Chemistry, Medicine, Photography

has had considerable experience. Furthermore this criticism is not intended to apply to tri-color processes which require the greatest possible precision and in which the possibilities for control are much restricted.

If my scientific training arms me against these pitfalls and errors in which others, less fortunate in their background than I, may fall, then it has made an invaluable contribution to the success of a life devoted to photography.

This is all I originally intended to say and this account logically ends at this point but since the editor of U. S. Camera Magazine insisted on my saying something about pictures, I shall, at the risk of repeating what has already been said too many times, venture a few general remarks on photography.

It is impossible to lay down universal rules or to set up specific criteria for good photography. No individual photographer can do this. He is limited to telling, at most, why he takes pictures in his particular way. If he has developed a characteristic style or uses exclusively a certain technique he will find this task easier than if he has not style of his own. For my part it is not difficult up to a certain point and in general terms to account for the way I photograph. I always intend to get into a picture what I see in the original. This is not as obvious a statement as it might seem without consideration, since, what one person sees is quite personal and not necessarily what another sees. When I look at a field, here in Maine in the late spring, I see many things besides an expanse of grass and weeds. Close to me I see, individually, translucent grass blades with the sunlight filtered through them. I see furry hawk-weed stems, very straight and stiff, without dark buds, a little too heavy at the top. Further from me the field seems speckled with these buds.

I see, below the new, the matted, yellow, dead grass that in another year will sink into the soil. If I should photograph this field I should want these things to appear. Therefore, a technique that will bring out great detail is necessary. On another the field will make quite a different impression. To him the detail might be secondary if not lost entirely in a general effect. He would photograph it for that general effect and his technique would be adapted to his impression.

The detail of a subject is of especial interest to me so I always try to retain as much of it as possible in a photograph. To me this is important but I cannot dogmatically say that every picture is better with detail than without. A friend of mine apparently gets a general impression of a subject without noticing the detail, for he once said to me that he could not understand my pictures, they were so intricate. If I were like my friend I probably would not be a photographer.

And finally the camera is an instrument especially suited to recording the intricasies, delicacy and detail of a subject. It issuperior in this respect to any pictorial art. Is it not a pity to neglect this inimitable potentiality?