



**HAL**  
open science

# Magnum Distributions, 1947–1960: Photographers’ Emancipation and Concessions

Clara Bouveresse

► **To cite this version:**

Clara Bouveresse. Magnum Distributions, 1947–1960: Photographers’ Emancipation and Concessions. Photography and Culture, 2021, 14 (1), pp.39 - 50. 10.1080/17514517.2020.1815967 . hal-03592263

**HAL Id: hal-03592263**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03592263>**

Submitted on 1 Mar 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L’archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d’enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## **Magnum Distributions, 1947-1960: photographers' emancipation and concessions**

Clara Bouveresse

Magnum Photos is a legendary photographers' cooperative. Founded in Paris and New York by Robert Capa, Henri Cartier-Bresson, Maria Eisner, George Rodger, David Seymour, Rita and William Vandivert, it produced iconic pictures and helped define and promote the profession of photojournalist. This paper interrogates the agency's contribution to the history of post-war photojournalism during its first years (1947-1960), focusing on the role of "distributions", sets of pictures that were circulated internationally to magazines and partnering agencies.

"Distributions" may be defined on three different levels. A distribution was a numbered set of pictures (prints or slides) with accompanying captions and a presentation text, which composed a story or "reportage". But "distributions" also referred to the circulation of such sets of pictures, which were shipped to magazines and Magnum's partnering agencies around the world. The backs of distribution prints bore the scars of this circulation process: stamps, codes, numbers, annotations. Distributions were thus on one hand a form, a product, the sequencing of pictures to tell and sell a story; on the other hand, a network, the circulation of those stories to the agency's clients. "Distributions" were also an inspirational beacon in the cooperative's culture. Generations of photographers learnt their craft looking at distributions and producing

their own sequences. Distributions represent Magnum's contribution to the tradition of the photo essay and their legacy still inspires documentary projects today. In Magnum's myth, distributions are thus presented as a revolutionary invention that enabled photographers to secure complete control over their work. They embody the cooperative's ideals of freedom and independence. For Magnum's seventieth anniversary in 2017, an exhibition at Le BAL in Paris celebrated early distributions, presenting press prints in a gallery setting and paving the way for the sale of such prints on the art market.

This paper contributes to recent research initiatives exploring the behind-the-scenes of image production, moving beyond the myth surrounding iconic photographs (Morel 2006, Lavoie 2010, Gervais 2015, Hill and Schwartz 2015, Bair 2020). It argues that distributions helped photographers gain independence, but indirectly, as a process rather than a result: they were in fact a stepping stone that enabled Magnum members to support their personal work, which often found its most accomplished expression in photographers' books. Taking into account those three levels – distributions as a form, a network and a beacon –, this research demonstrates how, during the cooperative's first years, distributions represented a compromise between the photographers' visions and the needs of the market. Distributions thus form one specific instance of the famous nexus between words and pictures, and art and journalism.

### **The art of selling distributions: network and product**

Magnum's business plan, outlined by Robert Capa in 1947, consisted in selling the same pictures different times, to as many clients as possible. This model could exist only if photographers retained the rights to their pictures, instead of surrendering them to their clients. The agency functioned as a platform of exchanges between producers (photographers) and clients (magazines). In this context, distributions were a channel

through which pictures were presented, promoted, pitched, and sold. The collective project *Generation X* is the perfect example of a successful distribution: it was sold to more than a dozen magazines internationally, as seen in figure 1<sup>1</sup>. The series presented twenty-four portraits of young people around the world who had just turned twenty. In a shattered post-war context, this project exemplified the cooperative's cosmopolitan, humanist vision, which was famously championed by the Museum of Modern Art curator Edward Steichen in his *Family of Man* exhibition (Berlier 1999). *Generation X* is one of Magnum's famous early group distributions. The cooperative continued to produce collective features on popular subjects. For instance, in 1960, it circulated a distribution on beaches throughout Europe, presenting various vacationing traditions and many young women in bikinis. This attractive and timely summer story was published in the French weekly *Elle* and the Italian magazine *Settimo Giorno*, among others.

Distributions participated in the synching of photographers' vision and magazines expectations. They never represented the sole expression of the photographers' or of Magnum editors' choices. During the cooperative's first years, photographers tended to produce individual pictures instead of sequences. Robert Capa played the role of an editor inside the agency and taught them to produce "stories" composed of pictures imbued with journalistic value. Capa had an acute sense of the market needs. Distributions were a way to package pictures in order to sell them, inviting clients to select as many photographs as possible. The agency considered exploring the market for simple, isolated photographs to be sold to newspapers through a "syndication" scheme, but this proved costly and unsuccessful. The focus thus remained on the magazines' market, with a minimum price of 25 dollars per photograph, prohibitively high for dailies. A list of reference prices was established,

ranging from 50 to 500 USD, with an average of 100 USD for black-and-white images and 200 USD for color. Prices also depended on the size of the image on the page (covers being the most expensive) and on the print run of the magazine.<sup>2</sup>

Magnum gradually devised a system to circulate and sell distributions. During its first year in 1947, the New York office set up a log to register and number each story with its arrival date, the number of prints and the clients to which they were sent: this formed the first “distribution” system. On Mondays, the log was analyzed to determine which clients were next in line for a particular set of pictures. Distributions were indeed to be sent to clients in a strategic order, as their value decreased over time, and the agency sought to attract the highest bidders. In 1955, the New York office also started to sort stories according to their progress, marking each of the 200 topics being processed simultaneously: “S”, for “Suggestion”, the development of an idea; “A”, for “Assignment”, when the shooting took place; and “P”, for “Pictures”, at the postproduction and sales stage. Photographers were told that this “inventory” “may seem like a horrid business-like term for creative activity. But it won’t be confused with your shopping list<sup>3</sup>.”

Magnum operated an international network, with one office in Paris, one in New York, and a circle of agents. The most important clients were American magazines such as *Life*, *Holiday*, *This Week*, *Look*, *The Ladies Home Journal*, etc. American weeklies were richer than their European counterparts, benefiting from the strength of the dollar as an international currency. Magnum offices shared information on potential clients, market research, on-going stories, and sent one another prints and negatives. Speed was central to successful sales, especially at the end of the 1950s when magazines set up shorter deadlines and jet planes sped up the circulation of both pictures and

photographers<sup>4</sup>. The New York office opened its own lab in 1957 to offer personalized and faster services.

At the end of the 1950s, the agency also defined typical sale agreements. There were two types of rights for images: single reproduction for one publication, or exclusive rights for a certain region, such as first world rights or first US rights. Instead of getting assignments, Magnum preferred to secure “guarantees”, whereby the client asserted her interest in the story and would get a first look on the results. Guarantees enabled Magnum to negotiate prices after production, and to retain the rights to the images. The cooperative also tried to encourage independent production through various funds or internal percentage incentives. In 1957, half of the agency stories were initiated by photographers or staff, half came from clients’ assignments.

Selling pictures remained a tough business, highly uncertain and precarious, threatened by misunderstandings and delays. Editors could approve a story idea but reject the resulting pictures. Disappointed photographers would then resent their clients or feel betrayed. Success depended on good relations with clients, and Robert Capa spent a lot of time befriending editors, inviting them for dinners and magnificent parties conveying an appealing Magnum image. They were also encouraged to meet photographers on the occasion of Magnum’s annual meetings, to discuss their expectations and potential stories.<sup>5</sup>

Magnum’s relations with its clients thus swayed between friendship and conflict.<sup>6</sup> The agency’s story is often recounted in terms of conflict, which makes for a powerful narrative; and indeed a fight was waged which profoundly marked the profession.

### **Defending photographers’ rights and profession**

Distributions could yield profit only if the agency retained the rights to the pictures, in

order to sell them to different clients. Magnum participated in the juridical fight for the recognition of photographers' status as authors. The cooperative could be compared to a union: the coalition of photographers enabled them to enforce their demands<sup>7</sup>. Magnum used stamps asserting the copyright's terms on the backs of prints<sup>8</sup>. The founding members were experienced photographers who had produced celebrated pictures: they knew that some images could be reprinted over the years and gain a historical value. Robert Capa had published *Slightly Out of Focus*, an autobiographic and mythologized account of his adventures as a reporter, the year Magnum was founded, already fueling and capitalizing on the iconic aura of his Second World War pictures. Magnum thus started resisting the practices of clients who used to retain negatives and claimed to be owners of the work as they had assigned it; in this context, the focus on independent production, with sales coming only afterwards, was essential.

Magnum photographers had other demands: they wanted captions in line with their intentions, to limit cropping and to offer tighter selections instead of the 500 pictures required by some magazines. Distributions were instrumental in affirming these demands: they offered a framework to present organized sequences of photographs with captions and a narrative. In 1947, Robert Capa famously asserted a certain control over the captions accompanying his exclusive USSR pictures; Henri Cartier-Bresson did the same after his return from China in 1954 (Janssens and Kalff 1994, 233-234).

Magnum photographers also belonged to the American Society of Magazine Photographers (ASMP), which started defending photographers' rights in 1949. Its first president, Philippe Halsman, was a Magnum contributor. In 1951, the ASMP enacted its *Code of Minimum Standards*, which established acceptable rates for stringers.

The statement of *Camera* magazine editor and Magnum friend Romeo Martinez may thus be qualified: "Capa and his friends invented authors rights in photography"

(Lacouture 1989, 48). First, the twentieth century is characterized by a continuous expansion of the protection of author rights to many different fields. Second, the agency had allies in this battle, which participated in a larger movement of recognition of photojournalism as a profession.

The profession became indeed increasingly institutionalized, with its codes, its culture and its standards. In 1955, the first World Press Photos contest in Amsterdam marked a moment of self-definition for photojournalists. The contest's leaflet even included a cartoon of the typical fiery reporter (figure 2). Photojournalists started retracing their own history, enhancing such founding figures as Erich Salomon. In 1958, the cooperative discussed the possibility of representing Erich Salomon's archive. Photographers stated their allegiance to his legacy: "this offer is a great honor to Magnum, since the tradition of photo-journalism was really started and established by Dr Salomon, and Magnum truly following this tradition"<sup>9</sup>. Robert Capa, for his part, embodied the character of the heroic reporter, traditionally presented as the greatest war photographer of all times<sup>10</sup>. He always made a point to define himself as a journalist, and prompted others at Magnum, most notably Henri Cartier-Bresson, to do the same<sup>11</sup>.

The agency hence played a key role in the recognition of the profession of photojournalist, along with other institutions like the ASMP or the World Press Photo<sup>12</sup>. Part of this recognition was built through discourses opposing photographers to photo editors, as well as text and pictures.

### **The vocal conflict between photographers and photo editors**

Magnum played a mythic role in the self-assertion of photographers against picture editors. Even such a famous and successful distribution as *Generation X* had required a lot of fighting to convince magazine editors to run it. Robert Capa, at the forefront of these battles, eloquently voiced his frustrations:



I sold GX [*Generation X*]. All this meant lots of hustling because New York editors are stupid and scared and it takes people to be seen at the same magazine before you can straighten out the smaller matter, for which finally they pay a ridiculously low sum<sup>13</sup>.

Magnum member Erich Lessing also reflected on this uneven “photographer-editor relationship”, and wondered whether photographers should accept to be “recording machines”. Discouraged, he concluded: “But who are we to give orders to H. Luce? So we remain objective recorders and give everybody who buys our pictures the right to edit, choose and distort”<sup>14</sup>. Dispiriting Henry Luce was a powerful magazine magnate who managed the *Time* group, which included *Life* magazine. Robert Capa had provocatively given Magnum the nickname “Time Inc. Stink Club.” He strategically presented the cooperative as a clique of insubordinate troublemakers defying the authority of the *Time* group – many had joined Magnum after quitting its magazines. Stories on the agency stage this revolt of the founders against the constraints of magazines, stressing their freedom and independence, with particular emphasis on the conflict with *Life* magazine. Wilson Hicks, *Life* editor from 1937 to 1950, was deemed an authoritarian dictator, pushing photographers in the background, using them as producers of raw material which he only knew how to select, crop, caption and sequence. Until the 1960s, *Life* editors even prepared “scripts” with detailed indications on the kind of pictures they expected for each story (Loengard 1998). Magnum member Ernst Haas thus pitied his *Life* colleagues: “only to watch them sitting in an office waiting for an assignment, made me yawn and shiver”<sup>15</sup>.

The conflict with *Life* often revolved around Henri Cartier-Bresson, a reputed figure who stood for Magnum’s principles. In 1949, Magnum president Maria Eisner feared that *Life* would attempt to “steal” Magnum’s star photographer to muffle the “insurgents”<sup>16</sup>. The year after, when Henri Cartier-Bresson won the Overseas Press

Club award for his work in Shanghai, Magnum and *Life*, which had published the pictures, fought over who should represent him at the ceremony. Magnum president Maria Eisner finally had to yield, but *Life's* editor, Ed Thompson, paid a fair-play tribute to Magnum in his speech, describing the cooperative as “a very special group of first-class people who cover the important events the world over”<sup>17</sup>.

Indeed, Magnum and *Life* were not only opponents: they were also partners. *Life* was one of the agency's most important and prestigious clients<sup>18</sup>. In fact, Magnum and *Life* had many things in common. Both claimed to inherit the tradition of the photo essay, and to represent excellence in their field. Moreover, *Life* was not always portrayed in such a dim light. The magazine was careful to frame its own prestigious story, and *Life* photographers have been recounting their adventurous lives just as Magnum reporters did. *Life* photographers, in the field, would not necessarily go by the book and follow their scripts. Magnum and *Life* photographers both had in fact to adapt, though through different channels, to the constraints of their trade.

### **“Is the photographer the best judge of his own pictures?”**

The relation between photographer and editor was thus one of power, cooperation, and conflict: the same goes with writers and their editors, as studies of newsroom politics have shown (Darnton 1975). Journalists tended to be vocal about their independence but they had to please editors behind the scenes. During the 1950s, photographers nonetheless stated loud and clear their rights as authors and questioned the power of picture editors. In February 1958, *Popular Photography* magazine went as far as to ask this provocative question: “Is the photographer the best judge of his own pictures?” The “pros” summoned to tackle this issue were none others than photo editors: the process amounted to asking them whether their job made any sense, as it was their role, precisely, to judge pictures. Unsurprisingly, they all answered that photographers

needed a critical, external point of view to improve, preventing them from being blinded by the intentions and emotions they may have projected onto their pictures.

One of the respondents was Magnum's editor, John Morris. It was his job to edit pictures, and like his colleagues, he could not undermine his own position. Yet he also represented a cooperative of photographers who advocated control over their work. He thus opted for a diplomatic answer: yes, photographers may be the best judges of their pictures; but they must submit to the constraints of the publication and adapt to the clients' needs. His role at Magnum was precisely to act as a go-between for photographers and clients, that is, magazine editors. This was a difficult position, where he had to balance clients' and photographers' visions, to make up for misunderstandings, soothe resentments and disappointments. He advised photographers, promoted their work and selected pictures with or without them – a process described as “boiling down” stories. In the mid-fifties, there were two stages of selection: a first choice of thirty to fifty pictures, and then a set of six to eight pictures distributed internationally<sup>19</sup>.

Photographers were often disappointed by these tight edits, but it would have been too expensive to circulate large sets. Yet they preferred to rely on their in-house editor, to make the selection inside the agency, instead of surrendering control to their clients. This was what differentiated Magnum's products: it did not deliver raw images, but indeed “distributions,” constructed narratives. Distributions were a first step, a channel and a compromise to negotiate the difficult photographer-editor relationship.

### **Eloquent pictures**

Distributions also redefined the relation between text and images. Magnum members argued that pictures were not mere illustrations, but could convey a story in their own right. Distributions helped to imbue photographs with specific narrative qualities. The

journalistic legitimacy of images was built in relation to text and inherited from certain conventions. Distributions texts were indeed written by editors and/or photographers in an informative style following the classic inverted-pyramid structure. Robert Capa typically advised Magnum members to avoid a “literary style”<sup>20</sup>. He reminded them not to cram their accounts with editorial comments, and more importantly, to let pictures speak for themselves: this would become a Magnum motto.

Pictures were not only on a par with texts, they progressively supplanted them: certain pictures were “worth a thousand words”, stated the already fashionable formula. The long-desired legitimacy of photographs was achieved to such an extent that they were given a fascinating power. This benefited both photographers and magazines in their self-promotion. In January 1958 for instance, *Photography for Men* boasted to present Magnum “journalistic gems”, which had the miraculous ability to “relive the past, know the present and see the future”.

### **Silent photographers**

Such eloquence of images paved the way for a new stance of Magnum photographers, who chose to become silent. They refused to comment on their pictures; words would have indeed threatened to shadow the strength of their vision.

In 1957, the American Society of Magazine Photographers published its first annual volume of pictures<sup>21</sup>. Three of the Magnum members showcased in the book dismissed the very idea of discussing their images. Ernst Haas took a modest, humble stance:

If one tries to take pictures which stand alone and speak for themselves, it is as difficult as it is embarrassing to add words of explanation [...] I am glad to cease writing and give the following pages of pictures which seem to be much more of an expression of myself than these frustrated words.

Elliott Erwitt was rather clear-cut:

Little is more irritating to me than photographers pontificating about photography or talking about their pictures in public, unless these photographers have just come back from China or the moon, or have something very particular to say, or a great new technique and approach to talk about, or are interesting and intelligent personalities. They should stick to talking through their pictures.

But of course the palm for concision belonged to none other than Henri Cartier-Bresson, who presented his portfolio with just two sentences: “France is my country, and these are just a few glimpses at a 100th of a second. I prefer to let these photographs speak for themselves”. In fact, Henri Cartier-Bresson was a repeat offender in muteness. In 1955, he had declined to express himself during a panel in his honor at the Museum of Modern Art. He then wrote a letter of apologies:

What one has to say is expressed in one’s work more than one’s face. To my mind, it is a distortion of a romantic attitude to consider that the life of a person is more important or intriguing than his work. The *hows* are not important. It is the outcome that counts. The results have to mature in silence and with a certain amount of secrecy, which is necessary for meditation.<sup>22</sup>

Paradoxically, such a declaration may tease the readers’ curiosity. It feeds a fascination for Henri Cartier-Bresson’s mysterious persona, which he claimed should remain behind the scenes. He did not deny the importance of the “secrecy” surrounding his character. The photographer’s withdrawal thus helped to reassert his mysterious genius.

But photographers’ silence could become deafening, and threaten the very business of distributions. Pictures without text had no journalistic value, or so complained Magnum editors. They wished photographers would spend more time captioning, editing and archiving their work. Some photographers were reluctant to do

so as they felt awkward with words. Others just lacked time or desire to comply, dropping pictures at the office with no explanation and running on to the next job. Cornell Capa forcefully contrasted the thrills of production and the burden of postproduction, “the joy of taking pictures first and then the pain of being confronted with the mountains of contact prints on one’s return.”<sup>23</sup>

The photographers’ reluctance to bother with distributions led John Morris, in 1958, to provocatively state that it would be best for Magnum if all photographers stopped production for a month. This would have created time to edit and process the pictures accumulating in the office. He called for a refining of the distribution process, with more investment of photographers’ time and ideas:

In brief, we have got to abandon the notion that a story consists of a set of a dozen or so prints with captions and a brief introduction, laid down on an editor’s desk. Our present procedure could be compared to a writer who turns in a set of notes to an editor, and calls it a story. But worse than that, in most cases, we don’t even have the notes – the great bulk of our contact prints are without words at all. Their value, in this stage, is a value only as Art – almost worthless as Journalism.<sup>24</sup>

John Morris interestingly summoned the opposition between art and journalism, which crystallized as the profession defined itself.

Magnum then-president Cornell Capa, brother of the founding member Robert Capa, supported his views:

Magnum is still living in an unresolved turmoil of curious heritage and myth. This is “photographers don’t need direction and words are not necessary.” Most of our operational and editorial problems stem from this indecision. Photo-journalism, as it is practiced on both sides of the Atlantic and as a matter of pure form, must include images and some word information.<sup>25</sup>

Distributions disrupted the traditional prevalence of text over images. But when text was entirely dismissed, images moved into the realm of art. Journalism still

depended on the interaction between both forms, a dialogue at play in exemplary distributions, which were to include exceptional images and compelling text.

### **Distributions, a beacon in post-war photojournalism**

Distributions enabled photographers to redefine the relation between text and pictures, giving images narrative qualities and journalistic value, to such extent that at the end of the 1950s, text seemed irrelevant. Yet silent photographs could not perform their journalistic duties. The institutionalization of photojournalism emancipated photographers with such success that they abandoned the constraints pertaining to the profession, the obligation to write texts and captions, and turned towards artistic ventures. Journalistic legitimacy paved the way for a cultural recognition that took away certain photographers from the press. The affirmation of the profession was built through a series of oppositions against picture editors, between text and pictures, and it contained the seeds of the classic opposition of art and journalism. Distributions were central to these shifts, and remained inspiring beacons for generations of photographers, renewing the legacy of the photo essay. Distributions did not express the vision of an individual, but the compromise where Magnum met its clients and its public, defining new markets and new values for photographs. They took part in the editing process that would culminate in photographers' books, which were better suited to the expression of personal choices.

Distributions provide a revealing framework to examine how the agency helped renew and promote the profession of photojournalist. It was, with other institutions, at the forefront of the fight for the recognition of photographers' rights. This crusade for legitimacy is often recounted in epic terms. Magnum's captivating anecdotes give a heroic shape to the character of the reporter. The cooperative's myth is in itself a major contribution to the profession, serving as a model for generations of amateurs and

aspiring photographers. Magnum also defined a model of iconic pictures, imbued with journalistic value and potential to become historic landmarks. It expanded the realm of photojournalism, setting the terms of on-going debates, building oppositions between “hard news” and “in-depth reporting”, “icons” and “documentary”, “journalism” and “art”.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> *Holiday* (United-States), *Point de Vue Images du Monde* (France), *Katholieke Illustratie* and *Panorama* (Netherlands), *Epoca* (Italy), *Aktuell* (Norway), *Famillie Journal* (Denmark and Sweden), *Zondagsvriend* (Belgium), *Soir Illustré* (Belgium), *De Spaarnestad* (Holland), *Das Ufer* (Germany), *Du* (Switzerland), *Femina* (Denmark).

<sup>2</sup> John G. Morris, “A report on 1957 operations,” March 15, 1958, MF010-003-019, Magnum Foundation, New York.

<sup>3</sup> John G. Morris, “Current Story Inventory Forms,” April 2, 1955, AG 33, box 48, Center for Creative Photography (CCP), Tucson, AZ.

<sup>4</sup> “Since the founding of Magnum, the photographic market has gone through a complete change and a considerable dislocation. During the past four years it has accelerated, and in the present one, the ‘jet age’ is really effecting us with the critical shortening of the deadlines and hardening of market demands for preferential handling.” Cornell Capa, “Where is Magnum Going?” December 28, 1959, AG 199, box 3, CCP.

<sup>5</sup> Cornell Capa, “Revised schedule of Meetings,” 1959, MF010-004-001, Magnum Foundation, New York.

<sup>6</sup> Robert Capa, “Report to the stockholders of Magnum,” February 15, 1952, MF010-004-001, Magnum Foundation, New York.

<sup>7</sup> “Our ‘hardened’ policy of retaining negatives is meeting softening resistance.” Cornell Capa, informal report, August 22, 1957, Magnum Foundation, New York. See also John G. Morris, “Magnum Memo #98”, New York, April 6, 1957. AG 199, box 4, CCP.

<sup>8</sup> “This photograph can be reproduced only with accompanying caption or with text strictly in the spirit of its caption”, “Summary of Magnum meetings in Paris, June 29- July 3 1954,” MF010-004-001, Magnum Foundation, New York.



- 
- <sup>9</sup> “Minutes of the Executive Committee and Board Meetings,” April 7, 1958, MF010-003-019, Magnum Foundation, New York.
- <sup>10</sup> He gained this reputation with his coverage of the Spanish Civil War: “The Greatest War Photographer in the World,” *Picture Post* 1:10 (December 3, 1938), 13.
- <sup>11</sup> He warned Henri Cartier-Bresson against the Surrealist artist “label” (Janssens and Kalf, 1994: 226-7).
- <sup>12</sup> “Magnum has upheld and in many instances spearheaded all efforts to maintain and advance ethical practices in the fields dealing with photographers and photographs.” Cornell Capa, “Magnum’s State of Health, November 1956 to January 1959,” MF010-004-001, Magnum Foundation, New York.
- <sup>13</sup> Letter from Robert Capa to George Rodger, January 16, 1952, Jinx Rodger private archives.
- <sup>14</sup> Erich Lessing, letter from Geneva, December 20, 1956, quoted in “Magnum memo #87,” December 28, 1956, AG 33, box 48, CCP. Interestingly, Erich Lessing’s thoughts were quoted in a Magnum memo and circulated to all photographers: this exemplifies how the debate on photographers’ status was at play within the cooperative.
- <sup>15</sup> Letter from Ernst Haas to Robert Capa and Maria Eisner, translated from German and sent by Maria Eisner to Henri Cartier-Bresson on December 15, 1949, Henri Cartier-Bresson Foundation.
- <sup>16</sup> Letter from Maria Eisner to Eli Cartier-Bresson, February 4, 1949, Henri Cartier-Bresson Foundation.
- <sup>17</sup> Maria Eisner memo to Henri Cartier-Bresson on the Overseas Press Club Award, March 16, 1950, Henri Cartier-Bresson Foundation.
- <sup>18</sup> Standing up against *Life* had financial consequences. In 1955, Henri Cartier-Bresson had already published almost 100 pages of pictures in *Life* (97 pages and a half, according to the Bulletin, “What’s with Magnum?” June 3, 1955, AG 33, box 48, CCP).
- <sup>19</sup> John G. Morris, “Memo on the European Distribution System,” June 19, 1956, MF011-001-001/2, Magnum Foundation.
- <sup>20</sup> Letter from Robert Capa to George Rodger, January 16, 1952, Jinx Rodger private archives.
- <sup>21</sup> Mason, Jerry (ed.), 1957. *Picture, American Society of Magazine Photographers Picture Annual*. New York, Ridge Press/Simon and Schuster: 142. Magnum Foundation, New York.
- <sup>22</sup> During an American Society of Magazine Photographers (ASMP) panel on the occasion of a presentation of Henri Cartier-Bresson’s work at the Museum of Modern Art, New York.

---

Letter from Henri Cartier-Bresson to ASMP members quoted in the Bulletin, "What's with Magnum?" 3 June 1955, AG 33, box 48, CCP.

<sup>23</sup> Letter from Cornell Capa to Erich Hartmann, January 29, 1957, MF010-004-001, Magnum Foundation, New York.

<sup>24</sup> John G. Morris, "Special Memo," April 30, 1958, AG 33, box 48, CCP.

<sup>25</sup> Cornell Capa, "Where is Magnum Going?" December 28, 1959, AG 199, box 3, CCP.

## References

Bair, Nadya, 2020. *The Decisive Network. Magnum Photos and the Postwar Image Market*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Berlier, Monique, 1999. "The Family of Man: Readings of an Exhibition." In *Picturing the Past: Media, History and Photography*, edited by Bonnie Brennen and Hanno Hardt. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press: 206-241.

Darnton, Robert, 1975. "Writing News and Telling Stories." *Daedalus*, Spring 104: 175-194.

Gervais, Thierry, in collaboration with Gaëlle Morel, 2015. *La Fabrique de l'information visuelle, photographies et magazines d'actualité*. Paris: Textuel.

Hill, Jason E and Vanessa R. Schwartz, 2015. *Getting the Picture: The Visual Culture of the News*. London, New York: Bloomsbury.

Janssens, Rudolf and Gertjan Kalff, 1994. "Time Incorporated Stink Club: The Influence of Life on the Founding of Magnum." In *American Photographs in Europe*, edited by David E. Nye and Mick Gidley. Amsterdam: VU University Press: 233-234.

Lacouture, Jean, 1989. "Les pères fondateurs." In *Magnum, 50 ans de photographies*, edited by Jean Lacouture, William Manchester, Fred Ritchin. Paris: Nathan: 48.

Lavoie, Vincent, 2010. *Photojournalismes. Revoir les canons de l'image de presse*. Paris: Hazan.

Loengard, John, 1998. *Life Photographers, What They Saw*. Boston, Mass.: Little Brown.

Morel, Gaëlle, 2006. *Le photoreportage d'auteur. L'institution culturelle de la photographie en France depuis les années 1970*. Paris, CNRS.

---

## Figure captions

Figure 1. Magazines which published the ‘Generation X’ distribution, presentation for the Columbia Missourian award to the project, April 30, 1954, Magnum Foundation archives, New York.

Figure 2. *De Fotojournalist*. *Officieel orgaan van de nederlandse vereniging van fotojournalisten*, cover of the Journal of the First World Press Photo Contest 1956, Magnum Foundation archives, New York.