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I became involved in the study of California photographers quite by accident. In the spring of 1971 I went into a small antique store not far from my home and was asked: “What do you collect?” “Nothing,” I said, but the proprietor persisted. “What do you do for a living?” “I am a photographer,” I replied. A few minutes later she presented me with a double handful of carte-de-visite and cabinet card portraits with the comment: “These will get you started.” Later, I was astonished to find that each photograph included the photographer’s name and that they were all from my local area. Moreover, I had never heard of any of them. From this tiny nucleus of images, I have acquired—over a period of 20 years—a collection in excess of 100,000 photographs. Each of these has been keyed to my listing of some 10,000 photographers (and related trades within the photographic industry) who were active in California photography before 1910.

In the beginning I did not have a clue as to how or where to begin my study of local photographers. I had never conducted research, nor had I received any training in the systematic study of historical artifacts, nor did I know anyone who had. Over the intervening two decades that I have studied the photographers of California, I have made mistakes, missed opportunities, and struggled to find the ways and means of recording their lives and works. Many of my methods are homegrown and most lack the stamp of approval of “Better Academics Everywhere.”

The following account traces my techniques and experiences studying one region’s photographic heritage. I break my research methods into three broad categories: assemble—evaluate—disseminate.

---

ASSEMBLE

Assembly, for me, means the process of gathering together the resources that will enable me to investigate the existence of photographers within my sphere of study. This includes gathering photographs, researching public records, and systematically reviewing the literature of the past.

I have read (i.e. scanned for notices, comments, etc.) nearly every newspaper published in California before 1865, and for some counties, every newspaper before 1920. Each census from 1850-1920 has been searched for possible members of the photographic trade. I am also an avid reader of any and all photography-related publications. In California this includes *The Pacific Coast Photographer* (1892-1894) and *Camera Craft* (1900-1942), both published in San Francisco.

To this has been added a national search of photographic periodicals, where frequently I will find mention of California photographers as early as the 1850s. Particularly useful are “paid-in” biographical mentions and sketches of prominent citizens often found in the local and county histories which were popular in the late 19th and early 20th century.

Because I lack formal training in the proper use of library keys and techniques, I have compensated by becoming a browser. When open stacks are available, I will often browse each book on every shelf looking for potential ideas and information. Consequently, I have found numerous useful items which could not have been found using standard library data bases. Also, such browsing has often led to new avenues of investigation that would not have occurred to me otherwise.

While I am certain that many of my colleagues also use these same data-gathering techniques, I believe that I am unusual in at least two areas: first, that I record anyone involved in almost any aspect of the photography industry. This means gallery clerks, retouchers, and photo-printers, as well as gallery owners; Kodak sales people and those involved in photo-lithography; likewise, advanced amateur photographers, camera-club members, and fine-art (or salon) participants. I even record those who can be...
shown to have worked in the photographic optics industry or photographic product production generally. (I will include a motion-picture projectionist but not a "photo-play" actor, for example.)

The second aspect, which is probably unusual, is that I value any type of information whether it relates directly to photography or not, so long as it can be tied to the life of someone who once worked in California photography. In practice this means that I try to document an individual's entire life, even if they only spent a brief time in California or in the photographic trade. I am especially interested in those photographers who, unlike Ansel Adams, failed to achieve prominence in their own lifetimes, as well as the role of women in the photographic industry (which ran to at least 20% of the trade by 1910).

My data-collecting methods are simple (perhaps "archaic" is a better word). Whenever possible I try to obtain a physical copy (xerox, for example) of the entire page or document where information is found. This reference copy is marked with the source citation and filed in a standard 9-by-12 manila folder under the photographer's name. I have never been very successful in making citation file cards and I have enjoyed having the collateral information available. (For instance, a page with a photographer's advertisement may also contain advertisements for other local businesses and situations which enable me to better understand the sociology of the era in question.)

Where possible, these pages are arranged chronologically in each photographer's folder. In instances where a single page may contain references to more than one photographer, the page is xeroxed as many times as there are different individuals. My single best investment for photographic research has been a xerox copier and I make at least 50,000 copies per annum. I also like to make xerox copies (front and rear) of all original photographs and other illustrations and file these reproductions along with my basic biographical files. Likewise, when studying a specific photographer, I will xerox any and all references to that photographer from standard sources and add them to the file.

I began to collect original photographs largely because I found that in order to illustrate an article it could cost several hundred dollars when illustrations had to be purchased from historical agencies such as the California Historical Society. I discovered that this same money easily brought me large numbers of original photographs which I could use without institutional restrictions. My only criterion for acquiring original photographs (aside from their cost) is that they be maker-marked or otherwise linked to a California photographer. A major emphasis has been placed on the collection of California stereographs. Because stereographs are a published form of photography, they enable me to study trends in marketing, etc. I have about 5000 California-subject stereographs representing over 500 different photographers, publishers and/or distributors, and it is probably the best such study collection available anywhere.

In my opinion there is no substitute for an opportunity to examine original artifacts directly, not only for the obvious information they contain, but also for the more subtle awareness such handling provides—something I often refer to as finding "the fingerprints of the artist."

In addition to the aforementioned resources, I have produced a staggering number of copy negatives and prints over the years. This production is an ongoing facet of my research. One technique, which I use whenever possible in data gathering, is a hand-held 35mm camera with which I make snapshots of all kinds of field data. I use Tri-X film, employ available light and a lens which will focus down to about two inches. I take photos of all accession information, the object itself (front, back and any special details), and even "shoot" some of my own hand-written notes. In one case, where I was using card-access files, I made more than 700 negatives in a four-hour period. (To have done this note-taking by hand would have required weeks.) I have used these 700 negatives hundreds of times during the ten or more years since they were taken. Each negative
is also filed under the photographer's name and is seldom actually printed; instead, I often use a loupe to read the data thereon. When prints are needed, I use outdated printing paper which I "quickprint," which is to say that I do not make any attempt toward "archival" processing, etc. These prints receive only a brief rinse and are hung up to dry after which a xerox copy is made and the photo-print discarded.

I strongly recommend the hand-held camera for note taking. Usually, however, I have to convince an archive attendant that my procedure is both quiet and non-damaging to their collections. Another concern is that I might have made a "reproducible" negative and they will have lost control of its use. Basically you need to negotiate the use of a camera, but the results are well worth the effort.

With the exception of xeroxing, I treat my original photographs with the utmost respect. Each is archivally sleeved in transparent mylar. I absolutely recommend clear sleeves so that the artifact may be viewed without taking it out of its protective cover. I also store my photographs flat rather than on end. (Stereographs, however, because of the curved cards, are stored vertically.) I find this is essential in order to keep them in good condition. Each photographer is identified by a notation written on the edge of 2-ply archival board (and visible when the drop-front is opened) which is used to separate each photographer. I also use the 2-ply board where needed to stabilize the photographs themselves. Case art and tintypes, etc., are stored in their own section. I use drop-front boxes in two basic sizes: 8-by-10 (for all photographs up to that size) and 11-by-14 (for photographs of intermediate size). I also use oversize boxes when needed. My photographers are further divided into those active before 1900 and those active after 1900.

Copy negatives are made on a regular basis; first, for all images of recognized importance, and then as part of the ongoing publication process. I make my 4-by-5 negatives on a process camera; 35mm negatives are often made for less critical needs.

I also maintain a specific archive of images relating to my home county (Humboldt County, California) to which I add resources dating from the present day. My "greater California" photographers are collected mainly before 1940. In addition, I collect writings by or about California photographers.

I make every effort to obtain reproductions of important illustrations as I go along rather than at the end of a research project. Thus, when the research is finished, I can move directly into a publishing mode without the hassle of trying to obtain illustrations (often a lengthy and frustrating task) at the end of the project.

Finally, it is essential to have basic reference tools such as books and periodicals relating to the field. Because I am nearly 300 miles from a major library, I have felt compelled to assemble my own reference library. I subscribe to most journals in the field and have made the collection of out-of-print periodicals a priority. Many of these long-ago periodicals are invaluable, both for the information they contain and as sources of illustrations for ongoing work.

---

**Peter E. Palmquist**
EVALUATE

The most basic part of evaluating historical evidence is to determine "fields of study" as well as to create consistent access to these fields. In my case, everything is filed "by photographer." My vertical files are arranged by photographer as are my collected photographs. Even my reference library is organized, wherever possible, in patterns that reflect my major areas of interest.

My techniques for evaluating the data collected is based on a mixture of traditional and common sense approaches; review the literature, summarize the assembled data, examine and record information found on collected artifacts, etc.

The first major task is to establish the full name of the photographer or subject. Proper name spelling is frequently a problem since primary sources often contain blunders of amazing proportions. Until I am fully satisfied that I have correctly established the subject's name, I retain all name and spelling variants. Not surprisingly, one of the biggest challenges is deciphering the handwriting of census-takers. Determining occupation can also be a problem. In the 1910 census, for instance, almost anyone connected with the photography industry was called a "photographer" even though other evidence clearly indicated that they worked as a photo-finisher, or in some other behind-the-scenes occupation.

Once a name has been established, I try to follow the subject through the census, directories, photographic journals and newspapers. Although reading miles of newsprint is difficult and time consuming it is one of the very best resources for evaluating the life activities of a photographer. In one case I noticed that there seemed to be a gap in a certain photographer's production. This puzzle was solved by finding that the photographer had been involved in a serious buggy accident and had been unable to work for a period of nearly a year. Newspapers (especially the gossip columns) also provide first-hand information about the photographer's family (if any) as well as serving as an excellent record of his or her advertising habits.

Over the years I have come to treat photographic partnerships as separate items, so that "Smith," "Jones," and "Smith & Jones" are considered three different entities. Certain other topical fields are also maintained, such as the "California Camera Club" or the "San Francisco Photographic Salons," etc. Women in the history of photography is another interest and one which I research on an international front in addition to those whose activities were limited to California.

The second major task—once a sizeable body of material has been assembled—is to create a chronology of the photographer's life. I find this an essential step on the road to understanding a photographer's life. With a completed chronology in hand, it is easy to identify areas requiring further research. Much of my work consists of arranging tiny bits of information, no small amount of which may be contradictory.

In some cases it takes dozens of bits of circumstantial tidbits combined to indicate a fact. My work on Carleton E. Watkins brings this process home. The San Francisco earthquake and fire not only destroyed Watkins' gallery and archive of photographs; it also destroyed the business and personal records of a lifetime. As a consequence of this great loss of primary resources, I have tried to encircle rather than begin my research in the center of things (i.e. San Francisco). Major pieces of the Watkins puzzle were found as far away as Vermont and smaller pieces were found in well over 200 different locations in America and several in Europe. Although I first began work on Watkins in the early 1970s, I am still finding elements and "missing links" to what is best described as "a complex biographical maze."

Mostly I have resisted the impulse to "attribute" photographs to a photographer on the basis of pictorial style alone. I usually resort to this method only after having

Fig. 5 Advertisement for G. Ambrose, Sacramento City Directory (1850s).
collected or examined large numbers of vintage prints over a period of years. Some traits, however, are almost impossible to ignore. One photographer virtually always left a bit of untrimmed area on the edges of his photographic prints. The kicker was that each print was untrimmed on three of the four edges; never four, two or one. When I say that I have avoided dating and attribution on stylistic considerations, this does not mean that I have not looked for possible commonalities of studio backdrop, posing chair, patterns in studio floor tile, etc., with an eye to linking unknown work to identified examples from a known studio.

One of my better traits, which has served me well in evaluating photographs, is that I have spent over 35 years as a professional photographer. As a consequence, I am accustomed to handling photographic images and also have very strong ideas of how a photographer actually works. I believe I am one of only a handful of historians of photography who has been employed in the trade. Because I have lived a photographer’s life, I am much more inclined to document the commonplace rather than limit my search to the so-called “masterpiece” examples of a photographer’s output. My contention that Watkins was first and foremost a “commercial photographer” is a case in point.

I have sometimes been asked to compare the role of the photographic historian with that of an art historian. My glib answer is that the art historian “builds the pyramid of knowledge from the point down” while the photographic historian “builds from the ground up.” I feel that the art historian approach has done a considerable amount of disservice to photographic history due to the lack of basic documentation across the field. An example may be made of a well-known art historian who contended that Watkins’ New Series work represented a decline in his artistic vision. Obviously this critic had seen little in the way of Watkins’ New Series, or he would never have arrived at this hasty conclusion. I suggest that the careful “building-block” traits of the photographic historian will establish a body of resources that will enable the art historian to do a better job as well.

One element of the evaluation process that cannot be overlooked is the need to invest many years in the process. There is no substitute for a lifetime spent in regional study. Over and over again, I have been able to use previous research as an aid to understanding ongoing projects. This is especially true of California because of its immense geographical size and the large number of photographers who have worked within its borders. Even the idea of “borders” requires revision since nearly every photographer who worked in 19th-century Nevada also spent some part of his career in California. Likewise, due to economic situations, there have been specific linkages between California photographers and the gold rushes of British Columbia and Australia, to say nothing of the natural connection between California and Hawaii. Nor can we stop here, since virtually every director of photographers that has been published around the world contains at least one individual who also worked in California.

Note-taking is an essential part of evaluation. I confess to a number of “sins of omission” during my early attempts at recording data. For instance, I assumed that I would always remember where I found each biographical or chronological tidbit, only to find that 20 years later I haven’t a clue as to its origin. The message: record the source immediately and directly on every collected document. Over the years I have lost precious time trying to recover unrecorded (or carelessly recorded) source information. While I would be the first to admit that computer filing would be a perfect solution to data management for the study of photographers, it has not worked for me. The problem stems from the fact that I began gathering data well before computers were readily available (try entering twenty years’ worth of information after the fact) and affordable. I have neither financial resources nor the aptitude to enable me to move wholeheartedly into the computer age. I do, however use a computer to write but not to file-and-sort, etc. The consequences are that I do most searching by hand. Perhaps one day...?

Graphic evidence of my overall drive and compulsion for collecting and preserving information is shown by the fact that I also collect myself. I maintain my own “brag books” of clippings and activities which are bound in hardcover and shelved along with my collected research.

Fig. 6 Photographer’s manuscript identification and dated tax stamp on reverse of carte-de-visite, July 20, 1865, J. G. Smith, Vallejo, California.
notes and writings (all bound as hardcover books with gold lettering on the spine). Collectively, these form what I call the "Palmquist Cal-Photo" series; each volume is unique in the world.

DISSEMINATE

What is the point of knowing things if you cannot share this information with others? I believe strongly in the need to share information and in the need for dissemination of new research. To this end I try to publish whenever and wherever possible.

In the beginning, I had data but no way to share it. My first four articles were written by others, with myself as the resource. It was quickly evident that I could not continue this awkward arrangement. The problem was that I had never written anything. Undaunted, I decided to try, and wrote my first two books in longhand. I used to roll the manuscript up, unrolling it whenever I needed to cut-and-paste new information. Then (and now) I did not know a paniculple from a Mack Truck!

Eventually, I learned to type and purchased a "correcting" typewriter, yet the writing process remained exceedingly painful, especially since I still needed to compose in handwriting first. In 1984 I obtained an early CPM computer which I used for word processing. Today, I can compose directly on the computer screen, but the writing process is still far from easy.

Over the years I have published some 27 books (depending on how you count books) and more than 250 articles on the history of California photography. You would be surprised how many people think that I have made a "fortune" because I have completed books. The truth of the matter is that I have never made a penny by publishing. Mostly I have supported myself by doing photography and picture research for other authors. Picture books are very expensive to produce and seldom make money anyway. My experiences with Carleton E. Watkins: Photographer of the American West (1983) is typical. I was paid $5,000 to write the text for the book, but spent some $10,000 on the research alone. I did not receive any royalties from this book; nor have I ever received a royalty check.

The truth of the matter is that it is very hard to convince a publisher to undertake a book on photographic history unless it is written from a popular viewpoint. Worse, the process of tailoring a book for a commercial or university press is onerous and daunting. Having gone through this process many times, I am unwilling to do so again. Stubbornly, I now research, write, design, pasteup, advertise and distribute my own publications. I make small quantities and do my best to sell them to libraries and colleagues so that the money spent for printing can be returned for use in the next project. I do not recommend this process for others.

The idea of publishing electronically has been suggested to me on many occasions. So far I have resisted
because I am an independent researcher and have only my publications to document my rights of authorship. Although I do not know what will happen in the future, I have seen far too many instances where information from all sorts of sources (including myself) have been puddled together without credit. After I have established my authorship, however, I will be much more inclined to consider electronic distribution in the future.

There are also major questions as to how a researcher should report data. One has only to look at the already published checklists and directories of regional photographers to see the wide range of reporting techniques. Many listings are strictly limited to name, place and date. Most only deal with photographers and ignore all of the related occupations. My tendency, right or wrong, is to record nearly everything (see, for instance, my Shadowcatchers: A Directory of Women in California Photography before 1901 (1990). In fact, my preliminary estimate suggests that it would require a book of about 50,000 pages to accommodate my assembled information on California photographers active before 1910.

Writing and publishing have not been my only avenues of distribution for my research. Lectures, exhibitions, and a wide variety of other activities have enabled me to reach a wide spectrum of the public. I often give a workshop called, “How to Care for Family Photographs,” which is an outreach that pleases me very much. I have also been happy to assist others in their research. This is a two-way street and I have benefited from the help of others in every arena of my work.

**EPILOGUE**

While preparing for this essay, I found myself looking into a rear-view mirror and using a hindsight which is now entering its third decade. It is an interesting image and one that I could never have foreseen in that spring of 1971. Over the years I have worked along on projects which seemed appropriate and timely yet lacked anything resembling a carefully planned or cohesive career in photographic history. I have often doubted my priorities or wondered whether I could have done better; or even if I should leave the field to others far more qualified for this line of work. For a time I wanted to return to school in hope of obtaining the many advantages of a scholar’s union card; American Studies, perhaps. Despite these concerns I always plunged ahead.

From the beginning, I kept a running “laundry list” of my activities in the field of photographic history. After 20 years this listing has reached a total of 34 pages. As an exercise for this paper, I extracted the projects relating specifically to Watkins and also those relating specifically to Women. I was startled to find that there were so many. I have listed them in a two-part Appendix at the end of this essay so the reader will see how often my major themes have been revisited again and again over the years. As I mentioned earlier, I am a strong believer in the idea that effective photographic history requires a lengthy, even lifetime, commitment.

Reflecting on my laundry list, I think I discern a pathway which has been wending its way slowly yet apparently upward. No brilliance here, only an obsessive “staying of course” toward a broader understanding of the California photographers of the past—all dead now.

Perhaps I really am an historian. If so, it would not be hard to argue that I am in truth preparing a place for myself—perhaps remembering my own 35 years as a professional photographer—a niche in the fabric of our times, past, present and future.
APPENDIX

1. Activities undertaken in connection with my ongoing research into the life and work of photographer Carleton Eugene Watkins (1829-1916); arranged in descending chronological order:


[Lecture] “Carleton E. Watkins: Photographer of the American West,” California State University, Chancellor’s Summer Arts Program (July 17, 1989).


[Lecture] “Carleton E. Watkins: Photographer of the American West,” California State University, Chancellor’s Summer Arts Program (July 26, 1988).


[Lecture] “Carleton E. Watkins: Photographer of the American West,” Humanities Department, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA (March 27, 1985).


[Lecture] “Carleton E. Watkins: Photographer of the American West,” Department of Journalism, The University of Texas at Austin, (November 6, 1984.)


[Lecture] “Carleton E. Watkins, Master Landscape Photographer,” Art Department, Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA (May 11, 1983).


II. Activities which I have undertaken in connection with my study of Women in the history of photography; arranged in descending chronological order:


[Lecture] "Dating the Stereographs of C.E. Watkins," annual convention, the National Stereoscopic Association, San Jose, CA (August 7, 1982).


[Article] "Watkins—The Photographer as Publisher," California History (Fall 1978).
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[Lecture] "Women in Photography—The First One Hundred Years," Art Department, Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA (May 11, 1984).


[Exhibition] "Emma B. Freeman Photographs," Clarke Memorial Museum, Eureka, CA (March 6-12, 1983).


[Consultant] Into the Shadows: The Emma Freeman Story, student film project, KEET-TV and Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA (1982).


[Checklist] "California Nineteenth Century Women Photographers," The Photographic Collector (Fall 1980).


