

# Photography

[Art & Culture](#), [Artists](#)



This article endeavors to respond to Carol Armstrong's article, "Biology, Destiny, Photography: Difference according to Diane Arbus." Photography is helpful to human in a number of ways. According to this article, there is difference between photography, destiny and biology as it has been argued by a renowned photographer, Diane Arbus. Photography has a myriad of implications to humans since the creation of humanity. However, the problem is the rampant flaws that are associated with the impression created by photographs. Armstrong is very clear in drawing a distinction of Arbus photography from those of the modern ones.

Arbus has successfully constructed a definitive position on photography; she helps in drawing a thick line between the camera and the body. Her proposition is that the camera is not in any way an extension of the body. Arbus draws a triadic relationship between the apparatus in photography and the subjects. She claims that the works are between her and the 'others'. The camera itself has its own flaws. There are things that cannot be revealed through a camera. Some discomfort makes an individual to shun having a thoughtful glance on the photograph. The gaze that a photograph gives to us creates a situation whereby we are unable to keep staring at it. There appears to be a relationship between the three components of photography, the camera, the photographer, and the subject. Throughout the relationship there appears to be misconceptions that result in flaws.

According to Armstrong, Arbus draws a gender construct whereby the camera is categorized as 'other'. Here it introduces an aspect of gender politics, Arbus brings forth differences as a result of plurality which are caused by aspects of gender and sexuality. In addition to expression of

gender issues, Arbus' works are rich in photographs that feature hermaphrodites. In addition to gender and sexuality based photographs, children have also featured in her works but have not lacked controversy especially when it comes to interpretation.

Armstrong talks about the photograph of a baby that has various features. In the photograph there is difficulty in interpreting the meaning because of its nature. The immediate clue that tells an interpreter of the meaning of a photograph lacks. This is a possibility especially because the lips are shut up as well as the body is completely covered. According to Armstrong an interpreter is left with the option of postulating the likelihoods which have a margin of error. Most of the times there is a likelihood of assuming some of the necessary details. This is common phenomenon in photography; while a photograph can give an impression of the subject, it lacks an explanation of some aspects.

Armstrong attempts to clear the air concerning the view that Arbus only took photographs of freaks. Taking a photograph of Gloria Vanderbilt's baby that was sleeping was a demonstration by Arbus that he was not exclusively for the freaks. Despite Gloria's objection of the use of the photograph because it depicted the baby as dead, she later on accepted and it came to be a contributor towards Arbus' acknowledgement in the Museum of Modern Art. Arbus never attempted to prove a point that only freaks appeared in her photographs. However, she made a point that through her photograph it was possible to turn every individual into a freak.

Works Cited

Armstrong, Carol. “ Biology, Destiny, Photography: Difference According to Diane Arbus.” 1993.