Journal of American Studies of Turkey
22 (2005) : 5-18

Alfred Stieglitz's *Camera Work*, and the Early Cultivation of American Modernism

Ted Eversole

Leadership in the early cultivation of modernism in America rested with a group of New York avant-garde artists either influenced by or inspired by the photographer and connoisseur Alfred Stieglitz, (1864-1946). Stieglitz was a key stimulus to American artists who wanted to be informed of, as well as debate, the changes in painting going on in Europe in the early twentieth century. Under Stieglitz's tutelage, a growing population of artists absorbed modernist ideas. In many ways, the success of the famous New York Armory Show of 1913 was a direct result of Stieglitz's influence as were many of the artistic experiments with new stylistic forms that occurred in the decade before 1913.

Alfred Stieglitz was a mentor as well as organizer and "Cromwellian" defender of the faith. He refuted those who looked at the products of photography as being mechanical non-art. His artistry revealed the depths of selectivity possible and his subject matter dramatically captured and contrasted life in New York and its many moods, seasons and tempers. New York City, its buildings and humanity, became a naturalist backdrop for his conception of a particular world, at a particular time. He had what critics today would call a sense of place, although his horizon was not only urban, and could include his country home in Lake George, New York, and even the transitory clouds passing over the American landscape.

Stieglitz's technical accomplishments were almost as imposing as his artistic successes. He emerged as the "scientist-poet" who, in less than twenty years since his initial studies in Germany during the 1880s under Hermann Wilhelm Vogel, the inventor of orthochromatic film, had elevated the camera into one of the great tools of art. Stieglitz took this scientific invention of the nineteenth century, at first glance a vehicle for unflinching realism and antagonist of modern art, and translated it into an inspiration for modernism. His photographic art often omitted the contradiction between the real and perceived natural world, making it more personally self-expressive as opposed to real. Photography was for Stieglitz a catalyst that brought a justification for the painter's innovations (Richardson 24).

Not only through his singular art did Stieglitz contribute to this rebirth, he also worked for a more practical public outlet as well. To accomplish this he took over the dying Society of American Photographers in 1897 and the all but dead New York Camera Club and, as he said, "called forth a live body" (Norman 42). Aware of the Photographic Secessionist movements in the 1890s in Vienna, London, and Paris, which endeavored to free photography from a purely commercial and technical orientation, by 1902, Stieglitz wanted his own New York Photo-Secessionist movement to do the same. A year later, *Camera Notes* became, under his editorship, the large and handsome *Camera Work*.[1] By no means was this all that he accomplished. In 1905 he rented three rooms on the top floor of a brownstone at 291 Fifth Avenue and called it the Little Gallery, or more simply, 291 (Larkin 179).

This article focuses on Stieglitz, his gallery, and the journal *Camera Work* as cultivators of modernism.[2] It is not Stieglitz, the photographer, that is most critical, but Stieglitz and his coterie of modernist painters and writers who took the spirit of the new art forward to a largely unappreciative American audience. This marked the beginnings of modernist criticism and a modernist American worldview. Modernism itself became the broad brush that reflected a changing and increasingly mechanized and science-based world of new opportunities, possibilities, and problems. Artists of this early period attempted to come to grips with this change in many ways and forms. In the cultural confusion of the time, this often resembled an avant-garde vs. anti-avant-garde clash. At the heart of this modernism was a previously unheard of independent spirit and concern for self-expression in whatever vision the artist chose for this expression, be it non-representative, non-objective, or abstract. The *Camera Work* critics and artists are then historically important even though post modernist musings might see them as useless vestiges of an unacceptable past plagued by racism, homophobia, sexism, and capitalism.[3]

This 291 period, from 1905 to 1917, marked one of the most incredible eras in America's creative past. The Fifth Avenue studio emerged as a virtual oasis of modernism, functioning as an informal exhibition hall for the kind of work that turned up at the Armory. In addition, it stood in 1913 as the organizational epicenter for much of the planning and direction of the Armory Revolt. As the historian Warren Susman remarked, "Transformation seemed to be what the new culture was all about" (Gabler 51). The 291 Gallery stood out as the home ground of the modernist team. Here artists fervently struggled in a variety of media, to participate in the marketplace of contemporary ideas. As one Stieglitz scholar, Geraldine Kiefer, concluded, this background made 291 an "experiment station" (Kiefer xix).

Modernist ideas as artistic expressions were a phenomena that met both public and intellectual hostility, comparable in some ways to the late nineteenth century impact of Darwinism. As historian Samuel Hunter stated,

> The same old tired epithets that had been used to discredit Eakins and progressive art of the past, revealing again the intellectual and emotional impoverishment of American art criticism at its popular level, were dusted off and pressed into service to ridicule the new and unaccustomed in art (Hunter 47).

If cultural change was a necessity, it was equally clear that the vehicle for this transition would not emerge from the established artistic forces and their organizations. Though there had existed since 1817 a Society of American Artists that had broken away from the old Academy of Design in New York, this group contributed little to the cultural struggle between the academicians and insurgents. This artistic counter-organization in time lost what little independent fervor it had. In fact, its agreeableness and general conservatism was so entrenched that by 1906 there was no clamor to oppose the reunification of this newer body with the older National Academy of Design.

There were a few minor challenges to academic dominance before 291. For instance, a group called "The Ten," which included Frank W. Benson, Joseph DeCamp, Thomas W. Dewing, Childe Hassam, William Metcalf, Robert Reid, Edward F. Simmons, Edmond G. Tarbell, John Henry Twachtman, and Alden Weir, provided a not so lively body of American Impressionists (Brown, *American* 197).

Another artistic group that emerged in the early years of the twentieth century, as a challenge to the academicians, was the Ash Can School. The challenge, however, was more one of attitude and subject matter than form. The derisively labelled "Ash Can School" was not highly original in terms of style, and by no means could it be called avant-garde. Nothing in its contents would startle a European audience. This informal group of artists, composed of John Sloan, William Glackens, George Luks, and Everett Shinn, later joined by Maurice Pendergast, Ernest Lawson, and Arthur B. Davies, took as their spiritual leader the Philadelphia painter, Robert Henri. Under Henri's influence, this group was urged to examine "life," as unstartling as this may seem. In addressing this issue, Milton Brown suggested that "He (Henri) convinced them that expressing the vitality and richness of the American scene was worthy of being an artistic credo and not merely the subject of a hack illustration" (Brown, *American* 8).

The standards of realism were thin mechanisms for expressing a changing artistic vision. Perhaps it was Henri's influence, and reliance upon

nineteenth century naturalism, which kept this group from joining the coterie of modernists. Several of the group (Luks, Glackens, Shinn and Sloan) were Philadelphia newspapermen and their experience was that of reporters who chose to record aspects of the twentieth century urban experience as and when they observed it.

When this group finally did exhibit together at the Macbeth Gallery in New York in 1908, nonetheless, a worthwhile precedent was established. A definite celebrity followed their efforts and there was even room for rejoicing from the financial standpoint as well, for the exhibition netted $4,000 in sales (Hunter 39).

Alfred Stieglitz, meanwhile, demonstrated an even more consequential break with the old order than "the Eight" ever could fathom. For Stieglitz and his followers, revolt symbolized not only an ideological alienation from the forms of the genteel tradition as manifested by the Academy; their struggle represented a complete revolt involving the very spirit of art.

However, the modernist triumph meant for Stieglitz an internal growth of the individual that would ultimately bring complete creative freedom. As one commentator observed:

> Stieglitz understood clearly the great schism between art and society, as it exists in our time. Faced with this situation he assigned to society, to the great unappreciative mass of the public, the role of villain and to the disinherited artists the role of hero . . . in his own mind and his disciples', he intensified the nature of the schism by glorifying the artist and sanctifying artistic labor (Brown, *American* 39).

For another, Stieglitz was the twentieth century American "with the bark still on him" (Hughes 348).

At the urging of Edward Steichen, the Luxembourg born American painter and photographer, who was familiar with the advances taking place in Europe, and who also aided Stieglitz with the operation of his gallery, Stieglitz initiated the first showings of European modernism in America. In January 1908 the war with tradition began when "fifty-eight original drawings" by M. Auguste Rodin were put on view. "It is the first time that New York is to be given an opportunity of studying these unusual drawings," Stieglitz later reported (*Camera Work* 21 (January 1908), 45).

Within four months Stieglitz was planning an even more decisive departure. Steichen wanted a Matisse exhibition that would undoubtedly further set the critics on their heads. These works would indeed be abstract to the limit of current perceptions. The announcement for this show stated:

> The closing exhibition of the year will be devoted to the drawings, lithographs, watercolors, and etchings of M. Henri Matisse, the leading spirit of a modern group of French artists dubbed 'Les Fauves'. . .. It is the good fortune of the Photo-Secession to have the honor of introducing Matisse to the American public and to the art critics (*Camera Work* 22 (April 1908), 44).

Through such early exhibitions as the Rodin and Matisse, Stieglitz worked to promote a new vision of what was modern in the arts. Precisely because of such efforts, Stieglitz helped steady the keel of the modern experimenters in this largely unreceptive new world. Little wonder advanced American painters, such as Marsden Hartley, who needed exactly this kind of encouragement, found the 291 to be "the largest room in the world." For many years this first generation of modern painters would find their only sympathetic American community here.

The achievements found in the earlier Rodin and Matisse shows had to be built upon. Stieglitz followed them in December 1909 with an exhibit of lithographs by Toulouse-Lautrec; paintings and watercolors by Henri Rousseau in November 1910; and Cézanne watercolors in March and Picasso drawings and watercolors in April 1911. For all of these artists this was to be their first significant showing to an American public (Larkin 180). Stieglitz continued to challenge his opponents, giving the academicians little time to regroup. As he declared, "We all have to learn how to see. We all have to learn to use our eyes, and 291 [is] here for no other purpose than to give everybody a chance to see" (Bruno 402). No wonder that academic governors of the old order such as Sir Purdan Clark, Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, exclaimed, "There is a state of unrest all over the world in art as in all other things. It is the same in literature, as in music, in painting and in sculpture. And I dislike unrest" (*Camera Work* 26 (April 1909), 25).

A 291 mainstay, Marius De Zayas, helped define the theoretical basis of Picasso's early efforts particularly as seen in his 291 exhibition. De Zayas applied his critical understanding and modernist insights to interpret as well as place Picasso's work into an aesthetic context that reflected the 291's spirit and its search for the new art's inner meaning.

Stieglitz's promotion of the visual arts linked him with other emerging modernists. The emotional dynamics of modern mankind – suffering and forgiveness, love and hope, the vocabulary of modern man's struggle with a dispassionate industrial and technical world – could indeed be represented in its intricacies by painters and sculptors just as it could be by poets, film makers, novelists, dancers and musicians.

These artistic innovators all shared the common cultural ground of modernism. Dramatically, for some, as Virginia Woolf famously remarked, the world turned upside down, for, "on or about December 1910, human nature changed" (Howe 15). Thus what followed in the arts from this time onward suggested a definite breach with the traditional past. For other critics the true modernist upheaval came only in 1922 when James Joyce's *Ulysses* and T. S. Eliot's *The Waste Land* appeared, and in doing so brought the modernist experiment in literature to its most fruitful stage (Howe 15). However, for most historians of modernism, such precise projections are risky. Arthur O. Lovejoy drew such a conclusion when trying to define the beginnings of Romanticism (Lovejoy 228-253).

Nevertheless, these early decades of the twentieth century were pockmarked with the residue of artistic revolt in all the arts. Modern art became the symbol of the artistic awareness of form and idiom. Alfred Stieglitz and his Camera Work-291 group led this universal modernist revolt. The other arts followed suit with experiments of their own. In sum, the "End of American Innocence" was at hand (May, passim).

In August 1912, the pages of *Camera Work* again took center stage when Gertrude Stein's writings on Henri Matisse and Pablo Picasso were published. As the editorial preface to this special issue indicated, it was not only Stein's comments upon the painters that were significant, although her articles carried an independent perspective. Stieglitz knew at this time that the revolutionary changes on modernist canvases were not to be in isolation from other arts. As the editorial stated:

> The development of this movement is the outward and visible sign of an intellectual and aesthetic attitude at once at odds with our familiar traditions and undreamed of by most of our generation. So that its attempts at self-expression are more or less puzzling, if not wholly unintelligible, to the average observer who approaches them for the first time . . . it happens that the movement found its first expression in the field of painting and that in that field have appeared its most striking, and therefore its most discussed manifestations (*Camera Work Special Issue* 2 (August 1912), 3).

These *Camera Work* pieces were Gertrude Stein's first American exposure, and reflected Stieglitz's awareness of the new and his commitment to the experimental. He was well aware of Stein because she had impressed him in their first meeting in Paris in the summer of 1909. Spending many evenings together, the two no doubt shared ideas concerning the main tenets of the

modern movement. After all, to survey the modern movement was the basis of the trip (Dijkstra 13). Stieglitz's understanding of what was new gave him a command of the modernist discussion, which he later translated to the Armory Show's survey of European modernism. The Stein contributions clearly merited the special supplement, along with the beautiful Picasso and Matisse reproductions that accompanied it. Stein's writing was advanced and distinctive, even for a journal like *Camera Work*.

The commitment to modernism also dominated the work of the other contributors to *Camera Work.* While none was as revolutionary in terms of form and method, perhaps the frequent contributor Benjamin De Casseres stood next to Miss Stein in terms of stylistic boldness. De Casseres's modernism had the quality of chant and fun. As he wrote, "always somewhere in the world there is being birthed a human revenant of the great God Pan, who loves to finger his immortal pipe to jettison his fullness of joy over an outworn world, to spill into the golden matrices of art his hyperborean chart." The internal artistic sensation and motivation was seen in the work of poet-artists like William Blake and other romantics of the early nineteenth century, but by the twentieth century these internal visions had been transformed. De Casseres revealed this reawakening, but for him the mechanism for real discovery involved an acceptance of Freudianism and the concept of the unconscious (*Camera Work* 34-35 (April-July 1911), 14; *Camera Work* 36 (October 1911), 17).

Equally committed to modernism but of a less esoteric variety was the photographer, Alvin Langdon Coburn. His article "The Relation of Time to Art" explored the question of why modern art, not naturalism, was the only solution to the dilemma of the modern era. As Coburn described it,

> Photography born of this age of steel seems to have naturally adapted itself to the necessarily unusual requirements of an art that must live in skyscrapers, and it is because she has become so much at home in the gigantic structures that the Americans undoubtedly are the recognized leaders in the world of movement of pictorial photography (*Camera Work* 36 (October 1911), 73).

Camera Work also drew scholarly contributors to its pages such as Henri Bergson, who gave philosophical validity to the journal's overall effort. In a piece entitled "What is the Object of Art?" Bergson challenged the past utilitarianism and materials in art. He concluded in reference to the modernist vitality,

> So Art, whether it be painting or sculpture, poetry or music, has no other object than to brush aside the utilitarian

> symbols, the conventional and socially accepted generalities, in short, everything that veils reality from us, in order to bring us face to face with reality itself (*Camera Work* 37 (January 1912), 24).

In addition, emerging and important modern artists such as Wassily Kandinsky provided Stieglitz with further critical support. In a *Camera Work* extract from his *The Spiritual in Art,* Kandinsky elaborated his artistic viewpoints and perspectives. He viewed the work of the other modern masters in light of their relationship to the overall modern *Weltanschauung*. Kandinsky confirmed that there was indeed a movement afoot, which had definite interrelationships with the age around it, and which in turn indicated that artistic efforts were not completely a product of random experimentation. For instance, Kandinsky saw Matisse as an "excellently gifted…colorist," whose work showed how "the specifically French conceptions of beauty in art, with its refined, epicurean and pure ringing melodious quality, is carried over clouds to cool and abiding heights" (*Camera Work* 39 (July 1912), 34). Kandinsky revealed a similar understanding when he described Pablo Picasso's special brilliance whose experiments challenged both form and color itself.[4]

Though European Modernism was a major influence in the early 291 years, Stieglitz was aware of advanced American artists who were also participants in the domestic drive towards modernism. Stieglitz knew that an entire chorus of young American painters had gone to study in Paris in the decade 1900-1910. A large proportion of this group was indeed under the influence of the modernist revolution. For example, Alfred Maurer (1900), Bernard Karfiol (l901), Samuel Halpert (1902), Maurice Stern (1904), Max Weber (1905), and Abraham Walkowitz (1906) were artists who went abroad, and whose careers would on occasion intersect with Stieglitz's American experiment. This earlier group, in turn, was followed after 1906 by Walter Pach, Charles Demuth, Morgan Russell, Stanton MacDonald-Wright, Thomas Benton, Arthur Dove, Andrew Dasburg, Morton Schamberg, Charles Shuler, Marguerite and William Zorach, Joseph Stella, Arthur Carlos and Marsden Hartley, all also important artists whom Stieglitz would at times befriend and encourage. Through this artistic movement between America and Europe, Stieglitz discovered which American artists had emerged with some authority in the modernist movement. Stieglitz's 291 Gallery worked, therefore, to show not only the leading European experimenters, but, before 1912, also the American modernist pioneers. The architect of 291 showed the work of John Marin, Marsden Hartley, Alfred Maurer, Arthur Dove, Max Weber and Abraham Walkowitz (Richardson, E. P., 372). Another young 291

habitué, Alfred Kreymborg, remarked, "29l was the address on 5th Avenue to which one often referred in answer to the demand, 'Where are you going'? And one added cordially, 'Come along and see the Cézannes, Matisses, Webers, Walkowitzs, Hartleys and O'Keeffes'" (Kreymborg 127).

When the Association of American Painters and Sculptors came to launch the largest and most significant exhibit of this period – The International Exhibition of Modern Art, held in New York at the 69th Regiment Armory in early spring, 1913 – these leading advocates of Modernism found themselves deeply indebted to Alfred Stieglitz and his organization. In effect, the Armory show was both a springboard and a vindication of the work that Stieglitz had been sponsoring over the years at 291. The artists of 291 did not require the Armory show to teach them the truths of modernism. Instead they saw themselves as progenitors and the Armory show simply helped to spread their gospel to even a larger number of people, because of its scale – it exhibited approximately 1600 works – and the sensationalism it provoked. As the major historian of the Armory, Milton Brown, concluded, "The Armory show had a profound effect on artists, collectors, and the art market. It set in motion forces which eventually transformed the character of American art...[and] was a wedge which helped shift the weight of American taste" (Brown, *The Story* 212).

Though Stieglitz and 291 were vindicated by the Armory show of 1913, the cultural life of this stimulating group was dispersed in 1917 when the building housing the Gallery was demolished. Even before this date, however, the demands of publishing *Camera Work* and the costs of such an exquisite journal had become too much to overcome. In January 1915 regular publication ended. This was not an official end, because irregular issues would appear until 1917. But as a steady periodical, *Camera Work*, an artistic masterpiece of experiment and form, was finished.

However, 291's example did inspire others. For instance, Charles Daniel, an ex-saloonkeeper with a profound affection for modern art, opened up a new progressive gallery. As Daniel wrote concerning this event, "291 was the original impulse of my going into the modern world of art…. Aside from the pictures, the attitudes of Mr. Stieglitz toward art and life made a deep impression upon me" (*Camera Work* 47 (January 1915), 33). Daniel's gallery exhibited the works of Charles Demuth, Abraham Walkowitz, Man Ray, and others of the 291 assembly. Meanwhile The Modern Gallery under the leadership of Marius De Zayas commenced operations. This gallery announced it would function "for the sale of paintings of the most advanced character of the modern art movement – Negro sculpture, pre-conquest

Mexican art, (and) photography." The force behind its operation was "but an additional expression of 291" (Dijkstra 21).

Nor did the death of *Camera Work* mean the complete withdrawal of Stieglitz from the publishing arena. For instance, he sponsored Marius De Zayas after his return from Europe in 1915, and Agnes Ernest Meyer, when the two began the new avant-garde beacon, *291*. With its first issue in March, 1915, *291* was

> beautifully printed in two colors on large leaves of sturdy paper, [and] presented on its six pages a remarkable variety of material. The cover was geometrical….Inside were a drawing by Picasso, one of Apollinaire's most intricate ideogrammes, 'voyage' . . . some Freudian dream sequences by Stieglitz, and several short essays, including one on simultanism in art and literature (Dijkstra 21).

The next twelve issues of the magazine continued the experimentation of the first issue. *291* built upon the stream of consciousness technique and utilized bold typographic set-ups to illustrate such artists as John Marin, Pablo Picasso, Ragia Block, and Abraham Walkowitz. Besides these painters, Francis Picabia, who was to play a significant role in this little magazine's development, appeared in the second issue.

Even the disappearance of the magazine *291* worked to establish a common tradition for the "little magazine" in America, characterized by bold editorial formats and dazzling displays, although they existed only briefly. The growth of these small artsy magazines like *Camera Work* and *291* set valuable precedents for the proliferation of the avant-garde magazines of the 1920s.[5] For example, three modernist journals appeared in New York in the year 1917 alone, all of which worked to accent the latest turn in the modern movement towards Dadaism: *391*, published by Picabia, and *The Blind Man* and *Rong Rung*, edited by Marcel Duchamps (Dijkstra 38).

However, by 1917 international events had changed America and with these changes, the modernist continuum was to be temporarily broken if not redirected forever. American intervention in the war in Europe induced a sobriety that swept the country. In artistic terms, the greatest modernist casualty of the war was the closing of the 291 organization and thus the end of its seminal role in the development of modern art.

As for Alfred Stieglitz, the demise of 291 did not end his quest for artistic perfection in an American context. He continued to struggle with the effects of artistic revolution until his death in 1946. More directly, from 1925 to 1929 other galleries came under his paternal influence. For instance, during this time he operated the Intimate Gallery, or Room 303, on Park

Avenue at 59th Street. Here one could find Stieglitz's later photography and the work of Georgia O'Keeffe, John Marin, Arthur Dove, Gaston Lachaise, and Charles Demuth.

Finally, in the face of the Great Depression, Stieglitz opened in 1930 what was to be his last gallery, An American Place, at 509 Madison Avenue. Although in these later artistic adventures some of Stieglitz's earlier enthusiasm for extreme modernism had faded, he nevertheless kept up much of the spirit of 29l. He remained a passionate artistic persuader and fascinating demonstrator of his artistic values, even though his tastes had become more conservative. As one of his friends, Herbert Seligmann, observed,

> The chief objective before him always was the fight for the true, sensitive, and selfless worker, particularly in America. The foe was commercialism and its accompanying indifference to quality; its snobbism, hypocrisy, and disregard for the spirit, sacrificed to the predominance of mass production criteria (Seligmann v).

For some his most lasting accomplishment was found in the photographic creations that he left behind. For others his major accomplishment was found in the many artistic careers that he fostered. However, a most important episode had ended with the demise of *Camera Work* and 291, even though some of the old crowd from 291 remained true to the man and his vision in his later life.[6] The poet William Carlos Williams noted precisely the pivotal role of these artistic moderns:

> In Paris, painters from Cézanne to Pizarro had been painting their revolutionary canvases for fifty or more years but it was not until I clapped my eyes on Marcel Duchamps's *Nude Descending a Staircase* that I burst out laughing from the relief it brought me. I felt as if an enormous weight had been lifted from my spirit for which I was infinitely grateful (Williams 52).

In summary, Alfred Stieglitz stood as a seer and experimenter who struck out "against complacency in life as well as art, "and art became "a way one could rediscover [oneself] experimentally (Abrams 316-317). Recently, Marcia Brennan concluded, "the Stieglitz circle of writers often combined anti-Puritan rhetoric and appeals for sexual liberation with the expressed belief that these progressive attitudes would foster a vital new American art" (Brennan 15). Stieglitz remains an icon of early modernism who made a sizable impact on the development and expression of American culture in the twentieth century. This is why he continues to be of interest and remains a subject deserving critical evaluation for both his promotional

role in the history of modernism as well as for his own art. In today's parlance, he would surely be a celebrity of note.[7]

Works Cited

Abrams, Ann U. *The Lyrical Left: Randolph Bourne, Alfred Stieglitz, and the Origins of Cultural Radicalism in America.* Atlanta: Emory University Press, 1975.

Brennan, Marcia. *Painting Gender, Constructing Theory: The Alfred Stieglitz Circle and American Formalist Aesthetics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2001.

Brown, Milton. *American Painting From the Armory Show to the Depression*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.

-----. *The Story of the Armory Show*. New York: The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, 1963.

Bruno, Guido. "The Passing of '291'." *Pearsons' Magazine* 38 (March 1918), 402-403.

Dijkstra, Bram. *Hieroglyphics of a New Speech: Cubism, Stieglitz, and the Early Poetry of William Carlos Williams*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Gabler, Neal. *Life the Movie: How Entertainment Conquered Reality*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998.

Howe, Irving. *Literary Modernism*. New York: Fawcett World Library, 1967.

Hughes, Robert. *American Visions: The Epic History of Art in America*. London: Harvill Press, 1997.

Hunter, Samuel. *Modern American Painting and Sculpture*. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1959.

Kiefer, Geraldine W. *Alfred Stieglitz: Scientist, Photographer, and Avatar of Modernism*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1991.

Kreymborg, Alfred. *Troubadour.* [1925]. New York: Sagamore Press, 1957.

Larkin, Oliver. "Alfred Stieglitz and '291'." *Magazine of Art* 40 (May 1947), 179-183.

Lovejoy, Arthur O. *Essays in the History of Ideas*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1948.

May, Henry F. *The End of American Innocence*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959.

Norman, Dorothy. *Alfred Stieglitz: An American Seer*. New York: Aperture Biography, 1990. Richardson, E. P. Painting in America. New York: Thomas A. Crowell, 1956.

Richardson, John Adkins. *Modern Art and Scientific Thought*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971.

Seligmann, Herbert J. *Alfred Stieglitz Talking*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.

Williams, William Carlos. "Recollections." *Art in America* 51 (February 1963), 24-64.

Notes

[1] The *Camera Work* issues used for this article were the bound, facsimile editions held by the University of Cincinnati library, Cincinnati, Ohio. Other editions appear in Marianne F. Margolis, ed., *Camera Work: A Pictorial Guide* (New York: Dover, 1978) and Alfred Stieglitz, Camera Work: *The Complete Illustrations 1903-1917* (Koln: Taschen, 1997).

[2] The interest in Stieglitz's photographic contribution is well documented and frequently observed. For his own perspective on photography see Richard Whelan's annotated *Stieglitz on Photography: His Essays and Notes* (New York: Aperture, 2000). Also of value are many volumes covering this aspect of his career. See for instance Marianne Fulton, Camera Work*: A Pictorial Guide with Reproductions of All 559 Illustrations and Plates* (New York: Dover, 1978); and Weston J. Naef, T*he Collection of Alfred Stieglitz: Fifty Pioneers of Modern Photography* (New York: Viking Press, 1978). The enormously successful show, "Alfred Stieglitz and His New York Galleries," an exhibition of over 1,600 prints at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., January 28-April 22, 2001, led to Sarah Greenough's *Alfred Stieglitz: The Key Set* (New York: Abrams, 2002). Also see Weston Naef, *Alfred Stieglitz*: *Photographs From the J. Paul Getty Museum* (Los Angeles: John Paul Getty Museum, 1995), Christina A. Peterson, *Alfred Stieglitz: Camera Notes* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1996*)* and new academic studies such as Teresa Mulligan's *The Photography of Alfred* Stieglitz (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2001).

[3] Attempts to produce a simplistic or agreed definition of modernism and postmodernism remain a critical problem. For certain historians, modernism poses an "ism problem." See Richard R. Bretell, *Modern Art, 1851-1929* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 47. Others see modern art as only understandable if these "isms" are broken down into styles and periods. See Amy Dempsey, *Styles, Schools, and Movements* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2002). Modernism might also be defined by linking key features of modernism such as abstraction and expression. See Liz Dawtrey, et al., *Investigating Modern Art* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1996), 16. A postmodernist sees modernism as " the principle of unlimited self-realisation, the demand for authentic self expression and the subjectivism of a hyper stimulated sensitivity…this temperament unleashes hedonistic motives irreconcilable with the discipline of professional life" (Hal Foster, ed., *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodernist Culture* (New York: The New Press, 1998), 5). Another key postmodernist view sees culture as a product itself whereas modernism was a "critique of the product": "postmodernism is the consumption of sheer commodification as a process." See Frederic Jameson, *Postmodernism Or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism (*Durham: Duke University Press, 1999), x. "Postmodernism is long on attitude and short on argument," according to Mark Lilla, *The Reckless Mind* (New York: New York Review of Books, 2001), p. 163.

[4] Kandinsky's ideas greatly influenced the "Der Blaue Reiter" and as with the Vienna Secession movement, which included artists such as Gustav Klimt and Josef Hoffman, Stieglitz gained from this enlarged base of modernist ideas.

[5] For a full discussion of American writing and the little magazines in the 1920's, see Frederick J. Hoffman, *The 20's: American Writing in the Postwar Decade* [1949](New York: The Free Press, 1965). For a more specialized account see Susan A. Turner, *A History of the Freeman* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963). Rebecca Zurier's *Art For the Masses: A Radical Magazine and Its Graphics, 1911-1917* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988) examines how this radical magazine became an outlet for many of the Stieglitz circle of the period.

[6] The painters Charles Demuth and Marsden Hartley are two prominent examples. See Robert Eugene Haines, "Image and Idea: The Literary Relationships of Alfred Stieglitz" (Ph. D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1968). See also Patricia McDonnell, *Marsden Hartley: American Modern* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997), Jonathan Weinberg, *Speaking For Vice: Homosexuality in the Art of Charles Demuth and Marsden Hartley* (London: Yale University Press, 1993), and J.T. Voorhies' collection of Hartley correspondence, *My Dear Stieglitz* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2002).

[7] For additional investigations of Alfred Stieglitz see the Alfred Stieglitz Archive, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University. Beginning with Waldo Frank, ed., *America and Alfred Stieglitz* (New York: Literary Guild, 1934), Stieglitz became the subject for serious study. Dorothy Norman's *Alfred Stieglitz: American Seer* [1973](New York: Aperture, 1995), remains an important work. Barbara B. Lynes's *Stieglitz, O'Keeffe and the Critics*, 1916–1929 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998) and Geraldine W. Kiefer's *Alfred Stieglitz: Scientist, Photographer and Avatar of Modernism* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1991) both offer interesting and different perspectives on the Stieglitz influence. A more personal look is provided by Stieglitz's granddaughter, Sue Davidson Lowe, in her *Stieglitz: A Memoir/Biography* (New York: Farrar-Strauss, 1983). Other works of biographical interest are Richard Whelan and Jennifer Josephy, *Alfred Stieglitz: A Biography* (New York: Little Brown and Company, 1995) and John Szarkowski's *Alfred Stieglitz at Lake George* (New York: Henry N. Abrams, 1995).