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Critics hail Harold Edgerton’s photographs not only as hallmarks of technological achievement, but also as works of art. Although Edgerton did not consider himself an artist, he clearly displayed an interest in aesthetics. Edgerton took dozens of frames to capture the perfect image to create a symmetrical crown for his famous “Milk Drop Coronet” photograph.

Which is more representative of a fast-moving object — hundreds of ‘flawed’ pictures or one that achieves visual perfection?