Question 1

With the advent of digital photography, it is easier than ever to combine or alter images with a simple click of the mouse. It does begin to bring up the question; can we really believe what we see?

Considering that photography is a medium that can convey a million emotions in one single image, is it ethical for a photographer to draw more emotional response by digitally altering an image? Is this any different than using different lighting in a studio to create an effect?

Respond to this…

This is a tough debate to get into because these are so many aspects to consider. On one hand, using photoshop allows photographers to be "lazier" (for lack of a better word). No more do you have to take 10,000 shots to get the perfect one- you can just edit whatever you did not like out. However, it's not that photoshop is that easy to use. Editing a photo is photoshop isn't a cakewalk either. I feel that it is different than just varying lighting in a studio as elements are usually being added in photoshop that could not otherwise be.

I guess what it boils down to for me is what it's being used for. If it's being used to create surrealist or science fiction images that could not otherwise be made, then I'm all for it. If it's being used to edit celebrity photos to make them look even more unrealistically skinny and pretty, then I'm not. Photoshop has it's place, but it shouldn't be the first line of defense for a photographer. Simply getting good shots naturally is talent in photography. Editing mediocre photos into good ones is talent in graphic design.