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This thesis considers the photographs of the twentieth-century photographer, Diane Arbus. In America during the 1950s and 60s, Arbus photographed both marginalized and mainstream subjects including dwarfs, giants, transvestites, nudists, debutants, socialites, and celebrities. At one point in her career, she expressed an interest in family portraiture and, indeed, a number of her images depict families.

Scholars who have written about Arbus, such as Susan Sontag, Carol Armstrong, Anthony W. Lee, and John Pultz, have formulated theories about Arbus’s motivations, although their findings focus on individual features of her work. Sontag argued that Arbus exploited her unorthodox sitters whereas Armstrong and Phillips believed that Arbus was concerned with the individuality of each person that she photographed. Pultz and Lee considered her motivations for taking pictures of families. This thesis seeks to determine if there is a direct relationship between families, the marginalized, and the mainstream by comprehensively examining her work.
I argue that Arbus was interested in the factors which either made her subjects members of the mainstream or marginalized them and that her photographs juxtapose both sides of American society in the 1950s and 60s. She belonged to a family who publicly misrepresented themselves in order to conform to dominant standards, which at the time were being defined by media representations of the nuclear, “normal” family. Arbus recognized the artifice associated with her family’s public presentation and broadly equated them with individuals and families in the mainstream. Additionally, she led a secretive, unconventional private life and identified more with the “freaks” in her photographs than with her middle and upper-class subjects because their experiences more closely paralleled her own. Arbus envied people in the margins who did not conform to American standards and were thus not concerned with manipulating their public image. These attitudes influenced her photographic depictions. I believe this thesis will offer a novel and thorough interpretation of the photographer’s work and contribute to the breadth of existing scholarship on Arbus.
I. INTRODUCTION

The photographer Diane Arbus (1923-1971) photographed a range of subjects. She visually captured the intimate lives of social pariahs and marginalized individuals, as well as mainstream Americans, and families in and around New York City during the late 1950s and 1960s. Her photographs depict myriad subjects including socialites, debutantes, celebrities, nudists, albinos, transvestites, hermaphrodites, dwarfs, and giants.1

Because of her work depicting marginalized individuals, Arbus has received both criticism and praise. Shortly after Arbus’s death in 1971, the scholar Susan Sontag negatively reviewed her photographs. She believed that Arbus exploited her sitters due to boredom or privilege.2 More recently, Arbus has been praised for a humanist portrayal of the subjects. In the 1990s and early 2000s, the scholars Carol Armstrong and Sandra S. Phillips believed that she sought to recognize and celebrate the individuality of each human, marginal or otherwise.3 In 2003, Anthony W. Lee and John Pultz curated an exhibition centered around a donation of nearly 300 of Arbus’s photographs. They suggested that Arbus cared about domesticity, identity, and the theme of family. I will instead propose that she neither exploited her subjects nor did she revel in the notion of family or the individuality of each human. Rather, Arbus saw a contrast between mainstream and marginalized society. She tied the concept of family to this

---

1 Arbus also photographed the mentally ill, however, I will omit this group from discussion because the images are uncharacteristic of her larger body of work. She took a series of photographs at a mental hospital which are included at the end of her monograph; each of them is untitled. She wrote to her friend, Peter Crookston: “I took the most terrific pictures. The ones at Halloween… of the retarded women… they are very blurred and variable, but some are gorgeous… I think about doing a book on the retarded… I could do it in a year.” Her visit to the institution came very shortly before the end of her life and it seems that she was taking these photographs as part of a new project which was never finished. Thomas W. Southall, Magazine Work (New York: Aperture, 1984), 171.


juxtaposition because it had great significance in shaping mid-century American culture.

Furthermore, Arbus had an unorthodox personal life. Therefore, she had a greater sense of identification with marginalized sitters than mainstream subjects because their experiences more closely paralleled her own.

Throughout her career, Arbus was best-known for photographing people who might have been vulnerable to stereotyping and discrimination because of their marginal status, although she also took pictures of mainstream society. In mid-twentieth century media, prevailing American values and ideologies were represented by the nuclear family. Depictions of wholesome families were pervasive in popular television programs, museums, and scholarly institutions. Members of dominant American society sought to emulate the standards depicted in popular culture and scholarship. In contrast, a number of social and political factors contributed to the isolation and marginalization of many Americans during the middle of the twentieth century. Although numerous watershed moments occurred in these decades, circumstances were slow to change for citizens in the peripheries. Nudists, homosexuals, and transvestites were deemed “sexual deviants” by members of the public. A growing resentment with this classification and a concern for equal rights led to various protests, demonstrations, and legal pursuits, for example, the Stonewall riots-- a series of demonstrations by members of the gay community in New York City on June 28, 1969. However, progress was gradual and several groups found safety and companionship in private clubs, bars, or campgrounds. People with physical deformities likewise felt shame in public despite the beginnings of the Disability Rights Movement in the 1960s.

---

4 The nuclear family, which was introduced by George Murdock in 1949, was defined as a married man and woman living with their offspring. Murdock wrote that in American society the nuclear family was “the type of family recognized to the exclusion of all others.” “The Changing American Family,” *The New York Times*, https://www.nytimes.com/2001/05/18/opinion/the-changing-american-family.html.
which enacted laws to remove barriers for the physically handicapped. Many physically deformed individuals were enticed by sideshows and circuses which offered them safety, solidarity and financial gain in exchange for being labeled odd, grotesque, or freaky.

“Freak” has been adopted by scholars, critics, and journalists as an overarching term to define the subjects in many of Arbus’s photographs but she also generalized many of her sitters by using this word. The origin of the term freak, described by author Michael M. Chemers historically grounds the word and offers insight that may demonstrate why Arbus selected the subjects whom she photographed. He writes:

Freak is a descendant of the Old English *frician* which refers to a dance of sudden jumps and gestures... Over time, ‘freak’ characterizes something that appears uncanny or unique and takes on an unwholesome connotation. ‘Freak’ enters common usage in reference to a particular type of performance of human abnormality in the late 18th century or early 19th...As naturalists attempted to categorize Earth’s species, a specimen that failed to match a perceived average was labeled *lusus naturae*, a ‘sport’ or ‘freak’...of Nature.

Certainly Arbus took photographs of “human abnormalities.” She found unconventional subjects at freak shows, circuses, and drag venues, but she rarely portrayed her sitters performing or exhibiting their talents and features. Instead, she took pictures of these individuals in private spaces, whether outside, backstage, or at home. She also photographed a wide variety of contexts with many minorities and marginalized people serving as sitters, for example--burlesque dancers, Puerto Rican housewives, unconventional couples, and political protesters. This suggests that

---

6 She has been quoted using the word freak: “There is a quality of legend about freaks.” “Freaks were born with their trauma.” “Freaks...not quite my best friends but they made me feel a mixture of shame and awe.” *Diane Arbus*, ed. The Estate of Diane Arbus (New York: Aperture, 1972), 3.
Arbus interpreted the term freak in a more recent sense, meaning a person who “failed to match a perceived average.”

Arbus has assigned this categorization to many whom she photographed but it is reasonable to suggest that she was personally attracted to the notion of freakery. Although she maintained the appearance of a mainstream American woman in public, much of her private behavior would not have been considered average or acceptable. She was born Diane Nemerov on March 14th, 1923, to David Nemerov and Gertrude Russek Nemerov, an affluent Jewish couple in New York City. Diane and her two siblings, Howard and Renee, were raised in a wealthy and high-profile New York City milieu; indeed, her mother was heir to the prominent department store, Russeks Fifth Avenue. At home, her father was often absent and her mother was emotionally troubled, which led to a distressing and peculiar life for the children. However, the family’s social presence was refined, cultured, and calculated. For example, Gertrude regularly bought tickets to the Metropolitan Opera, as any good society woman would, even though she had no interest in actually being present at the performances. She also avoided drinking alcohol in public to prevent herself from inadvertently disclosing anything too personal. Gertrude refined and protected her reputation in public and only indulged herself privately. The children were instructed to suppress their emotions; Diane was taught to expect unhappiness and not to look forward to good news.

---

8 The term “freak” and variations of it will appear throughout this paper because it has been used by Arbus, scholars, performers, and other stigmatized individuals whom I cite or refer to. It is also a part of the vocabulary in certain genres of photography and entertainment. Here, I aim to show the historical development of the term freak in order to understand its use in a variety of contexts and to discern what the word may have meant to Arbus, specifically. Chemers, Staging Stigma, 6.
Perhaps as a symptom of her childhood experience, Diane began to engage in secretive sexual behavior in her adolescence. In adulthood, she remained a member of New York City’s dominant society, though her elusive and erratic habits privately endured. Neither convention nor boredom is therefore a convincing motive for her creative practice because her past was neither conventional nor boring. Arbus recognized the artifice associated with her family’s public presentation and, more broadly, the portrayal of mainstream individuals and families. She identified more with the non-conforming individuals in her photographs than with her middle and upper-class subjects.

II. SCHOLARLY JUDGMENTS

There is an abundance of scholarship on Diane Arbus. Many evaluations of her images focus on marginalized sitters although, more recently, some have analyzed her photographs of mainstream individuals and families. In the time since Arbus’s death in 1971, scholars Susan Sontag, Carol Armstrong, Sandra S. Phillips, Anthony W. Lee, and John Pultz have published books and articles on her work. Their scholarship offers a range of interpretations on Arbus. In 2003, the scholars John Pultz and Anthony W. Lee organized a catalogue and a traveling exhibition, which started at New York University’s Grey Art Gallery, titled “Family Albums.”

The show, which pertained to Arbus’s family portraiture, was conceptualized after a recent donation of previously unseen photographs by Arbus was made to Mount Holyoke College by an

---

alumna, Gay Matthaei.\textsuperscript{11} The donation included over 300 images of the Matthaei family made in their New York City townhouse over Christmas in 1969. Lee, an Associate Professor of Art History at Mount Holyoke College, received the photographs and enlisted the curatorial help of Pultz, an Associate Professor of Art History at the University of Kansas and Curator of Photography at the Spencer Museum of Art. Together, the pair combed through the Matthaei photographs and returned to Arbus’s larger body of work to reanalyze it through the lens of family. They each formulated statements which were published in the exhibition’s accompanying catalogue.

As part of their evaluation, the scholars examined Arbus’s photographs, her writing, and correspondence with others. In a 1968 letter to the deputy editor of London’s \textit{Sunday Times Magazine}, Peter Crookston, Arbus wrote, “I have been wanting to do families.” She also briefly mentioned her idea for a new project: “The working title, if you can call it that, for my book which I keep postponing, is Family Album. I mean I am not working on it except to photograph like I would anyway, so all I have is a title and a publisher and a sort of sweet lust for things I want in it. Like picking flowers. Or Noah’s Ark. I can hardly bear to leave any animal out.”\textsuperscript{12} Arbus would never finish a book with the name “Family Album” before her death in 1971. Still, Lee proposed that her overall body of work proved to be an adequate representation of what may likely have been included in the more specific project.\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{12} Pultz contended that this was the one and only time before her death that Arbus mentioned the “Family Album” project. John Pultz, “Searching for Diane Arbus’s ‘Family Album’ in her \textit{Box of Ten Photographs}, Monograph, and \textit{Esquire Work},” in \textit{Diane Arbus: Family Albums}, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 1.
\end{flushleft}
Lee wrote about media, Jewish-American families, photographic histories, Arbus’s influences, and family albums in his essay, “Noah’s Ark, Arbus’s Album.” He felt that her intentions could be discerned by looking into 1960’s magazine culture, the postwar Jewish family, conventional family albums, and the work of Arbus’s predecessors, Walker Evans and August Sander. Furthermore, he believed that her commercial past and ethnic background shaped her artistic objectives. Her work with the “carnal and carnivalesque” exemplified a trend in 1960s journalism, claimed Lee. Magazines needed grittier imagery in order to compete with television. Lee then contemplated societal circumstances for the postwar Jewish-American family. He wrote that Jewish Americans in the 1960s were reconsidering family life, ethnic identity, and the role of the Jewish father. Thus, Arbus sought out mothers, not unlike herself-- a Jewish American raising two Jewish-American daughters apart from their father. However, Lee admitted that it was possible to push this interpretation too far by suggesting, wrongly, that Arbus aimed to discover an iconography of the Jewish-American family.\(^\text{14}\)

Pultz similarly acknowledged uncertainty about how Arbus would have presented her “Family Albums” project but nevertheless recommended that her existing work be evaluated with the concept of a family album in mind.\(^\text{15}\) Pultz looked at the photographs as they were arranged for her monograph, in a project titled A box of ten photographs, and in her commissioned work for Esquire. He determined that Arbus was interested in the theme of domesticity. He identified her regular presence in the sitters’ most private spaces-- their homes, often even their bedrooms, and asserted that she was an intimate of the people in her


photographs. Both Pultz and Lee contextualized Arbus’s images and kept a narrow focus on the notion of family.

In contrast, Susan Sontag’s 1973 review of Arbus in the article titled “Freak Show” is hypercritical and condemning. She compared photographs from the 1972-1973 Diane Arbus retrospective held at the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) to Edward Steichen’s “Family of Man” exhibition at MoMA in 1955. Sontag revered Steichen’s show and she believed that it successfully depicted humanity as a shared experience. Indeed, Steichen and his colleagues’ aim was to illustrate universal values and events. His brother-in-law, Carl Sandburg, wrote the following poem to be displayed at the entrance of the exhibition:

There is only one man in the world and his name is All Men.
There is only one woman in the world and her name is All Women.
There is only one child in the world and the child’s name is All Children.  

The show, with 503 photographs from 68 countries, portrayed what Steichen called “the gamut of life from birth to death.” Among the categories were “Lovers,” “Marriage,” “Childbirth,” “Work,” “Women’s Work,” and “Children,” all built around ostensibly shared events. Most viewers agreed with Sontag’s appreciative review of the “Family of Man,” and the show received widespread praise, both critically and publicly.

Sontag then analyzed work from the MoMA retrospective which occurred shortly after Arbus’s death in 1971. 112 photographs were displayed in the exhibition (all but three of them were portraits). Some of Arbus’s most iconic images were included, such as pictures of a Mexican dwarf, a Jewish giant, and a hermaphrodite with a dog. Sontag thought that each of

---

16 Sontag, “Freak Show.”
Arbus’s subjects was grotesque and that, in contrast to the “Family of Man,” the retrospective portrayed a world of hopeless isolation and immobility. She believed that Arbus took an interest in the people whom she photographed out of a desire to “violate her own innocence [and] her sense of being privileged.” Sontag asserted that “In their acceptance of the appalling, the photographs suggest a naïveté that is both coy and sinister, for it is based entirely on distance, on privilege, on a feeling that what the viewer is asked to look at is really other.”

More recent arguments presented by Carol Armstrong and Sandra S. Phillips oppose Sontag’s claim that Arbus illustrated a world crippled by despair. Both Armstrong and Phillips claimed that Arbus was a humanist. In “Biology, Destiny, Photography: Difference According to Diane Arbus” (1993), Armstrong contended that Arbus’s primary concern was the “absolute individual nature of the physicality of every body.” Armstrong addressed topics such as sameness, difference, nature, and culture in the work. She pointed to Arbus’s photographs of twins and triplets to underscore her thesis. *Three triplets in their bedroom, N.J.,* 1963 (figure 1), shows a set of identical teenage girls. Three matching beds are pictured in the image but only the corners of the outside two are visible; the trio sits atop the center bed. There is a glimpse of a decorative headboard and a curtain covering a window above the bed at the right side of the image. A patterned wallpaper with a scattering of irregular diamond shapes, some solid, others only outlined, serves as the portrait’s backdrop. The girls wear the same outfit-- a black skirt, white blouse, and a headband. Their hairstyles likewise match one another. Armstrong recognized the biological nature of their identicalness and the cultural supplementation of their

---

19 Sontag, “Freak Show.”
20 Sontag, “Freak Show.”
likeness with matching clothing. She suggested that the sameness in the photograph implored the viewer to scrutinize it closer in order to discover the minute differences. Additionally, Armstrong thought that the asymmetries in the photograph, seen in the off-center composition and the abnormal wallpaper, were meant to stress the notion of difference. She considered biological and cultural associations with numerous topics in Arbus’s work such as gender, sex, age, mental and emotional states. In the end, Armstrong argued that flaws made humans unique and that it was this imperfect individuality which Arbus exalted. She concluded, “it is obvious that there is no such thing as a ‘normal’...everybody is a slightly different ‘freak’.”

Sandra S. Phillips, the Curator Emeritus of Photography at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, similarly referred to Arbus as a humanist. She believed that Arbus was interested in the individual nature and experience of each of her subjects. In her article titled “The Question of Belief” (2003), Phillips explored the entire span of the Arbus’s career, including her commercial work for Harper’s Bazaar and Esquire, a proposed project for a Guggenheim Foundation grant in 1963, “American Rites, Manners and Customs,” a 1967 exhibition at MoMA called “New Documents,” and a project near the end of Arbus’s life that the photographer named A box of ten photographs. Phillips concentrated on the technical nature of the photographs and how each of Arbus’s mechanical decisions bolstered her vision. She argued that Arbus’s approach to photographing sitters was always “to be attentive to their individuality.”

Arbus certainly did care about individuality. She began her career photographing fashion models and commercial advertisements with her husband, Allan. Years after leaving the fashion industry, she remarked to a journalist, “I hate fashion photography because the clothes don’t

---

23 Phillips, “The Question of Belief,” 54-64.
belong to the people who are wearing them. When the clothes do belong to the person wearing them, they take on a person’s flaws and characteristics, and are wonderful.” By taking a documentary approach, Arbus found that she could be conscientious and attentive to individuals’ characteristics. Thus, she never intended to exploit any of her subjects out of boredom or privilege as Sontag suggested. Nonetheless, Arbus’s central concern was not the individuality nor the idiosyncrasy of each of her subjects.

I will argue that her photographs demonstrate a broad interest in notions of marginalization and nonconformity, particularly, how those deemed freaky or grotesque compared with mainstream Americans. I will illustrate the societal expectations for mainstream and marginalized individuals in the 1950s and 60s and explain how Arbus’s photographs subvert them. Additionally, I suggest that Arbus’s interest in photographing families was neither separate from nor in addition to her interest in nonconformists. Instead, it served to further accentuate the juxtaposition between the dominant society and the margins because representations of the nuclear family were defining the American mainstream in the middle of the century. Finally, I contend that Arbus’s personal experiences gave her a unique perspective on the mainstream, the marginalized, families, and the relationship between them.

III. MID-CENTURY MAINSTREAM AMERICA

The American culture in which Arbus worked during the 1950s and 60s was characterized by depictions of the traditional, nuclear family. In the fields of sociology and anthropology, the author G.P. Murdock asserted that the nuclear family was a universal theme.

24 Lubow, Portrait of a Photographer, 4.
This became a widely accepted theory in academic circles, but idealized and embellished representations of the nuclear family also became pervasive in the American media. In the entertainment industry, television programs such as *Leave it to Beaver* and *The Adventures of Ozzie and Harriet* promoted traditional American families. The MoMA exhibition, “Family of Man,” aimed to unify the globe through the notion of a nuclear family. Thus, the traditional, upstanding American family (two heterosexual parents and one or more children) became the symbol for and model of mainstream society.

**G.P. MURDOCK AND THE NUCLEAR FAMILY**

In academia, scholars considered universal values and family systems. In 1949, the American anthropologist, G.P. Murdock, wrote the book *Social Structure*. In it, he hoped to confirm that the nuclear family was a universal feature of any human society.\(^{25}\) To prove this he examined kinship systems in a number of cultures. Murdock defined the nuclear family as “a social group characterized by common residence, economic cooperation and reproduction, including at least two opposite sex adults who maintain a socially approved sexual relationship established and defined by marriage customs, and one or more children.”\(^ {26}\) The nuclear family, Murdock alleged, had four functions: sexual, economic, procreative, and educational. His theory had a great impact on scholarly thought in the fields of sociology and anthropology. As it continued to gain acceptance in the 1950s, representations of the nuclear family pervaded the American media.\(^ {27}\)

---


\(^{27}\) Hendrix, “Nuclear Family Universals,” 125.
TELEVISION FAMILIES

Popular culture in the 1950s and 60s presented an idealized picture of family that shaped dominant thought. The beloved television shows *Leave it to Beaver* and *The Adventures of Ozzie and Harriet* are notable examples. *Leave it to Beaver* ran on television from 1957 to 1963. The show centered around the curious but naïve Theodore “The Beaver” Cleaver, along with his brother Wally, mother June, and father Ward. The plot typically involved Beaver getting into some sort of innocent trouble. *The Adventures of Ozzie and Harriet*, however similar to *Leave it to Beaver*, followed a real-life family, the Nelsons. The program arguably had the largest media influence on American thought in the middle of the century because it lasted for a span of fourteen years, from 1952-1966. A journalist at the *New York Times*, Bernard Weintraub, offered a summary of the show:

Ozzie and Harriet. They were America’s ideal fantasy couple in the 1950s. He was a bit goofy, never seemed to have a job and was always puttering around the two-story Colonial house. She was an all-purpose Mom who happily wore aprons most of the time and never seemed to leave the kitchen. Their sons, David and Ricky, were virtuous and good-looking, two boys whose toughest problems seemed to be getting a date for the high school prom and asking Dad for the keys to the car.28

“FAMILY OF MAN”

Like *Leave it to Beaver* and *The Adventures of Ozzie and Harriet*, Edward Steichen’s “Family of Man” exhibition at MoMA perpetuated the myth of the nuclear family.29 The show

---


29 Arbus, along with her husband at the time, Allan, in fact had a photograph exhibited in the “Family of Man” show. In 1955, the pair was working in fashion photography and their picture, included under the section devoted to
was a global phenomenon in the mid-twentieth century; it toured the world for eight years and attracted more than nine million viewers. Its accompanying catalogue is still MoMA’s most popular publication, having sold more than 300,000 copies. As briefly mentioned above, the “Family of Man,” which ran at the museum from January 24th until May 8th, 1955, included 503 photographs from 68 countries; 237 photographers were featured. The “Visit Luxembourg” webpage states that the exhibition “was meant as a manifesto for peace and the fundamental equality of mankind via the humanist photography of the post-war years.” Steichen’s emphasis was not the experience of the individual but that of the family unit. He hoped to curate a show that would unify humanity through representations of ostensibly universal familial events such as childhood, marriage, fathers and their sons, childbirth, and woman’s work. To emphasize the global ubiquity of these ideas he included captions which named the photographer and his or her country of origin next to the photographs. Although the show has since been criticized for being naïve or arrogant, mid-century critics and audiences alike praised Steichen’s curatorial innovations and the “Family of Man” exhibition for its optimistic rendering of the human experience.

The media’s representation of the nuclear family in America undoubtedly influenced the public and leading scholars in the 1950s and 1960s. The success and acceptance of Leave it to Beaver, The Adventures of Ozzie and Harriet, the “Family of Man” exhibition, and Murdock’s

---

"Fathers and Sons,” was from a fashion shoot done for Vogue magazine. Shortly after the exhibition, however, the Arbuses left fashion photography and Diane Arbus’s work changed significantly.

theory of the nuclear family in both popular culture and the scholarly world demonstrate that traditional, middle and upper-class families were the archetypal symbols of the American mainstream. Today, family systems are more complex, extensive, and diverse, but there are still citizens and lawmakers who possess a sense of nostalgia and longing for the stereotypical American family from the 1950s and 1960s. The perpetuity of this notion underscores its momentous impact in American society, beginning in the middle of the twentieth century.

Arbus was exposed to familial imagery in the media during the 1950s and 60s and her work demonstrates an undeniable interest in the notion of family. She photographed mainstream American families in addition to taking pictures of marginalized ones. However, her approach to family photography was distinct from popular depictions of family life in the middle of the century.

IV. FAMILY

Families were recurring in Arbus’s work; she photographed marginalized, mainstream, nuclear, and non-traditional variations of the theme. Scholars Pultz and Lee argued that Arbus’s brand of family photography was the result of political and social factors in the 1960s including shifting media concerns, conventions of family portraiture, and photographic history. Lee considered the various familial configurations in Arbus’s photographs: siblings, lovers, parents, fathers and sons, mothers and sons, mothers with babies, mothers with monkeys, mothers who have lost their children, national mothers, godless mothers, elderly couples trying to be youthful, teenage couples trying to be adult, and so on.\(^{33}\) However, he only briefly commented on gender

\(^{33}\) Anthony W. Lee, “Noah’s Ark.”
nonconformists and the physically deformed when he spoke about Arbus’s attempt to create an all-encompassing family album. Pultz also neglected to adequately discuss the marginalization of Arbus’s subjects in favor of social factors and shifting notions of family. He wrote about the images *A young man in curlers at home on West 20th Street, N.Y.C.*, 1966, and *Russian midgets in a living room on 100th Street, N.Y.C.*, 1963, only to stress the inclusion of a domestic space in their titles. Similarly, Sontag, Armstrong, and Phillips failed to establish a strong connection between Arbus’s range of subjects and the theme of family. When discussing Arbus’s work, Sontag made comparisons to the “Family of Man” exhibition, Armstrong considered biology, and Phillips touched on the idea of a family album, although none of the authors elaborated in much detail on the direct relationship between family, the mainstream, and the marginalized.

Both family and freak portraiture have historical roots in the nineteenth century. In early freak photography, studios were generally given instruction by the performers in order to accentuate the subject’s most striking oddities. The sitters and their managers determined the props, costumes, and poses for the session. In addition, they made decisions about post-production, as well as which images would be selected and reproduced. One picture of an albino woman included a handwritten note scribbled on the back, “Make half length and have the hair show as white as possible.”34 By emphasizing their peculiarities, sideshow performers, their managers, and the photographers hoped to capitalize on the nineteenth-century photo-collecting trend in America.

Photo albums served as a form of entertainment in American homes around the turn of the century. Individuals were compelled to collect and arrange photographs, a phenomenon that,

---

Robert Bogdan, author of *Freak Show: Presenting Human Oddities for Amusement and Profit*, calls “cartomania.” Bogdan wrote that photo collections were the television sets of nineteenth-century homes. Album owners and their guests spent hours looking over the portfolios. The collections were typically called family albums although, in addition to pictures of various family members and friends, album owners gathered photographs of performers, statesmen, generals, and interestingly, freak show performers. Nineteenth-century photo albums conveyed an odd mix of familiarity, unfamiliarity, reverence, and curiosity. Although she was working several decades later, Arbus’s photographs of conventional Americans, nonconforming subjects, and families are imbued with similar range. It is clear that she was attracted to the marginalized in contrast to their mainstream counterparts. It is also evident that she took more than a secondary or incidental interest in the genre of family portraiture.

The photographs of families taken by Arbus underscore the juxtaposition between the marginalized and the mainstream. She viewed dominant society through the lens of her own high-profile, wealthy, and pretentious family. In spite of any discontent in their private lives, the Nemerovs publicly displayed themselves as a healthy, admirable, and “normal” family. Thus, Arbus may have equated the mainstream with the middle and upper classes, like her own family, and concluded that Americans who sought to emulate the model of dominant society via the media’s archetype of the nuclear family often misrepresented or overstated their public presence. Alternatively, she likely presumed that marginalized individuals and their families presented themselves more authentically. They were not concerned with conforming because, due to their traumatic or unorthodox conditions, they did not (in some cases, could not) embody the media’s

---

charade of conventional family life. In certain scenarios, Arbus authentically captured her notion of mainstream and marginalized families, although in some situations she found it necessary to facilitate her interpretation.

In a letter from 1968, Arbus told Peter Crookston, the deputy editor for London’s *Sunday Times Magazine*, that she had been wanting to photograph families for a project that she named “Family Albums.” In November of the same year, Arbus published the article “Two American Families” in Crookston’s publication, the *Sunday Times*. “Two American families” included a short essay and the images *A young Brooklyn family going for a Sunday outing, N.Y.C., 1966* (figure 2) and *A family on their lawn one Sunday in Westchester, N.Y., 1968* (figure 3). In the magazine, the image of a Brooklyn family, the Daurias, is small in comparison to the picture of the Tarnapols from Westchester next to it. The editorial is clearly a comparison between two types of American families. The photograph of the Daurias depicts a family of four: Marylin, Richard, Richard Jr., and an infant (who is not named). Marilyn holds the baby and Richard takes the hand of their young, mentally-disabled son, Richard Jr., to guide him along. The title suggests that they are out for a stroll but it appears they have stopped momentarily to allow Arbus to take their picture. Both parents wear deadpan expressions but Richard looks directly at the camera and Marilyn stares elsewhere. In the article’s larger photograph, the Tarnapols are pictured on a very large, enclosed, suburban lawn. The mother and father, Nat and June, are recumbent on cushioned lawn chairs, sunning themselves; both have their eyes closed. Paul, one

---

37 The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Arbus’s *A box of ten photographs*, and several other sources use N.Y. for the location of this photograph (titles read- Westchester, N.Y.). However, Arbus writes in the *Sunday Times* article that the family is from Westchester, Connecticut. A search determined that there is only a Westchester county in New York but an official town named Westchester exists in Connecticut. It is probable that the title of the photograph is misrepresentative of the actual location.
of their three children, plays in a small plastic pool in the background. The family indulges in their leisure without acknowledging Arbus’s presence. Paul is physically closed-off from his parents, whose backs face him. In the text adjacent to the photographs, Arbus verbally compared the two families. She mentioned the occupation of each man and indicated the families’ economic statuses. She remarked that Richard Dauria, an Italian immigrant, was working as a garage mechanic and noted that Nat Tarnapol was a successful agent and pop music publisher. She added that the Tarnapols were a part of the upper-middle-class. Arbus commented on the Daurias’ bond: “the family is undeniably close in a painful, heartrending sort of way. After I had photographed them they piled into their car to go to visit one of their parents. It was a Sunday.”

Of the Tarnapols, she wrote that they “seem to be dreaming the child and the child seems to be inventing them.” Arbus articulates the obvious unity and closeness of the Daurias, who in the photograph are visibly connected to one another, whereas she observed the Tarnapols’ lack of a physical or visual relationship and thus remote mental ties.

The isolation and pretense that Arbus illustrates in the photograph of the Tarnapols are, in fact, themes in her pictures of mainstream families. Donated to Mount Holyoke College were many images of the Matthaei family taken by Arbus in 1969. Several prints and contact sheets from the session are included in the exhibition catalogue by Pultz and Lee. The Matthaei family’s wealth is obvious in the images where Arbus photographed them with their guests.
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40 These two families are again featured in Arbus’s *A box of ten photographs*, which she began a year after the *Sunday Times* article. In this project, her only portfolio, Arbus selected ten photographs that served to demonstrate her achievement in photography thus far. Many of her iconic sitters are pictured in the portfolio, The Daurias, Eddie Carmel, and Lauro Morales, for example, as well as mainstream subjects like the Tarnapols and a suburban living room at Christmas time in Levittown, Long Island. That she chose to include these images in her portfolio of only ten photographs suggests that Arbus was interested in, again, juxtaposing the mainstream and the marginalized.
enjoying cocktails and dining around a candlelit table. In some photographs, members of the group position themselves on a sofa or chair in order to appear in front of exquisite oil paintings by Renoir and Monet; in others, individuals stand near fine china. Photographs like this account for nearly half of the 300 taken by Arbus over the two-day session. For the other half of the images, which are entirely contradictory to the rest, Arbus requested that the two Matthaei daughters, Marcella and Leslie, look stoically at the lens. Leslie asked that her photographs not be included in the exhibition catalogue but there are several prints of Marcella, in different outfits and locations, appearing distraught. In one image of the teenager (figure 4), she wears a white dress against a white background. Consequently, most of the image is washed out and attention is drawn to Marcella’s face, which is framed by her long, blonde hair and bangs. The girl, with a dead stare and slight frown, looks anguished as if she is holding back tears. In a series of photographs showing Marcella at a different moment (figure 5), she is pictured sitting on a sofa wearing a black dress with a lace collar. She appears to experience the same negative emotions, only with somewhat less intensity. However, in one image from the contact sheet, Marcella breaks character and the corners of her lips rise as she begins to crack a smile. It is the only picture in the series that gives the impression that the child might be amused, as her face immediately returns to a melancholy expression before the next photograph is taken. This demonstrates that Arbus, who instructed Marcella to maintain the appearance of misery, was intent on presenting the Matthaeis’ lavish lifestyle alongside the image of disillusionment, isolation, or hopelessness—a stark and disorienting juxtaposition that recalled her own childhood.

41 Lee, “Noah’s Ark,” 56.
In 1971, Arbus was assigned to photograph another wealthy, high-profile group of people not unlike the Matthaeis or her own family. An *Esquire Magazine* project led Arbus to the household of the Nelson family, from the famed *Adventures of Ozzie and Harriet* television show.\textsuperscript{42} The magazine commissioned her to photograph the Nelsons five years after the show went off-air, to see what had become of “the most perfect expression of the ideals invested in the American middle-class family.”\textsuperscript{43}

The Nelsons, even “off-camera,” were devoted to keeping up appearances as seen in photographs from a session on the Nelsons’ lawn. In nearly every shot, Ozzie and Harriet Nelson maintain plastered-on smiles and cheerful dispositions. In one photograph Harriet appears to let down her guard and is visibly disturbed by something; her brow is furrowed and her lips are pursed (figure 6). However, by the next shot in the series, presumably taken rather quickly after the first, she has managed to regain her artificial composure.

Indeed, the family did go to great lengths to protect their reputations. A documentary from 1998 titled *Ozzie and Harriet: The Adventures of America’s Favorite Family* deconstructs the myth of the Nelson family. Members of the Nelson clan revealed some of the hardships they experienced off-screen. They spoke about their struggles to live up to the illusion of their lives as presented on television. Kris Nelson Tinker, the former wife of Ricky Nelson stated, “I spent my whole life fighting the fairy tale. First trying to be it, then trying to tell the truth.”\textsuperscript{44} She explained

\textsuperscript{42} The author of *Diane Arbus: Magazine Work*, Thomas W. Southall, noted that *Esquire* sought out “young photographers whose work embodied a personal viewpoint.” Additionally, Arbus left fashion photography almost two decades before photographing the Nelsons in order to focus her work on subjects that meant something to her. Therefore, she must have determined that photographing mainstream families was important or she would not have accepted the commissions.

\textsuperscript{43} Lee, “Noah’s Ark,” 56.

\textsuperscript{44} Weintraub, “Dousing the Glow.”
that the Nelsons went to extreme ends to maintain appearances, including working with a hospital to change data on the birth certificate of her first child. Kris was 17, and three months pregnant when she married Ricky. A child in the family conceived outside of marriage would have compromised the Nelsons’ mythical image. Therefore, by changing the documented weight on the birth certificate, the family hoped to claim that the newborn baby was not conceived before marriage but was, instead, premature. The documentary also uncovered drug addiction and broken marriages. Behind the scenes, the Nelson family endured more complicated dilemmas than simply finding a date for the prom or procuring the car for a night, however, in public they perpetuated the archetype of the traditional American family.

In contrast to mainstream, idealized families like the Nelsons and Matthaeis, Arbus photographed families with unconventional situations and dynamics. Some notable examples are the Jewish Giant at home with his parents in the Bronx (figure 7) and A family one evening in a nudist camp, P.A., 1965. These photographs do not present false appearances but give the impression of authenticity. Arbus wrote about her experience with the Carmel family:

I know a Jewish giant who lives in Washington Heights or the Bronx with his little parents. He is tragic with a curious bitter somewhat stupid wit. The parents are orthodox and repressive and classic and disapprove of his carnival career...They are a truly metaphorical family. When he stands with his arms around each he looks like he would gladly crush them. They fight terribly in an utterly typical fashion which seems only exaggerated by their tragedy...Arrogant, anguished, even silly.45

During her visit with Eddie Carmel, the “Jewish Giant” and his parents, Arbus took nearly seventy photographs (figure 8). In some, the family posed and Eddie embraced his parents, but Arbus felt that only one picture genuinely revealed the familial relationship as she

had observed it. Arbus remarked that the father and son “really can’t endure each other,” although she thought that the mother was “very sweet and she’s right in between them because she makes peace with both of them.” In the photograph, there is a recognizable tension between the three figures. The father, Yitzhak, glares at Eddie while Miriam, Eddie’s mother, looks at her son with an expression of concern or curiosity. The image has a comical element as well; the parents look exceptionally small as a result of their poses and proximity to their giant son. Eddie, who loved the photograph, joked, “Why did it have to happen to me?... My luck, I have to have midget parents.” Of the many photographs taken during her visit to the Bronx, Arbus felt that this image captured the hostility, tenderness, and silliness of the Carmels and was, therefore, the one she chose to authentically represent the family.

Another of Arbus’s family portraits was taken in 1965 at the Sunshine Haven campground in Pennsylvania, A family one evening in a nudist camp (figure 9). In the image, three figures-- a mother, father, and daughter sit near a stretch of road. They have apparently pulled off the street and parked their vehicle to relax in this grassy area; the automobile’s fin is slightly visible at the edge of the frame. Probably, the family members are part-time nudists because the older woman’s torso and bottom half are significantly less tanned than her arms and face. The younger female is the only one with clothing other than shoes and glasses; she wears a pair of shorts. The family does not seem interested in posing for the camera. None of the subjects smile or strike flattering poses even though they look at Arbus as she takes the

---

photograph. In fact, they seem irked by her presence. This picture was the only image included in an unpublished article written by Arbus titled “Notes on the Nudist Camp” from 1966.

In the text, she reported that Sunshine Haven was a “family sort of camp,” and asserted that “single men are theoretically not allowed.” She wrote that the only two behaviors which could lead to expulsion from the camp were staring and getting an erection. Arbus’s text established that the camp was a family environment, exclusively, and not a playground for sexual deviants and voyeurs, contrary to popular thought. She also indicated the stigma associated with the nudist lifestyle and acknowledged that for many of the camp’s residents, merely being present at the colony was their darkest secret. Arbus photographed this family of part-time nudists relaxing openly on the grounds of the Pennsylvania camp where they were free to indulge their preferred style of living, free from the discrimination or legal backlash that they would have inevitably received had they practiced nudism in public.

Arbus seemed inspired by the ability of the nudist family, the Daurias, and the Carmels, to remain authentic despite what she called their “traumas.” These families faced their challenges and were not devoted to maintaining public appearances, unlike the mainstream families with whom she worked. When photographing the marginalized, she captured what she believed to be their most genuine representation. Alternatively, she depicted themes such as artifice, vanity, and solitude pertaining to the middle and upper classes, even going so far as to manipulate her sitters and their contextual settings.

V. ARBUS

Arbus’s upbringing may have been responsible for her unique outlook on the mainstream, the marginalized, and family. Her background has certainly been a serious point of discussion for researchers attempting to discover her artistic intentions, although most interpretations appear to rest on a shallow perception of Arbus’s early family life. As mentioned, she has been criticized by scholars such as Sontag for allegedly exploiting her sitters in order to “violate her own innocence and privilege.” Lee also expressed his understanding that Arbus turned to provocative subject matter as “a compensation for her own conventional background.” Pultz too described Arbus’s privileged childhood in Manhattan. In reality, her childhood experience was atypical, isolating, and troubled.

The Nemerovs (figure 10) were undoubtedly prosperous, however, they were certainly not a conventional nuclear family by 1950s standards. The four universal functions of a nuclear family named by Murdock were sexual, economic, procreative, and educational. In Murdock’s model, a familial system must satisfy the standards for each of the factors in order to be considered nuclear. The sexual and economic functions apply mostly to the parental units, whereas the procreative and educational responsibilities involve all members of the family. In an article from 1975 titled, “Nuclear Family Universals: Fact and Faith in the Acceptance of an Idea,” the sociologist Lewellyn Hendrix summarized the procreative function as the “birth of offspring but also the regulation of abortion, infanticide and neglect of infants and children.” He characterized the educational function as the “acquisition of discipline and traditional responsibilities.”
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50 Sontag, “Freak Show.”
knowledge and skill.” He continued, “The burden of education and socialization everywhere falls primarily upon the nuclear family.”

David and Gertrude Nemerov were unable to successfully perform these functions. David ran the department store Russek’s Fifth Avenue after Gertrude’s father Frank died, and the duties occupied most of his time. When present at the family’s home, he was emotionally-guarded and distant. Diane’s brother Howard believed that David provided approval, not love. If Howard somehow upset his father, it only became evident the following morning at breakfast when David shrugged him off with the statement “Don’t kiss me, I have a cold.” In addition to his regular absences and the aloof treatment of his children, there were rumors about David’s extramarital affairs, which were later confirmed to be true.

Gertrude was a desperately self-involved woman. She remained in bed most days until eleven in the morning, applying cosmetics, smoking cigarettes, and talking on the telephone. She also experienced bouts of severe anxiety and depression. When Diane was eleven, she had a breakdown which all but entirely debilitated her. Later in her life, she remembered, “I started thinking I don’t love [my children], I didn’t understand them...I started thinking I couldn’t care properly for my children. I felt helpless. I was so miserable that I could barely function.” It was Diane, not Gertrude, that cared for the youngest Nemerov, Renee. Diane would read her sister books, cuddle, and dress her. When Renee was fifteen, she was confronted and raped by a man with a knife while out one night. After the attack, she did not confide in her mother but instead looked to Diane for comfort. Diane consoled the distraught teenager and took her to see a
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52 Hendrix, “Nuclear Family Universals,” 127
53 Lubow, Portrait of a Photographer, 16.
54 Lubow, Portrait of a Photographer, 9-11.
physician. Despite the family’s private struggles, Gertrude and David were committed to presenting themselves as a healthy, functional, upper-class family. Of Gertrude, Renee recalled, “We thought she was terribly artificial, concerned with outward appearances only, in how things looked to people.” Renee thought that her mother was “preserving an image that she wanted to present to the world.”

Diane, Renee, and their brother Howard (figure 11) suffered from the neglect and pretense of their parents. The children were often left alone or in the care of one of their three nannies; they felt they were disconnected from the outside world. Diane regularly escaped to her bedroom for hours. She later wrote about her childhood: “One of the things I felt I suffered from as a kid was that I never felt adversity. I was confirmed in a sense of unreality… I mean that sense of being immune, you know, was, ludicrous as it seems, a kind of painful one.” This specific statement has often been used by scholars to emphasize Arbus’s privileged and sheltered upbringing, although in the context of isolation and detachment it, instead, demonstrates a failure by the Nemerovs to adequately nurture their children.

As a result of their upbringing, the Nemerov children became especially close with one another, particularly Howard and Diane. Renee remembered that it was “them against the world.” While their parents were away on lengthy trips to France and the children were left alone, the pair built forts and played house. Howard later admitted that he and Diane experimented sexually with one another during these moments alone.

55 Lubow, Portrait of a Photographer, 56-57.
56 Lubow, Portrait of a Photographer, 12.
57 Lubow, Portrait of a Photographer, 16.
This adolescent affair seemingly had a great impact on both Nemerovs. Diane’s subsequent lovers described her sexual character as oddly sisterly. Likewise, Howard, who became a successful poet later in life, wrote many poems which appear to have been colored by the sexual experiences with his sister. Interestingly, the poems do not typically describe explicit sexual encounters or love. In a 1963 book, which he named *Journal of the Fictive Life*, Howard contemplated why he was incapable of writing about these subjects. He questioned if his writer’s block might pertain to an earlier life experience. Diane knew firsthand what Howard was referring to and felt similarly that the course of her life had been altered by an earlier encounter. She wrote to her brother, “it hits me with a kind of contagion, not precisely as though it were my book but I recognize so nearly everything in it, like I am possessed.” In reality, the romance between the two was not only a past affair, but an ongoing one. Diane confessed to a psychiatrist near the end of her life that the sexual relationship with her brother had continued; stating that the two had shared an intimate connection in New York as recently as July of 1971.

In fact, Arbus engaged in illicit sexual activity throughout her life. She attempted to photograph her sexual encounters while attending orgies and swingers parties, however, she stated that she could not enjoy the pictures because they never looked the way that sex felt. She once told a lover that she envied her sister for being raped because she felt that sex was best when it was intense. Her lust for sexual experimentation was insatiable. The book *New York Unexpurgated*, which listed opportunities for casual intercourse, was in her personal collection. Arbus would take Greyhound rides and sit in the back row in order to indicate her willingness for
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sex; described having sexual relations with multiple partners at a pool party; lent a hand to
masturbating movie-goers at a Forty-Second Street grindhouse; and confessed to sleeping with
any man who ever asked her. Her biographer, Arthur Lubow, noted, “Even in the sexual
revolution of the sixties, this kind of libertinism divorced from emotional attachment was
unusual for women.” Though she consistently participated in unorthodox sexual behavior and
confided in her journal or to a few close friends, by most accounts, she kept private about it. The
word “mysterious” was one that she often used to characterize her erotic experiences. Her friend,
Pati Hill, once remarked, “I’ve told you everything and you are still full of secrets;” Arbus
replied that it was because she needed them.

Perhaps she stayed quiet about her personal affairs because she learned from Gertrude
always to maintain public appearances and to avoid being stigmatized herself. Arbus owned a
Spoiled Identity*, that describes certain sociological conditions for the socially “abnormal.”
Goffman included the physically deformed, the mentally ill, and those with uncommon sexual
preferences in his description of stigmatized individuals. Certainly, Arbus knew that her
incestuous and promiscuous practices would qualify as atypical. Likely she was fearful of
becoming stigmatized and wanted to preserve her place in dominant society.

Arbus was raised in the mainstream and she stayed there. She was familiar with the
upper-class elites whom she photographed in New York City and she claimed that with each of
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her subjects, “there’s always some sense in which I identify with them.” However, she was candid about the artifice that she associated with society women like her mother. She once spoke with her friend Frederick Eberstadt about her feelings on Gertrude’s public image. He remarked that “Diane was very scathing about it,” and “She thought it was pretentious and fake. She felt her mother had money but no style. She saw it as a kind of tinny reflection of WASP glory.”

Her disapproving attitude about upper-class Americans is evident in Arbus’s photographs of the mainstream. Viewers are able to discern the societal positions of her elite subjects based on photographic details and captions. The captions for images of mainstream Americans are banal but materialistic; she used words and phrases that associate the subject with wealth or the upper-class such as *pearl necklace and earrings* and *Fifth Avenue*. Like their titles, the photographic details are also typically concerned with material possessions and social status but lack personal or intimate characteristics of the individuals pictured. In *Four people at a gallery opening, N.Y.C., 1968* (figure 12), a group of well-dressed people stand in the foreground. Behind them is a blank wall. Therefore, one cannot associate the individuals with a specific style of art, in fact, there is no indication that they are at the gallery opening because of an authentic interest in anything being exhibited there. Instead, the subject of the photograph is the societal element of the event and the physical appearance of the four people pictured.

Arbus photographed many mainstream women at close range or cropped them so that only the subjects’ faces and torsos are visible. *Woman with a veil on Fifth Avenue, N.Y.C, 1968* (figure 13), depicts a woman from the neck up. The buildings in the background are unclear and
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64 Lubow, Portrait of a Photographer, 245.
65 Lubow, Portrait of a Photographer, 11.
blurry, although the location (a street nicknamed “Millionaire’s Row”) is apparent in the title.\textsuperscript{66}

The viewer has no sense of what activity is happening around the subject and the details which stand out in the image are her adornments-- a veil attached to a chiffon turban, very large pearl earrings, and a portion of fur, either from a scarf or a coat. There is nothing personal about the woman; she is merely a nameless embodiment of wealth, or the pretension to it.

*Lady at a masked ball with two roses on her dress, N.Y.C, 1967* (figure 14) is a similar photograph. The top half of a woman is pictured in front of an entirely black background. Again, no activity occurs near the subject even though the title indicates that this picture was taken at a high society ball. The woman’s features are obscured by a decorative mask, which covers a large portion of her face. Thus, viewers devote their attention to her ornate trimmings-- the beaded detail and pearls on her mask, several roses, and her revealing, ruched dress.

Certain images of mainstream individuals represent people with a clear resemblance to Gertrude. Arbus entered the bedrooms of upper-class women and photographed them in their negliges, in some cases, still half-tucked into their beds. In 1966, Arbus photographed the Boston socialite, Brenda Frazier Kelly Chatfield-Taylor (figure 15). Brenda was an unhealthy, alcoholic, anorexic, and bulimic woman who had been through two divorces and had suffered multiple suicide attempts. Her family relationships were strained and she, like Gertrude Nemerov, had a falling out with her daughter. Also similar to Gertrude, Brenda remained in bed most days smoking cigarettes, applying makeup, and speaking on the telephone.\textsuperscript{67} In the photograph, Brenda maintains a serious expression. She wears fur and fully made-up face and

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{66}Michelle Young, “A Guide to the gilded age mansions of 5th Avenue’s Millionaire Row – Part II” 6sqft, August 28, 2017.

\textsuperscript{67}Lubow, *Portrait of a Photographer*, 347-348.
\end{footnotesize}
nails while sitting upright in bed holding a lit cigarette. The photograph is an uncanny representation of the activities Arbus witnessed her mother privately acting out while she was a child. Arbus’s childhood experiences shaped her understanding of American society. As a result, her photographs of people in the mainstream typically depict shallow and pretentious upper-class elites.

VI. THE MARGINALIZED

Although she was familiar with mainstream Americans, Arbus felt a stronger sense of identification with people in the margins of society because their experiences were akin to hers. Arbus regularly attended freak shows, drag venues, and nudist camps in and around New York City, which in the 1950s and 60s was a hub of activity for marginalized communities. Her photographs depict members from many marginalized groups, but particularly so-called “sexual deviants” and physically nonconforming individuals.

She often met and photographed people who would have been considered “sexual deviants” by 1960s standards. In an article written in 1968, “Sexual Deviance in Contemporary America,” deviant behaviors were ranked according to incidence, sanctions, and the existence of social systems (figure 16). The list included masturbation, premarital coitus, postmarital coitus, extramarital coitus, noncoital genital contacts, female homosexuality, female prostitution, male homosexuality, exhibitionism, peeping, fetishism, social nudism, incest, offenses against children, rape, and hard-core pornography. The deviants whom Arbus photographed typically belonged to one of the four behaviors categorized as part of a specialized social structure: female prostitution, female homosexuality, male homosexuality, and social nudism. However, the
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majority of her pictures portraying “sexual deviants” typically involve male homosexuality or gender non-conformity and social nudism.

SOCIAL NUDISM

Nudism was considered by the public to be a deviant behavior which endorsed perverse sexual activity and voyeurism. Therefore, practicing nudists were typically relegated by dominant society and law enforcement to private campgrounds where they could display their nudity without consequence. Thus, of the aforementioned deviant behaviors, social nudism was one of the most communal and organized. Within these communities, members had distinct procedures and value sets which were at odds with mainstream mores.

Arbus visited her first nudist colony in 1963, Sunshine Park in New Jersey, and another in 1965, Sunshine Haven in Pennsylvania. Upon arrival at Sunshine Haven, she was introduced to nudist ethics by the director, who advised her that the moral code in the camp was higher than in the outside world. In the 1960s, most naturists practiced an overtly moralistic style of social nudism. They reacted against the cultural obsession with sexuality and residents of nudist camps were taught about the aesthetic pleasures of the body separate from its sexual functionality. A majority of members initially joined the social nudist movement out of a concern for health or as an alternative to traditional sex education for their children. Therefore,
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69 While Arbus was visiting, Sunshine Park was actively engaged in a lawsuit to defend their protective rights. Lubow, Portrait of a Photographer, 303.
70 Southall, Magazine Work, 68.
71 Naturist, synonymous with nudist, was one of the words used by members of the community to describe themselves. It is also used by Arthur Lubow in the book Portrait of a Photographer.
72 The authors note some exceptions: “For many males in the nudist movement, there is likely to have been in the beginning of the nudist career a basic voyeuristic concern; however the ideology and the socialization process of the camp turn this into a socially approved interest in the conventional values of the nudist community.” Gagnon and Simon, “Sexual Deviance in Contemporary America,” 118-120.
Arbus decided that the only way she could responsibly photograph nudists was as a nudist. After stripping away her clothes, she remarked, “It just takes a minute and you learn how to do it, and then you’re a nudist.” She was fascinated to observe nude men, women, and children enjoying traditional forms of leisure or performing conventional routines such as mowing their lawns, getting their mail. She noticed that the homes were nicely decorated with photographs and furnishings, but Arbus joked that the pictures on the walls were mostly nudes.

Although she was amused by her subjects’ eccentricities, Arbus never tried to exaggerate their “freakishness” by photographing, for example, a giant next to a dwarf or a nudist in a sexually-explicit pose; that kind of treatment may have left her vulnerable to genuine claims of exploitation. However, she was interested in the qualities which made her non-conventional subjects different from the mainstream and her photographs emphasize that contrast. Regarding her pictures of social nudists, Arthur Lubow wrote that Arbus found it “essential for the viewer to recognize an established genre, in order to understand how nudity was subverting its conventions.” Indeed, she used familiar themes to create provocative photographs which illustrate how the marginalized subverted mainstream expectations.

By incorporating symbols of the naturist community rather than individual nudity, Arbus considered the larger societal conditions for social nudists. *Retired man and his wife at home in a nudist camp one morning, N.J.,* 1963, (figure 17), includes multiple references to nudity aside from the sitters themselves. The picture depicts the couple in the living room of their home on the compound. The woman sits on a vinyl or plastic-covered couch at right and her husband sits in a matching chair at left. The television console between them is topped with a lamp, a clock,
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and two framed photographs. One of the pictures presents a nude woman, likely the wife herself or a close relative. Arbus’s photograph also contains a broader reference to nudity. A framed picture of a pin-up model hangs on the wall above the husband. Text on the illustration reads “MAN” and it appears to be an advertisement taken from a magazine and used for decoration. Images of nude women such as these would likely have been considered inappropriate in mainstream society and would only have been viewed privately. By prominently displaying not only their own nude photographs but the illustration of a topless woman from a magazine, the couple rebelled against conventional expectations and took pride in their alternative lifestyle.

Arbus staged other comparisons between the dominant society and the nudists. Although she regularly entered her sitters’ homes and private spaces (transvestites, socialites, dwarfs, etc.), almost all of the pictures of naturists were taken outdoors in settings with prominent foliage. Her decision to photograph them outside, near lush vegetation, recalls the biblical setting of Eden and the notion of morality; a significant theme to most social nudists who considered themselves more righteous than the majority of Americans in the mainstream. A husband and wife in the woods at a nudist camp, N.J. (1963) (figure 18) shows a man and wife standing nude in a clearing in the woods at the Pine Forest nudist camp in New Jersey. Scholars have compared the image to Albrecht Dürer’s Renaissance engraving of Adam and Eve. The biblical reference was acknowledged by Arbus, who compared nudist camps to the Garden of Eden.

In the photographs of nudist men, women, and children, there is a likeness to mainstream individuals, with the obvious difference being the lack of clothing. In one of the images taken at Sunshine Park in 1963, A young waitress at a nudist camp (figure 19), Arbus photographed
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Lorna Jahrling, a server at the local diner. Jahrling is nude though, in most ways, she looks like a typical teenage waitress. The nearly thirteen-year-old stands in a relaxed pose with a straight face. She wears a short hairstyle and a headband. A small apron with a pocket for her order-taking notepad is tied around her waist. *Nudist lady with swan sunglasses* (1965) (figure 20) depicts a woman with styled hair, a necklace, high heels, and decorative swan sunglasses. She holds a towel and is likely coming from or going to a sunbathing session but has stopped to smile and pose for Arbus’s camera.

In a MoMA exhibition from 1967 titled the “New Documents,” Arbus included two photographs of separate beauty competitions—*Beauty contest, nudist camp, P.A.*, 1965 (figure 21) and *Miss Surf beauty contest, Venice Beach, California*, 1962 (figure 22). One of the images depicts a mainstream contest whereas the other displays a competition taking place in a nudist colony. In the Venice Beach pageant, a number of young, female contestants on a stage face away from the audience. Even though the contest is held inside a conference room or gymnasium, all of them wear swimwear. Each woman has styled her hair in either an updo or a short, curled bob. The convention is familiar— the female contestants will all go through a series of outfit changes which will be judged by a panel, and one contestant will be selected as the winner.

In comparison, the nudist beauty contest is less recognizable. One does not see the competition, but the pageant’s conclusion. The winners stand on a small stage and hold trophies and flowers; each person also wears a crown and a sash. The pageant title is not reserved only for one young, female beauty queen, rather, there are six winners, an entire family— a man, woman, and four children. Their titles are printed on their respective sashes: King, Queen, Princess,
Prince, Jr. Princess, and Jr. Prince. In this photograph, Arbus does not picture the conventions of a traditional pageant, including the superficial performances and adornments. She only depicts the celebratory accessories, which are shared by a group of individuals. The inclusiveness and independence of the nudist pageant make the traditional beauty contest seem superfluous and shallow in contrast.

In her representation of nudist communities, Arbus defied mainstream assumptions that social nudists were perverse and voyeuristic deviants. Instead, they demonstrate the naturists’ ability to practice their unconventional behavior while continuing to function within a community. In some situations, Arbus even renders a sense of optimism and intimacy whereas her images of mainstream Americans present isolation and pretension.

SEXUAL NONCONFORMITY

Another group classified by the public as “sexual deviants” whom Arbus photographed were gender nonconformists and homosexuals. These groups were subject to medical, religious, and legal classification and discrimination which culminated in the 1950s and 1960s. Though homosexual and gender-nonconforming groups fought this prejudice, the negative attitudes of respected institutions like the state and church served to validate an already intolerant American public.77 Thus, sexual nonconformists such as drag queens and transvestites found safety and companionship at particular bars, clubs, and social venues.
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77 A 1974 study by Martin S. Weinberg and Colin J. Williams compared the experience of homosexuals in Europe (Copenhagen and Amsterdam) vs. those in America (New York and San Francisco). They found that European homosexuals seemed less threatened by the heterosexual world and experienced and anticipated less intolerance, indicating that the cultural context in America was hostility towards homosexuals. Ira L. Reiss and Gary R. Lee, *Family Systems in America*, (New York: Holt, Reinhold, & Winston, 1988), 123.
Arbus made regular visits to bars with nightly drag shows and touring productions of female impersonators as they stopped in New York. She made several photographs at places like the Jewel Box Revue and the 82 Club where she joined her sitters backstage.\(^\text{78}\) Her interests in female impersonators and homosexuals, as with nudists or any marginalized group, were how they compared to the mainstream.

At the time when Arbus was photographing, homosexuality was illegal in 49 out of 50 states and a man could not safely appear as the opposite sex in public.\(^\text{79}\) Therefore, transformations for performances typically happened in backstage dressing rooms or at home. In these safe spaces, Arbus found men practicing the same feminine rituals as the women she photographed for fashion magazines or on the streets of New York City. In the late 1950s, she shot common feminine rituals for advertisements and articles in magazines, such as ladies preening in powder rooms or trying on clothes at department stores.\(^\text{80}\)

*Two female impersonators at a dressing table, N.Y.C., 1962, (figure 23)* depicts two men primping themselves backstage. They are pictured in front of a large mirror which is illuminated by lights along the top. One of the figures sits on a stool and the other stands nearby. The seated man is nude, wearing only a necklace, and it seems that he turned to look at Arbus just after finishing his hair or makeup. The standing figure wears heels, a robe, and a neatly-styled hairdo and strikes a pose for the photographer.

*Another photograph, A young man in curlers at home on West 20th Street, N.Y.C., 1966 (figure 24)* is a close-up image of a man. He is wearing makeup and his hair is pulled into plastic

---

\(^{78}\) Lubow, *Portrait of a Photographer*, 275.


\(^{80}\) Lubow, *Portrait of a Photographer*, 274.
curlers. A cigarette hovers in his hand near his mouth; his nails are long and painted. The subject in this photograph appears similar to two “normal” girls with their hair in curlers in another of Arbus’s pictures. Although in the image of the young women, she photographed them in public, standing on a sidewalk in front of a storefront (figure 25).

In the middle of the twentieth century, medical hypotheses regarding homosexuality greatly contributed to stereotypes of gay men and women. Experts in fields of medicine and psychiatry determined that homosexuality “violated the ‘hidden laws of nature’ by confusing the appropriate roles of men and women.” Homosexuality came to be scientifically associated with male effeminacy and female “mannishness.” This interpretation spread from scientific communities to the American public in the 1940s and 50s. Arbus confronted the societal expectations of homosexuality, particularly regarding male effeminacy. She did not photograph men performing as women on stage or in front of audiences. Instead, she went backstage to observe them executing the same feminine rituals as the women in her commercial photographs, applying makeup and trying on clothes. Therefore, her photographs undermine assumptions of homosexuality and present femininity as merely a societal construction rather than a “law of nature.”

PHYSICAL NONCONFORMITY

The marginalized were often marked by their appearance-- social nudists’ lack of clothing and drag queens’ feminine features became recognizable features. Physically non-conforming individuals were likewise, although more uniquely, associated with their bodily

---

81 D’Emilio, Sexual Politics, 17-18.
presentation. Two “types” of physical non-conformists were classified in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries—“born” and “made” freaks. Dwarfs, giants, albinos, and those with facial or bodily deformities were considered “born” freaks in some communities whereas those with physical eccentricities or talents such as tattooed men and human pincushions were referred to as “made” freaks.\footnote{\textit{Portrait of a Photographer}, 242.} Those born with physical deformities feared unwelcome glances, derogatory remarks, or worse when in public.\footnote{Frances Cooke MacGregor, “Some Psycho-Social Problems Associated with Facial Deformities,” \textit{American Sociological Review} 16 (October, 1951): 631.} “Made” freaks were not free from discrimination either. Arbus acknowledged the weight of making intentional decisions to become a part of the sideshow, “You know, a made freak was like a man… who turned himself blue by eating something. Now he had to live blue, the whole rest of his life, it wasn’t like he could go back. So it was a kind of big decision.”\footnote{\textit{Portrait of a Photographer}, 242.} Many individuals could not return to a normal way of living once they fashioned themselves a freak and were thus outsiders in a nation that endorsed conformity. Though these individuals were often victims of stereotyping or misconceptualization, they were also the subjects of fascination for many Americans.

Visiting dime museums, carnivals, freak shows, and circuses became a favorite form of entertainment for Americans. The pastime was enjoyed nationwide though nowhere was it more active than in New York City. During the 1860s, more dime museums operated in New York’s Bowery district than anywhere in the world. The best attractions in the business hoped to perform at G.B. Bunnell’s Museum, Hubert’s Museum and Flea Circus, or any of the various others. New York City was a major stop for traveling circuses as well. The Ringling Brothers,
Barnum and Bailey returned every spring to start its season at Madison Square Garden.\textsuperscript{85} By the start of the twentieth century, amusement parks had been developed across the country, however, none could compare to New York’s Coney Island. During its prime, the massive site had three parks-- Steeplechase, Luna Park, and Dreamland. Freakery was part of the allure of Coney Island which drew its inspiration, in part, from the Bowery museums; Coney Island’s busiest road was named after the Bowery district. Freak shows started on Coney Island in 1880 and in the years 1910 to 1940, no place on earth had more human attractions being exhibited.\textsuperscript{86} At its height, Coney Island freak shows brought in as many as 30,000 patrons a day. Freakery prospered in New York and it remained a part of the city’s culture even as the popularity of sideshows waned in decades following the 1940s. The Ringling Brothers circus visited Madison Square Garden every spring, Coney Island continued to perform freak shows for park visitors, and museums such as Hubert’s kept their doors open to the public.\textsuperscript{87}

These New York City venues are where Arbus encountered freakery. She frequented spots like Hubert's Dime Museum, Coney Island, and the spring circus at Madison Square Garden and she also paid visits to nearby destinations for traveling shows. While visiting these places, Arbus met the “Mexican dwarf,” the “Jewish giant,” Jack Dracula, the “man from World War Zero,” the “human pincushion” and many others. Once she became familiar with her subjects, Arbus asked to photograph them backstage or in more intimate settings such as their

\textsuperscript{85} Bogdan, \textit{Freak Show}, 40.
\textsuperscript{86} This included the attraction known as “Lilliputia,” a “midget city” that was scaled to the size of some 300 dwarfs that worked there.
\textsuperscript{87} Bogdan, \textit{Freak Show}, 56.
homes. She subverted public perceptions by photographing physically nonconforming individuals in various intimate settings.\textsuperscript{88}

Myths about people with bodily abnormalities began in the nineteenth century and continued into the 1950s and 60s. Popular beliefs were that people became physically deformed as a result of witchcraft, to atone for his or her father’s sins, or because of something done by the mother during her pregnancy.\textsuperscript{89} Freak show managers and performers promoted and exaggerated legends about the physically nonconforming in order to increase their profit. Arbus was aware of the myths perpetuated in the mainstream, but her photographs deny the viewer that kind of interpretation.

Arbus did not photograph physically nonconforming individuals on stage being exhibited for an audience or in public. Instead, she visited performers in private areas such as backstage, at home, or in their hotel rooms (if touring). By removing her subjects from a public context she distanced them from associations with myth and fascination. Individuals such as Jack Dracula (figure 26) and William Durks (figure 27) become familiar and relatable.

\textit{Russian midget friends in a living room on 100th Street, N.Y.C., 1963} (figure 28) shows two women and one man sitting together inside of a home. The friends are seated close to one another in the center of the room where they seem to have been conversing before Arbus captured their attention. All of the figures in the picture look at the photographer, one of the women offers her a warm smile. It seems as if Arbus’s presence inside of their private space is welcome. In fact, a separate photograph from the session (figure 29), taken by one of her hosts,

\textsuperscript{88} There are photographs of “freaks” performing, such as \textit{William Durks, the man from World War Zero} in 1959, although she typically grew more comfortable with her subjects and photographed them later at home or backstage. See \textit{Man from World War Zero and his wife the Alligator Skin Lady, N.J.} from 1964.

\textsuperscript{89} Frances Cooke MacGregor, “Some Psycho-Social Problems Associated with Facial Deformities,” 631.
shows Arbus at the table with two of the dwarfs enjoying a snack. Like her photographs of nudists and female impersonators, *Russian midget friends in a living room* depicts the subjects participating in the same conventional rituals as mainstream individuals, in this case, a visit with friends. Arbus did not put the sitters on display or allude to a mythical quality about them but instead captured the hospitality and friendliness that she enjoyed while spending an afternoon with the group.

**VII. CONCLUSION**

Arbus related to her marginalized subjects and actually formed close relationships with many of her sitters. Her friendship with the Jewish Giant, Eddie Carmel, began a full decade before she photographed him with his family in the Bronx. They met at the Ringling Brother and Barnum and Bailey Circus in the spring of 1960, which is where she took her first pictures of Carmel, and the two remained friends. While teaching a class in 1971, Arbus spoke about the giant’s quirky ability to compose a poem or a song on the spot. Six months after Arbus’s death, Carmel appeared on a talk show hosted by Richard Lamparski where he asked to be given a subject for one of his on-the-spot poems. The host suggested Diane Arbus, to which Carmel replied:

> A long time ago I had a real strange pal,<br>  A truly strange and wonderful gal.<br> In a world that’s growing quickly and seems to be in some kind of weird stir,<br>  Here was a marvelous gal, a photographer.<br> Who would suddenly open up her little eyes and mutter,<br>  And quickly snap her camera shutter.<br> Diane Arbus is now not with us anymore,<br>  And it’s a tragedy that suddenly we have faced a closing door.<br> Of a wonderful gal, a talented one,
Affectionately known as a lovely dear old son of a gun. Diane Arbus.\textsuperscript{90}

The short, charming rhyme indicates the caring bond shared by Carmel and Arbus.

Lauro “Cha-Cha-Cha” Morales, the Mexican dwarf, and Arbus knew each other for many years as well. They met at a circus in 1957 and she began photographing him each spring while he was in New York to perform. She referred to him as “the dwarf I quite adore.”\textsuperscript{91} In his book, \textit{Diane Arbus: Portrait of a Photographer}, Arthur Lubow implied that the pair may actually have shared a sexual connection. He wrote that \textit{Mexican dwarf in his hotel room in N.Y.C., 1970} (figure 30) likely illustrates “an erotically powerful communication” between the photographer and the subject following a sexual encounter.\textsuperscript{92} Morales sits nude in an unmade bed with only a towel across his lap and a hat on his head; his posture is relaxed. The sensual expression and slight smile on his face seem to be directed at the photographer rather than the camera. The image may indeed illustrate a post-coital moment between the two, though empirical evidence pointing to anything more than a history of friendship is lacking. Lubow made similar claims about the sexual nature of her interactions with Eddie Carmel and individuals at the nudist camps she visited. However, whatever the sexual, romantic, or friendly relationships with her subjects, Arbus made photographic decisions not to individualize her sitters but to emphasize their marginal position in society.

It is evident that Arbus considered the societal conditions of her sitters because of the decision to caption the photographs as if they are material for a study in anthropology or sociology. The most individualized features of Arbus’s sitters, their names, are consistently

\textsuperscript{90} Lubow, \textit{Portrait of a Photographer}, 523.
\textsuperscript{91} Lubow, \textit{Portrait of a Photographer}, 517.
\textsuperscript{92} Lubow, \textit{Portrait of a Photographer}, 518.
omitted in her photographic captions. The titles for Arbus’s photographs often include signals of whatever condition marginalized the subjects, made them minorities, or contributed to their characterization as human oddities: *Puerto Rican woman with a beauty mark, N.Y.C., 1965*, *Nudist lady with swan sunglasses, Pa., 1965*, and *Transvestite at her birthday party, N.Y.C., 1969*. In contrast, Arbus’s captions for photographs of “normal” people are banal, materialistic, and typically associate the subject with the mainstream. She usually commented on their clothing or location, such as *Woman with a veil on Fifth Avenue, N.Y.C., 1968*, *Lady at a masked ball with two roses on her dress, N.Y.C., 1967*, *Man at a parade on Fifth Avenue, N.Y.C., 1969*, and *Four people at a gallery opening, N.Y.C., 1968*. These titles suggest that Arbus was interested in how her marginal subjects compared to mainstream members of society. She excluded the personal details of “normals” and created a control group against which she could study the marginalized.

In the middle of the twentieth century, mainstream Americans were influenced by media representations and formal descriptions of families. “Normal” people attempted to imitate idealized versions of families like the Nelsons and the Cleavers. Arbus used the notion of family to bolster her juxtaposition of dominant and marginalized society. She stressed the artificiality of Americans seeking to conform to the mainstream and indicated the isolating effects of such behavior. In contrast, Arbus’s photographs of marginalized families depict tension and flaws but appear to portray authenticity.

The relationship between conformity, nonconformity, and corresponding familial dynamics was a significant part of Arbus’s professional work as well as her personal life. As a child, she witnessed her family preserve their public image at the cost of her and her siblings’
care, however, Arbus continued to protect her own reputation as an adult and she remained in the mainstream. She remained quiet about her private affairs because she knew that she would not have been accepted publicly by her contemporaries had she openly indulged her sexual preferences and activities. Therefore, she felt a sense of identification with those who likewise did not conform to society’s dominant standards, but she felt something more than empathy with them; Arbus envied the marginalized people whom she had met during her career in photography. She wrote:

Most people know or fear that sometime in their life they’re going to have to face some monumental, traumatic experience--so they sort of have this dread hanging in front of them all through life. But the freaks are born with a situation that is traumatic. They know that nothing much worse or more frightening can happen to them, so they don’t have to go through life dreading what may happen, it’s already happened. They’ve passed their test. They’re aristocrats.\(^{93}\)

Unlike her, the nonconforming individuals who she photographed were living with their stigma, not dreading its exposure or concealing it. Perhaps they did not nor could not safely display their abnormalities in public, but that was not Arbus’s concern. The public was a place where mainstream Americans masqueraded for one-another as refined, healthy, “normal” people. Instead, she visited backstage areas, personal residences, and private camps to take pictures of people celebrating their eccentricities with the support of a community. Often she tried to fit in or become friendly with her sitters, but Arbus could never fully connect with them. When asked if she formed attachments to any of the people she photographed, she replied, “Well no, I try not to. Sometimes I do. I mean, they’re not my friends.”\(^{94}\) She abandoned her clothing and lived as a nudist for a week, attended numerous freak shows and drag balls, spent years getting to know

\(^{93}\) Lubow, *Portrait of a Photographer*, 243.

\(^{94}\) Lubow, *Portrait of a Photographer*, 347.
transvestites, dwarfs, and giants, but she never truly felt like a part of anything. Even when photographed at orgies and “swingers” parties, she considered them too “suburban” or lacking in intensity. Arbus remained an outsider because she was incapable of finding a place among the marginalized, became disillusioned with the mainstream, and never felt nurtured by her own family. However, these conditions gave her a truly unique and unusual perspective. She mused, “I do feel I have some slight corner on something about the quality of things. I mean it’s very subtle and a little embarrassing to me, but I really believe there are things which nobody else would see unless I photographed them.”

Figure 1- Diane Arbus, *Triplets in their bedroom, N.J.*, 1963
Figure 2- Diane Arbus, *A young Brooklyn family going for a Sunday outing, N.Y.C.*, 1966
Figure 3- Diane Arbus, *A family on their lawn one Sunday in Westchester, N.Y.*, 1968
Figure 4- Diane Arbus, *Marcella Matthaei*, 1969
Figure 5- Diane Arbus, _Matthaei family portrait session_, 1969
Figure 6- Diane Arbus, *Ozzie and Harriet Nelson on their lawn, L.A., C.A.*, 1971
Figure 7- Diane Arbus, *A Jewish giant at home with his parents in the Bronx, N.Y.*, 1970
Figure 8- Diane Arbus, contact sheet for *A Jewish giant at home with his parents in the Bronx, N.Y.*, 1970
Figure 9- Diane Arbus, *A family one evening in a nudist camp, Pa.*, 1965
Figure 10- The Nemerovs gathered for the wedding of Diane’s younger sister Renee in 1947. From left to right: Diane, David, Renee, Roy, Gertrude, Rose, and Frank, with flower girl, Doon, in front. Image courtesy of Alisa Sparkia Moore.
Figure 11- The Nemerov children, circa 1931, when Howard was 11, Diane was 8, and Renee was 3. Image courtesy of Alisa Sparkia Moore.
Figure 12- Diane Arbus, *Four people at a gallery opening, N.Y.C.*, 1968
Figure 13- Diane Arbus, *Woman with a veil on Fifth Avenue, N.Y.C.*, 1968
Figure 14- Diane Arbus, *Lady at a masked ball with two roses on her dress, N.Y.C, 1967*
Figure 15-Diane Arbus, *Brenda Diana Duff Frazier, 1938 Debutante of the Year, At Home*, 1966
Figure 17- Diane Arbus- *Retired man and his wife at home in a nudist camp one morning, N.J.*, 1963
Figure 18- Diane Arbus, *A husband and wife in the woods in nudist camp, N.J.*, 1963

Figure 19- Diane Arbus, *A young waitress at a nudist camp*, 1963
Figure 20- Diane Arbus, *Nudist lady with swan sunglasses, P.A.*, 1965
Figure 21- Diane Arbus, *Beauty contest, nudist camp, P.A.*, 1965
Figure 22- Diane Arbus, *Miss Surf beauty contest, Venice Beach, California, 1962*
Figure 23- Diane Arbus, *Two female impersonators at a dressing table, N.Y.C.*, 1962
Figure 24- Diane Arbus, *A young man in curlers at home on West 20th Street, N.Y.C.*, 1966
Figure 25- Diane Arbus, *Two girls in curlers, N.Y.C.*, 1963
Figure 26- Diane Arbus, *Jack Dracula in a bar, N.Y.C.*, 1961
Figure 27- Diane Arbus, *Man from World War Zero and his wife, N.J.*, 1964
Figure 28- Diane Arbus, *Russian midget friends in a living room on 100th Street, N.Y.C., 1963*
Figure 29- Photograph of Diane with Russian midgets in their 100th Street apartment, taken by one of her hosts using her camera, 1963.
Figure 30- Diane Arbus, *Mexican dwarf in his hotel room in N.Y.C.*, 1970
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