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Introduction

Why Street Photography?

_Gun 1, New York_ (Fig 1) was taken in 1954 in New York City by William Klein. The photograph is of two young boys; one is on the left holding a gun pointing directly at the viewer and the other, on the right only displaying his side profile. In this photograph, Klein uses the gun to control the frame, creating a spatial illusion of depth. Though the gun is the closest object to the viewer, it is out of focus, causing the viewer’s eyes to travel past the gun directly to the boy’s face on the left. This very up close photograph created using a wide-angle lens in order to fill the frame, makes the photo arresting and a bit shocking. The wide-angle lens captures more content into the frame, even though Klein gets up close to his subjects. Furthermore, seeing a child pointing a gun is also disturbing. By capturing this moment up close, Klein puts the viewer face to face with the complete, rough image of an agitated, violent, and propelling reality. The close up viewpoint makes the viewer captivated by the photograph, and offers an intimate sensation of the viewer taking part of the photograph, rather than just looking into a scene. Klein not only makes himself an active participant, but he also allows the viewer to be an intimate contributor to the picture by creating a sense of immediacy.

With just a glance, a viewer is drawn into a world and a reality captured by the photographer. Klein’s photograph, at my own first glance, drew me in with its unique aesthetic that struck me as rare and special. I felt a sense of nostalgia as I examined _Gun 1, New York_, and tried to understand why such a photo elicited this feeling. I had no easy answers for why I was so drawn to Klein’s boys. When I came across _The Americans_ by Robert Frank, I realized that these photos brought up the same feelings I had when I viewed Klein’s photo.
My interest in photography and art long predated my knowledge of either of these photographers. Growing up, I was surrounded by art. My mom has always worked in the art world and my uncle is an artist. During high school, I followed this passion to a summer job where I worked in a photography studio and was able to observe millions of negatives that ranged from professional magazine editorials to snapshots of the photographer’s personal life. Despite the glossy and obviously appealing staged photographs, I was continually drawn to those raw and realistic moments captured by the photographer.

In considering my developing interest in these particular types of photographs, I also recognized that my childhood in New York City had impacted my perspective. The streets of New York City offer a chaotic landscape, filled with anonymous individuals constantly in motion. It is the hybrid of these experiences, the childhood exposure to photography and art, the appreciation I gained for the seemingly mundane negatives at my summer job, and the familiarity of the anonymous gritty and raw New York City street life that led me to have such a strong reaction to Frank and Klein’s work, and to, what I came to learn was called, street photography.

While I have always been fascinated with photographs taken on the street, I never understood what made them stand out so much to me. Throughout my time at Bard, whenever I had the opportunity to choose an object for a paper, I always gravitated towards American street photographers in the post-war period. There was something about the candidness of the everyday life on the street that fascinated me. The peculiarities, the quirkiness, and the unknown of the street, coupled with the details and mysteries, intrigued me.

My visceral reaction to street photography made me want to explore the differences between this genre and others that seem similar, such as documentary or photojournalism, so that
I could better understand my fascination. I also started to think about what made these photographs, that I admired so much, have the aesthetic that they had, and why is it rare to see photographs that look like this today.

Through my research, I discovered that a lot of post-war street photography’s aesthetic was achieved, in part, because of technical innovations that emerged in that time period. It was an era marked by an economic boom, complete with prosperity and freedom, in a world rich with ideas and innovation. Yet, I also came to realize that the aesthetic that I had associated with street photography, which was a direct result from technical innovations of the post-war time period, also impacted current street photography. Those innovations were the roots of the same inventions that ultimately impacted and changed the overall aesthetic of these photographs that had initially drawn me in.

I also noticed that in the genres of photography, street photography and photojournalism tend to be candid, and do not take place in the studio or laboratory or any other controlled environment. Journalism pictures tell a story and record events and history. The photojournalists are witnesses and their pictures usually have a function and do not necessarily have an artistic intent, although that may be an unintentional by-product. In contrast, street photography has the element of candidness, impulsiveness, and serendipity (even though sometimes they are posed to appear spontaneous). These photographs also have a feeling of lurking, stalking, and peeping. There is an inherent danger to them, which is visceral and makes them more “real” and more truthful. Thus, they reflect the human condition in a more profound way. The photographer has a power and control over the subject that is less apparent than in a posed studio photograph, but in turn, more real. I discovered that this was why I love the boy with the gun. It is not only the boy
with the gun that is threatening, but the photographer shooting the pictures has the same menacing intent toward his subject and the viewer.

Though William Klein’s work was the inspiration, my exploration beyond Gun 1, New York led me to realize that there were many layers to the genre of street photography. His work became a springboard for my research and soon I recognized the crucial element of technical advancements. And yet, while I felt it was important to explore and understand the background of these innovations, I also did not want to only focus on the details of those technical aspects. I aimed to offer an overview of the most significant innovations in photography, and their direct impact on several key photographers to illustrate how their work formed a genre.
Chapter One:

Photography Innovations: An Overview of Technical Advancements and Their Impact on Street Photography

After World War II, street photography emerged as a prominent photographic mode for capturing the strange, candid moments that were hidden in life. Rather than a full departure from the already-established genre of social documentary, street photography was a means of documenting life in a less prescribed manner. Using the real world as subject matter, street photography allows the photographer to choose to portray himself through his subject or to illustrate his perspective on the world through the moment he captures. Rather than standing as a completely new art form, street photography takes elements from a number of varied genres and can be distinguished primarily through “predominant styles and subject matter.”

Street photography represents a hybrid of varied types of photography including, but not limited to, “the tourist snap, the documentary photograph, [and] the photojournalism of the fait divers (news in brief).” Street photography is therefore a combination of social-documentary photography and photojournalism. Street photographs are “often pictures that have a casual air, but prize the representation of a moment sealed in time from the everyday confusion of the street.” These photographs capture the fascination with the unknown of individual lives within a public space. As a result, street photography can seem ordinary in its subject matter, but it is the ambiguity

---

captured between the photographer and the subject and thus, “asks to be treated as much as a vernacular photography as a high art one.”

After the war, many street photographers went against the “rules” and “regulations” of what photography was in the early 20th century. These “rules” related to subject matter and technique and became more rigid with the teachings of Ansel Adams, who developed the “Zone System” to achieve that perfect exposure. Alfred Stieglitz set the tone for 20th century photography in America with his call for “Straight Photography.” After the international movement called Pictorialism, which welcomed all sorts of manipulation of technique and treated subjects both real and theatrical, Stieglitz called for a renewed commitment to “straight photography.” The technical components that were part of this ideal of straight photography included a specific way of capturing light and perspective in a sharply focused image. For example, Alfred Stieglitz’s From My Window at the Shelton, North, taken in 1931, represents the conventional high art photograph. (Fig 2) He was an expert in all of the photographic processes, and From My Window at the Shelton, North shows the meticulous detail and perfection of light and shadow that Stieglitz was known for. Stieglitz’s own photography was sharp, crisp, high contrast, with maximum depth of field and transparent shadows. Straight photography, as preached by Stieglitz advocated “full frame” photography, which entailed no cropping of the negative. It was a meditative style of photography, usually done with larger format cameras on a tripod. Stieglitz, and the “straight” art photographers that followed him, were attempting to distinguish themselves from the amateur ‘snapshooters’ who had emerged in the field of photography since 1888. Veering from the expected and rule-based photograph, or incorporating

---

critical thinking or spontaneity into one’s work was considered quite unusual and was very likely to be ignored by the photography world of the 19th century as well as the early 20th century. However, street photographers adapted to the snapshot subject matter and technique to uniquely self-expressive ends, and would frequently disobey these rules and create their own rules.

Photographers after World War II, such as Henri Cartier-Bresson, Robert Frank, and William Klein, paved their own paths in the genre of street photography. Their photographs commonly had unusual vantage points, out of focus scenes of blur and grain, and lacked the traditional distance between photographer and subject using close-ups to capture the subject. This close up viewpoint forms a sensation that the viewer is intimate with the moment, rather than just having a distanced observational view. These transgressions from the ‘typical’ photograph made these individuals the rebels of photography.

Because street photography can be described under different organizing principles, it is a highly inclusive category. Another aspect of street photography that must be acknowledged is that it has to be taken in the public realm. Vettel-Becker writes of street photographs, that “almost any image taken in the public rather than the private sphere whose subject matter is neither portraiture nor nature, including photojournalism and social-documentary, has been included under its umbrella term.”

Street photography may be a combination of different modes of photography, but the innovative intention of these photographers is to creatively insert themselves or their perspective into the photograph. Street photographs consist of images that may show social relations and may be politically suggestive, but they are also often individualized and experimental, representing both the photographer’s inner vision (what caught and attracted their eye), as well as the photographer’s physical position.

---

8 Patricia Vettel-Becker, Shooting from the Hip (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), 68.
What follows is a brief discussion of significant technical developments for street photographers, which will be followed by in-depth case studies. Many technical developments in photography led to the development of street photography from simple pictures made in public to a recognized artistic subject genre within the modes of photography. In this chapter, I will discuss several technical advancements of photography that led to this transformation, specifically the stereograph, the Kodak camera, the flash, the Leica, the Rolleiflex camera, Kodachrome film, and the digital revolution.

The stereoscope, invented in 1838, was a new instrument that made surfaces look solidly three dimensioned by exploiting the fundamentals of binocular vision. A stereograph involved two photographs side by side, which were almost identical to each other, placed on a piece of cardboard and looked at with a stereoscope. Through the instrument each eye only saw one picture, but the pictures recombined in the brain to create a third picture. The third picture, one’s perception, sees everything from both pictures combined to form a dimensional illusion. This allows the viewer to experience depth perception.

This instrument brought the viewer a step closer to a sense of reality. When the stereoscope became popular in the mid 1800s, Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote that its appearance of reality “cheats the senses with its seeming truth.”9 When looking into the stereoscope, the mind is seduced by the depth of the photograph and the viewer is transported into the scene. The earliest street photographers were mostly comprised of commercial businesses (such as those that distributed photography supplies, including E. & H. T. Anthony & Company) that were attempting to survey the streets for a tourist clientele. The depth provided by the stereoscope was an important and desirable component because it allowed the viewer to be engulfed directly into

---

the scene and also feel the energy and movement of the photograph. For example, Julius Wendt, a news dealer in New York, would place a stereographic camera in front of his store and capture people walking on the street. (Fig 3) When viewing Wendt’s stereograph, it is as if you are part of the scene and walking towards the pedestrian. This invention removed the space and the separation between the viewer and the captured moment. The lack of separation was crucial in the development of street photography as a viable art form. Street views of major cities were a staple of commercial stereography companies like the London Stereoscopic Company and Underwood and Underwood. A street view helped build tourism because it allowed people to see what places looked like, which could increase their interest in visiting. (Fig 4) Furthermore, with the stereograph’s relatively small negatives, stereoscopic images needed much shorter exposures, allowing for more spontaneity.

While the stereograph was an important innovation that helped street photography grow into its own genre, the innovations of the Eastman Kodak company had much greater impact on street photography. The technical trajectory and development of the Kodak camera led to its increasingly accessible use. Prior to the Kodak, cameras involved the use of glass plate negatives that were both heavy and fragile. In 1886, Eastman began selling lightweight rollable film, which was created by coating paper with emulsion. The quality of the image was not as good, which is why it initially did not attract the photographers of the time. Nevertheless, George Eastman realized that roll film could be instrumental in developing a simpler photographic method. He hired engineers to design cameras to use roll film as well as to design a mechanical shutter that could take a picture in a fraction of a second. George Eastman, John Carbutt, and Hannibal Goodwin all discovered how to use celluloid for photographic film. Celluloid film was flexible.

---

and transparent, which made it possible for the film to be winded and placed in small devices. This was the start of mass photography.\textsuperscript{11}

The Kodak camera was something no one had ever seen before. In its first iteration, in 1888, there was no focus; just a button to take the picture, and a key to wind the roll of film inside the camera. It was a small box, loaded with an 100-exposure roll of film. People would take the pictures and when the roll was done, they would send it back to Eastman’s factory, where the pictures would be developed. Then the camera would be reloaded and sent back to the owner. Eastman advertised the camera with the slogan “You press the button – we do the rest”. It sounded easy and simple, which attracted millions of amateurs.

Despite all of the advancements, the Kodak produced images that were imperfect and often blurred. (Fig 5) Yet, while it was not recognized at the time, this imperfection was something that the Kodak contributed to the development and definition of street photography, because it was a departure from the perfectly posed and poised standards of original photography. In fact, the very imperfection of Kodak snapshot photography helped street photography to develop as its own genre.

For the very first time, you did not have to be a skilled photographer to take pictures. It was not only much easier for the person taking the photo, but also for the subject. No longer did a person have to sit for an extensive amount of time, without moving, to get their picture taken. The Kodak also looked so different from the standard large cameras that many people did not always know when their photo was being taken. This opened up the world of the candid and beautiful moments that could be captured spontaneously. The Kodak allowed anyone to go anywhere in broad daylight and take pictures. The Kodak thus made it possible for ordinary people to capture simple, warm, moments in life, and be able to keep them as memories.

\textsuperscript{11} Collins, The Story, 66.
Thus, while Eastman initially intended the Kodak camera to allow the amateur to capture personal moments, he ultimately opened the door for amateur photography to become a major influence on art. This example led street photographers to become “generally more enchanted with what became known as the ‘snapshot aesthetic,’ and apparently un-composed everyday subjects, illuminated only with available light, and taken in a way that mimics instantaneous sight.” The snapshot adds the instantaneous ingredient to the street photograph. The immediate effect has to do with the notion of time. Time can never stop, never go backwards or speed forward. Time is a constant, steady-moving interval.

The 20th century photographer Henri Cartier-Bresson, who is known for coining the term “the decisive moment,” developed the mode of the 35mm snapshot, which can be seen in Behind the Gare St. Lazare (Fig 6). Cartier-Bresson’s interest in this decisive moment emerges from surrealism. Surrealism was a form of expression through writing that expressed the imagination and portrayed the unconscious. It quickly spread to other art forms. “The images obtained by such means, whether visual or literary, were prized precisely to the degree that they captured these moments of psychic intensity in provocative forms of unrestrained, convulsive beauty.”

When describing the “decisive moment,” Cartier-Bresson writes that the photograph combines “the simultaneous recognition, in a fraction of a second, of the significance of an event as well as of a precise organization of forms which gave that event its proper expression.” Cartier-Bresson, in a way, captured the “real” moments, but with surrealist thinking. He searched for revelation through the ordinary, by capturing those moments in photographs.

---

A photograph is the only tool that comes close to stopping time itself. Therefore, a photograph represents a moment in time and can only be seen thereafter as a moment in the past. And although this concept is part of all photographs, the “snapshot” that is done on the street represents a specific type of photograph. Street photographers shoot moments in time because they crave the ingredient of surprise and the chance quality that appears out of ordinary reality. Even through the chaos of the streets, the photographer will find a moment of clarification.

There were an increasing variety of cameras emerging in the early 1900s, with the advancements of flash. The flash had been around for a while. Originally, in 1887, flash was created with flash powder, a metallic fuel mixed with chlorate that creates a bright explosion when lit. The mixture was dangerous and tedious to manage when taking a picture, so the invention of the flash lamp in the 1890s was a much-welcomed development. Flash lamps held the flash powder inside and were connected to the shutter of the camera box. This led to the invention of the flash bulb in 1929, though these bulbs were fragile and could only be used once. In 1965, Kodak created the “flash cube” for their Instamatic camera, which you would rotate for each new flash picture. While the flash cube provided a usable flash for the amateur photographer, professional photographers already had access to convenient flash technology, since the 1930s when the electronic flash bulb was developed. There have since been a variety of advancements to the electronic flash, such as high-speed and strobe flashes, which have been used by street photographers to their advantage.

The technical advancements of the flash have made it easier for street photographers to go out and photograph at any time of the day. Weegee (Arthur Fellig), known for his crime scene photographs, was able to capture many of his moments because of his use of flash in the dark of night crime scenes. (Fig 7) Some street photographers not only use the flash to illuminate the
subject or scene in the dark, but also use it in broad daylight to create a certain effect in their pictures. Photographer Diane Arbus often used the dramatic effect of flash in her photographs to create a surreal look. When looking at Arbus’s photograph, Woman with Veil on Fifth Avenue, N.Y.C, (Fig 8) it is evident that she used the flash in a dramatic way to bring out more texture and light in the fabric of the veil, as well as the texture of the woman’s face. The flash is used to create a dramatic look, as it adds a spotlight on the subject. Moreover, when color photography emerged later on, the flash allowed photographers to enhance the colors, making them look more vivid.

In 1924, a new camera was built that changed photography. This camera was called the Leica. The camera was small enough to carry around in a bag, but its technology was far more complex. The Leica offered “a great scope of shutter speeds and extra rapid crystal sharp lenses together with its size and ease of manipulation.”15 The Leica used 35mm film and had a short focal length lens. The Leica allowed photographers to capture moments quickly inside, outside, in the dark, and in the light, and in many ways offered photographers “the pocket notebook of passing events” in the form of a camera.16 Its innovation changed how news and history were recorded, and offered a new language and form of communication through photography because of the ease and speed of this new camera.

The Leica made it possible to take candid pictures, capturing moments on the street that were true to life. The moments captured by the Leica were filled with motion, expression and energy. Notably, the Leica allowed the candid moment to be more accessible and quicker to capture. Photographer Alfred Eisenstaedt used the Leica camera in many of his photographs, and Sailor and Nurse (Fig 9) shows the combination of qualities that the camera produces. Here, the

16 Morgan, The Leica, 8.
Leica captured a frozen, intimate moment for the couple, but also kept the movement of the ordinary people and everyday life that continued in the background. The Leica camera will be further discussed in chapter two.

Following the popularity of the Leica, the Rolleiflex camera, which was introduced in 1929, offered photographers a different outcome because of the square shape of the film. The first Rolleiflex, which was called “Rolleiflex Twin Lens Reflex (TLR),” made 2x2 inch square negatives that were high quality. The camera was small, compact, and easy to operate and allowed the photographer to work with speed with a large size negative. This camera was popular because it incorporated a lot of benefits into one camera. For instance, it had a great viewfinder, was small and durable, not complex to use and had great optics, which all together produced high quality negatives. Ultimately, photographers such as Walker Evans often used both the 35mm and the Rolleiflex TLR in working to capture a particular moment.

As street photography grew into its own genre, continued technological innovations further helped transform this genre from a simple photograph snapped on the street with an ordinary camera to a photograph that captured a moment in a spectacular fashion. The introduction of color film took street photography to a new level. Color has been around for a long time, however it became more popular when, in 1935 Kodak invented Kodachrome, a color reversal film. The film was easy to use and produced good quality photos. For example, a Kodachrome photo by Chalmers Butterfield (Fig 10) shows the high quality photograph that the film produced. Kodachrome film had four monochrome coatings; blue, yellow, green, and red. When developing this film, there is a different process than that used for developing black and white film. The process is more complex, but using different color lighting and filters, it produces a colored image. As time went on, color film was improved and became much more
popular. The emergence of color film impacted street photographers because it allowed their photographs to be closer replicas of what they saw. William Eggleston is a photographer who turned color photography into a respected format in the late 1970s. Eggleston’s *Untitled (Frontier Sign)* (Fig 11) shows the clashing of colors that he was known for capturing, which could not have been done without the invention of color film. Using color in their photographs, street photographers gained a closer and more realistic view of the captured moment, because after all, life is in color. On this point, the photographer, Joel Meyerowitz has stated, “I always felt color was the most descriptive force in photography’s language.”

Yet, Meyerowitz also acknowledges the disadvantages of color over black and white, noting that color “was slower than black-and-white and so it changed my behavior on the street from instantaneous reaction in the thick of the crowd to a more watchful response at a greater distance.” As a result of the inclusion of color, the viewer might also take more time to process what they are seeing. In the context of street photography, this extra processing time could be seen as a disadvantage and departure from the emphasis on direct and quick connections between the subject and the viewer. Thus, color photography offered a truer view of a scene, but also presented a potential obstacle. Beyond color, other innovations would develop over time that would further impact the essential characteristics of street photography.

One of these new innovations is digital photography. In recent years, the drastic shift from traditional film to digital photography has significantly impacted street photography, both in positive and negative ways. The digital photographer’s ability to shoot, and then assess his or her exposures in the next moment removes a piece of the spontaneity of the street photograph. It is not the captured moment that is impacted by digital photography, but rather mindset of the

---

photographer that is affected. The photographer now can capture each moment until they have exactly what they want, rather than trusting their intuition and their eye that they captured the moment. The candidness and spontaneity of street photography is influenced by this mindset. More importantly, the original snapshot can be altered by the computerized post-production techniques of Photoshop. The artistic value of a chance “snapshot” is indelibly affected by the fact that a photographer can fundamentally alter a photo. (Fig 12)

Furthermore, social media and the invention of the camera phones have meant that anyone can document everything at anytime. This constant documentation degrades the value of the moment, because if everything can be captured, what does a spontaneous or significant moment really look like, and how does it differ from the next moment? The ingenuity and innovation of a particular photograph is difficult to capture, when every moment can be considered a captured moment. Thus, the newest innovations have artists documenting what everyone is doing at every moment, and possessing the ability to change (using Photoshop or other editing devices) the material that was originally captured, and this has changed street photography in a profound way. As a result of the digital revolution, the definition of street photography seems to be in flux. Since everyone can be a digital photographer in their own right, there is no way to ascribe meaning and worth to every photo shot of every moment on every street. Thus, the difference between every photograph on the street and true and honest street photography has become muddled.

That said, the digital revolution has also been an asset to street photography’s development. Social media has offered an automatic gallery for street photographers. Applications such as Instagram have also offered artists the opportunity to curate their own galleries of street photography. The most powerful aspect of street photography is its ability to
produce a sensation of intimacy. Social media allows people to share their pictures on their phones; viewers can scroll through them and even zoom in and out to form a deeper intimate connection with the photograph. Then again, the ability to zoom allows the viewer to focus on a component of the picture, rather than viewing the photograph as a whole, and viewing a photograph on a smartphone automatically reduces the size of the image. Debate continues about whether the digital revolution has affected street photography in a negative or positive way.

The evolution of photography, and particularly its technical advancements, has had an undeniable impact on the transformation of photographs from the simple moments in the street in stereoviews to a fully developed genre of street photography. Yet these technical developments both narrowed and expanded the definition and properties of street photography, and continue to do so today. Though street photography as we know it today emerged in Europe after World War I, it became the major artistic genre in the United States, and particularly New York City after World War II. In the following chapters, I will look in depth at three key innovations and discuss the photographers who best exploited them through the subject of street photography.
Chapter Two:
The Influence of the 35mm Camera on Street Photography

*Hyéres*, (Fig 13) taken by the French photographer Henri Cartier-Bresson in 1932, features a person riding a bicycle in the narrow streets of Hyéres, France, and conveying the motion and speed of the cyclist was surely part of the photographer’s intent. By shooting from an overhead vantage point, he is able to contain the subject within the converging geometry of the architectural shapes and forms. Moreover, this picture is composed very deliberately. Cartier-Bresson framed this view so that the cyclist sits within a frame that is filled with lines and shapes that show a strong formal convergence. He encourages the viewer’s eye to follow a rhythm when looking at the stone stairs that are wrapped by iron banisters. Although it is stone, Cartier-Bresson still gives this material a sense of motion. The viewer’s eye travels down the staircase, but the stair is cropped, which forces the eye back to the biker in motion.

Cartier-Bresson therefore captures a fleeting moment, but uses a systematic perspective. The biker is placed to the left of the composition between the foreground and the background. The jagged foreground is more intense with the shapes of the steps and banister, whereas the background is smooth, with the sidewalk curving with the biker. The decision to photograph the composition from an overhead vantage point helps create an illusion that the street is lifting upwards. In many ways, Cartier-Bresson puts together elements that are opposites, which create the tensions in this picture: the foreground and background, the elegantly composed picture of geometric forms and the fleeting movement of the biker in motion.

He has chosen to photograph on what seems to be a gloomy day in an area where light is blocked by the buildings, which is why the photograph lacks much contrast. Instead, he seems
more interested in the bold patterns that surround the subject’s motion than the contrast of light and shadow. Moreover, by placing himself at the top of the stairs, above the subject, it is likely that the biker did not see the photographer, nor even know that the photograph was taken. This photograph is a great example of why photographers like Henri Cartier-Bresson used the 35mm camera.

The 35mm film allows the camera to be smaller because the film is smaller, which makes it easier for street photographers to wander the streets and snap away with ease. The Leica took the flexibility of the 35mm to a new level, enabling cameras to be smaller and even more portable and versatile in their uses. Cartier-Bresson adopted the 35mm format camera, specifically the Leica, early on. In the 1920s, Cartier-Bresson, along with other European photographers, brought the small hand held camera to the center of photography. Using this format, he excelled in candid photography and became the format’s first “master.” The photograph of the cyclist in Hyères was made possible by the small camera size, the fast shutter speed, portability, and the potential to keep the photographer discreet.

The first viable compact 35mm format camera was brought to market by the German Oskar Barnack in 1925. Barnack built the Leica when he was working at Leitz, a lens company in Germany. At first he was in charge of microscope research at Leitz, and then he was promoted head of development in 1913. He was a precision mechanic, as well as an optical engineer, which helped him invent the compact 35mm camera. Essentially, it consisted of just a box with a lens, a shutter and two film spools, although over time it consisted of more components. Both the film and the lens can measure up to 35mm, which refers to the focal length of the lens and the width of the film. For instance, when a camera has a 18mm lens, it is a wide-angle lens, whereas a 55mm lens is narrower. The number represents the distance between the lens and the camera’s
image sensor. Ultimately, the shorter the focal length, the wider the angle of view. The 35mm format camera typically has a focal length of 43mm. However, the length of lens varies depending on the photographer’s preference. The focal length of a lens is important because “it determines the location and size of the images which the lens forms of objects at different distances, the depth of focus, the perspective and many other things and is one of the main keys to the secret of the performance of the lens.” Street photographers often use 35mm cameras because of the intimate yet removed quality their small size allows. Photographers can get close to their subjects, but not too close, so it will not be obvious that they are taking a picture. However, Cartier-Bresson set the 50mm to be the lens for street photographers, yes not all street photographers used it.

The Leica’s small size and lens precision also offered photographers an opportunity to capture a new kind of moment, ranging from photographs from the front lines of war to the front rows of rock concerts. Capturing this moment was possible due to the small size of the camera, the speed of the camera, and the depth of focus. The precision of the camera was achieved through German engineering that created a high quality lens to capture and create sharp negatives. In a Leica advertisement from the 1967 issue Photography Annual, it states “the precision side of a Leica is the side you never see - the inside. That’s where 725 parts work together - smoothly, silently, flawlessly...a camera that is affable and easygoing on the outside, but intricate, tough and disciplined within.” Ease with precision had always been an important trademark for Leica.

The dimensions of the first Leica were 5.24 inches long, 1.54 inches wide, and 2.60 inches high. The small size made it possible for photographers to easily travel with their camera,

\[19\] Morgan, The Leica, 70.
\[20\] Editors of Popular Photography, "Leica," advertisement, Photography Annual, 1967
and take pictures in many different places. The camera was so small that it could fit in one’s pocket, and could allow the photographer to be discreet and even secretive in capturing individuals candidly on the street. Prior to the Leica, cameras were usually big and heavy (with the exception of small box cameras like the Brownie, which were not flat like the Leica) because of cumbersome fixed lenses.

The Leica had a lens that would collapse into the body of the camera when it was not being used, which made the whole camera more compact for carrying. When the camera would be in use, the photographer just had to pull out the lens, rotate it and lock it to be ready to take a picture. In order for street photographers to capture fast moving situations they most “often use a moderately wide lens, such as the 35mm lens on a 35mm camera, as their normal lens. They don’t have to pause to refocus for every shot, because with this type of lens so much of a scene is sharp. At the same time it does not display too much distortion.”

Additionally, the camera’s fast shutter speed and the winding mechanism allows the photographer to take a sequence of photographs showing movement, and offers a more in-depth interpretation of the subject. The Leica’s design combined the movement of winding the shutter and clicking the button to make it quicker and more comfortable when taking a picture. The shutter speed affects the sharpness of the moving action in a scene. Also, the small roll of film could have up to 24 exposures (which later expanded to 36) so you did not have to change the film often. Finally, the Leica had a vertical rangefinder, which was a distance scale that allowed the photographer to set the focus distance on the lens.

Kodak had always been perceived as the amateur camera for anyone to use, and Kodak’s first advertisements marketed their hand-held camera as an easy, simple machine that even
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children could use. The slogan “You press the button, we do the rest” in their 1888 advertisement explained the system perfectly. (Fig 14) It was a camera that was so simple that they advertised it as “the only camera that anybody can use without instructions.” Although this advertisement was published in 1888, Kodak continued to keep the idea of pure simplicity as the basis of their brand, and they continued to market their products to amateurs as the cameras to use for everyday snapshot moments, as we see in two ads from 1950. (Fig 15) Kodak produced a whole line of miniature snapshot cameras like the Brownie Hawkeye, which took 120 film cartridges, but they also began making a 35mm camera in the 1950s - especially for people who wanted color slides.  

When looking at the two 1950s Kodak advertisements, we see the camera being used by a father snapping his wife and son sledding, with the words “Family fun together--what a time for pictures” and “Snapshots keep your happiest times.” The moment on the right shows a father taking a photo of his wife and daughter on Easter with the words “Snapshots tell the story best”. Both show the Kodak camera being used in capturing family moments by ordinary people, showing the typical way the Kodak camera was perceived and used by people after the war.

By the 1930s, often companies like Nikon, Canon, and Contax were making miniature cameras to compete with the Leica. Kodak had already been around and was marketed to amateurs and young children in the post-war period because it was a simple, anti-automatic camera with a few manual controls.

At the other end of this spectrum was the Nikon. It was advertised in 1959 as being an automatic camera: (Fig 16) with what seems to look like an ordinary camera, Nikon creates a camera that has all features that capture a quality photograph, but it can be done by just clicking the release button. The advertising copy reads,
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22 Color slides will be further discussed in chapter three.
...the image you see is bright, clear, full size...focusing is fast, easy, positive. And the camera handles with incredible ease and speed. And then, you press the release. Instantly, the automatic features take over...and with such speed you are almost unaware that you have captured the picture.

The Nikon camera was evidently just as easy to use as the Kodak, by simply just pressing a button. However, it had advanced technological features like the Leica that produced high quality photographs with such ease that you “are almost unaware that you have captured the picture.” The advertisement suggests that the Nikon does not even need the photographer to be conscious or aware when taking the photograph. It is as if the photographer does not have to use his mind at all. Despite the camera being technologically advanced, it is so advanced that it could be seen as negating the photographer’s creative capabilities. Even the image used in the advertisement presents a camera without the photographer. There is just a hand holding the camera with a finger on the shutter with a black background. The black background gives the viewer a feeling of emptiness. It seems that there should be a body attached to the hands holding the camera, however, the black background detaches the hands from any such body. This detachment represents the camera in isolation, and the ad negates the human intelligence needed in order to use the camera.

A Leica advertisement that came out around 1970 sent a different message, promoting the Leica as the “think” camera. (Fig 17) This advertisement lacks a human body like the Nikon ad, and there are no happy family moments as in the Kodak ad. Instead, the ad emphasizes the word “think” and even ridicules the automatic features of other cameras:

This “pro” doesn’t boast electronic circuitry. It doesn’t have photocells to select the area of interest. No little indicators to tell you there’s not enough light. The Leica M4 is strictly for those of you who prefer to do your own thinking, your own creating.

These ads bragged that the camera scorches the latest “automatic” technology, and trusts the user to do their own thinking. The use of the black background seems to remove the attention on the
camera and lead the viewer to the large white letters that read “the think camera.” Leica seems less interested in advertising the technical features of the camera and more interested in advertising the camera’s ability to allow the photographer to use their creativity and intelligence. The Leica represented a different kind of elitism. It showed that the photographers are smart enough to make their own rules. It was appraising of the independent thinker, and in this sense, it professed to be anti-authority. In fact, the Leica was the choice for post-war street photographers because it was the in-between of the simple amateur camera like the Kodak and the easy to use technologically advanced automatic camera like the Nikon.

If the Kodak was simple to use but did not allow much of the photographer’s choice in camera settings, the Nikon took this almost too far, to where the photographer could take high quality photographs, but did not need to incorporate any intelligence in the process of taking them. For instance, the photographer no longer needed to know how to check the light meter when taking a picture. All of these improvements had suppressed choice. On the contrary, the Leica required intelligence and encouraged the photographer to be creative. It was a sophisticated tool of versatility, by which photographers were able to be imaginative and innovative. Street photographers wanted a camera that was simple to use, but also had manual settings for the focus, the light meter, and shutter speed so they could capture these detailed moments the way they perceived them, the way they “think” others should see them. The characteristics that became common in street photographs (blur, grain, unusual vantage points, low angles, etc.) were natural with the Leica.

Using the Leica, Cartier-Bresson had developed the camera’s capability for capturing subjects in a new way. For instance, he emphasized geometric space in many of his pictures. “Just as one can analyze the structure of a painting,” Cartier-Bresson says, “so in a good
photograph one can discover the same rules, the proportional mean, the square within the
rectangle, the Golden Rule, etc. That’s why I like the rectangular dimension of the Leica
negative, 24 by 36 mm.” In many ways, his experimentation with the Leica on the street set the
rules for street photography. His photographs had a new look because they did not have much
contrast, usually lacking sun, which produces a gloomy, low light picture. His photographs often
did not tell a story or have a specific point that he was trying to make. However, his photographs
are complex, even if it is not a straightforward narrative. Joel Meyerowitz and Colin Westerback
argue that

In much of his work, the place is sharp edged and timeless, the human presence motion-
blurred and evanescent. The image is balanced precisely halfway between a meticulous
composition and a knee-jerk reaction. The two elements are contradictory yet mutually
dependent.”

First and foremost, his style encouraged the street photographer to see the camera, and
specifically the Leica, as an extension of the body. Cartier-Bresson writes, “Photography is a
way of living. To me, my camera is an extension of my eye. I keep it all the time with me.”

Cartier-Bresson’s photography emphasized the importance of looking and waiting. In his
words, “Sometimes it happens that you stall, delay, wait for something to happen...You wait and
wait, and then finally you press the button - and you depart with the feeling (though you don’t
know why) that you’ve really got something.” This idea rejected the simplistic notion of just
“clicking” the button, and pointed out the decisions a photographer makes when capturing a
moment. He believed that composition is important, but that it is our intuition that is the most
significant: “Composition must be one of our constant preoccupations, but at the moment of

shooting it can stem only from our intuition, for we are out to capture the fugitive moment, and all interrelationships involved are on the move.”

Cartier-Bresson’s photographs can be described as “intellectual” because they were effectively made by his creative mind, which was enabled by using the Leica.

Though Cartier-Bresson is considered the father of 20th century street photography, his work also gave rise to generations of street photographers who took the format and genre in other directions, like Robert Frank. In some ways, the post-war street photographers opened a new chapter in street photography by embracing some earlier characteristics of Cartier-Bresson’s work, while also rejecting some of his precepts. Particularly through his innovative use of the Leica, Robert Frank led the way in American street photography.

Robert Frank, a Swiss-born, American street photographer, started taking photographs in Switzerland and continued when he arrived in New York City in 1947. Frank took a job as a fashion photographer, hired by the art director Alexey Brodovitch. Brodovitch encouraged Frank to use a 35mm Leica, “which seamlessly merged the camera with the eye, creating more fluid, immediate, even balletic photographs.”

However, Frank did not like the limitations that fashion photography placed on him. As a departure from his work in fashion photography, Frank began to use his 35mm Leica to capture America in the way he perceived it. His photographs, which formed the basis of his book, “The Americans,” were grainy with blurred forms and motion. This is evident in one of Frank’s famous images, “Elevator -- Miami Beach, 1955” (Fig 18), which shows a sad young woman in an open elevator as people are walking out and passing her. The young woman is in focus while the people around her are blurred and in motion. By focusing on her, he brings the attention to the emotion that is revealed by the young woman’s facial

expression. The feeling of busy, rapid movement that comes from the blur of moving figures, is juxtaposed with the lonely, sad and stillness of the young woman who is well defined, but still slightly out of focus. Not only does the compact camera allow Frank to capture rapidly changing moments, but Frank was also able to set the shutter speed and aperture to create the effect of sharpness in one area and blur in others.

Frank did not exactly follow Cartier-Bresson’s advice that you needed to have a great “eye” in order to capture that perfect moment. Cartier-Bresson explains the importance of the eye in *The Decisive Moment*: “what the eye does is to find and focus on the particular subject within the mass of reality; what the camera does is simply to register upon the film the decision made by the eye.”

In fact, Joel Meyerowitz and Colin Westerback make the argument that “Frank made compositions that relied upon no eye at all. He took such chaney photographs that it was impossible for any of them to be a masterpiece, or even be able to stand alone as an image.”

“Chance” is a good word for both Frank and Cartier-Bresson. Cartier-Bresson discusses “chance” in an interview and says,

> We have to be alert and know when to pick the moment which is significant. Then, it’s just intuition. It’s instinct. We don’t know why, we press at a certain moment. It comes, it is here, it’s given. Take it. Everything is there, it is a question of chance, but you have to pick and force chance to come to you. There’s a certain will.

Frank also believed in this “chance” effect, but with the difference that Frank would sometimes capture moments without looking into the camera, which added the factor of simple “luck” to his photographs. Relying on chance, his photographs often showed mistakes, imperfections and uncertainty. Frank used his “intuition to guide him to symbolically fertile places while
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employing visible film grain, blur, and an unorthodox sense of composition to crystallize his emotional response to a given scene’s fleeting essence.” For example, a photograph called Bar, Gallup, New Mexico, 1956 (Fig 18) seems like it was taken from a low angle, probably without looking into the viewfinder when clicking the shutter button. Frank’s method of photographing was regarding the outcome of how the photograph would look, but he relied on chance and his intuition that the photograph would capture what he wanted. The outcome of the photograph may appear to be a “bad” photograph in the traditional sense of focus, lighting, contrast, and other technical standards, but this is what made Frank’s photographs unique. He loved mistakes, and made mistakes into something expressive and aesthetically beautiful. Frank used the Leica to shoot from below the subject, which can exaggerate the photograph’s height. Changing the camera angle changes the point of view. For instance, the low angle makes the viewer feel as if they are hiding and seeing something discreetly. The distorted framing and low angle of this picture suggests that Frank shot at hip level. Having the only light source be the fluorescent light shining overhead, directly above the man in the photo, would normally stop a photographer from taking this photo because of the effect the light would have on the exposure. However, in Frank’s photography, the light ultimately created a harsh and eerie atmosphere that works well with the dark interior. Frank saw something and used his intuition to capture the scene, without concern for the “image quality” of his photographs. Frank has therefore “broken photography’s rules, thus becoming, in effect, photography’s own rebellious son. Like a gunfighter in a shoot-out, he ‘shoots from the hip,’ producing this poorly lit, grainy image, framed seemingly by chance.”
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at his face with him looking through it. This adds to the idea of the Leica allowing the photographer to be discreet.

When discussing the quality of Frank’s photographs, what is considered a “good” photograph is one that speaks to the viewer with emotion, whether negative or positive. In Frank’s words, “Above all, I know that life for a photographer cannot be a matter of indifference. Opinion often consists of a kind of criticism. But criticism can come out of love. It is important to see what is invisible to others.”

Frank found his own way by exploiting the versatility of the Leica by using it to capture moments that are seen through his perspective.

When breaking down the 35mm Leica camera into separate features that made it so perfect for Frank’s needs, the first aspect of the device to mention is the small size. The size of the Leica enabled Frank to be unobtrusive, quiet and discreet. This is evident in Frank’s photograph, *Sagamore Cafeteria, NYC*, taken in 1954. (Fig 20) Frank was able to capture the man sitting at a table without being noticed, and the lens was wide enough to capture the man and his surroundings. Frank has an interesting perspective on his subjects. Instead of capturing the man in an open environment, he was attracted to the surroundings of the man isolated in the frame. This isolation, in the form of the image, coincides with the emotion that the photograph creates: that of isolation and even loneliness. Furthermore, in both *Bar, Gallup, New Mexico* (Fig 19) and *Sagamore Cafeteria, NYC* (Fig 20) Frank was able to capture these two moments that are inside, with low lighting, and without a flash, because of the optics of the Leica lens. If Frank had used flash, these photographs would not have the same gloomy feeling that they possess. Also, the flash would attract the attention of the subject to the photographer, which would no longer make him discreet. Furthermore, Frank used the surroundings, such as the jukebox on the
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left and the wooden wall structure on the right in the scene to reinforce emphasis on the seated man.

Frank utilized the 35mm lens to create depth of focus in many of his photographs. For example, *From the Bus, New York, 1958* (Fig 21) shows an unorthodox vantage point by using the 35mm lens to focus on the hand hanging outside the vehicle window, making this the focal point of the photograph, as well as capturing a glimpse of the outside surroundings, which gives the viewer mixed emotions of relaxation and chaos. As is explained in *The Leica Manual*, “The photographer can, at will, select the range of object distances within which everything is imaged with the best possible sharpness and, if he uses his camera correctly, he can always direct the attention of the spectator to the subject of interest.” For instance, from what is captured in the photograph, it seems that the streets are packed with bumper to bumper traffic, giving off an anxious feeling of being stuck and trapped between large vehicles and with nowhere to go. The hand is loosely holding a cigarette and draped over the side window as if the person is enjoying his time and not bothered by the chaotic busy streets of New York. By using this 35mm lens, Frank creates an interesting juxtaposition between chaos and order.

The Leica made it possible for Frank to get in the thick of the crowds to capture his subjects, which created an intimate sensation in his photographs. For example, a photograph of a group of people sitting around a jukebox (Fig 22) shows the close interaction that Frank had with his subjects. This photograph makes you feel as if you are part of the scene, whereas the Cartier-Bresson photograph felt more as if you were looking into the scene through a window. (Fig 13) However, Cartier-Bresson took many photographs that were close-up to his subjects, showing that the Leica is capable of both. What is evident in all of Frank’s photographs is the blur, the unconventional perspective, the unorthodox vantage points, and uncanny juxtapositions that were
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all possible because of the Leica format camera. The grain that is seen in his photographs are from the film and printing process.

What seems to be evident through Frank’s work is that it was not merely the technical components of the Leica that made such photographs possible. In fact, it was the opposite, it was the in between of the amateur “just click the button” Kodak and the heavy-tech Nikon that encouraged these photographers in the post-war to represent the world spontaneously, creatively, and personally, however way they wanted. The Leica was the iconic camera for the time because it was a period of change, individuality and freedom - change in the way photographs were expected to look, individuality in capturing a reflection of yourself, and freedom as not just in the liberation from the tripod, but in the freedom to ignore the rules. The Leica made it possible for photographers like Robert Frank to shape street photography in post-war America.
Chapter Three:  
Color Photography

American photographer William Eggleston was also a Leica lover. Eggleston was born in Memphis, Tennessee in 1939. His father was an engineer and his mother was a judge. However, his grandfather raised him because his father was enlisted in the United States Navy during World War II and his mother followed him. Eggleston’s grandfather introduced photography to him at a young age, though Eggleston lost interest soon after. It was when Eggleston attended college and studied Henri Cartier-Bresson in an art class that he was reawakened to photography.

Eggleston collected hundreds of Leicas and Canon bodies and stored them in briefcases that he had custom made. He would take them apart because he was interested in the way cameras were built, and beyond the mechanics, he appreciated the feeling and precision of them when he would hold them.\textsuperscript{36} However, although Eggleston photographed with a Leica, like Frank and Cartier-Bresson, there was one significant difference: color.

Eggleston first photographed in black-and-white, but when he shot his first roll of color film in 1965, he took a new approach to photography. Unlike the aforementioned photographers, there is very little spontaneity in Eggleston’s photographs, which in part could be because he did not use the Leica in the same way. While Frank and Cartier-Bresson seemed to relish the opportunity to capture motion, Eggleston’s photographs very often captured still moments. Eggleston’s work indicates that not all street photography has to emphasize instantaneity and the capture of action.

\textsuperscript{36} The Colorful Mr Eggleston, directed by Jack Cocker, produced by Alan Yentob (2009; n.p.: BBC ONE, n.d.), DVD.
Eggleston’s work represents the initial shift for photographers using the Leica to capture still moments with color in street photography. An untitled photograph by Eggleston in his book, *William Eggleston Chromes*, exemplifies his style. (Fig 23) The geometric composition of this photograph is evident through the lines and shapes. Eggleston uses the details of the structure’s architecture, along with the clear lines of the poles, fences, and wires to point out all the different ways one can look at the photograph. Whereas Cartier-Bresson utilized geometric shapes to create a setting to draw the focus to the main subject (Fig 13), Eggleston’s shapes equalize each element of the composition. The car on the roof of the blue house is as important as the “Esso” sign on the left. The geometric lines draw the viewer’s eyes to everything, equally, not just the center of the composition.

Though Eggleston’s photographs are very often formal and still, they are also unpredictable. For example, Eggleston’s photograph of a McDonald’s storefront in Pittsburgh taken in the 1980s (Fig 24) exemplifies many of the unique characteristics of his work, such as the juxtaposition of the ordinary with the unexpected. Eggleston captures the simplest and most familiar moments, but with his particular compositions and his use of color, he highlights the extraordinary elements of those moments. In fact, his work brings out the complexity of the seemingly simple moment. This photograph features the McDonald's storefront side by side with a photography store. By placing the camera at eye level and shooting from a distance, he is able to capture both storefronts. Yet at the same time, he does not take the shot at an angle where he captures the whole of both storefronts, or more of one than the other. Similarly, the cars and the person walking are clearly an important part of the composition, but no one subject is the main focus. Here, Eggleston has chosen to photograph a subject that is banal but he portrays it as something far more than ordinary. He is showing the beauty that is often overlooked by people in
their day-to-day environments. This effect is done by Eggleston’s use of color and unique vision. The color blocking of the reds and yellows of these two initially seemingly unrelated storefronts, intensifies the complexity of the entire frame, and these effects make these un-spectacular subjects turn into a more sophisticated and intricate composition.

Eggleston’s pictures seem ordinary and intuitive, as if there was no forcing in the act of taking the photo. However, at a closer look, they become more complex than simple, ordinary subjects. He is not relying on obviously decorative elements or even nostalgia. He is photographing between the gaps of everything else. When looking at Eggleston’s photographs, one should not look for a main subject, and instead one should look at everything equally. In doing so, the small details that may seem unimportant at first will be fascinating. There are blocks and shapes of color within the composition, which create a vibrant geometric effect. Although the photograph seems truncated, everything that is in the composition seems to work together. The eye is brought to every part of the composition and therefore the viewer faces a choice in choosing what is the focus of the entire frame. It is as if he is showing the viewer that something may seem obvious at first, but he forces the viewer to interpret the photograph and find meaning in the subjects that go beyond their usual everyday interpretation.

Eggleston is now admired for utilizing color, yet he was strongly criticized when he began using it in 1965. Despite the controversy, he never stopped using it, and color gradually grew in popularity and became a phenomenon in street photography. Eggleston’s color photography was initially rejected largely because it was seen as a more commercial medium, not suitable for self-expressive art because of its strong associations with advertising and magazine work.
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In fact, color in photography had been around since 1840, but at the time it was added by painting on the photograph, a manual process, divorced from technology. Even though this was not efficient because the color pigment faded easily, it was the most popular technique to produce color photographs for about one hundred years. This approach intertwined painting and photography, which at the time was also somewhat controversial because photography was not accepted as a fine art yet. Other advancements in photography slowly helped color be accepted in the fine art world.

Though their “autochrome” plates were invented in 1903, the Lumiere brothers only marketed these color plates in 1907. The Autochrome process consisted of coating a glass plate with three colors of dyed potato starch grains on one side, filling the role of color filters. The plate was coated with other chemicals as well and was placed into the camera where light could pass through. The problem with the autochrome process was that it required long exposures compared to black-and-white film. Therefore, in order to keep the camera still, a tripod was necessary for taking a photograph. The heavy and complicated autochrome equipment and the outcome of a glass slide that had to be viewed against the light made the autochrome photograph an unappealing medium for most photographers.

After many attempts by various inventors to efficiently achieve color photographs, in 1935, Kodak introduced the invention of Kodachrome film. Kodachrome is an emulsion and was marketed in a variety of formats for making prints. As described in a major manual on color photography:

Kodachrome has three light-sensitive layers, each containing separate black-and-white emulsions with different color sensitivities. The top layer is sensitive to blue light, the middle layer to green, and the bottom layer to red. (There also is a yellow filter layer positioned below the blue to keep blue light from affecting the bottom layers. The yellow
filter layer disappears when the film is processed.) Each black-and-white emulsion layer records light in proportion to the original colors of the subject. This invention was revolutionary because it made color possible in photographs that were high-quality images, with sharpness and hues that were truthful to the subject. Photographers who were interested in portraying naturalistic subject matter by showing natural colors used Kodachrome.

Kodachrome is color reversal film, also known as slide film, which can be projected on screens. People would have gatherings to view the slides showing events such as weddings or family vacations. Given its ease of use and its casual application, Kodachrome was advertised for the amateurs. A 1941 advertisement for Kodachrome film (Fig 25) shows a snapshot image of a man and woman smiling on vacation. Under the image, part of the text reads: “On your own home screen - gorgeous full-color “stills” - with KODACHROME - at surprisingly low cost…” Kodak advertised this film to amateurs highlighting its low cost and ease of use. However, the major limitation to Kodachrome was the complex printing process. This is why amateurs were also interested in a newer color product called Ektachrome, which was also a Kodak product and was introduced in the early 1940s. It allowed smaller printing labs to process film negatives and prints without advanced equipment, or even for the amateur to process the film themselves, which allowed them the ability to process their photographs just like the professionals.

Ektachrome is also an emulsion that was marketed in different formats for making prints. It could also be used to make a color reversal slide film. What made this different from Kodachrome is that the process was not as technically intricate. For instance, when working with 35mm film, the Ektachrome process produced a positive image directly when processed.
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Therefore, when it is being developed, there is no print to be made, just a tiny transparency that could then be placed in a cardboard frame and put in a projector to be displayed.

If photographers wanted color prints, options were limited. In 1945, the dye-transfer printing process was introduced, but because of its complexity, it became a more popular choice among professional photographers. The color image was “formed...by absorbing dyes from a series of gelatin-relief images - a highly complex and time-intensive matter, but one that resulted in excellent color fidelity and outstanding image stability”\(^{39}\) for printing on a paper support. This technique was rarely used outside of the commercial world because of the tediousness of the process. Kodak stopped making the materials for the dye process in the 1990s because of the associated complexity and expense. Yet, ultimately the dye-transfer process would inform Eggleston’s use of color in his photography.

Eggleston never finished school; he was self-taught, using his surroundings, his own experiments, and his available resources to explore his interests. His entree into photography was no exception. He read a Kodak manual, which helped him learn how to work a camera. It could be said that in addition to the influence of Henri Cartier-Bresson, Eggleston’s composition comes from the time he spent with his friend who worked in a drugstore photo lab. During his time spent there, he was exposed to all of the family snapshots that were printed throughout the day.\(^{40}\) Eggleston was struck by the everyday subject matter and the composition of the prints, but was disappointed in the color quality, which spurred him to pursue adding brighter and more vivid color to his photography.

The dye-transfer process was appealing because of the intensified saturation and the stability of the colors. One critic has noted that: “Eggleston’s use of the dye transfer process,

\(^{39}\) Horenstein, *Color Photography*, 18.

\(^{40}\) *The Colorful Mr Eggleston.*
increasing the preciousness of the photographs as artistic objects, differentiated them from the typical snapshot they sometimes loosely resembled.”41 The rich colors allowed his subjects to stand out, which helped separate the amateur family snapshot from his own compositions. He was among a few photographers who brought the dye-transfer process into the art world.

Photographers before the 1960s were not that interested in these inventions because they were expensive and required a significant time commitment. However, it seems that it was not only the technology that created a resistance to color photography. It appears that there was also a cultural reason. In the art world, color photography was not accepted right away. For instance, the photographer Walker Evans discussed the lack of color’s appeal in an essay published in 1969 in the book, *Quality: Its Image in the Arts*: “There are four simple words for the matter, which must be whispered: color photography is vulgar.”42 In his perspective, color was not only unappealing, but also lacking in sophistication because it did not resemble the black-and-white photography of the time. The “vulgarity” of color was not just its commercial associations. It was also vulgar in that it showed things “as they looked” in an everyday sense. Therefore, “seeing” in color is highly ordinary. Black-and-white photography was classed a transformation of the everyday, whereas color was not. In 1950, Edward Steichen tried to advocate for color photography in an exhibition that he organized *All Color Photography*, which consisted of 342 photographs by 75 photographers. Steichen attempted to put already accepted art photographers work who had experimented with color, such as Harry Callahan, with journalistic, industrial and amateur photographs. However, his advocacy had a reverse effect, reinforcing the association of color as “a commercial and amateur medium not suitable for art.”43 This largely was a result of
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Steichen’s photography focusing on fashion, commercial work and architectural design. As a result, “color photographs - most commonly presented within the museum in expensive state-of-the-art commercial processes such as dye transfer and carbro prints - could only really be understood within a context of industrial design.”

This created a distinction between black-and-white art photography, and color photography, which was associated with industrial design, and other commercial advertisements and applications.

Apart from industrial design, color was mostly associated with magazines such as Life and movies. Even when Kodachrome film was introduced for photogenic color prints on paper in 1935, it still was not acknowledged as a popular choice for photographers. Photography exhibitions usually exclusively featured black-and-white photographs. Most already accepted photographers only used black-and-white as the color in their work. For instance, Robert Frank believed that “black and white are the colors of photography.”

Anything outside of these two tones was relegated to the world of advertising. Color photographs were a rare find in exhibitions before the 1970s. However, at the end of the 1970s, color photography had begun to take off. Eggleston had an exhibition called “Color Photographs” at The Museum of Modern Art in 1976, which was also the museum’s first publication on color photography. In the MoMa’s preview press release, it states: “In their work the role of color is more than simply descriptive or decorative, and assumes a central place in the definition of the picture’s content.” However, the exhibition was met with much negative criticism. Hilton Kramer wrote a review for the New York Times, stating that the exhibition was a failure. Kramer criticized the exhibition for being too avant-garde and not catering to the public’s taste.
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York Times on Eggleston’s show and said “Perfect? Perfectly banal, perhaps. Perfectly boring, certainly.”

Though photographers in the past, such as Walker Evans and Robert Frank, were known for different photographic approaches, both used photography’s ability for self-expressive purposes using black-and-white film. Each told his truths, but in different ways, yet always perceived in black-and-white. This created a cultural perspective that believed “black and white was historical, a medium associated with modernism: it represented not only a belief in visual truths but an assumption of compulsory engagement with the world.” While “the rise of color - and resistance to it - was a cultural phenomenon,” ultimately, color was accepted into high art photography as another way to capture the world with a camera. Eggleston was capturing subjects similar to amateurs, but was finally accepted by the art world because of the hyperreal effect his color produced.
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Chapter Four:

Digital Revolution

At one time, people’s homes stored boxes that were filled with negatives and polaroids, photographs that were developed from film, and mounted into album books with paper triangles at the corners. Today’s photos live in a “cloud,” or on people’s phones, iPads or computers. People rarely print their photos, instead sharing them via text message or through social media. Photographs are taken and shared rapidly and as a result, each photograph carries less weight than photographs prior to the digital revolution.

The shift from traditional to digital photography created a whole new approach in the photography world, and in many ways changed the face of street photography. The innovation of the digital photograph was different than anything before because it not only changed the way photographs looked or how they were taken, but it also changed the process of making the photograph. There was a shift “in the location of photographic production: from the chemical darkroom to the ‘electronic darkroom’ of the computer.”

The shift began with the first digital camera, constructed at Kodak labs by Steve Sasson in 1975. It is ironic that the Eastman Kodak house was at the center of the invention of the digital camera, as, in many ways, this innovation would ultimately make film, which was responsible for Kodak’s major revenue, obsolete. Sasson took various pieces that he found around the lab to construct the camera. (Fig 26) The camera was larger than most point and shoot film cameras that had already been invented. It was definitely a step back from the lightweight, easily transportable device that had been praised for a while now. It also was a step back from a fast exposing camera because it took twenty-three seconds to take one black-and-white image. What
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made this camera different from any camera before was the Charge Coupled-Device, also known as CCD, which allowed the camera to store 30 images on a cassette tape that was attached to the back of the device. George E. Smith and Willard Sterling Boyle invented the CCD in 1969, who found that when “Light hits a tiny grid of photosensitive silicon cells, each...build a charge proportional to the intensity of the light hitting it. This charge can be measured precisely and we can know exactly how bright that portion should be. Add filters, and color can be discerned too.” What all of this created were “pixels”, which form together to make a digital image. When you zoom into a digital image, you can see the pixels that look like small blurred squares, but when you zoom out, the pixels are less apparent and the image emerges.

However, it was not until the 1990s when the digital camera began to take off among consumers. In 1991, Kodak introduced a modified Nikon F3. (Fig 27) The camera was digital, but not the typical digital camera that is seen today. The photographer could capture images digitally, which would be stored on a hard drive that was carried separately. Later on, cameras were able to have memory cards that were inserted into the camera, which stored images on it. This allowed the photographer to take more photographs (as much as the memory card could store) and insert it into a computer to view the images larger or to have them printed.

These technological innovations began to develop faster as companies would build off of other companies’ inventions. In 1995, the Casio QV-10 camera (Fig 28) was the first digital camera to have a LCD screen on the back of the body where the user could preview the images before taking them, as well as view the images after. This camera was revolutionary in not only
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the digital world but in photography overall. Never before was someone able to look at their images right away after taking them on the camera body.\textsuperscript{52}

As their popularity increased, digital cameras began to become more compact. These cameras would

...generate photographs by focusing the light rays of a scene through a lens onto a sensor - an array of light-sensitive diodes. The sensor converts the image to data that is transferred to a memory card in the camera. Some compact cameras - the more expensive ones - rival digital SLRs (D-SLRs) in picture quality and features, but most are designed for the pockets of tourists and casual snapshotters. Many cell phones are also compact digital cameras.\textsuperscript{53}

With the rapidness of the technological world, digital cameras began to rapidly change as well. Companies were easily able to access other companies’ products, and build off of their inventions. As a result, Leica, Nikon, Panasonic, and Sony (among others) all developed cameras that produced great digital images. In large part, one digital camera’s superiority over another is determined by cost, and as such, money plays an important role in the choice of camera.

In the mid 2000s cell phones began to have cameras, combining the phone and camera into one device. Now, on some level, everyone was a photographer, capturing images at a moment’s notice. Steve Jobs, who was the co-founder of Apple, did something similar to what Eastman Kodak did earlier, which was that he simplified the technical components of a camera. Kodak had created a camera that made anyone able to be a photographer. Similarly, Apple’s invention of the iPhone, released in 2007, was revolutionary in its simplicity and ease of use. Though camera phones had already been invented, the iPhone was the first to take high quality images with the touch of a finger.

\textsuperscript{52} The closest anyone had come to instant photography was the Polaroid.
The iPhone has evolved over the last decade, but always kept its basis, which is that taking something that is complicated and highly advanced, and making it simplified for the user. Just like Eastman Kodak’s slogan, “You press the button, we do the rest,” Apple created their product with the mission of having everything in one place for anyone to use easily. One of their slogans for an Apple product was: “The all-in-one for everyone.” As a result, today, the iPhone has become a viable camera replacement. In fact, in 2012, Annie Leibowitz described the iPhone camera as “the snapshot camera of today.”

Although digital cameras have become advanced, allowing for high-quality, high-resolution results, it has disadvantages for many, and particularly, for street photographers. From the physical camera to the photographing process, and then on to the printing process, digital photography signifies a shift in street photography. In many ways, digital photography, which may seem to be an ideal mode for a street photographer, has turned out to be somewhat of a departure from the tradition.

Street photographers often use small, lightweight, compact cameras to capture quick moments anonymously or as quietly as possible. Thus, one might assume the iPhone camera is the perfect tool for the street photographer. However, many street photographers change the lens of their cameras to photograph certain subjects in the specific way that they want. Most compact digital cameras do not have interchangeable lenses, which would restrain the options for street photographers.

Additionally, many of the compact digital cameras that first came out did not have a viewfinder. The photographer would preview the image by looking at a monitor that was located on the back of the camera. The advantage to some was that the photographer could see the image
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before taking it. However, for street photographers, who were using their photographs to bridge the gap between themselves and their subjects, the extra lens of the monitor was a barrier to their work. The difference between the direct view of the viewfinder, and the potentially altered view on a screen is the relationship between the eye and the subject. The eye is now looking at a digital screen, rather than through a viewfinder, which takes the eye farther away from the subject.

Technically speaking, the original digital cameras had a “noticeable delay - called shutter lag - between pressing the shutter button and the actual exposure that can cause you to miss peak action.” This shutter lag could be problematic for street photographers because of their desire to capture quick and in the moment shots without the need for any planning.

Some can argue that the process of developing and making the print is an experience that is necessary in being a photographer. With digital photography, people are less likely to develop and print their photographs for a few reasons. One, it is a lot cheaper to view photographs on a screen rather than to have them printed. Two, viewing photos digitally (on a screen) is a much faster, and more efficient way to view them, and three, less paper is used when removing the printing component. However, the problem with this is that a huge essence of photography is the print. It is not just the taking that is important to photography, but the making is important as well. The digital camera allows the photographer to see right there what was taken, which removes the intuition and luck aesthetic, as well as the printing process component of traditional photography. Photographers are unable to view the photographs on a film camera until they finish the roll, develop the negatives, and make a contact sheet. Therefore, the photographer has to believe in their intuition that they got the shots that they wanted because they will not know until they look at their contact sheet.
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A contact sheet (Fig 29), which is a positive paper print of all the negative images, shows the photographer a preview of all the images from the roll, where they can then choose which negative they want to print individually. The contact sheet was a staple part of the experience of film photography because it not only was the first time that the photographer can preview their images, but it also was the selection process where the photographer chooses the images that resonated with them. For viewers, contact sheets help give insight into how the photographer works and their thought process in taking pictures. For example, Robert Frank’s contact sheet #1 (Fig 29) shows Frank’s process of choosing of negatives that he wanted to enlarge for further viewing. A contact sheet can be done digitally, however, by dragging all the adjacent exposures on a photoshop file and then printing them out as a group, is a more laborious task, and not part of the natural process in the way traditional contact sheets are done. There is no limit to the number of pictures to take with a digital camera. Whereas, a contact sheet from a roll of film has a limit, such as 36 frames, which makes the process of choosing begin there. Therefore, the course of selecting from a digital contact sheet is more diluted with the number of pictures, and the process of choosing with film is more concentrated. It is far more likely that digital photography would skip the step of making a contact sheet.

Furthermore, the opportunity to choose, in the moment, from multiple shots, and placing the emphasis on looking at the product (the image on the screen), rather than the subject, is a departure from the original street photographers’ process. William Eggleston was vocal about his process of taking photographs. He only would take one photograph of his subject, allowing that to be the shot that he needed, no matter what the outcome was. “I have only taken one picture of one thing. Not two. I would take more than one, and get so confused later, when I was trying to figure out which was the best frame, and said this is ridiculous, I am just gonna take one and
that’s gonna be the one.”\footnote{The Colorful Mr Eggleston} The digital camera, with the unlimited number of photos that can be taken, has allowed the user to capture many shots with the certainty that one of them will be good, rather than trusting that they got the shot they wanted.

Cartier-Bresson coined the term the “decisive moment.” With the rise of digital photography, and particularly with the way images are quickly taken and shared across social media platforms, his phrase is losing its essence. People have access to a camera at almost all times, which virtually allows one to document everything at any time. This has created many problems, one being this constant desire to show everyone what they are doing at every moment. People today use photography to create a façade of their life. Specifically through social media where you can just post the highlights of your life, edit the photos to make them look a certain way and ultimately curate the way people view your life. Digital photography allows people to display what they are doing at every moment, but they can still have the choice of only showing what they want. The fleeting moment that held such importance for Cartier-Bresson has been lost and taken over by the constant desire to snap away at everything, making no moment more unique than another. In fact, many people spend most of their time photographing their life rather than actually living in it. Rather than living in the moment, people are far more concerned with using their phones to record the moment. In large part, this obsessive desire to constantly document is the effect of the rise of social media.

The psychologist Linda Henkel discusses the negative effects of the rapidness of photo taking. She notes that because people are constantly taking photos of everything, attempting to capture the moment, they actually will not remember the moment. As she writes, “When people rely on technology to remember for them - counting on the camera to record the event and thus
not needing to attend to it fully themselves - it can have a negative impact on how well they remember their experiences."\(^{58}\)

Along with the invention of digital cameras came the invention of digital manipulation. At the end of the 1980s and early 1990s, “the rapid growth of personal computers and consumer imaging software made computer-generated and manipulated imaging an option for others besides the scientist-artist.”\(^{59}\) Software programs, such as Photoshop, were invented once images could be downloaded and viewed on a computer screen. Photoshop is an editing software that has tools and commands to change a photograph. Some of the features include adjusting color balance, erasing mistakes or blemishes, and adding filters to create special effects. Software programs that allow the user to alter the photograph in any way are a disadvantage to street photographers. It removes the quick, intuitive and realistic aesthetic that is cherished in most street photographer’s work.

As a result, the truth of a photograph is compromised: “Digital imaging tools make it possible to easily improvise the content of reality, spawning artists who are accustomed to inventing worlds rather than presenting them, and viewers who are willing to accept such inventions.”\(^{60}\) The element of candidness, which is such an important part of street photography, is interfered with because we can no longer presume the “truth” of the image. Further, these digital manipulations, and the accessibility of photographs offered by social media and the Internet have made it possible for people to post and retrieve photos anywhere, which creates the problem of authorship. There is a struggle to control who can use the image and for what purpose the image is being used. Further, it is difficult to track who takes authorship for the image both
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\(^{60}\) Hirsch, *Exploring Color*
because images are so easily accessible on the Internet, and because they are easily altered using editing software. For example, Instagram allows people to post any image without copyright or authorship. Also, social media apps, such as Instagram, have editing tools and filters which enable the user to alter the original image. A photograph of a city that was taken and then altered by using the X-Pro II filter on Instagram (Fig 30) shows how filters and editing can completely change the original look of a photograph.

Yet, in some respects, the digital camera lends itself to street photography. For most street photographers, having a perfectly focused image was never their main intent. Therefore, the negative criticism that the iPhone lens is poor compared to those of high tech cameras, such as a Canon camera with a 24-105mm lens, could actually work in favor for street photographers. A phone that could produce “mistakes”, such as blur from the phone not being held steadily or not a perfect clear image is an aesthetic that street photographers did not mind. Street photography is not necessarily about the quality of the picture, but more so about the moment that is being captured. While not defined as a street photographer, Nick Knight, the British fashion photographer who also balked against traditional photography, speaks about the effect of technology and what it means to him and his work. In Knight’s words, “What I’m into is visual connection to what I’m taking, not pin-sharp clarity. It’s absurd for people to think all photos need to be high-resolution - what matters, artistically, is not how many pixels it has, but if the image works...The machinery you create your art on is irrelevant.”61 Knight’s take on digital photography should speak to street photography, in a world that has been taken over by this technology.

Overall, despite what seems to be a medium that naturally lends itself to this genre, digital photography has largely had a negative impact on street photography. The close connection between digital photography and social media has limited how effectively digital cameras can be used in street photography.
Conclusion:

The Death of Street Photography

Has the digital revolution put an end to street photography? Although many technical innovations, such as small compact cameras, were crucial to the development and formation of street photography and its original genre, ultimately, it seems that the invention of phone cameras has led to the demise of street photography as well. The progression of inventions related to photography made the task of capturing candid moments much easier. Digital allow people to take endless amounts of photos with no extra cost. Ultimately the candid photo became too easy to capture with the invention of camera phones. With the rise of smartphones, cameras have truly become ubiquitous. In a report on U.S. smartphone usage, Aaron Smith examines the effects of smartphone ownership in America. Smith writes, “today nearly two-thirds of Americans own a smartphone, and 19% of Americans rely to some degree on a smartphone for accessing online services and information and for staying connected to the world around them.”

The prevalence of images on social media, the Internet, and in day-to-day life has changed the landscape for street photographers. iPhone 6 ran an extremely successful campaign where photos “discovered using one of the many online photo-sharing platforms such as Instagram and Flickr” became a billboard advertisement for the smartphone. Given the premise that any person could “take a photo with [their] iPhone 6 and it could go up on a billboard all over the world,”
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capturing a moment on the street and sharing it has become commonplace and accessible to everyone with a smartphone.⁶³

Before the Internet and the ability to post pictures to an audience of thousands, if not millions, people were much less concerned about having their images snapped in public. With the rise of the Internet and social media, images are shared and uploaded everywhere, which has made people more conscious of their picture being taken. It is extraordinarily easy for images to be posted and shared all over the internet, and as a result, people are not only conscious of when they are being photographed, but also more reluctant to have their photo taken. Even if the person is told what the photograph is for and where it is going, there is no assurance that it will not be spread over the web by others. Consequently, candid shots are more difficult to come by.

Furthermore, authorship has always played a strong role in street photography, but since the increase in images on the Internet and social media, authorship has become much more complex. In fact, because of how widely and publicly a photo can be shared, and how little control the photographer has over the journey of his or her photograph, authorship seems to be a dying concept. Despite laws that suggest that each photographer owns the images that they create, in reality a brief Google Image search shows how easily a photographer’s creative act can be effectively “un-authored.” As a result, the value of the photograph can be impacted. Whereas in the past people would stand in line to get into an exhibition of Eggleston’s work, today all of those pictures are accessible by the click of a button.

There is a much larger world of street photography today, which makes a lot of what is labeled as “street photography” seem familiar, typical, and overdone. However, that does not mean that street photography no longer exists, or there is no “good” street photography anymore, 

there is just a lot more of it. The problem is the lack of selectivity. It seems to be beyond human power to sift through the onslaught of images digitally posted to find the truly valuable ones. If Robert Frank or William Eggleston used Instagram or Flickr to share their photography, would they have gotten the same reception that they did in their time? Would someone have found their photographs and realized their unique value? When we consider the photographs that do emerge from the endless sea of images, intent seems to play an important role. Most likely, the advertising team at Apple whose responsibilities included sorting through social media platforms to find interesting and unique photographs, primarily aimed to sell more Apple products. Highlighting valuable photographs and discovering new photographers was just an accessory to the advertising campaign.

In this image-glutted environment, where digital photography reigns, I think talented photographers need talented curators more than ever. The ultimate impact of the digital camera on street photography is unknown, however, the potential for unique and creative street photography is greater than ever with the advent of digital photography. Yet, because of the multitude of images that are now accessible, it is incumbent on the artistic curator to sift through the images to find those that truly capture the ideas and visions of a unique photographer. The phone camera has not diminished the potential for a talented street photographer; it has just made finding him or her a greater challenge.

Street photography has evolved into a new kind of photography. Street photography was a representation of the life of the town and city, the social interactions of people in places. Now much of that material is on the Internet and social media, maybe the rules for judging the aesthetic of this new photography have not been defined yet. But eventually they will.
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From the very first moment you sight through this remarkable 35mm camera, you are impressed by a sense of quality and precision. The image you see is bright, clear, full size—the picture exactly as you’ll get it—all of it, even if you wear glasses. Focusing is fast, easy, positive. And the camera handles with incredible ease and speed.
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The automatic responsiveness of the new Nikon F is in itself a revelation. Add to it the incomparable quality of the Nikkor lenses—which, it accepts interchangeably—and you have in your hands a camera of unlimited creative scope and versatility—a tool that gives you every right to expect the finest picture results. For it is, unquestionably, the finest 35mm reflex money can buy.

See the new Nikon F at your local authorized NIKON dealer. $375 with Auto-Nikkor 1:4 lens. $335.50 with 12. For descriptive literature, write to Dept. HM-7.
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