated space’. The domination of space is ‘the realization of a master’s project,’ often ‘transformed by technology,’ and results in a ‘closed, sterilized, emptied out’ form (Lefebvre as cited in

58 In Lefebvre’s sense oeuvre has the connotation of a work (see Lefebvre, 1991a: 73): ‘Consider the case of a city - a space which is fashioned, shaped and invested by social activities during a finite historical period. Is this city a work or a product? Take Venice, for instance. If we define works as unique, original and primordial, as occupying a space yet associated with a particular time, a time of maturity between rise and decline, then Venice can only be described as a work.’
Stanek, 2011: 87). It is this tension that most aptly characterises the two case studies discussed in Chapter Four and Chapter Five. Both photographers were operating in what is essentially the ‘dominated space’ of the modern city with its logic of transparency, legibility, and policed order of the sensible. However, since Lefebvre’s triad is not about fragmenting space into three parts, but understanding their overlap, it must also be examined whether the photography of Atget and Annan can be related to a practice of appropriating space – as it has been shown to be complementary to both spatial practice and representations of space.

On a superficial level, as the façades of Le Corbusier’s buildings in Pessac were manipulated through the addition of ‘decorative elements’ (Stanek, 2011), so were a large number of photographs in both Atget’s and Annan’s work. In this simple sense, the surface of the image was manipulated, marked, and shaped, and thus appropriated by the photographer. The indexical event is not what has the final say on what the image ends up being; or, put differently - the perceived, material space is not the sole determining factor in what the photograph included. Atget adjusted the frames of his image, effectively omitting certain elements and emphasising others. Annan did similarly, when creating composite photographs by adding clouds from other negatives, or adjusting the whiteness of the linen in the closes. It has been shown how these practices had to do with aesthetics. As Kracauer has commented, ‘[t]he aesthetic value of photographs would in a measure seem to be a function of their explorative powers’ (Kracauer, 1960: 22) - and one might add, particularly so - as documents.

On a different level, it has been shown how through the documentation of the particular, the overlooked, and the emphasis of the strange, Atget worked towards the documentation of the character of the city itself. Moreover, Atget’s work operates pedagogically, by showing the city while simultaneously changing what is perceived and how it is perceived. To quote Kracauer, ‘[w]here masses of stone and streets converge […] an urban image arises that has never been the subject of any interest’ (Kracauer as cited in Reeh, 2004: 110). Atget’s photography actively and consciously produced ‘urban images’ of this kind. By showing the small, the
particular and the overlooked, Atget managed to show something about the manner in which one lives in the documented space. As Fraser (1968: 205) has noted, it is these type of photographs that show Atget’s dedication to a project of documenting the city ‘as a place in which one moves around, consumes things, seeks mental refreshment, and rest’. Despite Atget’s photographs being ‘unpeopled,’ his work captures the elements of the city ‘as they impinged on someone actually living […] in an ordinary daily way’ (Fraser, 1968: 204-205). Kracauer has added that it is such a view of the city that affords a perspective which does not take away agency from people’s everyday life in the city (Kracauer as cited in Frisby, 2013: 138) that, in Foucault’s terms (2008), is left untouched by the sorting gaze of the panopticon and the total institution.

In Annan’s case, the phenomenological hermeneutic has demonstrated a cartographic, abstract logic of the city that is embodied by the bourgeois, the social engineer, the archivist, and the privileged. Yet Annan’s photographs also work towards documenting the city, as well as constructing a way of seeing it. This way of seeing is not purely visible; it is constructed through an adherence to aesthetics and a use of technology. Furthermore, Annan’s work demonstrates how photography itself and its logic of making things visible and transparent can be a form of ‘opening up’ the city, making it more transparent by turning it into an object of knowledge; a process that is only one channel of the panoptic mechanisms of power. In addition, Annan’s work demonstrates the importance of the lived dimension of space. This is most evident in the aesthetic contrasts utilized in his work in order to establish difference between closes and streets. Additionally, it is also expressed in the virtual walk constructed by Annan’s arrangement of photographs and visual documentation of landmarks that ultimately results in a phenomenological equating of the gaze of the viewer of the photograph with the photographer’s presence on the street.

These examples pose a tension. On the one hand, both Atget and Annan actively and consciously appropriate the city, change how it is viewed, teach how to experience it, and as a result of that have the potential to affect the viewer of the images and subsequently the experience of and in
the city. On the other hand, both were involved in the discourse of documentary photography and its construction of a relationship based on privilege and otherness that operates through visibility, discrimination, control and exclusion. It is this tension that Lefebvre describes as representational spaces, or lived space (1991a). It is here that dominated space, both as material space and its abstract logic, clashes with the people inhabiting it who - in order to live in it – must either passively accept it or appropriate the space and make it their own. Thus, as much as photographers’ work is largely determined by the perceived space, i.e. the material built environment, as well as the abstract conceptions of space, photography can also be a form of appropriating space and making transparent both space itself and the practices that produce it.

If, as Harvey asserts (2008), Lefebvre’s ‘right to the city’ is about the ‘material and immaterial resources of the city’ (Schmid, 2012: 45), it is at the core of any practice of appropriating space. Even more so, Schmid (ibid) asserts that Lefebvre himself amended the term several times and shifted the focus to ‘the right to centrality’ (Lefebvre, 2003: 194), ‘the right to difference’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 64) and even ‘the right to space’ itself (Lefebvre as cited in Schmid, 2012: 49).

‘Abstract space,’ i.e. the notion of space, has its roots in conceived space and is integral to ideology, but it also manifests itself materially since ‘what we call ideology only achieves consistency by intervening in social space and its production, and by thus taking on body therein’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 44, emphasis added). Moreover, the idea of space as something to be made transparent (or documented, made visible, etc) is something already produced (Lefebvre, 1991a) – ‘a space cannot be perceived without having been first conceived in the mind’ (Schmid, 2012: 51). Understood this way, the notion of the photographic city is not only about the influence that space exerts over documentary photography, but also about the influence that documentary photography exerts on conceptions of space, before the spaces have been even produced. In other words, photography should be understood as a practice that produces and reproduces space. As it has been shown, it is important to note that:
‘there is a total subject which acts continually to maintain and reproduce its own conditions of existence, namely the state (along with its foundation in specific social classes and fractions of classes). We also forget that there is a total object, namely absolute political space – that strategic [conceived] space which seeks to impose itself as reality despite the fact that it is an abstraction, albeit one endowed with enormous power because it is the locus and medium of Power.’ (Lefebvre, 1991: 94, emphasis added)

In contrast to this ‘absolute space’ of capitalist and state forces, practices and institutions, Lefebvre defines a ‘differential space’ (1991a); or as Schmid frames the opposition: domination and self-determined appropriation, centre and periphery, privilege and exclusion (Schmid, 2012: 56-57), as well as isotopy and heterotopy (Lefebvre, 2003). The space in which Lefebvre leaves room for appropriation, but which is at the same time to a large extent at the mercy of the material and the abstract, is that of representational spaces. This is so because representational spaces are about signification – about pointing to something beyond space. Namely, the subjective experience of space (Schmid, 2012). A representational space can be a phallic monument as a signifier of patriarchal entrenchment of power, as much as it can be a scribbled graffiti over a monument.

Understood this way, the tension at play in representational spaces is the very same in the practice of photography. The photographic oeuvres of both Atget and Annan have been shown to be determined largely by both the material environment and the abstract conception of the city as legible, transparent, and panoptic. However, the tension of class privilege shown in the analysis of a single photograph in Chapter Four and the phenomenological analysis of an embodied class perspective in the analysis in Chapter Five demonstrate that both photographic practice and photograph are at the centre of this tension between domination and self-determination. Atget’s work clearly demonstrated a new, albeit strange, reading of space thereby appropriating the material environment and going directly against the abstract logic of the boulevard by both revealing
and challenging the legibility of the city. By making the city foreign and
canny, Atget actively inhabited the space and changed it. Annan,
however, demonstrated the centrality of the document in mediating urban
planning and human experience. It may be argued that Annan’s
photographs are forceful in their directedness to a particular viewer – one
that already exists, when in Atget’s case the viewer was in the process of
being created.

However, Annan’s photographs allow for the hermeneutic of a code of
urban space just as much as Atget’s work. The contrast of centre and
periphery, privileged and objectified is even more evident. Understood this
way, both photographers are engaged in politics in the sense of Rancière’s
use of the term (1992). Namely, both intervene in the visible order
established by the ‘police’ of the status quo (2001: n.p.), allow for the
appearance of a subject i.e. the worker, the poor, the immigrant (2001:
n.p.), and ‘the introduction of previously uncounted objects and subjects’
(Rancière, 2004: 7). On a literal level as well, the photographs of both Atget
and Annan are forms of appropriating space since they serve as proof of
the palimpsest nature of urban space (Huyssen, 2003). The buildings and
closes although physically gone or in a state of ruin can still stand as
photographs, and thus can be part of a fight against the illusions of opacity
and transparency. Moreover, the photographs reveal urban space itself to
be mutable and changing, since they capture it both now and in its past
forms. Appropriation of space should not necessarily be successful. It is,
according to Lefebvre (as cited in Stanek, 2011: 87), occurring at the centre
of a conflict between powers that seek to constrain and forces that seek
to appropriate. Understood this way, both Atget and Annan appear to be
working at the centre of this tension and conflict.

Moreover, by building on Lefebvre’s spatial work this way, documentary
photography can become a means for the construction of a code of
urban space, or ‘a language common to practice and theory, as also to
inhabitants, architects and scientists’ (1991a: 64). A key task for which
would be to ‘recapture the unity of dissociated elements, breaking down
such barriers as that between private and public, and identifying both
confluences and oppositions in space that are [otherwise] indiscernible’
(Lefebvre, 1991a: 64) in very much the same way that Annan captured the
oppositions between closes and streets while simultaneously breaking
down the symbolic (or metaphoric) distance between them in order to
demonstrate the interrelations between their differences. Similarly, Atget
showed the unpeopled city only to allow for a deeper understanding of its
life, changes, and differences. Moreover, Atget’s photographs of interiors
demonstrated the bourgeois retreat from the new urban space and its
‘reciprocity of gaze, of human interactions and relationships’ (Gilloch, 1997:
79) that took over the street.

Lefebvre argues that this code, or language, ought to be interwoven with
practice as well as ‘the changes wrought by practice’ (1991a: 64). As
Sekula has argued, documentary photography tends to rely on metonymy
(2016). It does so, since metonymic identification links the part with the
whole, thereby allowing a reading of the partial element in terms of its
adherence to a visual logic, where an example could be ‘the recognition
by occupants that their living space is embedded within a wider social
network.’ (Butler, 2012: 60). However, Lefebvre himself has noted (1991a:
96):

‘we are concerned with practical and social activities which
are supposed to embody and ‘show’ the truth, but which
actually comminute space and ‘show’ nothing besides the
deceptive fragments thus produced. The claim is that space
can be shown by means of space itself. Such a procedure
(also known as tautology) uses and abuses a familiar
technique that is indeed as easy to abuse as it is to use -
namely, a shift from the part to the whole: metonymy.’

However, representational spaces are, as is documentary photography,
‘embodying complex symbolisms’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 33), which ‘relate the
individual to the community by producing a bond grounded in experience
and in history’ (Stanek, 2011: 131). Shapiro (1988: 126) also asserts that a
photograph is capable of affecting in such a way ‘the viewer, [so that their]
interpretive codes are challenged, [and one] is inclined to reflect upon
[their] status or place within the social order’. Because of this,
‘photography […] must be read within a politicized reading practice, one which situates the images in order to discern their complicity with prevailing power and authority as well as their challenges’ (Shapiro, 1988: 131).

Moreover, a photograph should be seen as ‘a complex of mobilities, a nexus of in and out conduits’ that is itself ‘analogous to an active body’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 92-93). Simply taking a photograph to be an act of communication is an omission of its context of production, storage and reinterpretation, and potential for appropriation. As Rancière argues (2001):

‘This is precisely why politics cannot be identified with the model of communicative action since this model presupposes the partners in communicative exchange to be preconstituted, and that the discursive forms of exchange imply a speech community whose constraint is always explicable. In contrast, the particular feature of political dissensus is that the partners are no more constituted than is the object or the very scene of discussion. The ones making visible the fact that they belong to a shared world the other does not see -- cannot take advantage of - the logic implicit to a pragmatics of communication’ (n.p., emphasis added)

One needs to only think of the waiter in Atget’s L’homme arme or the faceless crowds of Glasgow’s streets in Annans’ photographs to see Rancière’s point regarding the pre-constituted ontological difference between social groups in terms of politics. That is why it is important to note that the potential for identifying the police order (Rancière, 2001) in a given photograph is only one result of the tension at play, just as self-determined appropriation is only a potential alternative to ‘passive[ly] experienced’ space (Lefebvre, 1991a: 39). As Rockhill summarises Rancière’s position, ‘art is not, in and of itself, an act of political subjectivization’ (Rockhill, 2009: 200).

It is similar in the case of the focus of this project: the classed character of documentary photography and its adherence to the interplay of the illusions of transparency and opacity leaves photographs ‘docile’ (Barthes,
2001: 43). This docility, in turn, can be either taken up by the Archive and its power to abstract a photograph from its production, use, and intention, or appropriated by those being excluded by the archive. As Sekula (1999b: 446) has observed, this brings a caveat since ‘the archival perspective is closer to that of the capitalist, the professional positivist, the bureaucrat and the engineer – not to mention the connoisseur – than it is to that of the working class’. However, in exactly the types of photographs that have been shown in this project, and particularly those that have been analysed on their own in some depth, a different perspective can be found. Namely:

‘The images show traces of lives lived while refusing to interpret them. The sheer attentiveness with which each scene is presented suggests meaning, but the viewer or reader is left to determine what that meaning might be. The pensive image emancipates the visual from “the unifying logic of the action” […]’, says Rancière. Human places without humans in them, rich portraits of awkward unknown people, […] — these are moments of metonymy in which the viewer is invited, not simply to infer the ways that images extend the experiences they display, but also to be stretched and shaped by the forms that such extensions have taken.’ (Hollinshead-Strick, 2017: 95)

Despite the lack of a fixed meaning of a photograph, even when ‘its significance recedes, even as the faces become, one by one, unrecognizable’ (Gilloch, 2015: 35), the photograph tends to persist. Yet, the photograph, through a ‘phenomenological hermeneutic’ in conjunction with the Lefebvre-informed spatial analysis demonstrated in this chapter, affords ‘the possibility of an encounter’ of difference (Schmid, 2012: 48). This ‘breakdown’ of the existing order and hegemonic interpretation, in turn, allows for the reconstitution of the photographs as ‘a new space’ (Hollinshead-Strick, 2017: 93) that allows for a heterological interpretation though an emphasis of difference in the past in order to acknowledge difference in the present.
6.2. On the Archive and ‘Other Spaces’

With regards to heterology, in the preface to his influential ‘Order of Things’ (1989), Foucault refers to a short story by Borges titled ‘The Analytical Language of John Wilkins’, in which a curious encyclopaedia is mentioned. It is described as follows:

‘animals are divided into: (a) belonging to the Emperor, (b) embalmed, (c) tame, (d) sucking pigs, (e) sirens, (f) fabulous, (g) stray dogs, (h) included in the present classification, (i) frenzied, (j) innumerable, (k) drawn with a very fine camelhair brush, (l) et cetera, (m) having just broken the water pitcher, (n) that from a long way off look like flies’ (Borges as cited in Foucault, 1989: xvi)

According to Foucault, this taxonomy reveals a carefully produced order that ‘localizes [the] powers of contagion’ of each category. This, in turn, brings about the problem of the heteroclite, or the abnormal – that which is inevitably placed outside each category of the list and occupies ‘the empty space, the interstitial blanks separating all these entities from one another’ (Foucault, 1989: xvii, emphasis in original). It is these empty spaces, understood in the wider frame of spatial analysis provided in the last chapter, that necessitate for a consideration of ‘other spaces’, or heterotopias. Particularly, it is important to make note of archives as this type of ‘other spaces’. Famously, Foucault has written on the notion of heterotopia (1986; 1989) as ‘a space that is absolutely central to a culture but in which the relations between elements of a culture are suspended, neutralized, or reversed’ (Lord, 2006: 1). Among its key examples of gardens, prisons, and military barracks, Foucault (1986: 26) touches on the museum as well:

‘[T]here are heterotopias of indefinitely accumulating time, for example museums and libraries. Museums and libraries have become heterotopias in which time never stops building up and topping its own summit’

It has been noted (see Lord, 2006: 6-7) that the Museum, despite being an institution that relied on fixed values, is capable of incorporating critique
and reflection on those very values. However, the Archive remains characteristically fixed in its assumption of impartiality. Topinka (2010: 60) further adds to the discussion of heterotopias that they ‘reconstitute knowledge, presenting a view of its structural formation that might not otherwise be visible’. Foucault himself describes such spaces as akin to mirrors, allowing a reflection which ‘reconstitutes our own visibility, presenting us an alternative view of who we are’ (Topinka, 2010: 60). According to Bosteels (2003: 120), the concept of heterotopias allows for ‘a peculiar standpoint from where to write a critique of modernity derived from an immanent yet disturbing relation to the here and now’.

The archive has a significant role in the practice of documentary photography. Sekula goes so far as to claim that ‘archival ambitions and procedures are intrinsic to photographic practice’ (Sekula, 1999b: 444). However, this begs the question of what exactly are these ‘archival ambitions and procedures’ to which Sekula alludes. On one hand, the archive relies on a logic of universality, standardisation, and homogenisation (Sekula, 1992; 1999; Edwards, 2009a; Tagg, 1988). Since the meanings of photographs are ‘context determined’ (Sekula, 2016: 4), then it appears that the context of the archive is one of a simplification and a stripping down of meaning. This, however, consists of both negative and positive mechanisms – meaning from the photograph’s original context is subtracted, while a new, archival meaning is added onto it. It has been argued that in the archive, ‘the possibility of meaning is “liberated” from the actual contingencies of use’ thus resulting in ‘abstraction from the complexity and richness of use’ (Sekula, 1999b: 444, emphasis in original). Tagg similarly makes the point that the archive is the site where photographs are most at the mercy of ‘significant distortions’ (Tagg, 1988: 2). Similarly, Edwards has argued that ‘the ordering of the archive was itself premised on homogenizing ideas of historical significance’ (Edwards, 2009a: 142). This, in turn, has led to a reduction of ‘all possible sights to a

---

59 ‘This points to a problem: the museum is ‘progressive’– progressing out of Enlightenment values of universal truth and reason – because it can critique those values, and yet it cannot perform this progressive critique without relying on the Enlightenment values at the basis of that notion’ (Lord, 2006: 3)
single code of equivalence [which is] grounded in the metrical accuracy of the camera' (Sekula, 1992: 352).

It has been noted that both Atget’s and Annan’s work fit into the frame of a singular project; Atget is reported to have gone so far as to claim that he possessed the entirety of Paris through his photographs (Guichardet, 1999). This notion of the project, rather than the single image (Solomon-Godeau, 1991) is connected to the conception of vision as knowledge - or put otherwise - of photographs as evidence of ‘proximity to and verification of an original event’ (Sekula, 1999b: 447, emphasis in original). It is this process that Edwards (2009a: 138) has referred to as the ‘historical desire’ embedded in the archive, and its ‘concern with the loss of the potential of photographs to provide historical evidence’. Furthermore, Edwards defines this concern as an ‘entropic anxiety’ (2016: 138-141), or ‘a battle against forces that were relentlessly and increasingly perceived as random and disordered [as well as] against cultural and material disappearance’ (Edwards, 2009a: 138). As Adorno has evocatively remarked, the ‘museum and mausoleum are connected by more than phonetic association’ (Adorno 1981: 175). Kracauer has also compared the figure of the historian to Orpheus, claiming that one ‘must descend into the nether world to bring the dead back to life’ (Kracauer, 1969: 79), a statement reminiscent of Benjamin’s claim that in the high-stake game of history and class struggle ‘even the dead will not be safe from the enemy if he [sic] wins’ (Benjamin, 1968: 255).

This growing ‘entropic anxiety’ of modernity that Edwards describes has led to a preoccupation with the document, the archival, and the historic – all of which has proliferated in the discourses of evidence and transparency. It is not only that everything should be documented so as it is not lost to entropy, but also that everything is pliable to become a document, to fit ‘a single code of equivalence’ that is determined by the archive. As Foucault (2002: 7) has argued:

‘...history now organizes the document, divides it up, distributes it, orders it, arranges it in levels, establishes series, distinguishes between what is relevant and what is not,'
discovers elements, defines unities, describes relations. The
document, then, is no longer for history an inert material
through which it tries to reconstitute what [people] have done
or said, the events of which only the trace remains; history is
now trying to define within the documentary material itself
unities, totalities, series, relations.’

The notion that the document does not possess the meaning of the
historical event brings its own issues. Namely, this leads to a hegemony of
an interpretive perspective that is located in the archive as ‘a structure
[which maintains] a hidden connection between knowledge and power’
(Sekula, 1999b: 447). This is because ‘at any stage of photographic
production the apparatus of selection and interpretation is liable to render
itself invisible’ (Sekula, 1999b: 446), effectively making the archive appear
transparent, neutral, and capable of invoking the past. Moreover, Foucault
(1989) emphasises the archive’s ability to produce order even from
disparate elements. It does so by ‘cutting’ (Foucault, 1977: 154) and
abstracting a photograph from its former ‘context of use’ and production
(Sekula, 1999b). The Archive thus becomes an other space ‘in which things
are juxtaposed: herbariums, collections, gardens […] stripped of all
commentary’ (Foucault, 1989: 142), yet bound by an abstract logic and
order (as discussed in section 6.1.2. Representations of Space). This way the
Archive presents itself as the last and true form of knowledge of its stripped
and cut open objects of collection – it is only necessary to have:

‘creatures present themselves one beside another, their
surfaces visible, grouped according to their common features,
and thus already virtually analysed, and bearers of nothing but
their own individual names’ (Foucault 1989: 142-143)

In the Archive, then, it is only necessary to have the image and the title of
‘Staircase, Hotel le Charron, Paris, France’, taken by Eugène Atget ca.1900.
This presentation of a final product is done through a mechanism that is
‘liable to render itself invisible’ and transparent (Sekula, 1999b: 446). For
instance, it has been argued that the manner in which the Archive has
treated photographs has been one of ruination, where urban space is
conceptualized as transparent representation of the past – of railings, of ironwork, of buit environment – while omitting both the social reality and the lived experience of those spaces. This logic of transparency, as it has been shown in Chapter Two: Documentary Photography and the City in relation to urban space, as well as in Chapter Four: Eugène Atget’s Paris and Chapter Five: Thomas Annan’s Glasgow in relation to social class in documentary photographs, is one based on ‘a discriminatory, not inherent, sense of order’ (Bhabha, 1994: 155-156). The transparency of the cities of Paris and Glasgow has been shown as a type of formal spatial order that is only legible to outsiders, the privileged, and the powerful – for example, as demonstrated through the discussion of the map in relation to Annan’s work. The Archive is this other space, outside of the spaces and practices discussed so far (see section 6.1. Spatial Analysis). Understood this way, any transparency will inevitably privilege a particular viewer who belongs to that other space and who is capable of ‘extracting a certain kind of technical information’ from it – exactly the way that a viewer of a document does:

‘by [...] extracting a certain kind of technical information from the picture [archive] and by the picture’s [archive’s] ability to display just that technical sign. Both were needed for the document to become a document.’ (Nesbit, 1998: 403)

Thus, transparency and legibility are accessible only to those who read maps and aerial photographs, rather than those who live in the documented spaces. Just as it has been shown that the newly transparent city constructs new types of places in order to avoid the reciprocity of interactions and gazes, the logic of panopticism and transparency also lacks reciprocity.

6.2.1. On ‘Other Spaces’

Heterotopias are not simply spaces of difference, but also spaces that allow difference. In a response to Foucault’s concept, Lefebvre has conceptualised heterotopy (2003: 6) as ‘the other place, the place of the other, simultaneously excluded and interwoven’ (Lefebvre, 2003: 128) in opposition to isotopy – ‘places of identity, identical places’ (Lefebvre, 2003:
Furthermore, ‘isotopy and heterotopy clash everywhere and always, engendering an elsewhere’ (Lefebvre, 2003: 172). This elsewhere can be understood as a utopia, a non-place, or, an imagined place. It is an idea recalling Lefebvre’s term of ‘the right to difference’, as well as Rancière’s argument that ‘[t]he logic of emancipation is a heterology’ (Rancière, 1992: 59, emphasis added). It is this clash of a dominant identity (isotopy) with another (heretopy) that creates difference. Such encounters allow for the formation of a political subjectivity that is ‘the formation of a [subject] that is not a self but is the relation of a self to an other’ (Rancière, 1992: 60).

Understood this way, archives are not only spaces in which the ‘interstitial blanks’ in a given order of things are made sense of. Rather, archives should be understood as spaces that allow for this very process of difference, heterology, and formation of political subjectivity. Archives can be an ‘imperial formation’ (Stoler, 2008), as much as ‘relief and ruin’ (Ecchevaria as cited in Stoler, 2002), or the literal ‘residence of the magistrate’ (Stoler, 2009: 50). This section has argued that the Archive tends to render its role in mediation transparent and neutral, and the problems that this brings. Namely, it has been demonstrated that the Archive is as much ‘the site, the mute ground upon which it is possible for entities to be juxtaposed’ as a ‘vanishing trick that is masked’ (Foucault, 1989: xviii). Derrida too (as cited in Stoler, 2009: 50) has remarked that the Archive is ‘that which commands, shelters, and conceals itself as it gathers together signs’. Put simply, since the archive hides the interpretive practices at its core, it must itself be interpreted as an active agent in shaping its system of order.

Furthermore, in order to bridge isotopies and heterotopy, Lefebvre has made the point that neutral spaces are required such as ‘crossroads, thoroughfares, places that are not so much nothing as indifferent (neutral)’
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60 Rancière provides a political example of this – the brutal slaughter of Algerians by the French government in the 1960s, where France’s Left, unable to identify with either the government or the Algerian Other, was forced to create a new political subjectivity for itself elsewhere (see Toscano, 2018).

61 Stoler (2002: 99) cites Ranajit Guha, for whom ‘colonial documents were rhetorical sleights of hand that erased the facts of subjugation, reclassified petty crime as political subversion, or simply effaced the colonized’ (emphasis added).
(Lefebvre, 2003: 128) or ‘intersection (intersection of streets and paths),
garden, park’ (Lefebvre, 2003: 38). Due to the dualistic nature of identity
and difference, centre and periphery, and isotopy and heterotopy, the
neutral also can be seen in a twofold manner. Lefebvre likens the street to
‘an incision-suture’ (Lefebvre, 2003:37) of ‘juxtaposed places’ (Lefebvre,
2003: 38), due to the manner in which a street both separates or cuts
through spaces and connects them. Neutral spaces ‘make the
“elsewhere” sensible, visible, and legible, intercalated in urban time and
place’ (Lefebvre, 2003: 131). Moreover, as Barthes notes, the neutral is ‘that
which outplays […] the paradigm, or [it is] everything that baffles the
paradigm’ (Barthes, 2005: 6), indicating that the street, as code, is its own
place and non-place simultaneously.

Following this logic, a documentary photograph is exactly this type of
neutral space. That is not to say that the photograph is not always inscribed
with ideology or trapped in a discourse. Rather, it is always at the centre of
the tension between appropriation (in Lefebvre’s sense, 1991),
emancipation (in Rancière’s sense, 1992), and domination (Lefebvre, 1991)
and the established order (Rancière, 1992). A documentary photograph is
a juxtaposed space; this has already been demonstrated. Annan’s
photographs have been shown to open up the spaces of the numerous
closes, seemingly cutting through them like a street, as much as suture
spaces together and allow for reflection on their interconnections. Through
a material hermeneutic of objects making up the urban image, such as
lampposts, the suturing of closes and streets has been shown. Similarly, the
phenomenological street-level documentation can be understood as a
strategy for suturing together the abstract logic of the city map onto the
experience of the street. Atget’s photographs have been shown to play
with this dualism of the ‘incision-suture’ by simultaneously cutting up pieces
of the city in order to sew them back together in a new constellation of
elements. The minute and overlooked details, themselves cut up pieces
of the city, functioned as interstices of the perspective of the boulevard and
the totality of the identifiable building. Similarly, the strange vistas and
surreal parataxis worked as sutured-on layers onto the everyday
experience of the city, a continuous making strange of the familiar.
At the core of both photographers, as well as the centre of the incision-suture, is interpretation. It is on this logic that the space of The Archive functions. As Lord (2006: 5) argues:

‘What every museum [or archive] displays, in one form or other, is the difference inherent in interpretation. Interpretation is the relation between things and the words used to describe them, and this relation always involves a gap’

These gaps, or neutral spaces, are the very logic, on which an institution such as the Archive constructs its own assumed neutrality and objectivity. As Foucault (1977: 154) asserts, echoing Nietzsche, ‘knowledge is not made for understanding; it is made for cutting’ in very much the same way as one must be aware of ‘the empty space, the interstitial blanks’ (Foucault, 1989: xvii) that have been cut into any ordered system. These cuts, or a paraaxis of a kind, have been shown in the incision-sutures of Atget’s and Annan’s photographs, whereby the fragmented and the repetitive – such as the ornament, the doorway, the façade, or the Tron Steeple – reflect a total order of the space that is the city. This is clearly evoked in a telling paragraph from Foucault’s ‘The Order of Things’ (1989: 142):

‘The documents of this new history are not other words, texts or records, but unencumbered spaces in which things are juxtaposed’ (emphasis added)

However, this is not enough. The juxtaposition of disparate entities only serves to obscure the process that brought them together. At the core of this, at each stage, is the process of interpretation. Chapter Four and Chapter Five have already argued the importance of interpretation in curatorial practices of two institutions, while this section has showed the manner in which the Archives make themselves transparent in the process of mediating knowledge, thereby obfuscating the political significance of knowledge.

6.3. Conclusion and Summary
This chapter has aimed to address the first research sub-question question of this project, namely:
1) What are the practices involved in the construction of a photograph as documentary?

The practices involved have been identified as 1) the spatial practice of engaging with the perceived space of the city; 2) the representation of space; and 3) the tensions of interpretation of a photograph.

In order to provide an answer to this question, this chapter concerned itself with the work of Henri Lefebvre on space and its parallel to the documentary practices of Atget and Annan. Furthermore, this part of the chapter worked towards providing an answer to the second sub-question:

2) What is the relation between documentary photography and the environments of an image’s production, storage, and interpretation?

It has been demonstrated that documentary photography is not merely reflective of the material environment of the city, nor only reflective of an abstract intention, it is a practice engaged with representation and entailing ‘the possibility of an encounter’ of difference (Schmid, 2012: 48). It is interwoven with ‘what the phenomenology of the urban experience identifies as [the city’s] essential feature: the unforeseeable, the surprise, the spontaneous' (Stanek, 2011: 105). As such, documentary photography carries with itself the opportunity for self-determined appropriation of the city.

If one attempts to adapt Lefebvre’s spatial analysis to documentary photography, the production of photography can be broken down into a triad of its own. In photographic practice, the photographer is concerned with material production - technology, aesthetics, and content that determine the photograph both in terms of image-content and material qualities – ultimately, what is perceived. Following this, institutional curation is concerned with what can be said about the photograph, by whom, and to what purpose – with the production of knowledge - in other terms, the conception of the photograph as document and its ‘abstraction from the complexity and richness of use’ (Sekula, 1999b: 444, emphasis in original).
Finally, the interpretation of documentary photographs can be understood as the production of meaning – what can be appropriated from the photograph, to what can one exercise one’s ‘right to difference’ – or otherwise understood as the site in which a code of understanding space through ‘a language common to practice and theory, as also to inhabitants, architects and scientists’ can be made possible (Lefebvre, 1991a: 64). However, the danger of the Archive’s hegemony has also been noted with regards to a photograph’s meaning.

As Chapters Four and Five have demonstrated, the analysis of documentary photography is capable of unveiling photography’s constituent practices. Chapter Six has, however, demonstrated that documentary photography is a practice enmeshed in space, and, as such, it can be understood, similarly to space itself, as being at the mercy of state and capitalist forces (exemplified through the Archive and its monopoly of ownership, both material and in terms of legibility). That being said, the absolute space of this abstract logic of a given society’s mode of production can always be and should be challenged (Lefebvre, 1991).

In Chapters Four and Five it was established that the photographic practices of Atget and Annan relied on the documentary function of the photographs, an adherence to established aesthetic codifications, and a reflective use of technology. On the basis of this, the current chapter has expanded a broader context in which images are produced as documentary photographs. This chapter has focused on Lefebvre’s theoretical work on space as an object of inquiry, rather than a container of such objects. According to Lefebvre, space is produced, and this can be understood through a triad of spatial practice, representations of space, and spaces of representation, which can be spatially translated into the triad of perceived, conceived, and lived space. Findings from both case studies were related to each element of the triad.

First, the photography of both Atget and Annan was shown to have engaged closely with the built environment of the city, and thus with what Lefebvre terms the perceived, material space (1991a). It is at this site, to follow Rose’s terminology (2007) that the material production of
photographs is at stake. This, in turn, is largely reflective of the existing city: the narrow closes lacking light, the overlooked ornaments, the wide axes of the boulevards, the shopfronts, lampposts, etc. Second, these same material elements of the city can be seen to reveal the abstract logic of the city. As it has been noted by Vidler (1993; 2011), Paris at the time of Atget was a fully legible city. Similarly, Annan’s construction of the folio volume of *The Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow, 1868-1871* by adhering to a cartographic logic further emphasised what Lefebvre describes as conceived, abstract space. Understood this way, the photographs are not merely of material elements of the city, but of codes, signs, and messages.

Third, Lefebvre’s concept of representational spaces was used in order to reflect on interpretive practices of photographs. A comparison was made between practices of actively inhabiting space and thereby appropriating it with the practice of documentary photography. Namely, just as space can be at the centre of tensions between dominating forces and attempts at resisting through self-determination, so can documentary photographs – they can adhere to the prevalent position of privileging the already privileged classes, or can allow for the encounter of difference and the opportunity for ‘the recognition by occupants that their living space is embedded within a wider social network’ (Butler, 2012: 60), and ultimately political understanding. Additionally, a brief discussion of the Archive as an other space has been given in order to account for its role in the conception of space, as well as the interpretation of images.

Finally, it has been demonstrated that the environments of creation, storage, and interpretation of documentary photography make up their own triad. This triad can be understood as mutually complementary forces and tensions, alternatively described as the different practices of material production, production of knowledge, and production of meaning. Respectively, each can be made to respond to the site of the photographer and their practice, the site of the institution, and the site of the image itself expressed through its dual potential either for reinforcing the established order or self-determination.
Chapter Seven: Conclusion

This research project has argued in favour of an understanding of documentary photography that is interwoven with considerations of the modern city (including urban planning, architecture, and everyday life) and the archive (the institution, the ‘historic desire’ for preservation, and the construction of authenticity and historicity). On one hand, it has been argued that documentary photography originated at a time in which the city was made to align with ideas of transparency, order, and vision. This has also been shown to be related to the subject of documentary photography, as evident in the two case studies. On the other hand, it has been argued that the Archive has contributed to the production of documentary photographs as aesthetic images, deprived of political significance.

The intersection of these three domains has been found in the notion of the photographic city, in which a panoptic principle guides an aesthetic regime of visibility, history, and truth that is based on unobstructed vision – both physical, conceptual, and as exercise of power. The city, the photograph, and the archive have been shown to be equally at the service of this panopticism, effectively resulting in the production of a practice of documentary photography. It is in the problem domain that the class relations of the city, the practices of knowledge production and power of the archive, and the scopic regime of photography converge, all the while complementing each other, in a unique manner. It has been shown how the city adopted photography’s vision for its urban planning, how the archive drew its power from the changes in the city and its power structures, and how documentary photography emerged as the instrument of both institution and state.

This final chapter will provide the conclusive remarks to the project. First, a brief summary of the main chapters will be given, followed by a more specific summary of the key findings of the research in relation to the two case studies and their theoretical discussion. Second, some remarks will be made regarding the implications of this project in the form of a theoretical
synopsis. Third, a few notes will be given regarding the limitations of the projects, and fourth, the future development of the research and the wider implications of its findings will be outlined.

7.1. Summary

This doctoral project explored the domain of documentary photography and its intersection with the modern Western city and the institution of the Archive. Chapter 3 argued for the importance of the city and its urban planning, architecture, and its role in the experience of everyday life. It has done so through an engagement with photographic theory on the notion of documentary photography. The role of Enlightenment ideas of transparency, visibility, and legibility have been shown as constitutive of the city. The photographic theory in conjunction with the discussion of the modern Western city have been put synprojected in the notion of a photographic city – the idea that the representation of a city, its material and perceived space, is shaped by the pre-existing conceptions of it, effectively shaping lived experience. The examination of the case studies showed that conceptions of a space have been operationalized to reshape the perceived material reality leading to projects of urban demolition and rebuilding being put into place, such as Glasgow’s slum clearance and Paris’s Haussmannisation.

The research consisted of two case studies: first, that of Eugène Atget’s work in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London; and second, that of Thomas Annan’s work in the Mitchell Library in Glasgow. Both photographers’ work was analysed with several considerations in mind: first, in terms of image-content; second, in terms of document qualities and functions; and third, in terms of its explanatory power to better understand the domain of documentary photography. These three steps were iterative and at times simultaneous, not necessarily occurring in the sequence given. Chapter 4 outlined the analysis of Atget’s work and the city of Paris, while Chapter 5 detailed Annan’s work and the city of Glasgow.

In the case of Atget’s photographs of Paris, the practices of production of a documentary photograph have been identified as 1) the construction of the photograph as possessing a documentary function i.e. as a means of
recording a number of visual elements; 2) the adherence to established aesthetic codifications that in turn build on and match the defined documentary function of the photographs; and 3) the potential for a phenomenological hermeneutic of the photographs which emphasises the photographs’ political significance.

In Annan’s photographs of Glasgow, the practices of producing an image as documentary photography emerged as 1) the construction of the photograph as possessing a documentary function i.e. through the systematic documentation of a particular built environment in the form of a project; 2) the following of aesthetic codifications, even in cases of post-factum manipulation of the photographic print; and 3) the establishing of a logic of cartographic and phenomenological interrelations between the photographs as means for documenting the lived experience on the street.

Chapter 6 demonstrated, by building on the preceding chapters, that the production of images as documentary photographs can be seen to occur on three levels – material, conceptual, and interpretive. Through a theoretical discussion of Henri Lefebvre’s work on spatial analysis, a parallel was established between the production of space and the production of documentary photography. Namely, the practices involved have been identified as 1) the spatial practice of engaging with the perceived space, i.e. the built environment, of the city; 3) the representation of space in the form of abstract conceptions such as urban planning; and 4) the tensions of interpretation of a photograph and the inherent power relations.

Finally, the coda of this project worked to provide a discussion on the Archive that both addresses the convergence of the photographic and the archival in a photographic record, but also the sociological understanding of an institutional document. Key example of this is the institutional curation of the images making up the two case studies. In both cases, instances of curation emerged as processes of producing ways of reading the images in a singular way. It was shown that these ways of reading are constructed on the basis of a form of visual analysis similar to the one undertaken in Chapters 4 and 5. Ultimately, the links between urban space, documentary photography, and the archival impulse were
demonstrated. In the coda, an empirical engagement with the archival institutions of the photographs in the two case studies revealed the curatorial practices at the centre of the process of production of a photograph as an institutional document.

7.2. A Pedagogy of the Eye

The findings of this research point to two key factors in the domain of documentary photography and its production of images as photographs belonging to the domain. First, the research showed that any examination of documentary photography requires an understanding of its relation to space or the archive. In the works of both Annan and Atget, both the cities and the archival institutions have played a complementary and integral role to the production of certain images as documentary. Particularly, the primary reasons for many of the photographs, or what has been hitherto referred to as their documentary function, has had to do with their engagement with instances of the cities’ built environment that were at some stage in a process of disappearance or demolition. This has resulted in the photographs’ authenticity and indexical appeal. In turn, these notions have been shown to be further reinforced by the archives through the construction of a network of documents that serve as mechanisms for the production of authenticity, historicity, and provenance of an image, thereby making it more than its sheer image-content. Thus, Atget’s ornaments and Annan’s linens are transformed into more than signifiers. They become mechanisms that reinforce, as well as extend, the Archive’s territory.

Second, the other key factor that emerged out of this research is the edifying character of the documentary photographs and its role in the production of images as documentary photographs. Particularly, the analysis of both Atget’s and Annan’s work showed that at the centre of their practice was more than a visual representation of the perceived space of the city, and more still than a photographic formulation of the abstract conceptions of space integral to the modern city. Rather, it emerged that both photographers were continuously engaged in a pedagogical project, where through a certain phenomenological logic
the viewer is made to see the city in a particular way. Most importantly, this particular way of seeing the city is novel and in some manner out of the ordinary. In Atget’s case, this has been shown to be his choice of strange environs and vistas, the overlooked, and the borderline surreal, while in Annan’s case this has been shown to manifest in his contrasting aesthetics of close and streets, as well as his phenomenological enactment of the cartographic logic of the city. Ostensibly, it can be argued that this pedagogy of the eye, i.e. teaching the viewer what to notice and how to experience the representation of the city, is purely a requirement of their work in the sense of a narrative of their respective projects. However, it has been noted how Atget’s work is not only a practice of producing photographs, but of producing Paris itself. A similar claim can be made regarding Annan’s photographs. Understood this way, both photographers appear to engage not only in teaching the viewer, by means of constructing a viewer (as it has been noted), how to see their respective photographs, but also teaching the viewer how to see, and experience, the city itself.

Both of these points raise the issue of interpretation. Alterity, difference, and the production of meaning in response to dominant institutions of codified and hegemonic knowledge has been raised as persistent issue at all stages of the practice of documentary photography. As it has been shown in the last sections of both Chapter Four and Chapter Five, the interpretation of the photograph is an act of the production of its meaning, as well as the production of the meaning of the space it represents. Thus, by teaching the viewer how to interpret the photograph, not only the meaning of the photograph is being produced, but also the meaning of the spaces that the photograph has documented. This pedagogical aspect of documentary photography has been further reinforced by the empirical discussion in legibility of images. Namely, the curation of photographs in a given institution is this very act of producing the photograph, simultaneously producing its meaning, as it produces the meaning of what it purports to document. It has also been shown that institutions favour an aesthetic reading, since it is likely to obscure political understanding.
Finally, this brings up the issue of power and its relation to pedagogy. As Rosler has asserted, documentary photography has ‘a general aim of developing an educated, electorally active public’ (Rosler, 1982: 81). Moreover, this manifests itself primarily in documentary photography’s communication of ‘(old) information about a group of powerless people to another group addressed as socially powerful’ (Rosler, 2004: 263). If, in this case, the archive has the hegemonic control over the legitimacy of interpretations of documentary photographs, the very opportunity for a pedagogy of the social inequalities and the political significance of the urban projects is made unlikely, since the archive is ‘a structure [which produces as much as maintains] a hidden connection between knowledge and power’ (Sekula, 1999b: 447). This creates a documentary photography that, despite its liberal and left-wing sympathies, operates on an aesthetics of ‘[t]he expose, the compassion and outrage, of documentary’ (Rosler, 2004: 263), rather than collective struggle, where ‘an appreciation of “great art” […] supplants political understanding’ (Sekula, 2016: 67). At the core of this is the opposition of a formal, abstract order dictated by an institution or the state (in the case of urban development, for example). As Magnusson asserts,

‘To see as a state is to suppose that the most important political problems are resolved once sovereignty is established. This supposition is very much at odds with experience’ (Magnusson, 2011: 120)

As Magnusson argues, the opposite of the state imposed formal order, be it in the city or the archive, is the perspective of those who actually live in the space. In terms of documentary photography, this takes on the meaning of appropriation of photographs, the spaces, people, and events it documents, as much as allowing interpretation and re-interpretation. In terms of a concept that this project has been using intermittently, albeit consistently, it is about a certain ‘distribution of the sensible’ that would strive to disturb or at the very least challenge the existing social order that has ordained certain groups as lacking the ability to govern themselves, rendered them invisible, or deprived them of possessing a ‘legitimate’ political subjectivity.
This project has been arguing in favour of the latter side – that of self-determination, the right to difference as expressed in the right to re-interpret documentary photography, space, and the institutions that govern those very rights. It is through such interpretation that ‘other spaces’ can be opened up as possible, even if they remain non-existent. And furthermore, citing Magnusson, this project has aimed ‘to see like a city’ – in the sense of accepting ‘disorderliness, unpredictability, and multiplicity as inevitable’ and the complexity those bring, rather than rejecting it in favour of the simplicity of sovereignty (2011: 120).

7.3. Limitations

Certain limitations have contributed to the shape of the project, and should be acknowledged. First, this project has focused exclusively on professional photographers, rather than amateur ones. This can be understood as an oversight, since amateur photographers, although differing in scale, quantity, accessibility, and subject, would have led to different findings. For example, Edwards cites Morinetti, that what scholars tend to term ‘the modern novel’ is an amalgamation of not more than 200 books, effectively omitting the thousands that make up the category (2009a). The case is similar with documentary photography, where professional photographers and famous pioneers cast a long shadow in which many different perspectives and approaches might be discovered (see Hudgins, 2013). For example, Hudgens makes intriguing arguments about the different types of photography produced in smaller industrial cities (Hudgins, 2013). Furthermore, Hudgins notes the institutional and state-centred focus of architectural and urban photography in the middle of the 19th century, which meant that architectural photography reached the public some time later (2013: 20). In summary, Hudgens (2013: 19) points to the context of the photographic practice of such amateurs:

‘Obliged neither to glorify the governing regime nor aspire to a pictorial (small “p”) aesthetic, photographers in industrial cities had humbler structures to photograph, and humbler ambitions for their images’ (emphasis added)
Second, there are some limitations in terms of the data samples that make up the two case studies. In terms of Atget’s work in particular, the majority of his work is currently stored in the Bibliothèque nationale de France. However, due to logistical reasons, access to the BnF’s collections was much harder than the VAM Museum in London. In terms of Annan’s work, it has only been explored through the focus of urban space – thus omitting rural photographs, technological documents, or portraits, of which his work consisted. On a more general note, other professional photographers with similar projects have been identified – such as Georg Koppmann in Hamburg, for example – but access to original photographs was similarly difficult due to funding and geographical distance. The political geography boundaries of this research programme have proven to be illustrative and illuminating, yet ultimately somewhat restricting. Other photographic projects of documenting cities such as Jan Bulhak’s (Matulyte and Bulhak, 2003) photographs of Vilnius (used for proof of the city’s Polish-ness), the documentation of the quasi-Haussmannisation of Cairo by Benjamino Facchinelli (Seif, 2013), Ara Güler’s photographs (2009) of the modernization of Istanbul among others appear to be holding much in store for future exploration - as well as allowing for an expansion of the discussion of power, the Enlightenment, and modernity through an engagement with colonialism and imperial power. Additionally, photographers working in documenting the city that succeeded Atget and Annan could be of interest for research – such as Germaine Krull’s photographs of Parisian ornaments, or Henri Cartier-Bresson’s and Manuel Álvarez Bravo’s mixture of documentary and surrealism.

7.4. Future Developments and Implications

There are several directions in which the current project and its findings can be developed in the future. Three potential developments are highlighted below.

First, the Lefebvrian concept of the right to the city, in conjunction with the importance of interpretation that has been highlighted, can be used as a basis for the development of a right to photographs, to photography, or even a photographer’s right to the city. As shown, the importance of
interpretation when it comes to documentary photography is central to the determination of meaning. Moreover, the argument put forward in Chapter Two of the photographic city poses a potential problem for the political dimensions of any urban photographic practice. Some notes have been made in Chapter Six regarding documentary photography and appropriation of space, but the tension at the core of the practice, as well as the photographic principles at play in the city, need further examination.

Second, the issues of space, the archival, and documentary photography can be transferred to the study of virtual space. Namely, video games are a popular form of media that increasingly incorporates photography in its mechanics. Furthermore, considerations of the digital archive, issues around post-photography, and what constituted an authentic digital document can be raised. The issue is a current one, and at the time of writing, there are two key publications that aim to document video game photography in relation to urban built environment (Damian Martin, forthcoming) and urban cartography (Dimopoulos, forthcoming). The application of the findings and theory that drove the visual and spatial analysis can also be supported by a growing literature on the topic. Particularly, Benjamin Fraser (2015), a noted scholar on Lefebvre, has devoted some time on sketching an approach to understanding video games in a Lefebvrean sense. Video games allow for a novel exploration of an interesting convergence of Lefebvre’s triad, as well as a pronounced use of the map as a tool for lived experience that is indicative of contemporary practices.

Third, in a sense closer to the perspectives and subject matter discussed throughout the project, this project has built on contemporary conversations on photography and Lefebvre’s work (Tormey, 2013), but does so in more depth. It has also provided an account of two photographers that have not been compared. It has done so by focusing on the role of urban space in their photographic work. Furthermore, this project has provided a political reading of the work of both Atget and Annan that has been lacking. In Atget’s case the interpretation of a single image was used to illustrate the historical conjuncture and political significance of documentary photographs. In Annan’s case, the
photographic practice that adhered to the ‘state simplification’ of a formal spatial order was used to demonstrate the importance of how space is conceived and subsequently presented, interpreted, and understood. Both photographers were used for exploring the concept of the archive and its role in interpreting, storing, and producing documentary photography. The significance of interpretation and the issues around power, transparency, and lack of reciprocity were highlighted, thus once again bringing to the fore the political significance of photographs. Overall, the project has built on the literature (Buck-Morss, 1989) and provided a tool for political appropriation of photographs. It does so by adapting Lefebvre’s theory of space to the field of documentary photography.

With regards to contribution to sociology on documentary photography, this project has engaged in a research programme that explores two pioneering documentary photographers in relation to the city of their practice and the Archives that collected their work. As noted, the intersection of archival photographic data, sociological inquiry, and documentary photography, although present in discourse (Becker, 1974), merits further exploration (see Rose, 2007; 2014). In terms of urban studies, this project has engaged closely with the work of Henri Lefebvre on space (1991a). This has been done through close reading of Lefebvre’s abstract theory in relation to the empirical studies on archival photographic data. Moreover, Lefebvre’s theoretical work on space has been expanded to incorporate photography as a practice that produces space. On the basis of this, a critique of Lefebvre’s work on photography has been developed. Ultimately, this project has worked to develop an engagement with documentary photography as a practice, while considering its intersections with urban space and the archival.
Appendix One

Example of Victoria and Albert Museum Digital Catalogue – Figure 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House, 25 Rue St Laurent, Beauvais, France</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object:</strong> Photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place:</strong> 25 Rue St Laurent, Beauvais, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artist:</strong> Algav, Jean Eugène-Auguste, born 1827 - died 1887 (photographer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials and Techniques:</strong> Albumen print from paper dry plate negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit Line:</strong> Purchased from the Artful 1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection:</strong> Prints &amp; Drawings Study Room, Intro F, used K, shelf 226, box A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**

*House, 25 Rue St Laurent, Beauvais, France* was taken in 1854 by Algav, Jean Eugène-Auguste, a French photographer known for his landscapes. The image was part of a series that Algav created in the late 19th century, documenting the city of Beauvais. The photograph captures the essence of the Place du Vieux-Marché, which is a significant historical site in Beauvais.

Algav’s work is celebrated for its technical excellence and the way it captures the atmosphere of the city. His images were highly regarded during his lifetime and continue to be admired for their aesthetic qualities.

**Explore related objects**

- **Photographer:** Algav, Jean Eugène-Auguste
- **Architecture:**
- **Subject:** Places
- **Style:** DOCUMENTARY
- **Place:** France
- **Gallery:** Prints & Drawings Study Room, Intro F, used K, shelf 226, box A
### Appendix Five: Coding Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Visual Themes</th>
<th>Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doorway</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Elements of Architecture</td>
<td>Documentary Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>balcony</td>
<td>partial elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>church</td>
<td>repetition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>detail or isolated element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>doorways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-commercial/residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balcony</td>
<td>Ornament</td>
<td>Ornament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in balcony, doorway, railing, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Streetscape (boulevards, streets, close)</td>
<td>Urban Image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Interior (Bedroom, Church halls, Palaces, etc.)</td>
<td>Interior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photograph as Image</td>
<td>Clipmarks</td>
<td>Technological Affordances</td>
<td>Using Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photograph as Document</td>
<td>Vignette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photograph as Document</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Manipulation of Images</td>
<td>Aesthetic Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photograph as Document</td>
<td>Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photograph as Document</td>
<td>Labels</td>
<td>Legibility</td>
<td>Legible Photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Curation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Spatial Order</td>
<td>The Right Way of Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamp location</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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