

## **The Chairman's Competition, 2009-10 Fine-Art Photography**

So, how do I interpret fine-art photography?

Primarily it has to be an image which immediately evokes an emotional response, and for me it has to be a pleasant response, uplifting/ beautiful/ peaceful/ awe-inspiring/ even intriguing or mysterious maybe. One that makes me wish I had produced it, or at least had seen what the photographer saw.

I know that there are many other emotions, many images which provoke anger, or pity, or revulsion, and while I may be moved by them, I would not wish to live with such a picture hanging on my wall. There is enough stuff in the media portraying those kinds of images.

The usual definitions of a fine-art photograph imply that it should be a print, on textured paper, and some would say black and white. I would certainly like to see more monochrome entries than we usually have, but am perfectly happy with colour, and whatever paper the photographer considers he wishes to use. (Textured paper is expensive, I know)

So, for this competition, in 2009-10, as it is not points-scoring, I only want prints, nothing projected. No digital.

If some of you have already prepared images for projection, you have plenty of time to create a print.

It doesn't have to be a big print, on a big board. A beautifully presented miniature stands as much chance. Content, quality, and presentation are what is important for a picture that might hang on someone's wall.

Ruth 14 04 09

Addition 22 11 09

I have altered this slightly since I first sent it round to you all, as there are now no slides. And I got it wrong about how many trophies there are. So there will be 3 classes of prints, Mono, Colour, and up to A4, which can be mono or colour.

I haven't altered anything in my definition. Good luck.