

WAR/PHOTOGRAPHY

IMAGES OF ARMED
CONFLICT AND
ITS AFTERMATH

ANNE WILKES TUCKER
AND WILL MICHELS
WITH NATALIE ZELT

WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY
JEFFREY WM HUNT,
LIAM KENNEDY,
HILARY ROBERTS,
JOHN STAUFFER,
BODO VON DEWITZ,
AND NATALIE ZELDIN

THE MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS, HOUSTON

DISTRIBUTED BY YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS,
NEW HAVEN AND LONDON

Copyright © 2012 The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston.
All rights reserved.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, including illustrations, in any form (beyond that copying permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law and except by reviewers for the public press), without permission from the publisher.

This catalogue was published to coincide with the exhibition *WAR/PHOTOGRAPHY: Images of Armed Conflict and Its Aftermath*, organized by the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, November 11, 2012–February 3, 2013. Other exhibition venues include the Annenberg Space for Photography, Los Angeles (March 23–June 2, 2013), The Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. (June 29–September 29, 2013), and the Brooklyn Museum, New York (November 8, 2013–February 2, 2014).

GENEROUS FUNDING IS PROVIDED BY

Phillip and Edith Leonian Foundation
The Annenberg Foundation
Mr. James Edward Maloney and
Mr. Carey Chambers Maloney
The Trellis Fund/Betsy and Frank Karel
The Robert Mapplethorpe Foundation, Inc.
Sutherland Asbill & Brennan LLP
An Anonymous Donor in memory of Thomas W. Tucker
Chris Hondros Fund
Trust for Mutual Understanding
Humanities Texas, the state affiliate of the
National Endowment for the Humanities
Richard and Dodie Jackson
Kelly Wirfel and John Holcomb

(Funders listed as of printing date.)

MFAH Publications Director: Diane Lovejoy
Editor: Heather Brand
Indexed by Kay Banning

Distributed by Yale University Press, New Haven and London
www.yalebooks.com/art

Book and jacket design by Julie Savasky and DJ Stout,
Pentagram, Austin, Texas

Typeset in Galaxie Copernicus and Akkurat
Printed in Spain by SYL

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Tucker, Anne.

War/photography : images of armed conflict and its aftermath
/ Anne Wilkes Tucker and Will Michels with Natalie Zelt ;
With contributions by Jeffrey Wm Hunt ... [et al.].
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Summary: "More than 480 images illustrate the relationship between photography and war, showing the experience of armed conflict through the eyes of photographers across two centuries and six continents" — Provided by publisher.

ISBN 978-0-300-17738-1 (hardcover)

1. War photography.

2. War. I. Michels, Will. II. Zelt, Natalie. III. Title.

TR820.6.T83 2012

779.092—dc23

2012015205

FRONT COVER

Dmitri Baltermants

Attack—Eastern Front WWII, 1941

Gelatin silver print, printed 1960

The MFAH, gift of Michael Poulos in honor of Mary Kay Poulos at "One Great Night in November, 1997"
97.463.

INTRODUCTION

BY ANNE WILKES TUCKER

The understanding of war among people who have not experienced war is now chiefly a product of the impact of these images [of wartime photographs].¹

—SUSAN SONTAG

THE SLASH in the title *WAR/PHOTOGRAPHY* acknowledges that armed conflict and photography are separate entities whose interactions between 1846 and the present have led to the creation of millions of photographs. Photographers (and various unmanned technologies) have covered almost every phase of armed conflict and its aftermath. Photographs have been useful in planning and conducting wars, and have been essential in gaining public support for war efforts and in the loss of that support. The texts in this book variously situate the selected photographs historically, in relation to the conduct of war from military perspectives, and with consideration for the aftermath of wars. Interviews with military veterans and historians as well as photographers, news-agency directors, picture editors, archivists, and curators have informed this project, and their views are quoted relative to the making, use, distribution, and impact of these photographs. Also included are statements by the pictures' subjects about the experiences that led to their being photographed as well as about the experience of being photographed, especially if the photograph achieved an iconic status and continued to affect their lives over time. Some fake photographs are included to acknowledge their occurrence in the history of conflict photography, and wartime events that are rarely photographed, such as hand-to-hand combat and rapes, are also noted. The last chapter of this book includes photographs made as retrospective reflections on specific wars and their consequences. Nearly five hundred objects, including photographs, books, magazines, albums, and photographic equipment, are featured. More than 280 photographers from 28 nations produced these photographs, which cover conflicts that occurred on six continents over the span of 165 years, from the Mexican-American War in 1846 through the 2011 civil war in Libya. Some of these pictures have never been published or exhibited previously, or were only known to limited audiences. Others are widely recognized, having won major awards and having been distributed internationally when they were made and long after their news value had faded.

The photographs came first in the process of shaping this project. We viewed and considered thousands of pictures in military archives, news agencies, photographers' files,

museums, books, websites, and other sources. More than two thousand images were evaluated before the final edit. Each picture's capacity to mentally and emotionally engage viewers' interests and to provoke questions was always paramount. Who made the picture, for what purpose, and from what point of view? When and where? What is the purported subject? What thoughts and feelings does it evoke? Even the best pictures cannot answer those questions without accompanying captions and other texts, but even with accompanying texts, the answers are likely to vary among viewers and according to when, where, why, and how the picture was published or displayed and to the text that accompanies it. As Susan Sontag wrote in discussing how the same photograph could be used by both sides of an argument, depending on its interpretation, "All photographs wait to be explained or falsified by their captions."² The curator and historian William Ivins wrote, "The nineteenth century began by believing what was reasonable was true, and it would end up by believing that what it saw in a photograph was true."³ In the digital age, it is understood that photographs and other forms of information are malleable and are often disseminated to manipulate public opinion as much as to inform. A picture does not change, but how it is perceived changes. As psychologist Wendell Johnson observed, "What we look at is not what we see."⁴ We "see" with our brains, and what we think we see is subject to the influence of our political, religious, cultural, and personal beliefs and experiences. Often what we see depends on what we expected or sought to find. Photographs may no longer be accepted as "truths" delivered by objective and transparent messengers, but they can nevertheless preserve something that once existed, or, as Martha Rosler identified while questioning photography's capacity to deliver it, "the explicit trace of the comprehensible in the living world."⁵ This project proposes that what was perceived and captured by photographers has residual value for hundreds of purposes, including instruction, keepsake, historical marker, publicity, reconnaissance, criminal evidence, and as a catalyst to further inquiry and understanding of armed conflicts and their aftermaths.

What photographs can and cannot (and should and should not) convey is often in dispute, as is the definition of what constitutes a war. Wars exist despite claims to the contrary, such as those expressed by French theorist Jean Baudrillard in his book *The Gulf War Did Not Take Place*.⁶ Baudrillard's concern was war as an idea, and he separated the actual reality of the

1991 war from the "reality" generated by those conducting the war and by the news media, stating that this war was a simulation enacted for the viewing public as a news event, primarily as a demonstration of American power. One of Baudrillard's key arguments proposes that the style of warfare used in the Gulf War was far removed from previous standards of warfare and that "it should not be seen as a war, simply because the US-led coalition chose not to engage with the Iraqi army or to take the kind of risks [such as hand-to-hand combat] that constitute war."⁷ He concluded that, because the war had not resulted in a new division of territory or a new arrangement of government, it was not a "proper war." Besides the mental convolution of ignoring the realities of killing, destruction, and suffering, a basic flaw in Baudrillard's premise is his rigid and convenient definition of war. He presumes that war is a fixed entity with defined goals, structures, and methods of fighting, but wars do not occur in the constrained circumstances that he envisions. In *A History of Warfare*, historian John Keegan refutes that there is a "nature of war," warns against the assumption that wars are declared by states with "absolute sovereignty, ordered diplomacy and legally binding treaties," and rejects the expectation for wars to have "definable forms with recognized conventions as well as a beginning and an end."⁸ Keegan describes World War I as a war that would not conform to Baudrillard's expectations. WWI, wrote Keegan, became a war for war's sake, and its political objectives, "difficult enough to define in the first place, were forgotten . . . [and the war was] rapidly reduced to mere justification of bigger battles, longer casualty lists, costlier budgets, overflowing human misery."⁹ Keegan also noted that in civil or tribal wars, or in those of insurgents or warlords, different conditions also exist, such as those described by photojournalist Michael Kamber in the 1993 conflict in Somalia, in which there was "no central authority, and where pretty much anything can happen. In many places it is completely anarchic, with clans and sub-clans and even sub-sub-clans fighting each other block by block."¹⁰

Given that no conflict takes the same course as any other, and that leaders, religions, history, cultures, and eras have an impact on the conduct and course of wars, certain patterns nevertheless begin to emerge in the recurrence of certain types of pictures when looking at thousands of photographs, and these photographs relate to a rough order of war. Thus, the structure of this book and exhibition neglects chronological order, except within the various sections, and is organized instead according to the most common and meaningful of the recurring types. These sections, determined in consultation with photographers, other curators, and military historians, begin with the advent of war and proceed through recruitment, embarkation, and training to "the fight" and its aftermath, including both military and civilian deaths, grief, property damage, medical care, prisoners, refugees, and executions, to war's end, memorials, and remembrance. Also included is a selection of portraits of troops in uniform and wartime leaders across time and military rank. These examples were chosen from a massive array of portraits, as those going into combat often have their portraits

made before departure, and most established armies photograph all incoming service personnel. Three other sections convey other aspects of war. One of these sections highlights the experiences of children and calls attention to the mental and physical damage inflicted on children during and subsequent to conflicts. Another section focuses on images taken at Iwo Jima during WWII in order to present photographs of most of the types in their original context. Finally, a section on photo-essays, including one by Larry Burrows and another by Todd Heisler, demonstrates how this form organizes multiple pictures sequentially.

Organizing the project in this way put an emphasis on what the pictures describe, but it posed the danger of diminishing each picture's individual complexities and histories. Taking the pictures out of their original contexts and grouping them with other pictures of like subjects served to connect them to activities devised and conducted according to military tradition and priorities, and these connections became the structure of the individual section texts. But it also could unfortunately narrow or even redirect the perceptions otherwise evoked. So care was taken to broaden the nature of the discussions in the accompanying texts. One important factor in addressing each picture is whether the photographer served in a military or governmental capacity, worked from a commercial perspective, photographed strictly as an amateur, or primarily addressed wars and their aftermath subsequently, sometimes many years later, with galleries and museums as the destination for their works. Hilary Roberts addresses these critical divisions in her essay "War Photographers"; they are mentioned here to discuss misconceptions that arise from not understanding those occupational divisions. Many texts about "war photography" are essentially about only one of these four sources of wartime photography: photojournalists. More recently, attention has also focused on soldiers' snapshots, especially as distributed on the Internet [see Bodo von Dewitz's "German Snapshots from World War I" and Liam Kennedy's "Soldier Photography"].

In addition, some writers are not cognizant of the complexity of the relationships between photography and military entities. While conducting a war, the combatants make decisions that will in part shape the subject matter that photographers (military, commercial, and amateur) will confront, including the war's aftermath, which of course does not mean that the military will like the resulting pictures or that it can control them, unless they are made by official war photographers. Artists and amateur photographers make pictures for personal reasons; military and commercial photographers must work with some higher authority, be it an editor, news-agency director, or various levels of commanding officers, who may have their own ideas of what types of pictures should emerge, or even whether a photographer should be present. Ideas from the home front, whether from military or news sources, are not always welcome on the front line.

As Roberts notes, "An official war photographer is one who is employed to photograph a conflict on behalf of a government institution, military force, or other noncommercial

organization. The photographer's employer defines the assignment (although the photographer often has considerable discretion in how that assignment is realized), and the resulting photographs belong to and are exploited by that employer. Official war photographers may be military or civilian, and they fulfill a diverse range of roles.¹¹ The most consistent quality of their photographs is their realistic tradition with minimal technical manipulation, and an emphasis on the clarity of the data. Often, photographs recommended as important pictures by military historians are chosen for the importance of their subject matter from a military perspective, including armaments, technical innovations, and notable battles or personages. Among the early military photographs in the show are those in two albums taken for didactic purposes. These pictures are straightforward, evenly lit, and easily deciphered. Imaginative invention by the photographer is ill-suited for most military purposes, although according to Roberts, contemporary military photographers in England, "who are tasked with generating images for publication in the press (i.e., in direct competition with civilian photojournalists), are being encouraged to use their imagination to generate unusual images which will attract the attention of picture editors."¹²

Contemporary policies in different services vary on identifying the name of the photographer when images are distributed by a military source. Often, the only credit given is to the branch of the armed services in which the photographer served, just as news agencies sometimes cite the agency name without giving that of the photographer. Recently, while looking at the prints selected for this project, a veteran said that he would not have thought to ask about the identities of the photographers. This reaction is due in part to service members being part of a larger unit, and their service to the unit and its goals take precedence over individual concerns.

Roberts also observes, "Commercial photographers may photograph war as individual freelance photographers or as the employee of a commercial organization. However, unlike official photographers, they work in the expectation that they, their representatives, or their employers will sell copies of the photographs that they take for income and profit."¹³ Commercial photographers have greater latitude in where they work and in what kinds of pictures they make. This is a liberty that carries considerable responsibility. Photojournalists make decisions, including what equipment to use, whether to work in color or black-and-white, and how to distribute their work. But first, they have to get into position to photograph, which means being enlisted in or embedded with an established army, attaching themselves to an insurgent group, or tracking down a warlord who might or might not honor a commitment to give them access and safe passage [fig. 1].

Being informed is critical to any photographer's capacity to make intelligent and, at times, life-saving decisions. Yet some are, as photojournalist Robert Knoth admitted to being on his first trip to a conflict zone, "as green as grass with only very vague ideas." Knoth said, "As I arrived in Mogadishu airport, I saw the shooting below me, and when I landed, the tanks

almost ran over me. I thought 'this is a very big mistake' and told myself to get back on the plane and pretend it never happened. But thankfully I held my ground and worked there for about a month. Then learning to develop photo stories took a few years."¹⁴

Experienced journalists understand the political and historical issues of the situations they cover, know facts about the commanders on both sides (including, at times, leaders' cell-phone numbers), and some learn to recognize the sounds made by the armaments of each side in a conflict in order to distinguish incoming from outgoing danger. They know how to protect themselves and their equipment and how to get their pictures to a potential purchaser if they are not contracted to a particular agency, magazine, or newspaper. The areas of greatest latitude for photojournalists are the focus of their stories (even when embedded) and their photographic styles. For many photojournalists, their goal is not different that of the military photographers. As Ashley Gilbertson said, "Craft is a creative picture that is well composed to make it clearer to the reader."¹⁵

Other journalists want to push the parameters of their craft. Tim Hetherington said, "I'm looking for different visual ideas to harness the story and surprise the audience."¹⁶ He was not alone among photojournalists in beginning to work with video. In fact, some agencies require photographers to also use the video function of their digital cameras for news purposes. Among Hetherington's various productions that evolved from being embedded in a platoon in Afghanistan, each with different formats and perspectives, were the film *Restrepo* (2010, with Sebastian Junger), the related book, *Infidel*, which includes his pictures, interviews with soldiers, and graphics of their tattoos, and *Sleeping Soldiers* (2010), which combines sound and images in a three-screen video installation. Before his death in Libya, Hetherington produced his most personal film, *Diary* (2010), in which he wove images taken on assignment with those of his daily life, and described it as "the subjective experience of my work . . . made as an attempt to locate myself after ten years of reporting."¹⁷

Photojournalists working for weekly or monthly magazines generally have more time to develop their stories, and potentially more pages for their images, than newspaper photographers. However, the increasing role of the Internet has changed distinctions within the realm of photojournalism that were previously important in understanding how and why pictures were made. For instance, the Internet does not present the same space limitations, nor does it seem to have a distinction for "yesterday's news." Information is perpetually available to be discovered at the viewer's convenience.

Critics and historians frequently speculate about photographers' motives and why they take risks with their mental and physical health and with their lives. Some writers have dismissed them as glory seekers and adrenaline junkies. Although conflict photographers do not deny the appeal of adrenaline rushes and surviving harrowing situations, most say that this is no reason to risk one's life and that the appeal diminishes. According to Robert Knoth, "It's just young boy stuff, testosterone.



FIGURE 1
Randolph Bezzant Holmes, Camel caravan though stream between steep hillsides, Afghan border, from the album Photographs of the Northwest frontier during the Afghan war of 1919, 1919, albumen print, Alkazi Collection of Photography.

And as the Israeli military historian Martin van Creveld says ‘men like games, and war is the greatest game of all.’ That may be why we start, but very few photographers do it for the rest of their lives, at least not for those reasons.”¹⁸

Many texts have been written on whether aesthetics should be a consideration for documentary photographers because, the critics postulate, subjective interventions such as visible aesthetic choices remove the air of cool impartiality expected in journalism.¹⁹ In describing this view on “the inauthenticity of the beautiful” as being at times puritanical, Susan Sontag summarized their arguments as being that a “beautiful photograph drains attention from the sobering subject and turns it toward the medium itself, inviting the viewer to look ‘aesthetically,’ and therefore compromise the picture’s status as a document.”²⁰ Documentary pictures that reduce visual information to the degree that they are solely beautiful pictures have been eliminated from the selections for this project because they lack qualities needed for additional inquiry. *New York Times* writer James Estrin articulated the view of numerous writers about this issue: “If it sears an image into the viewers’ mind and heightens their awareness by making them remember a particular scene and think about it, then my answer would be yes. If it converts a very real human drama into just another forgettable pretty picture, then my answer would be no.”²¹ Another critical position on this topic is presented in James Hillman’s *A Terrible Love of War*, in which he proposes that war (Mars) and the sub-

lime (Venus), violence and beauty, terror and love, are fused, and that “understanding the pair as opposites” is too easy. He discusses this fusion as a “mutual entailment” embedded in all civilizations’ forms of imagery.²²

A sub-debate within this controversy is the appropriateness of photographing another person’s suffering. This censure contends that aestheticized photographs contaminate the real with visual pleasure. For instance, cultural critic Mieke Bal stated, “Beauty distracts and worse, it gives pleasure—a pleasure that is parasitical on the pain of others.”²³ David Levi Strauss has questioned positions such as Bal’s, acknowledging that “there are inherent problems with representing the pain of others, but does that mean we should no longer attempt such representations?”²⁴ And he has observed that critics such as Bal and Rosler are also linking aestheticization with a condemnation of compassion, which Rosler termed “the weakest possible idea of social engagement.”²⁵ Strauss defends empathy as necessary for collective action and counters that “one needs first to feel the pain of others before one can begin to act to alleviate it. And one of the ways humans recognize the pain of others is by seeing it in images.”²⁶

This assertion raises the question whether photographs can instigate action and thus effect change.²⁷ Sontag expressed her doubts, stating that “surely photographs could not stop war, no one can do that. The only reasonable goal, so far unattained, is to stop genocide.”²⁸ But some photographers do harbor hope

that their images might shift public opinion, as was achieved by key pictures from the Vietnam era. Pulitzer Prize-winning photographer David Leeson acknowledged, "At the height of my career covering conflicts, I truly believed, deeply and passionately believed, that there existed a series of photographs, or a single photograph, that could end war. I wanted to find that one photo. . . . I still really believe there's a photo that's worth dying for. But can you find it? I never did. And that was probably the hardest part of it all, that I never found it."²⁹

This extraordinary statement goes further than most in admitting the trade-off that Leeson was willing to make. His belief in the power of the photograph was apparently shared by members of the violent mobs in Fallujah, Iraq, in March 2004. Four American contractors were killed, their bodies burned, and then at least two were hung from a bridge. Someone in the crowd told news crews that they "believed the United States would flee Iraq after seeing such scenes of carnage, as it had fled Somalia after Blackhawk Down."³⁰ The images of the frenzied crowd in Fallujah were reminiscent of the scene from Somalia in 1993, when a mob dragged the body of an American soldier through Mogadishu. These photographs shifted public opinion in the United States and eventually led to a pullout of American troops.³¹ Photographer Susan Meiselas is aware of the specific political events credited to various photographs, but she questioned what can be known about how photographs affect people: "In thinking about political effect, you have to ask to what extent is politics about action and to what extent is it about creating conditions for actions. As much as I have at times wanted someone to do something in response to having seen an image that I made, I don't know that there's any proof of that."³² Meiselas speaks from having spent a great deal of time trying to understand the reception of her own images and their effects as well as those by other photographers.

Malcolm Browne, whose photograph of a monk who set himself on fire in protest of the anti-Buddhist policies of the South Vietnam dictatorial leader Ngo Dinh Diem, questioned what might have happened if he had not taken his Pulitzer Prize-winning photograph: "I've had this searing feeling of perhaps having in some way contributed to the death of a kind old man who probably would not have done what he did—nor would the monks in general have done what they did—if they had not been assured of the presence of a newsman who could convey the images and experience to the outer world. Because that was the whole point—to produce theater of the horrible so striking that the reasons for the demonstrations would become apparent to everyone."³³

More commonly, contemporary photographers avoid discussions of effecting change and say, as Benjamin Lowy did, "I photograph wars for history, not to change the world," a sentiment expressed a century earlier by Mathew Brady when he said, "The camera is the eye of history."³⁴ Another stated goal of many photographers is for the work to be provocative, even at the expense of a ready clarity about its content. Cédric Gerbehayé wants his pictures to provoke questions, stating that he would much rather someone say "there is something

with your pictures, but I don't know what. I don't know why, but there is something" than to have his pictures immediately understood or admired as beautiful or as "a nice image."³⁵ Paolo Pellegrin responded in the same vein, stating, "I'm more interested in a photograph that is 'unfinished'—a photograph that is suggestive and can trigger a conversation or dialogue."³⁶ He refers to his best pictures as fragments of conversations and, like Knoth, he said, "it took years to develop my best style and (visual) language."³⁷ The diversity of these motivations demonstrates the dangers in generalized assertions about photographers' motives and goals in choosing to work in war zones.

Another recurring contemporary discussion is whether the radical change in photographic distribution is a factor in the power of photographs and their capacity to effect change. "For years," Michael Kamber wrote, "I've sat around with my buddies and asked why photography didn't do more—as in Vietnam—to change the course of the Iraq war. Not necessarily to mobilize people against it, just to get people more involved, to make them feel closer to the soldiers and civilians."³⁸ Some speculate that a contributing factor is the absence of powerful magazines, such as *Life* and *Paris Match* in their heyday (the 1930s to 1970s), which has been filled by millions of unfiltered photographs on the Internet. In their book *No Caption Needed: Iconic Photographs, Public Culture, and Liberal Democracy*, Robert Hariman and John Louis Lucaites noted that "a few dominant images can reflect either a scarcity of images or the reverse: an overabundance that has to be ignored if one is to function at all."³⁹ Journalist Tim Arango drew a similar conclusion when he wrote, "In an age of saturated media coverage and short attention spans, it may be more difficult for new images to take root in the collective memory."⁴⁰

Many photographs included in this project are widely acknowledged as being rooted in the collective memory of citizens around the world. People may not remember the name of the photographer Eddie Adams, but the gesture of lifting a straight arm with fingers mimicking a gun will stimulate a mental image of Adams's famous image *Police Commander Nguyen Ngoc Loan killing Viet Cong operative Nguyen Van Lem* (February 1, 1968). Similarly the words "flag raising" will often trigger recognition of Joe Rosenthal's picture *Old Glory Goes Up on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima* (February 23, 1945). As curator and photographer John Szarkowski observed, the best pictures enlarge one's sense of possibilities in understanding the real world, and when photographs are "remembered they survive, like organisms, to reproduce and evolve."⁴¹ Probably no photograph has been reproduced more than the Rosenthal's. It has been reenacted and appropriated for purposes ranging from memorializing those in the U.S. Marine Corps who died in combat to selling milk and real estate.

Sontag wrote, "The problem is not that people remember through photographs but that they remember only the photographs. This remembering through photographs eclipses other forms of understanding and remembering. . . . To remember is, more and more, not to recall a story but to be able to call up a picture."⁴² That view seems too fixed on a limited group

of iconic pictures. It is the opposite of Szarkowski's position that photographs can instigate inquiry, rather than subvert it. The primary goal of this project has been to expand the discourse about photographs of armed conflict and its aftermath by identifying types of photographs as well as introducing other avenues by which war photography might be understood, particularly in relation to military perspectives and priorities. Photographers' goals and intentions as well as historical and cultural contexts have also been considered. For too long, discussions about this genre have existed primarily in texts on specific photographers, news agencies, and wars, or have been claimed as the exclusive domain of theorists. Too many assumptions have been accepted that were often not based on real research. "I think," said Meiselas, "it is an area about which we know very little, certainly not enough to make the kinds of assumptions we are dealing with."⁴³ The field needs research because what is known is infinitesimal compared to what is unknown. Millions of photographs have not been researched in archives, other than those of the massive news agencies whose increasing control is popularly lamented. More interdisciplinary inquiry is needed to weigh the complexities from which conflict photographs arise. This project is a platform from which other inquiries can spring.

NOTES

- 1 Susan Sontag, "Looking at War: Photography's View of Devastation and Death," *The New Yorker* (December 9, 2002), 87. This article was later expanded into the book *Regarding the Pain of Others* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003).
- 2 *Ibid.*, 86.
- 3 William M. Ivins, Jr., *Prints and Visual Communications* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953), 180.
- 4 Wendell Johnson, cited in "Triangulation Misology: . . . To Mistake the Trappings of Intellectual Authority for its Substance," in *Nathan Lyons: Selected Essays, lectures, and Interviews*, ed. Jessica S. McDonald (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2012), 240.
- 5 Martha Rosler, "In, Around, and Afterthoughts (On Documentary Photography)," in *The Contest of Meaning: Critical Histories of Photography*, ed. Richard Bolton (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992), 319.
- 6 See Jean Baudrillard, *The Gulf War Did Not Take Place*, trans. Paul Patton (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1995). I would like to thank Chanon Praepitapmongkol for referring me to Baudrillard and other important essays and sources and Sheryl Conkelton for her comments on Baudrillard's writing.
- 7 *Ibid.*, 69.
- 8 John Keegan, *The History of Warfare* (New York: Viking, 1993), 5.
- 9 *Ibid.*, 21.
- 10 Michael Kamber, "On Assignment: Hard Lessons in Somalia," *Lens blog*, *New York Times*, June 15, 2009, <http://lens.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/06/15/assignment/>.
- 11 Hilary Roberts, "War Photographers: A Special Breed?" in this book, page 10.
- 12 Hilary Roberts, in an e-mail to Anne Tucker, August 10, 2012.
- 13 Roberts, "War Photographers," 12.
- 14 Robert Knott, interview by Anne Tucker and Will Michels, April 1, 2010, Amsterdam, in the archives of the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston.
- 15 Ashley Gilbertson, "War and Photography," panel discussion, VII Gallery, Brooklyn, New York, May 22, 2009, *Dispatches*, www.youtube.com/user/RethinkDispatches.
- 16 Tim Hetherington, "War and Photography," panel discussion, VII Gallery, Brooklyn, New York, May 22, 2009, *Dispatches*, www.youtube.com/user/RethinkDispatches.

- 17 "Diary: The Last Short Film by Tim Hetherington," *Open Culture*, April 20, 2011, http://www.openculture.com/2011/04/diary_the_last_short_film_by_tim_hetherington.html.
- 18 Knott, interview by Anne Tucker and Will Michels, April 1, 2010, Amsterdam, in the archives of the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston.
- 19 For example, see three books published by the University of Chicago Press: Susie Linfield, *The Cruel Radiance: Photography and Political Violence* (2010); Mark Reinhardt, Holly Edwards, and Erina Duganne, eds., *Beautiful Suffering: Photography and the Traffic in Pain* (2007); and Robert Hariman and John Louis Lucaites, *No Caption Needed: Iconic Photographs, Public Culture, and Liberal Democracy* (2007).
- 20 Sontag, "Looking at War," 94.
- 21 James Estrin, "Forum: Suffering and Art," *Lens blog*, *New York Times*, June 16, 2009, <http://lens.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/06/16/forum/>.
- 22 James Hillman, "War Is Sublime," in *A Terrible Love of War* (New York: Penguin Books, 2004), 104-77. I am indebted to Manfred and Hannah Heiting for calling this profound book to my attention.
- 23 Mieke Bal, in *Beautiful Suffering: Photography and the Traffic in Pain*, cited in David Levi Strauss, "Nikons and Icons: Is the Aestheticization-of-Suffering Critique Still Valid?" *Bookforum* (June-August 2007): 16.
- 24 Strauss, "Nikons and Icons," 16.
- 25 *Ibid.*
- 26 *Ibid.* This discussion is also indebted to the conference "Human Suffering on Display: Ethical Issues Documenting Pain, Disfigurement and Death in War and Other Conflicts," a seminar organized by the Centre for Applied Philosophy, Politics and Ethics, University of Brighton, Brighton Photo Biennial, and the Imperial War Museum at the Imperial War Museum in London, April 18, 2009.
- 27 This idea has been discussed in relation to specific photographs in other texts.
- 28 Sontag, "Looking at War," 82.
- 29 Dirck Halstead, "David Leeson Has Seen Hell," *Digital Journalist* (March 2005), http://digitaljournalist.org/issue0503/halstead_leeson.html.
- 30 Kamber, "Bearing Witness in Iraq," <http://lens.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/12/19/bearing-witness-in-iraq/>.
- 31 Jeffrey Gettleman, "Enraged Mob in Falluja Kills 4 American Contractors," *New York Times*, March 31, 2004, <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/03/31/international/worldspecial/31CND-IRAQ.html?pagewanted=all>.
- 32 David Levi Strauss, "An Amplitude That Information Lacks," in *Susan Meiselas: In History* (New York: International Center of Photography/Steidl, 2008), 109.
- 33 "Burning Monk," *Famous Pictures: The Magazine*, http://www.famouspictures.org/mag/index.php?title=Burning_Monk.
- 34 Benjamin Lowy, interview by Anne Tucker and Will Michels, April 2008, Amsterdam; "Mathew Brady Biography," *Encyclopedia of World Biography*, <http://www.notablebiographies.com/Be-Br/Brady-Mathew.html>.
- 35 Cédric Gerbehay, interview by Anne Tucker and Will Michels, September 2010, Perpignan, France, in the archives of Museum of Fine Arts, Houston.
- 36 "Paolo Pellegrin," *Magnum Photos*, http://www.magnumphotos.com/C.aspx?VP=XSspecific.MAG.PhotographerDetail_VPage&pid=2K7O3R13CHLN&nm=Paolo%20Pellegrin.
- 37 Paolo Pellegrin, in an interview, "Ambassador's Programme: Paolo Pellegrin," Canon, <http://cpn.canon-europe.com/content/ambassadors/paolo.pellegrin.do>.
- 38 Kamber, "Bearing Witness in Iraq," <http://lens.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/12/19/bearing-witness-in-iraq/>.
- 39 Hariman and Lucaites, *No Caption Needed*, cited in Strauss, "Nikon and Icons," 17.
- 40 Tim Arango, "Face That Screamed War's Pain Looks Back, 6 Hard Years Later," *New York Times*, May 7, 2011, 1 and 19.
- 41 John Szarkowski, *The Photographer's Eye* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1966), unpaginated.
- 42 Sontag, "Looking at War," 94.
- 43 Strauss, "An Amplitude That Information Lacks," in *Susan Meiselas: In History*, 109.