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Abstract. During In the history of photography, photography has had notable communication with objectivism. One of the main reasons that photography always has been accused that "photography is not art" was the nature of the media / art of photography and its objective and mechanical representation. This story is been problematic for the audience when Be aware that throughout history The brightest periods and artistic photography movements is caused by the nature of objective representative of camera Thus, this paradoxical function of objectivism in art of photography is the main issue in this paper. In philosophical thought in modern age especially after Dekart’s ideas, Phenomena exist beyond the knower subjectivity. In fact, Descartes’s thought, Distinguished the mind and the body or subject and object and considered it premier than the other one. In the context of such thinking, art is not considered as imitation of reality but it is the result of the creativity of the human mind. Convert the object to the subject and transition from object to subject and concept of subject it is a long way that Kant and Heidegger passed to take some distance from previous philosophical traditions. The purpose of this article is study of attitude of Kant and Heidegger about subject and object and its important result is describe and explain the characteristics of subject and object in photography be based on Kant and Heidegger viewpoints.
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1. INTRODUCCIÓN

Questioning about the artistic essence of photography is one of the most frequent questions - both in terms of the number of papers in this regard (which their writing is still continuing) and in terms of the discussions made in the artistic and academic circles - which most of the times it leads to questioning “What is photography?”

Perhaps photography is the only art that its nature and its concept of being an art have been of the fundamental issues of the discussions and writings to this extent. However, with a general look at the history of photography we find out that repetition of this question does not mean that there has been no progress in answering to this question, but on the contrary, presenting this question and the attempt to find an up to date answer for that have always led to identification of an aspect of all the aspects of photography which has been neglected prior to that, and further, most of the changes and ups and downs of photography throughout the history have risen from the heart of considering the same question and the attempt to answer that (Steve Edwards, 2011).

Until Renaissance and prior to the new age - specially in the ancient Greece- the theories of art commonly considered art as an imitation of reality, however in the new age and with the growth of Humanism and the changes in human worldview, this way of thinking has lost its creditability and aesthetic interpretation replaced imitation of reality. Due to the philosophical thinking of the new age, especially after Descartes theories, phenomena exist beyond the subjectivism of the recognizer (the artist). As a matter of fact, Descartes thought has distinguished mind from body and the subject from the object and gave superiority to it. In the content of such thought, the art was also no more an imitation of reality but it was a result of creativity of the active human mind (Tusk Peter, 2008). However, “according to popular belief, photo still was a spontaneous product of a soulless machine. The belief was that the camera produces document and not an image” (Edwards, 2001:68). Due to its nature, a photo camera mechanically records the subject and in the words of Roland Barthes, photographic images with a kind of data transfer are incapable of forming a relation. Therefore, photography lacks the special painting techniques and therein is the immediate implication of the governor and photography is somehow a dimensional continuity of Mimesis where in its frame, reality is mechanically manifested (Shepherd Ann, 2000).

Based on philosophy of arts in the nineteenth century, realities of the world are not preexisting things that should be indentified and represented, but it’s our subjective perceptions and beliefs that build the subject and configure it. Now, if representation is made through mechanical recording then it is clear that artists would not appreciate it. “In the nineteenth century, as the photography invented, art and technology -Expressive method and Mechanical method- were distinguished” (Wells, 2011:311) thereby photography which was following mechanical representation method could hardly be presented and recognized as art. Therefore, during several eras of the history of artistic photography, copying nature of photography was regarded as a disturbing factor and the artists and even critics have always been trying to find a solution for this problem and photographers fought a hard battle in order to introduce photography as art. After many centuries since Plato’s view on art, it still seems like photography is invented based on the same reasons that he hated the arts for. “The fastest way is to pick a mirror and take it to everywhere with yourself, then you will be able to create everything, from the sun and stars to the earth and yourself and other creatures without soaring any time and you can and you would make all manufactured objects and all that we mentioned just now”, Plato wrote in his book, the Republic (Shepherd, 2007:11). In this regard and since the beginning of the history of photography, photographers attempted to convert photo from objective approach to representational expression, using several photography methods. One of such photography artistic movements was called “Pictorialism” photography movement. Pictorialist photography is a general title, however in brief in order to address the characteristics of such photography style it can be stated that for pictorialist photographers artistic quality had more value than documentary reality. Therefore, photographers that wanted to be accepted at the position of an artist, followed the trend of subjects in the paintings of their time in terms of content and style. In 1892, a group of photographers separated from The Royal Photographic Society of Great Britain – the same Society that emphasized on the scientific and technologic aspects of photography during 1870s and 1880s and did not indicate Artistic Photography- and established “Closed Circle Brotherhood Society” under the leadership of Henry Peach Robinson. This group was later became well-known as the “...
Pictorialists”. Robinson believed that “even the most bitter enemies of photography as an art should also accept that when several photographers represent the same subject, then the resulting photos will be different and this is not because of them using different lenses and chemicals, but it is originating from the point that each of them also have a different subjectivism that leads to their fingertips and from there is extended to their photos”( Wells, 2011:320).

Art critics also in the photo exhibitions bewared photographers from addressing everyday scenes based on their comparison with painting. Mike Viorba in definition of Pictorialist photography considered the goal of this style of photography to be creation of images wherein the magnificent beauty of the sublime photo to be consistent with the moral beauty of the sublime image without addressing a particular individual or geographic identity ( Wells, 2011:321). Therefore, photographers usually limited themselves to imitate from inferior types of paintings; lifeless nature, instructive scenes of everyday life, artistic portraits and attractive landscapes. However as the conditions and characteristics of Pictorialist photography changed over the years, a group moved beyond this limit. Robert Demachy believed that the beauty of nature itself is not forming an art work – and this is only presented by the way the artist expresses it. Uncreative copying from nature, whether it is made by brush, pen, or camera can never be called an art work. Addressing the best paintings, he always pointed out that the artist distinguishes the common reality from the final work and that means non-objective look! One of the most important reasons that Demachy opposed objective photography was that, in his opinion, art is the result of personal expression of the artist. He believed that an art work should be a counterpart of nature and not a copy of that. Art alone is in human, art is in subjectivism and not in objectivity ( Demachy, 1980:172). As it is apparent, the nineteenth century artist did not accept photography alone to be art and were in pursuit of liberation from photographic objectivity.

1.1 Subject and Subjectivism

Subjectivism comes from the word Subject meaning character, person and main topic. This word is opposed to Object meaning the thing and material object. Subjectivism in term addresses the subjective approach to deal with the reality which is under study in a way that the realized value judgments come in the research. Subjectivism has its roots in Idealism. Idealism is a philosophical school that is raised by Plato, Hegel and Kant. In this school, the outside world is an expression of human thoughts and social phenomena are evaluated by their extent of compatibility with their conceived counterparts.

1.2 Leading Theorists of Subjectivism

Among the leading theorists of Subjectivism we can name Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel: 1770-1831, Immanuel Kant: 1724-1804, Wilhelm Dilthey: 1833-1911, Heinrich John Rickert: 1863-1936, and Wilhelm Windelband :1848-1915. Hegel who belongs to Idealism philosophy, did emphasize more on the importance of the subject and subjective products rather than the material world. In fact Hegel presented a kind of evolution theory based on Idealistic thoughts which according to his theory, humans at the first stage only had the ability of intuitive understanding of the world around them. This while at the next steps they could also understand their own existence as well. In accordance with Hegel’s plan, individuals evolve from the stage of recognition of objects to the stage of self recognition and awareness about their position.

Based on Kantian epistemology, reality lies in the bed of subjectivism. He assumed that the creative action of the recognizer individual builds the epistemic subject and the world’s orderliness, discipline and relations are due to the structure of knowledge in the epistemic subject of the human. For him, the epistemological problem derived from the impact and mutual exposure of the subject of a recognizer individual with the outside world ( Sabine Kreibel, 2007:23). Kant's philosophical system is called Critical Philosophy or Transcendental Subjectivism and is the core of the new philosophy in the nineteenth century. Kant separated the two types of Subjectivism, i.e. Transcendental Subjectivism and Dogmatic Subjectivism. Subjectivism is a theory which considers epistemic issues only for the subjective issues and the outside world without subject of the recognizer is considered unreal. This is the Kantian Dogmatic Subjectivism. Kant claims that subject imposes a structure to the outside world which therein the outside object should be consistent with that and what cannot be adapted with such a structure is beyond the experience. As a result, objects are also separate from the subject of the recognizer and therefore are beyond the experience. Kant called this the Transcendental Subjectivism. Kant believed that human is as a recognized object and takes part in a phenomenal world as a physical existence, however his
distinction is not his physical body but his spirit. Human as a spiritual being should be considered like a free subject that is wandering the territory of thoughts. Although he is a determined recognized object as a physical being (Ashley Lagrinch, 2011), however after Hegel and Kant, Idealism movement emerged in Germany that contained the critical philosophy of Kant. This movement is known under the name of Neo-Kantian movement and included Dilthey, Windleband and Rickert etc. They were not Subjective idealists, however they overruled the Kantian concept of "noumenon in itself" as it cannot be empirically recognized and understood. Neo-Kantians have also drawn a particular border between the human world and natural world since Kant’s era.

As the twentieth century artists attempted to remove the old and previously common grammar, they therefore found photography to be the best tool for such purpose. The features of media which have been emerged in the modern era, on the other side, took part in supporting the new definition of photography as an independent medium from painting and caused an emphasis on the inherent qualities of photography. Therefore, not only the objectivism of photography was not rejected any more, but also it was emphasized. In 1916, Alfred Stieglitz concluded that photography and painting are opposed points before they are similar activities. According to Grino, he believed the application of photography is not to provide aesthetic pleasure but to present visual facts about the world. Therefore he moved passed the blur imagism to reach purism, a style with sharp edges and apparent objects, which although is not synonymous of the photographic modernism, but involves its American style appearance (Grünberg, 2010:41). The Straight Photography, which was presented by Stieglitz, focused on direct recording and documenting and emerged as a response to Pictorialism. This school has been formed in pursuit of achieving fundamental intrinsic characteristics of the camera. Photographers of this school avoided manipulation of the subject, photo and negative, and attempted to have a direct contact with the subject and photo. Strand works were not based on existing artistic approaches but there were based on the intrinsic characteristics of photography, itself. His photos were pleasant in terms of aesthetics and he also believed in the intrinsic characteristics of photography to some extent and thus he complied with his “straight” treatment to photography and did not commit manipulation in order to present his subjects and displayed them in a real form. Strand himself said: The attempt has always been to convert camera to brush and to liken photos to painting, gravure and charcoal drawing and things like them, it means to anything but photo.

I prefer the simple documentary photos of the National Geographic Magazine or aerial documentary photos to the counterfeit photos of the Pictorialists (Edwards, 80). Strand gave a special importance to the objectivity of photography and emphasized on it; because in his opinion, this characteristic of photography were distinct from other artistic forms. He felt a great respect for the objects as they were and never intended to make or created them or as said to direct his images (Brian Coe, 2000:232). In an article dated 1917, Strand wrote: The unique power of photography is its pure and undisputable objectivity. Such objectivity is the essence of photography (Soutter, 2012:33). Edward Weston, in line with the perspective of Strand, believed that each method of making an image has its own characteristics, therefore photography as an art is different from other forms of visual arts such as painting, a difference that not only have to be accepted but also should be emphasized. Through a redefinition of photography in Europe and aligned with artistic modernism, it could recognize its intrinsic characteristics to a large extent and gradually artist photographers were found who in addition to their experiences, discovered diverse and special features of photography and gave an artistic independence to photography. Particularly in Germany, many photographers emphasized on objective photography in their works. The “New Objectivity” emerged in Germany in the 1920s as a painting style in response to expressionism and as its name indicates, it returned to the reality with no feeling involved and focused on the objective world and were opposed to idealistic, romantic or abstract expressionism orientations. New objectivity soon developed in to the field of photography as the camera was the best tool for objective representation, although photography, with no dependency on this style of painting, had presented this orientation of objectivity concerning reality a few years back. While in most European countries, the definition of photography were involved with the refusal of reality, but the photographers of this school did emphasize on the physical and objective aspects. Excessive detail recording and impartial approach of the New Objectivity had a great congruence with the philosophy. The tradition of continental philosophy since the age of enlightenment, and particularly in Germany, had a serious emphasis on visible objectives. As an instance, for Kant and Hegel, the world of objects provides the grounds of
interoperability for us wherein it is possible to experience ourselves as subjects. Visual strategies correlated with objective photography under such conditions, would assist our comprehension from the objects of the world and to study our relation with them (Souter, 2012:35).

The photographers of the “New-Objectivity” focused their attempt on providing a clear and vivid reality in images and emphasized on the various aesthetic aspects of the everyday objects which were not noticed in the noise and commotion of the modern life (2008,114).

Helen Gardner addressed the “Potters Hands” by Ranger Patch and writes that is work of art prevent any personal comment by intentionally converting the image into an abstract composition and the photo content exclusively is available to the calm representation and lies in an organized world which is implicitly indoctrinated (Gardner, 2008: 796).

The concepts based from New Objectivity gradually extended to other countries and although the imaging accuracy and details of the conformation did not disappear in any of them through the adaption stage, however the effective factors did lose their senseless realism and gained a poetic expression (Task, 2008: 120). In the first half of the twentieth century, photography continued while it was recognized as an art and could express itself as a form of modern art and gradually opened its place in a number of museums and archives (of course not at the level of other arts such as painting).

The point that has to be mentioned about photography in the first half of the twentieth century is that although photography gradually gained a relatively independent place for itself in art and progressively had absorbed the extremely elitist spirit of modern art, however as Wells addresses, still documentation, press photography, commercial art and studio portraits were the main driving force of photography and photography—in comparison with other arts such as painting and sculpture—was still considered a second class art. However, in pursuit of the developments, the art after 1960 entered into an unintended discourses and faced fundamental issues and problems in artistic, technical and conceptual terms. In line with negating traditional media such as painting and sculpture, which led artists toward new media such as photography, the reason for appreciating photography was more because conceptual artists considered photography as an inferior art (comparing to superior art such as painting) and thus used photography for responding to the modern art and opposing that. Therefore, conceptual artists noted objectivity of the photography due to the fact that artists were after documentary images that mostly recorded and represented an even or phenomena in a series. Thus the emphasis on authenticity of photo and the relation of photographed image to “The Real” formed the main reason for the artists to use photo and their tendency to photography. Photography which since its invention had the dream of entering the field of art, were then in a ground which questioned the traditional fundamentals of art and artistic values of the modern age. While the aesthetic sensitivities were complied as much as possible in the tradition of photography, the in use of the conceptual artists from photography, photos had no outstanding artistic quality. Conceptual artists who at first used photography as a tool, later were fascinated by the intrinsic characteristics of this media and attracted many youths to photography. Although each of those artist had their own ideas and approaches, however they were common in using the fundamentals of photography and intrinsic elements of this media and often had a phenomenological approach toward photography. Douglas Huebler in the exhibition catalogue of 1969 stated: The world is full of more or less interesting objects and I do not intend to add a new thing, but I prefer to express the existence of things, in the sense of their existence in time or place (Marzona, 2005:17).

If the photographed image in the new age tended to express a mystery or a particular feeling, but now in the conceptual art only the objectivity based on media of photography remains that is formed with no sense of the artist subjectivity (elite).

Conceptual artists who used photos not only were not loyal to the principles of artistic photography but also they opposed such claims and stood on the opposite point to that (Artists Book). A part of the artists used photography in order to record their works and although the photos were presented in the Gallery but mostly their documentary application was of concern for the artists and photos, with their intrinsic objectivity, were only representing the original art work. However, some other conceptual artists had placed the issue of “Photographic Objectivity” as the theme of their work. These artists had a critical view on the concepts of presentation and representation, reality and the structure of image. Another one of these artists was William Anastasi who challenged the indexing logic of the photo and its objective representation with his works. Anastasi in his untitled work in 1964 drew on the wall of the gallery and then photographed parts of it and printed them on real scale and placed the photos on their exact place on the actual drawing presented the concept of moving one degree away from
photography with four photos with enigmatic attitudes, expressing ces and still ern was to display paradoxical objectivity t.

trayal of buildings in the 1920s and erman photographer ing photographic it. Looking only to the far as possible. This tight and disciplined form of attempt to avoid involving their Bechers had in mind by objectivity. They political gesture due to its nature. This is what new action in German photography and was also a past, without the slightest idea of the future, was a human and a perspective of a new start. The approach of photography is to describe the world objectively, precisely and particularly and without the influence of inner feelings of the photographer, cold and neutral. The German photographer couple, Brend and Hilla Becher are considered one of the first photographers who presented a conceptual exploration on the capacity of “Objectivity” in the photographed images. The period in which Bechers were doing their work, was the post-war Germany in the 1950s and 60s. In that period and as a result of horrible things that have taken place during the war, most people rejected ideologies ( an ideology of anti-ideology! ) Bechers themselves expressed that they do not believe in portrayal of buildings in the 1920s and 30s. In the photography of those years, things were either seen from the above or from the under and thus there was a desire to covert the object into a memorial building and thereby were exploited by the socialistic attitude. On the other hand, they were after a new perspective of the world, by a new human and a perspective of a new start. The approach of Bechers as postwar photographers are both in acceptance and appreciating of the Machine Age and also criticizing it. Looking only to the past, without the slightest idea of the future, was a new action in German photography and was also a political gesture due to its nature. This is what Bechers had in mind by objectivity. They attempted to avoid involving their subjectivity, as far as possible. This tight and disciplined form of Bechers in expression was the result of a precise acceptance of a constant and direct look that had no change in almost half a century ( Sara James: 15). More than anything, their concern was to display the capacity of photography in conceiving reality and what we educe from things in a physical and objective relationship. Although Becher’s approach was similar to the existing approach in the “New Objectivity”, but there were the nuances and still fundamental differences. For an instance, August Sander, applying objectivity, intended to display in what position are we placed in general term. He benefited from the science in order to objectively display the outside world and to describe this world for us, while the objectivity of Bechers is quite different. Bechers were after presenting a latent concept in their works with objectively recording and archiving them together. In fact, the difference between the work of Bechers and New Objectivity can be said to be if objectivity was only an intermediate for expressing predefined concepts for New Objectivity, then for Bechers and in general for Conceptual Artists, Spritualism and Conceptualism moved from the stage of producing image and objectivity to the stage of reading it. Therefore, although the objectivity character was the main expression of photography in the aesthetics of the contemporary artistic photography, but it is clear that the intention of objectivity here is a kind of paradoxical objectivity which therein the formative fundamental subject bears a birth. Thus, through the process of the contemporary artistic photography, “The Real” passes apparatus ( as a combination of the photographer’s subjectivity in addition to the special world of photographic image) and became a new “Reality” which can be called “Media Reality” or “Photographic Reality”. In conclusion, and as it is observed in this article, as long as photography were after a position in art and avoided objectivity which was actually the intrinsic feature of the photography mechanism, although it could take a place for itself in art but it was always considered a second class art. However, as soon as the conceptual art was presented and considering the changes in the art world, then it was the artists who approached photography and attempted to produce photographic works and therefore a reveres trend took place. Emphasis on being artistic gave its place to being photographic, and photographers emphasized on being artistic in their works instead of being artistic and therefore “Objectivity” which since the beginning was an obstacle for promotion of photography as an art, became the distinctive feature of this art, and nowadays even other arts are benefiting from
this very feature of photography, i.e. “Objectivity” (Adrian Pier, 2013: 36).

1.3 Historical Trend of the Literal and the Philosophical Meanings of Subjectivism

Subjectivism is derived from the Latin term “Subjectum” and that derived from the Greek term “Hypokeimenon”, “Sub” and “hypo” both means base, basis and foundation. “jectum” is the past participle of “jectare” meaning “to cast” and “to drop”. The above term, both in the Greek era and in the medieval, were used with the meaning of “an objective and external thing”. “Subjectum” has an opposite relation with “Objectum”, thais is comprised on “ob” meaning “opposite” and “jectum” meaning “to drop”. “Objectum” is something subjective and dependent on subject and in Latin indicates perceptual form in consistency with an objective existence (Keramat Moaleli, 2005).

Although even Descartes used “Subject” and “Object” with the Medieval meanings of these two terms, and called the Subjective realm of imagination and instantiates of the objects “Objective Reality”, but he made an interpretation form these two terms and considered boundaries for them that caused the emergence of new meanings for them. He established the principle of “Cogito”, and considered the “Human Self” to be the only true existence which all other existences are dependent on it and are as representation or products of such thinking self, and are its objects. Thereby, their externalization no longer matters, but their narration, subjective demonstration and them belonging to human recognition is valid and of the essence. Existences other than human, including God and objects and even other humans have objective prestige and are dependent on the Subject.

In Kant’s philosophy, the two terms of “Subject” and “Object” are applied with their modern sense and opposed to the old era. Kant considers “Objective” as an issue that is out of the area of the Subject and belongs to recognition or an external object. “Subjective”, however in his philosophy indicates an issue that is in the Subject and is considered as its aspects. “Subject” means human as it is the recognizer subject, in a particular sense. In the new age, “Subjective” means the recognizer subject and “Objective” means the recognized object which are opposed to the Latin and Greek meanings (Suzanne Sontag, 2010).

“Subjectivism” in Hegel’s philosophy reaches to its peak and totality and absolute certainty of the spirit is achieved in terms of human self-consciousness. Despite the fact that Nietzsche sharply criticizes Descartes, but is still flowing in the same thinking path and reaches “Subjectivism” to its destination. His “Super Human” is the perfection of Descartes “Cogito”.

Of course, however human is the center of attention and is a measure for everything in some schools, but still, the new philosophy was only established in the new age and a new realization method was structured which based on that, human and his subject is the measure for determination of the degree of certainty for things and imposes itself on objects and distinct them. This new plan, which has substantial and intrinsic differences with the past is addressed in the next discussion.

Dominance of the “Human Self” is based on Descartes principle of “I think, therefore I am” which is known as the “Cogito” theorem, which thereby human gains a new position in the existence and is no more criticized by a religious belief as it was during the Medieval period, but recognizes itself as an absolute and indisputable existence that its being is more certain than anything else. The nature of human is changed in this new era and becomes the “Subject” which in comparison, all other existences become “Objects” for this “Subject”.

The Spirit of “Cogito” theorem is independence in thinking. Descartes is willing to reach scientific certainty with his own personal experience. With this theorem, Descartes places wisdom and consciousness at the peak of the beings and accepts only what is directly experienced and became intuition. The thinking “Self” as the subject and the influential in the world is derived from such wisdom. Descartes uses the term “Objective” opposed to “Formal” and in the sense of subjective realm of imagination and instantiates of the objects. He uses the term “Subjective Reality” in the sense of reality as it is in the subject and the term “Formal Reality” in the sense of reality as it belongs to our perceptions. Such application has no difference with the Medieval concepts of “Subject” and “Object”, but what brings Descartes and his philosophy to the frontier of the schools in the new age is his expressions about these terms. He considers the Human Self as the only true existence and in his opinion as certainty, and other existences as “Objects” for this only one “Subject” that are dependent to it. In the new age, Human and the truth of his intrinsic has become the subject of recognition and his nature have become a new; i.e. his nature is changed and forms the subject of recognition. His is at the center of universe and everything is distinguished as his consequence, for his will and for him.
Spinoza presented the duality between the thought and protraction which emerged as a result of Descartes philosophy, and addressed perception and existence as an integrated whole that has various features and diverse forms. To comply with Descartes, he believed that the reason as the first and the last measure should be regarded for all issues, inclusive of theoretical, philosophic, political and even life routines. Further, "Intuition" and "Comparison" as the two faculties for recognizing the truth are presented by Descartes and "Intuition" is defined as the direct certain knowledge. Intuitive understanding of Descartes have two conditions: it should be clear and distinct and should be derived directly. The integration emphasized by Spinoza has been previously confirmed by Descartes in his theory about the "tree of knowledge". Descartes analogizes knowledge to a tree that its root is metaphysics, its trunk is physics and its fruits are ethics, medicine and mechanics. Leibniz, along with Spinoza and Malebranche are called “Cartesian Philosophers”. Despite of their different perspectives with Descartes, they have entered into philosophy with the same method as his. Leibniz observed there is a spirit in human, which although has no dimension, but is the origin of actions, and thereby he realized Self through comparison, and found out that there is a origin in all beings that is immaterial and although reason has no clear and distinct understanding of it, but still it rules for its existence. He believed that the objects and their characteristics are apparent and thereby the continuous matter is inexistant and unreal and also time and place are abstract and imaginary, which provided the grounds for Kant, his fellow German countryman to create a revolution in philosophy which as he himself interpreted is like the Copernican revolution in the Astronomy.

Kant himself addresses his Copernican revolution in philosophy in the second edition of Critique of the Pure Reason, and emphasizes: If instead of considering the objects as the principle and comparing human subject (mind) to that for adaption, we consider our subject (mind) as the principle and then adapt the objects with it, then we would better understand and easier solve the metaphysical issues and problems. In his opinion, we are incapable of recognizing the "Objects per se" and we are just able to understand the apparent; because only the apparent are figured under time and place and are placed as the previous essential form the condition of the possibility of imagining phenomena. Time and place are the inner characteristics of our mind and therefore and subject dependent (Wilfried Böse, 2010: 76). In his opinion, we recognize things because we ourselves have created them; i.e. it’s their form that is created by us. Everything is “Subjective” for him; because the apparent world is subjected to our conditions. He presented his theory of Subjectivity and that the experience is pre-time and pre-place and then later he presented the theory of Subjectivity of things that its task is to create the objectivity of the whole empirical world. His things are actually legacies of Descartes innate ideas. He applies “Subject” in the sense of human in terms of him being somehow the recognizer subject and applies “Object” in the sense of dependent recognized or the external object. The existence of thing is its objectivity for the Subject. In his philosophy, beings exist because they are experienced and particularly recognized by the Subject. The mind previously and in the feeling stage adds the two element of time and place as the previous intuitive elements, and for understandings it adds twelve things that are pure and non-empirical priori understandings to the knowledge. Thereby totality and necessity that are prerequisites of knowledge and are derived from the subject itself are acquired. Kant inherited the fundaments of his philosophy from Descartes and he made the grounds for many schools in the western philosophy of the new age. He commences from reason as the absolute essence in his philosophy and eventually reaches to the absolute essence again. All of his philosophy is reason that emerges with various forms; i.e. his philosophy of nature is reason that has a non-intrinsic state and is a stage that reason should pass through in order to reach spirituality.

1.4 Productive Apparition from the Perspective of Kant

At first glance, the prospect of finding that original spontaneity which is so characteristic of imaging consciousness somewhere within the seemingly irrevocably sensory parameters of photography’s representational nature does not appear promising; it would appear that photography falls fully within processes of what we would have to call reterritorialization, whereby previously delimited conceptual patterns are imposed upon the fullness of the earth. The lines of escape which cut across processes that establish territoriality, and so lead toward the liberating superfluity of the earth’s open potential, do not seem evident in the static mode of image capture through which the photograph is produced. It is upon these grounds that
photography is criticized as representational, and as being incapable of eliciting original thoughts which produce new concepts. It maybe then, that what we should be asking is whether there is a sense in which photography can ever leave this humanized World Horizon, and could ever point back toward a more primordial Earth. Such a possibility would necessarily define photography in terms of deterritorialization, and firmly establish an ability for the photograph to produce creative lines of escape which are not inherently reifying and objectified. Could this be possible; and if so, in what way should this possibility be conceptualized? (Martin Hochleitner, 2008:24)

However, such subjectivity situation is not always the same, but is always diverse and is only existant based on its distinct nature. In this regard we need to consider that the only comprehensive character that particularly is assignable to human is its plurality. That is self-variant spontaneity that makes our sense of recognition identifiable. Subjectivity is always a difference, whether it is associated hysteria or punctum madness.

Now therefore the issue we are facing regarding poststructuralism nature of photography is as following: How the nature plays the role for creating imaginary forms concerning the position that is displayed by photography, such as the nature positioning of the Earth? (the same: 26).

Here we are irrevocably dragged toward the undeniable empirical nature of thought. Apparition is regarding the conditions. A thing that appears, is appearing under its apparition conditions. The conditions are the formative appearances of the apparition. The appearing object, appears under such conditions. Apparition, in fact, comes back to the conditions of apparition, the same as appearance to essence … It can be figured that Sartre’s conception from Non-dogmatic knowledge under the title of “lateral irrealt apparitions, correlates of an impersonal consciousness”, addresses Kant and indicates the essential conditions that are absolute for a “Productive Appearance”. This is compatible with Leibnitz perspective, that viewpoint builds the subjectivism. However, if we face situations that are created prior to formation of subject/object, then we would state that we are dealing with apparitions that have a sense of “Conditioned Appearance”, i.e. condition based varieties that the appearance becomes possible through them. After Kant’s writings, such “Apparitions of the Productive Appearance” have established the grounds for formation of all modern sciences: specially, time and place as the most independent diversified image. This is a general public mid-subjectivism, that permits no differential diversity; and in exact words, conditioned viewpoint is nothing but what is generalized in common for all. This is a fundamental principle of scientific methodology: repeatability of empirical discoveries. However, this is exactly the nature of a concept which is totally related to the poststructuralism philosophy (Kuan Chung & Sheng, 2012:78).

Until here we can notice that Husserl’s application of the “Earth” as a general background for all possible experiences, opposes the application of Francis Bacon who used positional diversity of photography his paintings in order to make a background horizon in terms of empirical differentiation, as a “associate”, and in fact, associate continues its role in the philosophy of Deleuze and his attempts along with Felix Guattari. We find that the concept of Proportioned Characters are formed between the “Logic of feeling” and “Thousand Plateaus” and then in “What is Philosophy” as the last attempt of Deleuze and Guattari we observe the emergence of “Concept Forming Figures”. These advances are in the heart of the analytical methodology which we used for the present research, and in no way we consider the concepts like Sartre’s lateral irrealt apparitions” or Leibnitzs’s “Accurate Perceptions” or Bartz’s Punctum, even virtually to be the same; however, each of these concepts have particular functions which we intend to both study and form them by the differential structures in which they are formed. We can, in fact, change such roles to observe what differences would emerge. However in order to do so, we need to understand the precise position in which these structures are formed, therefore we need to comply with an education approach in this research and to place extensive quotations on which we rely. If formation of concept forming figures are described based on Geographic Philosophy (Simon,2003) such meaning of Positioning would surely and necessarily extend to the concepts which form such concept forming figures. As it has been previously indicated, the photographer plays a significant role in establishment of the nature of the concept forming figures and has already done it, and it is done in positional terms. Yes, photography captures still images of the event which after that they are separated from their dynamization. However, when the proportional horizon, which movement is measured by that, changes from the Earth to the “Horizon of Humanity World”, it would be still when the totality of such horizon hides its empirical characteristic – change in the spontaneity of knowledge; and when the positional diversity, that is the feature of photography, in
involved then we should ask the question whether photography is really by nature capable of reifying as much as we have drawn toward this belief. Therefore photography is not considered as a process that presents the subjects as its Object or the objects as its Subject, but according to definition, it is essentially a process of territorialization; and as it is displayed through Bartz’s Punctum analysis of photography, it is something that is uniquely evolve from itself (Johnson Patricia, 2009:34).

1.5 The Position of Subject and Object from the Perspective of Heidegger

Art, in the thought of Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) has a very fundamental role. His most significant work regarding art is “The Origin of the Artwork”. His thoughts in this book are very complex and poetic and its translation to Farsi has added to such complexity. Some intellectuals consider Heideggers works to be untranslatable. A viewpoint that perhaps is based on Heidegger’s approach toward translation. He considered translation to be necessarily a personal interpretation and believed that the original though is ambiguous in its heart and nature and with the prejudice he had for German language and its capabilities, he was extremely inattentive to translation and connection between language structures (Gerry, 203: 162).

The two fundamental questions of Heidegger regarding the philosophy of art are What is the relation of the secret of the art work to the secret of existence? And What is the origin of an art work?

The treatise of “The Origin of the Artwork” seeks to find the answer for those two questions. Heidegger added two annexes to the above treatise: “Epilogue” that criticizes the tradition of classic aesthetics and the other one is “Supplement” which therein he addresses some of the ambiguities of the thesis and his re-perceptions.

The main question in “The Origin of the Artwork” is to find the origin of the artwork. This question is answered in the very first paragraph of the book. The origin of the artwork is not the artist but is the “Art”. Questioning about the origin of the artwork at the very beginning becomes questioning about art (Young, 2005: 36). Heidegger states in order to find out what is art, it should be understood from the work of art, and to understand what is work of art is only possible through the nature of art. What is artwork is found out from the nature of art and What is art is induced from the nature of artwork (Kockelmans, 2003: 144). It is obviously a circle that is vicious in logic. In his hermeneutical method, he accepts the circle and considers in inevitable for the understanding process and also believed that such a circle provides the grounds for the most fundamental type of recognition. Understanding art is associated with understanding the work of art and understanding artwork is associated with understanding art, and without each, understanding the other is impossible. In Heidegger’s belief, the important point in the hermeneutical circle is to enter it and not exiting it (Heidegger, 1999:85) and in order to enter this circle, he starts from the work of art, however he does not provide much explanation for this choice. For the purpose of reaching to the truth of art, Heidegger expresses three interpretations from the Object that philosophy have developed in the Western thought tradition:

• Object is a plurality of sense impressions that is derived from something for the senses (theory of Object as Unity of Senses). Based on this theory, objectivity of an object is based on the unity of the plurality of what have been given to senses which the method of visualizing such unity do not cause a change in specific feature of this interpretation of the objects. According to this theory, object is sensible and is what can be understood.

• Object is a formed matter (the theory of Matter and Form). In his opinion, there is “another thing” involved in artworks other than objectivity and being artistic for the artwork is actually returning to this other thing. An artwork is an object, but in addition narrates from another thing, and this character distinguishes it from the pure object that is only itself and is not symbol for anything else. This “other thing”, in fact, is emergence and discovery of the truth.

1.6 What is the Art of Photography

The art of photography is not the only tool that is defined due to its operation. Identity of a tool is defined due to its relation to others. The same as words that have no independent meaning and are defined in relation with others in a sentence. The
art of photography is more concerned in its definition as a tool rather than its aesthetic aspect, and the look on photography artwork is in terms of aesthetics and is enjoyed that way. The art of photography as a tool is a kind of cultural activity which can only be found in exhibitions and museums of the art of photography. In this interpretation of the art of photography, the observer of photography artwork looks at the art of photography artwork like janitors of a museum who dust a sculpture or persons who are in the business of transporting photography artworks from an exhibition to another and transport the photography artwork like a trunk of a tree or a piece of coal (Glendinning, 2001:153). Referring to Heidegger’s theories on art, such interpretation of art is also void and the art of photography is as the “Discovery of Truth” and “Opening of the World”. According to Heidegger’s example for distinction between an object as a pure tool and an artwork, which was van Gogh’s painting tableau of “The Farmer Woman Shoes”, it can be concluded that the truth place itself in the photography artwork and the art of photography per se gains independence and identity. The intrinsic characteristic of the art of photography is not creating beauty but it is creating the truth. In Heidegger’s perspective, the truth does not mean compliance with the real, but it is emergence and discovery of being and the photographer artists is someone who realizes existence in his work of art. Further, considering his opinion regarding “The Great Art”, in photography the great art is nothing less than “Occurrence of the Truth”. This occurrence shall not be considered as creating a representation or a precise and clear image of beings or objects, but it is an original opening or appearance of the beings, as they are. Therefore, relying on this theories on the three interpretations of the universe, the art of photography artwork does not carry either sense characteristics or substance and accident and not even matter and form, but it is introduced as “The battlefield of the Earth and the Universe”. The objectivity nature of the photography artwork which is its terms of existence, is a battle between the universe that is opened and the Earth that wills to cover the secrets of the work.

Heidegger in his treatise “The Origin of the Artwork” instead of using familiar and common terms of western philosophy and aesthetics terms, enters a set of new and unique terms in his work. Terms such as the universe, the earth and the battle between these two. The art of photography is understood based on the concepts of the universe and the earth. The universe builds itself on the earth and the earth soars through the universe. The universe, although is relied and resides on the earth, but attempts to dominate it. Whereas the universe is opener and exposing by nature, cannot bear and permit what is covered therein. The earth on the other has as is both preservative and concealing, always attempts to immerse the universe and to cover and conceal it (Kockelmans, 2003: 212-218). According to his thoughts as he believed the universe is not solely the form of an object and the earth is not solely the equivalent of the matter, although at the first look, the earth seems the passive aspect of the photography artwork that is utilized like matter in the tool. In his opinion, the earth is the concealed aspect of the photography artwork and it would be opened and uncovered only when is placed in the universe, not to be a tool of a matter that fades in the function, like a knife or saw that as long as they work properly no one pays any attention to them. The Matter (the earth) appears in the photography artwork and come into the open world of the work universe. The earth and the universe are in fact the form and character of the photography art work. The universe is the form of the photography artwork that is a simultaneous product of the skill and creativity of the photographer artist, and the earth is its character that always carry the content, a massage and is real. Further again considering the painting interpretation of the Farmer Woman Shoes by Heidegger who wants us to understand that there is a kind of negligence in our regular interactions with objects, on the other hand, the photography artwork can bring our attention to it. An attention to what is existing, and the photography artwork brings this attention by its irregularity. The photography artwork picks a common and unattended object for human and grants it a universe that takes it out of the regular world and gives the possibility of openness to such an object and then once again that object enters the area of human awareness. Thereby the character of the photography artwork is made of knowledge and awareness. The effect of photography artwork is to create this particular understanding and reminds the existence of things. Along with the art of photography, this characteristic requires a creator. Whereas Heidegger’s interpretations are enigmatic and mysterious, thus his interpretations give a magical power to the art of photography and photography artwork that cause existence of human. In terms of his theories, the existence and nonexistence of photographer artist for the art of photography and the photography art work is the same and is as a path that reached inexistence through the process of creating the art of
photography. The photography artworks are as streams that the truth appears in it, and the truth is the truth of the existence, existence for appearance which insert human as an intermediate. The photographer, in this interpretation of art is an intermediate and is like the truth of existence utilizes photography in order to appear the truth.

The photography artwork and the art of photography emerges in the absence of the photographer as its creator. The art of photography is an occurrence of nature which humanity of the human is pending to it. Thereby the origin of the art of photography, in Heidegger’s opinion, is not the photographer but is the “art of photography” itself. It is not like we have an entity at the beginning, that is human, who creates the artistic objects, but we are facing an occurrence that lets human to be human, in a way that everything that exist (including human himself) can display itself as is (Glendinning, 2002:159). This is there that as Heidegger indicated, the origin is the artwork and it expands to the art of photography too. The common perspective is that the art of photography is born by the subject of the photographer or the photography artwork. However, according to Heidegger’s theories, as the art of photography exists, the opposite of the artwork exists too, and as the art of photography exists then the art of photographer exists too. Therefore the origin of everything is the nature of that thing and thus the origin of photo as an artwork is the nature of the art of photography. The art of photographer is undoubtedly the causality origin of the photo, but the sublime position of a photography artwork should be found in the art of photography itself.

The nature of photography is discovery of the truth. If the art of photography is the origin of the photography artwork and if the art of photography is the appearance of the truth and if the truth is appearance and discovery of the existence, then the existence is the origin of the photography artwork and the art of photographer is an intermediate for appearance of the existence and the truth. Through his path, not only the art of photographer is involved in the discovery and emergence of the existence and the truth, but also he considers the observers of the photography artwork (who he calls them “holders”) that pay attention to the appearance of the truth in the photography artwork to be involved in it. Not all observes are the holders of the photography artwork. Holders are the observers who understand the sublime position of the art of photography and preserve its sacred arena and consider the role of truthmaker for the photography artwork. Traditional observers are those who have no role in making the photography artwork to become the art of photography. According to Heidegger, any art is poetry in its nature. The art of photography, architecture, music, they are all kinds of poems. Poesy is not the art of composing poetry, but it is the same thing that the nature of all forms of art are dependant to it (Kockelmans, 2003:262).

2. CONCLUSION

Considering the theories of the two referred philosophers in this article (Kant and Heidegger) it can be stated that each of them attempted to present specific definitions of Subject and Object in order to discuss their thoughts. In Heidegger’s view, poesy is the nature of the art of photography; but his intention of poem is not rhythmic fancy words that cause the contraction and expansion of the spirit (Helli, 2002: 438). In his opinion, the art and artistic experience can provide the grounds for a kind of present encounter with the universe. Heidegger’s propose of Art is not the capability of utilizing artistic techniques, but is a kind of present encounter (non-achievable) with the world and a poetic life and a enthusiastic residence in the world. In Heidegger’s criticism on Subjectivism, the point for sure is not that whether human should be considered as a sound and perceptive being or not, but the point is that throughout the metaphysic’s history, subject or being sound is as the truest distinction between human and other begins and the understanding relation with the world is the foundation for any other relation between the human and the universe, objects and others and himself too and the land of intuition is the immediate understanding of the existence and present and non-conceptual understanding and relation with the totally forgotten world.

It is in the Kantian Philosophy which the two terms of Subject and Object are utilized with their modern meaning and opposite to their old meanings and the Object is an issue that is out of the area of the Subject and belongs to recognition or an external object. In his philosophy, Subject means human as is the recognizer subject in its particular way. In the new era, “Subjective” means the subject of recognizer and “Objective” means the object of the recognizer that is opposed to the Greek and Latin meanings. Kant distinguishes Subject and Object, and thus, Objects as the other can proceed to fight and colonization with his subjective mind. In Kant’s opinion, the world of objects provides us with the grounds for interoperability wherein it is possible to experience ourselves as Subjects. Under such conditions, visual strategies correlated with objective
photography could assist our understanding from the objects in the world and to study our relation with them. While criticizing the realistic traditional metaphysics which according to that the recognizer subject and the moral subject are considered as substance, Kant replaced such substance with the concept of metaphysical subject. The metaphysical subject, as being a subject, can justify the general grounds for recognition and moral law without it, itself, being the subject of any science or proof.

In Heidegger’s philosophy, poetry have an extent of a language. As he has a ontological interpretation of art and such interpretation can be extended to the art of photography too, likewise he also interprets poetry and language in an ontological process. Poetry is language and language is where the “existence” parades. The common assumption of the language, that is a tool only for communication and expressing inner states, should be set aside. Language means discovery of existence. Considering this interpretation of language, any form of art such as photography, architecture, painting, music and etc are a kind of language in which existence is sound and reaches from concealment to openness. Naming objects as a state is not an indication of an object, but naming something is actually becoming sound and putting it into words and telling and such narrating and putting into words is indicating and evoking the existence. Language is the origin of existence and poetry evoke things by naming them. Therefore, poetry is the same as language, just like the art of photography, however the poetry is an uncommon language; because the emphasis on disrupting the system of the common language is evident only in poetry more than any other art and based on that, it is like the beings we interact with on daily basis are appearing in another way in the art of photography.
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