Lost Eyeglasses

by Fredo

Mr. Fredo Mora, is an MFA (Hertel Dorn Research) and Center for Photographic Arts (Hertel Dorn Research) student. He is also a Photo Tech at the Hertel Dorn Research Center. Mr. Mora's work has been exhibited in commercial (example below) and in fine photographic venues and museums.

Mario Tomas' Lunch - Copyright Mario Tomas

A successful and almost stalled setting, in several, although for very very unpleasantly warm. Consequently, there were many little breaks, and the shots were taken in a rather rushed manner. Nevertheless, the results were very good, and I was very happy with them. Very well staged and dangerous. It just seems wrong to be sitting, photo-ing and having a good time, while people are working. Mario Tomas reduces the stress and confusing that I generally experience when I am at the Great Divide Inn.

Mario Tomas, is known by his a lifetime "living" and where he arrived in Hertel Dorn Hills, as a discovered it was many with Surfaces and satisfactory.

Mario Tomas, is a Photo Tech.

I don't like people in my studio. I am by much introvert(ed) (when I am at the counterside), and I am especially so when I am at work. I am a photo tech, and I am a photo tech because I am an analytic introvert in an photographic context.

I stand working around it, treating all the brightly and possibly my homeboy as they were some slightly random vertical or horizontal lines, and I am very happy with the results. But all I know, is I am not good enough, there is a problem.

The Lost Eyeglass Shot, Left as it is Left Lost - Copyright Mario Tomas

The Lost Eyeglass Shot, Left as it is Left Lost - Copyright Mario Tomas

I'm sure of this, I'm sure of it, I am sure of it, I am sure of it.

I don't like people in my studio, I don't like people in my studio, I don't like people in my studio, I don't like people in my studio.

Lost Eyeglass Shot, Left as it is Left Lost - Copyright Mario Tomas

Lost Eyeglass Shot, Left as it is Left Lost - Copyright Mario Tomas

But wait, I've got that idea, there was a pair of Photoshop CS4 Bits and Pieces, and I'm sure I can do something with that, I'm sure I can do something with that, I'm sure I can do something with that,

"Angler" was still at it, and that was about 25 years later. Now at that spot is a "Angelworm" so that explains that. I now wonder, did Andreas spot the "Angler" or didn't he....and got him as a present on the finished slide....(yet to his case :-).

Greets, Ed

Posted by: Ed | Thursday, 20 August 2009 at 09:51 AM

More "frozen" water... is a glorious photograph. Thank you for (1) creating and (2) sharing it. Delightful.

Posted by: Christine | Thursday, 20 August 2009 at 09:51 AM

BTW, Chris, computational photography is an other great and very photographic way of eliminating people from pictures (or adding them if needed)...I take several shot of the same object through a long telephoto lens...then combine the shots using pano software...I can then mask people in an out the shot at will....great in these overpopulated times (and you break the limitations of the 12 Mpixel sensor...) into the Gigapixel domain if needed. And what's more you can even use a Merlin Orion motorized head to do so....now that must be tempting for an astroheal like you :).

Greets, Ed.

Posted by: Ed | Thursday, 20 August 2009 at 09:51 AM

Interesting with people, especialy such happy ones. Boring without.

Posted by: Henry Rogers | Thursday, 20 August 2009 at 09:51 AM

I could use the improved Spot Healing Brush right now. I'm spotting scans of 50-year-old B&W negatives for my high school reunion with CS3, and it's taking forever. Grrr...

As for northern climates, here in the Twin Cities we also just had our warmest July on record, with many 90s and not a single day in which the high was not 80 degrees or warmer. I skipped my birthday rolls in my sea kayak in mid-July because the lake temperatures were in the mid-60s and the forecast high was 101. (I like to roll once for every year, but the last time everything came together was on my 64th birthday.)

Posted by: Chuck Hope | Thursday, 20 August 2009 at 09:51 AM

Let me be a contrarian. I don't believe your fire smoke scene is "real". I simply don't. The foreground is dark, with virtually no detail. I don't believe that's how it looked to you at the time. I suspect your eyes were able to discern a lot of detail in that foreground. I suspect what this image shows is the limited dynamic range of the camera. In which case, a gradient filter (either a grad used during shooting, or in PS after the fact) is absolutely necessary to show the scene as it actually was. A blanket statement such as "They do not think I used a . . . gradient filter in Photoshop to get that effect. My reputation lies in rendering it beautifully, not in inventing it." seems just a little misleading.

By the way, I do understand your point in all this, it's just that often times it IS necessary to manipulate the image to bring it more inline with reality.

Posted by: Bruce | Thursday, 20 August 2009 at 09:51 AM

PHOW, here's my personal "ethic". If there is a transient element I don't like in a scene I'm shooting (say a stick or piece of trash that's washed into a stream in the last rain and will be gone with the next), I have no problem removing it (physically - just toss it out of the scene). But if I don't do so because I didn't notice it, I won't clone it out - sort of my punishment for not being attentive. If OTOH there is a transient element I can't physically remove (say a contrail), I don't object to cloning that out. I will not clone out more or less permanent objects (say a tree trunk that will be in the stream 10 the next 100-year flood or power lines in the sky). If I can't work around or incorporate them, then I don't get a picture. Does this make sense?

Posted by: Greg Dooley | Thursday, 20 August 2009 at 09:51 AM

I guess I must have missed the whole "genuine -vs- false" aspect of this article.

As William Klein is so fond of saying, every photograph is essentially bullshit regardless of your intentions. From the moment you choose a point of view and choose to include/exclude elements you've entered the world of interpretation. You travel even deeper when you make the decision to open the shutter. This minute or the next? This hour or the next? Today or tomorrow? It's all subjective.

I don't really know anything about your followers, Chris. But I'll bet they don't really follow your work for its supposed fidelity to "reality". They like your interpretation and rendering of "reality". For example, the fact that you witnessed and photographed nighttime space launches does not make your photos of the scenes special at all. The manner in which you rendered those images (i.e. your interpretation of the scenes, the laborious manner in which you cloned and printed them) is what distinguishes those images to your followers (I'd bet).

Shocking photography to some cried of "truth" is necessary to get a paycheck in certain types of work. But it makes zero sense as a hobby and is suicide in art.

Enjoy yourself with your camera. Time is limited.

Posted by: Kenneth Tanaka | Thursday, 20 August 2009 at 09:51 AM

The "Frozen Water" photo is a great selective view of a phenomenon and Chris had the gotspa and technique to bring the idea to fruition successfully. Congratulations Chris!

Posted by: Alex | Thursday, 20 August 2009 at 09:51 PM

This was a fun exercise. I now have some idea what to look for to tell if a scene like this has been substantially retouched: primarily areas where crisp texture gives way to mush.

But I have to make a request, too. Please don't refer to people as lice. That particular metaphor has a history. Its use in Nazi antisemitic propaganda is also discussed in Art Spiegelman's MetaMaus. (Mike, feel free to add an Amazon link if you wish.) That one poster is not an exception.

People are often a pain in the ass, but they're still people. Unfortunately it does need to be said.

Posted by: Andrew Bowles | Thursday, 20 August 2009 at 09:51 PM

I have no issue with people removing, moving or adding elements to pictures. However, I have no interest in the results as photographs. Indeed, I don't consider them to be photographs.

I have a similar aversion to heavily tonally manipulated photographs.

A recent lula contributor explained his picture of a rock (Sugar Loaf Rock?). I still do not understand how he described it as a photograph and have no interest in this type of synthetic imagery. Painting is better for this purpose in my view.

Posted by: Mike Mitternacht | Thursday, 20 August 2009 at 09:51 PM

Chris wrote:

" I photograph to show what I see."

Not at all possible today, maybe once the tech allows a camera behind your eyes it might get close, but it will never be a print as that again changes everything. You should photograph to show a print viewer what you want them to see as only you can see what you see. Just not possible to transfer your view to another intact.

Posted by: rodney hamilton | Thursday, 20 August 2009 at 09:51 PM

As the little gecko says on TV, "Ah, come off it, mate."

Mike

Posted by: Mike Johnston | Thursday, 20 August 2009 at 09:51 PM

I think you went in the wrong direction, Chris.

I would have added more people to the waterfall shot — maybe something like this, by Andreas Feininger.

Or one of the many paintings by Pieter Bruegel...

Posted by: Bruce Dickinson | Thursday, 20 August 2009 at 09:51 PM

Dear Robert,

"Chris wrote:

" I photograph to show what I see."

No I didn't. Don't put words in my mouth.

~~~~~~

Dear Andrew,

"Please don't refer to people as lice..."

Uhhh, and I never did! See above comment to Robert.

Is there some alternate universe version of this column that people are reading???

pax / puzzled Chris

Posted by: chris | Thursday, 20 August 2009 at 09:51 PM

"Shocking photography to some cried of "truth" is necessary to get a paycheck in certain types of work. But it makes zero sense as a hobby and is suicide in art."

Kenneth you summed up in a concise sentence what I have been trying to say in essays for years!

Photography is not any one thing, it's both documentary and artform, much as writing is. On the one hand you have the transcript from a court case and on the other you have science fiction, but nobody hats an eyelid.

But photography by its nature does not offer as much freedom of expression as say painting, therefore does not lend itself as well to impressionistic or abstract work. However it is entirely capable of presenting very convincing work that turns out to be totally stage managed.

The exception I suppose is photo-based graphic art, which is arguably something else. The borderline is a little vague, but I think it starts where you put elements IN to a picture that were not initially there.

Posted by: Steve Jarratt | Thursday, 20 August 2009 at 09:51 PM

Dear Jan and Ken,

Well, numerous past writings here make it clear that I'm not inclined to shackle photography to anything. I'm sure it's readily apparent to long-time readers that my tastes in photography and what I consider to be "legitimate" (for lack of a better word) photography are exceedingly broad (I'm only mentioning this for the newcomers). In fact, from private conversations, I think my idea of photography is even broader than our "Beatnerd Editor's. So, we can put that aside.

I'm going to call bullshit back on William Klein and on Jan's statement that, "...no picture ever tells the truth..." Fundamentally, *they are* falsehoods wrapped in a paper-thin shroud of fact. It's a trick of rhetoric. Because they're being used argue that since photographs don't tell the truth, it does not matter how much they lie.

I'm going to make a reductio ad absurdum argument, now. It's not ad hominem. Just to be clear. It's for the purpose of pointing out the absurdity of these assertions.

Neither of you ever tell the truth by any absolute sense. Not the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Not unless you're one of those extraordinarily rare individuals cursed with both an eidetic memory and a 100% ironclad and inflexible set of ethics. And even then, you would only be able to tell the truth as you saw it, from your perspective and position, from the moment and location in space and time that you acquired the information you're reporting.

So, no, you guys never tell the truth.

That's an justifiable statement as yours, Jan's and Klein's positions. In fact, it closely parallels them word for word.

So, are you happy with that characterization? Even though it's factually correct, do you think it's an accurate and complete picture? And furthermore, since it's factually and scientifically possible to establish that you can't possibly tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, does that mean it does not matter when and how you lie?

It would be correct to say that no photograph tells the "whole" truth, and some photographs don't tell you any truth. That does not mean they don't tell many, many truthful and accurate things. In fact, the majority of what they tell, that people actually pay attention to, is reasonably truthful. People are good at ignoring the abstract issues, like black and white not being real" (a deeply and profoundly silly argument) or compositional structures, unless those things produce a profoundly deceptive impression in the viewer. Which they can. And when people can tell it's done that, they don't like it. The hotel room or cruise ship suite that's photographed with the ultra-wide-angle lens that creates the impression it's three times as big as it really is. The politically biased photographs that are composed and positionally selected to make a speaker look like they have a vastly larger or smaller audience than they really did. People have an expectation of what a realistic photograph is telling them.

That it sometimes tells them something that is false, whether by accident or artistic intent, is irrelevant. What is not irrelevant is to claim that consequently it makes no difference, so what the hell? That's as nonsensical as saying that since you guys aren't capable of telling the truth, it makes no difference when you lie. You can choose to ignore the difference, you can choose to work with it, you can choose to work against it; they are all valid artistic choices. But to make believe that the matter isn't even real or of import because "...no picture ever tells the truth..." is a load of crap.

pax \ Chris

[Please excuse any word-salad. Macfoweth in training!]
==========
-- Chris's Online Gallery http://chris.com/
-- Digital Restorations http://photo-repair.com/
==========

Posted by: chris | Friday, 21 August 2009 at 12:46 PM

Hi Chris, sometimes we are arguing with the argues not with you!

Of course, what you say is entirely consistent though perhaps some people have greater semantic resistence to the over-use of the word "truth" than others. It is very difficult to present an absolute truth in the scientific sense, but nor can anything be fairly judged for falsehood unless it is first being presented as a truth.

All opinions are neither truth nor lie, just the view of the same world from a different window. You cannot dispute the opinion, only the facts that underpin it.

Truth is art is more of an emotional resonance than a factual statement and I think most of us are happy with that ambiguity. The argument is mainly about technicalities.

Posted by: Steve Jarratt | Friday, 21 August 2009 at 08:01 PM

Chris,

"Uhhh, and I never did! See above comment to Robert.

Is there some alternate universe version of this column that people are reading???

Please look up "Irony". When you stop the flow of your prose to add a one-sentence paragraph saying that you used a word "by choice", you are inviting readers to consider the detailed meaning and associations of that very word. You can't claim it was just one word that happened to work and you're not responsible for its full meaning.

I'm a little disconcerted by your response. I took some care to make a potentially volatile point in a polite way, with an example, and you appear not even to have paused for a moment to ask yourself what I might have been talking about. Of course there are a lot of so commenting and only one of you responding. If you want to continue this, there is a little more (not a lot, I'm not an historian) that I could say about why your use of the word was disturbing in this context. Anyhow, that is the actual universe version of the column that you wrote and I read.

Posted by: Andrew Bowles | Saturday, 22 August 2009 at 10:01 AM

Andrew,
Chris and I discussed this at length, because I agreed with you, and I ended up consulting with three experts: a professional writer, a professional translator, and a professional copyeditor (all three distinguished in their respective fields). I was obliged to retract my objection: all three experts sided with Chris, concluding that his use of the word "Irony" meant "abundantly supplied with" and that "Irony" has become a metaphorical word with no necessary connection to its etymological origin in "Issue," the singular of "Ies." Two of the three did say that he appeared to invite the comparison to lice with his verbal highlighting of the word and/or his use of the word "with" ("Irony with"), but, when I quoted the full passage to each of them and asked the question "has he in any way called the hatters and vaudevillians lice?", all three answered "no."

And there's an end on it; it was interesting to look into from an editing standpoint, but I'm not inviting any more discussion on this topic here.

Mike

Posted by: Mike Johnston | Saturday, 22 August 2009 at 10:01 AM

Four images here: by far and away the most pleasing & interesting is the frozen water.

As for removing objects - I take a stance akin to the loose impediments rule. People & stray fauna are (w)inowable.

Posted by: Martin Hampton | Monday, 24 August 2009 at 07:01 AM

Dear Hans,

Attempting to evaluate a print from a .JPEG in a blog is a fool's errand, as Mike and I frequently point out.

Neither the highlights nor the shadows are blocked up in the original. There was plenty of exposure range in the color neg film I used to handle the brightness range of the scene, and I had little trouble rendering it in a dye transfer print.

A tobacco gradient filter produces a false rendition, not one the eye sees. There are ways to compress the luminance range of a scene to better approximate what the eye sees, but that is not one of them.

pax / Chris

Posted by: chris | Tuesday, 25 August 2009 at 07:01 AM

Some work is sometimes needed to produce what is remembered rather than what was.

Posted by: Harold | Tuesday, 25 August 2009 at 08:01 AM

The comments to this entry are closed.
~~~~~~