

## Photography links

There are some photography-related sites about (digital) photography that I find particularly interesting and frequent regularly. Some others have solid information about specific topics. Here are some of my hot-list sites.

### Regular haunts

- Digital Photography Review [<http://www.dpreview.com/>] -- the mothership. In my opinion the best technical reviews of digital equipment I've seen anywhere, and a lively community around it, too.
- Flickr [<http://www.flickr.com/>] -- the cleverest idea for photo sharing to date, bar none. Whatever you want to do with your pictures, you can do it at Flickr... except create a gallery that looks like anything other than the default. But there is a good reason for that too...
- Imaging Resource [<http://www.imaging-resource.com/>] -- solid equipment reviews: less technical than Phil's, with more personal impressions -- by a keen amateur and gearhead for keen amateurs and gearheads. If you want to find out what a camera can do, go to DPRReview; if you want to find out what it's like, read the Imaging Resource review.
- digicamera.net [<http://www.digicamera.net/>] -- the annoyingly named best resource for digital camera info and news for Finnish photographers. (I *never* get the URL right -- IMO it should be "digikamera" -- it is a Finnish-language site, after all.)
- Photography Blog [<http://www.photographyblog.com>] -- Running commentary on photography-related news scoured from the Net and the photography press, with a personal angle, and a fair bit of related resources too. Good resource for staying abreast of events.
- Luminous Landscape [<http://www.luminous-landscape.com/>] -- opinionated but well informed stuff on a huge variety of topics from Michael Reichmann, a landscape photography guru, and his gang. Don't much care for the photography, and some of the articles drive me up the wall -- but there are enough gold nuggets in there to make it worthwhile.
- PBase Magazine [<http://www.pbase.com/magazine>] -- in my opinion, this web-zine is better than many commercial photography rags (including some I've written for). They're only at issue #3 so far, but are doing great.

### Specific resources

- Van Walree Optics and Photography [<http://www.vanwalree.com/>] -- extremely well-written and technically solid rundowns of all kinds of optics trivia. If you've wandered, for example, what causes vignetting, you can find the answers here.
- The Pumpkin [<http://doug.kerr.home.att.net/pumpkin/index.htm#OpticsPhoto>] by Doug A. Kerr -- a wealth of in-depth information of various issues regarding optics, light, and photography. Pretty

technical, though.

- Digital Lens FAQ [[http://www.swissarmyfork.com/digital\\_lens\\_faq.htm](http://www.swissarmyfork.com/digital_lens_faq.htm)] by Joseph S. Wisniewski. The technical low-down on what's meant by a "digital lens".
- Adam T's Lens Tests [[http://www.mankman.com/Lens\\_Tests/lens\\_framework.html](http://www.mankman.com/Lens_Tests/lens_framework.html)] -- A series of straightforward tests on a variety of Canon EF mount lenses. We all know that Canon L lenses are good, but it's the cheapos that are way better than they have any business being that are really interesting -- and Adam T has discovered a bunch of these.
- Joseph Wisniewski's Digital Lens FAQ [[http://frog.netperson.net/~wiz/digital\\_lens\\_faq.htm](http://frog.netperson.net/~wiz/digital_lens_faq.htm)] -- The low-down on what "digital" lens lines actually mean.
- Hin Chua's gallery [<http://www.pbase.com/magazine>] -- This guy is one to watch. He's relatively new to photography (and, in fact, visual arts in general) -- and he does work that puts most veterans I've seen to shame.
- Ed Leys's California Light and Structure [[http://www.blackmallard.com/cal\\_ls/](http://www.blackmallard.com/cal_ls/)] -- A lovely gallery of landscape photography, by someone who's truly mastered his medium.
- Chuck Gardner's photo class [<http://super.nova.org/PhotoClass/PhotoClass00.html>] -- He's distilled essentials of making good pictures into a few, simple guidelines. Definitely worth a close look.
- Kodak's Taking Great Pictures guide [[http://www.kodak.com/eknec/PageQuerier.jhtml?pq-path=2/3/38&pq-locale=en\\_US](http://www.kodak.com/eknec/PageQuerier.jhtml?pq-path=2/3/38&pq-locale=en_US)] -- OK, it's designed to sell stuff, but that doesn't mean it's bad. One of the best all-round photography primers that I've run across, with a wealth of information on all kinds of topics. In particular, I think the composition [[http://www.kodak.com/eknec/PageQuerier.jhtml?pq-path=38/315/332&pq-locale=en\\_US](http://www.kodak.com/eknec/PageQuerier.jhtml?pq-path=38/315/332&pq-locale=en_US)] section is worth a very close look.
- Photozone [<http://www.photozone.de/>] -- Excellent database of user ratings of SLR lenses; the system is built in such a way that the ratings actually mean something. Don't take it as the last word, but it is one of the more valuable data points on the topic of lenses. The data is solid and detailed, as only the Germans know how to do it...
- Lomography [<http://www.lomography.com/>] -- Check here for a refreshingly different, lo-fi view on photography.
- Depth of field essay [<http://www.photo.net/learn/optics/dofdigital/>] -- Everything you never thought you needed to know about depth of field and sensor size / film format.
- The Classic Camera Repair Forum [<http://www.kyphoto.com/classics/forum/>] -- I found out how to disassemble, clean, and (important) reassemble a 1936 vintage lens here. If you ever have a similar problem, this is the place to ask.
- Rob Galbraith's Digital Photography Insights [<http://www.robgalbraith.com/>] -- especially worthy of note is the compact flash performance database. Not that I ever take his advice...

Unless otherwise indicated, all materials on this site are by Petteri Sulonen. They are licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution License [<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/1.0/fi/>]. I would appreciate it if you dropped me a line if you want to reproduce them. Any trademarks are property of their respective owners; their use is purely editorial and does not constitute an infringement.