

Why photography, at the end of the day, is not an art research paper example

[Design](#), [Photography](#)



The idea that photography is part of art has been a controversial topic.

Various critics have argued that photography is calm and does not provide the sense of emotion that is evident in other types of art works such as paintings. This paper argues that at the end of the day, photography is not art due to the fact that photography does not extrapolate some of the fine details such as artworks, photography does not illustrate creativity but opportunity, and at the same time photography does not present the emotion of the photographer.

First of all, photographs do not capture some of the fine details that may be intended by the photographer. For example, it is difficult to capture some of the fine details such dirt on garments or some fine patterns of clothing.

Other fine details such as the surrounding environment are often left out of pictures as the camera zooms in to the object that is in front of the camera.

On the other hand, some paintings have a well-established background, middle ground, and fore ground. This three-dimensionality is an aspect that lacks in some of the photos that capitalize on the qualities of a given object. For example in Fig I. 1 which shows soldiers in World War I taken by Han Hildebrand in 1879 the photo has a well-established foreground but the background is blurry. The photograph focused on the soldiers and their guns as opposed to the comprehensive context of the photo. In this way you cannot describe photography is being an art.

Secondly photography does not illustrate creativity. Photographers in most cases take photos when they come across beautiful scenery or something which they believe will be attractive to others. This cannot be described as creativity. Photographers do not have much to think about and create their

own narratives that are not already exposed to them (Young 39). Fig 1. 2 below also taken by Hans Hildebrand illustrates the destruction resulting from the world war. The photograph shows the remaining ruins after the destruction of a city. This photo cannot be described as being a creative piece. Instead, this photograph is just a reaffirmation of the historical events that took place at the time. One cannot understand the mood at the time nor was the emotion of the photographer at the time the photograph taken. This is the case in fig 1. 3, 1. 4 and 1. 5 below. For the lack of creativity, photographs are at the end of the day not art.

Third, photographs do not present to the audience the emotions of the photographer. For example, photographs do not illustrate roughness or smoothness. This is a quality that is evident in paintings based on the brush strokes and choice of color by the artist. However, the colors that are found within photographs are those that are found in nature which means that in terms of color and emotions, photographers do not contribute to photographs in this regard. For example in Fig 1. 2 below, we cannot know whether the emotions of the photographer were one of sadness or happiness. The only thing that is we sure about in the photograph is the fact that there is a massive destruction of buildings. For this reason photographs cannot be considered as art.

In conclusion, photographs cannot be considered as being art because they do not capture fine details that are present in other works of art, photography is also not based on creativity but on the opportunity that is available for the photographer. Finally photography is not art because it does not capture the emotions of the photographer and the mood at the time of

taking a photograph.

Fig 1. 1: Trench Warfare by Hans Hildenbrand

Fig 1. 2: Sommepy Ruins by Hans Hildenbrand.

Fig 1. 3

Fig 1. 4

Fig 1. 5

Works Cited

Young, J. O. (2003). Art and knowledge. London: Routledge.