



Internet Bullying, Protocols & Safeguards

Ink Free # 4

August, 2024

By any measure, the major geomagnetic storms glancing off the earth during early May 2024 proved to be a massive event. Most people witnessed a combination of flares, CMS, X-rays, and superheated plasma expanded at a scale most humans might never fully comprehend. We should stand humbly in awe. What we observed, photographed, and admired, the Aurora Borealis, captivated our attention enough to alter our daily routines to stay up and even position ourselves to see skies of red, green, blue, and sometimes purple ribbons, streaks and glows.

Images from all over the world, even a few from the southern hemisphere capturing the Aurora Austrail, overwhelmed the social media, news broadcasts, and print media. G 5 class events pushed enough energy to light up our night skies well south than normal, and well north in the southern hemisphere, exposing more people than likely ever witnessing the dramatic color dances, displays, and irie glows. Genuinely unique, even if most

have no idea what they saw. According to NASA, there is no way yet to measure the amount of energy, heat, and other radiation. But massive it was. And it was beautiful.



Image by Rhonda Royse of the May 2024 Aurora and the Milky Way, Chiricahua Mountains, Arizona

Social media platforms surged with images. To me, that is special; it was a natural event that eclipsed all the rants, politics, commercial marketing, and the like for several days. Remarkable, well, so it appears at first scan.

Then, several California photographers posted that they are tired of so many AI-forced Aurora photos, especially those with over-saturated looks. Paragraphs of their complaints centered on the images posted are not what the human eye sees. The posts are more vivid. 'Damn, those photographers that push the saturation slider. They should know better, etc. Shame on them. Boo, Hiss Booooo. One complainant posted, "Don't post them here". For the record, I disagree with this gentleman, but I can respect his opinions.

Nowhere do they ponder how and why a digital camera provides a crisp, vivid image of a landscape, night sky, or anything else for that matter, but the cameras do. Even when capturing a photo in RAW (the raw digital data sticking to each pixel on the camera sensor), the image on the back of the camera results from a complex mathematical algorithm to take the data and produce an image. Most camera com-

panies tweak their math to create the most vivid reduring possible. It is called marketing. Even in software programs, the image that pops up is a mathematical reflection of what the sensor recorded. So the camera displays what the human eye might not see. OK, it is still the artist who determines what they like.

The sensors have filters over them that block out all of the electromagnetic spectrum except visible light. Some light we can not see does find its way to the sensor. Ok. Not the photographer's fault, right?

Without getting into the science/physics of light, the human eye and the modern complex sensors receive the same light. Some sensors record more reds, and some do not. The short conclusion is the camera does a better job of recording reds and vivid greens. Don't blame the photographer for starting with a more vivid set of colors. Yes, it is possible, and likely, many people do process their images, especially night photography, to enhance the saturation and reduce the noise.

A brief quote from the net sums up some of the differences between what a camera records and what humans can see:

The visible light spectrum ranges from violet light, which has a wavelength of around 400 nanometers, to red light, which has a wavelength of around 650 nanometers. Most people have three types of cone cells, and each color stimulates more than one cone. What color can humans not see Red-green and yellow-blue are the so-called "forbidden colors." Composed of pairs of hues whose light frequencies automatically cancel each other out in the human eye, they're supposed to be impossible to see simultaneously.

So, the social media folks who are so tired and offended by "over-saturated" Aurora images feel that those posts are dishonest. Maybe a few are, but many use what their camera gave them. That still is not the point. The photographer posting a glowing red sky behind an iconic saguaro cactus is doing so because they want to share the joy of witnessing a solar event of such staggering proportions that most would never have seen in their lifetime. They chose to share the excitement, joy, and wonderment.

Little do they know their images will be judged by someone they do not know by criteria that do not match the reason to share in the first place. Facebook's self-proclaimed critics constantly mock their giving and sharing joy and accuse them of cheating, dishonesty, and fake. Really!???

A few social media protocol suggestions, if I may.

- The social media contributor should **never**, post anything they do not want to be stolen,
- share anything personal, and
- know that if a post can be offensive to even one person, it will be.
 - Be prepared to be judged and bullied.
 - Let that runoff in the gutter.

Come on, guys, I respect your point of view only to ask you to respect mine in return. ***There is something very wrong with your spirit if you get pleasure from humiliating, embarrassing, and belittling other people.*** All these people posting wanted to do is share a rare event, that left them in awe of the power of nature, and the utter vastness of space. They wish to share a subject so personal to each while so naturally huge that it challenges our minds with wonder of forces and size we will never fully comprehend. Please let artists like yourselves be artists. Social media is not a contest, and it is not your personal space. It is social and should be respectful.



Ink Free

Is a new press less, type less, Ink less

Greg McKelvey

gempssphotos@gmail.com

Tucson, Arizona