William McKinley had antelope eyes. Or so said an unnamed photographer in a 1902 article in *Wilson’s Photographic Magazine* that recounted the photographer’s experiences capturing the image of “every president since Grant.” William Howard Taft reportedly was easy to work with, but Theodore Roosevelt was “an excessively hard man to pose for the camera” because he was “generally stricken with the fidgets.” Grover Cleveland had “a decided aversion to the camera,” while McKinley “had the most remarkable pair of eyes that I ever saw in a man’s head. They were literally as mellow as the eyes of an antelope.”¹

Whether Leon Czolgosz, the would-be anarchist who shot the president while he greeted well-wishers at Buffalo’s Pan-American Exposition, thought McKinley’s eyes were especially bovine has gone undocumented. What is documented, however, is the assassination’s role in a transformative moment in the history of photography. When Czolgosz shot the president on September 6, 1901, McKinley had been shot perhaps hundreds of times in Buffalo already, by cameras. During the day and a half that McKinley spent in Buffalo before being fatally shot, he gave a major speech before a large crowd at the exposition, toured exhibits, and visited Niagara Falls. These and other activities gave photographers of all stripes a number of opportunities to photograph the president as he moved about in public. Both
professional photographers and amateur “camera fiends” photographed the illustrious visitor before his fateful encounter with an assassin, eager to make a snapshot of the visiting president.

Those images took on increased significance (and financial value) almost immediately after the shooting as photographs of McKinley in Buffalo began to circulate in local and national newspapers and magazines. The press closely followed the minute-by-minute drama of McKinley’s improving, then rapidly declining, health over the eight long days between the shooting and McKinley’s death. Newspapers and magazines reported on and pictured the comings and goings from McKinley’s sickbed of family members, Vice President Theodore Roosevelt, and various cabinet secretaries. Photographers revisited all the scenes of the shooting and its aftermath. After the president’s death, magazine and newspaper editors peppered their coverage with what they came to call the “last photographs” of President McKinley. They labeled the images with captions such as “McKinley’s Last Speech,” “Last Picture of McKinley, Day He Was Shot,” and “Last Photograph of the President . . . Taken Twenty Min [sic] Before the Shooting.” Still other photographs seemed to split fine hairs as far as the claim to “last” was concerned, such as “The Last Photograph Taken at the Request of President McKinley” and “The Last Photograph of President McKinley by His Own Permission.” Perhaps most poignant: a photograph of McKinley at Niagara Falls captioned “Last Trolley-Ride.”

One might easily tumble down a rabbit hole trying to determine which of the dozen-plus images declared to be McKinley’s last photograph really was the last photograph of McKinley before he was shot. But that question is less important than the question of why newspapers, magazines, and sellers of photographic images deemed it important to emphasize McKinley’s last photographs in the first place. What value—political, financial, or otherwise—did they place on their claims to holding the last photographic representations of a now dead president? Perhaps the obsession with “last” resulted from the shock of yet another presidential assassination; after all, McKinley’s assassination constituted the third murder of a U.S. president in just thirty-six years. Yet while all kinds of visual representations depicted and remembered the violence unleashed upon Abraham Lincoln in 1865 and James Garfield in 1881, no similar obsession with last photographs dominated the visual histories of those previous assassinations. What did change was the value that photography now placed on the importance of timely snapshots.
The obsession with the “last photographs” of McKinley was grounded not in anxieties about yet another presidential death but in what Neil Harris has called the “visual reorientation” that Americans experienced after 1885 with the rise of halftone and handheld photography. As chapter 4 argued, by the turn of the twentieth century, photography had a new relationship to time. In the 1840s John Quincy Adams struggled with the lengthy time requirements needed for achieving a properly exposed (and awake) daguerreotype. More than fifty years later, President William McKinley participated in a new shift in the photograph’s temporality when the nearly instantaneous amateur snapshot and halftone news image came to dominate the medium. While both the daguerreotype and the snapshot froze their subjects in time, the operations that produced the two kinds of images evolved decidedly different relationships to time itself. The daguerreotype, with its long exposures, tapped into a sense of time as duration, but the snapshot framed time as the force of the opportune moment. By the dawn of the twentieth century, photography became oriented toward the act of capturing the right moment and being ready to make a picture. The snapshot and the news photo stood as exemplars of the new visual value of timeliness.

These technological and social shifts appeared perhaps most visibly and consequentially in the aftermath of McKinley’s shooting and death. While the moment of the shooting itself was not captured photographically—perhaps the ultimate failure of the new timely photography—the shooting still played an important role in the visual chronicle of the assassination. It constituted an event that dramatically distinguished “before” from “after” and thus became a key reference point for those seeking to highlight the value of their images. By labeling the many photographs they did have as McKinley’s “last,” photographers and editors attempted to capture the force and power of that moment despite its literal photographic absence. McKinley’s was the first presidential assassination to take place after the shift to timely photography and the last presidential assassination to offer no photographic images of the moment of the shooting. As a result, the McKinley assassination offers a unique opportunity to examine up close the tensions that arose when the medium’s new claims to timeliness clashed with the absence of images of the event itself. What the McKinley assassination lacked in timely images, it more than made up for with images of literally everything else.
McKinley and the Modern Media

Elected in 1896, William McKinley was the first president to invest in what today we would recognize as “modern” communication methods. Though historians often treat his much-lauded “front porch campaign” of 1896 as a passive approach to campaigning, it in fact relied on a number of new methods for doing politics, such as data gathering and advertising. That advertising included photographs, along with the brand-new medium of motion pictures. McKinley was the first president to appear in a motion picture, doing so as a candidate in 1896. The Biograph film, short yet plodding by today’s standards, was revolutionary for its time. Just over one minute long, it depicts McKinley in front of his Canton, Ohio, home with his personal secretary, George Cortelyou, apparently reenacting the moment McKinley received word of his nomination. As they walk together toward the camera, McKinley puts on his stovepipe hat and his glasses and takes some papers from Cortelyou. The two then confer about them, McKinley removes his hat and glasses again, and the two wander slowly from the frame, exiting stage left. Despite what today screens as an uneventful, indeed awkward presentation, the film engaged audiences of the time. One newspaper account of the film’s screening reported that when “Major McKinley stepped onto his front lawn, the whole house went wild.”

Once elected, McKinley created structures for the management and dissemination of presidential news. He was open and inviting with newspaper reporters and strategic about using communication strategies to his advantage, and his personal secretary, Cortelyou, pioneered the role of what today we would call the White House press secretary. In terms of photography, two aspects of McKinley’s time as president stand out. One is the rise of photo agencies. In the fast-moving, turn-of-the-century halftone era, print outlets needed timely photographs faster than their own staff could deliver, and photo agencies emerged to fill that gap. One key player was George Grantham Bain. A New York City photographer, Bain launched his own news service in 1898. In 1899 he connected with President McKinley, joined him on trips, and gained regular access to the White House. In this way Bain collected hundreds of photographs of McKinley for distribution and sale. Such images satisfied not only a president always looking for good
press but also the increasingly voracious appetite for images of celebrities and public figures that agencies like Bain’s sought to feed.

In addition to its relationship with the photo agencies, the McKinley White House cultivated relationships with photographers and invited them to travel with him. On his 1901 tour of the United States, for example, a photographer traveled with the press and had his own darkroom aboard the train.14 Perhaps the most important ongoing relationship McKinley shared with a photographer was that with Washington, DC, photographer Frances Benjamin Johnston. While the job of official White House photographer as we know it today did not exist until much later, Johnston came close to fulfilling that role with McKinley. The daughter of wealthy, connected parents (her mother was a Washington, DC, journalist), Johnston took up photography in the late 1880s; she used one of the earliest Kodak cameras, generously provided by family friend George Eastman.15 Not long after becoming a photographer, Johnston used her family connections to gain access to both the White House and its inhabitants (her mother was a cousin of Frances Folsom Cleveland). She published her first images of the White House and its grounds in a magazine in 1890 and by 1893 operated her own photography studio in Washington, DC.16 Throughout her career, Johnston photographed five presidents (Cleveland, Benjamin Harrison, McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, and Taft), along with their wives and children.17 She also used her access to the occupants of the White House to photograph other prominent families in government. In 1897, for example, she recorded in her diary on January 4 that she photographed “Mrs. Cleveland” and all the “cabinet ladies.”18 Later, when McKinley took office, she photographed him regularly, including at his inauguration, along with making portraits of his wife, Ida Saxton McKinley, and his cabinet.19 Fatefully, Johnston was with the president and Mrs. McKinley in Buffalo for the Pan-American Exposition in 1901 and made some of the images that became famous as McKinley’s “last” photographs.

McKinley at the Exposition

President McKinley was not supposed to be in Buffalo that September. Originally, he and Mrs. McKinley planned to visit in June as part of an extended western tour that would take them as far as California.20 But when the first lady, who suffered from various health issues throughout her adult
life, became too ill to do the full trip, a separate trip to Buffalo was planned for September.\textsuperscript{21} The president would be tightly scheduled during his two official days in the city, arriving on the evening of Wednesday, September 4. McKinley would keep to a full slate of activities on Thursday, September 5, and Friday, September 6, including a major speech to be delivered to the exposition on the fifth, which was to be declared “President’s Day.” In its preview of the president’s itinerary, the \textit{Buffalo Courier} proclaimed, “Sept. 5th will be one of the greatest days of the entire exposition.”\textsuperscript{22} The \textit{Courier} noted that the events on the schedule were “each individually planned to draw big crowds,” and pronounced confidently that the presidential visit would “bring the Exposition to the zenith of its glory.”\textsuperscript{23}

The Pan-American Exposition was one of several world’s fairs held in the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, each designed to showcase innovation, culture, and commerce. Margaret Creighton writes that these events “flaunted military and industrial power, new technologies, and consumer goods. They became extravagant advertisements for nation states, and, when possible, showcased colonial possessions.”\textsuperscript{24} Running from May to November of 1901, the Pan-American Exposition announced it would “promote commercial and social interests among the States and countries of the western hemisphere.”\textsuperscript{25} The exposition’s various buildings showcased machinery, transportation, music, art, agriculture, and that exciting form of energy driving many new technologies, electricity. State and so-called foreign buildings highlighted national culture and commerce both below and above the U.S. border, with buildings dedicated to Central and South American nations as well as Canada.\textsuperscript{26}

The exposition competed with the memory of the immensely popular Chicago World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893. The Pan-American Exposition advertised itself as “second in size only to the World’s Fair and far more attractive and unique in many particulars beyond that display in 1893, and thoroughly original in its most distinctive features.”\textsuperscript{27} One of those “distinctive features” was the “Illumination,” a display of electric light achieved by lightbulbs and searchlights choreographed to outline the features of major exposition buildings. The nightly presentation of the power of electric light produced a dramatic view of the exposition that, organizers touted, sent “its gleams for many miles around, embracing in its grand circle the Falls of Niagara and the Canadian Frontier.”\textsuperscript{28} The exposition’s midway, advertised as an “amusement section,” continued previous expositions’ racist traditions.
Its “African village” and “Old Plantation” exhibits (complete with Black actors performing as slaves) sat alongside a beer hall, a talking horse, and the “Palace of Illusions,” which was a house built completely upside-down. Regular parades of the midway’s attractions, including Lubin’s Picture Machines—a float that would photograph the crowd as it proceeded along the parade route—further called attention to all that the midway had to offer visitors. Yet despite the wide variety of its many attractions and the ceaseless boosterism of city fathers, the exposition never achieved the financial success its organizers hoped for. It cost 7 million dollars to put on but earned only 6 million; organizers later claimed that the death of President McKinley resulted in 1.5 million dollars of lost revenue.

Photography played an important role at the exposition, one that privileged the professional photographer over the Kodak-wielding amateur. Following norms established at the Chicago World’s Fair in 1893, the Pan-American Exposition had its own official photographer, photography concession, and specific rules about who could photograph on the grounds with what kinds of cameras. Specific exhibits also featured photographic technologies. Organizers sought to control the visual image of the event as much as possible and to ensure that visitors bought the exposition’s official souvenir books and images. Photographer C. D. Arnold had served as the official photographer of the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago, and he served again in that same role in Buffalo. Chicago’s photography division, led primarily by Arnold, caused controversy for its practices, especially its attempts to limit amateur photography on the grounds. Concerned about the rise of smaller cameras and the seemingly endless number of images they could put into circulation, Arnold tried to ban amateurs entirely, which would force visitors to purchase officially sanctioned images of the fair if they wanted a memento. But after a public outcry, he instead created a scheme of rules and fees designed to impose strict controls on amateurs’ photographic activities.

The practice in Buffalo mirrored the rules ultimately put in place in Chicago. Arnold, well known as an architectural photographer, produced the sanctioned images at the exposition. Many of these highlighted the architectural features of the major buildings on the grounds, and Arnold published them in a 1901 souvenir book, *Official Views of Pan-American Exposition*. He also kept a studio on the grounds of the exposition, where he sold officially licensed souvenir copies of his images. As in Chicago,
select professional photographers were allowed to work at the exposition. For example, B. W. Kilburn, a New Hampshire company that held the stereograph concession at Chicago, appears to have held it in Buffalo as well. The Edison Company produced a series of “actuality” films (one-minute nonfiction films) featuring spectacles and snippets of everyday life at the exposition. Photographers working for magazines like Collier’s and Frank Leslie’s came to the exposition to cover President McKinley’s visit. Frances Benjamin Johnston would make many images during her visit to the fair to document President McKinley’s official visit, including some of those that came to be labeled and sold as the president’s last. Her specific presence at the exposition would have been no threat to Arnold, however. He had worked closely with her during the run of the Chicago fair, where she served for a time as an official photographer.

As far as amateurs with cameras were concerned, the exposition’s official guide set forth specific rules that they must follow in order to have “camera privileges.” Camera privileges could “be enjoyed upon payment of 50 cents per day for each instrument and a somewhat less rate when permit is taken out for a week, the only limitations being that no tripods be used and the plates must not be larger than 4 x 5 inches.” Translation: visitors with cameras had to pay to bring them onto the exposition grounds, but no one would be allowed to use any equipment with the capacity to produce larger, high-quality images that might compete with the exposition’s official photography concession. The Kodak Brownie, introduced just a year before, cost only one dollar, while the fifty-cent fee per camera per day cost the equivalent of roughly $14 in today’s dollars. When paid on top of the twenty-five-cent daily admission fee, the cost of the permit likely dissuaded amateur photographers from bringing their cameras to the exposition. Even so, lavish Kodak advertising urged customers to “Take a Kodak with You to the Pan-American Exposition” and suggested that the company’s more expensive Folding Pocket Kodak would be ideal for capturing the spectacular sights. Extant images made by amateurs visiting the exposition show that lots of visitors did bring their cameras to make their own snapshot souvenirs.

The official plan slated the president, Mrs. McKinley, and advisers to arrive in Buffalo by train on Wednesday evening, September 4, and make their way to the home of exposition president John Milburn, where they would stay during their time in the city. The Buffalo Courier pointed out that
McKinley’s first full day in Buffalo would be especially busy. The next morning, Thursday, September 5, the president and his party would be escorted in carriages to the exposition grounds in a military-style parade. Shortly thereafter, President McKinley would make a formal speech outdoors to a large assembled crowd, review the troops, attend a luncheon, and then visit exposition buildings and exhibits. During the evening, he and Mrs. McKinley would view the Illumination. On Friday the sixth, the schedule would be lighter but still busy: a morning trip to Niagara Falls followed later
in the day by a four o’clock public reception at the exposition’s Temple of Music.46

Local newspapers trumpeted that the McKinleys’ first night and day in Buffalo went off without a hitch—save a salute from a welcoming cannon set so close to the tracks that it broke several windows on the McKinleys’ train and caused some alarm. Large crowds awaited the president’s train on Wednesday night, where a reporter acknowledged the role of the halftone press in making McKinley recognizable to the locals: “Through the grating of the fence emerged the face of a man known wherever papers are printed—President McKinley. . . . It was a privilege to the people to obtain a close scrutiny of the faces of the President and Mrs. McKinley.”47 That close scrutiny was followed the next day by what the Courier called the “proudest day in Buffalo history” as the president visited the exposition, made an hour-long speech, and took in the spectacle of the Illumination.

The next day, citizens of Buffalo and surrounding communities looked forward to opportunities to catch a glimpse of the president and possibly shake his hand at the public reception in the Temple of Music. But first, that morning McKinley and his party traveled from Buffalo to Niagara Falls. They lunched at the International Hotel and visited the falls, where the president reportedly “climbed like a schoolboy to the highest rock formation above the falls.”48 Photographers followed along to capture the scene. A local photographer named Smith made several unposed exposures of the president mingling with his party outside of the International Hotel, which were later produced and sold as cabinet cards.49 Orrin Dunlap, another local photographer, captured the president and his party at the falls, making at least one image later published in Frank Leslie’s Weekly after the president’s death.50 Leon Czolgosz, a loner with anarchist leanings, was also at Niagara Falls that day, where he traveled with the intention of shooting the president. Traveling under the alias “Fred Nieman,” Czolgosz realized he would have no opportunity to shoot McKinley there and returned to Buffalo.51 (He later said he had followed McKinley around the exposition the previous day but found no good opportunities to commit his crime.52) Back in Buffalo, Czolgosz joined those in line for the public reception later that afternoon, a white handkerchief wrapped around his gun to make it look like he had a hand injury.53

After returning from Niagara Falls to the Milburn house in Buffalo, the president freshened up and then rode to the exposition for the public
reception. A stereograph of the exterior of the Temple of Music shows hundreds of people lined up to get a glimpse of the president or possibly a handshake. As President McKinley readied to meet the public, members of the Secret Service and dozens of soldiers, along with his secretary, George Cortelyou, and assorted dignitaries, stood nearby. Scott Miller described the scene at the Temple of Music as the assassin approached the president, who had been shaking hands with an ongoing stream of citizens for about fifteen minutes:

For a frozen instant, nobody moved. It was too fantastic to believe. From the dais where McKinley was shaking hands with the public the sound of
a firecracker echoed. A second report soon followed. A slightly built young man, standing only a few feet from the president, was holding a gun covered in a white handkerchief. A small mushroom cloud of smoke wafted upward. The president clutched at his chest and was beginning to lean forward—his expression, not of pain, nor anger, but one of confusion.

The exact details of what happened next differ across accounts, but the gist of it is this: A man directly in line behind Leon Czolgosz, an African American exposition worker named James Parker, tackled the shooter to the ground, where Secret Service agents and others struggled to subdue him and began to beat him until the president, still conscious, asked them to stop. Czolgosz was taken to another room in the building and later removed to the police station, where crowds gathered outside, shouting for his head. The president was helped to a chair, where he remained until removed from the building by an ambulance and taken to the exposition hospital for surgery to remove the bullets. Working in insufficient, badly lit conditions, doctors were able to remove one bullet but unable to find the second, so they elected to close up the president with the second bullet still inside of him. Later that evening he was returned by ambulance to his lodgings at exposition president John Milburn’s house, where arrangements had been hastily made to allow him to recover there under the care of doctors and nurses. Police set up barricades on the street—guarded by an army regiment—and established an ad hoc communications operation, including a telegraph operator and stenographers to draft messages.

Figure 5.3: B. W. Kilburn, “Anxious to Get a Peep at the President. Pan American Exposition,” 1901. (Library of Congress.)
News of the shooting traveled quickly. The Buffalo Courier wrote of the scene outside the Temple of Music, “With the remarkable rapidity that the news of a direful calamity spreads, so was the fact of the prisoner’s assault disseminated through the 20,000 people who were in one great mob outside the building.” The local and national press soon set up camp at the Milburn house and published nearly hour-by-hour updates on the president’s condition. The vigil lasted for eight long days. At first the president seemed to be doing well. In its extra noon edition of September 8, the Buffalo Courier reported, “The President has passed a good night and his condition this morning was quite encouraging. His mind is clear and he is resting well. The wound was dressed at 8:30 this morning and found in a very satisfactory condition.” There were reports that the president asked for a newspaper and wanted to know how his exposition speech had been received. Cabinet members traveled to Buffalo and moved into the nearby Buffalo Club, essentially setting up a temporary White House there; the Courier reported that Western Union had strung a direct line between the Buffalo Club and the Milburn house. All day long people streamed in and out of the Milburn house, besieged for comment and photographed at their arrivals and departures. Vice President Theodore Roosevelt, who at the time of the shooting was the guest of the Vermont Fish and Game League at Lake Champlain, hurried across the state to see McKinley, assuring reporters that the president would fully recover. The Courier described the buzz of activity during the vigil: “Messenger boys go and come constantly, for the telegrams of sympathy and regret continue to come in what seems to be a never-ending succession. At nearly regular intervals a secretary from the Milburn residence hands a bundle of type-written sheets to the press representatives. They are the official bulletins of the condition of the President. So it goes on in unfailing routine, offering no change or stirring incident to arouse the camp to activity.” At first the press tent was occupied by local reporters and national ones already in Buffalo to chronicle the president’s visit. But reporters from around the country soon converged on the city, the Courier reported in booster-like fashion: “Early Saturday morning the influx of out-of-town newspaper correspondents set in. Immediately upon receipt of the first bulletin announcing the shooting of the President, the papers in the large cities hurried men of their staff to Buffalo. The most brilliant and capable men were sent, accompanied by photographers and
artists. Buffalo is the news center of the world today and the men are not needed at home.”

The news media reported every detail of the president’s condition during the eight days between his shooting and his death: what he ate, what he drank, who visited him, even the condition of his wound. But while the textual updates in each issue of the newspaper arrived hot off the presses and straight from the front porch of the Milburn house, the options for photographic coverage of the drama were limited. Unlike the period of the Lincoln and Garfield assassinations, where citizens had to content themselves with formal memorial portraits of the stricken presidents or artists’ representations of the dramatic moment of the shooting or death, in the halftone era expectations ran higher. Implicit in the breathless news coverage lingered a question: Had anyone photographed the actual assassination?

Assassination Photographs

The Buffalo Courier obliquely addressed this question in an article published two days after the shooting under the headline “Amateur Photographs of Czolgosz’s Crime.” The piece opened by observing, “‘Johnny with his camera’ got in his work yesterday on everything pertaining to President McKinley.” The writer referenced a popular comic song, “Up Came Johnny with His Camera,” in which the “Johnny” of the title sneaks around town with his camera, surreptitiously taking snapshots of young women playing leapfrog and riding bicycles. (Johnny surely was a camera fiend if there ever was one.) Like the fictional Johnny, the Courier reported, eager Buffalo photographers sought to capture anything related to the event that they could. But there remained the problem of photographs of the actual crime itself: Did any exist? On this point the writer equivocated. First, the article claimed that “two or three self-possessed snap artists were fortunate enough to secure pictures of the President and Czolgoz [sic] just after the latter had committed his cowardly attempt at murder.” Furthermore, the article explained, the photographs of the crime would certainly become valuable in the future:

These pictures will be melancholy souvenirs of one of the greatest crimes and news events which has ever startled America. Whether the President lives or dies, they will always be valued highly by those who succeeded in
getting the pictures, and in case death should ensue from the assault their value will increase many fold. This is the first great crime of the sort in this country, if not in the world, which has ever been successfully snap-shotted. Both Lincoln and Garfield, the two presidents previously assassinated, were struck down in the presence of large crowds, but amateur photography was practically unknown twenty years ago.\(^67\)

Yet despite its own claims about “success”—variants of that word appear twice above—the newspaper neither reproduced photographs of the shooting nor offered any information about who the “snap artists” in question might be. Nor did the Courier mention them again in its coverage of the events. Furthermore, no such images were later discovered or are known to exist today.\(^68\) If any snapshots of the shooting itself existed, the Courier neither appears to have had them nor to know who did.

Curiously, after offering such a surprising headline and claim, the Courier then went on to explain that despite the presence of cameras on the exposition grounds, it would have been difficult to secure the very snapshots of the shooting that it claimed had been made:

The development of amateur photography in the past ten years has made it a popular amusement and the instantaneous film carrying camera an almost necessary adjunct to a successful outing. Hundreds of cameras are brought on the Exposition grounds every [sic] day and a few of these hundreds happened to be within the Temple of Music when President McKinley’s would-be assassin fired the shots. Still less of them were at such vantage points they could be used, and still less of those were in the hands of operators with sufficient presence of mind to press the button at the crucial moment.\(^69\)

The writer opened the passage broadly (the hundreds of cameras brought onto exposition grounds) and then narrowed the field considerably, by first pointing out that a camera would have had to have been inside the Temple of Music, then that it would have had to have a good view of the scene, and, finally, that it would have required an operator “with sufficient presence of mind” to actually make a picture “at the crucial moment.” Theoretically, an alert and knowledgeable photographer would both recognize the timely opportunity posed by the moment and act accordingly. But rising to this kind of occasion would have been difficult under the circumstances, as the Courier admitted. The writer went on to point out that other complications would have emerged as well, such as “the condition of the light.” Observing
that a good picture capturing the moment of the shooting would have had to have been taken “instantaneously,” the writer confessed that “the light was very poor for such purposes and this accounts for the number of failures standing out against the two or three good pictures.”\textsuperscript{70} Indeed, flash photography was in its own infancy during this period, so any amateur photographs would have had to be made by photographers adapting their practice to available light in the space.

What the article said about photographs of the shooting was confusing and contradictory: The \textit{Courier} both declared the triumph of snapshot photography in the McKinley era yet at the same time offered no evidence that the “great crime” had in fact been “successfully snap-shotted.” Not only that, but it also explained that the photographs it insinuated did exist would have been nearly impossible to make. Perhaps the writer was cleverly leaving open the slim possibility that someone somewhere might have such photographs and eventually share them. Perhaps the \textit{Courier} heard rumors they existed and wanted to imply to its competitors that the paper might have a scoop. It is impossible to know for sure. Ultimately, however, it appears that the \textit{Courier} claimed such photographs existed because it seemed utterly impossible that they should not. In the United States in 1901, “Johnnys with a camera” seemed to lurk everywhere in public. Thanks to halftone reproduction, photographs now appeared regularly in newspapers, magazines, books, and advertisements. Indeed, just one dollar would buy anyone their own opportunities to make pictures. By emphasizing that exposition visitors \textit{could have} photographed the president at the moment of the shooting, regardless of whether or not they actually \textit{did}, the \textit{Courier} trumpeted the new visual value of timely photography.

By extension, it signaled to readers the importance of \textit{all} of its visual coverage of the events. Even though new images of the two stars of the show—the president and his assassin—were conspicuously absent, it became immediately clear in the days after the shooting that photographs would be important. With no up-to-the-minute photographs of the president or his assailant to share with readers, newspapers and magazines made up for that absence by making hypervisible almost everything else remotely connected to the shooting. The sheer quantity of photographs was dizzying. Newspapers and magazines photographed the Milburn house, where the president was brought to recuperate, along with the numerous dignitaries coming and going from it. And they published photographs of the scene of
the crime, helpfully marking with an “X” the chair in the Temple of Music on which the wounded president had sat immediately following the shooting. 71 Farther down in the same article that proclaimed photographs of the shooting existed, the Courier touted the vast scope of its other visual coverage:

While no pictures of the President could be secured yesterday, everything in any way connected with his visit to Buffalo and with the great crime was photographed many times. It is no exaggeration to say a thousand pictures were taken of the Milburn house. The first photographers appeared on the scene at daybreak. These were for the most part representing local and outside papers, all of which were anxious to give their readers a pictorial representation of the crime at the earliest possible moment. A little later the amateur photographers began to come, and they came all day. . . . The police permitted the camera fiends to stop long enough to take a snap or two. . . . Nothing possible to photograph connected with President McKinley and the all but tragic ending to his visit to the Pan-American Exposition has escaped. When collected and classified later these pictures will form an interesting and authentic history of the greatest crime which ever stirred Buffalo. 72

With no ability to publish photographs of either the shooting or its famous victim, the press needed to fill in the blanks however it could. If “a thousand pictures” were necessary, then so be it. Barbie Zelizer writes of a similar journalistic problem reporters faced some sixty years later when those riding the press bus did not actually witness firsthand the assassination of President Kennedy: “For journalists who wanted to uphold their status as preferred observers, this situation posed obvious difficulties. . . . The fact that they missed the event raised professional problems.” 73 Zelizer points out that their solution was to emphasize their “firsthand” view of events, an approach that effectively obscured the fact that the most of the assembled press had not seen the actual shooting. Captions of photographs published during the period between McKinley’s shooting and death revealed a similar approach. Caption writers used “ing” verbs to emphasize that the news was happening in the present of the picture: the texts emphasized McKinley associates “giving” “waiting” reporters the news, reporters “getting [the] latest news” of the president’s condition, and visitors “coming” and “going” from the Milburn house. 74

The visual coverage of the McKinley vigil continued much in the same vein until things took a turn for the worse early in the morning on Friday,
September 13, exactly one week after the shooting. Because doctors were afraid to probe too far for the bullet left inside the president, gangrene had set in. The previous day the president had seemed in good spirits but no longer had an appetite; furthermore, his heart rate had jumped precipitously. Later in the day it was reported that the president could no longer eat solid food. The president’s men sent for Vice President Roosevelt. After rumors circulated throughout the evening that the president had died, he finally did succumb to his wounds just after two o’clock in the morning on September 14.

Theodore Roosevelt was sworn in at a friend’s house in Buffalo later that day, and funeral planning for the president commenced. William McKinley was publicly memorialized in three separate cities, each event replete with all the pomp and circumstance rightly accorded a president. The first came in Buffalo itself, where McKinley’s body was viewed in city hall by more than one hundred thousand citizens who, the Illustrated Buffalo Express proclaimed in its headline, “look[ed] their last upon their dead president’s calm face.” On the morning of the sixteenth, the president’s body was loaded onto a train headed for Washington, DC, where it lay in the East Room of the White House that evening and later was transported to the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol for funeral services. Both the new president and Grover Cleveland, the only living former president, accompanied the procession. Finally, the president returned home to Canton, Ohio, where he was laid to rest on September 19.

Newspapers and magazines covered the funeral events as closely as they had covered the events surrounding the shooting, and again the press offered ample photographic views to its readers. In an ad titled “WE PICTURE IT. SEE!” the Illustrated Buffalo Express trumpeted the new visual value of timeliness, advertising that its September 22 issue would offer readers a “complete photographic record of the late president’s funerals, and scenes incident thereto” and pledged that the coverage would be “artistic—timely—complete.” Newspapers and magazines used photographs to reconstruct the last days of McKinley’s life by revisiting his trip to Buffalo and republishing pictures from his two days of public events. In their study of news coverage of presidential deaths, Kevin Barnhurst and John Nerone chronicled the various visual motifs that were repeated in news coverage of these events, including the “cross-country train ride,” “the grieving widow, the team of doctors, and the body of the president.” The visual coverage of the McKinley
assassination featured these motifs. Barnhurst and Nerone also identified a more self-reflexive motif that they termed “the news of the news.” In each case of a presidential death, they write, “the story was itself another story: the way the news spread like contagion through the public and the way the newspeople covered it.” In the case of the McKinley assassination, reporters’ descriptions of how the news spread across Buffalo and of their vigil outside the Milburn house exemplified this motif. Yet what made McKinley’s death visually different from those that came before, and to some extent those that came after, was the media’s specific obsession with his “last” photographs.

**The Last Photographs of William McKinley**

The impulse to collect, publish, and name photographs of McKinley as his “last” highlighted the assassination as a timely news event, one that demanded equally timely photography. However, the absence of photographs of the actual shooting in the Temple of Music produced a problem for those seeking to share or sell timely news of the McKinley assassination: How could one valorize the new visual value of timely photography in the conspicuous absence of photos of the one moment that mattered most? The press responded to this dilemma by framing McKinley’s “last” photographs to emphasize their timeliness and the privileged access of a few photographers. As they appeared in newspapers, magazines, and
other photographic items for sale, the photographs and their captions accomplished this framing in three related but distinctive ways.\textsuperscript{82} First, editors touted photographs as McKinley’s last by captioning them in terms of their temporal relationship to the moment of the shooting. Second, they broadened the notion of “last” to include the last acts of the man himself, especially his last public act of giving a speech at the exposition. Finally, photographers hurriedly copyrighted their own “last” photographs, which underscored the commercial value of images made by photographers with unique and therefore opportune access to the president.

After McKinley was shot, he was not photographed again, at least not in any images that circulated publicly. He did remain visible in death, however. After he died, sculptor Edward Pausch created a death mask of him. In addition, tens of thousands of Americans viewed the president lying in state in order to look “their last upon their dead president’s calm face.”\textsuperscript{83} But the shooting officially marked the moment when President McKinley the man disappeared from public view. Before Czolgosz raised his hand to shoot, the president had been hypervisible at the fair, in his public speech, at Niagara Falls, and—fatefully—at the Temple of Music. Photographers chronicled most of these activities. The shooting thus marked a liminal moment—unphotographed, despite what the \textit{Buffalo Courier} obliquely claimed—in which the “before” of Buffalo’s triumphant presidential visit deteriorated into the tragic “after” of a presidential death.

Photographers, newspapers, and magazines marked that liminal moment by reproducing photographs of McKinley in Buffalo in ways that explicitly referenced the shooting itself as a temporal marker. \textit{Collier’s} magazine put a photograph of the McKinleys’ arrival at the Pan-American Exposition on its September 21 cover, captioning it—erroneously—“President and Mrs. McKinley’s Last Appearance before the Shooting.”\textsuperscript{84} The headline was factually correct only if speaking in the most general terms of their two-day appearance at the exposition. The cover’s sub-headline explained more honestly what the photograph depicted: “The photograph represents the arrival of the presidential party at the Exposition grounds on the morning of September 5, the day before the attempted assassination.”\textsuperscript{85} While the magazine had chosen the week before to feature a formal portrait by Frances Benjamin Johnston on its shooting-related cover, editors chose for the September 21 cover an image that highlighted the very public spectacle of the McKinleys’ visit, even though the president and his wife are difficult to pick out in the
Frank Leslie’s declared that its own photographer had made the “last” photograph of the president and his wife. In its September 28 issue, it reproduced a somewhat blurry snapshot of the president and Mrs. McKinley walking with her doctor and a Secret Service agent, captioning it “The Last Photograph Taken of President and Mrs. McKinley during Their Buffalo Visit.” Photographs of McKinley delivering his exposition speech on September 5 also got the “last” treatment by newspapers and magazines. Collier’s reproduced photographs of McKinley speaking and reviewing the troops “before he was shot by the anarchist, Czolgosz.” Similarly, the Brooklyn Eagle twice reproduced photographs of McKinley delivering his speech at the exposition, captioning one “This photograph was taken during the delivery of his last address, on September 5, the day before he was shot.” On September 15 the Illustrated Buffalo Express reproduced two photographs of the president by Frances Benjamin Johnston, one made “in the Govt building the day before he was shot” and the other noting the historical significance of a photograph of McKinley delivering his speech: “This picture, one of the most characteristic portraits of President McKinley ever made, will always have a peculiar historic interest. It not only shows him the day before he was shot, but in the act of delivering the address.” These and other similarly captioned pictures gained news value not for their visible subject matter but rather for the way editors framed their temporal relationship to the event of the shooting itself. Photographs that would have mattered somewhat as records of a successful presidential visit now became historically significant because of the shooting and the president’s subsequent tragic death.

That temporal relationship moved even closer to the time of the shooting itself in other “last” photographs of McKinley. While the captions discussed above highlighted a general time period “before” McKinley was shot, another group of captions emphasized a foreshortened time frame of mere hours and minutes before Czolgosz’s deadly act. Frank Leslie’s reproduced a photograph it captioned “The last photograph taken at the request of President McKinley—three hours later he was shot.” A few weeks later, after McKinley died, the magazine shared two additional, temporally foreshortened “lasts”: a blurry snapshot (apparently by a bystander who copyrighted the image) of McKinley traveling in a carriage that it captioned “The Last Photograph of the President . . . Twenty Minutes before the Shooting” and another higher-quality photograph of McKinley in the same carriage “while driving to the reception at which he was soon after shot.” The Illustrated Buffalo Express remarked of its own carriage photo
(one by Frances Benjamin Johnston that it paid for), “This was taken but a few minutes before the shooting.” The *Atlanta Constitution* got into the time-compression game as well, though it (perhaps purposely) erred in doing so, captioning a photograph of McKinley’s speech “McKinley making his address at Buffalo just prior to being shot” when he was actually shot the next day. Such captions increased the news value of the images by compressing time in order to place the images closer to the moment of shooting. Pegging such images to the liminal moment of the shooting itself invited those who encountered the photographs to consider the drama of the timely news photo: *this* photographer, *these* subjects, all were *there*, at
that moment, which came so close to the fatal moment itself. By framing the photographs in this way, magazines and newspapers invited the viewer to participate in the drama of the shooting itself, to absorb the full impact of the “last” photographs as a knowing observer.

The labeling of McKinley photographs as his “last” not only tied the images to the specific moment of the shooting; it also foregrounded the final earthly acts of the man himself. News photographs initially made to chronicle a presidential visit took on new meaning and visual power after his death. Given that McKinley the man became essentially invisible—reported on but never seen after the shooting—these “last photographs” offered viewers a poignant opportunity to follow the president’s final days and hours in public life. They also served the additional function of keeping McKinley visually present even in his bodily absence. A Frank Leslie’s feature titled “Last Acts in the Life of the Late President” gave McKinley’s final activities powerful visual expression, presenting what it called “photographs which have a pathetic interest in the time of our great mourning.” The spread included photographs of three McKinley “lasts”: the last funeral McKinley attended (in Ohio, during the previous year); McKinley’s “last trolley-ride,” the morning of the shooting; and McKinley’s “last view of the falls of Niagara—taken early on the afternoon of the day he was shot.”

Collier’s published a two-page spread that included a page of photographs of McKinley speaking in public, captioning the feature “Last Speeches of President McKinley.” Shifting emphasis from the timing of the shooting to McKinley’s own personal experiences, these kinds of photographs invited readers to contemplate McKinley’s final public activities. Such images delivered what Frank Leslie’s termed “pathetic interest,” because the viewer knew what McKinley himself did not know: this was the last time he would do these activities. While the moment of the shooting still loomed large, these “last” photographs were distinctive for the way they invited the viewer to consider the president’s own personal experiences.

Magazines and newspapers published several photographs whose captions emphasized that the president authorized them. Frank Leslie’s declared that its “special photographer” made “the last photograph taken at the request of President McKinley.” Similarly, a photographer named Smith of Niagara Falls, New York, captioned three different images of McKinley as the “Last Photograph of President McKinley by his own permission.” (See fig. 5.2.) It is not necessarily clear whether these photographs were in fact made with McKinley’s explicit permission; they seem to be snapshots the photographer
grabbed as the president was leaving or arriving for lunch at the International Hotel in Niagara Falls on the day of the shooting. Regardless of the facts, the choice to emphasize that photographs were made by McKinley’s “request” or with his “permission” should be understood in the context of cultural anxieties about camera fiends. Especially in light of the president’s death, editors or sellers of photographs would want to reassure potential readers, viewers, and purchasers of McKinley images that they were not stolen by a stealthy camera fiend. Other, obviously official, images emphasized in their captions that they had been sanctioned; for example, a Frances Benjamin Johnston photograph of McKinley made at the government building the day before the shooting was captioned the “last portrait” of McKinley, emphasizing his choice to consent to and pose for a photograph.

By far the most frequently published images of McKinley’s last acts recognized his last speech, delivered on September 5 on the Pan-American Exposition grounds. These photographs depict his final, formal public act as president, the last time he would speak directly to the people. Before radio, television, and the internet, presidents relied on the bully pulpit for communication with citizens. McKinley’s speech thus constituted an important final statement on the state of the nation and his ideas about the role of the
United States in the world at the dawn of the twentieth century. Photographs made of McKinley during that speech came to stand more broadly for his beliefs and values as president and therefore those of the nation. All the illustrated news outlets published at least one (often more than one) image of McKinley’s “last speech.” In a special section of “souvenir pictures of the president,” the *Illustrated Buffalo Express* told readers, “Of the portraits of President McKinley, especial attention is directed to the one showing him as he stood in the Esplanade on September 5th, delivering his memorable

Figure 5.7: Frances Benjamin Johnston, “William McKinley delivering his last address, Buffalo, N.Y., Sept. 5, 1901.” (Library of Congress.)
address.” Even the Buffalo Medical Journal’s October 1901 issue, which discussed the medical issues surrounding the president’s shooting and ill-fated recovery, published a photograph of McKinley’s speech, captioning it “And thus he began his last speech!” All of the photographs of McKinley’s “last acts,” but especially those of his last speech, invited viewers into the experience of McKinley’s final public activities as president and highlighted both his personal and presidential agency.

Because of their connection to a timely, dramatic news event, McKinley’s last photographs quickly became lucrative commodities. In Collier’s, Illustrated Buffalo Express, and other outlets, photo credit was given to photographers such as Frances Benjamin Johnston and O. E. Dunlap, who sold their images of McKinley in Buffalo to these publications. Johnston’s skillful handling of her McKinley photographs offers an illustrative example of the post-assassination photographic economy at work. Johnston’s photographs of McKinley’s last speech got particular play largely because of her unique access as McKinley’s personal photographer. Three of her “last photographs” received broad circulation after the shooting: her photograph of McKinley giving his September 5 address, a photograph of McKinley posing with advisers and other attendees at a reception at the government building on the day before he was shot, and a photograph of McKinley and his press secretary, George Cortelyou, in a carriage on the way to the fateful reception at the Temple of Music. Published with captions declaring “Copyright by Frances Benjamin Johnston,” the photographs made clear Johnston’s claim on the images and granted her prominence as McKinley’s specially selected, privileged observer. Johnston sold one McKinley image to the Illustrated Buffalo Express for fifteen dollars, a surprisingly high fee for the time. In the days after the shooting, the Illustrated Buffalo Express published four of Johnston’s photographs. According to Bettina Berch, “Her whole sequence of McKinley photographs suddenly became valuable, as newspapers and wire services vied for the right to reproduce the last images of the president. Johnston’s mailbox filled with requests from common people for copies.” Johnston also sold prints of her “last speech” photo to average citizens who wrote to request them. The “last speech” photograph, in particular, achieved wide circulation, eventually becoming the model for a statue of William McKinley erected at his memorial site in Canton, Ohio. Johnston appears to have maintained boundaries around her entrepreneurship, however. Several weeks after the shooting, Kodak contacted her for permission to use a Johnston photograph of McKinley in its advertising, because they knew she had used
one of their cameras. Johnston turned down the offer, though it is unclear whether she was more concerned about exploiting the former president’s death or damaging her reputation as an artist by admitting to the use of an “amateur” camera.108

By copyrighting their images and charging for their use, photographers like Johnston recognized both the literal and figurative value of the new timely news photograph. Photographers not only protected their work in light of the photographs’ status as lucrative commodities in the wake of the president’s death but also ensured that their work would live on as historical documents. That Johnston’s images from Buffalo live on today in the Library of Congress archive with their captions of “last” intact suggests the historical value the photographs continue to hold as news images of a presidential assassination—even one that wasn’t actually photographed by a camera.

**Last Photographs and the Visual Value of Timeliness**

The complicated story of McKinley’s last photographs exemplifies the dramatic changes photography had undergone by the beginning of the
twentieth century. While one could still pose or sit for formal portraits, photography had been taken to the streets in more ways than one. Amateur, handheld cameras put photography into the hands of the masses, which put more cameras in more public places. News photography increasingly put photographs into the pages of newspapers and magazines and, by extension, out onto the streets in print. In this time of mass circulation of photography in every form, the dramatic moment of the McKinley assassination should have been the pinnacle of the new timely photography. With cameras everywhere in public and pictures everywhere in print, this huge news event was ripe for exploiting the possibilities of the timely image. But the assassination is notable for the failure of the new timely photography to capture the ultimate “prize” of an image of the president being shot. Though photographers and editors offered pictures of nearly everything else, photography could not at that moment live up to the demands of the new visual value of timeliness.

Given the absence of photographs of that single moment, the mad scramble for McKinley’s last photographs makes sense. As much about upholding photography’s new visual value of timeliness as it was about memorializing the slain president, the obsession with his last photographs reveals the new power the timely photograph had brought to the culture by the dawn of the twentieth century—even if that new power was not yet fully realized.
Plate 1 (Figure 1.1): John Adams Whipple, daguerreotype of portrait of George Washington by Gilbert Stuart, 1847. (National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution; gift of Helen Hill Miller.)
Plate 2 (Figure 1.3): Unknown maker, American mother and daughter with print of George Washington, ca. 1845–1848. Daguerreotype, half-plate, 5 1/2 x 4 1/2 inches (14 x 11.4 cm). (Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City, Missouri; gift of Hallmark Cards Inc., 2005.27.70. © Nelson Gallery Foundation. Image: Thomas Palmer.)
Plate 3 (Figure 1.6): George P. A. Healy, Dolley Madison with two presidents on the south portico of the White House, 1846–1847. (Courtesy of George Eastman Museum.)
Plate 4 (Figure 2.2): Philip Haas, daguerreotype of John Quincy Adams, March 1843. (National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution. Acquired through the generosity of the Secretary of the Smithsonian and the Smithsonian National Board, the Burnett Family Fund, Carl and Marilynn Thoma, Connie and Dennis Keller, Tim Lindholm and Lucy Gaylord Lindholm, Mr. and Mrs. John W. McCarter Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Ronald J. Gidwitz, Ellen G. Miles and Neil R. Greene, Ronnyjane Goldsmith, David D. Hiller, Richard and Janet Horwood, and Mary Martell.)
Plate 5 (Figure 3.2): Auguste Edouart, silhouette of John Quincy Adams, 1841. (National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution; gift of Robert L. McNeil Jr.)
Plate 6 (Figure 3.5): Benjamin Franklin Butler, lithograph of John Quincy Adams after Haas lithograph, 1848. (National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution.)
Plate 7 (Figure 4.1): Mathew Brady, Abraham Lincoln, candidate for U.S. president, before delivering his Cooper Union address in New York City, 1860. (Library of Congress.)
Plate 8 (Figure 5.2): Smith, “The Last Photograph of President McKinley, by his own permission. Taken at the International Hotel, Niagara Falls, N.Y.,” 1901. (Library of Congress.)
Plate 9 (Figure 5.3): B. W. Kilburn, “Anxious to Get a Peep at the President. Pan American Exposition,” 1901. (Library of Congress.)
Plate 10 (Figure 5.7): Frances Benjamin Johnston, “William McKinley delivering his last address, Buffalo, N.Y., Sept. 5, 1901.” (Library of Congress.)
Plate 11 (Figure 6.1): George Grantham Bain, portrait of Theodore Roosevelt, 1885. (Library of Congress.)
Plate 12 (Figure 7.4): Erich Salomon, “President Hoover at the annual dinner of the White House journalists,” 1932. (Library of Congress.)
Why the Candid Camera Was Barred from the White House

by ROSA REILLY

The candid camera is certainly no novelty in political circles. Months ago, Stephen Early, Press Secretary at the Executive Mansion, barred the minicams from Washington. And more recently, Mr. Early placed a month’s ban—which was later reduced to a few days—on two press services because of the Jefferson Island photographic fracas. You all recall the melee which followed the Democratic Jove feast on Jefferson Island, where, in the early summer, Mr. Roosevelt and his followers gathered to relax under the trees and renew political friendships. Here some unconventional photographs were taken and distributed—pictures which showed the President and his friends in shirt sleeves with handy glasses at their elbows.

Popular Photography has endeavored to sift the rumors which flew around after this occurrence from the truth. The facts in the case are these: According to R. P. Dorman, General Manager of the Acme News Pictures, Inc., his service and the three other major news syndicates asked for permission to send photographers to Jefferson Island to cover the political picnic. This request was refused, with the result that no photographers attended.

The world was naturally astounded, therefore, to see a few days later four or five pictures of Mr. Roosevelt and his Senators and Congressmen enjoying themselves on Jefferson Island. The pictures were released by Acme and the Associated Press although they had had no cameramen on the Island. Where did the pictures come from? Who took the photographs? Well, the talk around New York and Washington is that several Congressmen or Senators took the unconventional photographs—which weren’t really so unconventional after all—and turned them over to Acme and the Associated Press. Those in the pictorial “know” also are snickering in their sleeves because they say Acme and AP thoughtfully provided certain of the nation’s representatives with photographic equipment so that they could take adequate pictures.

Whether that is true or not cannot be verified. However, some abdominal laughter has been had all around. The President enjoyed himself with a fair Ammonia-sensitized film enabled newshawk McKervey to get these candid shots of the President at his desk. Contrary to rumor the pictures in themselves had nothing to do with the candid camera ban.
Plate 14 (Figure 9.1): Pete Souza, “President Barack Obama and Vice President Joe Biden, along with members of the national security team, receive an update on the mission against Osama bin Laden in the Situation Room of the White House, May 1, 2011.” (Official White House photo via Obama White House Flickr photostream.)

Plate 15 (Figure 9.2): Pete Souza, “A temporary White House staffer, Carlton Philadelphia, brought his family to the Oval Office for a farewell photo with President Obama,” May 8, 2009. (Official White House photo via Obama White House Flickr photostream.)
Plate 16 (Figure 9.6): Pete Souza, “President Barack Obama poses for a photo with a patron at Jerry’s Family Restaurant, a diner in Mount Pleasant, Iowa,” April 27, 2010. (Official White House photo via Obama White House Flicker photostream.)