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Abstract

Since the invention of photography, the medium has played an increasingly central role in shaping spectators’ imagination of distant suffering and calamitous experiences. The discourse of humanitarianism has evolved alongside photography and has relied on the medium to give it shape. Indeed, humanitarianism is and always has been a photographic situation, which is to say, photography has played and continues to play a significant role in constituting the very terms of humanitarianism, including how it is referenced, conceived, understood, and practiced. This dissertation is concerned with the historical role of photography in shaping the humanitarian imagination, as well as the ways the medium has given form to and mediated the relations between its central actors. It also argues that knowing this history is crucial for advancing humanitarian photography and humanitarian relations writ large.

*Regarding Aid: The photographic situation of humanitarianism* takes a cultural history approach that enables an exploration of the way in which photography can present links to the past, revealing the origins and the longstanding nature of some of the practices and debates around humanitarian photography. Using a variety of visual theories, I define photography as an event rather than a technology for producing pictures. The dissertation is built around three case studies: 1) Henry Dunant’s graphic language in *A Memory of Solferino*; 2) Lewis Hine’s European photographs for the American Red Cross taken during and immediately after the First World War; and, 3) a journalist’s photograph of the French army in Rwanda during the 1994 genocide which is prominently used in a memorial site. These case studies allow for an exploration of photography’s role in altering people’s perceptions with regard to distant suffering, in focusing on particular types of subjects, and in mediating humanitarian relations. I examine the ways in which humanitarian actors and Western spectators have been prioritized in aid discourse at the expense of the objectified suffering “other,” but coinciding with a recent movement within the humanitarian ecosystem, I also explore the way that photography might reshape aid in more collaborative and de-imperialized ways.
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Chapter 1

The View From Here

Humanitarianism has enjoyed a range of definitions since entering the English lexicon in the early nineteenth century. From signifying the primacy of humans and altruistic imperatives, to misplaced sympathies, through to motivated self-interests, the term has encompassed a range of concepts and sets of practice. In its earliest iterations it referenced a theological position claiming God’s human rather than Divine nature. It was also ascribed to a “Religion of humanity” in which humans rather than the Divine would be the source and motivator for service for the betterment of humans (Davies 2012: 3). Despite the early Christian gloss—something that has long given the term its sheen—humanitarianism has almost exclusively centered on “concern with benevolence towards humanity as a whole, with human welfare as a primary good” (Davies 2012: 3). Usage of the term has not always been positive. For instance, Charles Dickens introduced the term as an adjective in *Bleak House* (1853) in reference to his character Mrs. Jellyby who showed more sympathy for distant sufferers than to those at home. For much of the nineteenth century, the term was used in a derogatory fashion criticizing those who could or would not see local suffering (Lydon 2016). The term has also been used in “a more unsavoury context”: *Humanitarian* was the title of Victoria Woodhull’s social reform and feminist journal that was steeped in white-superiority eugenics (Davies 2012: 4).

Despite its various early applications, the term only came into wide use in the twentieth century. Today the term has been associated with ideologies, activities and professions intended to alleviate or prevent suffering and disasters wherever they may occur (Donini 2012). Projecting the term back in time, scholars of humanitarianism have traced the phenomenon’s early roots to the abolitionist movement at the turn of the nineteenth century, and its moral philosophical origins farther back still to the mid-eighteenth century (Barnett 2011; Halttunen 1995; Haskell 1985; Laqueur 1989; Rozario 2003). The form of humanitarianism most recognizable today—primarily defined by adherence to
principles of neutrality and impartiality—has its origins in the mid-nineteenth century. It has also almost exclusively become aligned with international relief and development organizations. Indeed, state and military use of the term has been met with contention by humanitarian organizations who have considered themselves its legitimate proprietors. Moreover, since the phenomenon’s emergence, humanitarian action has predominantly been considered the purview of Western organizations and states operating with a variety of motivations, principles, values and rhetorical frames. There has been a recent trend within the humanitarian organizations and scholarship to de-Westernize narratives over humanitarian action, a move that is both recognizing humanitarianisms cosmopolitan roots and its intersubjective existence (Abu-Sada 2012; Anderson, Brown and Jean 2012; Bennett, Foley and Krebs 2016; Harvard Humanitarian Initiative 2011; Warrington and Crombie 2017). This dissertation traces some of these trends and their intimate connections with photography.

The relationship between photography and humanitarianism is a long one. Indeed, the rise of humanitarianism overlaps directly with the history of photography. The medium has played (and continues to play) a significant role in constituting the very terms of humanitarianism, including how it is referenced, conceived, understood and practiced. Humanitarianism, in all its disparate forms, has relied on photography to give it shape. As the camera was used to record ever more examples of the human condition, previously overlooked members of the human family and unseen forms of human suffering became harder to ignore. As photography was used and adapted to ever more information sharing and rhetorical practices, organized aid became increasingly the legitimate and expected response to such suffering. By the same token, photography has also contributed to prolonging or even instigating further suffering. Western dominion in humanitarian photography and the blind spots of their visual hegemony is increasingly being opened to critique (Chouliaraki 2013; Fehrenbach and Rodogno 2015; Hesford 2011; Lydon 2016).

---

1 Historian Thomas Haskell (1985) has linked modern humanitarianism to the rise of capitalism in the nineteenth century. Michael Barnett (2011) has identified three “ages of humanitarianism” originating from early nineteenth century abolitionism. Johannes Paulmann (2013) considered three historical “conjunctures” in out of which humanitarianism, as we know it today, emerged.
The aim of this dissertation is twofold: 1) I am concerned with the historical role of photography in shaping the humanitarian imagination, as well as the ways the medium gave form to and mediated the relations between its central actors; 2) with the counsel provided by specific cases, I contend that knowing this history is crucial for advancing humanitarian photography and humanitarianism writ large.

It is hard to imagine humanitarianism without conjuring up images of suffering or, conversely, images of smiling aid recipients—mental images that originate, by in large, from photographs. Sight and pictures have long been associated with humanitarian sentiment and action. In a similar way that seeing suffering was foundational to the development of Enlightenment moral philosophies in the eighteenth century, the circulation of photographs depicting destitution and damage inflicted to human bodies in the nineteenth century gave rise to humanitarianism as an ideology, a practice, a profession, and an international movement. Prior to the inception of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and their creation of the First Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded in Armies in the Field (1864), the circulation of combat photographs of injured soldiers and dead bodies contributed to altering perceptions of warfare and battlefield healthcare. During the First World War, the camera became instrumental in bringing to light and defining a newly emerging humanitarian subject—one that would come to dominate humanitarian action for the coming century: the modern refugee.

Over the course of the last one hundred and fifty years, the camera has been pivotal in making suffering known and recognizable. It has also had the unfortunate association of limiting benevolent vision: it has been part of decisions that exclude certain forms of suffering and certain kinds of people from the humanitarian field of vision. The camera has been instrumental in shedding light on human misery; it has also created and perpetuated blind spots, some of which predate the medium’s invention. In short, photography has been pivotal in mediating social relations and in shaping responses to the calamities that humans have had to endure.
In this respect, humanitarianism is and always has been a photographic situation. To speak of the photographic situation of humanitarianism means that with the invention of the camera came a new engagement with the visual dimensions of humanity and new forms of humanitarian relations. The camera centralized the importance of appearance, recognition and perception in humanitarian action while also becoming a tool to record, set in motion, and manage humanitarian encounters. Beyond merely making pictures of the actors and actions central to humanitarianism, the mobilization of the camera has increasingly become instrumental in constructing, amplifying and connecting those people and events.

In this dissertation I take a cultural history approach that enables an exploration of the way in which photography, mobilized by a range of humanitarian actors, introduced new forms of humanitarianism, and expanded the terms of who could be subjects of humanitarian action. More specifically, a cultural history approach prioritizes tracing the role of photography in expanding or limiting people’s “ways of thinking and feeling” towards others (Williams 1961: 64). Combining this historical approach to visual theories associated with the photographic situation, invites thinking about the ways the present is linked to the past. My focus on the photographic situation of humanitarianism overlaps and deviates in critical ways from histories of humanitarian photography.

Humanitarian photography has been defined as “photography in the service of humanitarian initiatives across state boundaries” (Fehrenbach and Rodogno 2015: 1). Such a definition is helpful as it gives shape to a phenomenon that has been central to humanitarianism since the invention of the camera some one hundred and fifty years ago. The breadth inherent in this definition is reflected in my study: I do not restrict the pictures I look at to photographs created by or for aid agencies. Histories of humanitarian photography have contributed to expanding the definition of humanitarianism as they encompass a wide array of humanitarians and humanitarianisms including missionary,
reformist, philanthropic, artistic, and—its most recent and most recognized form—international and non-governmental aid organizations.²

My combined cultural history and visual theory approach deviates from scholarship on histories of humanitarian photography that tend to sequester those photographic events to a historically situated past rather than deliberately consider them for their impact or influence on attaining future goals of humanitarianism. I look beyond the content of the pictures and locate the greater force of the medium in the arena of actions and actors that extend beyond the picture’s frame or the little black box of the camera. The photographic situation is an approach to analyzing and conceiving of photography that follows from visual culture scholar Ariella Azoulay’s (2012) theorization of “the event of photography,” in which the camera is understood as mediating relations rather than as simply a technology for producing pictures. In this view, photography is “subject to a unique form of temporality—it is made up of an infinite series of encounters” beginning from the initial photographic moment through to the present (Azoulay 2012: 26). In “restoring and reestablishing” links with those encounters new perspectives can be gained on the ways in which the past has an impact on the present. My intention is to “incorporate [photography] into social and political memory” as a way of challenging the idea that humanitarianism is a response to, rather than a consequence of social and political conjunctures within the past one hundred and fifty years, and that issues facing humanitarianism today are not necessarily exceptional to this moment, but have roots in past moments (Berger 2013 [1978]: 57).

Over the course of the dissertation, I proceed through three case studies shaped by a series of key questions: How has humanitarian photography figured in shaping imagination of humanity and in formulating responses to human suffering? How does thinking historically about humanitarian photography change the ways in which moral

² Additionally, histories of humanitarian photography have expanded the definition of humanitarianisms, challenging notions that would restrict its actions to those that occur across state boundaries, locating humanitarian sentiment and action instead as something that occurs within localities with “privilege”—such as privileged social status, but also the privilege of not being the victim of disaster or complex crisis—as a condition of humanitarianism.
obligations and social responsibilities to suffering in the present are regarded? How can consideration of the photographic encounter impact humanitarian relations and reconfigure conceptions of the victim, perpetrator and benevolent actor?

With the cases explored in this dissertation, I seek less to find answers to my questions than to consider them as opportunities to gain insights and guidance. The histories of humanitarian photography I put forth are less concerned with changing history or memory than with exploring and considering the ways in which history and memory will be incorporated into the present.

Lay of the land: Overview of scholarship and debates

Humanitarian photography may be as old as the technology of the photographic camera itself, but scholarship related to it only began to flourish later in the twentieth century. My overview of this scholarship begins at that point. During the last quarter of the twentieth century, scholarship on humanitarian photography was dominated by criticism and moral debates about representing suffering. The past decade has seen a growth in histories of humanitarian photography that have added historical depth to earlier critiques at the same time as complement a recent upsurge in broader critical histories of humanitarianism. With my dissertation, I build on this existing scholarship while also deliberately working to complement a shift towards beneficiaries’ perceptions of the humanitarian system in recent humanitarian scholarship and reflection.3

Critiques of humanitarian photography

The body of scholarship examining humanitarian photography has largely focused on the content and mobilization of pictures in various humanitarian arenas. Within this scholarship, photography is understood as a purposive tool, whether as an institutional mnemonic device, as evidence, or as a rhetorical tool to persuade people to a particular

---

3 Numerous descriptors are used to identify subjects associated with the humanitarian gaze: victims, sufferers, recipients, beneficiaries, affected populations, along with humanitarians, benevolent actors, and the humanitarian system, sector, enterprise, internationale, and—more recently—ecosystem. In this dissertation, I alternate with this language depending on the context or for stylistic variation.
idea or behaviour. An overview of the debates is instructive as it presents its crucial role in drawing attention to paradoxes of humanitarian visual culture including the exploitation and commodification of sentimentalism, suffering, and stereotypes. It also traces the influence of rhetorics of progress, colonial and liberal ideologies, as well as Western psychology in humanitarian sentiment manufactured and manipulated for a variety of political and economic ends. A holistic overview of the histories of humanitarianism reveals the camera’s indispensable role in this discourse while also acknowledging the importance of further broadening the analysis of humanitarian photography to prioritize its impact on the encounters of the professionals, the subjects and the spectators of humanitarian action.

The Ethiopian food security crisis of 1984 proved to be a watershed moment for the humanitarian sector (Campbell 2012a: 12). This period included unparalleled growth in humanitarian organizations, along with unprecedented global media attention, and a burgeoning of organizations’ own public appeals. Michael Buerk’s report for the British Broadcasting Corporation on 23 October 1984 is widely understood to have singlehandedly shaped peoples’ imagination and subsequent reporting of famine for years to come (Franks 2013). While this event suggests a direct correlation between certain forms of appeal campaigns (e.g., photographs of victims in direct mail marketing) and the tremendous boon to humanitarian organizations at the time, the connection is more complex. The post-colonial and post cold-war geopolitical climate, the expansion of the foreign correspondent media industry, the growing photojournalism profession, technological advancements in communication (tele-visual and other) and in travel, all contributed to these successes in more causal ways than the mere content or circulation of photographs. Such a nuanced take, however, was not the dominant interpretation at the time as money and other successes came in from supporters following the transmission of appeals (Franks 2013). As a result, certain forms of awareness campaigns were reinforced

---

4 In relation to scholarship on humanitarian photography, the 1984 Ethiopian famine is often cited as the originator of the trope of the starving child. Franks (2013) recognizes that the 1967-70 famine in Biafra just as easily can be, and is, seen by many—particularly those for whom those images form part of their living memory—as the source for this visual cliché. Histories of humanitarian photography have been sourcing its deeper roots (Fehrenbach 2015; Gorin 2014; Kind-Kovács 2016).
and crystalized as standard humanitarian visual practice. They also became the subject of impassioned criticism from within and outside the humanitarian system as their use intensified.

From within the movement itself came scathing attacks of humanitarian organizations as becoming “merchants of misery” (Lissner 1981). Several years before the Ethiopian famine, Jorgen Lissner then project director of Danchurchaid, was appalled that development agencies resorted to using photographs of emaciated children to promote non-emergency relief projects simply because infrastructure projects were not regarded as visually appealing. From there, criticisms concentrated on the commercialization of suffering and the exploitation of victims whose experiences, represented photographically, were being appropriated “into processes of global marketing and business competition” (Kleinman and Kleinman 1997: 1). Tragic moral choices arguably underlay many decisions regarding showing conditions of disaster and extreme deprivation with the knowledge that “aid campaigns depart from this convention only at the risk of prejudicing their income” (Burman 1994: 29). The concern was with distorting or appropriating experiences and events for quick gains in social or financial currency while letting nuanced information slide by the wayside. One of the larger critiques coming from within the humanitarian movement itself was the 1987 *Images of Africa* report. The multi-method, multi-country study commissioned by the United Nations’ Food and Agriculture Organization concluded that foreign press and humanitarian agency representations of the Ethiopian famine were limited in scope, simplified the crisis, and contradicted the overall objectives of the majority of the humanitarian agencies included in the study (Van der Gaag and Nash 1987).

Media studies and visual culture scholars drawing on various disciplines including sociology, psychology, political theory, and literary criticism also weighed in. These scholars have drawn attention to the paradoxical nature of humanitarian photography and raised concern about the ways in which certain types of photographs distort the experiences of suffering, its causes, and its potential solutions (Benthall 1993; Manzo 2008; Moeller 1999; Polman 2010). According to media and visual scholars, humanitarian photography has contributed to the dehumanization of victims by removing
all personal characteristics and biography. Such pictures tend to present a narrow characterization of humanity in distant places as “bare life” stripped of all markers of social or political identity (Kennedy 2009). Arguably, de-identifying subjects may be a way of preserving their privacy, but privacy is rarely cited as a concern. Individuals are plainly visible in the photographs, and without identifying information their images readily take on whatever meaning agencies assign them, or that has been built into the minds of spectators. Debates about privacy, particularly where minors are concerned, have been growing steadily and remain contentious. Yet there is also a strong perception that “if those lives remain unnameable and ungreivable, if they do not appear in their precariousness and their destruction, we will not be moved” (Butler 2004: 150). The degree to which those lives can be made apprehendable remains unclear.

Concern over the paradoxical nature of dominant modes of humanitarian representation included critique of certain photographic content becoming iconographic. Photographs, such as the often-repeated image of the lone, malnourished child have come to stand in for famine or poverty (Burman 1994). The ubiquity and uncritical use of such images has turned this figure into a metaphor implying that an entire continent is perpetually dependent on foreign aid (Campbell 2012a; Hariman and Lucaites 2007). The circulation of pictures of children (and to a similar extent, women and girls) reinforced the infantilization of the Global South. The emaciated child became an aid fetish: an uncritically accepted target for sentimental response that obscures the structural conditions producing the suffering (Burman 1994; Chouliaraki 2013; Gorin 2014). The point has been reached where the use of such an image of a child in any other context than reinforcing stereotypes of dependence requires extensive qualifications. For

---

5 Kennedy draws from Agamben’s (1998) concept of bare life here. See also Fassin (2012) and Redfield (2013) for ways in which non-visual representation operate similarly.

6 A recent case of a minor working in the sex-trade being photographed while apparently being raped, all the while being recognizable in the photograph, has ignited a surge of debate (Chesterton 2017; Doucleff 2017).
instance, photographs of children in the ICRC collections could represent any food security crisis in Africa from the last century [Fig. 1].

Figure 1: Mekele. ICRC Feeding center. Displaced children. Photo by Catherine Peduzzi, 1984. ICRC V-P-ET-N-00030-17

7 Historian Benjamin Thomas White has recently argued similarly about visual tropes used in representations of refugees (Images of refugees: http://singularthings.wordpress.com); David Campbell (2010) has also written persuasively about the “stereotypes that move,” such as a photograph of young Luke Piri suffering from malnutrition in Malawi in 2002. The photograph was used in various news and aid organization publications often in ways that perpetuated Africa’s image as a starving continent (https://www.david-campbell.org/2010/10/20/stereotypes-that-move/).
An apolitical representation of victims may bode well in terms of supporting neutral and impartial care—basic tenets of modern humanitarian action—but the continuous bracketing out or ignoring of the political and social structures could contribute to further human suffering. Indeed, this was Lissa Malkki’s conclusion in her classic ethnographic study of Rwandan and Burundian refugees in 1996. With the “the disqualification of the refugees’ own inescapable political and historical assessments of their predicaments and their future” aid organizations ended up proposing homogenous repatriation plans that did not take into consideration potentially perilous consequences identified by victims (1996: 379). Without the specificity of histories and cultural or political contexts “such forms of representation deny the very particulars that make of people something other than anonymous bodies, merely human beings” (Malkki 1996: 389). According to Malkki, dehistoricization and depoliticization mutes victims, rendering them “speechless emissaries” meant “to ‘speak’ to us in a particular way: wordlessly” (1996: 390).

Scholarly attention to humanitarian campaigns of the last three decades has focused almost exclusively on audience reception (Boltanski 1999; Chouliaraki 2013; Dogra 2014). This body of work has done well to draw attention to the role of neoliberalism in transitioning humanitarian agenda setting by aid agencies to donor-led decisions that are often based on private individual preferences rather than on communal civic consensus. Yet the focus tends to remain tied to agency-donor relations in which “aid subjects” are conceived as homogenous victim groups, and “humanitarian publics” as monoculturally Western (Boltanski 1999; Chouliaraki 2013). Instructively, Dogra’s (2014) historical and empirical research has enabled her to describe today’s humanitarian visual culture as continuing a longstanding pattern of oscillating between “other” and “oneness” representations. As a result, she nuances the dominant misconception that “positive” forms of representation emerged as a response to “shocking” atrocity pictures, and she concludes that both forms in fact still rely on the perpetuation of difference.

---

8 Photographs deemed of an “othering” kind are those that exaggerate difference and distance between spectators and subjects and often aim to build an appeal based on pity or charity structures on imbalances of power. On the contrary, “oneness” representations are those meant to appeal to a common, shared humanity; these are often considered correctives to the “othering” kinds that are more regularly considered “negative” and exploitative today.
The critiques and discourses on the psychological, social, political and affective aspects of humanitarian photography contribute to understanding the force of certain themes in the humanitarian visual landscape. Recent histories of humanitarian sentiment and visual practices further enrich this knowledge, while at the same time opening up the study of humanitarian visual culture to explorations of the role of photography in shaping humanitarian vision and relations.

**History and humanitarian photography**

Recently, several histories of humanitarian photography have been produced (Breen 1994; de Laat and Gorin 2016; Fehrenbach and Rodogno 2015; Godby 2013; Gorin 2014; Grant 2001; Thompson 2007; Twomey 2012a, 2012b; Sliwinski 2011). This scholarship vividly illustrates the practices of early humanitarians such as missionaries, philanthropists and political reformers. These histories have pointed out continuities between visual and other representational practices associated with the development of humanitarian sentiment. These histories show that, from its earliest use, photography was a recording device meant primarily to illustrate the realities of humanitarian actions: the fact that it was being done along with who, what, where, and when.

The mobilization of photography had a large and influential role in the development of institutional identities and the formation, challenge, and transformation of humanitarian principles and values (Davison 2007; Nolan and Mikami 2013; Rodogno and David 2015). In turn, photography is said to have contributed to the shaping and recognition of so-called humanitarian crises, humanitarian publics, victims, and humanitarians themselves (Manzo 2008; Noble 2010; Thompson 2002). Astute humanitarian workers saw the potential to shape their messages and the perceptions of their audiences with photography; the practice of manipulating other non-photographic visual media for polemical purposes pre-existed the photographic medium (Breen 1994; Godby 2013; Grant 2001). Historians of humanitarian action describe numerous cases where photographs have been used as evidence of atrocities, as tools against regime-made disasters (e.g., famine, conflict), and as vital sources of information for distant spectators (Breen 1994; Godby 2013; Taithe 1996).
Along with a focus on early media and communication practices, humanitarian photography scholarship has added to a parallel vein of knowledge led predominantly by cultural historians on the history of sentiment (Laqueur 1989; Boltanski 1999; Haltunnen 1995; Kennedy 2009; Haskell 1985; Sliwinski 2011; Sontag 1978, 2004). Reaching back to well over a century before the invention of photography, these scholars trace the emergence of sentiments such as compassion, pity, and sympathy from the Renaissance and early Enlightenment periods, considering them as quintessentially modern sets of emotions. Humanitarian sentiment, namely the impulse to alleviate suffering and pain of others, has been considered as a Western European cultural response that coalesced with discoveries and inventions of pain relief methodologies (e.g., anesthetics) (Buck-Morss 1992; Haltunnen 1995; Haskell 1985; Laqueur 1989). From this ability to control physical pain, it was no great leap to consider social suffering as also being manageable, possible to alleviate or eliminate altogether.

Before photography’s invention, graphic language and illustrations (e.g., prints) were increasingly incorporated into various popular and authoritative texts—from the novel, government inquiries, to medical autopsies—with the express purpose of shaping perceptions and generating sympathies. For social historian Thomas Laqueur, these “humanitarian narratives” were a sign that “some people [had] begun thinking and feeling in new ways,” regarding a wider swath of the population around them as part of a humanity worth caring for (1989: 200). Generally the arc of these chronicles would include a victim, almost always described as innocent, who would struggle with a villain (e.g., disease, disaster, or an individual or group causing suffering) only to be saved by a hero, in most cases either a technology or a person of light skin and of socio-economic privilege. The “sensationalistic” details of suffering experienced or inflicted operated on two fronts: to represent the truth of the claims, and to “demand attention and sympathy” by the readers (Laqueur 1989: 184). Such compositions were expected to form a common bond between the reader and the victim with the personalization of a victims’ misery anticipated to nurture the “moral imagination” thus contributing to the generation of a more humanitarian outlook towards subjects who until that time had “been beneath notice” (Laqueur 1989: 176, 191). Despite the truth claims and affective forces inherent in the stories, Laqueur also recognized these texts as political rhetoric and idealized or
over-dramatized versions of humanitarian action and emotion. In many ways, humanitarian photography has simply extended the narratives into visual form (Fehrenbach and Rodogno 2015; Gorin 2014). The tales, however, could not guarantee that audiences would respond in idealized or intended ways.

Concerns and debates have centered on the extent to which pictures deemed shocking or obscene can feed into voyeuristic tendencies such as the pleasure of looking on the pain of others (Haltunnen 1995). The arousal that comes from exposure to graphic depictions of suffering bodies and the afflictions or inflictions to them is not always of a sadomasochistic degree, but can emerge from sexualized racial and gender stereotyping of the black, and more often than not, female body (Solomon-Godeau 1991). It is this potential of the rendering of humanitarian appeals captivating on a sensual level that can transform humanitarian photography into a sort of pornography, a term that has today become an uncritical, commonplace nomenclature of any appeals that perpetuate stereotypes (Campbell 2012; Reinhardt, Edwards and Duganne 2007). Concerns have also been raised around the potential that the plethora of photographs of suffering would result in people becoming inured to the continuous appeals resulting in their turning away in anger or in boredom through compassion fatigue (Berger 2013; Moeller 1999; Paschalidis 2003; Reinhardt, Edwards and Duganne 2007; Rozario 2003; Sontag 1977).

**Reflections on debate and scholarship of humanitarian photography**

To date, much of the discourse around humanitarian photography remains centred on the sensationalism of “pornographies of suffering”, anxieties around compassion fatigue and on the aesthetics of “iconic” aid imagery. Historical scholarship and counter-critique has contributed convincing arguments against any simplistic sense of moral righteousness in the invocation of the language of porn, contending that its usage has become a “substitute for answers” as it directs debate away from the causes of suffering and is replaced by worry over empathetic failure, thus contributing to “a fable that asserts we fail to recognise our ethical obligations towards others” (Campbell 2011; see also Dean 2003 and 2004). By extension, Campbell (2012b) has compellingly argued compassion fatigue as a myth. Histories of humanitarian photography have shown that anxieties around mass circulation of harrowing images are longstanding, and are evidence of capacity for
empathy more so than its disappearance, however, its fragility remains (Curtis 2015; Rozario 2003). Similar to discourse of fatigue or pornographic qualities of pictures of suffering, focusing on “what makes a photograph iconic” often becomes a debate about aesthetics rather than politics. Much can be gained in terms of deliberation and critique when the attention moves from the “what” of the photograph to the “how” of its operation, something that Hariman and Lucaites (2007) have carefully argued occurs over time as pictures are (re)used and become ways of working through social issues (see also Azoulay 2010).

A more recent set of scholars has located redeeming value in photographs conventionally deemed as shocking (Linfield 2010; Smith 2007; Sliwinski 2011). Sliwinski (2011), for instance, has convincingly claimed that people’s passionate responses to atrocity imagery are a sign of our humanity. Such emotional responses crucially precede being able to define and respond to violations to humanity through documents including declarations of human rights.

What the majority of scholarship and debates about humanitarian photography reveal however is a lack of concern for the photographed subjects. Indeed, the subject is often avoided altogether, along with the causes and conditions that have rendered them worthy of photography. Put differently, the subjects are often rendered as objects. When victims become objects, concern turns once again toward spectators or humanitarian agents and their apparent moral failings or righteousness, rather than the experiences of and injuries done to suffering subjects. When treating photography as sequestered to a particular moment, be it a historical or contemporary one, it obscures the impact (or reverberations) of photographic events on the present. Locking events to a historically situated past restricts possibilities of attaining future goals of humanitarianism (no matter how idealistic) for the lessons and insights gained from hindsight get disconnected, or, especially in the case of the perspective of victims, are lost to history.

While photography is recognized in much of the literature as a medium that translates, manipulates, and shapes perceptions and discourses of humanitarianism, it is the content of the photographs or the context of its applications that is centralized. When attention is
paid to the affect of photography on audiences, subjects, and organizations of humanitarianism, each of these tend to be considered as discreet—mainly monocultural and homogenous—entities rather than as multi-dimensional agents interconnected through political and social histories and cultural affinities. Approaching photography as a medium that deals in events allows for acknowledgement of the different yet converging vantage points, thereby broadening the perspective of the humanitarian movement and its imaginary across temporal, geographic and socio-cultural divides. The recent turn to historicization by scholars and critics within and outside the humanitarian system, along with an industry-wide interest in its perception by people traditionally the targets of humanitarian action signals that the time is ripe for a broader and deeper theoretical-historical approach to humanitarian visual culture.

Shift in the humanitarian sector’s gaze

My emphasis on the photographic situation of humanitarianism has a parallel in recent shifts within humanitarian discourse itself. Government aid agencies, non-governmental aid organizations, and scholars from a wide range of disciplines have been turning their attention to histories and ethics of aid. This upswing in self-reflexivity has paid particular attention to recipients’ points of view. In this section I present a brief overview of this “beneficiary turn” in order to situate my project in relation to it.

Until recently, humanitarian workers have had a rather ironic history of being ahistorical in their self-awareness and reflexivity, a symptom of their culture of exceptionalism and urgency (McHarg 2012; Redfield 2013). Historians, political theorists, and anthropologists have recently been involved in writing the social, cultural, political and legal histories of humanitarianism and human rights (Barnett 2011; Davies 2012; Hunt 2007; Moyn 2012; Sliwinski 2011). There is a sense that these multidisciplinary historical lens will shed light onto contemporary concerns such as the increasing amount of violence (or increasingly mediatized violence) that targets humanitarian workers, growing contestation of the “universality” of humanitarianism, and the ongoing existential crisis within the humanitarian movement (Davies 2013; Davey, Borton and Foley 2013; Fast 2014; Givoni 2016; Labbé 2012).
Criticism has also emerged from within the movement itself in the form of autobiographical tell-alls as well as from arms-length ethnographies, investigative journalism and cultural critiques (Barnett 2011; Davies 2012; Davey, Borton and Foley 2013; Fassin 2007; Fox 2014; Lissner 1981; Orbinski 2008; Redfield 2013; Reiff 2002; Paulmann 2013; Moyn 2012; Vaux 2001). These critiques have each in their own way disrupted simplistic notions of humanitarianism as benign altruism and its actors as embodiments of principled compassion. In the wake of a new wave of conflicts that arose after the end of the Cold War, concerns mounted over the ways in which the humanitarian industry appeared to be abused and misused by state actors and militaries, and even betrayed by their own kind as a result of competing ideologies (Braumann 2004; Polman 2010; Rieff 2002). Ultimately, humanitarian action has been disenchanted, revealed to be participating in a kind of “biopolitics” that engages the technologies and governance over life and death. These non-state actors have taken over the role of deciding whose life is worth risking or saving, decisions that have often been uncritically influenced by legacies of colonial and eugenic ideologies (Fassin 2007, 2012).

In the years since the initiation of the Global War on Terror the consensus has been that there is a marked change in attitudes towards humanitarian organizations. Following a few high profile instances of targeted violence towards humanitarian actors, there have been growing calls for more participatory or cosmopolitan humanitarianism (Fast 2014; Givoni 2016; Kurasawa 2004). One response to this has been the growth of “perceptions studies.” These qualitative studies, often conducted by humanitarian organizations themselves, shift the focus from measuring achievable results for donors to “[gathering and analyzing] local population accounts, expectations, and assessments of humanitarian organizations, projects, and practices” (Nouvet et al 2015; see also Givoni 2016). Though often not explicitly addressing the use of visual communications, the rise of these sorts of studies over the past decade signal awareness on the part of humanitarian organizations to develop sensitivity to the visual aspects of their actions. This sensitivity has extended to a recognition of potential for contradictions in the perceptions of logos splashed on billboards, pamphlets, t-shirts, tents and trucks, and the broader ways in which humanitarianism is a visual enterprise: what they are seen to be doing and how they wish to be seen. On the one hand these visual elements are integral to the safety of
humanitarians, particularly in conflict zones. On the other hand, the same visuals are associated with histories of colonialism or perceived as symbols of modern imperialism. Indeed, pushback (to the point of violence) towards aid organizations has been linked to “misunderstandings” of humanitarian agencies’ representations (visual and otherwise), occasioning a renewed interest on the humanitarian image or branding (Lindsay 2015; see also Abu-Sada 2012; Neuman 2017). Photography may not be centrally featured in perceptions studies, but it is inherently implicated in these reflective exercises.

As a largely Western undertaking, humanitarian aid has been recognized and critiqued as an extension of Empire, even if it has always fundamentally also been a moral enterprise (Barnett 2011; Donini 2012; Grant 2001; Lydon 2016). Perceptions projects may be working to explore such views from the perspective of affected communities, recent projects that seek to “unsettle” colonial photography and the histories predominantly associated with them may offer further methodological directions (Angel and Wakeham 2016; Lagae 2012; Lien, Edwards and Legène 2012; Noble 2010; Payne 2011). Considered as a form of “visual reparation,” these projects prioritize experiences and histories of people from communities that have by in large been overlooked, or been consistently represented by foreign or settler-colonial actors. Projects of decolonization are seen to build knowledge within communities and bridges between cultures.

Photography has been central to many of these projects. One in particular, “Project Naming,” revisits photographs whose origins are rooted in colonial practices of social control based on a eugenic science of European supremacy. In this particular project initiated in 2001 by the Ottawa-based post secondary school Nunavut Sivuniksavut in collaboration with Library and Archives Canada, pictures such as those originally “seeking to produce propagandistic scenes of institutional order” have become portals to learning about cultures and histories that had long been downplayed, ignored or

---

9 I apply the term “reparation” here in a context of transitional justice theory, rather than other applications of the term from and within queer-studies and psychoanalysis. Visual reparation, thus, as I consider it in this de-colonization process, is concerned with photography being a vehicle and tool for performing acts of de-colonization in terms of redress or restitution for past injustices. Overlap appears to exist, and warrants further study, between a transitional justice and psychoanalytic conceptions of “reparation” when considering the role of photograph in repairing wounds within or between cultures.
suppressed (Angel and Wakeham 2016: 56). Many of the people in the photographs were never named or only identified with generic terms such as “guide” or “native type.” The photographs were for decades stored in the national archives after having served their purpose of nation building and sovereignty claims. Now, the photographs are becoming “sites for the transformation of emotional response to political engagement and the assertion of Inuit culture” (Payne 2011: 98). They also speak to nation-to-nation relations, and work to resolve past wrongs, as the photographs necessarily recall colonialist actions toward indigenous populations. Projects such as these have a primarily focus on reparations and healing for communities harmed by colonization. In terms of people often depicted as victims or recipients in humanitarian photography, similar photo-based oral history projects are only just hesitantly beginning (Warrington and Crombie 2017). They are a response to and progression from recent projects aimed at de-Westernizing aid (Abu-Sada 2012; Anderson, Brown and Jean 2012; Bennett, Foley and Krebs 2016). As archives from international aid organizations and agencies become increasingly accessible, the opportunities are there for reparation-type projects to be undertaken in the humanitarian ecosystem.\(^{10}\)

This recent scholarship and criticism suggests valuable insights can be gained when concern over visual representation merge with critical histories.

**In sights: Case Studies**

My dissertation is organized around three case studies in order to offer “concrete, context dependent knowledge(s)” about the photographic situation of humanitarianism (Flyvbjerg 2001: 73). Case study is a method applied in numerous disciplines from the social to the medical sciences. As such, there are multiple forms of case-based approaches to research. For this reason it is important to clearly outline the ways in which cases are conceived, selected and analysed in my project (Becker and Ragin 1992). The act of “casing”

---

\(^{10}\) In 2016, the International Committee of the Red Cross opened up their Photo Library to the online community when before it was only available for physical access in Geneva. Other aid agencies, such as the Canadian International Development Agency, now formally part of Global Affairs Canada, Médecins Sans Frontières, Terre des Hommes, and Oxfam are also making more of their visual archives accessible to the public.
(Ragin’s term for identifying or defining cases for study), will always involve an element of artificiality. By their very nature, cases are constructs that abstract from social reality. They are a “product of operationist research strategies,” but ones that are built from a preexisting reality (Harvey 2009: 15). Cases are also always partial since it is impossible for the case-construct to recreate ontological reality in its entirety. As such, there is a perpetual tension with the case and its referential object. The result is that the case is always open to further enquiry. The case study is a method that lends itself well to studies meant to “uncover a particularly rich problematic” (Flyvbjerg 2001: 84). Opting for a case study design rather than a historical chronology allows me to build a narrative critique with the objective that “good narratives typically approach the complexities and contradictions of real life” (Flyvbjerg 2001: 84).

The cases I have selected feature a range of humanitarians, their institutions, publics, and subjects as sources for understanding the role of photography in conceptions, references to, and practices of western humanitarianism (or -isms). Each involves perception, spectating, witnessing—sight, vision and representation—as a necessary part of humanitarianism. The cases are roughly chronologically organized, and unfurl the multidimensionality of experience and practice in humanitarian visual culture: differences in humanitarian reason, differences in actors’ ideological points of view, autonomy and agency, and particular political, social and historical contexts.

I have deliberately not focused on the most iconic moments in humanitarian action from the last half of the twentieth century, namely, the conflicts and famines in Biafra and Ethiopia. That said, the shadows of these events loom large in humanitarian historiography. The three cases presented extend across nearly one hundred and fifty years of humanitarian history and each focuses on a different dimension of the photographic situation. In succession, the cases move from advent of the idea of an impartial and neutral humanitarian agency (the origins of the International Committee of the Red Cross), to the negotiated representation of the subject of humanitarian aid (the rise of the figure of the refugee in WWI), to the appeal for recognition and acknowledgement on the part of the humanitarian subject within humanitarian action (in the aftermath of the Rwandan Genocide).
First case study: Visualizing humanitarianism: Henry Dunant’s “lamentable pictures” spark an international movement

Though originally not containing any photographs or illustrations, Henry Dunant's book *A Memory of Solferino* (1862) relied heavily on “lamentable pictures” of suffering soldiers to carry out its affective work in calling for the creation of a relief society to provide impartial and neutral care to the war wounded. The success of the book is credited with having sparked the creation of the organization that would later become the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). Dunant’s text reflected and drew on the contemporary aesthetic styles of reformist and abolitionist writings. His book also relied heavily on graphic writing meant to conjure images of pain and injustice in the mind’s eye of the reader.

In this chapter, I contend that credit for Dunant’s successes must also go to the popular use of the camera at battles being waged in Europe in that mid-nineteenth century moment. Photography invited new perspectives on the visual world, contributing to a popularization of anti-war sentiments and social democratic ideals. With this case study, I apply visual and cultural theory to explore ways in which the camera contributed to people being able to see and think differently. Doing so offers a fresh look at the origins of modern humanitarianism and of humanitarian visual culture. It also reveals limits to Dunant’s humanitarian imagination, constrained by habits of feeling related to his social position.

Second case study: Visual Displacement of Refugees: Lewis Hine’s First World War Photographs for the American Red Cross, 1918-1919

With this chapter, I turn from creators of humanitarian organizations to creators of humanitarian imagery. Lewis Wickes Hine is the American photographer best known for his early twentieth century photographs of Ellis Island immigrants in New York City, and for the National Child Labor Committee. From June 1918 to April 1919, Hine worked for the American Red Cross (ARC) photographing their relief and reconstruction activities in Europe. The ARC hired Hine because of his reputation as America’s foremost photographer of social reform issues, yet fewer than two dozen of the over fifteen
hundred photographs he made for them were published. To this day, this collection remains virtually unknown.

With this case study I focus on the ways in which the ARC framed—and later displaced from the field of view—European refugees. During the war, Hine’s sympathetic pictures of refugees bolstered the ARC to become America’s preeminent civilian war relief agency. After the war, particularly when Eastern European refugees made the transatlantic journey to North America, the burgeoning humanitarian image of the child displaced pictures of refugees. Hine’s extensive photographic collection reveals distinguishing characteristics of refugees that were occluded, resulting in refugees being subject to the same treatment as immigrants. His photography also reveals limits to the humanitarian imagination, reserving the sympathetic title of refugees to particular subsets of white, Christian Europeans. This case is part of a historical pattern of the rise and fall of sympathies for refugees coinciding with their coming in and out of view.

Third case study: Resisting a Singular Vision: “Watching” a Photograph of the Rwandan Genocide, (re)building Humanitarian Relations

Located at the top of a hillside in the Western Province of Rwanda sits the mass grave and a memorial to the most effective resistance of the county’s 1994 genocide. The Bisesero memorial site contains the human remains of 50,000 people as material evidence of the slaughter that occurred there. It also contains on display one solitary photograph made by a British journalist in the final days of the genocide. The picture depicts the French army, under the auspices of Operation Turquoise, meeting with Tutsi resistance fighters and a group of passing Interahamwe three days after the Tutsi had been assured that the army would bring reinforcements for their protection. In the intervening days, the majority of Tutsi on that hill—now exposed to the killers—were murdered. Of some two thousand people, fewer than eight hundred survived.

This is a case of tracing the relations within the encounter depicted in that single photograph, to restore links between spectators separated by space, time, and social positions. The photograph reveals ways in which historical thinking of a picture can be a
source for building humanitarian sentiment that does not rely on appeals to transcendental human essence, but rather on human boundedness. It is in this interconnection that humanity is recognized and then subsequently controlled, denied, but it also forms the foundation of the development of a sense of moral obligation and social responsibility, which are at the core of humanitarian action and impulse.

**Critical lens: Theory and methodology**

My theoretical framework acts simultaneously as my methodology. I take a combined cultural history and visual theory approach to a case study analysis. I have built my approach around “the recognition that the technology of photography is not just operated by people but that it also operates upon them” (Azoulay 2012: 15). Photography is thus always historical and always active. In taking a historical approach I acknowledge, “there is no unmediated access to the past” (Darnton 2003: xii). Instead, I maintain that my project is a deliberate attempt to project contemporary questions and concerns about humanitarianism (its conception, practices and relations) onto a backdrop of the past. In doing so, I do not wish to romanticize or exoticize the past, nor treat historical events as repositories of lessons-learned. Instead, my aim is to gather different points of view on the present by looking through the lens of the past, while at the same time gaining fresh perspective on the social and political context of that past. Applying historical thinking to humanitarian photography is a way of restoring links to the past and in this way also restoring obligations forged with those links. Current visual theories that take photography to be a decidedly political and culturally performative phenomenon make my approach possible.

Until recently, dominant approaches in photography studies and criticism focused on politics of representation and semiotics, which is to say, the pictures’ content and symbolic meanings. Photographic theory in the last quarter of the twentieth century concentrated greatly on the development and consequences of the medium’s perceived objective and evidentiary nature. From being considered a screen onto which the current structures and ideologies of society are reflected, to being a tool of state control, photography was recognized as obtaining its cultural force through discursive practices that succeeded in creating and reproducing—through its representative capacity—a
“mythic aura” of an objective medium (Sekula [1974] 1982: 5; see also Bourdieu [1965] 1990; Sekula 1984; Tagg 1988). Influenced greatly by formidable theoretical innovations of Michel Foucault, photography could be seen as more than simply a tool used by external power (Tagg 2009), but a “performative force” violently imposing or holding in place certain discursive conditions. Indeed, even the apparently reformist photography produced by the Farm Security Administration in America during the Great Depression, according to photographic historian John Tagg, challenged any sense that there was a manifestly objective truth—as claimed by documentary photography—rather than conditions created and reproduced in systems of power.

Significantly, these studies and critiques contributed to a media literacy in which photography is now widely acknowledged as being shaped by ideologies, politics, economics, and socio-cultural constraints that form along changing hegemonic lines (Butler 2009; Mitchell 1986; Sontag 1977, 2003). Not discounting the material and symbolic value of the photographs, more recent photographic theories shift the gaze away from the content of the photograph, emphasizing instead the act of photography and the actions and impacts that spring from it. Recent anthropological studies of photography have provided empirical examples that challenge conventional western interpretations or understandings of photography’s evidentiary or rhetorical forces (Pinney and Peterson 2003, and Edwards 2001, 2011). As visual anthropology moved from mere documentary practice to ethnographic enquiry, studies of non-Western applications and interpretations of photography have challenged any notions of universal audiences or uniform acceptance of dominant photographic meaning. In tracing social-lives of photographs or the signification and force of the medium in disparate cultures, western epistemologies of photography have been challenged, and notions that photography reproduces and reaffirms exiting culture have had to make way for the possibility of photography’s involvement in cultural transformation (Pinney 2008).

As much as there is potential in social biographies of photography to disrupt structures of signification, remaining attentive to the potential violence of disciplinary frames—for instance those imposed upon from academic disciplines such as anthropology or (art) history—is prudent (see Tagg 2009). In this current period in which movements are being
made to decolonize academic disciplines and their methodologies, time will tell how many disrupting perspectives will be absorbed into exiting disciplinary frames or themselves become new forms of foreclosure and fixing of meaning (Tagg 2009).

Throughout much of the scholarly literature on historical photographs, they were considered as pictures of the past: of what has already been socially and politically achieved. In this dissertation, I deviate from conceptions that treat photography solely as historical, juridical or forensic evidence, or as a rhetorical and propagandist tool. I approach photography as foremost a cultural, social, and political phenomenon, the dimensions of which extend beyond the content or frame of the picture in order to make plain the interrelations and mutual dependencies that form the foundation of the humanitarian impulse.

A cultural history approach is particularly apt for looking at photographic histories of humanitarian imagination and relations for its intellectual concern is the history of thoughts and ideas of average inhabitants of the past. Undoubtedly, notable humanitarian actions and events—the Geneva Conventions, International Humanitarian Law, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—were developed at the hands of the elite, but the inspiration and affective support for them emerged from, percolated within, were challenged, accepted or dismissed, within the public realm, or as Sliwinski (2011) has argued, through the “world spectator’s” faculty of judgement. Following Robert Darnton, cultural history seeks to be “rigorous—to deploy evidence in a manner that supports a compelling interpretation” in the study of “the worldview of the masses and [the] study [of] the values and attitudes of people in the bottom ranks of society” (Darnton 1984: xvi). The interpretation of worldviews is an approach borrowed from anthropology—hence cultural history also often being referred to as “historical anthropology”—and recognizes that history is an interpretive discipline like other human sciences. The aim with cultural history is to “make sense of how other people made sense of the human condition,” which is not always an obvious consciousness to locate (Darnton 1984: xvii).

According to the cultural theorist Raymond Williams, the “most difficult thing to get hold of, in studying any past period, is the felt sense of the quality of life at a particular place
and time: a sense of the ways in which the particular activities combined into a way of thinking and living” (1961: 63). This “felt sense,” these “ways of thinking and living,” are what Williams called “structures of feeling” and amount to, in essence, the “culture of a period” (1961: 64). According to him, looking at the art of a period is one way in which such feelings can be gleaned. As a form of communication that “outlives its bearers,” it is in art that ideas and sentiments—the “actual living sense, the deep community”—of the past are contained and accessible (Williams 1961: 65). Art is also where deviations and disruptions from these sentiments initially appear. It is a location where a “new generation responds in its own ways to the unique world it is inheriting, taking up many continuities, that can be traced, and reproducing many aspects of the organization, which can be separately described, yet feeling its whole life in certain ways differently, and shaping its creative response into a new structure of feeling” (Williams 1961: 65).

William’s theories on tracing transformations in the structures of feeling at a given point in time form the central thematic core of my second chapter, the case study of the impact of Henry Dunant’s graphic language on the inception of the ICRC.

As a point of entry into the “culture of a period,” art is also articulated to the dominant hegemonic ideologies of an era as much as it is a location where challenges to those ideas can be located. The degree of connection art may have to its period’s dominant ideologies varies, though history has certainly shown that art can become a handmaiden to the ruling elite. Judith Butler has explicitly employed the concept of “framing” to point out the ways in which it is possible that the photographic “frame decides, in a forceful way” what is allowed to be seen, how it will be seen and what is to be made of the visible (Butler 2004: 5). Through this framing “a political background is being explicitly formulated and renewed” while at the same time “the frame works both to preclude certain kinds of questions, certain kinds of historical inquiries, and to function as a moral justification” for particular forms of response (Butler 2009: 71; Butler 2004: 4; see also Reese 2003 and Tankard 2001). In short, photography can be a way of restricting people’s ability to imagine other than what the ruling classes—those with the means to make and mass distribute media arts—intend. Despite its appearance, “framing” is not absolute: there is room for disruption within the spectators’ interpretive frames and with a picture being re-framed (e.g., which happens when a photograph is repurposed in different places or
revisited at different times). The theoretical concept of framing forms the anchoring concept in the third chapter, a case study of Lewis Hine’s photographs of First World War refugees in Europe.

Looking at the structures of feeling at various moments in history and in considering the ways in which photography can be framed and re-framed is a way of exploring a period’s visual culture. Visual culture simultaneously refers to a field of study and to an analytic concept (Azoulay 2012). Besides being about the visual aspects of a society and culture (e.g., architecture, paintings, pottery), visual culture is also about patterns and practices of viewing. Indeed, as the visual theorist and historian of photography Shawn Michelle Smith puts it: “What is seen and not seen in photographs depends on the cultural filters through which they are viewed, and on the repertoire of image that have shaped looking” (2007: 15). In contexts where cultural filters and repertoires of images include racial discrimination, ethnic polarization and imagery that normalized murder, “visual culture can be a matter of life or death” (Smith 2007: 15). My final case study, which focuses on a single photograph from the Rwandan genocide, articulates the broader perils of photography to Tutsi-Rwandans in 1994. This case is also an exemplar of a way forward for humanitarian photography: to take into consideration the ways in which different actors are tethered to a photograph and thus also “bound up with others” (Butler 2009: 180).

Structures of feeling, framing, and the visual culture of a given moment in time structure the theoretical framing of each of my case studies. The theories configure the evidence constituted by the cases in such a way as to draw out particular counsel each of them provides in relation to my research questions. Each of the theories and the cases also center on visual theorist Ariella Azoulay’s (2008, 2012) concept of the event of photography.

Azoulay’s theoretical intervention, the “event of photography,” offers a conceptualization of photography in which analytic attention is redirected to the actions and the situations surrounding the camera and its pictures. Photography is thus not simply a mechanism for making images, but is an action that produces "commotion and communion" (Azoulay
The event of photography is a consequence of the medium being “subject to a unique form of temporality” (Azoulay 2012: 26). It is this temporal aspect of photography that is particularly salient to my dissertation as it enables the restoration of links to the past. That it is an action redirects attention from the physical image to the situation in which the arena of actors and actions around the picture or the little black box of the camera that mark the location of photography’s greatest force. In this way, all photography associated—however tangentially—with humanitarianism becomes a source of unconventional knowledge, unique in ways that historiographies and testimonies are not.

Azoulay is not the first theorist to note the way in which photography has a unique relationship with time. Indeed, John Berger, in his way, preceded Azoulay in explaining this quality of photography to be able to “extend[d] the event beyond itself” by “implicating other events” through the act of “the spectator’s lending the frozen appearance a supposed past and a present” (Berger [1982] 2013: 90-91). Berger eloquently elaborated on the ways in which photographs can play an integral role in making social and political interconnections associated with the photographic situation more apprehendable:

Photographs are relics of the past, traces of what has happened. If the living take that past upon themselves, if the past becomes an integral part of the process of people making their own history, then all photographs would reacquire a living context, they would continue to exist in time, instead of being arrested moments. It is just possible that photography is the prophecy of a human memory yet to be socially and politically achieved. Such memory would encompass any image of the past, however tragic, however guilty, within its own continuity (Berger [1978] 2013: 57).

Photographs in this configuration continue to perform an integral social function in the conception and responses to the situations from which they emerged while simultaneously foregrounding the relations there associated. For Berger, and later Azoulay, photographs become entry points into exploring the negotiations (or lack thereof) in the encounters and events they set in motion or were associated with. Photography thus offers an opportunity for all points of view to be known, and to situate them within the “cultural and social hierarchies that organize the power relations between
As Berger and Azoulay recognize, the possibility of photography, when considered as being connected to ongoing sets of social and political relations, in enriching insights of the past, making claims in the present and conceiving of the future. To say that humanitarianism is a photographic situation is to acknowledge that different players with different power exist together to make humanitarianism. In most cases, the event of photography reveals imbalances of power that exist within the negotiations and relations of humanitarianism, the roots of which can be traced to the pre-photographic era. Pictures are part of power struggles, but there is no sovereign control over them. Although photographs can only ever depict, many forces emanating from creators, subjects, and spectators—the borders of which are increasingly blurred—shape those depictions. The photographic situation is a direct result of the emergence of the medium of photography. The popular spread of photography brought with it a new visual culture, a new relation to the visible world (Azoulay 2012). Being able to see pictures of distant people and different conditions of life (and suffering) generated and diversified humanitarianism beyond religious or missionary practices. The ability of photography to alter perceptions expanded the term “humanitarianism” to include those who had been beneath or outside notice. Untold number of other events can flow from the photographic event; it is ongoing so long as the pictures (physically or in other forms) circulate. Circulation of images is vital to the photographic situation of humanitarianism and any attempt to describe the pictures, define them, or provide meaning is an act of translation which is shaped by modes of practice (culture) and power. Ultimately, photography contains and is associated with so much more (e.g., politics, affects) than is visible in the picture.
What Azoulay’s conception encourages is a consideration of the different perspectives as equivalent of value, perhaps even weighed more heavily to the most vulnerable. Rather than maintaining the primacy of the photographer, the spectator or the content and aesthetics of the picture as the locus of discourse, it is the relations that are forged or implicated in the photographic situation that are foregrounded. She also broadens the scope of reflection beyond Western contexts and views, turning the attention to more nuanced and multi-dimensional conceptions of subjects, who are also spectators in a broader, global understanding of spectators and audience. Thus, there is at once broadening and narrowing of the spectators: they no longer remain monoculturally and homogeneously Western, rather they include aid recipients and their communities, and they are capable of civic engagement and complex thought. This formulation encourages “disintegrate[ing] the subject/object dichotomy” as it “implicates us all” (Kleinman and Kleinman 1996: 7).

When media and visual culture scholars and critics within and outside the humanitarian system offer correctives in relation to humanitarian photography, it has thus far been in the form of codes of conduct, or laudable proposition statements that lack concreteness of empiricism or practice (General Assembly 1989; ICRC-IFRC 1994; McGee 2005). In considering humanitarianism as a photographic situation in which encounters and relationships are mediated with the technology of the camera, there are more opportunities to explore how a humanitarianism in which “bonds of mutual commitment and reciprocity across borders through public discourse and socio-political struggle” might be possible, or at least an ideal worth continuing to strive for (Kurasawa 2004: 234). The application of my interdisciplinary theoretical framework and the photographic analysis that follows becomes a praxis, a way of engaging with the past, that acknowledges its ongoing (unresolved) impact in the present, offering new perspectives on current issues. Ultimately, it unfurls and lays out ever-present tensions where the medium of photography is used to navigate the morass of moral obligation and social responsibility that faces constant political-economic pushback, and where the best intentions often result in ambiguous results.
Conclusion

Historically, it has largely fallen to humanitarians (defined broadly) to introduce or inform spectators of global calamities. They have also become the *de facto* moral authorities on how to judge and respond to these calamities. Yet it is not humanitarians’ messages alone that shape spectators’ imagination and responses to human crises. Pictures in the mass circulation commercial press, visual arts and private photographs also populate the internal mental albums through which spectators make sense of their world and human suffering therein. Surely humanitarians have a responsibility when it comes to visual representations and practices, but they can never have full control over how people interpret and respond to events. Additionally, humanitarian photography undoubtedly has contributed to expanding the fold of human attention and care. It has also demonstrated limits in the form of stubborn habits and patterns that continue to limit humanitarian thought and practice today. The cases explored in this dissertation are neither a celebration nor condemnation of humanitarian photography. Rather, they are about the role of photography in mediating humanitarian imagination, sentiments and relations. They are also meant to look to ways in which photography can continue to be a positive force in humanitarianism by challenging it when it flounders and reinforcing it when it succeeds.
Chapter 2

Visualizing humanitarianism: Dunant’s ‘lamentable pictures’ spark an international movement

Henry Dunant, the founder of the Red Cross, wrote these words near the end of his 1862 book, *A Memory of Solferino*:

But why have I told of all these scenes of pain and distress, and perhaps arouse painful emotions in my readers? Why have I lingered with seeming complacency over lamentable pictures, tracing their details with what may appear desperate fidelity?

The passage is a bridge to his call for a relief organization that would provide care to soldiers wounded in war. The quotation suggests that the text is filled with “lamentable pictures,” and yet remarkably, the only figure illustrating the book’s first edition was a line drawn map.11 While the book did not contain pictures in the physical sense of the word (photographs, prints or drawings), his publication is filled with images in the notional sense (mental pictures, imagination). Dunant created his pictures with graphic language, and he mobilized them to guide his readers on affective and political responses. Though this passage is not one of Dunant’s most circulated quotes, I consider it here as part of modern humanitarianism’s visual heritage. I draw attention to it because it speaks to the potency of “pictures” in the expansion of humanitarian sentiment in the mid-nineteenth century, pictures that increasingly would originate in photography, but that were also aligned with images in people’s minds. Dunant’s images are foundational in this respect, sparking an international movement and inspiring the creation of a committee that would eventually become the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).

Dunant’s own skill in uniting people to a cause can be credited for his success, but the spark emanating from his book may not have ignited had it not been for the combustible

---

11 Dunant would create three editions of his publication within the first year: one for close acquaintances, followed by one for heads of state and political officials, and a third popular edition (Grumpert 1938: 84).
material, so to speak, that existed in the social and political context in which he wrote and made his appeal. Dunant’s book appeared at a time in which new forms of international travel and communication accelerated changes in sentiment and in social and political culture. Prime among the new technology was the photographic camera. The popularity of photography from the late 1830s onward brought with it new capacities for viewing, in essence a new visual culture. The technology of the camera extended the gaze temporally and geographically thus enabling a reconfiguration of existing ways of seeing (Berger: 1972; Azoulay 2012: 64). The result was an ability to draw attention to previously overlooked and vulnerable bodies, in Dunant’s case, the common soldier, a figure that had been derided as the “scum of the earth” (Marwil 2000: 35). Being able to linger over images of dead bodies, to gaze from a distant locale, made it possible for spectators to see soldiers as citizens worthy of protection and care, particularly when those images of the dead were juxtaposed with pictures of strapping soldiers preparing for battle. The unintended narrative of life to death that emerged in the early pattern of war photography at the time made imaginable to viewers what Dunant called for: the prospect of providing neutral, impartial care to all those wounded in battle no matter their rank or allegiances.

In this chapter, I situate Dunant’s book within the incipient visual culture of the time in order to access the era’s “structures of feeling,” a concept coined by the cultural theorist Raymond Williams that refers to the “felt sense of the quality of life” and the “culture of a period” (1961: 63). Williams suggests that an “actual living sense” of an era can be gleaned through an analysis of its arts as it communicates “deep community” long after the bearers are gone (Williams 1961: 64). In looking at Dunant’s text in relation to other morally instructive reform literature and to visual arts of the time, I am able to trace continuities and changes in structures of feeling that altered public perception enough to transform Dunant’s “ghost of a plan” into a reality (Grumpert 1938: 88).

---

12 The Duke of Wellington made this statement in 1813; it reflected a common sentiment particularly among the gentry.

13 Gustave Moynier is quoted as having said that Dunant’s “ghost of a plan” would never have amounted to anything had Moynier not intervened (Grumpert 1938: 88).
I begin by looking at the role of visuals in shaping Dunant’s perspective on suffering and its alleviation to see how his own insistence on sight and vision as central to “proper” sentiment was both a literary convention at the time and a conviction in humanitarian practice that continues to this day. I position his book alongside moralizing reform novels popular at the time to emphasize the way he reproduced but also diverged from that convention in a crucial way: Dunant focused on himself as a role model with whom his readers could relate and emulate. Finally, I align Dunant’s successes with a pattern in conflict photography emerging at the time that was instrumental in changing social conscience. I describe the narrative inherent in photographs from the Crimean War, from the Battle of Solferino itself, and from the American Civil War as having had an effect that contributed to the “manipulation of sentiment [to] expand the reference of terms ‘our kind of people,’” thus enabling the common soldier to be seen as a citizen worthy of care and protection (Rorty 1998: 123). Consequently, in drawing attention to changes in structures of feeling, I also encounter habits of feeling that constrain humanitarian imagination, particularly along the lines of race, class, and gender. In the end, Dunant’s text is a prism revealing social, political, and economic contingencies and convictions that existed as opportunities and constraints for his innovative idea of a neutral humanitarianism. Moreover, his book set the standard for relating to subjects who receive aid, the consequences of which continue to have resonance today.

Affected eyewitness

As the story is conventionally told, Dunant’s inspiration for the creation of an aid organization emerged in response to the scenes of a battle he encountered purely by accident. It was in June 1859, while en route to meet with Emperor Napoleon III to support a colonial expansionist scheme for a mill in Algeria, that everything changed for Dunant. According to Dunant himself, his witnessing of the battle was profoundly transformative, utterly altering his worldview and redirecting any sense of purpose he had.

---

14 Dunant’s fledgling company was to build a mill, to turn that part of Algeria into a “bread basket of North Africa,” what Dunant lacked however, was access to water. He went to meet with Napoleon, who controlled Algeria at the time, to seek water rights (Grumpert 1938; Durand 2015).
before that time. In this section, I explore the centrality of sight and vision in Dunant’s development of humanitarian sentiment. Despite focusing on vision—at the expense of the combined force of all other human senses—the description of Dunant’s battlefield story presented here contains traces of the lived reality of the mid-century moment and sets the scene for my focus on the role of vision and images, and their perpetual and ubiquitous centrality on the part of humanitarians, in the development (and trajectories) of the humanitarian imagination.

Dunant came from a well to do, and well respected, Genevan family, but he was not independently wealthy. He lived a rather sheltered and privileged life that enabled him to participate in numerous philanthropic and charity activities and to reach the age of 31 before embarking on a business venture that was to be the proverbial making of him. While his activities identify him today as a lifelong humanitarian, at the time he was being primed for a financial career. On the recommendation of General Dufour, a family friend and former mentor to Napoleon III, Dunant went to meet the Emperor who was holding court in Sardinia while leading the Franco-Sardinian army in the fight for liberation from Austria. Dunant had prepared a publication he intended to present to the sovereign in which he extolled Napoleon and justified the Emperor’s rule as a noble attempt to restore Europe as the greatest nation in the universe (Grumpert 1938: 30). Events, however, would not transpire as planned.

Dunant’s “presumptuousness” led him, on the sweltering hot Friday afternoon on 24 June 1859, to the scene of the “most murderous bloodbath of the century” (Grumpert 1938: 38, 41). Although largely forgotten outside of Italy and humanitarian circles, the Battle of

---

15 The conventional historiography and official institutional narratives from the Red Cross were based largely on Dunant’s personal memoir and his accounts in Memory of Solferino.
16 Precarious living was another aspect of his family: his paternal grandfather having spent time in debtor’s prison (Durant 2011).
17 Some biographers have gone so far as to describe Dunant as being too coddled by his mother or so devoted to her that he developed a debilitating dependence on her (Grumpert 1938).
18 Dufour was Napoleon’s military instructor before the latter become Emperor; Dufour’s character is often described as intelligent, careful and sensitive.
Solferino has been described as the final decisive battle in the Italian wars of independence (Moorehead 1998: 2).\(^{19}\) Ironically, it was also “one of the most dilettante wars ever fought” (Grumpert 1938: 38). Although both armies were rather evenly matched with a combined fighting force of about 300,000 soldiers, the majority were weak as a result of having marched extensively in previous days (Moorehead 1998: 3). Neither army expected an engagement that day, but when each learned of the other’s positions, fight they did. For fifteen hours, along a 16-kilometer front, they battled. It all ended when a heavy summer thunderstorm turned the battleground to mud, literally stopping combatants in their tracks. Historically, the battle is significant because it resulted in unprecedented numbers of wounded due in part to fatigue, poor preparation (e.g., lack of food and water), and new weapon technology: the “French grape-shot” and dumdum bullets (Dunant [1862]: 20). The result was what Dunant encountered: 50,000 immediate casualties and another 40,000 in the following days and weeks (Dunant [1862]: 106).

In the end, Dunant never met with the Emperor. Instead, “temperament, training and tradition” compelled him to stay and provide what assistance he could (ICRC in Dunant [1862]: 9).\(^{20}\) Not being medically trained, he could do little more than provide comfort in the form of dressing changes, tobacco, water, letter writing, and company to those who might survive and to those who would surely die. Still in his tropical colonial suit—which would later earn him the moniker of “the man in white” by the soldiers to whom he would tend—he ended up staying for three days providing care alongside local villagers. Thereafter he dropped off his monograph with one of Napoleon’s aides. He

---

\(^{19}\) The First Italian War of Independence, 1848-9, was followed a decade later by the Second Italian War of Independence, also known as the Franco-Austrian War, 1859. The Battle of Solferino was the final battle in these wars.

\(^{20}\) In his memoir, written some forty to sixty years after these events, Dunant claims that his upbringing and youthful exposures—and informal education in philanthropy—influenced his response to the Battle of Solferino much less than it might otherwise seem (Durand 2011: 16).
then visited larger hospitals in nearby Brescia for three weeks, before he finally returned home, exhausted.\textsuperscript{21}

Three years passed before Dunant would write and publish his account. The elapse of time did little to diminish the details he would recall or his emotions surrounding the events. Dunant’s publication was an account of the ad hoc care he provided to soldiers wounded in the battle. In it, he described the blood and gore of conflict and the excruciating misery that followed in its wake. For the bulk of the book, Dunant focused on combatants overcome with pain and suffering. Dunant explicitly invited his readers to engage his narrative visually, to become witnesses alongside him. Dunant sets up his accounts of the battle as those of “a mere tourist with no part whatever in this great conflict; but it was my rare privilege, through an unusual train of circumstances, to witness the moving scenes that I have resolved to describe” (Dunant [1862]: 16).

Dunant’s writing, his selection of words, his choice of scenes to describe, are meant to grip readers and encourage “the onlooker” and fellow “tourists” to visualize in their mind’s-eye repulsive panoramas of battle (Dunant [1862]: 22, 64-65): “What tragic, dramatic scenes of every kind, what moving catastrophes were enacted!” Dunant exclaims. Furthermore, these vistas are framed such that, “every door, window, and courtyard was a ghastly scene of butchery” (Dunant [1862]: 20, 24). He writes: “A little further on, it is the same picture, only made the more ghastly by the approach of a squadron of cavalry, which gallops by, crushing dead and dying beneath its horses’ hoofs” (Dunant [1862]: 19). In the final section of the book, Dunant presented the sketches of an unprecedented plan: “Would it not be possible, in time of peace and quiet, to form relief societies for the purpose of having care given to the wounded in wartime by zealous, devoted and thoroughly qualified volunteers?” (Dunant [1862]: 115) All of this occurred in little over one hundred pages.

\textsuperscript{21} While at Brescia, Dunant observed physicians from the enemy armies willingly being pressed into the service of tending to the wounded coming from all sides of the conflict. Dunant also made appeals to philanthropists in Geneva to donate funds and supplies. When he returned to Geneva, Dunant continued trying to make a go of his Algerian business. In 1867, three years after the first Geneva Convention, Dunant had to declare bankruptcy as a result of his soured schemes (Durand 2011: 32; Moorehead 1998: 7).
Dunant’s inspiring appeal based on witnessing the harms done to so many lives did not, however, secure his role within the organization he ultimately created. Circumstances and acquaintances eventually led Dunant to meeting Gustav Moynier, then president of the Geneva Public Welfare Office, who would become both partner and rival in the development of the ICRC.  

22 Fairly soon after the establishment of the committee, Dunant would be overtaken by Moynier who had a personal agenda in mind for the organization.  

23 By 1867, the course of Dunant’s disassociation with the ICRC was expedited and concretized when his North African business scheme failed catastrophically. His ensuing bankruptcy resulted in a self-imposed exile from Geneva. From then on he lived a tremendously precarious life, subsisting on the good will of others, mainly in Paris, until he disappeared from the historical records for fifteen years (1875-1890). He resurfaced at the end of the century in a charitable hospice in a small village in Switzerland when a young local journalist came to inquire about the wizened old man (Grumpert 1938). In 1901, he was awarded the first Nobel Peace Prize, the money from which he used to pay off some of his creditors and he donated the remainder. He lived the last of his days at the hospice, dying penniless.

Even in retelling his story, the interplay and a potency of sight and images is apparent: Dunant’s witnessing, the reorientation of his focus, his resolve to share three years later what he had seen, and his vision of a neutral organization of medical providers (Grumpert 1938: 77). Undoubtedly, Dunant saw many horrendous things in the aftermath of battle. Recently, historians have been writing more fulsome sensorial experiences of warfare to attempt deeper immersion on the part of readers, something that Dunant gestures at with some of his gruesome descriptions (Smith 2014). Dunant takes great effort in guiding his readers’ imaginative capacities by forming images in their minds of what he saw,

---

22 From here they would solicit the support of three others: the respected military leader General Dufour, and two military physicians, Louis Appia and Theodor Monoir, to found the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).

23 Early histories would have it that Dunant had a weak personality enabling—even demanding—Moynier’s strength to turn the idea into a reality. Moynier is quoted as having said that Dunant “had not the ghost of a plan for turning his inspiration into fact” (in Grumpert 1938: 88). Revisionist historians have since disputed this fact as rhetoric on the part of Moynier who had been in a power-struggle with Dunant since the earliest developments of the Committee (Ottaviani et al: 2005).
convinced—influenced to an unknowable extent by his own experience—that seeing was a primary sense for building affect. The following section builds on this idea of sight and moral sensibilities in popular literary conventions at Dunant’s disposal.

**Translating suffering**

Dunant himself claimed that it was a divine force that guided his hand to write *A Memory of Solferino*. To come away unaffected from the encounters he had at Solferino would be virtually impossible. Indeed, there is consensus among Durant’s biographers that “the hell of Solferino was indelibly etched on his brain” resulting in some form of posttraumatic stress disorder (Grumpert 1938: 77; see also Durand 2011). It is the historical circumstances surrounding him that provide more concrete clues as to why he wrote, and why he chose the genre of writing that he did as his platform of self-expression and appeal.24 Dunant recognized early on in his campaign for his aid organization the rhetorical force of visual pictures; he used woodblock prints in some of his first pamphlets promoting his ideas (Durand 2011: 42). Dunant was also friends with Jean-Gabriel Eynard (1775-1863), a wealthy banker and early photography enthusiast (Durand 2015). In this section, I explore Dunant’s attraction to written texts despite his interest in visual technologies. I also present a crucial deviation he makes from the literary conventions that inspired him, which, I contend, was instrumental to his success.

Dunant came from a society with a long, rich history steeped in literary culture. He had joined a local literary society in Geneva in his 20s and considered himself a man of letters second only to his religious identity (Durand 2011). Dunant was a Calvinist, a religion in which the word is prized over iconography. While Dunant was known to have an interest in photography, it was generally considered to be a lowbrow art (Durand 2015).25 Thus it would seem natural that he would have gravitated to the written word to express himself.

---

24 One of Dunant’s more recent biographers characterised it this way: “Solferino became a nervous affliction, a product of the mind of young Monsieur Dunant” (Durand 2011: 76).

25 Another factor that may have played into the lack of illustrations was cost. The only image in his text, the map of the battlefields, already represented a full third of his publication costs (Durand 2011).
The style he mobilized was a graphic form of writing that prioritized visual scenes as the source for seeing moral instruction.

A succession of Scottish Enlightenment thinkers from David Hume, to Francis Hutcheson, to Adam Smith, had long before Dunant’s time prioritized scenes of suffering as central to exciting the imagination, enabling spectators to “enter into” the body of the sufferer and develop the proper sense required to end the other’s distress” (Halttunen 1995: 307; see also Rozario 2003: 423). “Spectatorial sympathy” in poetry, theatre and a wealth of sentimental visual arts burgeoning in the eighteenth century were popular devices marshaled to open eyes and soften hearts (Halttunen 1995: 307). Such works demonstrated virtuous attitudes and educated proper sympathetic responses on a number of issues ranging from animal welfare to childcare and treatment of women or the elderly. These ideas contributed to ethics becoming “a matter of viewing the pain of another,” a point of polemical debate to this day (Halttunen 1995: 309; Sontag 1977, 2003; Appel and Smith 2007; Linfield 2010; Dean 2015). The appeal to the visual sense was not limited to actions or physical pictures in front of the eye; carefully crafted graphic language was composed in popular texts with the intent of generating appearances in the mind’s eye.

The graphic humanitarian novel was popular at the time Dunant was putting pen to paper. Considering his literary background, for him to turn to this genre of writing was natural. His decision was likely also influenced by another chance encounter he had, one that took place almost a decade before having set himself down to write. In 1853, Dunant had the good fortune of meeting Harriet Beecher Stowe, the American author of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* (1852), during her stay in Geneva. She was on tour “pleading the cause of humanity in old Europe” and happened to stay at the home of a relative of General Dufour (Durand 2011: 67). Stowe, and her literary peers, Charles Dickens, Victor Hugo, and Emile Zola, were writing a form of the humanitarian narrative meant “to

---

26 The General was, in many ways, Dunant’s mentor: he would later help arrange the battlefield meeting between Dunant and Napoleon, and would later still become one of the five founding members of the Red Cross (Durand 2011: 67).
arouse people to a crusade against wrong through books or appeals” (Grumpert 1938: 15).\(^{27}\) Abraham Lincoln is said to have credited her book with having contributed to the American Civil War, a conflict that was still nearly a decade away when she and Dunant met (Grumpert 1938: 15). Her writing and advocacy skills substantially influenced the young Henry.

In her text, Stowe relied heavily on graphic depictions of the bodies of slaves and the violence done to them to represent their full humanity. Consistent with the genre, Stowe employed the language of explicit visual imagery to foster abolitionist sentiments.\(^{28}\) The descriptions Dunant offered of the care he provided to scores of wounded soldiers were rich with imagery equivalent to that of Stowe’s: “I moistened his dry lips and hardened tongue, took a handful of lint and dipped it in the bucket they were carrying behind me, and squeezed the water from this improvised sponge into the deformed opening that had been his mouth” (Dunant [1862]: 62). Describing another soldier who had been peppered with grapeshot, “The rest of his swollen body was all black and green, and he could find no comfortable position to sit or lie in. I moistened great masses of lint in cold water and tried to place this under him, but it was not long before gangrene carried him off” (Dunant [1862]: 67).

Dunant was also keenly aware that his text had to have a story, a narrative structure to maintain his readers’ interest. Following suit with other reform novel writers, Dunant took artistic license where required in order to maximize affect. For instance, he placed himself as a witness to the battle when in reality he only arrived on the scene the evening.

\(^{27}\) Grumpert continues: “During their lifetime, they were honoured and admired, and even now are accorded full rites by the motion picture industry. It was felt that even the shadow of pain and suffering was a last damnable blot on modern civilization” (1938: 15).

\(^{28}\) Subsequent literary critics have differentially interpreted and debated Stowe’s use of violence in her novel. For example, in her analysis “The ecstasies of sentimental wounding in Uncle Tom’s Cabin” (UTC), Marianne Noble (1997) puts her ideas into dialogue with those of Laqueur and Halttunen who each find different motivations and impacts of Stowe’s mobilization of violence in UTC. Noble reveals the ways in which the humanitarian narrative is a “double edged sword” in which is precariously balanced liberation and repression, raising awareness and objectifying. What this criticism points out is a longstanding, perpetual paradox of potentially doing harm while trying to do good by objectifying victims and their pain.
the fighting ended. He never visited Solferino. Instead he spent three days providing care in the nearby town of Castaglione where a church had become a makeshift hospital. With all its literary and graphic devices, Dunant’s text was as much a work of fiction and entertainment as it is a moral enterprise. It was also a project of self-interest and self-preservation as much as it was an altruistic one.

Importantly, Dunant deviated from Stowe in one crucial way. Unlike Stowe’s famous work, Dunant wrote himself in as the hero, albeit not already in possession of heroic qualities. Dunant’s story is about his transformation from disaffected tourist to advocate for the care of wounded soldiers. His text has many of the characteristics of a classic bildungsroman, or coming of age story. Joseph Slaughter (2007) has positioned the bildungsroman as an ideal form of writing in the service of humanitarianism and human rights. Conventional humanitarian narratives that centralized suffering and graphic descriptions of pain as the source of moral development, he argues, had less guarantee that readers would respond in the ways that writers intended. Indeed, longstanding anxieties accompanied the creation and critique of these stories for the potential of them being interpreted by audiences as entertainment or worse. One option to direct readers to a particular behaviour or response was celebrating the readers’ “exquisite sensibility” as a feature in many texts (Halttunen 1995: 307). Another option was to allow the main character’s moral instruction be a feature for readers to model. The focus then was taken

---

29 He consulted a military strategist to help him recount the details of battle, and hired a map expert to create the line-drawn rendering of the battlefield.

30 Castaglione was the town seven kilometers outside Solferino where Dunant attended to the wounded (Grumpert 1938: 30).

31 For that matter, his publication would also prove to be a source of currency. Not so much financial security in terms of the book’s commercial success, which it was not, but in terms of social currency. As his business venture floundered and eventually collapsed, the path of a “social careerist” was another option for him to make a living (Grumpert 1938). Of course, this was a path taken by many in his circle of influence and by his peers. Such self-interest has been the source of debate, anxiety and aporia among humanitarians and its critics to this day. Such behaviour is considered paradoxical to humanitarian action, which is idealized as altruistic (Brauman 2004; Orbinski 2008; Rorty 1998; Vaux 2001). While an important aspect to pay attention to particularly historically, in order to explore the moral trajectory of this man and the influences of his actions on subsequent humanitarianism, the apparent paradox may be an intractable moral debate, it may also not be a moral failing; altruism is a myth struggled with by many humanitarians, the recognition of which only makes humanitarian action/engagement better (Rorty 1998).
off suffering and instead concentrated on encouraging emulation through a “sense of responsibility to [the] moral integrity of one’s own class of humanity” (Festa 2010: 103; see also Lydon 2016). The benefit of this was that readers were not left to their own devices to determine “proper sentiment” and what actions should be taken in response to that emotion. Repeatedly in Solferino, Dunant steers spectators along a directed, emotional path.

In the vein of the classic bildungsroman, Dunant provided examples of proper sentiment and encouraged its development in his readers:

The moral sense of the importance of human life; the humane desire to lighten a little the torments of all the furious and relentless activity which a man summons up at such moments: all these combine to create a kind of energy which gives one a positive craving to relieve as many as one can (Dunant [1862]: 73).

Along with providing care to soldiers, Dunant’s text was concerned with introducing an innovation for humanity: along with raising awareness of the plight of the battlefield wounded, Dunant’s originality lay in his call for impartial care provided by a neutral third party. Dunant focused on drawing attention to suffering as something equally felt by soldiers, officers, allies and enemies. Dunant mobilized his text to show this consciousness for the benefit of his readers:

[The] women of Castaglione, seeing that I made no distinction between nationalities, followed my example, showing the same kindness to all these men whose origins were so different, and all of whom were foreigners to them. ‘Tutti fratelli’ [all are brothers], they repeated feelingly (Dunant [1862]: 72).

Dunant’s witnessing and his firsthand experiences in the aftermath of fighting transformed his perceptions when it came to battlefield care. Making his point through the words and deeds of local women further symbolized the simplicity and naturalness of his idea. His book with its graphic text became a proxy to his readers, being a substitute for actually standing on the sidelines of the battle with him.

32 Florence Nightingale famously stated following her experience at Crimea, “Suffering lifts its victim above normal values. While suffering endures there is neither good nor bad, valuable nor invaluable, enemy nor friend. The victim has passed to a region beyond human classification or moral judgments and his suffering is a sufficient claim” (British Red Cross n.d.).
In leading by example, Dunant was showing how change in sentiment was possible but also he inadvertently revealed limits to his humanitarian imagination. Certain cultural and social biases remained in Dunant’s appeal. Old habits of feeling in the form of stereotypes and biases surface in his representations of other groups such as “African rage and Mussulman fanaticism” (Dunant [1862]: 30). And despite his acknowledgement of having found inspiration in Florence Nightingale’s healthcare provision in the Crimean War, Dunant still maintained the need for “kindly and experienced men” to organize and work alongside “weak and ignorant women” (Dunant [1862]: 121). As the omniscient narrator, Dunant also became the authority figure, speaking for the victims who remained anonymous while the generals and officers were given the honour of being named. The soldiers were also already taking on characteristics of the ideal victim by repeatedly showing “sincere gratitude” for the humanitarian gestures of being “soothed, comforted and consoled” (Dunant [1862]: 66, 71). Such habits of feeling unwittingly maintained separations and hierarchies supporting a privileged-suffering dichotomy.

Dunant might have reconfigured and fictionalized some of his experiences for added affect, but he may not have needed to go to such great lengths. His text has been credited as having sparked the ICRC, but it is not Dunant’s perceptions and innovative ideas alone that lead to the inception of the Red Cross. The opinions and designs Dunant proposed in his book were not unfamiliar or utterly radical among the circles in which the book moved. Already existing in the intellectual and political landscape were expanding social democratic ideas and growing anti-war sentiments. Dunant set himself apart from his peers who also lamented the cruelties of war by presenting a clear plan for bettering the quality of life (or death) for common combatants. Support for his proposal was an alignment of his ideas with the sentiments building in society, sentiments that coalesced

---

33 Dunant was inspired by the dedication and resolve shown by the women of Castiglione, he also credited Florence Nightingale as a further inspiration (Dunant 1862: 120). Despite this, Dunant saw his organization as being led by men. Ironically, Nightingale was against Dunant’s plan, arguing that it would lead to governments to relax their responsibilities towards their fighting force (Davies 2012: 5; Durand 2011). Nightingale’s caution has since been termed the “Nightingale risk” in conflict studies circles (O’Gorman 2011).

34 This credit comes not only from the ICRC, but also from critical humanitarian scholars such as David Rieff (Slaughter 2007: 327).
with expanded vision made possible with new technologies of the time including the camera, that would contribute to a restructuring of feelings and have a definitive impact on public conscience.

**Visual media and the acceleration of moral sentiment**

Much of the credit for the success of *A Memory of Solferino* has to go directly to Dunant and his skill in rallying people to a cause. He developed this proficiency while working for the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA) in the decade before the battle of Solferino. He worked for the YMCA while the First War of Italian Independence, 1848-9, and the Russo-Turkish war, 1853-56, raged. The Crimean War was a campaign in the Russo-Turkish War; the Battle of Solferino would be fought during the Second War of Italian Independence in 1859. During his time with the YMCA, his correspondence and communication talents were instrumental in internationalizing the association (Durand 2011). Building on these abilities, Dunant circulated *Solferino* across Europe and discussed its contents and ideas in person with members of the European nobility, political leaders, ministers of defense and military physicians. He also toured it through the Salons of Paris. High praise followed from various arenas of the political and cultural elite. The Brothers Goncourt, popular social commentators of the time, noted in their *Journal* of 8 June 1863, “One finished this book by damning war” (cited in Grumpert 1938: 84). Among other philosophers and philanthropists, Victor Hugo wrote in a letter to Dunant, “I have read your book with the greatest interest. You are arming humanity and are serving freedom…I endorse your noble efforts with enthusiasm, and I send you my heartiest good wishes” (cited in Grumpert 1938: 85). Also in 1863, “England’s most popular author,” Charles Dickens, published “The Man in White” in his weekly journal, *All the Year Round*, “which was devoutly read by the English-speaking world, [presenting] a detailed analysis of the book of the ‘travelling amateur’ and his difficult and courageous attempt to alleviate the misery of war” (cited in Grumpert 1938: 84-5). There’s no doubt that Dunant played a large hand in his own success, but that his call for a relief society to be viewed by his readers as a “damnation of war,” and “armament” in the service of humanity, and for it to become the spark for an international movement
was made all the more possible because people were already starting to think differently about warfare and its impact on infantrymen.

Despite the scale and numbers of conflicts being a sign of apparent moral decay at this time, this mid-century moment is considered one of “unprecedented acceleration in moral progress” (Rorty 1998: 121). Rather than see it as a heroic endeavour as it has been portrayed in popular culture for centuries, people were seeing war in a different light thanks to the new technologies of the era. Steam technology, the telegraph and photography made it possible for communication to travel greater distances at unprecedented speeds. The battle of Solferino has been described as the most modern conflict of the century as telecommunications, trains, and steamers enabled public opinion to be weighed in almost hourly (Gumpert 1938: 39). Unlike all the other new technologies of the era, the photographic camera shared human experiences and events in previously unmatched details.

The rise in popular use of photography brought with it “the emergence of a new relation toward the visual” (Azoulay 2012: 65). It did so by seemingly collapsing distances in time and space, making it appear as though viewers were witnessing scenes firsthand. It also brought new subject matter into the homes and hands of spectators. Pictures from places and cultures all over the world were being circulated and displayed, opening peoples’ eyes and minds to different possibilities and ways of life. Furthermore, the freezing action of the camera enabled viewing aspects of the physical world that were otherwise impossible to be seen with the unaided human eye. Photographs encouraged the lingering of ones’ gaze on a scene, making the moment that had long since passed continue to exist and take on multi-various forms of meaning. With the introduction of the camera into innumerable social arenas, including its presence at battlefields, the opportunities and limits of the medium contributed—often in unanticipated ways—to a restructuring of sentiments.

In the text in which he introduced the concept of “structures of feeling,” Williams (1961) recognized that changes to the dominant culture were slow, hence its title The Long Revolution. He also recognized the arts as being a prime location where boundaries of
that dominant culture could be pushed and tested, reinforced or revolutionized. The mid-1800s may have been a moment of acceleration in sentiment, but the ideas it was hastening has been planted nearly a half century before Dunant was able to capitalize on them.

Already some four decades before Dunant penned his book, criticisms of the sufferings brought about by warfare circulated. In 1807, Napoleon Bonaparte led an invasion into Spain that compelled Francisco Goya, the Spanish court painter known mainly for his idyllic scenes of everyday life among the gentry, to become a de facto documentarian and commentator on the cruelties that accompany conflict. Along with his courtly responsibilities, Goya had long included representations of societal changes in his work. After experiencing an unknown illness which left him deaf, Goya’s work became more introspective on the one hand and more social commentary on the other (Tomlinson 2002). Indeed, with the security that came from his position, Goya felt confident in being able to go in new artistic directions. It is thus not surprising that he would turn his attention to the cruel horrors of a war that would last for six years. The act of foreign aggression by the French soon degraded into all out civil war, the Peninsular War, 1808-1814. Barbarities enacted by Napoleon’s army and by Spanish rebels who saw this as an opportunity to overthrow the monarchy were followed by a period of famine and anarchy.

While his peers continued to create works that glorified war or merely depicted miseries of warfare as unavoidable, Goya broke from painterly traditions to present horrific scenes of brutality, famine and repression with a dramatically accusatory tone. He combined each unflinching image of brutality and despair with titles that explicitly expressed particularly strong sentiments against the conflict [Fig. 2]. With such titles as “They do not want to,” “Bury them and keep quiet,” and “There is no one to help them”, Goya guided spectators to a new interpretation of war as abhorrent and repulsive. With this collection of work, “Goya did not flee the world, but probed the depths of events, so that

35 For instance Jacques Callot’s Les Grands Misères de la Guerre (1633).
his nightmares always possess both tremendous verisimilitude and universal meaning” (Serraller 2002: 45).

Figure 2: Plate #9, No Quieren, (they do not want to). Francisco Goya, circa 1820. Museo del Prado. Public domain.

It took Goya five years to create this series he titled Fatal consequences of the bloody war in Spain with Bonaparte and other emphatic caprices, 1810-1820.36 Despite Goya’s reputation, the prints were never put into wide circulation within his lifetime. It is speculated that the prints were too critical of the French, then the European powerhouse (Jones 2003). By 1863, when Henry Dunant was circulating Solferino throughout salons of Paris and among the European elite, changes in public opinion resulted in Goya’s work taking on new significance. Sentiments that earlier had appeared unconventional and controversial had become widespread and accepted as the “fatal consequences” of numerous battles taking part in quick succession were being made visible through the

36 Reproduced in 1863 under the title, The Disasters of War.
new medium of photography.\textsuperscript{37} His prints were published for mass circulation for the first time in 1863 under the more generic title \textit{The Disasters of War}. Goya may since have been credited with having introduced the sentiment of revulsion of warfare (Bouvier 2011; Sliwinski 2011). Its popular uptake owes much to the introduction of the camera in the mid-nineteenth century.

By the time that Dunant was writing \textit{A Memory of Solferino}, photography had been in popular use for nearly two decades. The state of the art had moved away from the one-off Daguerreotypes and now consisted of the collodion process with glass plate negatives to which a wet emulsion was applied just prior to exposure.\textsuperscript{38} Photographs were circulated as individual prints, displayed in exhibitions and projected in lantern lectures. They were also readily translated into wood block prints for mass circulation in newspapers and books. Photographers, journalists and media moguls were quick to take advantage of camera technology to impress their existing audiences with the distinctively modern medium and to entice new ones (Hill and Schwartz 2015). In 1842, the \textit{Illustrated London News} was launched and it featured bold prints—often made from photographs—depicting calamities and conflict with the express conviction that “disaster could push newspaper sales” (Hockings 2015: 22).\textsuperscript{39} The idea of bringing a camera onto battlefields was inspired by a desire to inform, by personal curiosity, and by the sheer challenge of making pictures in a conflict.\textsuperscript{40} Regardless the intent on the part of creators and

\textsuperscript{37} Goya’s prints contain many images of violence toward civilians, mainly women. It would be almost a century from the time he made his pictures before humanitarian laws to protect women, children and other non-combatants would come into effect.

\textsuperscript{38} A dry collodion process was also possible, but most photographers of the time used the wet process for, as one photographer said of the dry process, “it is too slow to be employed where the exposure must only occupy a short time” (J.L. 1859: 183)

\textsuperscript{39} With crimes, disasters and calamities as its regular fare, Herbert Ingram’s \textit{ILN} focused on more serious issues than another British magazine, \textit{Punch}, that launched around the same time. Concern for readership, sales, social conventions and Victorian sensibilities, the \textit{ILN} carefully meted out its news with a strong dose of excitement and entertainment (Hockings 2015).

\textsuperscript{40} Writing for the \textit{Photographic News} in 1859, J.L. wrote this account of his endeavour to make photographs of the hostilities mounting in Italy: “When I left England my intention was to make a tour with the camera in Switzerland, but the exciting prospect of being able to get plates of battle-fields, sieges, and other incidental scenes, induced me to change my course, and, instead of remaining among the glaciers and ice-peaks, to make a journey to the sunny plains of Italy” (183).
distributors, spectators were responding to the images in a variety of ways. Spectators were starting to see war as something other than heroic because, for the first time, “the common soldier had begun to acquire a human face” through a pattern of conflict photography that emerged in the decade that included the Crimean War, the battle of Solferino, and the American Civil War (Marwil 2000: 35).

Among the earliest conflict photographers, Roger Fenton was a professional photographer commissioned by the English print-seller Thomas Agnew to photograph the Crimean War (Brady 1968; Newhall 1982: 85; Marwil 2000). Though not the only photographer making pictures of the campaign, Fenton is credited as being the most prolific and certainly the most recognized today. Over the course of three months in the spring and early summer of 1855, before disease would nearly take his life and force him back to England, Fenton succeeded in making some three hundred and fifty exposures (Brady 1968: 83). Reproductions of Fenton’s photographs were circulated later that same year among the British Royal Family and Napoleon III’s court. An exhibit containing three hundred and twelve prints was put on public displayed in both London and Paris (Brady 1968: 83).

Fenton’s photographs were always products of careful composition. With exposure times measured in seconds or minutes (as opposed to today’s fractions of a second), with heavy box-type large format cameras, and with the need to develop the plates in a mobile darkroom immediately after being exposed, the technology at the time prevented him from making candid exposures or action shots. A century later, his pictures have since been described as dull (Marwil 2000: 32). Compared to today’s conflict photography made in the thick of battle, it is understandable that his pictures can come across as stale.

---

41 The publisher intended to turn a profit through the sale of postcards and portfolios, popular forms of circulating photographic prints at the time.

42 Brady (1968) mentioned several others who were commissioned to make photographs of the Crimean War, Richard Nicklin in 1854, and “two young officers—Ensigns Brandon and Dawson” in the spring of 1855; none of their photographs appear to have survived to the present (76).

43 Fenton travelled with his assistant by ship to Sevastopol where they converted a four horse drawn wine cart into a mobile darkroom.
and outdated. Such an anachronistic perspective led art critic Beaumont Newhall to conclude that Fenton, limited by the technology at the time, had to “resolve [himself] to the still life in the aftermath of battle” (1982: 85). Newhall possibly made this statement with photographs like Fenton’s most well known photograph of the Crimean war in mind [Fig. 3].

![The Valley of the Shadow of Death](image)

**Figure 3: The Valley of the Shadow of Death, by Roger Fenton, 1855. Library of Congress: LC-DIG-ppmsca-35546.**

*The Valley of the Shadow of Death* (1855) was a photograph of a dry and barren landscape transected by a roadway.⁴⁴ There are in fact two exposures made from the same tripod position. In one the road lays empty, in the other cannonballs are strewn across it. Apparently Fenton had cannonballs from the ditches repositioned to give the picture a different effect. While it is the exposure with the projectiles that was the one most widely circulated, the contemporary impact of these particular photographs has been

⁴⁴ Its title was taken from the moniker soldiers had given to another valley in Sevastopol. The nickname referenced both “Psalm 23” and Tennyson’s popular 1854 poem *Charge of the Light Brigade* based on the Battle of Balaclava that took place before Fenton arrived.
overshadowed by subsequent, and still ongoing, debate about the integrity of the image (Zhang 2012). Fenton did not, however, only photograph in the aftermath of battle. The majority of his war photographs were of soldiers and officers posed singularly or in groups in the British military camps.

Using the camera to the best of its advantage, Fenton meticulously posed his subjects in ways that accentuated their discipline, their camaraderie, their strength and their vitality. To be fair to Newhall, although technically superior to many of his peers, Fenton’s conflict images were staid compared to some of his contemporaries. Photographers practicing in conflict settings, then as now, had ample graphic subject matter on which to train their lenses. War photographs depicting the physical effects of conflict on human bodies were being made, with the earliest known coming from the 1847 Mexican-American War depicting a battlefield amputation [Fig. 4]. Fenton’s choice of sedate picture content was more likely political-economic in nature than due to the failings of the technology or its operator.
The war that would make Florence Nightingale famous was also a war that was tremendously unpopular in the UK after British involvement unexpectedly dragged on through an uncommonly harsh winter. The British suffered great losses in the Crimean War due to what was seen as mismanagement that resulted in troops being severely undersupplied. It is said that more soldiers were lost to exposure and disease than to enemy fire. During the unforgiving winter of 1854, William Russell of The Times of London shared narrative dispatches that painted “grim pictures” of the events (Brady 1968: 80). Such reports greatly differed from government propaganda or from traditional historiographies that glorified warfare. Eventually public criticism would become intense enough to lead to the resignation of the Aberdeen government in February 1855. It was in the spring and early summer of that year that Fenton went to photograph the campaign under Royal Patronage and with the backing of the British government. His supporters hoped to turn the tide of public sentiment with photographs that could command loyalty
and build patriotism, essentially, photographs that would steer clear of injury and death (Brady 1968: 76).

Fenton’s photographs of strapping soldiers and officers in full battle dress may have bolstered patriotic sentiments in the hearts of some of his viewers [Fig. 5]. Despite the anticipation of renewed support for the military engagement, the photographs also offered opportunities for perceiving the conflict in different ways. Following the 1855 London exhibition of the Crimea photographs, a journalist with The Times wrote that the pictures presented the “private soldiers [with] as good a likeness as the general” (Newhall 1982: 85). To make such an observation may have simply been a statement of observable fact. But in the highly structured, hierarchical British society, to say that people of different ranks were being given the same treatment—even if only in photographs—was quite an act of leveling. Spectators may not all have been conscious of this democratizing aspect of Fenton pictures, but the camera was making this more of a possibility. Once raised in profile, it was no great leap for photography to contribute to making the common soldier’s life “grievable” (Butler 2004).
While Fenton’s photographs could not be circulated en masse, photography enthusiasts followed Fenton’s efforts through review articles in popular newspapers and in technical photography journals. These accounts were sources of information on the battles. These were also instrumental sources for building professional patterns of practice around the making of war photographs. In the months leading up to the battle of Solferino, the *Photographic News* included the statement, “The example given by Mr. Fenton in the Crimea will not, therefore, want imitators in Italy” (Anonymous 1859: 129). Imitators they got.

---

The half-tone press, which would facilitate the reproduction of photographs onto paper, was still several decades away; Fenton’s photographs were circulated through exhibitions, lantern lectures, and translated into woodblock prints, which further editorialized and sanitized his pictures.
Several professional and amateur photographers have been identified as having made pictures at the battles that were part of the Franco-Austrian War, of which Solferino was the final, decisive battle (Johnson 2012; Marwil 2000). Compared to Fenton’s, the numbers of photographs that have survived are much fewer and none have attained the status of his Crimean pictures. For being the bloodiest battle of the nineteenth century, Solferino has not had the same lasting impact on popular memory as the Crimean War that preceded it or the American Civil War that would shortly follow. The dearth of Solferino photographs compared to the wealth of those produced in the other two battles is a likely contributing factor to Solfernio’s conflict being all but forgotten. The photographs known to have survived, however, reveal a pattern already developing in terms of war photography practice.

A couple of sets of stereograph pictures exist from the Franco-Austrian War that in many respects share equivalences with Fenton’s (Johnson 2012). The largest remaining collection come from the Gaudin Brothers, who were professional French photographers commissioned to make photographs of French soldiers, and their allies, in bivouac [Fig. 6]. Like Fenton’s, these too are clearly staged and carefully composed. Taking photographs of regular troops may have been a novel “means of memorializing [governments] military accomplishments” (Johnson 2012). Such pictures, which had few equivalents in earlier conventions of celebratory battle art, also communicated the scale and quality of lives put at risk.

---

46 Stereographs were a popular form of photography particularly among landscape photographers. The dual exposure pictures, when seen through a specifically designed viewer appeared three-dimensional. The technology fell out of favour at the end of the nineteenth century as the technology was not easily adaptable for commercial consumer cameras. As aid organizations today turn to techniques such as 360° photography and virtual reality, it would seem that recent advancements in 3D technology is ripe for a comeback. The affective force of these technologies remains to be seen, but likely will emulate the pattern of historical technological innovations, including the stereoscope.
Figure 6: French army in bivouac, 1859, by Gaudin frères. Photograph courtesy of vintagephotosjohnson.com

Fewer in number are photographs attributed to Jules Couppier of the battlefields made in the days following several of the conflicts that were part of the Franco-Austrian War, which lasted from April 26 to July 11, 1859. Unlike Fenton’s, these are panoramas made from a distance. Fenton’s Valley picture may have made the battlefield appear more palpable with its proximal composition; Couppier and Fenton’s are equally devoid of human figures. Couppier, however, did make a certain type of photograph that Fenton did not, or could not. Amidst the Couppier collection are a few photographs that contain images of the wounded and the dead. A stereograph photograph of “a convoy of the wounded and survivors” survived from Solferino (Johnson 2012). It is a picture taken at high angle, perhaps from a church bell tower, of carriages filled with injured soldiers stretching as far back as the eye can see being moved into town to its makeshift medical facilities [Fig. 7].
Figure 7: Vue de l’Avenue do Brescia avec convoi de blesses et de Vivres. [View of the road to Brescia, with the convoy of the wounded and survivors.] Aftermath of the battle of Solferino. ca. June 24-June 26th. Attributed to Jules Couppier. Photograph courtesy of vintagephotosjohnson.com

From the battle of Magenta, which took place two weeks before Solferino, there exists a stunning picture of a pile of corpses awaiting burial at the local cemetery [Fig. 8; detail, Fig. 9]. That this image was made into a stereograph enhances its affective potential. Stereographs are a type of photography that was predominantly reserved for landscape scenes. These were near identical pictures that when viewed through a specialized finder would make the pictures appear three-dimensional.
Figure 8: 702. Vue du Cimetiere de Melegnano – le lendemain du Combat. [View of the Cemetery at Melegnano – the aftermath of combat.] Attributed to Jules Couppier. Photograph courtesy of vintagephotosjohnson.com

To see a photograph of a mass of bodies was itself shocking and new; to see it in three-dimensional quality would have been harrowing. That is precisely what Oliver Wendell Holmes suggests in his personal experience of encountering a stereoscope (possibly this same image) of a “heap of dead lying unburied” at the cemetery at Melegnano in his friend’s collection of pictures (Holmes 1861: 27; see also Marwil 2000). The American poet, physician, essayist, and co-founder of *The Atlantic Monthly* continued:

> Look away, young maiden and tender child, for this is what war leaves after it. Flung together, like sacks of grain, some terribly mutilated, some without mark of injury, all or almost all with a still, calm look on their faces. The two youths, before referred to, lie in the foreground, so simple-looking, so like boys who had been overworked and were lying down to sleep, that one can hardly see the picture for the tears these two fair striplings bring into the eyes. (Holmes 1861: 27).

Holmes, whose own son would later go missing for a time during the Civil War, lamented what was an indignity done to the bodies of “simple” “boys” and the death of
these “two fair striplings” (Holmes 1861: 27). The lives of common troops—even those an ocean away—were generating passionate sentiments in powerful people.

![Image](image-url)

**Figure 9: Detail of “702. Vue du Cimetiere de Melegnano – le lendemain du Combat.” [View of the Cemetery at Melegnano – the aftermath of combat.]”**

*Photograph courtesy of vintagephotosjohnson.com*

The reports from another photographer present at a battle that preceded the Battle of Solferino provides additional affective context to Couppier’s images. Known only as J.L., he described himself as a British tourist who diverted from his plans to make landscape photographs in the mountains of Switzerland and Italy upon hearing of the impending battle at Palestro, May 30-31. By chance rather than design, he became a *de facto* correspondent for the *Photographic News*, a journal that predominantly featured articles on the technical aspects of the medium. Over the course of three lengthy accounts, J.L. retells of the technical challenges of making photographs during the conflict, including the intrusion of a “stupid Piedmontese soldier” who ruined two of his five exposures (J.L. 1859a: 183). None of his exposures appear to have survived to the present, but J.L. did provide a helpful description:
I will send you proofs of these [surviving exposures] as soon as I have an opportunity of printing some. They will not be quite like what I hoped to send you. You will see many dead bodies scattered about among the trees, and many lying side by side ready to be thrown into the hole in which they will be interred as soon as it has been dug, but no bodies of men in actual conflict; I felt it would be absolutely impossible to get near enough to pitch my camera, though I was myself able to see the fight distinctly from beginning to end. (J.L. 1859b)

Couppier’s stereoscopes depict almost the same scene J.L. described, corroborating each other’s pictures. J.L. continued to employ a photographic language to describe more of what he saw and what he could not photograph. Aside from the mechanical matters, J.L. also revealed—in ways reminiscent of Dunant’s account in *A Memory of Solferino*—the way in which witnessing the battle affected his own views on warfare. Watching the battle from within a tree in the accompaniment of the priest who informed him of the commencement of fighting, J.L.’s account includes his transition from someone who admired war to now being stunned by it:

> There is something wonderfully impressive in the sound of the marching of a body of armed men… I afterwards saw bodies of men moving towards each other to engage in actual combat without any similar feeling… to describe what took place over the whole scene of the fighting is out of my power. (J.L. 1859b: 208)

Perhaps J.L. is bowdlerizing, or perhaps he was really taken aback. He describes a transition in thought from battles as conceivably heroic and exciting to warfare being a human tragedy. A little later he goes on to graphically describe his experience in the moments immediately following the end of the fighting:

> Their [the wounded’s] groans could have directed us to where they were lying, even if we I not been able to see them. You can form no concept of the sickening sensation I felt when I found myself in the midst of pools of blood, which splashed about at every step spreading a sickening smell in the atmosphere. The bodies of the slain were lying pell-mell among the wounded, very few of whom were able to withdraw themselves from the horrible contact. We moved each in succession, and laid them gently on their backs—the dead, dying, and wounded side by side. (J.L. 1859b: 208)

Demonstrating a sort of kinship with Dunant’s later writing, J.L. is writing for the benefit of “you at home [who] have not a thorough conception of the horrors of warfare, or of the injustice and cruelty it involves” (J.L. 1859a: 183). Consistent with Dunant and to a great
extent the combat photography of the era, J.L.’s accounts focus on the impact of warfare on the common soldier. Laying “pell-mell,” J.L. description is an image quite in contrast to conventional war art that on the occasion of showing wounded combatants would more likely focus on officers and generals surrounded by all their supporters. Nineteenth century combat photography brought to the fore the ways in which the fighting brutalized the bodies of average troops.

Correspondences such as J.L.’s about the battles that were part of the Franco-Austrian war were not restricted to niche technical journals or to the Europe. With the telegraph and steam transport, news of the battle travelled across to North America as well. Coincidentally, the first battle that the freshly established New York Times newspaper covered was the same that inspired Henry Dunant. The Crimean War was geographically too far away and did not have as much relevance to Americans as did the wars of Italian liberation. So in the spring of 1859, accompanied by two colleagues, the newspaper’s editor and co-founder, Henry Jarvis Raymond, went to Italy out of “that inexplicable perversity of human nature which pushes on towards scenes of carnage” (in Marwil 2005: 47). Like Dunant in A Memory of Solferino, Raymond wrote in a manner meant “to dissolve authorial distance and thereby enable readers to see in their minds what was not before their eyes” (Marwil 2005: 48). But unlike Dunant who arrived later, Raymond was there midday on 24 June, during the height of battle. While J.L. had a clear vantage point form his perch in a tree, Raymond was unable to see much through the smoke and from his position on a distant hillside. Nevertheless, from the periphery, he saw scenes of carnage echoing those Dunant and J.L. would later write about.

Raymond did his best to describe them for his readers who would have been unfamiliar with such mass devastation. He wrote of the musket and sabre wounds, the jaws cut away

47 The Journal de Geneve (1826-1991) did not reproduce prints to illustrate its newspaper. It did however reproduce photographic language. It was common practice to transcribe, with the facility of the telegraph, accounts from other foreign newspapers. Dunant would have been reading the graphic accounts reproduced in this journal, and would have been getting additional information about distant events from people within his transnational social network.

48 The New York Times was founded in 1851.
and the gaping holes in men’s bodies, and tried to generate in his readers a sense of the scale of the assault by inviting his readers to imagine carts full of bloody soldiers in front of New York City Hall (Marwil 2005: 52). The graphic language that Raymond provided might not have been enough for readers with no reference pictures in their personal or collective imaginations to draw from in order to visualize the grotesque hoards emerging from this battle. 49 In a few short years, however, there would be a massive collection of war photographs made during the American Civil War that would be have lasting impact.

The photographs that Mathew Brady and his company made during the American Civil War were not solely of the type of photographs that Fenton was making and circulating. 50 Instead they included more harrowing images like those from Solferino. Brady and colleagues’ pictures differed from those of the other two battles in a critical way. Brady and his team had secured access to the battlefields and made photographs before the bodies of the dead soldiers were removed [Fig. 10]. The common practice of staging living combatants in their camps or rearranging items in a “still life” scene was extended to the repositioning of corpses for added effect. Today’s preoccupation with fidelity and integrity of an image was not a concern in 1863. Truthfulness was more important than accuracy, and the truth in these photographs was that the men and boys depicted in them were dead as a result of the war.

49 Dunant’s European readers would also have been referencing the many illustrated newspapers and a visual arts tradition that were making use of photography, for instance the Sevastopol mural, or even first hand memory of recent battles in Europe as they formed images in their minds of what they read (Hannavy 2004).

50 Mathew Brady was a commercial photographer in New York at the time that the Civil War began. He hired upward of twenty photographers, or camera operators, to make visual records of various aspects of the war’s battles. Among the most well know photographers he hired were Alexander Gardner and Timothy H. O’Sullivan.
The ways in which the photographers operated at Crimea, around Solferino and in the American Civil War amount to a pattern. Included in each collection were pictures of soldiers and officers, always carefully posed. Not all were for propaganda, as is how Fenton’s pictures have predominantly been viewed; they were also mementos commissioned by individual soldiers. Each collection of photographs from these three battles also included images of the sites where the battles took place. Although none of the photographers included images of the fighting itself, for obvious technical reasons, all had created what amount to before and after pictures. All had created narratives in which

---

51 The Photographic News reported, “we know that most of the subaltern officers figure largely in the collections of portraits which have been made. It is the fashion to have one’s portrait taken in camp” (Anonymous 1859: 172).
the vital, the strong, the living combatants were then cut down, killed or extinguished from the scenes of battle. Comparing all three sets, Fenton’s barren battlefield landscapes may have presented a more allegorical narrative. Couppier’s Solferno pictures were certainly more harrowing but anonymous. And those from the Civil War made the story all the more graphic with human figures that were recognizable and identifiable, as this quote from an 1863 exhibition review that appeared in the *New York Times* reveals:

> we could scarce choose to be in the gallery when one of the women bending over them should recognize a husband, a son or a brother in the still, lifeless lines of bodies that lie ready for the gapin gossiping trenches (in Moeller 2005).

With each conflict, the intimacy between the spectator and the dead increased, yet the soldiers continued to remain nameless masses. The indiscriminate suffering of soldiers and the gruesomeness of war were made palpable with the aid of the camera. Photography’s democratic treatment of soldiers and generals also invited thinking of a more uniform and egalitarian medical treatment across all ranks.

A result of being at the forefront of “convey[ing] the human face of war”, nineteenth century combat photography made it possible that soldiers “increasingly [were] regarded as fellow citizens—sons, brothers, fathers” (Marwil 2000: 35). Riding a rising wave that seemed to accompany the creation and circulation—through exhibitions, textual descriptions, or prints—of combat photographs, passionate and empathetic responses made way for an organized political response. People were feeling differently towards warfare. Such emotions benefitted from the concrete actions Dunant appealed for; he was able to give that emotion an action. It is within a landscape in which soldiers were included in the broadening terms of humans worthy of attention that Dunant’s ideas declared in *A Memory of Solferino* could take hold.

In 1863, Dunant and the other four members of the newly minted “Permanent International Committee for Relief to Wounded Soldiers in Time of War” successfully brought together representatives from sixteen different nations in what was the first major
step towards the creation of what would eventually become the ICRC.\textsuperscript{52} This was a year after Dunant published his book, a year after the American Civil War ended, and the same year that Francisco Goya’s *Disasters of War* series was published. The autumn meeting set out to outline expectations, feasibility and plans with an aim to organize neutral and impartial care to all combatants regardless of rank. The following year would see the creation of the First Geneva Convention, the *Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded in Armies in the Field*, with its specific focus on the care for the common soldiers. As a “permanent” and “international” organization that would prepare and train in times of peace, it would not be long before it would branch out into peacetime arms of the Red Cross, and then also provide care to various people impacted by conflict including prisoners, civilians and internees. By the time Dunant received his Nobel Prize in 1901, national Red Cross societies were appearing all over the world. Today the Red Cross, described as a “Movement, is represented by the ICRC and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies that between the two provide humanitarian assistance and its legal protection through over 180 national societies in over 80 countries” (IFRC n.d.).

Any number of reasons prevented or deterred Dunant from employing photography in his book, which incidentally contributed to setting a tone within the organization until the First World War (Piana 2015). But photography made the suffering Dunant had witnessed and been deeply affected by more real in the eyes of those who would eventually be his supporters. While Dunant’s original proposal in response to what he had seen was ultimately a militaristic one rather than pacifist, the alleviation of previously overlooked suffering was helped by the presence of the camera.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I mobilized Raymond Williams’ concept of structures of feeling as a way of accessing the “lived sense” of the culture at the time Dunant wrote his text. Revisiting

\footnote{\textsuperscript{52} The other four members included General Dufour as president, Gustave Moynier as vice-president, Louis Appia and Theodore Monoir as representatives of the medical corps. Dunant’s official title was secretary.}
Dunant’s text through a visual theory lens and attending to the cultural history of his time, provides a fresh look at the ways in which seeing warfare differently—in previously unmatched detail, and in an inadvertent before-and-after narrative—contributed to people thinking differently about combat. Photography at the time was quickly being adapted into political, social and cultural norms from propaganda, to critique, to collective and private mourning by the time of the American Civil War. The camera accelerated, if not instigated in the first instance, democratic sentiment in the case of warfare and what society was willing to accept in terms of risking the lives of people increasingly seen as citizens, and as vulnerable, grievable individuals.

In these retellings, the spectator is called to take part in shaping and negotiating the terms of who would be worthy of care and how. It is a role that would be complex and at times challenging. Spectators were guided, persuaded and instructed on how to respond emotionally and practically with the photographs, their descriptions, and the accompanying stories. There is, however, no guarantee of the outcome, and the emotions generated do not necessarily translate into action. Dunant’s “lamentable images” may have sparked the international Red Cross movement; the photography surrounding his appeal was adding to the fuel. But Dunant did not leave it to his readers to formulate their own response. Along with modeling proper sentiment towards suffering soldiers, Dunant outlined in no uncertain terms what the response to those sentiments ought to be. By focusing on suffering without giving name to its sources, he set a tone and example for humanitarian communication that continue to influence humanitarian action—particularly within the ICRC—to this day.53

53 Only later in his life did Dunant become a pacifist, calling for the end to all warfare which he identified as the root of much suffering, not just experienced by soldiers. His initial appeal did not include public condemnation of belligerents; this is a practice that has continued with the ICRC to this day (though it is arguably for strategic reasons rather than allegiance to any tradition begun by Dunant) and remains a point of critique against the ICRC.
Chapter 3

Visual Displacement of Refugees: Lewis Hine’s First World War Photographs for the American Red Cross

…the great social peril is darkness and ignorance…the dictum, then, of the social worker is ‘Let there be light;’ and in this campaign for light we have for our advance agent the light writer—the photo-graph.

Lewis Hine 1909

From June 1918 to April 1919, the American photographer Lewis Hine made photographs of refugees and other Europeans affected by the First World War while working overseas for the American Red Cross (ARC). In this chapter, I explore Hine’s refugee photographs and the ARC’s use of them to consider framing and visibility as two crucial aspects in the establishment of refugees as primary humanitarian subjects. Hine’s photography and the ARC’s use of them in their popular publication, The Red Cross Magazine, is an early example of a pattern of representation that accompanies refugees to this day. The rise and fall of public sympathy for refugees coincides with the ways in which they are visually represented, and also with their coming in and out of view in public arenas. In the case of Hine’s pictures, European refugees were centrally featured in ARC publications when building its reputation as a preeminent relief agency, only to be visually displaced by the image of the suffering child at the war’s end. In this process of being visually constituted and then replaced, the unique characteristics of refugees diminished, and these subjects became less distinguishable from immigrants writ large. This resulted in refugees being subjected to the same quota restrictions and visa controls imposed by foreign governments, in this case by the United States, who took advantage of this confusion for their own protectionist goals. Refugees emerged as a new humanitarian subject in direct result of the changing global order that came with the First World War. Lewis Hine’s photography, and the ARC’s use of them, both shaped and restricted public imagination with regard to refugees, and international spectators’ responses to them.
To begin, I present the ARC’s 1918 wartime use of Hine’s photographs in *The Red Cross Magazine* to explore the way refugees were framed as ideal humanitarian subjects. Judith Butler uses the concept of framing to describe the way in which “a political background is being explicitly formulated and renewed through and by the frame” (2009: 71). Through compositional cropping, captioning, and related discourse, “the frame functions not only as a boundary to the image, but as structuring the image itself” (Butler 2009: 71). Butler insists “it is crucial to attend to this frame, since it decides, in a forceful way, what we can hear, whether a view will be taken as explanation or as exoneration, whether we can hear the difference, and abide by it” (2004: 5, original emphasis). Hine’s photographs helped the ARC frame itself as an exemplary provider of aid. The ARC would subsequently re-frame the refugee subject when global and domestic political and public sentiments changed after the war’s end.

I also explore a set of photographs Hine made between November 1918 and April 1919 after the armistice was signed. Hine capitalized on his unique approach that combined empirical methods with an approach he called “interpretive photography” in which he deliberately sought to forge affective connections between spectators and subjects. In this way he further humanized refugees and helped define these subjects from other civilians affected by the war. But even in Hine’s hands the medium would remain limited in its ability to describe refugees and “refugeedom,” the condition of being a refugee (Gatrell 2005: 197). As a photographer concerned with social uplift and highlighting the human spirit, Hine’s pictures contributed to a sentimental education meant to include refugees among those worthy of care. This attempt was ultimately muted by the limits of Hine’s own humanitarian imagination and by the photographs being virtually unused.

The final section explores how the refugee subject was eventually displaced in *The Red Cross Magazine*. Over the course of 1919-1920, the emerging figure of the child—a figure that would become a universal icon for humanitarianism in subsequent decades—became predominant. This displacement diminished opportunities to imagine alternative frames for the refugee, or to recognize distinguishing characteristics of refugeedom. At a time when refugees were making their way across the Atlantic to North America, this visual displacement had a material impact. Refocusing on children’s needs and displacing
the unique aspects of refugees, American anxieties about the unassimilated alien eventually triumphed. Refugees became equivalent to immigrants, which contributed to the 1922 closing of America’s borders to people still seeking a place to settle after having fled conflict and persecution during the war.

Despite Hine’s esteemed status, the photographs he made while working overseas for the American Red Cross at the tail end of the First World War remain virtually unknown. These photographs take on a new significance in the current era of unparalleled global migration. Indeed, this case provides an important lens for gaining perspective on the present. Hine’s pictures enable us to rethink the opportunities and limits of our contemporary frames. This history explores the potential consequences of visually representing—to eventually visually replacing—a group of people made vulnerable by territorial displacement.

**Coming into the frame: 1918**

In the year leading up to Lewis Hine being hired, the ARC underwent a full-scale expansion and retooling of its public relations endeavours. Among the most visible changes was the transformation of its member newsletter, *The Red Cross Bulletin*, into a publication with much wider public appeal. In 1917, the newsletter was re-launched as *The Red Cross Magazine*. It had grown in page size, included full colour illustrations throughout, and listed amongst its main rivals the *Saturday Evening Post* and *Good Housekeeping* (Irwin 2013: 84). Other magazines and journals, such as *Charity and the Commons*, later to be renamed *The Survey*, concentrated primarily on social welfare and global affairs. 54 None of these other magazines had as broad a reach into different segments of the American population as the ARC’s publication. The rise of the ARC as the nation’s official humanitarian agency was the result of a rare display of bipartisanship by political and social leaders, which translated into a broad and diverse American audience for its magazine. The *Magazine* became the most influential humanitarian

---

54 Photographer and theorist Allan Sekula (1982) aptly considered these publications as “the philanthropic agents of capital” that may have had “the look of a political threat to capital”—similar to many social reform and humanitarian organizations—without actually being a threat to it (17).
During the early years of the First World War, there was strong public opposition to the US joining the conflict. The influential Peace Movement and the government at the time did not consider it Americans’ place to meddle in the affairs of other countries: “many Americans regarded the conflict as evidence of the failures of Old World politics and diplomacy” (Irwin 2013: 55). Non-involvement in the conflict did not mean that America was disavowing participation in the war altogether. Many Americans supported large-scale civilian relief through organizations such as Herbert Hoover’s Commission for Relief in Belgium, the American Friends Service Committee, and the American Committee for Near East Relief (Irwin 2013: 56). However, by 1917, with the war going on years longer than expected, ideas of internationalism gained momentum as it had become apparent—even to some in the Peace Movement—that in order for domestic social issues to be properly addressed, peace in Europe was necessary (Kaplan 1988). President Woodrow Wilson may have been re-elected on a platform of non-intervention, but his tune changed during the course of 1916 as ideas of “cultivating international community and constructing a global liberal civilization” took hold (Irwin 2013: 24).

When the Americans declared war against Germany in April 1917, the ARC fell under the mandate of the American Army (Hutchison 1997). By this time, support for their nation’s civilian relief efforts had become a patriotic duty (Irwin 2013: 79). The Red Cross Magazine had become one of the most effective tools for selling the ARC and its message of international humanitarian patriotism. As a humanitarian organization, it was the ARC’s role to raise awareness of suffering that needed alleviating and to build sympathy for victims. The Magazine hired Lewis Hine and other social progressive artists and authors for their skills at building affect and raising consciences (Irwin 2013:

---

55 All ARC’s staff would be given a military rank. According to his employment record, Lewis Hine, hired by the ARC at the age of 44, was given the rank of Captain, although in one photograph of him in uniform, the caption has him listed as a Lieutenant.
Hine was one of thirty-seven photographers the ARC hired to record their overseas activities. At the time, Hine had the reputation as America’s foremost social photographer for highlighting some of the worst social conditions of his time. In the decade before the War, Hine had worked with the National Child Labor Committee and for the popular sociological magazine *The Survey* where his photography was used in the campaign against child labour and in support of other social reform causes such as immigration, labour, and housing. Hine had become known for his skill in creating “photographs of revelation” that drew attention to politically contentious issues such as labour reforms and xenophobia (Gutman 1967: 14). He built his career using his camera to, as Walter Rosenblum later put it, “lay bare the poignancy of modern life” (1977: 11).

Before becoming a photographer, Hine had studied education and sociology at a time when scientific methods and evidence were reshaping the epistemology of social welfare and charity work. Influenced by mentors and peers who advanced an approach to benevolence work that identified structural determinants (rather than moral ones) of wellbeing, Hine developed unique photographic skills “as a means of focusing activity in the world, a ‘scientific’ means of heightening perception, sharing experiences, clarifying vision” (Trachtenberg 1977: 121). Put simply, Hine understood photography as capable of gathering and conveying information in ways that other conventional scientific methods might not. In his own words, Hine said of his approach: “if I could tell the story in words, I wouldn’t need to lug a camera” (cited in Gutman 1967: 19). Hine’s skills would prove invaluable for shining light on civilians’ wartime need; they were equally instrumental in making the ARC shine as American’s preeminent relief agency.

---

56 Other notables included: Ida Tarbell and William Allen White (Irwin 2013: 84).
57 By 1913-1914, Hine was “considered the most extensive and successful photographer of social welfare work in the country” (Rosenblum 1977: 20).
58 And lug he did; Hine used large format 4x5 and 5x7 Graflex cameras mainly. These were box-type camera that used glass plate negatives, and required the use of a heavy wooden tripod. The conditions in which Hine found himself working in Europe resulted in him dispensing with the tripod (Kaplan 1988: 106–7).
When Hine first arrived in Paris in June 1918, his photographic talents were mobilized in various humanitarian arenas, not all of them civilian-specific, but all focused on the human side of the war. Until his arrival, photographs appearing in the magazine predominantly centered on military engagements and on ARC administrators or workers. Hine’s photographs brought readers closer to those combatants and noncombatants who fortuitously found themselves under the ARC’s attentive care. During his first six months in Europe, he was photographing activities of the Bureau des Refugiées and Relief, the Bureau des Mutilés, and the Children’s Bureau in and around Paris (Kaplan 1988) [Fig. 11]. His photographs of refugees included pictures of them as they arrived at the Gare du Nord train station in Paris, and in the homes they made of condemned tenements turned into temporary accommodations.

Figure 11: Lieut. Col. Homer Folks and his staff who are about to start on a mission which will include visits to Italy, Servia [sic], Greece, Palestine, Switzerland, Belgium, England, possibly Russia, Roumania [sic] and other Balkan states. The purpose of the expedition is to prepare a survey of actual needs existing in the
various countries where the American Red Cross is engaged, or may be engaged in
the near future. Left to right: Lieut. Hine, photographer, Capt. Pompelly, Secretary
Picture taken in front of the American Red Cross Headquarters, Paris. Library of
Congress: LC-A6199- 8432

As per the practice of the day, the majority of Hine’s photographs go uncredited in ARC
publications. Identification and confirmation of Hine’s ARC photographs has since been
determined by comparison of his stylistic characteristics, his known travel routes while in
Europe, by cross reference with reproductions in at least one other contemporaneous
publication in which Hine is given credit, and with the provenance provided by various
archives. Through archival research for this dissertation, I have successfully identified
some 18-20 photographs of Hine’s in the ARC Magazine from 1918 to 1920, and 10-12
additional photographs of Hine’s in the ARC Bulletin. The figures are not exact, as there
are some images that appear to be Hine’s, but remain (and likely will remain)
unconfirmed as they only appear in the Magazine and not in any of Hine’s or the ARC’s
archival photograph collections.

From today’s perspective, some of Hine’s obviously staged promotional photographs
merit art historian Daile Kaplan’s description of them as “superficial,” “nondescript” and
having “a didactic, illustrative quality” (1988: 61). The vast majority of them portray an
innocent victim rescued by a white savior as visual iteration of the familiar humanitarian
narrative. There was also a strong gendering to the ARC’s iconography: women—and
more specifically nurses—served as allegorical figures that helped to frame the ARC as

59 The Library of Congress holds the bulk of Hine’s European photographs, which are within the American
Red Cross collection. The ARC deposited their collecting with the LOC in 1944. There Eastman Museum,
in Rochester, and the Methodist Church each also have smaller deposits of original Hine prints and
negatives from his time in Europe.

60 In 1988, when re-discovering Hine’s photographs in the Library of Congress and other collections,
Kaplan resorted to comparing written notations accompanying the prints or negatives Hine made, enabling
hand writing comparisons to other known samples. She also traced the unbroken lineage of photographs or
collections of pictures associated with a particular publisher or project. Kaplan also isolated several of
Hine’s photographs solely on his characteristic style, which I have also done in identifying certain
photographs that only appear in the Magazine and not in Hine archival collection.
an agency of caring nurturers, or embodiments of “The Greatest Mother in the World” (Irwin 2013: 86). Among the first pictures the ARC reproduced of Hine’s were those of the American Red Cross Child Welfare Exhibition at St. Etienne, American soldiers resting and recuperating at ARC hospitals, and warehouses professionally administered and fully stocked [Fig. 12]. Hine’s photographs included Red Cross workers undertaking health checkups and preforming staged public health demonstrations. The neat uniforms and smiles in these pictures offer a simple message: the ARC had everything under control in wartime France.

Figure 12: Dr. Bonness and her assistant explaining child hygiene to mothers at the American Red Cross Child Welfare Exhibition at St. Etienne “March of the Red Cross”, The Red Cross Magazine, November 1918, p. 83. Library of Congress: LC-DIG-anrc-16892.

In the summer of 1918, readers leafing through the July edition of *The Red Cross Magazine* would encounter an eight-page photo-essay, “Fly—the Germans are Coming!” [Figs. 13-20] In this article, Europe’s refugees were being positioned to stake a claim on American sentiments, however briefly. The pictures focused on refugees, a category of war-affected people that had swelled to unprecedented numbers. Although not the first time the ARC included photographs that referred to refugees, this was the first time such a large spread of photographs appeared. Pictured were rows of animal-drawn or human-pushed carts laden with personal belongings that rolled along country roads—a mass movement of people fleeing deeper into France in advance of the on-coming Germans [Fig. 13]. Titles such as, “THE ROAD OF SORROWS”, and “THE LONG PROCESSION,” frame the photographs as representations of an exceptional and arduous journey (ARC 1918: 37-44). How eerie it is today to encounter the a picture with the title “THE TWENTIETH CENTURY CARAVAN”, which appear as a sort of prophecy for the past one hundred years in which repeated refugee crises have patterned themselves off of that which emerged on a massive scale with the First World War.

Following these were pictures of a stream of German captives being led through a French town, and a row of British artillery being taken to the front lines. The final five photographs are more intimate pictures of refugees with their livestock, receiving food, shelter and additional support from Red Cross workers at the Gare du Nord in Paris where the ARC had set up a Cantine pour Refugiées [Figs. 18-20]. Titles and captions for these final pictures included “A WOUNDED REFUGEE BOY” and “Red Cross officials taking full particulars of the refugees,” which helped bind the collection of photographs into a humanitarian narrative where innocent victims fled the “German Drive” to find

---

62 The earliest photograph I was able to identify within the Magazine that referred to refugees appeared in June 1915. The photograph of Belgian women working in a Dutch garment factory deliberately “promoted” refugees as industrious. The Netherlands took in upwards of 400,000 Belgian refugees and settled them "Belgian villages", so-named to avoid the term “concentration camp” which the British had been so infamously associated in the Boer War (1899-1902) (Gatrell 2014). Despite the nice name, the Dutch made Belgian refugees manufacture household items and toys while residing in the camp/villages. The ARC provided material support to these refugee settlements, and were already at the beginning of the war presenting refugees as industrious and orderly, rather than chaotic or threatening.
much appreciated respite and relief at the hands of caring and capable American Red Cross workers [Fig. 20].

The final five photographs are stylistically consistent with Hine’s corpus. I have only been able to locate two of the five photographs in the ARC’s collection of photographs held by the Library of Congress (those from Figure 12). Neither identify Hine as the photographer, but the style of picture and captioning strongly suggest these were made by Hine (LC-A6196-4246 [P&P] and LC-A6196-4799 [P&P]).
Fly—the Germans are Coming!
The appalling cry that ran through Picardy in the first days of the German Drive

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY CARAVAN
Farmers and breeders of live-stock save their stock and their household goods at the same time

THE ROAD OF SORROWS
French peasants who last year returned to their homes are driven to the road again by the on-coming Germans

Figure 13: The Red Cross Magazine, July 1918, Vol. 13 No. 7, 37. Public domain.
Figure 14: The Red Cross Magazine, July 1918, Vol. 13 No. 7, 38. Public domain.
Figure 15: *The Red Cross Magazine*, July 1918, Vol. 13 No. 7, 39. Public domain.
Figure 16: The Red Cross Magazine, July 1918, Vol. 13 No. 7, 40. Public domain.
Figure 17: The Red Cross Magazine, July 1918, Vol. 13 No. 7, 41. Public domain.
Figure 18: The Arrival in Paris, *The Red Cross Magazine*, July 1918, Vol. 13 No. 7, 42. Public domain.
Figure 19: *The Red Cross Magazine*, June 1918, Vol. 13 No. 6, 43. Public domain.
At the time, no internationally recognized legal definition existed for this group of people “that appeared in the public arena virtually overnight” (Gatrell 2005: 197). The term “refugee” had been resurrected during the Great War’s early years, having not been applied to mass population movements since the Huguenot’s expulsion from France in
1685 (Germano: 2015). Presumably, the term was introduced because of its sympathetic associations with Christian charity, a dominant but not exclusive religious orientation in Europe. By the time the term was applied in the First World War, it had expanded from its original meaning of Protestant persecution to encompassing all people fleeing persecution and seeking safety. Historian Peter Gatrell (2005) notes that “refugeedom,” a term he translated from a popular Russian word, has been used to refer to the conditions and experience of being a refugee since 1915.

With a lack of centralized monitoring or consistent criteria to define refugees, estimates remain difficult to determine with formal accuracy, but as many as ten million people were displaced during the Great War (Gatrell 2014). Along the Western front, Belgians moved by the hundreds of thousands across into the Netherlands, France and over to England. By 1918, as the Germans advanced into France, the numbers of refugees in that country rose to a height of 1.85 million (Gatrell 2014). Meanwhile on the Eastern front, at one point, one-third of the Serbian population was on the move along with hundreds of thousands of Italian and Greek refugees in the Mediterranean and Balkans. Farther north, equally great numbers of Jewish, Armenian and Turkish refugees travelled along the Eastern-European border with Russia (Gatrell 2014). Many of Europe’s refugees had become stateless through having been expelled by conquering armies, and as documentation linking people to countries were not common (Ngai 2004). By the time the ARC arrived in France (in 1916) during the period of American neutrality (1914-1917), humanitarian aid agencies applied the term to practically all people displaced within and beyond national frontiers.

The rise of nationalism was a core outcome of the conflicts of the First World War and “nation states became a powerful instrument for the manufacture of new refugees” (Gatrell 2013: 19). This was a war that saw the end of several great empires, namely the German, Russian and Ottoman empires. What began as sentiments of belonging based on cultural affinities emerged as ideological foundations for a new form of governance by the people rather than by autocratic rule. Empires and monarchies traditionally possessed multiple nations under their rule, nationalism, by contrast, brought with it essentialist divisions. The push for nationalism unwittingly contributed to the creation of refugees as
people identified by different nationalities were now being deemed a potential threat to national purity or presumed to have divided loyalties. As the war unfolded conquering armies pushed civilians out, sometimes with scorch and burn techniques such as was used by Russians in what is today Poland. Alternatively, civilians fearful of the new political order that would take its place followed retreating armies only to find themselves without support in these new lands.

It was this Great War that created stateless persons, making way for the subsequently emergent category of illegal aliens, thus making stark the emerging reality that rights no longer inhered in the person, as has been the central tenet of European philosophy since the time of the French Revolution. Rights were increasingly tied to citizenship (Ngai 2004; see also Hunt 2007). For many in today’s world it is difficult to imagine anything other than a nationalist social order, but it is in this era that the decisions and actions to move in this direction took hold and spread. Nationalism is a social and political construct that may have emerged in response to autocratic rule, in the name of “the people,” but it also created unintentional masses of displaced, stateless and, later, illegal people who continue to be created and justified through a now familiar rhetoric and provocative nationalist discourse that present displaced people as a security or existential threat, revealing that “sovereignty is not merely a claim to national rights but a theory of power” (Ngai 2004: 12).

During the First World War, contemporary representations of this new category of people included sympathetic discourse that focused on the tragedies experienced by refugees, the catastrophes they left behind and the efforts they undertook to leave. Refugees were commonly placed in Biblical contexts with their movements being equated with exodus (Gatrell 2014). But refugees, especially young males, were also viewed in a negative light. Particularly early on in the war, they were presented as cowardly opportunists evading their responsibilities. As the war continued, metaphors such as deluge, streams, waves and floods became increasingly predominant. This language may have signaled the scale of the tragedy, it also alluded to refugees being a chaotic hoard, as disorderly and untrustworthy (Gatrell 2014). After years of conflict that created ever more refugees, the ARC’s sympathetic 1918 presentation of refugees presented a counter-narrative to debate
and anxiety about refugees that had been circulating and growing in various arenas outside the pages of the *Magazine*. Unlike people in France, northern Europe, England or in Russia, where the bulk of the European refugees fled to, Americans were insulated—separated by a vast ocean—from the social and economic effects of refugees. The ARC’s open support for refugees enhanced America’s image as a humanitarian nation.

The ARC’s July 1918 refugee-focused photo-essay was itself a large version humanitarian narrative expressed through fifteen photographs, dispersed across eight pages. The pictures’ distribution divided the narrative into two main parts: flight from persecution [Figs. 13-17], and arrival into the ARC’s nurturing arms [Figs 18-20]. The first set of photographs set up the refugees as innocent victims, frail and vulnerable as represented by mainly elderly travellers [Figs. 13-15]. The perpetrators of this victimization are themselves depicted in the series rather than merely alluded to by the people’s movement. The menacing Germans are shown here in captivity, which supported an image of Allied successes [Fig. 17]. The final five photographs take on a different look and feel [Figs. 18-20]. They are more characteristic of Hine’s pre-war Ellis Island and tenement project images that were meant to build sympathies between spectators and the pictured subjects, and to illuminate conditions associated with being displaced.64

In a way, these earlier projects that focused on immigrant settlement might have primed the American audience to think sympathetically about refugees, making it possible to conceive of them as another set of “proto-Americans.” Hine happened to begin his career during a period of heightened and generally unrestricted immigration to the United States. Between 1880 and the start of the First World War over twenty-five million

---

64 Hine photographed at Ellis Island from 1906-1909 and again in 1926; for the National Child Labor Committee his first project was *New York Tenement Homework* (1908); additional photography projects included photography for Charles Weller’s book *Neglected Neighbors: stories of life in the alleys tenements and shanties of the national capital* (1909) and a special feature entitled *The Pittsburg Survey* (1909) about the working conditions, particularly the workday length, of the largely immigrant labor force in the steel mills and mines for the socially progressive magazine *Charity and the Commons* (later renamed *The Survey*), which led Hine to been hired on as staff photographer.
immigrants arrived in America. His first project was intended to present a counter discourse to the rampant xenophobia that existed at the turn of the twentieth century. The Ellis Island project was done while he worked as a teacher in New York City with the primary “desire that [students would] have the same regard for contemporary immigrants as they have for the Pilgrims who landed at Plymouth Rock” (Rosenblum 1977: 17). Primed though his audience may have been, this earlier experience also reveals a pattern of rising and falling sympathies for newcomers. Regardless, Hine’s photographs in Europe would—as with his earlier ones in New York—focused on physical features and postures in an effort to foster identification and bonds as opposed to differences.

Consistent with Hine’s more didactic promotional pictures reproduced in the ARC Magazine and his earlier work at Ellis Island, the photographs in the refugee photo-essay include mainly women and children being ministered and cared for by ARC workers in their paramilitary uniforms [Figs. 19, 20]. These pictures suggest that—overlooking the difference in ages or modes of transportation from the first set of images—the women and children at the Gare du Nord train station are the ones, or could be substituted for, the people from the carts and wagons on the preceding pages. At the very least they are from the same category of innocent victims. Over the course of the eight pages, the photographs systematically move in closer to the refugee subject as the pictures change from wide-angle views of “long processions” of animals, carts and people, to medium-distance images of elderly men and women riding atop hay wagons, to finally culminating in close-up pictures of individuals receiving ARC care. The photo-essay enabled the magazine’s readers to virtually travel with the refugees on their journey from the “brutal and merciless” Germans toward the benevolent ARC. One picture in particular drives the narrative arc of the photo-essay. “THE ARRIVAL IN PARIS” appears at the peak moment in the story, marking the transitional shift in the narrative from the period of flight to eventual safety [Fig. 18]. There is no evidence as to what the story’s picture editors or peers thought of the image, but clearly there was as sense of its having a unique force, thus its having been the only one reproduced as a full-page.

65 In 1907 alone, a year when Hine was making photographs at Ellis Island, over one million immigrants passed through the processing center.
Central in the frame is a woman looking directly at the camera. She is standing with a boy, possibly her son, who is holding the chain attached to a goat’s neck. The three are pictured head-to-toe and are placed at the centre of the frame. Everything around them is obscured by the blur of a shallow depth of field. Stylistically, it contains the hallmarks of Hine’s photography in which he personalizes his subjects by bringing them up close. The tight crop, the direct gaze of the woman, and the isolation of the subjects from the fullness of the events around them, the spectator is invited to a more intimate encounters with a distant other. This picture forms a narrative bridge between the images that precede it—of the journey—to the images that follow it of the caring attention at the hands of skilled ARC workers. But the picture also offers more than mere syntactical assembly. The full-page portrait in the ARC Magazine deviated slightly from Hine’s style. It contains more pathos than his pre-war photographs. In his images of newcomers to America and of child labourers that he photographed in the decade before the war, his subjects represented hope amidst the misery of the dehumanization of the immigration process or industrial exploitation. He often achieved this through the subtle gesture of the gentlest smile. This single image from France, on the other hand, is full of restrained wariness (on part of the mother who is eyeing Hine) and weariness (on the part of the son who looks downward with his mouth open as if in a sigh).

Although the photograph appears at the peak moment of transition in the narrative, it suggests a moment of disorientation and confusion that comes between times of chaos and calm. This is a fleeting instant that comes when rest finally is allowed, after the anxiety and activity of moving, after the clear certainty of needing to flee has ended, and when having found a peaceful spot—but not knowing one’s place in that new, unfamiliar location—allows for a softening of one’s steeled nerves. The image also seems to open questions about the whereabouts of the husband and/or father. But here the photograph’s interpretive frame reaches its limits. It cannot explore the state of being stateless compared to other ways in which people were affected by the conflict, nor does it offer guidance or information on the where-nexts and hows of settlement. The essay as a whole articulates the value of the ARC to help refugees navigate their new milieu. Overall, the structure of the photo-essay’s layout framed the refugee subject as an ideal recipient of American aid and provided visual support for the implicit ideological message: These
people are the reason the United States joined the war; they need America’s care and the ARC is the chief agency for its provision.

That the ARC would feature refugees in its publications was not a surprise. Care for refugees was part of the ARC’s larger wartime mandate of noncombatant assistance. It was in the ARC’s interest, even their responsibility, to make and circulate photographs of its relief activities. American entry into the War was predicated largely on humanitarian action (Irwin 2013). For an organization that began its international assistance efforts only ten years earlier, photo-essays such as this were as important to the agency as to the recipients of their aid. To frame the refugees as victims in need of assistance contributed to building the ARC’s profile as America’s foremost relief agency. Through this straightforward syntactical arrangement, the ARC also specified its scope of practice by singling out the refugee as a distinct group within the broader category of noncombatants under their care.

With this refugee photo-essay, the ARC set itself apart, even above, the ICRC during the war through this demonstration of comprehensive civilian relief, which, here, singled out the special category of the refugee. Once the United States had declared war, the ARC could no longer claim neutrality. Neutrality was a basic tenet promoted by the ICRC from whom the ARC had originally modeled itself. Although the ARC was not the only American group providing assistance to non-combatants, the ICRC remained steadfast in its adherence to the Geneva Convention of 1864 in which care would be provided to wounded combatants (it did extend this to sailors and prisoners of war, and as the war dragged on to civilians in detention) (Irwin 2013: 107). Articles such as this photo-essay grew the ARC’s status and character while it simultaneously drew attention to the war’s unintentionally created refugee subject.

According to Judith Butler, “there are ways of framing that will bring the human into view in its frailty and precariousness, that will allow us to stand for the value and dignity

66 Clara Barton cited Henri Dunant’s text A Memory of Solferino as having inspired her to found the ARC in 1881 (redcross.org).
of human life, to react with outrage when lives are degraded or eviscerated without regard for their value as lives. And there are frames that foreclose responsiveness” (2009: 77). Hine’s refugee pictures aimed to bring the frail and vulnerable into view as he focused on the material conditions of being uprooted, as he interpreted through careful visual representation the uncertainty of being displaced, and fostered sympathy (and possibly outrage as Butler suggests) by homing in on the vulnerable lives being cared for. The ARC’s framing of the pictures in the essay further guided spectators to support the agency’s legitimacy and to identify with and value refugees as dignified humanitarian subjects. Hine and the ARC were doing this at a time in the war when the refugee figure was increasingly being disparaged within Europe.

Refugees were an unexpected consequence of the war and had emerged as a “liminal figure who threatened social stability partly by virtue of the sheer number of displaced persons, but also because the refugee was difficult to accommodate within conventional classification such as assigned people to a specific social class” (Gatrell 2014). Having fled violence or persecution, refugees were not the same as immigrants who moved with a plan for permanent settlement. Early on in the war refugees were largely accepted in neighbouring European countries as “hapless wartime victims” (Gatrell 2014). As the war continued, and as countries scrambled to accommodate the growing numbers of people who were putting a strain on economic and social structures, the image of the refugee began to change.

The ARC’s framing was a counter-narrative to many negative representations that simultaneously circulated. Not long after these photographs were created the armistice was signed, thus putting an end to ARC war relief work. The reconfiguration of the humanitarian landscape that followed armistice provided Hine with ample professional and artistic opportunity to further specify the refugee subject whose conditions would still take years to improve. Hine worked to continue to frame the refugee subject as the ARC had done during the war. He also worked to visually define refugeedom, but was restricted by the limitations of the photographic medium and by his own humanitarian imagination. As important a contribution for imagining and responding to refugees these pictures could have been, his education of the refugee was ultimately muted because, as a
result of social and political changes within the ARC and America, the refugee would eventually become visually displaced through a desire and act of focusing on other humanitarian figures.

Making appearances, 1918-9
When hostilities came an end, so too did the ARC’s program of wartime relief. The agency, however, was not quick to quit Europe.\textsuperscript{67} For many Americans, especially many ARC workers, there was no question but to stay and continue to provide assistance where possible. The sense of duty that had propelled and bolstered aid during the war had not dissipated, at least not immediately, with its end. Many within the United States government also saw diplomatic benefits to a continued American presence in Europe, particularly in the politically volatile Eastern borderlands (Irwin 2013). Before the war’s end, H.D. Gibson, chairman of the American Red Cross Committee to Europe, declared the needs in Europe to be “unlimited” and organized a Special Survey mission “to have a scientifically studied picture of the comparative necessities of the various countries in the lines of work which we have been engaged” (Gibson in Kaplan 1988: 67).\textsuperscript{68} Lewis Hine was invited to be the photographer on this team comprised of epidemiologists, nutrition experts and social workers that would record health and welfare needs. Starting their tour on Armistice Day, the Special Survey provided Hine with the opportunity to finally apply his full set of photographic skills. From November 1918 to February 1919, Hine travelled as part of the Special Survey team in the Balkans. This was followed up with a quick ten-day trip in April 1919 through northern France and Belgium to survey the reconstruction needs along what had been the Western Front. Overall, Hine made between 1,300 and 1,500 prints and negatives while working overseas with the ARC. Approximately 1000 of

\textsuperscript{67}The War Council that had been convened to oversee the ARC’s overseas activities dissolved in March 1919.

\textsuperscript{68}As quoted in a letter from H.D. Gibson, chairman of ARC Commission to Europe, to lieutenant colonel Homer Folks who was Director of the Department of General Relief for ARC in Europe before becoming director of the Special Survey Mission. Other American aid groups, including Herbert Hoover’s Commission for Relief in Belgium had been active during the war and remained so after its end. Hoover’s group focused on food, while the ARC did on clothing and shelters. The relation between American aid groups was complementary.
these were made in Italy, Serbia, Greece and Belgium between November 1918 and April 1919 (Kaplan 1988: 10).69

The photographs Hine made for the Special Survey were meant to be part fact-finding and part public appeal to build support for ARC peace-time relief and reconstruction projects. To achieve this, Hine applied a different narrative structure than he employed while promoting the ARC’s war relief activities within The Red Cross Magazine. He diverged from the didactic humanitarian narrative format of photography, building instead onto the ARC’s sentimental and humanistic framing of refugees. In combining the use of photography and social sciences, which was unique in his day, Hine set his photographic approach apart from his peers. What further set him apart—and that keeps him relevant and inspirational to this day—was his capability of combining scientific inquiry with an emotionally affective eye. Photographer and theorist Allan Sekula described this quality of Hine’s practice as “a realist mystic” in which “his realism corresponds to the status of the photograph as report, [and] his mysticism corresponds to its status as spiritual expression” ([1974] 1981: 20). Hine was certainly aware of, and in many ways appeared comfortable with, the realist and sentimental rhetorical aspects of photography. He himself had said in a Photographic Times article in 1908 that “good photography is a question of art” (Gutman 1967: 27). In his pre-war child labour and immigration work that generated passionate social and political debates, Hine recognized his photographs had to be affective as much as they had to be informative, and certain aesthetic choices could add truthfulness to his photographic depiction. He explained this in a 1935 letter to Florence Kellogg, then picture editor of The Survey:

It is for the sake of emphasis, not exaggeration, that I select the more pictorial personalities when I do the industrial portraits, for it is only in this way that I can illustrate my thesis that the human spirit is the big thing after all. With regard to this emphasis, I think we should apply the same standard for the veracity of the

69 In the end, we know little of Hine’s personal views about the European-ARC pictures. In reference to a post-war project about the dignity of labour, Hine wrote that the European pictures were “negative,” but also akin to a “visual joy-ride” (Gutman 1989: 36). Homer Folks wrote in a letter to his wife “I don’t think Hine was ever so happy in his life as here” (Gurman 1967: 26–7). This reflects a paradox that has become a point of critique against more recent conflict and humanitarian photographers such as Sebastiao Salgado and James Nachtwey (Linfield 2010).
photograph that we do in the written work. Even in art, poetic license shouldn’t slop over into yellow journalism…I have a conviction that the design, registered in the human faces thro [sic] years of life and work, is more vital for purposes of permanent record, (tho [sic] it is more subtle perhaps), than the geometric pattern of lights and shadows that passes in the taking, and serves (so often) as mere photographic jazz (McCausland Papers 1935).

Hine mastered, mobilized, and combined the different aesthetic aspects of photography to great affect without feeling a need to turn his lens on atrocity or disturbing imagery—the yellow journalism he referred to—in order to shape his visual message. It was also his skill at working with different cultural groups that contributed to Hine’s successes in bringing his audience into closer proximity with distant and different others. Hine had become adept at relying on hand gestures and basic English to communicate his intentions while working on his first photography project at Ellis Island in 1906. The cumbersome large-format camera technology at the time required Hine to secure a high degree of consent on the part of those he photographed. This, along with his “honesty and simple dignity” enabled him to put subjects he met along his travels across Europe at ease in front of the lens (Rosenblum 1977: 9).70 In this way, Hine worked to create photographs that would educate his American audience of the hard realities and miserable conditions of (post)war life and engender their sympathies.

Employing posture as a visual language, Hine made use of cross-culturally relevant symbolism in the stances and configurations of his portrait compositions to enhance Americans’ ability to relate with people from afar. Concentrating his camera on women, children and the elderly, Hine positioned the groups and individuals in his pictures in such a way as to disarm and to generate positive feelings. Often repeated is the figure of the pieta (or Madonna and child) [Figs. 21, 22]. For a predominantly Christian America, the apparent intimacy and careful attention suggested by the pieta signaled virtue and preeminent importance of a mother’s care. Hine’s pictures often conveyed tenderness and protection among adults and children [Figs. 23, 24]. He also pictured people in the midst

70 Walter Rosenblum knew Hine through their association with the Photo League in New York City.
of various tasks suggestive of capability and willingness to actively better their own conditions [Fig. 25].

Figure 21: “Serbian mother cleaning vermin from child’s head. Lescovatz, Serbia” (GCAH-79332)
Figure 22: “Corner in basement of ruined building where nine persons (2 families) live in one corner. Saloniki, Greece” (GCAH-79372)
Figure 23: “Three ragged refugee children. Lescovatz, Serbia” (GCAH-79331)
Figure 24: “Tent used by Jewish people, fire refugees, very unsanitary. Salonika, Greece” (GCAH-79375) (These handwritten captions are in Hine’s own hand).
Figure 25: “A returned refugee, and family are constructing a barrack. Mercatel, France.” (GCAH-69322)

The direct gaze predominantly assumed by his subjects was a characteristic visual technique that transcended the evidence and essence of whatever social condition he was picturing, from child labour, to immigration, to noncombatants in war, to refugeeedom. It was uncommon at the time to picture subjects looking directly at the viewer, but this was something Hine routinely did to highlight the individuality of his subjects. Add to that a close-up composition and a smile, and that was Hine’s signature trademark. To some, the pose and close crop were construed as confrontational. A subject’s gaze into the camera lens was conventionally considered offensive, particularly to those who believed a degree of deference was called-for when people from the lower rungs of society were engaging with those higher up. Many portrait photographers and practitioners of the era’s popular
Pictorialist and Secessionist photography preferred profiles. Women looking away or askance was a common trope used to enhance the common gendered themes of nurturance, motherhood and nature. According to Judith Gutman, Hine’s frontal presentation “consistently…found [a] person’s strength. Not romanticized strength. Not dramatic power. Just plain insistent human will” (1967: 14). For Hine, the direct posture was crucial to his message; he insisted on apprehending the individual in all of his or her uniqueness, rather than rendering them as allegorical, and therefore objectified, figures. This framing also invited viewers to make a more personal connection with the pictured subjects, or at the very least it made it difficult to deny the existence of the people staring back at them.

It is said that Hine’s photography brought sociological statistics and demographics to life (Rosenblum 1977: 18). In his European photographs, he was less able to join personal details to the faces in his captions as he had previously done in his child labor work. Language problems presented a barrier to his being able to gather these details, as did the speed with which the Survey Team was sometimes made to travel. Hine pictured piercing eyes, disarming smiles, and detailed captions that encouraged viewers to connect with his subjects on grounds of familiarity. Perseverance, ingenuity, capacity to labor,

---

71 Hine was not the first or only person making photographs of immigrants or of the social ills associated with the wave of mechanized automation and the global migration that came at the turn of the twentieth century. Jacob Riis was a well-known investigative journalist and social reformer that used photography in his campaigning against tenement living conditions at the end of the nineteenth century (Madison 1970). Hine and Riis knew of each other, Riis even purchased some of Hine’s photographs for his traveling lantern lectures, but they did not work together (Kaplan 1988: 22). Photojournalists like Jessica Tarbox-Beals and the Brown Brothers also included similar subject matter in their work (Gutman 1967: 30). Much has been written about Riis’ approach to photography—which incidentally was largely made by two photographers he directed—particularly its apparent reinforcement of racial stereotypes and maintenance of distance, rather than identification with the people depicted (Kaplan 1988). Hine’s approach differed in that photography became his sole medium, and social reform his main subject, as well as his prime source of employment.

72 With his child labour work, he made a point of gathering information such as the names, ages and occupations of his young subjects. Such information was crucial to the campaign as evidence of the lax application of already meager laws. The inclusion of such details in his captions had the added affect of further humanizing, or bringing to life, his subjects. At times, he also included direct quotes from his subjects, affording them a voice of their own.

73 In Western Europe, in particular, Hine was sometimes made to take photographs from the Survey team’s vehicle, a restriction of their tight schedule in April 1919 (Kaplan 1988: 198).
loss of home or of children, were all themes Hine built into his images, and were ones an American audience could relate to. Even when a photograph’s caption retold of the most harrowing experiences, Hine allowed his subjects room to demonstrate their resilience. For Hine, “the human spirit” was “the big thing after all,” this sense motivated and underlay his photographs of social groups, individuals and the conditions in which they found themselves (Elizabeth McCausland Papers). He intentionally framed his photographs in a way to make them accessible as sentimental and moral teaching aids as much as sources of scientific evidence. Having been a teacher, Hine said of himself when he became a full-time photographer that he “was merely changing the educational efforts from the classroom to the world” (Hine in Rosenblum 1977: 17).

Although he had difficulty gathering the degree of personal details he has grown accustomed to, Hine was ascribing the term “refugee” to numerous captions of the pictures he made in France during the war and on the Special Survey tour after the war. It is unknown what definition or guidance Hine relied on to make his determination as to who was a refugees or not, but his photographs—perhaps even in spite of himself—contributed to defining the term. The content and themes in Hine’s refugee-labeled photographs contain elements that are repeated in pictures of today’s refugees. He frequently pictured family groups, often with children predominantly featured, burdened under the weight of their worldly possessions as they travelled cross-country by foot along dusty or muddy roadways, or along the rail lines [Fig. 26].
Figure 26: “Refugees on railroad track en route to Gradletza, Serbia.” (GCAH-79296)

Hine’s caption “Refugee family en route somewhere. Skoplje, Serbia” gestures toward the uncertainty of the undertaking taken by the elderly woman and her two young companions [Fig. 27]. The combination of the photograph and caption further suggests that the insecurity of the journey presented itself as a better option than the threats faced back home.
Figure 27: “Refugee family en route somewhere. Skoplie, Serbia” (GCAH-79306)

The ongoing need to attend to basic necessities of rest and replenishment are addressed in “Refugees cooking meal on road to Gradletza, Serbia” [Fig. 28] and “A group of nomads coming into the city of Saloniki, Greece” [Fig. 29].
Figure 28: “Refugees cooking meal on road to Gradletza, Serbia” (GCAH-79299)
Figure 29: “A group of nomads coming into the city of Saloniki, Greece” (GCAH-79376).

Picking up the repeated theme of travel with “Refugees on top of box car, exposed to all kinds of weather, returning to their home. Strumitza, Serbia” [Fig. 30], this photograph depicts the risks great numbers of people are willing to take. On one hand, such images speak to the enormity of the impact of conflict, compelling hundreds of thousands of people to flee violence. On the other hand, such photographs could well have supported rhetoric of hordes, deluges and waves that assumed disruption, chaos, and fear—and aggression, signified by the crowds of males.
Almost as if to respond to such anxiety, Hine made the pieta pictures and also photographed refugees orderly participating in routine activities, including registration. “Returned refugees to Pordenone showing girl of nineteen between two women of sixty-four (in front) and seventy-four (behind)” depicts the administration refugees were subjected to, but also their discipline and decorum [Fig. 31].
Figure 31: “Returned refugees to Pordenone showing girl of nineteen between two women of sixty-four (in front) and seventy-four (behind)” (GCAH-79292)

Often expressing hope or at least positive qualities of perseverance and ingenuity, Hine did not deny that the experiences of refugees were without perils and sorrow. In one pieta-style photograph, the caption references the starvation and death of “many children” over the course of the previous three years, with the most recent two deaths having taken place in the six days that came before being photographed (Doherty 1978: microfiche 7A7, 77:175:124). While Hine would never have made photographs of such horrors—he did not picture atrocity to shock viewers—this example points to the limits of photography.74 Hine depicted the smoke and dust, the tatters and the makeshifts shelters and the make-do conditions, but his photographs were unable to transmit the smells, the sounds, the anxieties, the distresses, the grief and the exhaustion of refugeedom. The photographs also obscure the distinctions between the stateless and the internally

74 Speaking in 1911, Hine said, “So many times have social workers told me that photographs of healthy, happy children do not make effective appeals in our child labor [sic] work, that I am sometimes inclined to think we must mutilate these infants in industry before the shame of it can be driven home” (121-122).
displaced, or the refugee from the local resident, each affected in their own way by the war. Other than his captions, there is little that distinguishes the refugees he photographed from other war-touched civilians he portrayed across Europe. Hine’s captions remain mute on the loss of political representation, or of the difficulties faced by some political, ethnic or religious groups versus others in (re)settling. This lack of detail may be the result of the broad and imprecise concept of refugees Hine was operating with. It is also a sign of the limits of the humanitarian imagination, including Hine’s own.

The philosopher Richard Rorty identified stories and representations of this sort to be a form of “sentimental education” with the potential “to expand the reference of terms ‘our kind of people’ and ‘people like us’” (1998: 123). According to this thinking, concentrating on the “sort of education [that] sufficiently acquaints people of different kinds with one another so that they are less tempted to think of those different from themselves as only quasi-human” offers more promise for a better, kinder world than appeals to rational moral arguments (Rorty 1998: 122-3). Hine built his career on creating photographic narratives of the kind meant to expand the term “one of us” as he consciously worked to challenge negative perceptions of newcomers to America. But with immigrants arriving in the United States to refugees in war-torn Europe, Hine also exhibited a restriction in his sympathies, likely unintentional, that was socially pervasive and that remains worth noting since it is a pattern that continues to this day. Dogra (2014) and Hesford (2011) have noted similar patterns in more recent development and human rights organization campaigns that perpetuate distancing and Orientalism, respectively, despite employing visual representation styles otherwise considered as “positive.”

Hine did not leave any record of what he actually sought to achieve with his European photographs and it remains unknown the degree to which he was working to include refugees into conceptions of “our kind of people”. His attraction and allusion to the “human spirit” in his words and photographs evoke parallels to what would be recognized today as “human dignity.” The ways in which Hine photographed refugees could certainly be seen as representing a dignified human that could be defined “as embodied subjects who bring meaning and value to the world” (Bergoffen 2009: 310). For Hine, it really may have been that the human subject did come before any designation
of nationality, race or creed. There are signs, however, of a blind spot in Hine’s humanitarian imagination. Despite his apparently systematic application of the term “refugees” across the Mediterranean and the Balkans, Hine also referenced certain people as “beggars.” They tended to be further identified as Turkish people residing in Serbia. Presumably, these Turks were also refugees or otherwise displaced and disenfranchised, yet they did not warrant the more sympathetic classification.  

Decades after the Great War, Hine applied for a Guggenheim Foundation grant for a project entitled “Our strength in our people” in which he proposed correcting “criticism based on insufficient knowledge” associated with “our alien groups, our unassimilated or even partly-Americanized citizens” through photography that would better facilitate “seeing, and so understanding” the newcomers. Certainly Hine was consistent in his career. But statements such as “our” betray a power imbalance in the relationship in which the vulnerable and marginalized are bestowed humanity, partial and limited at that, by those wielding greater social and political influence, including, in this case, benevolent humanitarians, be they photographers or agencies.

Despite the promise Hine’s Special Survey photographs afforded in terms of mobilizing a sentimental education that would include refugees into the fold of American social conscience and moral obligation, the opportunity was effectively muted. Fewer than two-dozen of the approximately one thousand pictures Hine made as part of the Special Survey Mission in Italy, Serbia, Greece, northern France and Belgium would ever make it into any of the ARCs publications. When they were, the photographs were only tangentially articulated to the ongoing needs of war-effected European, and fewer still on the unique situation of refugees making it easier for refugees to be considered equivalent to immigrants.

---

75 Patterns can be discerned between the way in which Hine portrayed refugees and the ways they are being portrayed today. Commercial press coverage of the recent refugee crisis was ambivalent about Syrian refugees. Aid agencies have been thus focusing on similarities—as per Rorty’s supposition—by featuring educated, professional and middle class Syrians in their campaigns.
Displacing Refugees: 1919-1920

*The Red Cross Magazine* started 1919 with a message both of support and of appeal to continue providing aid to Europeans still reeling under the effects of four years of war. Solidarity with Europeans was clearly voiced in this January editorial entitled “America must ‘carry on’”:

> The duty of the American people is plain…in the track of this war the task of reconstruction is greater than it has ever been... what they require from us is food, clothing, medical and surgical assistance, to give them strength for labor.

The statement however also betrayed the fact that ongoing relief efforts—now reformulated as reconstruction assistance—were facing debate. After the war’s end, “American popular and political enthusiasm for a major postwar humanitarian intervention quickly eroded” (Irwin 2013: 142). The passionate support of wartime relief did not continue once peace settled in. Accompanied by public fatigue with international assistance, the ARC also faced debate within its own organization as to its proper peacetime role. Patriotic duty, the sense that carried ARC’s relief activities throughout the war, was being replaced as the year went on by nationalistic fervor and a call to refocus benevolent activities on more local needs. The ARC found itself struggling against competing interests throughout 1919 and 1920, with refugees eventually being outmaneuvered by a narrowing of humanitarian idealism.

During the war, *The Red Cross Magazine* had been a beacon of the ARC’s expanding abilities. By the early months of peace it became a place in which existential disagreements about the agency’s role played out between its pages. In the May 1919 issue, two articles, both featuring Hine’s photographs, exemplify the ARC’s changing direction. In *The Awakening of the Children* by J.W. Studebaker, the National Director of the Junior Red Cross, three photographs Hine made while on the Special Survey were reproduced amongst a collection of pictures (not by Hine) of American children involved

76 On the cover of the May edition, “Invest your month in a new America” appeared under the title further evidence of an insular ideology taken precedence.
in various benevolent craft activities. Two of the captions accompanying Hine’s photographs reference the subjects as refugees, but this fact is surpassed by the overwhelmingly child-centric focus of the article’s photographs and text. The article is neither about refugees, nor about refugee children. Rather, it is about the way in which the war encouraged “American boys and girls take responsibilities as little citizens of the world” (Studebaker 1919: 9).

According to Studebaker, after having been exposed to “the published stories and pictures [from] the war [of] the people for France and Belgium, living in continual peril” American children were now poised to stand “side by side with people in any part of the world on behalf of the principles of democracy and freedom and justice” (Studebaker 1919: 14). It was now up to American children “to think of Europeans as their ‘brothers’” and “brace [themselves] for their responsibilities not only in the community, but in the nation and in the world” (Studebaker 1919: 9-10). The article invited building political and social responsibility, and Europe’s suffering children became the foundation on which this American leader of global benevolence would be built. In focusing on the war-effected child with Hine’s pictures of ragged, though smiling, Serbian children, and with the article’s lead photograph (composed in another cross-cultural visual trope: the Nativity), the situation of the refugee is occluded [Fig. 32, and also Fig. 23]. Gone are the child’s family and community, unseen are the unique aspects of resettlement, refugeedom, and “other specificities of the ongoing struggles of daily life in Europe at the time. The child thus turned into an ideal object of configuring and translating human suffering beyond ideological, political and national borders” (Kind-Kovács 2016: 34).

---

77 Hine did not receive a by-line as his pictures are included in the article along with a handful of other’s photographs; none are credited. Archival research confirmed that the first four photographs are Hine’s. On top of that, the article’s lead photograph captioned “Greek refugee families huddled in a ruined Turkish stable in Serbia” would later be published (also as an article leader) in The Survey in August 1919 (Hine and Folks 1919).
From a history of humanitarian photography perspective, it is in this peacetime, inter-war period that the child surfaced as a universal humanitarian subject. During a time in which there were political and social tensions emerging in response to rising Bolshevism, the child appealed to American aid workers who pressed for continued activity particularly in Eastern Europe where needs were greatest. The child represented an innocent, apolitical subject, an object of pity that transcended political and religious propensities (Gorin 2014). Refugees themselves were seen as too politically tarnished, carrying with them the complicated baggage of (former and future) nationalities, and of political and economic necessities that could translate into claims of rights and entitlements for displaced people.
While the European child emerged as a universal humanitarian subject and the object in the construction of an American humanitarian identity, the figure of the American child further displaced the European refugees from view. In the same May 1919 edition, the article “The Right to Youth” by Constance Wagoner turned attention to an issue that took on new significance in the United States after that nation’s youth had just been asked to risk the ultimate sacrifice in a distant war. The article focused on renewed calls to put an end to child labour. It exclusively featured Hine’s photographs made for the NCLC in the years before he went overseas. The photographs are framed by the appeal: “Is the child at home, the soldier of the future, less than the American fighter in France?” (Wagoner 1919: 75). 78 Ironically, it was Hine’s own photographs of children that displaced the refugee subject. 79

The displacement was not immediate, nor was it simply a matter of a gradual reduction in visibility in the Magazine’s pages. Consistent with its image as a caring agency, the ARC presented refugees and others in Europe as being well on the way to self-sufficiency and renewed productivity. In July 1919, one of Hine’s refugee photographs was reproduced in “Taking the West to Monastir” an article that reported on the successes of an ARC agricultural program in Serbia [Fig. 30]. The article worked to distance Americans from the people of Eastern Europe by confirming that life for Serbians and their neighbours was quickly improving, enough that American’s could return their attentions in a more inward-looking direction. While there were attempts at maintaining a foothold in Europe, the push for a more limited position in the world would ultimately prevail.

During this first year of peace, it had become increasingly important for the ARC to support changes in populist views as the agency continued to have its legitimacy

---

78 The illustrator of the lead image—a sentimental painting of a teacher surrounded by her doe-eyed charges—is the only artist credited revealing the lower value afforded to photography, despite the apparent recognition of Hine’s reputation. The photographs are part of the NCLC collection.

79 Hine’s photographs are extensively featured, and take on a bold new life in Volume 15 (1920). As the ARC responds to the waning interest in international affairs, Hine’s photographic skills are put to use reshaping the image of the ARC. With “Glimpses of the New Red Cross at Home” and “Helping Children to Health” Hine is instrumental in redirecting general humanitarian sentiment, reinforcing it along domestic lines (1920). It is almost as through there is no room in the American humanitarian interest to have genuine concern and interest in the wellbeing of near and distant suffering.
challenged. Early in 1920, it was charged with financial “extravagances and other abuses” (Irwin 2013). Although eventually exonerated, the damage had been done resulting in a dramatic seventy-five percent reduction in membership during the November drive. Even *The Red Cross Magazine* folded by the year’s end. This was also a time when the ARC made moves to have the United States become the home of the League of Red Cross societies—a peacetime arm of the Red Cross movement. The ICRC leaders in Geneva were outraged that the ARC extended invitations only to Allied countries, a partisanship that went against the ICRC’s fundamental principal of neutrality. Again, the ARC’s reputation was negatively affected. Given the changing political landscape in Europe, the ARC’s damaged reputation, and the dramatic drop in popularity among the American people, it became increasingly reasonable for the ARC to turn its attentions inward.

By 1920, the visual displacement of the refugee was complete. ARC Commissioner to Europe, Robert Olds, explained at the start of that year the difficulties the ARC was facing at home and abroad as he editorialized, “this is a Presidential [election] year and … many people in our country are saying America, and not Europe, should engage their attention from now on” (Irwin 2013: 164). Olds was reflecting a growing sentiment that had been gaining momentum throughout the previous year. Enculturation and indoctrination began to take precedence in the Magazine with articles such as “She Makes Aliens into Citizens” appearing in January 1920. The article “I Americanize Myself” was directed at new immigrants and “you men and women of the Red Cross and you who are engaged in Americanization work” with the goal of outlining practices that could be taken by newcomers to the US, as well as longtime citizens, to help with adaptation and integration into American life (February 1920). During that year, references to refugees remained, but these were relegated to the back pages in small, single-column articles. Long gone was the multi-page photo-essay of the noble and valiant refugee. Indeed, the wartime refugees, hundreds of thousands of whom were still

---

80 There was also a recurring series in 1920 entitled “It’s Mighty Good As It Is, But It Could Be A Better America,” a particularly courageous section that tried to air otherwise silenced issues on race, class, gender and age discrimination.
seeking permanent settlements across Europe had become visually displaced while still living with the consequences of having been territorially displaced.

The visual displacement from *The Red Cross Magazine* did not mean refugees were displaced from other public media or discursive arenas. Uncharacteristically by today’s practices, Hine maintained control over the photographs he made for the ARC. As a result, he was able to sell some of the same photographs that appeared in the ARC’s *Magazine* simultaneously to other publications. The sociologically oriented journal *The Survey*, with whom Hine had a longstanding professional relationship, produced four articles in 1919 that exclusively featured Hine’s photographs. Homer Folks, who led the Special Survey mission, also populated his publication *The Human Costs of War* (1920) with Hine’s photographs. With articles such as “They Departed Into Their own Country” and “The Pull of the Home Tie”, *The Survey*’s articles present a nuanced view of the experience of refugees—and people today defined as internally displaced—seeking settlements and the ongoing harsh existence of post-war life. Still the child would be prioritized, dominating the presence in articles such as “The War and the Children”, “Kids is Kids” and “The Child’s Burden in the Balkans”. Folks’s book also presented a rich description of the post-war experience, though with more of a moralistic, social Darwinian tone (Kaplan 1988). Neither of these publications had as much reach as *The Red Cross Magazine*, but each incorporated a broad selection of Hine’s photographs offering an opportunity to see the unique characteristics of refugeedom.

The various uses of Hine’s photographs by the ARC at this time is a rich example of “The determinations of news photographs” which, incidentally, is also the title of media and culture scholar Stuart Hall’s classic article about the ways in which news pictures take on authority and reinforce particular ideological views (1981). Hine’s photographs of refugees and of American child labourers changed in terms of their news value for the ARC after the war. His pictures from 1920 were all made during or—in the case of the

---

81 Hine’s working relationship with *The Survey* included his maintaining control over the layout and captioning of his photo-essays, a unique style he termed “Hineography” (Kaplan 1988). As a result, the articles appearing in this publication are more detailed and nuanced.
American photographs—before the war. The decision to include them in the ARC *Magazine* only after the war was the result of a shift at an ideological level. Following the loss of many young lives overseas, American youth became of greater social interest in terms of nurturing and caring for. Similarly, Hine’s photographs of refugees were reduced in terms of their news value as they competed for attention with other ARC interests, which really were broader American interests, such as child welfare. The visual displacement would have to dire consequences for those in Europe still struggling to find a place to call home.

As transoceanic travel became easier after the war’s end, North America became a destination for Europeans who still faced the relentless after-effects of war (Ngai 2004). Security and economic concerns were central to a growing negative discourse. The “waves” of refugees finding their way to American shores were, according to the rising rhetoric, not to be trusted, just as “hyphenated Americans” were presumed to be disloyal during the war (Ngai 2004: 19). Lawmakers in the United States further claimed that the economy could not absorb any more newcomers. The workforce built in the pre-war immigration period was at an optimal level, refugees from Europe would only pose a strain on the system. There was no longer a need (or room) for mass employment. It was not only the United States that was discouraging Europeans from coming to America. Canada, supporting the same rhetoric as its southern neighbours, took the step in 1920 to “prohibit any moderation of immigration restrictions on behalf of refugees from Central and Eastern Europe, now in Canadian ports seeking admission to the country” (New York Times 1920: 14). The visual displacement of refugees from influential and broad-reaching magazines as the American Red Cross’ contributed to a conflation of refugees with other foreigners, allowing them to be subject to immigration laws, which themselves were dramatically changing in this moment. In 1921, a two-year moratorium on immigration was put in place (Ngai 2003: 20). This was a precursor to the 1924 Johnson-Reed Act that would set country quotas and create a system of visas that continue in slightly altered forms to this day.
Conclusion

With a picture thus sympathetically interpreted, what a lever we have for the social uplift.

Lewis Hine (1909: 356)

Hine’s European photographs were described at the time as “reminiscent of his earlier child labor series,” even said to “stand out as some of his most moving images” (Doherty 1978: 52). They continue to be considered as “some of Hine’s most affecting photographs” (Kaplan 1988: 63). Despite this, the collection of photographs remains virtually unseen. His pictures for the National Child Labor Committee were circulated through pamphlets, exhibitions, and travelling lantern lecture shows and continue to be reproduced to this day. His Ellis Island photographs also continue to be used to identify Hine as a pioneer in photography of conscience. After the Great War, Hine’s ARC photographs were forgotten to institutional memory, remain under-represented in subsequent Hine scholarship, and were essentially “lost” in photographic archives. Daile Kaplan, who undertook extensive archival research to “crack” the obscure coding structure of an early ARC archivist that effectively hid Hine’s photographs for over five decades, concluded that Hine’s images “were not utilized to their fullest” because as “restrictions regarding wartime and postwar imagery were lifted” publishers turned to previously censored photographs (1988: 203). I regard this lack of circulation as the result of a complex set of historical contingencies, competing ideologies and agendas, that would ultimately see the refugee visually displaced by domestic interests that included a redirection of focus onto local American social welfare and humanitarian issues.

Hine’s pictures are a deposit in an ongoing history of the visual representation of refugeedom, a history in which sentiments towards this precarious subject have risen and fallen in direct relation with their coming in and out of view. The role of photography in the mediation of refugees continues to expand, has been challenged and been reformulated across time and space with different photographers and media in different places around the world over the past century. Even the apparent “loss” of Hine’s portfolio of European images in institutional memory, in the archives, and in its
underrepresentation in Hine scholarship (its treatment as an outlier in his corpus), is part of the photographic situation of refugeedom in which the refugee subjects continues to appear as a problematic figure. Indeed, the general absence of refugees in historical and political scholarship has been described as a “production of neglect,” the result of repeatedly regarding refugee crises as exceptional rather than recurrent and linked to broader historical events (Gatrell 2013: 11; Scott 1988: 84). In diminishing their visibility, the refugee subject and the unique conditions of refugeedom are obscured, enabling the refugee to be viewed merely as immigrants, or worse yet, ignored altogether.

The ARC’s positive framing of the refugee was certainly laudable. Focusing on and amplifying human vulnerability and weakness may well encourage standing up for the value and dignity of human life, as Butler suggests. Taking a critical look at Hine’s First World War refugee photography made for the American Red Cross thickens what has otherwise remained a very thin area of scholarship on this collection of the celebrated photographer’s work. This exploration of the history of the photographs’ creation and use also invites a different perspective on the current refugee and migrant crisis precipitated by the ongoing conflict in Syria and by growing international economic disparities that have their origins in the global political shift hastened by the First World War. As Hine himself suggested: much comes down to the sympathetic interpretation of pictures. While today’s social media technologies mean refugees are less likely to be visually displaced, the way in which they and their situations are framed can impact public sentiments, which in a broad way can influence political action. The lack of visibility, especially, the lack of specificity as to the conditions of suffering—in this case refugeedom—the more difficult it is to build support to alleviate that suffering, particularly when faced with competing situations of crisis.
Chapter 4
Resisting a singular vision: “Watching” a photograph of the Rwandan genocide, (re)building humanitarian relations

Figure 33: The sole photograph on display at the Bisesero genocide memorial site in Rwanda is this photograph taken by British journalist Sam Kiley on 30 June 1994, in the final days of the genocide. Photo by author, 2015.

High in the hills in Rwanda’s Western Province is the Bisesero memorial site. Also known as the “National Resistance Memorial,” the site is different from others in the country in that “it commemorates both suffering and survival” (CNLG n.d.; Meierhenrich 2010). Bisesero is the site of the largest resistance against génocidaires, the term since applied to those who took part in genocidal killings. For nearly three months, from April to the end of June 1994, Abasesero—the local Tutsi—and Tutsi from surrounding area organized and defended themselves in the forested area at the top of the ridge of hills known as Bisesero. With spears and rocks against armed killers intent on slaughtering them all—men, women and children—because they were Tutsi, the resisters held their ground (Des
Forges 1999; Morel 2010). In the end, however, they “were ultimately no match for the forces of the genocide” (African Rights 1997: 2). More precisely, they were overrun in the final few days of the genocide even after French forces arrived on a “humanitarian mission” (Des Forges 1999; Morel 2010). As part of the United Nations’ mandated *Operation Turquoise* the secluded Tutsi emerged from their hiding places on June 27 in response to a (false) sense of security gained by the foreign army’s presence.\(^{82}\) Once exposed, the Tutsi were easily slaughtered when the army retreated to seek backup over the subsequent three days. Approximately only a thousand of the estimated 50,000 survived (African Rights 1997: 2). Bisesero has been described as “a microcosm of the Rwandan genocide—a world that knew, that was indifferent, complicit—an enabler of genocide, a world that refused to act and intervene” (Schimmel 2012). For humanitarian organizations, the Rwandan genocide has become synonymous with a failure of their system in terms of not having been able to raise awareness when the conflict began and in terms of their misconceptions of aid priorities as the calamity continued (Banatvala and Zwi 2000; Binet 2014 and 2016; Jones 1995).

Contained within a gold-effect frame, there is displayed at the Bisesero memorial a sun-faded 8x10 photograph. Even knowing some of the site’s history, the picture is rather ambiguous when first seen. In this picture [Fig. 33] are visible rolling verdant hills such that have made Rwanda famous as “the land of a thousand hills.” Those hills make up the background. A large cluster of people makes up the middle ground. A white 4x4 truck (one among several) and a roadway make up the foreground. Although the crowd takes up a large proportion of the frame, immediately apparent in the centre of the image is a row of white males in military garb. That they are holding guns suggests that the photograph is of a military action. It is clearly not the acute phase of a violent action, but the presence of these soldiers is suggestive of its proximity: either a conflict has been

---

\(^{82}\) In the definitive text recounting the events at Bisesero, Morel acknowledges that there remains uncertainty as to the exact date of specific moments as the memories of those involved—survivors, photojournalists, military personnel—at times contradict each other. There is consensus to the extent that the dates of events are all within a day of each other: first encounter by French military and Tutsi took place on June 26, though more often cited as the 27\(^{th}\) and the encounter recorded by Kiley’s camera, on June 30 (2017: 1096-96).
prevented, is ending, or is pending. The military personnel stand prominently on a roadside that directs the viewer’s eyes from the bottom left through to the centre of the frame. The angle reveals the photographer’s position along that same roadway. Was the image-maker part of the military? Travelling with it? Following them? Leading? The picture does not disclose this information. Behind these men is a group—the large crowd—of people who are undoubtedly civilians. Standing on a rise at the left-hand side of the picture, this group is composed predominantly of males. Some are quite young, as suggested by their being half the size of the others. None on that hillock wear military uniforms. They are not the only black people in the photograph. Passing the military men along the roadway on the right side of the image is another group of black males dressed in military fatigues riding in the back of a pickup truck. Sitting backward in the truck’s bed there is one rider facing the camera and can be clearly seen smiling a broad full-toothed smile. On the hill, one of the white military men waves to the group in the truck. The photograph is filled with tension: bodies in the midst of motion, hands on assault rifles, almost all heads turned and eyes following the men in the pickup truck. Although one hand is up in the air (In salutation? In sendoff?), and a bright smile is clearly visible, this is not a photograph of merriment. The photograph is undoubtedly a depiction of an encounter the meaning of which it cannot reveal.

Until now, the cases I have explored involved focusing on collections of photographs and textual representations of pictures. In this chapter, I turn to the press photograph above made by British journalist Sam Kiley on June 30, in the final days of the Rwandan genocide, three days after the French Army were alerted to the existence of threatened Tutsi. I look to it to explore what insight a single picture can reveal about the photographic situation of humanitarianism and what counsel it can give in terms of building or reinforcing humanitarian relations. In keeping with the conceptual framework of the photographic situation, I take as my starting point the understanding that “there is much more to the photographic situation than can be seen in any given image” (Sliwinski 2012). As such, this case study entails exploring the arena of actors and actions within and beyond the frame of this photograph. Thus I am able to locate the image’s force and its potential for building and reinforcing a more humble humanitarianism built on a
recognition of mutual dependence, and for generating humanitarian sentiment through an acknowledgement of links of obligations forged in the past.

With the previous cases, photography was demonstrated as being at the forefront of building empathy by making suffering visible, and as (re)shaping perceptions through specific framing. I also explored what being displaced in the humanitarian visual landscape might mean in terms of amplifying vulnerabilities. By contrast, the photograph on display at Bisesero is articulated to a Western visual culture that proved perilous in 1994 for many Rwandans, particularly those identified as Tutsi. Indeed, visibility is not always sufficient to building humanitarian sentiment. This chapter is less about “looking” at how press photography, or media reporting more generally, failed to generate humanitarian sentiment (or sentiments necessary to support an early intervention). It is also not about how humanitarian sentiment might contribute to memorializing the Rwandan genocide. Instead, with this case I ask: How did the visibility of Tutsi suffering in international press photographs prove perilous? How does the memory and history of the genocide, as presented through the use of, and articulated to, this one photograph at the Bisesero memorial site, play a role in humanitarianism, in building humanitarian sentiment, and in strengthening humanitarian relations? What role is there for spectators?

In what follows, I explore the multiple social, political and historical dimensions of this photograph, tracing its current existence at the memorial site to the moment in which it was made, and connecting it to various cultural contexts and histories that remain articulated to it. My approach is not to “look” at this photograph in its original intended role as part of international press coverage of the genocide, but to “watch” how the photograph is being used since it has been on display at the Bisesero memorial. I contrast this act of “watching” after the fact to the more conventional notion of watching—or media viewing from afar—that took place while the genocide raged. I borrow the distinction between “looking” and “watching” a photograph from Ariella Azoulay (2008). For Azoulay, watching a picture is fundamentally an act of historical thinking, which “entails dimensions of time and movement that need to be reinscribed in the interpretation of the still photographic image” (2008: 14). Unlike conventional ways of watching the news where representative frames and the ways in which stories competing
for attention can contribute to passive seeing, Azoulay’s entreaty is deliberate and motivated. In “watching” the encounter at Bisesero as recorded by Kiley’s camera and through the subsequent use of the photograph at the memorial site, many perspectives, histories and legacies associated with that pictured event emerge. Adapting Azoulay’s concept of “watching” to this case becomes an intentional act of “viewing of the photograph that reconstructs the photographic situation and allows a reading of the injury inflicted on others [to become] a civic skill, not an exercise in aesthetic appreciation” (2008: 14). By “watching,” I explore the way in which thinking historically about photography can be a source for building humanitarian sentiment without relying on an appeal to transcendental human essence (e.g., Hine’s “human spirit”), or patterned responses to sad, sentimental stories.

Foundational in Azoulay’s thinking on photography is the interconnectedness of humans. Philosopher Judith Butler has described such interconnectedness as the way humans are “bound up with others” to the extent that humans are “radically dependent” on a sociality, or set of social relations, without which the unique, individual person cannot exist (Butler 2010). To be bound with others is a disposition that is part of social life, and a consequence of humanity. The interconnection is rather an interdependence upon which the safety and wellbeing of humans is contingent. It is in this configuration that all life is precarious. It is in this interconnection that humanity is recognized and then subsequently controlled, denied, but it also forms the foundation of the development of sense of moral obligation and social responsibility, which are at the core of humanitarian action and impulse. There is a praxis in Azoulay’s approach to engaging with photography; a deliberate and motivated engagement that seeks deeper understanding of and commitment to affected communities. For Azoulay, “watching a photograph” becomes a “civic skill” where “cultural and social hierarchies that organize the power relations between photographer, camera, and photographed person” can be (re)situated in their past while also considered for their ongoing impact in the present (Azoulay 2012: 24, 25).

First, I describe my two experiences of encountering the photograph at Bisesero. This recounting opens up onto the ways in which the ongoing event of photography can move in unpredictable directions. It is also my entry into “restoring and reestablishing” links to
different pasts and perspectives on the event depicted and to the broader encounter with foreign actors and spectators articulated to it (Azoulay 2012: 86). Second, I trace the way “watching,” as advocated by Azoulay, opens up to “potential histories” (2013). This is a theoretical tool also developed by Azoulay and is meant to confront and work through difficult truths, in this case, Western failure to intervene, foreign complicity and degrees of implication, and misperceptions on the part of humanitarian aid actors (2013). Third, I explore foreign media representations of the genocide to contrast Azoulay’s motivated form of “watching” with the frames watched by many foreign spectators, to get a sense of the perilous nature of the visual culture at the time. I conclude with reflections on the practice of “watching” this photograph with respect to spectatorial involvement therein. In exploring this photograph and its many interconnections, I propose a way forward, a new use for humanitarian photography in which “a radial system has to be constructed around the photograph so that it may be seen in terms which are simultaneously personal, political, economic, dramatic, everyday and historic” (Berger 2013 [1978]: 60).

A photograph on a hillside

While also being a site where the “numbers of resisters were large and the struggle long,” Bisesero’s additional uniqueness relates to its architecture (Des Forges 1999: 165). The Kigali memorial museum notwithstanding, Bisesero is the only site whose buildings were built after the genocide, while the other national memorial sites—Murambi, Ntarama, Nyamata, and Nyarubuye—use existing buildings at reclaimed massacre locations (Meierhenrich 2011). Paying tribute to those who fought and died in the surrounding hills, the Bisesero memorial is built into a hillside; and its architectural features are replete with symbolism. On two separate occasions, once in 2013 and again in 2015, I visited the Bisesero memorial site.

Upon walking under the archway that marks the memorial’s threshold, and past a monument made of spears and rock—examples of the resistance fighters’ simple defenses—there is a “bunker-like” main building that sits at the base of the hill (Meierhenrich 2010). This is where the photograph is housed along with a small library about the genocide, a guestbook, and donation box [Fig. 34]. On my first visit to the site, the memorial was still unfinished. Although having been built in 2004, one of the mass
graves at the top of the hill was, in 2013, weather damaged. Roots from surrounding trees had grown into the grave, allowing water and soil to enter. The trees in question had, ironically, been donated by Rwanda’s former colonial administrators, the Belgian government, to ward off erosion on the hillside. The bones from the grave had been moved, in their coffins, until repairs could be made, to a temporary shelter made of corrugated steel at the base of the hill. The metal shed already housed the skulls and long bones that were eventually to be put on display in the nine rooms of the memorial’s main buildings that wind their way up the hillside. This shed was where my first visit to the site began.

Figure 34: Visitors to the Bisesero Memorial Site in 2013 have an opportunity to “watch” the photograph [Fig. 33] as the site’s guide, in white on right, narrates the picture. Photo by author, 2013.
The pathway connecting the buildings zigzags up the hill, symbolic of the “constant changes of direction that many Tutsi were forced to adopt while running for their lives up the hillside in an attempt to escape the Interahamwe hunters on their heels” (Meierhenrich 2010) [Fig. 35]. The total of nine rooms represent the different prefectures (districts) that the victims came from. Upon my second visit, the bones from the shed that had been intended for display were evenly divided between the rooms while those that had temporarily been moved there were replaced in the recently refurbished tomb.83

The route from the main building to the others gets rougher the higher up the hill one climbs, suggestive of crumbling defenses. The last section of the pathway is uneven, natural rock. Lining the edge are mounds of cemented aggregate with holes, suggestive of hiding places. Boulders on the path stood in for barriers such as spies that would relay people’s hiding locations back to génocidaires. At the top of the hill sits the mass grave in which some of the leaders of the resistance, who were killed in the final days of the genocide, were given places of honour at its centre. Beyond this is a pine forest (donated by the Belgian government) where survivors camp during annual commemoration events.

The display of mass collections of bones and their unsettled existence is something that has been reflected upon by several scholars. Sara Guyer (2009) has taken an aesthetic and critical theory stance claiming that the exhibition of masses of human remains can act to perpetuate the overwhelming sense of the genocide being incomprehensible or insurmountable for distant spectators. In her ethnographic study of the complexities and painful struggles of women’s rise in positions of leadership and as peacemakers, anthropologist Jennie Burnet recounted the ways in which the display and movement of bones was contested and conflicted within post-genocide Rwandan society. Many survivors felt the display of bones dishonoured the dead or they protested the mass burials because “they claimed that among the dead were genocide perpetrators who had presumably been killed by the RPF” (Burnet 2012: 108). Burnet interprets the RPF-led government’s “explicit decision” to display and—in some cases to mummify and display

83 The tomb had been repaired in anticipation of the April 2014 commemoration events, which would mark the twentieth year since the start of the genocide.
corpses—as a blatant disregard for the ongoing suffering of survivors in its political act of “mobiliz[ing] these human remains to tell the story of the genocide” (Burnet 2012: 99; see also Schotsman 2000). I have come to understand the placement, displacement and replacement of the bones as an outcome of and a metaphor for the unsettlement that accompanies the long period of post-genocide transition. But it is not the bones that are the objects that claimed by attention at the Bisesero memorial, rather it was the sole photograph on display.

There was something about the materiality of the photograph that drew me in: its singular, solitariness compared to other memorial locations where photographs abounded or did not exist at all; its location at this remote, hilltop memorial site of resistance; and its being a photograph of a climactic encounter between innocents, perpetrators, and people variously implicated or complicit in murderous hatred. Material thinking is an approach within anthropology that explores the role of physical objects in studying “the constitutive importance, agency, and affective qualities of things in social relations” (Edwards 2012: 222). Anthropologist Elizabeth Edwards explains that with this approach, the physicality of a photograph—its placement, its circulation, the manner in which it is displayed, touched, or tucked away—all contribute to answering the question of “how this photograph matters and has meaning” rather than what it might mean (Edwards 2012: 224). The material manifestation of this photograph at the Bisesero memorial had me questioning how it signified, to myself, and how the process of exploring this way of signification could be a way of developing sentiments of responsibility.

---

84 Burnet applies the terms ‘victims’ or ‘survivors’ broadly to include other Rwandans, not only those identified as Tutsi (2012: 7). On the one hand the broad application of these terms is a reflection of current Rwandan social conventions and also laws in which ethnic identity was never acceptable as something to ask and today such identification is forbidden. On the other hand, Burnet uses these terms in an inclusive manner to “resist the erasure” of non-Tutsi survivors of the genocide, recognizing that the genocide made victims of all Rwandans.
Figure 35: The Bisesero Memorial Site with buildings winding up the hillside. The grey building (bottom, left of centre) is where the solitary photograph is on display. Photo by author, 2015.

On neither visit had I intended to formally study the photograph on display, but on each visit I found the photograph intriguing, keeping notes of the various ways it was discussed and called into service. 85 It is not typical of photographs of the 1994 Rwandan genocide that circulated in the international press at the time or that have been on display at several memorial sites across Rwanda since. Such photographs include piles of bloated corpses or bleached bones, macheted victims, or the now infamous ID cards that were

85 Considerable barriers exist that hamper the facility of conducting research in Rwanda. Particularly, based on anecdotal evidence, genocide-related research is prohibitively difficult to obtain approvals for from the National Research Ethics Committee. It is speculated that such research may include criticism of the post-genocide government, or its treatment (or neglect) of survivors. These are among the reasons why I chose to focus on the available public narratives provided by individuals in their professional capacities as guides rather than conduct in-depth, open-ended interviews that might otherwise have delved into opinion and perception of a potentially controversial nature.
instrumental in the deaths of so many. Some memorial sites in Rwanda, such as the Murambi and Kigali memorial museums, contain large photo galleries exhibiting these more typical photographs alongside repurposed archival photograph that create a narrative recounting of the genocide and locating its origins in the country’s early colonial rule. Other memorial sites display no photographs whatsoever, relying instead on physical artifacts such as human remains and personal effects as visual aids and evidence. The photograph above is the only photograph on display at the Bisesero memorial site.

Photographs may show a lot of information but they provide little in the way of meaning (Berger [1982] 2013: 66). Whereas in other contexts a caption presents a way of understanding the picture, at the Bisesero memorial it was the guides who provided the photograph’s meaning. On both occasions, the guides I met were themselves survivors from other parts of the country, rather than survivors from Bisesero. It is partly due to the effort of local survivors that this site, along with several others in the country such as Murambi and Nyamata, came into being (Ibreck 2010). The National Commission for the Fight Against Genocide (CNLG) now oversees it along with the other national memorial sites and numerous local district sites within Rwanda’s thirty territories. As a state sanctioned locations, there is undoubtedly an aspect of state building, uniformity of official memory, or other political motivations shaping the use and significance of each of the memorial sites, Bisesero included (Ibreck 2010; Vidal 2001). Memorial sites in Rwanda, as elsewhere, are often “part of a state led endeavour to promote a collective identity in a nation torn apart by genocide” (Ibreck 2010: 330). They are also sites of

86 Before being placed under the administration of the CNLG, guides at the site were survivors from the Bisesero area. The replacement of local guides with ones from other parts of the country is said to be to be in the interest of reducing potential for re-traumatization of survivors, it can also be construed as a means of official state message control.

87 The acronym CNLG is based on the French name of this government department: Commission Nationale Pour la Lutte Contre le Genocide

88 According to Meierhenrich (2013) there are seven national memorial sites. According to the CNLG there are five, with Bisesero counted among them (CNLG n.d.). Meierhenrich (2010, 2013) distinguishes official memorial sites from other unofficial, private or even invisible sites of memory—or lieux de memoires—and has documented some of them here: www.genocidememorials.com. See Pierre Nora (1989) for origins of the concept of lieux de memoires.
contention not least of which because they are “also shaped by the distinct concerns of Rwanda’s genocide survivors” who themselves are not homogenous (Ibreck 2010: 330).\(^89\)

Burnet visited the site several time in 2000, and attributed its state of being still incomplete in 2010 as a sign of tension between the Rwanda government and Bisesero survivors (and genocide survivors more generally) (2012: 108). Another point of contention is the fact that when survivors initiated the site, it was they who guided visitors through the site. Since oversight was put in the hands of the CNLG, guides, themselves survivors from other parts of the country, took over that responsibility suggesting that there government could maintain more control over the narrative (Burnet 2012: 108; Grzryb personal communication).

My experiences visiting Bisesero have not been the same as those experienced by other foreign visitors, suggesting that though guides are employees of the CNLG, there remains scope for narrative variability and use of the picture (Meierhenrich 2010).\(^90\) Most certainly, my experiences remain wholly different from those of Rwandans who visit for personal or civic reasons; most of whom are likely not aware of the above photograph as it is housed in a building used mainly by visitors from afar.

On my first visit in 2013, the guide at the site did not know who the photographer was or how the photograph made its way to the memorial site.\(^91\) On my second visit in 2015, a different guide was present. This guide also did not know the origins of the photograph, but named the photographer as Patrick de Saint-Exupéry (grand nephew of Antoine, author of *Le Petit Prince*) whom he described as “a photographer with the French

---

\(^89\) Considerable scholarship exists exploring Rwanda’s memory politics, and the ways in which in Rwanda “memory is neither plural, nor openly contested” (Ibreck 2010: 330; see also Burnet 2009 and 2012; Meierhenrich 2013; Prunier 2009; Vidal 2001).

\(^90\) Personal conversation with Amanda Grzyb revealed that while she has visited the site on numerous occasions, it was only once—during the trip we took together as part of her graduate course on media and the Rwandan genocide—was she shown the photograph.

\(^91\) In personal communication with Amanda Grzyb, she informed me that guides at the site recalled that the photograph just appeared at the site one day, having been delivered by the CNLG. Whether a narrative accompanied the photograph or if the guided developed the narrative they told in 2013 and 2015 independent of CNLG guidance remains unknown.
army.” On both visits, before heading through the main building up the hillside, the guides described Kiley’s photograph. The result for me was that the significance of the rest of the site could not be considered without reference back to that photograph.

According to the guides—and here I conflate their two stories as there is considerable overlap—the picture is of the French Army, as part of Operation Turquoise, meeting with the Abasesero and other Tutsi resisters who had been defending themselves in the Bisesero hills for nearly three months. While a simple reading of the photographed scene suggests the army is defending the group on the hillside, the guides told a more complicated story. The photograph was made in the aftermath of a wave of brutal killings that took place near the end of the genocide. According to the guides’ story, three days before this photograph was made, a group of French soldiers had met with Tutsis who had been defending themselves in the hills. Being told by the French that their military unit was very small, the resisters were assured that the Army would return in three days with reinforcements. The Army did return three days later, but in the interim, the Tutsis—now exposed to the génocidaires—had become easy prey and the majority where slaughtered. The guides pointed out that the Army was less than twenty kilometers away, yet took three days to return despite being aware that thousands of people were faced with a very real threat to their lives. According to the guides, some 50,000 bodies are buried at the site, killed in the surrounding hillsides over the course of the genocide.

92 I since learned that Saint-Exupéry was a journalist, not a photographer, and that he was traveling with a group of journalists following the French Army during the last weeks of the genocide (Moler 2010). It is not uncommon for journalists to have a camera as well, and since Saint-Exupéry has written much about his experiences at Bisesero, it is not surprising that local authority has his name attached to all things Western-media related from that incident (for instance, Saint-Exupéry 2004). The guide in 2015 also was not aware of how the photo got to the memorial site. Archivists at the Kigali Memorial Centre were unable to provide any further information about this provenance of the photograph or of how it found its way to the Bisesero site.

93 In 1959, after the Belgian government declared it would grant independence to Rwanda under Tutsi rule, the majority Hutus revolted resulting in targeted mass killings. Rwanda had been under Belgian colonial protection since the end of the First World War saw Germany’s control of the area get transferred to Belgium, under League of Nations mandate, as part of wartime reparations. According to the investigative journalist Jacques Morel, “The Abasesero are a group of close-knit Tutsi who had been able to evade attackers during the pogroms of 1959” (Morel 2010: 1083 note 20).
Fewer than one thousand people (nearer 800) survived the incident referenced by the photograph.  

In my watching of the picture, many elements and themes are articulate to this one photograph: death, mourning, resistance, foreign complacency, and official memory. In a dialectical way similar to the relationship between a photograph and its caption, the symbolic meaning built into the architectural features of the site, the display of human remains, and the solitary photograph all emphasize each other’s force and meaning. The site is undoubtedly a memorial to those who died during the genocide, but it is also a celebration of those who resisted the killers and protected others in the process. As the narrative associated with the photograph suggests, the memorial is also a site of condemnation: much of the blame for those deaths—particularly in those last few days of murder—is laid squarely on the French Army, and by extension, the greater international community. Whether and how much the guides at the site—or for that matter the Bisesero survivors who reside in a village at the base of the hill—find significance in the photograph (on its own or as it is called into service at the site) remains to be seen. Its presence, however, signals that at some level—perhaps by the government writ large or by the CNLG as an organization—the narrative associated with the picture remains significant; perhaps as a form of memory, of state building, or of unresolved political or emotional matters. Investigations into France’s complicity in the events at Bisesero remain active outside of Rwanda to this day (Morel 2010). Watching the photograph in this way, as it is used at Bisesero, reveals photography’s greater force. More than a relic of a past, it transects time, space and experience merging into an event that is ongoing, and linking to different perspectives that radiate from it.

94 According to reliable figures, but still considered a conservative estimate, approximately 83% of the original Tutsi population of Kibuye, the prefecture that contains Bisesero, were killed in the genocide. Approximately, 50,000 Tutsi resided in the area according to a pre-genocide census, only about two thousand survived (Morel 2010: 1079). Bisesero is purported to contain the human remains of some 50,000 people many of whom were killed in the surrounding hillsides between 8 April and 1 July; though mainly between 13-14 May and 24-30 June (Des Forges 1999; Morel 2010). Des Forges is cautious about estimates that vary. Contemporary accounts claim approximately 2000 people made up the resistance in the hills when the French were made aware of people defending themselves. Only about 800 would eventually be saved, the remainder having been slaughtered in the intervening days between the time the Army first were made aware of the persecuted and the Army’s return to provide protection (African Rights 1997).
The photograph as it is displayed at Bisesero has taken on much more than the photographer originally intended. Sam Kiley, who was then reporting for *The Times* of London, made the photograph while travelling with other journalists from France and the United States. He and his colleagues were aware of the slaughter taking place during the army’s delayed response. It was Kiley, accompanied by another journalist, who had informed the French Army in the first place of the group of civilian Tutsi taking shelter and resisting the *Interahamwe* in the hills (Kiley 2017; Morel 2010).

The photograph did not appear alongside Kiley’s articles for *The Times* in 1994, but aspects of the scene were reported in various textual press accounts: the 4x4 jeeps, the salutation, the approach of “a white pick-up full of Rwandan government soldiers” that frightened Tutsi, setting them to jump back “as if they had been electrocuted” (Bonner 1994; de Saint-Exupéry 1994; Peyrard 1994; Kiley 1994: 15). Photographs that were published at the time of the event included more typical hero narratives or conventional victims: dignified, resilient, grateful victims laughing joyously in the presence of the French army with “the capacity…to survive,” or groups of adults and children—the “living dead”—huddled in their hiding spot (Kiley 1994: 15; Peyrard 1994: 36-37, 41) [Fig. 36].

---

95 Incidentally, French photojournalist Benoît Gysembergh, from *Paris Match*, made a near identical copy of the scene (Morel 2010: 1151). Both French and English language reporters were drawing attention to the same situation.

96 According to Morel, Kiley and French reporter Vinvent Hugeux, from *L’Express*, and American photojournalist Scott Peterson (see a separate photograph by him below [Fig. 38]) met with a Captain with the French Army on 26 July 1994 informing him of the Tutsi taking shelter in the hills of Bisesero. Kiley and Hugeux then met with a Lieutenant-Colonel who was with other French reporters Patrick Saint-Exupery, from *Le Figaro*, and Dominique Garraud and Christophe Boisbouvier (unidentified news agencies), further informing them on the situation not twenty kilometers away (2010: 1093-1095). Again, French and English language reporters were making valuable information known to those who stood to make concrete, material decisions about the lives of persecuted people.

97 The photograph was reproduced in Jacques Morel’s investigative journalism tome, *La France au Coeur du Genocide des Tutsi* (2010) that provides painstaking detail of the events that took place around the time of the making of this picture in which he accuses the French government of complicity in genocide.
Figure 36: “En pleine montagne, huit cents Tutsi pris au piège des milices hutues attendaient la fin…” (On a mountainside, eight hundred Tutsi surrounded by Hutu militants awaited the end…), *Paris Match*, 14 July 1994, 33-34.

Anticipating photography’s ability to link to many perspectives, Kiley has since explained that he deliberately ran across the road to make the exposure from an angle that would include all the “different layers” of the event: the *Interahamwe*, the French soldiers, the Tutsi (Kiley 2017). He recalled that the Tutsi were utterly silent when the white pick-up with the *Interahamwe* drove by. As for the waving hand of the French soldier, Kiley described it as a “reluctant wave” as if to say “you need to get out of here” (Kiley 2017). French soldiers had just come to realize the extent—the “very spectacular scale of hideousness”—of the violence that had been perpetrated by *génocidaires* who had been “hunting them like rabbits for months, and murdering them day and night.” According to Kiley, “The French didn’t really know quite how to react, they were very ashamed” of not having intervened in the three days that had passed since having been alerted to the presence of persecuted Tutsi. While “the Hutus [in the white truck] were expecting a positive response,” Kiley “was rather hoping they [the French army] would
blow these fuckers away” (Kiley 2017). For Kiley, to this day, his actions at Bisesero—as quoted from his otherwise rather barren Facebook page—from 8 April 2017, “may be one of the few times I ever made a difference.”

Kiley’s perspective extends the scope of the photograph; it forms part of the links that build a more fulsome history of the events. Perspectives of reporters nuance an impression of an ignorant press as much as encountering uses of this photograph at the Bisesero site nuances conventional notions of victims and survivors as passive or homogenous. Upon further exploration, unpacking this single photograph from this one event at Bisesero opens up onto an intricate web of political and historical influences and legacies. That the photograph used at the site is a press photograph is important as the recognizable format facilitates drawing in visitors, many of whom are foreigners, indeed, part of the “international community” named by the guides as those that did little to intervene. Using Kiley’s photograph in particular at Bisesero, whether by accident though more likely by design, is a clear way of implicating Western spectators. Recognizing or encountering the photograph—or any other photograph for that matter—in this way, invites spectators to explore the different perspectives, histories, and interconnecting links that bind us together. Indeed, in what follows, I articulate the photograph to a broader visual culture and history of press photography that shaped spectators’ field of vision in 1994, one that impaired the ability for spectators to recognize Rwandan victims of genocide as subjects of humanitarian intervention (or even of a military one). It is an history that I could not divorce from the photograph, and it is a consequence of “watching” that may be similarly part of anyone’s experiences with other photographs. Before embarking on this historical exploration, however, some theoretical structure is required to guide access to and to underscore the importance of reestablishing as many links as possible in the process of “watching” a photograph.

---

98 The ICRC and Médecins Sans Frontières were two aid organizations that were operating in Rwanda during the genocide. They were there already when the violence began and they maintained a presence the whole time. The bulk of aid organization presence however would only occur when the refugee crisis escalated in June.
On encounters and potential histories

Visual culture scholar Ariella Azoulay describes photography to be both a technical and social invention that led to “the creation of a new situation in which different people, in different places, can simultaneously use a black box to manufacture an image of their encounters: not an image of them, but of the encounter itself” (Azoulay 2008: 92-3, original and added emphasis). With this conception of photography, Azoulay dispenses with concerns over control of the photograph’s meaning or claims to legal ownership and copyright. In this configuration, there is neither a singular, sovereign control over a photographic situation, nor a fixed significance to a picture. While photography can be manipulated for specific ends, it cannot be as fully controlled in the ways an illustration or a painting can. Embedded within and articulated to the pictures is an archaeology of legacy knowledges, pieties, and practices that influence spectators near and far about how to react—intellectually and emotionally—to situations depicted in them. Radiating from each image is also the opportunity to locate and trace additional histories and significances associated to the photographic situation. It is not a new idea that photography is an open medium in the sense that it is accessible to different signification and uses (Barthes 1978; Berger 2013; Edwards 1992; Pinney 2003). Azoulay’s critical contribution is combining that perception of photography within a new social space created by the invention of the camera.

Importantly, Azoulay’s history and theory of photography leads her to conclude that the invention of the camera created a new “civil space” within which bonds and responsibilities are forged between those implicated or articulated to the photographic situation. As a record of an encounter, the pictures produced by the camera are repositories of points of views from all those involved in the photographic situation of the picture’s making. With them there is a possibility for “restoring and reestablishing as many links as possible between the photograph and the situation in which it was taken” (Azoulay 2012: 86).

In watching the photograph on display at Bisesero and the ways in which it is used by survivors, there is a chance that “a given state begins to appear as a result of one among other possible paths not taken or actively rejected, one could begin to restore the other
possible options and to understand how the mere fact of their existence was removed” (Azoulay 2013: 552). This process of watching, rather than looking, unravels what Azoulay (2013) has termed “potential histories,” which are trajectories that might have happened had mechanisms of control been different or nonexistent. Becoming aware of and exploring these potential histories can lead to lines of questioning around calamities, in this case the Rwandan genocide, and the tragedy at Bisesero more particularly, that can be helpful in resolving lingering harms, and for reflecting on future responses. For instance, why were various options for intervention in the genocide early on not taken? What might have happened had some French troops stayed behind when they first encountered people hiding and defending themselves in the hills of Bisesero? Why did distant spectators express more sympathy for Rwandan refugees than those being pursued, attacked and murdered?

Azoulay’s concept of potential history emerged while she reflected upon archival photographs from the 1948 Palestinian exodus, also known as the Nakba, in which the violence of expulsion, dispossession and destruction remained unrecognizable as such by Israeli Jews because they were “trained by the regime not to identify the existence of a disaster” (2013: 550). For Azoulay, to explore potential histories is an act of challenging official memory and dominant histories that obscure or deny spectators’ ability to recognize a situation as a disaster, let alone their being implicated (or even complicit) within. In the situation of the occupied territories, Azoulay goes on to refer to Israelis who did not take it upon themselves to intervene in the expulsion of Palestinians—or to even speak out against it—as perpetrators. In the case of Rwanda, spectators watching from the distance of North American or Europe can be considered complicit, depending on their proximity to decision-making or capacities to intervene; they could at the very least be considered as implicated in the wrongheaded decisions of the regime in which they reside.

Azoulay considers potential history specifically within the context of “regime made disasters” in which hegemonic control operates to restrict historical trajectories along paths that deny potential options that did exist—however fleetingly—at a previous time. These “regimes” operate in such a way as to conceal the fact that disasters are even
occurring. The Rwandan genocide, or at least its prolongation, can be considered a form of regime made disaster. The regime associated more specifically with the visual culture in which the press photographs inhabit is not as discrete as the one between Israelis and Palestinians, or as directly obvious as the Habyarimana regime that amplified tensions between Hutu and Tutsi, and that orchestrated the Rwandan genocide. In the case of Rwanda, it is a regime that is transnational in scope and involves empires going back to the late nineteenth century, the pseudo science of Social Darwinism, discredited historiography, geopolitical capitalist forces and the power struggles of “la Francophonie.” In essence, the regime I refer to implicates the “international community” such as it was configured in 1994.

Watching the photograph at Bisesero opens up the possibility of gaining perspectives on the photographic situation in which the picture was made and its ongoing impacts. In this act, it becomes clear that the photographic situation is greater than what is depicted in the picture’s frame. It is comprised of a complex of power differentials between the different actors associated with it. It links to deeper and broader histories than the picture might otherwise immediately reference. Watching how the event was framed by Kiley’s lens in 1994 provides access—to the degree that they can be sought out—to underlying ideologies, biases, assumptions, and motivations that extend beyond those of the photograph’s creator or distributor.

Framed in the foreign press as civil war or tribal warfare, Western spectators recognized the genocide as a disaster, but not necessarily one for which they were responsible. The sense of complicity in this calamity was not apparent. Certainly, there was considerable variation between international actors as to the degree to which there was a sense of disassociation or association with the eruption of genocide. For instance, the French had long supported the Hutu regime as opposed to the predominantly English Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) rebels (Des Forges 1999; Melvern 2000 and 2004). The Belgians also acknowledged their colonial past with the small African country. By and large, however, Tutsi-Rwandans were hardly seen as victims of European influence as the foreign press perpetuated the sense that the conflict was purely infighting (Thompson 2007; Tyrell 2015). For practically the full duration of the one hundred days of genocide,
distant spectators were being overwhelmed with images of horror and little other than rote stereotypes of violence and later—with the focus on refugees—dependence, rather than context and connections with which to build sympathies or indignation.

Reporters present during the genocide have since lamented that the accounts relied on such shortcuts that represented Africa as deep and dark and chaotic (Doyle 2007; Chaon 2007). The racial-trope reflex, though inexcusable coming from within a profession revered for investigation skills and searches for the truth, was part of a deeply entrenched visual culture that was the product of a global social order. The subsequent critical reflection on the part of media professionals and scholars of the international media representation of the genocide, reveals the “highly ideological procedure” that is a “deep” structure in media practice, one that makes myth and ideology appear as natural, incontrovertible fact (Hall 1981: 241; see also Barthes 1978 and [1957] 2012). Long had Rwanda, and Africa more generally, been the subject of exoticization. The hazardous consequences of these century-old patterns of representation would be amplified particularly in the first weeks of the genocide as foreign reports framed the violence as another installment of ancient tribal warfare. The racialized reporting of the genocide was relegated mainly to the early days of the mass killings, but it set a tone that was hard to overcome as it supported political agendas such as America’s, a country that was trying to avoid a repeat of the horrific incident that had happened in Somalia only months before (Des Forges 1999).

Watching the Bisesero photograph unveils difficult knowledge not just about the horrors of genocide, but also a long history of racial discrimination in western culture. This history is so deeply rooted as to also be inescapable, but in being confronted by the ways it has resurfaced through the presence and (uncertain) use of Kiley’s photograph at Bisesero renders it something that can be—and ought to be—faced head on. This may not

---

99 Indeed, among the earliest reports I encountered in my research—an account that was utterly shocking, but not unsurprising—that shaped distant spectators’ imaginations of Rwanda was a early twentieth century description of the inhabitants of the Great Lakes region as being “the missing link” between pygmies and standard-type humans: “their type is totally distinct from the other people's” while “the pigmies are to these apelike beings [pigmies] as the dog-faced baboons are to the gorillas” (New York Times 1900: 17).
have been done during the acute crisis, but perhaps it can be done in the long period of
transition that comes after massive cultural trauma.

The appeal of Azoulay’s approaches to engaging with photography presented here is the
ability for “watching” and exploring “potential histories” to be done with any
photographs encountered. The fundamental premises, however, of interrogating a
photograph—resisting a singular or dominant reading—has been underlying aims of the
work of several photo-based artists engaging with the 1994 Rwandan genocide.

Most notably, the Chilean artists Alfredo Jaar created twenty-one different installations,
*The Rwanda Project*, over the span of nearly a decade, 1994-2000, in an attempt to work
through and seek some degree of understanding of the way in which the genocide was
allowed to continue for as long as it did while the world watched. Each successive photo-
based installation was a self-declared failure, not aesthetically but politically; Jaar
struggled throughout the project with the limits of the medium to bring spectators
comprehensive understanding of the experience of one-sided mass killing, of the
complexity of complicity, and the sheer (un)representability of genocide (Moller 2013;
PBS n/d). Many installations deliberately avoided featuring images of horrific violence,
focusing instead on the individuality of survivors and acknowledging their right to not be
re-traumatized or victimized. His work has been lauded for not exploiting the suffering of
others in attempts to create sentiments of solidarity. It has also been critiqued as denying
survivors’ wishes to have visual “evidence” of genocide be displayed and shared widely,
making Rwanda “invisible again” in a world that had long been indifferent to it (Mirzoeff
2005). While the project invites spectators to question and reflect on the prejudice and
blind spots associated to the unfolding of historical events with the use of photography,
media analysis figures less prominently in his work.

In one particular exception, Jaar reproduced the *Newsweek Magazine* covers published
during the period of the genocide as part of an installation work. Adjacent to each cover,
none of which ever addressed the situation until its August 1 edition, Jaar included a brief
annotation referring to the massacres taking place at the time, the numbers of dead, and
the slow pace of international intervention (Jaar 1998). Of all his installations, this is the
primary one that calls explicit attention to the media’s negligence and the public’s passivity. It is not the only installation to invite spectators to engage with their personal or their societies’ lack of attention to distant others, this is the one that triangulates the press, outside audiences and Rwandans affected by genocide.

Other artists have also worked—through the medium of photography—to generate a degree of understanding of the intimate nature of the Rwandan genocide. Robert Lyons and Pieter Hugo, in separate projects, created stark portraits in which subjects pose—expressionless—square to the camera in an attempt to centralize the horrifying fact that much of the killing was done by neighbours, friends, and even family members (Lyons and Straus 2006; Hugo 2014). Indistinguishable in Lyons’ pictures are the innocent and the guilty. The homogeneity between the photographs blurs the line between hunter and hunted; the individual portraits in concert reveal the banality of evil. In Hugo’s series, the pairs of people in each photograph are often touching, suggesting a high degree of intimacy, and this between victim and perpetrator. These projects accelerate understanding of the complexity of the intimacy of violence, and reconciliation. Lyons expressed an intention that his photographs might enable that “a common humanity would emerge” (Lyons and Straus 2006: 32). However, a great divide continues to exist between the subjects and the spectators as the intimacy remains focused on the interconnection between victims and killers; with no reference to external forces, there is little opportunity for distant spectators to connect with those in the portraits: the violence and the uniquely intimate nature of the barbarity remains a Rwanda characteristic. The practice of approaching photographs—be they press or (more conventional) art photographs—with the intention to “watch” for their political and cultural forces could counteract this tendency. The legacy of “Afro-pessimism,” where spectators expect and media creators continually reproduce negative representations of Africa, will take deliberate counter-actions by spectators and producers (Enwezor 2008).

Jonathan Torgovnik’s project, Intended Consequences, 2009, deals also with a decidedly intimate outcome of the act of genocide: children born of rape. While an intimate experience, its intimacy is something experienced by women in other genocide situations globally. The intimacy focused on by Lyons and Hugo—of neighbours and even family killing family members—is a different intimacy, one particularly unique to the Rwandan genocide.
Although at its core humanitarianism is a moral enterprise, it cannot be denied that it emerged from and remains embedded within a regime that has roots in violent social control and dominion. To work to restore links and to mobilize potential histories as a humanitarian instrument supports more recent moral and practical directions taken within the humanitarian system with respect to being more accountable to and participatory with beneficiaries.

**Perils of photography**

As part of a testimony for the compilation of survivor stories, *Life Laid Bare* (Hatzfeld 2000), Berthe Mwanankabandi directly condemned the international press, distant spectators, and visual representations of suffering:

> I don’t understand why the Whites watched us for so long, while we were put to the machete day after day. You who saw the genocide on television screens—if you don’t know why the Whites didn’t make the slightest protest, how could I, who hid in the marshes, ever hope to explain that?

> I don’t understand why some suffering faces, like those of the Hutus in Congo or the fugitives in Kosovo, inspire pity in foreigners while Tutsi faces, even sliced by machetes, provoke nothing but careless indifference. I am not sure that I comprehend or believe in the compassion of a foreigner. Maybe the Tutsis were simply hidden too far from the road, or perhaps they don’t have the right sort of faces to express such feelings. (Mwanankabandi cited in Hatzfeld 2000, 190)

Much could be unpacked from Mwanankabandi’s observation. At the outset, her application of the verb “watched” is in line with conventional practices of watching television or other action before the eyes; this is a fundamentally different sort of watching than advocated by Azoulay with respect to photography. Televisual, and such, watching is an act in which images stay fleetingly before the eye, repeatedly replaced with another. Mwanankabandi’s invocation of “watched” is suggestive of a more passive experience more readily associated with a competitive and short news cycle. While this does not mean that an impression cannot be made, it is a different undertaking that “watching” a photograph, which entails remaining with one image and building the action, the associations, and the ongoing events from a more deliberative position.
Mwanankabandi goes on to articulate a problem that has long preoccupied the thoughts and intellectual efforts of visual scholars and cultural critics of photography: what types of photography, if any, can “unite people of goodwill” (Sontag 2003: 6)? Or put simply, “What can make a difference?” (Fehrenbach and Rodogno 2016: 1153). Visual forms of the humanitarian narrative and shocking atrocity photographs or exotic imagery have been mobilized with the intent to move people to intervene. Why then did, as Mwanankabandi asserts, “Tutsi faces, even sliced by machetes, provoke nothing but careless indifference?” In a way, she answers her own question by pointing out a competition between suffering, particularly within the news media economy, but also within humanitarian culture. Here, Mwanankabandi’s perception points to a crucial insight: that “visual culture can be a matter of life and death” (Smith 2007:15).

While it is a field of study, visual culture is also a concept used to explain the way conventions, patterns of use, and frameworks of understanding are associated with photography. The way in which photographs are framed in the media, and how they are circulated and incorporated into discourses builds a “politically saturated” system that shape what and how viewers see events and the people living them. Visual culture is also the way in which spectators interpret photographs: “What is seen and not seen in photographs depends on the cultural filters through which they are viewed, and on the repertoire of image that have shaped looking” (Smith 2007: 15). Indeed, the crucial point that Azoulay is making in her thesis of “potential history” is to invite spectators to expand their repertoire of images—they internal photo albums—in a way that challenges dominant visual culture that might otherwise reflect and perpetuate dominant ideologies.

Here, I outline the ways in which photography, specifically foreign press photography, proved perilous for Rwandans. Foreign press coverage of the events in Rwanda in 1994 simultaneously was a product of and produced a visual culture that contributed to preventing spectators from registering Rwandan civilians as victims worthy of

101 At the time of the Rwandan genocide, the international commercial news media was concentrating on violence leading up to South Africa’s first democratic elections, the suicide of Grunge-music singer Kurt Cobain, and the sensationalistic murder trial of O.J. Simpson.
protection, as part of their realm of responsibility.\textsuperscript{102} I focus on photographs and reporting from the \textit{New York Times}, \textit{The Times} of London, and \textit{Paris Match} as sources for exploring the visual culture at the time.\textsuperscript{103} Sam Kiley, Raymond Bonner, and Michel Peyrard accompanied by photographer Benoît Gysembergh worked, respectively, for these publications and were present at the scene depicted in Kiley’s photograph (Morel 2010). Furthermore, these reporters came from three of the permanent member countries on the UN Security Council making decisions on responses to the genocide at the time.

The international press representations contributed to a global visual culture that proved perilous to Rwandans by delaying response to the crisis. Visual representations in the international press shaped imagination, judgment and reaction to the genocide. Distant spectators seeing the violence from a disaffected locale became unwitting “active participants in the production of knowledge about refugees” and ultimately the fate of their lives (Fair and Parks 2001: 51). The narrow visual representations, the ways in which the photographs were framed within a racial discourse and a thin or erroneous application of history contributed to a paucity of public sentiment and set the tone early on in support of a non-interventionist response. In this sense, the visual culture of the time “trained” citizens of the international community—the global regime under which

\textsuperscript{102} It is worth noting that photography has a long history in shaping and reflecting Rwanda culture, as photography has long been formidable in many African cultural experiences (Enwezor 2008). Not simply in terms of the colonial administrators mobilizing photography in their efforts to fix racialized categories of social hierarchy through the institution of identification cards. Photography was also a large part of social culture, particularly in family life. Much like in the West, posing for portraits and making photographic records was a routine part of celebrating milestones or special occasions. After the genocide the ID card photographs became prized and treasured family possessions. In many cases they were the only traces left behind of family members and loved ones killed. During the genocide, family photo albums were also destroyed. Similar to the defacing of family pictures during the Bosnian War, the destruction of family albums “became one of the exemplary forms of genocide,” which “leads to more profound forms of destruction, namely the annihilation of human beings” (Sliwinski 2009: 305). According to Marie-Louise Kagoyire, a genocide survivor, “They wanted to wipe us out so much that they became obsessed with burning our photo albums during the looting, so that the dead would no longer even have a chance to have existed” (in Hatzfeld 2000: 131).

\textsuperscript{103} I conducted thematic analysis based on archival research of \textit{The New York Times}, and the Canadian national newspaper \textit{The Globe and Mail} coverage of the Rwandan genocide for one of my graduate courses, under the supervision of Dr. Amanda Grzyb. My dissertation research builds on the archival research of \textit{The New York Times}, and brings in archives from \textit{The Times} of London, and \textit{Paris Match}. Western University Libraries do not hold subscriptions for archives to the latter two publications. I have had to rely on the research available online done by Jacques Morel for \textit{La France au cœur du génocide des Tutsi} (2010) available here: \url{http://78.217.242.21}. 
Rwandan lives were fated—to be incapable of identifying the events in 1994 as a disaster that concerned, let alone implicated, them (Azoulay 2013: 549).

To be clear, foreign press photographs may not be immediately obvious as a harmful form of photography during the genocide. The most obvious example of the perils of photography associated with the genocide is government issued identification cards. Belgian colonial authorities instituted the ID cards in the 1930s as part of larger global trend in administrative registration of subjects of Empire, and followed on the heels of the popularity of national identification cards and passports following the World Wars (Robertson 2009). In the case of Rwanda, the cards fixed into different racial categories social classes that had for centuries existed as fluid group divisions. Unwittingly, with these cards “the Belgians set the stage for future conflict in Rwanda” (Des Forges 1999: 34). Indeed, an extension of the same regime of global empires that had shaped the political and social world for centuries and that would later shape foreign media reporting of the genocide instituted the practice and the informational content of these cards. During the genocide the cards became a way for génocidaires to identify and hunt down Tutsi-Rwandans, transforming the cards into de facto “death warrants” (Des Forges 1999: 19). There exists a rather robust scholarship on ID cards, and their particular significance in the Rwandan genocide (Edkins 2015; Robertson 2009; Sekula 1989). It is not the perils of this type of institutional photography that I focus on here. Rather I concentrate on press photographs and aid organization pictures in foreign news publications in 1994 because they articulate to the photograph on display at Bisesero.

**Disaffected view**

When the genocide came to an end, media scholars undertook a period of critical self-reflection questioning what went wrong, as the consensus among media scholars was that they had failed during the genocide. According to media scholar Allan Kuperman (2007), the international print media at the time failed in four categorical ways: 1) conflated the genocide with the civil war; 2) underestimated the numbers of deaths; 3) reported that the atrocities were waning when in fact they were increasing; 4) reported mainly about events happening in the capital, Kigali, when the reality was that the majority of the massacres and killings took place in the surrounding countryside.
Amanda Grzyb (2009) further identified that the news reports, particularly in the first month of the genocide, focused primarily on the evacuation of foreign nationals who were relatively few in number and faced "phantom fears" of attack. Similar failures are reflected in the photographic record of the foreign press.

In the immediate aftermath of the 1994 Rwandan genocide, there was a sense that this was an “over-covered” media event (Roskis 2007: 166). Despite this appearance, in actuality there were few photographers in Rwanda when the killings began, and no pictures of actual slayings taking place.\(^{104}\) Moreover, the pictures by the few photographers that were present were not being published:

The two photographers moved on into territory controlled by the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), where they met some 15 survivors and gathered their stories. But the photographers’ raw, unadorned images and the survivors’ simple accounts left editors cold. Patrick Robert returned to Paris in early May scarcely having sold a single photo (Roskis 2007: 239).

In the crucial first few weeks of the genocide, Rwandan government officials were gauging their next actions based on international reaction to the killings. Photojournalists failed to photograph sites where massacres had taken place, even ones that were near Kigali such as those that took place at the Ntarama and the Nyamata churches in mid-April. This echoes Kuperman’s assertion that the press coverage was largely directed towards events in Kigali. Although reporters such as Marc Doyle of the BBC went beyond the city's limits, it appears as though photographers did not travel far in that first month (Doyle 2007: 148). This was a crucial period in which the UN Security Council was deliberating whether to initiate Chapter VII intervention that would have meant the deployment of ground troops (Des Forges 1999: 22). It is also the month in which the majority of the massacres occurred.

\(^{104}\) From the distance of his Kigali hotel roof, videographer Nick Hughes (2007) was able to capture what appeared to be an actual killing at one the innumerable roadblocks. While he wrote about it shortly after the end of the genocide, Allan Thompson later wrote about meeting the surviving family members (2014).
Figure 37: Rwandans assisting a Swiss family near the Burundi border as foreigners fled the fighting in Rwanda. Associated Press, *New York Times*, 10 April 1994, A1.

Initial photographs that were published did not include victims of the genocide. Reports in *The Times* such as “British Aid Woman Tells of Hell and Carnage in Rwanda” were echoed in the *New York Times* (Bond 1994). Photographs accompanying these articles focused on expats, presenting them as the sole identifiable innocent victims [Fig. 37]. An early photograph that included people identified as refugees may not have even been from Rwanda [Fig. 38]. Neighbouring Burundi had also been locked in genocidal violence for many months. Despite this, photographs of these “refugees” in Tanzania were accompanied with headlines and captions that focused on violence that "convulsed" and "hits Rwandan City as Tribes Battle" (Gray 1994: A6). In combination, the photographs and the accompanying text provided an early picture of the events in Rwanda as something beyond Western ability to control and beyond its interest. The

---

105 The caption reveals a misunderstanding of the violence in Rwandan, conflating it with ethnic fighting that had been taking place in Burundi since October 1993. Coincidentally, the photographer of this picture, Scott Peterson, is reported to have been with Kiley and French journalist Vincent Hugeux when the three met with French military personnel in July informing them of people hiding in Bisesero (Morel 2010: 1094).
The relationship between the photographs and their captions made it difficult for spectators unfamiliar with Africa, unaccustomed to seeing Africa as anything other than a visual trope of endemic violence and suffering, to identify links of this fighting to any historical obligations forged by members of the international community.

Figure 38: Camps like this hold thousands of refugees from Rwanda after fighting began in October. Scott Dam Peterson, Gamma Liaison, *New York Times*, 9 April 1994, A6.

The relationship between words and photographs would have a profound impact on spectators’ reactions to the genocide; it is an association that has long been recognized as something unrivaled between text and other visual media. Echoing Roland Barthes (1982) and his observation that “the image no longer *illustrates* the words; it is now the words which, structurally, are parasitic on the image”, Berger explained (204):

In the relation between a photograph and words, the photograph begs for an interpretation, and the words usually supply it. The photograph, irrefutable as evidence but weak in meaning, is given a meaning by the words. And the words, which by themselves remain at the level of generalization, are given specific authenticity by the irrefutability of the photograph. Together the two then become very powerful; an open question appears to have been fully answered. (Berger [1982] 2013: 92)
The dominant representation in the early weeks universalized all of Africa as being racked by "tribal problems," and most particularly the Great Lakes region comprised of Burundi and Rwanda as routinely partaking in "genocidal orgies" (Gray 1994: A6). The Hamitic myth in which “Tutsi - a tall and elegant Nilotic people” subjugated others in Rwanda was also presented as undeniable fact and possibly also justifying the violence toward Tutsi as their due comeuppance. The selection of photographs and the decisions around what information to include in the captions and accompanying articles was reflecting what was “consensus knowledge” about Africa, presenting the violence as natural and expected in a way that builds onto the apparent “news value” of the atrocity photographs, when it is also guided by “exchange value” (i.e., à la “if it bleeds it leads) Hall 1981: 234, 241; see also Zelizer 2010). Analytically, these practices reflect a “deep structure” of ideological choices being made for political and economic reasons or through uncritical bias and prejudice and part of global political violence (Hall 1981: 237).

Further shaping responses were headlines such as this one from April 15: "U.N. in Rwanda Says It Is Powerless to Halt the Violence" (Lorch 1994: A3). It was sandwiched between a photograph of corpses on a roadside, and the funeral cortège of the ten Belgian paratroopers killed while trying to protect Prime Minister Agathe Uwilingiyimana in the first day of the genocide [Fig. 39]. That tragic event which took place in the first days of the genocide was the only time that foreigners were the main targets. The genocide was not being presented in the foreign press as the culmination of over a century of Western interference. Instead, Rwanda continued to be portrayed as a "failed central-African nation-state with a centuries-old history of tribal warfare and deep distrust of outside intervention" (Sciolino 1994: A3).
On April 12, the *NY Times* ran a front-page photograph of a stack of corpses lined up along a roadside. The caption read: "Havoc in Rwanda. Victims of tribal war were tossed on the side of a road in Kigali, the capital.” No article accompanied the front-page image. The associated article appeared on page six and it included a photograph of a looter in Kigali stepping over a dead body of a Rwandan victim (Schmidt 1994: A6). The article focused again on the evacuation of foreigners while reporting of large-scale massacres in different parts of the country, suggesting an imminent threat to expats. While at times apparently presenting historical perspective by including reference to the
now discredited Hamitic myth, no context was given to explain how the nation-state was set up for failure through a colonial history. The lack of nuanced history supported a stance of non-intervention. Or as Fair and Parks more cynically put it: “Genocide demands actions. Tribal violence does not” (2001: 36). This perspective culminated in the UN unanimously deciding on April 21 to reduce the number of troops in the country to a bare minimum of 270 (Des Forges 1999: 133).

By May 1994, photographs predominantly featured corpses or rebel fighters from the Rwandan Patriotic Front as they advanced on the capital Kigali. Photographs of decomposing bodies in fields (New York Times May 19, 1994: A8), classrooms (New York Times, May 14, 1994: A3), beaches and waterfalls (New York Times, May 21, 1994: A1; May 28, 1994: A1, respectively) are interspersed with images of rebels who appear confident commanding captured Rwandan army perpetrators (New York Times, May 1, 1994: 16), sober in military convoy (New York Times, May 17, 1994: A8), and gloriously "lounging" in the Presidential master suite (New York Times, May 24, 1994: A3). Such pictures certainly supported stereotypes of violence being endemic to Africa and also played into a grotesque entertainment of “delicious horrors”, an unintended, but exploited response to catastrophic events (Rozario 2003; Halttunen 1995). As a consequence of focusing on the advancing rebels and the accumulation of dead bodies, the photographic press presented a narrative that downplayed, obscured and ignored the story of chief importance: that a state sponsored, one-sided mass slaughter was taking place. Among the dead bodies and the fighters there was no discernable victim—at least none that were alive to save—thus no justification for intervention.

Up until this point, there was little in the media coverage with which distant spectators could develop sentiments of solidarity, empathy or anything other than perhaps confusion or revulsion. The photographs did little to explain Belgium’s colonial relationship to Rwanda, or of France's support of the Hutu-extremist Habyarimana regime in hopes of preserving a Francophone Africa (Des Forges 1999: 503).  

106 In the few short decades since Rwanda's independence, the extremist Hutu government had established strong ties with the French government (Des Forges 1999).
assisted in the evacuation of foreign nationals in the first few days of the genocide and a
couple of months later they sent an interventionist force, *Operation Turquoise*, meant to
support the Hutu government against the RPF rebels (Des Forges 1999). Visual culture
worked against Tutsi-Rwandans since they were just one of the unfamiliar tribal names
associated with this bloody African conflict. Their ambiguous association with the
violence contrasted against the white expats early on and against streams of refugees
later on, which further contributed to obscuring the perceptions of distant spectators.

**Aid agencies’ singular vision**

By the middle of May, language used to report the genocide was changing from
"intertribal bloodletting" to "political and ethnic violence", and in some reports
“genocide” was being used. There would remain, however, a decided thinness on the part
of historical analysis even as the genocide was compounded—and eventually
overshadowed—by the emergent refugee crisis. The story increasingly became one in
which “The Flood of People May Overwhelm Aid” (New York Times, May 1, 1994: 16)
became the reason why headlines would change; finally, "The World Turns Its Attention
To Rwanda" (New York Times, May 25, 1994: A1). Media coverage shifted away from
the killings in Rwanda, not because these were subsiding, but because “following
refugees was easier than reporting about mass murder” (Fair and Parks 2001: 36). From
May through to the end of the summer, photographs of refugees dominated. Subsequent
media scholars noted that the news coverage of the refugees was as substantially thin as
that of the genocide itself: it "strip[ped] refugees of place, identity, history, and culture,
thereby creating a humanitarian story that reinforces notions of western benevolence and
African need" and left unacknowledged "complex political events that allowed state-
sanctioned genocide in Rwanda in 1994 and permitted the U.S. government" to avoid
classifying the event at genocide, thus enabling a relinquishment of obligations (Fair and
Parks 2001: 52). In many ways, aid agencies’ campaigns paralleled the thin news media
reporting.  

Some exceptions worth noting included Medecins Sans Frontieres’

---

107 Over the course of May through August 1994, *The New York Times* reproduced seven unique aid
organization appeals to support Rwandans. With the exception of UNICEF, all campaigns focused solely
“Doctors Can’t Stop Genocide” campaign (MSF 2014) and the fact that the ICRC broke from tradition to publicly denounce belligerents during the genocide (Gaillard 2004). Here, I explore how aid agency campaigns in the New York Times perpetuated a narrow vision of victims that did not consider the violence in Rwanda a humanitarian issue.

In early May, groups such as CONCERN Worldwide, the International Rescue Committee (IRC), and CARE placed appeals in The New York Times calling for assistance to those “escaping from hell” (New York Times, May 8, 1994: 18). UNICEF and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) joined in July and August. The majority of the aid organizations selected images of masses of people in transit, or of a lone child staring directly at the camera. The photographs selected by UNICEF and by the JDC represent two opposing poles of the overall spectrum of humanitarian photography mobilized in this moment. In UNICEF’s appeal for “long-term solutions” to the needs of Rwanda’s children, it included a photograph of a woman lying on the ground of what looks to be a refugee camp. She is not looking at the camera. She is smiling as a child, who looks at her and not the camera, playfully climbs on her shoulders. On the very next page of that same July issue, the JDC appeal featured a child apparently crying out in pain. The small body is twisting in what looks like pain; s/he is covered in bandages almost from head to toe. Despite the careful respect from UNICEF and the use of shocking atrocity from the JDC, both appeals—like all the rest—either do not refer to the history behind the conflict at all, or mobilize a very general and sensational history.

On refugees. In the same period, The Globe and Mail ran five different appeals. Oxfam Canada was defining the crisis as genocide as early as May 7.
Some appeals referenced Biblical theses of “exodus” (New York Times, July 29, 1994: A9). Others drew parallels between the Rwandan genocide and other humanitarian crises such as the Cambodian “killing fields”, or disasters and conflicts in Bangladesh, Sudan and Somalia, painting each of these unique situations with the same brush (New York
Times, May 8, 1994: 18 and May 5, 1994: A8). The JDC also turned to a history of genocidal violence experienced by different groups of Americans—namely Jewish and black people in an effort to build solidarity through shared histories of bigotry-based violence (Native Americans were not mentioned) [Fig. 40]. Each of these appeals that associates with historical references operate on a different level to connect with donors: religious, impartial (generic) charity, and common experience of discrimination.

The appeals that did not reference history, focused on the type of care needed, from water and sanitation, to vaccines, clothing, and shelter. CARE asked readers to "Help give the people of Rwanda a chance" (New York Times, July 22, 1994: A7). The image they included was of the iconographic destitute African child, barefoot, dirty and looking directly at the camera. The UNICEF appeal, described above, with the smiling woman and child also sought support for immediate relief and long-term aid. While the imagery between the CARE and the UNICEF appeals are also almost at opposite poles in terms of representing victims in a dignified light, both lack any sort of historical accounting. While this apparently supports fundamental humanitarian principles of neutrality and impartiality, it relies on donors forging bonds through ideas of transcendental universal humanity rather than links to obligations forged in the past. In a media saturated with different forms of human suffering competing for attention globally, historical links offer another source for bolstering the humanitarian impulse. Instead of seeing the victims as victims of violence rooted in deep structures of racism and colonialism, aid agencies just focused on vaccines and food. Care for bare life was at this point the target of aid groups, at the expense of other lives at risk. They certainly did not call on anyone—in Rwanda or outside it—to stop the violence; genocide itself was not presented as the humanitarian crisis.

The Rwandan genocide happened to occur in an era in which humanitarian aid was more synonymous with development assistance in poverty stricken countries. It was an era in which popular living memory of aid was linked to images of 1984 Ethiopian famine or

108 Further reflections and studies on the humanitarian focus on bare life can be found in Giorgio Agamben (1998), Lissa Malkki (1996) and Peter Redfield (2013).
perhaps the 1967-70 famine in Biafra. It was only when masses of people began moving out of Rwanda that the majority of aid organizations began to flood attention on the Great Lakes region of Africa. Rwandans had been presented early on as exotic, tribal, warring, distrustful of outsiders. Rwandans in the early news coverage were not recognized as humanitarian subjects in the way that later refugees would be seen. The focus would then be on camp diseases and a victim unblemished by confusing accounts of tribal warfare and endemic violence. This bias and belief, however, was not to be the reality in the refugee camps, as these places became populated with perpetrators of genocidal killings who were moving out of Rwanda. Presenting a universal victim may be neutral and impartial, but it did little to put pressure on ending the violence, instead it fed into cynical stereotypes of infantile and violent Africa.

In undertaking the exercise of restoring the links to various pasts and potential alternatives, it becomes clearer as to why the disaster in Rwanda was only considered to be such when the obvious humanitarian calamity of the refugee crisis and subsequent cholera outbreak emerged. The framing of the crisis as ancient infighting generated a disaffected view and made it appear that Rwandans were not “our”—distant spectators’—problem. Likewise, the singular vision presented in humanitarian agency appeals narrowly restricted the conception of victims, limiting attention to apparent innocents, those not associated with immediate conflict.

Conclusion

Watching the Bisesero photograph unveils difficult knowledge not just about the horrors of genocide, but also a long history of racial discrimination in Western culture. When links are restored and reestablished, foreign actors' roles are revealed to be more complex, involving many political states with different historical ties to Rwanda. The act of “watching” the picture reveals that no single photograph, nor actions by any media

---

109 As a result of aid organizations not being able to dissipate or manage the continuation of killing in the camps, the aid group Médecins Sans Frontières (incidentally the only aid group along with the International Committee of the Red Cross that had remained in Rwanda during the genocide) pulled out of the camps (Binet 2016).
outlets, could have changed the course of history on its own. This is not to absolve the media industry, but to recognize their forces in shaping spectators' imagination and their limited political influence, which are still deeply entwined.

Although at its core humanitarianism is a moral enterprise, it cannot be denied that it emerged from and remains embedded within a regime with roots in violent social control and dominion. This history is so deeply rooted as to also be inescapable, but in being confronted by the ways it resurfaced and contributed to further harms renders it something that can be—and ought to be—faced head on. This may not have been done during the acute crisis; it can be done in the long period of transition that comes after massive cultural trauma.

The atrocities at Bisesero took place 135 years, almost to the day, after the Battle of Solferino that inspired Henry Dunant to take steps to create a global Red Cross movement. In the 1860s, photography played an exceptional role in expanding spectator’s field of humanitarian vision, bringing the “common soldier” into conceptions of “one of us.” In 1994, press photographs of the genocide were largely shaped by holdovers from regimes many considered to be long past, making it difficult for spectators, and even journalists—at least early on in the genocide—to recognize the violence as something more sinister than civil war, let alone to recognize one’s implication (by proxy of being a member of the supposedly long-dead imperial regimes) in it.

Several decades before Azoulay introduced the idea of “potential history”, and the camera as a means of making a record of an encounter, John Berger wrote this cryptic but intriguing statement: “It is just possible that photography is the prophecy of human memory yet to be socially and politically achieved” ([1978] 2013: 57). With Azoulay’s conception of “potential history”, Berger’s declaration takes on more clarity. In watching a photograph, recognizing it as a record of an encounter, and acknowledging the civic space opened up by the camera and the power differentials between all the people coming in and out of that space throughout the photograph’s social life, there is opportunity to challenge ideologies and rationales underlying decisions made and trajectories taken. Through this act of watching, Azoulay is not proposing to change history, but to change
how its legacies, its memories, are incorporated into the future, for “life with a future can be possible only upon understanding that the future is inseparable from the past, not partitionable” (2013: 574).

While promising, this undertaking still depends on “subjective identities, social positioning, political commitments and moral values of its supporters, donors and workers. (Fehrenbach and Rodogino 2016: 1154). In the case of the violence of Israeli expulsion and exclusion of Palestinians, Azoulay speaks of it in terms of being “constituent violence” supported through laws and a system that obscures the fact of the violence (2013: 550-1). In the case of Bisesero, the ongoing impact of global imperial violence is also embodied in uncritically accepted conventions of media practices and spectating. In order for humans to recognize each other as “being[s] bound up with others” it is up to those making, using, circulating and discussing photographs to think historically, to restore links to different pasts thus restoring links to our mutual obligations (Butler 2009: 180). To move humanitarian photography in this direction, a direction that moves away from conventional victimization and hero narratives and towards acknowledgement of social and political interconnections and of past wrongs requires buy-in from spectators, particularly humanitarian spectators. Watching a picture may be possible with any photograph; but it does not mean that aid agencies can justifiably use any type of photograph in their campaigns. While the Bisesero photograph is a particularly rich example of a photograph that connects distant people to experiences and responsibilities, aid agencies can use photography in ways that are more “radial” as Berger suggested in order to amplify interconnections and responsibilities (2013: 60).  

110 While this poses a creative challenge for aid organizations and visual creators, the essential elements are the inclusion of multiple perspectives and historical reflection.
Chapter 5

Concluding Thoughts

At various times throughout the process of writing this dissertation, I have been asked to explain or justify my case selection. I suspect the recurrence of this inquiry is the result of my having selected cases that are not “iconic.” Indeed, I did not base selection on expected events such as the Biafra or Ethiopian famines, or focus on typical humanitarian victims such as women or children. In the interest of full disclosure, I was initially drawn to the cases I eventually settled on out of pure curiosity: Why had Henry Dunant chosen the words “lamentable pictures” and “framed” the imagery he wrote in his text as though looking at a photograph? Why had I never heard of Lewis Hine having made photographs for the American Red Cross given that both the photographer and the organization continue to be recognized to this day as having been formidable in shaping American social conscience? And, how could humanitarian photography benefit from a close reflection on survivors’ use of one single foreign press photograph at a site commemorating the 1994 Rwandan genocide? Ultimately, I deliberately chose these because they were outliers, unexpected cases, with the understanding that the photographic situation of humanitarianism is greater than cases thus far explored.

From having read much of the literature on histories of humanitarian photography I knew that anxieties, debates, struggles and actions around humanitarian photography constituted more of a recurrent pattern—a humanitarian visual culture of its own—rather than a linear progression. The cases I selected would contribute to the scholarship on humanitarian photography as each of these disparate cases—or any other event of photography associated with humanitarianism for that matter—were ways of accessing and participating in, and giving further shape to discourse and debate on the subject. That is not to say that research into cases such as media representations of the Biafra famine have been exhausted: by no means is that so. Rather, the cases I selected are instructive in their own right about particularities of a time and place, and each demonstrates that the photographic situation of humanitarianism is made up of a multitude of “cases” large and
small, well known and not, and that they overlap in considerable ways. To explore any of them becomes an exploration of the humanitarian project writ large.

I also had educational goals in mind when selecting my cases. I wanted to immerse myself within the literature on the early life of photography within humanitarian practice, thought and discourse with the understanding that insight on the present state of affairs could be gained from historical thinking. To my knowledge, no one has looked at the relationship of nineteenth century photography and Dunant’s initiating the creation of the oldest international aid organization. Since the ICRC was founded on care for wounded combatants, and its inception coincided with some of the earliest combat photography, a case exploring the relation between the two appeared compelling.

I aspired to undertaking original archival research. Lewis Hine’s European-ARC photographs are only a part of his overall corpus for that aid organization, and they represent only a fraction of his overall body of work. Hine’s ARC photography has been underrepresented in scholarship on this photographer. Only two articles appear in the literature that deals with Hine’s American-based ARC photography (Zapatka 1989, 1990). Gutman (1967, 1989) wrote briefly about his time in Europe, with Kaplan (1988) having thus far produced the most comprehensive look at his First World War pictures. While it was a treat to explore underutilized and unpublished pictures from a “father of documentary photography,” discovering how the ARC made use of his pictures proved to be the real education (Denzer 1988).

Finally, I wanted to challenge myself with focusing on one single photograph. Taking my inspiration from exceptional scholars such as Campbell (2010, 2012a), Hariman and Lucaites (2007), Smith (2007), Sliwinski (2009) whose careful attention to singular photographs has enriched thinking about famine iconography, the social-democratic work of iconic photographs, the shifting evidentiary quality of lynchings pictures, and the ways in which physical damage to a photograph constitutes an extension to genocidal violence, respectively. The more I “watched” the photograph on display at the Bisesero memorial site, the more my analysis opened up to additional photographs as they cohered to the relations depicted in Kiley’s image.
In the end, I can say that the cases I selected, each in their own way, seem to have chosen me in that in the process of researching them, the cases refined in unexpected ways. After having conducted archival research at the ICRC Photo Library in Geneva, the City of Geneva Archives and with the Henry Dunant Society, I had to accept that there was little in the historical record to directly associate Dunant to photography. Thus I expanded my scope to the spectators of nineteenth century photography and to Henry Dunant’s “lamentable images.” In so doing, I was able to gain a sense of the ways in which historical events and experiences of viewing photographs in that mid-nineteenth century moment structured feelings around warfare, democracy and citizenship, and around humanitarian action. Changes in those structures of feeling were intimately connected with the new technology of the camera making visible the physical consequences of war and spectators’ responses to those images. The spectators’ affective responses preceded or coincided with Dunant’s appeal for an organization to provide neutral aid to wounded combatants, making possible the ICRC (but not an end to warfare).

Lewis Hine’s collection of European photographs is dominated with photographs of people identified as “refugees.” Given the protracted conflict in Syria giving way to what the United Nations refers to “the greatest humanitarian tragedy of our time” (Jamieson 2013), Chapter Three ultimately focused on refugees and people displaced by the Great War. Exploring Hine’s photographs of refugees in France during the war, and in Italy, the Balkans and Belgium in the war’s immediate aftermath, opened up onto a history of the emergence of this new humanitarian subject. The ways in which the ARC used his photographs facilitated a discussion of the framing and the eventual displacement of refugees from the organization’s visual field as politics changed in that period of transition. Hine’s own blind spot with respect to certain groups he did not consider as refugees, and the ARC’s downplay then eventual displacement of refugees’ needs facilitated refugees being treated the same as immigrants, thus contributing to a pattern in which being shifted out of view exacerbated the vulnerabilities of a group already undermined by territorial displacement.

The expansion of nationalism around the world following the First World War contributed to the twentieth century being marked by numerous refugee crises. Hine’s
refugee photography and it subsequent “loss” in the archives is part of a pattern of the rise and fall in sympathy towards refugees coinciding with their coming in and out view. For Tutsi-Rwandans in 1994, visibility in the foreign press was not enough to build sentiments strong enough to support an earlier intervention in their genocide. In looking at the single photograph displayed at the Bisesero memorial site became an exercise in being guided by the ongoing use of a single photographs to retrace links and responsibilities forged in the past to confront hard truths. Thus making way for a different use of humanitarian photography that is directed more towards building humanitarian relations and sentiments, and that acknowledges and responds to social, political and historical interconnections.

My dissertation was built on “the recognition that the technology of photography is not just operated by people but that it also operates upon them” (Azoulay 2012: 15). To think along with Azoulay over the course of this experience has been formidable. That photography is a “record of an encounter” has particularly captured my imagination. While Azoulay builds on that notion to formulate her “civic imagination” and “political ontology” of photography, I gravitated towards the conception because of its inherent association to human interconnectedness, to being “bound up with others” (Butler 2009: 180). In this configuration, photography bears comparison to the complementary philosophy of understanding put forth by Hans-Georg Gadamer (2004 [1960]). In exploring the phenomenology of human understanding, this German philosopher posited that the act of understanding is dependent upon the interaction of various opinions and biases, perceptions—or horizons—of variously situated individuals. While a hermeneutician, Gadamer’s idea of the “fusion of horizons” is applicable to photographs or any mediation of photographic events because these can equally be read as texts:

A photograph, while recording what has been seen, always and by its nature refers to what is not seen. It isolates, preserves and presents a moment taken from a continuum. … Photography has no language of its own. One learns to read photographs as one learns to read footprints or cardiograms. The language in which photography deals is the language of events. All its references are external to itself. (Berger [1968] 2013: 20).
Gadamer’s ideas are complementary to Azoulay’s by way of the many perspectives—the plurality of vision—converging on one plane or in an ongoing event associated with a photographic moment. The kinship between the two continues. Gadamer’s fusion of horizon recognizes that communication and attempts at understanding is not always monocultural. Understanding is at its most complex when there is no apparent commonality among the horizons that are coming up against each other. For understanding to take place, a fusion must occur. Understanding is dependent upon, and can only be realized when an exchange of meaning and understanding takes place, when fusion occurs. Azoulay’s “restoring and re-establishing links” is a form of fusing horizons. The encounter with photography is always an encounter with our interconnected humanity, and any interpretation is evidence of our interdependence. Thinking of photography as a process of understanding is presumably a good foundation on which to build humanitarian relations among others.

Throughout the history of photography as it has been explored in this dissertation, my focus has revolved around the possibilities and limits of photography in making suffering visible and in shaping people’s understanding thereof. Along the way, its positive power has been shown to be great: sparking international movements and building sympathy for people otherwise overlooked or unseen. It has also been shown to have limits, restricted by users’ and spectators’ own cultural, social and political filters—blind spots that constrain the humanitarian imagination. With these cases and the questions I brought to bear on them, I steered in a direction of connectivity through visibility and the discursive and performative forces of photography. The ability for photography to forge, strengthen, reshape human bonds may be a boon to humanity, but the medium has technical limits of its own—it is only two dimensional and cannot mobilize all our senses—and it is limited by the imaginations of its operators and spectators. As new technologies emerge to enhance or alter photography (e.g., 3D imaging and virtual reality), knowing of the patterns, potentials and pitfalls of those who came before can be humbling and enlightening for those who come after.
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